

TEACHING AESTHETICS IN HIGH SCHOOL ART:
A DESCRIPTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION OF
TEACHERS' INTERPRETATIONS AND METHODOLOGIES

By

DELORES M. DIAZ

(Under the direction of Dr. Carole Henry)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the interpretation and implementation of the aesthetics component of the discipline-based curriculum by high school art teachers in Georgia. This study describes, analyzes, and evaluates high school art teachers' understandings of aesthetics, the role of aesthetics in their organizing philosophy and curricular structure, the problems they encounter in teaching aesthetics, and their methodologies for aesthetics instruction. This study, in effect, determines the coherence and efficacy of the aesthetics component of the discipline-based art curriculum in Georgia by examining the extent to which theory about teaching aesthetics has been translated into practice.

Although the theoretical foundation for this research is qualitative, it triangulates both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis of three instruments: personal interviews, a survey questionnaire, and documents. Constant-comparative and content analysis techniques were used to analyze the interviews and the documents. Contingency tables, chi-square, and Spearman's correlation were quantitative methods used to determine relationships among variables in the survey.

The three instruments all show that the aesthetics component has not been widely implemented for many theoretical and practical reasons: 1) the curriculum is poorly articulated, 2) teachers have weak training in the content and methods of teaching aesthetics, 3) teachers have only a vague understanding of aesthetics, 4) resource materials on aesthetics for the classroom teacher are scarce, and 5) readiness of students can be a problem in teaching aesthetics.

This research concludes with a conceptual model for aesthetics in the art curriculum and identifies the need for widespread initiatives to address three concerns identified in the study: 1) define aesthetics, its role in the art curriculum, and appropriate methodologies for instruction and assessment, 2) provide teacher training and resources for aesthetics instruction, and 3) establish a multi-directional web of communication to facilitate the alignment of theory and practice.

INDEX WORDS: Aesthetics, Art Education, Discipline-based art education, Curriculum, Qualitative research, Triangulation, Teacher training

TEACHING AESTHETICS IN HIGH SCHOOL ART:
A DESCRIPTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION OF
TEACHERS' INTERPRETATIONS AND METHODOLOGIES

by

DELORES M. DIAZ

B. A., The University of South Florida, 1967

M.Ed., North Georgia College and State University, 1982

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

© 2002

Delores M. Diaz

All Rights Reserved

TEACHING AESTHETICS IN HIGH SCHOOL ART:
A DESCRIPTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION OF
TEACHERS' INTERPRETATION AND METHODOLOGIES

by

DELORES M. DIAZ

Approved:

Major Professor: Carole Henry

Committee: W. Robert Nix
Pam Taylor
Richard Siegesmund
Bonnie Cramond

Electronic Version Approved:

Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2002

To my parents

Raymond and Loretta Montgomery
who taught me by example to seek
the good, the true, and the beautiful.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None of us makes life's journey alone. I often reflect upon the line from Tennyson's *Ulysses*, "I am a part of all that I have met," and think about how we influence and are influenced by the people around us. Countless people have accompanied me on this portion of my journey and have influenced its outcome in many ways. I offer each of them my deepest gratitude.

To my committee, thank you for your generosity and support. Dr. Carole Henry, my major professor, has been my lifeline during the turbulence, and Dr. W. Robert Nix has been my deep and steady anchor. I thank Dr. Pam Taylor, Dr. Richard Siegesmund, and Dr. Bonnie Cramond for their encouragement and expertise. I owe a special debt to Dr. Candace Stout, who inspired me to undertake this journey and led me during the difficult first steps.

To Mike Jordan, who helped me to understand and manage my statistics, no easy task . . .

To my professional colleagues all over the state who so generously shared their time and insights . . .

To Jane Hollingsworth, for her support and friendship . . .

To my family, for their understanding and encouragement . . .

But most of all, to my husband Joe, for his faith in me, his unwavering support, and his encouragement during times of frustration, I give my love now and through all of the journeys that lie ahead.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Rationale and Significance	4
Research Questions.....	5
II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	6
The Evolution of Aesthetics as a Curriculum Component	6
Rationale for Teaching Aesthetics	11
Aesthetics and Cognitive Developmental Theories.....	18
The Georgia State Visual Art Curriculum	25
Qualitative Methodology	31
III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	34
IV PILOT STUDY INTERVIEWS	37
Methodology.....	37
Description of Pilot Study Participants.....	40
Summary of Interview Responses	41

	Discussion and Conclusions	52
	Limitations	55
	Questions for Future Research.....	57
V	SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	58
	Methodology	58
	Description of Survey Sample	61
	Results of Survey by Theme.....	62
	Discussion of Results by Theme.....	97
	Conclusions and Implications.....	104
	Limitations	106
VI	DOCUMENTS AS DATA	108
	Methodology for Written Comments and Lesson Plans	108
	Summary of Written Comments	109
	Discussion of Written Comments.....	111
	Summary of Lesson Plans.....	112
	Discussion of Lesson Plans.....	114
	Conclusions: Written Comments and Lesson Plans	116
VII	CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS.....	119
	Conclusions.....	119
	Recommendations.....	121
	Implications and Contributions.....	129

REFERENCES	133
APPENDICES	144
A CONTACT LETTER FOR INTERVIEWS.....	144
B CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEWS.....	145
C DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR INTERVIEWEES	146
D SCHEDULE OF QUESTIONS FOR PERSONAL INTERVIEWS.....	147
E SURVEY COVER LETTER.....	148
F SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	149
G SECOND MAILING COVER LETTER.....	153
H LESSON PLAN REQUEST FORM.....	154
I LESSON PLAN-AESTHETICS FORM	155

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	A Synthesis of Developmental Cognitive Theories and Behavioral Theories with Implications for Aesthetics Instruction	24
5.1	Demographic Profile of Survey Participants	62
5.2	Comparison of Highest Art Degree (D-1) and Use of Curriculum Guide ((Q-1).....	64
5.3	Comparison of Experience (D-4) and Use of Curriculum Guide (Q-1)	65
5.4	Comparison of Use of State Curriculum Guide (Q-1) and Perceived Expectations of Curriculum Guide (Q-18).....	66
5.5	Comparison of Equal Emphasis of Components (Q-9) and Dominance of Production in Instruction.....	66
5.6	Comparison of Belief That Aesthetics Should Be Taught (Q-4) and Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32).....	67
5.7	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That Aesthetics Has No Concise Definition (Q-6)	68
5.8	Comparison of Preparation in Degree Program (Q-2) and Highest Art Degree (D-1)	71
5.9	Comparison of Highest Art Degree (D-1) and Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It.....	72
5.10	Comparison of Institution of Highest Art Degree (D-2) and Preparedness to Teach Aesthetics (Q-2)	73
5.11	Comparison of Year of Highest Art Degree (D-3) and Preparedness to Teach Aesthetics (Q-2)	74
5.12	Comparison of Year of Highest Art Degree (D-3) and Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It.....	74

5.13	Comparison of Perceived Preparedness (Q-2) and Belief That Aesthetics Is Analysis of Visual Elements (Q-10)	75
5.14	Comparison of Perceived Preparedness (Q-2) and Belief That Aesthetics is Description, Analysis, Interpretation, and Evaluation (Q-19).....	76
5.15	Comparison of Preparedness by Degree Program (Q-2) and Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q33)	77
5.16	Comparison of Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33) and Identifying Analysis of Visual Elements as Aesthetics (Q-10).....	78
5.17	Comparison of Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33) and Belief That Aesthetics is Description, Analysis, Interpretation, and Evaluation (Q-10).....	78
5.18	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Using the Curriculum Guide (Q-1)	82
5.19	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Preparedness by Degree Program (Q-2)	82
5.20	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33).....	83
5.21	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Ability to Conduct Student-Driven Discussions (Q-30).....	84
5.22	Comparison of Assessment for Aesthetics (Q-38) and Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32).....	84
5.23	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Providing Written Plans on Aesthetics (Q-17)	85
5.24	Comparison of Assessment for Aesthetics (Q-38) and Using Written Assessment for Aesthetics (Q-31).....	87
5.25	Comparison of Assessment for Aesthetics (Q-38) and Using Worksheets and Quizzes (Q-14).....	87
5.26	Comparison of Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33) and Belief That Aesthetics Has No Concise Definition (Q-6)	89

5.27	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That Students Need a Background in Production and Criticism (Q-16).....	90
5.28	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That Time Is a Constraint (Q-21).....	90
5.29	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That English Fluency Affects Readiness (Q-24)	91
5.30	Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That Academic Ability Affects Readiness (Q-37).....	92
5.31	Comparison of Belief That Students Dislike Aesthetics (Q-36) and Use of Worksheets and Quizzes (Q-14).....	93
5.32	Comparison of Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33) and Use of Worksheets and Quizzes (Q-14).....	94
5.33	Comparison of Planning for Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That Students Dislike Aesthetics (Q-36).....	95
5.34	Comparison of Planning for Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That Aesthetics is Too Difficult for Students (Q-29).....	96
7.1	The Structure of Aesthetics in the Art Curriculum.....	124

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Since the widespread adoption of a discipline based approach to art education (DBAE), most state art curricula now address studio production, art history, art criticism and aesthetics. The idea behind a discipline-based approach is to afford a more holistic understanding of art. Making art, interpreting and evaluating art and understanding the origins and nature of art are all inherently part of visual arts study. However, aesthetics as a component in a discipline based art curriculum has been the subject of much discourse among art educators over the last two decades because of a lack of consensus regarding the meaning of aesthetics and its role in the art curriculum. Philosophers and educators have debated multiple issues surrounding the inclusion of aesthetics in the visual arts curriculum (Crawford, 1987; Eaton, 1994; Geahigan, 1987; Hagaman, 1988; Hamblen, 1987; Lankford, 1992; Parsons, 1994; Reimer, 1987; Smith, 1987). Some have produced frameworks and strategies to facilitate the teaching of aesthetics (Battin, Fisher, Moore & Silvers, 1989; Delacruz, 1988; Lankford, 1992; Lipman, 1988; Moore, 1995; Stewart, 1997). However, very little actual research has been conducted on the translation of the theory of aesthetics in education into practice by the classroom art teacher (Burton, 1998; Delacruz & Dunn, 1996; Fisher, 1991; Lankford, 1992; Parsons & Blocker, 1993; Zimmerman, 1998). Related studies describe art teachers' attitudes and knowledge about aesthetics (Erickson, 1986; Fisher, 1991; Jewell, 1990; Richardson, 1982), the amount of

time art teachers spend on non-studio instruction (Mims & Lankford, 1995), the implementation of a self-designed aesthetics unit (Venable, 1997), the effect on instructional choices of dissonance between internal beliefs about art education and external constraints (Bullock & Galbraith, 1992; Erickson, 1986; Fisher, 1991; Richardson, 1982), and self-realization through multicultural aesthetics (Lifschitz, 1999). These studies contribute important information about the teaching of aesthetics, but they do not reflect how art teachers actually interpret and implement the aesthetic component in the classroom. Actual teaching practices may be the most accurate measure of art teachers' attitudes and knowledge about aesthetics because teachers purposefully plan instruction around the content and skills that they think are most important and/or in which they have the most competence (Bullock & Galbraith, 1992; Galbraith, 1990; Richardson, 1982; Richardson, Anders, Tidwell & Lloyd, 1990). Bullock and Galbraith (1992) recommend extensive case studies of art teachers' understandings and practices to enable researchers in art education to develop a field-based understanding that could lead to theories about art teachers' knowledge and instructional approaches to teaching aesthetics. This dissertation addresses the needs outlined by Bullock and Galbraith.

Although the accumulation and classification of data is a necessary first step before the formulation of theory (Cohen & Manion, 1995), the National Art Education Association (NAEA) Research Task Force on Instruction (Carroll & Key, 1998) reports a continuing lack of comprehensive studies on methods of instruction related to specific content, such as aesthetics, upon which practice and theory might be informed. Zimmerman (1998) specifically addresses the need for research in the discipline of aesthetics. The Research Task Force on Conceptual Issues (Marschalek & Rayala, 1998)

also targets aesthetics and identifies salient questions as a focus for research in aesthetics and criticism to contribute to a rethinking of the philosophical foundation of art education. Following are specific questions for research that were identified by the task force:

What is aesthetics and what is its purpose in a pluralistic art education? How does culture shape aesthetic experiences, aesthetic judgments, and responses? What new conceptual models of aesthetics are necessary to attend to social/cultural issues, diversity, new forms of art, and synthetic environments? How are aesthetics and criticism conceptually different and similar? What new conceptions of criticism are necessary to respond to the vast diversity of imagery in contemporary society? What means do art educators use to judge the appropriateness of images for public display in K-12 learning environments? What conceptual issues frame these questions? (Marschalek & Rayala, 1998, p. 11)

These questions are representative of the range of conceptual issues for research that can help to define the role of aesthetics in art education.

Purpose of the Study

Research that describes the depth and breadth of current teaching practices in aesthetics can help to answer some of these research questions from the classroom teachers' perspective, providing a valuable step towards the development of grounded theory for the discipline. The purpose of this dissertation is to determine the current interpretation and implementation of the aesthetics component by high school art teachers

in Georgia. This study describes, analyzes, and evaluates high school art teachers' understandings of aesthetics, the role of aesthetics in their organizing philosophy and curricular structure, problems they encounter in teaching aesthetics, and their chosen teaching methodologies for aesthetics instruction.

Rationale and Significance

This dissertation grew from a personal need-to-know. Following the adoption in 1997 of a state art curriculum that included aesthetics as a component, I realized that I needed to learn more about aesthetics and the methods for teaching it. Neither the state curriculum guide nor our adopted textbooks provided helpful information on the content and methods for teaching aesthetics. In both sources, aesthetics and criticism were used nearly synonymously. It was both comforting and disturbing to discover through casual conversation that my colleagues shared my confusion. Soon afterwards, a graduate course in aesthetics and criticism provided me with a foundation in aesthetics and a determination to confront what I perceived to be theoretical and practical weaknesses in the aesthetics component of our state art curriculum.

A preliminary investigation of professional literature revealed that the ambiguities about aesthetics in the Georgia art curriculum reflect a general and pervasive lack of consensus regarding the content and role of aesthetics that has plagued art education since 1960. Consequently, the goal of this dissertation is to provide information that will help to determine the coherence and efficacy of the aesthetics component of the current discipline based art curriculum in Georgia by examining the extent to which theory about the teaching of aesthetics has been translated into practice. It will also identify internal

and external constraints that influence choices that art teachers make regarding teaching aesthetics, art teachers' strengths and weaknesses in teaching aesthetics, and resources, materials, and methods that art teachers use for instruction in aesthetics. Such data may have implications for teacher training, curriculum revision, and materials development.

Research Questions

One central research question and six supporting questions provide the focus for this dissertation. The central research question is this: How has theory about the teaching of aesthetics been translated into practice by high school art teachers in Georgia? In order to make that determination, six other supporting questions must be asked: Do art teachers teach aesthetics? How do art teachers define aesthetics? What is the role of aesthetics in their organizing structure? What methodologies do they use for teaching aesthetics? What resources do they use for teaching aesthetics? What problems, if any, influence their teaching of aesthetics? The answers to these questions will provide a detailed description of the interpretation and implementation of the aesthetics component by high school teachers in Georgia.

CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Evolution of Aesthetics as a Curriculum Component

This study is based upon three assumptions derived from the related literature of general education, art education, psychology, philosophy, and research. The first assumption is that art teachers should teach aesthetics in some form (Barkan, 1962 & 1966; Csikszentmihalyi & Schiefele, 1987; Geahigan, 1987; Greer, 1984; Parsons, 1994; Reimer, 1987; Smith, 1987). The second is that aesthetics is a discipline with identifiable content and appropriate methods and materials (Battin, Fisher, Moore & Silvers, 1989; Broudy, 1972; Eaton, 1994; Eisner, 1998; Greer, 1984; Hamblen, 1997; Lankford, 1992; Lipman, 1988; Stewart, 1997; Van de Pitte, 1994). The final assumption is that the practice of aesthetics is describable, which means that there are observable and therefore assessable behaviors associated with aesthetics (Clark & Zimmerman, 1978; Crawford, 1987; Erickson, 1986; Erickson & Katter, 1986; Stewart, 1997).

The assumption that art teachers should teach aesthetics follows a twenty-five year chronology of contributions by philosophers and educators whose translations of theory have directly influenced the form and substance of art education today. During the period from 1959 to 1984, emphasis shifted from empirical to philosophical aesthetics, and the role of aesthetics expanded from an organizing concept to a subject of study for students. The advent of the Cold War in the 1950s led to the Wood's Hole Conference of 1959 organized for the purpose of determining ways to improve the

curriculum, specifically in science and mathematics. At the conference, psychologist Jerome Bruner (1960) concluded that in order to improve learning, isolated subjects should be replaced by disciplines, fields of inquiry practiced by professionals, and that the structure of each discipline could be taught in some intellectually honest form to students of all ages. The structure of the discipline refers to the broad underlying principles that are foundational for understanding the more complex learning in the discipline. Barkan (1962) rallied art educators around Bruner's findings and introduced the concept of art as a discipline and the artist as a model of behavior. Although Barkan did not mention aesthetics as a subject of study at this time, aesthetics figured prominently in his statement of goals for art education in which he addressed the cognitive nature of sensory perception. The goal of instruction in studio production, art history, and art criticism, according to Barkan, is to formulate ideas of aesthetic significance and to develop aesthetic sensibility.

Aesthetics gained impetus as an organizing concept for art education at the Pennsylvania State Conference in 1965. This conference, funded by the Arts and Humanities Program of the U.S. Office of Education, aimed to examine all aspects of art education with the intent of stimulating research and curriculum development. Barkan (1966) summarized the curriculum findings which endorsed art as a discipline with its own unique structure composed of studio production, art history, and art criticism with the professional as model. Aesthetic education as a curriculum concept was an "invisible theme" throughout the conference (Efland, 1984, p. 210). That same year, Ralph A. Smith produced a provocative anthology *Aesthetics and Criticism in Art Education* (Smith, 1966) and inaugurated the *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. Smith's work served

to broaden the scope of art education to include the aesthetic dimension of all of the visual and performing arts and life itself and to broaden the theoretical and practical foundations of art education to include aesthetics, philosophy of art, and criticism.

Four years later, the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) produced a guide for curriculum development for aesthetic education (Barkan, Chapman & Kern, 1970). The goal of aesthetic education as stated in the CEMREL guide was “to increase the student’s capacity for experiencing aesthetic qualities in the arts and the general environment” by “providing opportunities for aesthetic experience and opportunities to build the skills and knowledge necessary for significant aesthetic encounters” (Barkan, Chapman & Kern, 1970, p.9). An aesthetic experience was defined in the guide as any experience that is valued intrinsically. It is significant to note that CEMREL recognized a teachable body of skills and knowledge for developing aesthetic sensibility. Also significant is a structure which included all of the several arts in a juxtaposed rather than an integrated structure. In theory, their common aesthetic qualities would provide the structure of the curriculum while maintaining the integrity of each of the individual arts. The structure distinguished aesthetic education from humanities programs, which are unified by themes. Aesthetic education would complement, rather than replace, a regular art program in the general curriculum. The goals of aesthetic education were aligned with those of general education in that they encouraged personal development, transmitted cultural heritage, and sought to maintain and transform society (Barkan, Chapman & Kern, 1970). In the CEMREL program, enhanced aesthetic perception was both a goal and an organizing concept.

Following CEMREL, aesthetic education as a curricular concept became the concern of many scholars and educators who lacked consensus on the meaning and use of the term (Broudy, 1977). The work of philosopher Harry Broudy, an advocate of aesthetic education, was especially influential in the direction that art education would take over the next decade. Broudy (1966) justified aesthetic education as a foundational discipline in general education because of the unique form of cognition in aesthetic perception. According to Broudy, meaning in aesthetic perception could be controlled by the systematic identification of sensory, formal, and expressive properties of objects. Broudy's formal approach to the enhancement of aesthetic perception gave rise to a method for art criticism known as aesthetic scanning. Although aesthetic scanning is identified with art criticism, it is important because it marks a shift in emphasis from percipience, or sensory perception, and towards the cognition associated with interpretation. With Barkan and Broudy, aesthetics was included in theory about curriculum. It was part of teacher preparation rather than content for pupils (Lanier, 1985).

Lanier (1980) discussed weaknesses inherent in aesthetic education and proposed instead a curriculum for general education based on visual aesthetic literacy. Aesthetic education, according to Lanier, assumed an elitist concept of art, focused on criticism to the exclusion of aesthetics, and directed study towards the art objects. In addition, he argued that teachers cannot specialize in all of the arts and that time constraints preclude all but a superficial treatment of any of them. Aesthetic literacy, conversely, included only the visual arts, fine and vernacular, and focused on questions and problems of theory, simplified for age and grade levels, directing study towards the viewer and the

viewer's response. The only proper model for the student is the aesthete, who attempts to clarify the process of aesthetic response (Lanier, 1974). Teaching aesthetic literacy would require a dialogue, or non-studio, curriculum because the skills and knowledge required for the understandings on which response is based are different from those employed by the artist (Lanier, 1980). Lanier's dialogue curriculum involved looking at and talking and reading about art using skills that are inherent in the non-studio art disciplines of aesthetics, art criticism, and art history. Whereas aesthetic education, as described by Broudy, is systematic and scientific, aesthetic literacy is inquiry driven and philosophical. The value of including aesthetics in the curriculum, according to these theories, is that it not only enhances the aesthetic response, but it permits a theoretical level of motivation unavailable in art history, criticism, and production (Lanier, 1984).

The evolution of aesthetics in art education culminated in a conceptual model that specifically included aesthetics as a subject of study. This model was promoted jointly by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and W. Dwaine Greer (1984). Greer called this approach Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) and defined it as the integrated teaching of the four content disciplines of art: studio production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. He specified the need for a formal, continuous, sequential, written curriculum across grade levels similar to those of other academic subjects. This organization aimed to promote a deeper understanding of art by focusing on interconnected ideas rather than on isolated components and thus to facilitate transfer among the disciplines (Drake, 1993; Efland, 1995; Greer, 1984; Jacobs, 1989; Stewart, 1997). The interconnected ideas that bind the four disciplines are a shared subject, the

processes and products of art, and assumptions about the underlying values in each (Crawford, 1987). DBAE has been widely interpreted over the years (Moore, 1993). Diblasio (1985) interprets the aesthetic domain of DBAE as having a framework for developing aesthetic sensibility, based on aesthetic scanning, and a framework for philosophy of art, based on conceptual analysis. However, Moore (1993) asserts that aesthetics in DBAE was understood to be philosophical, evidenced by the fact that philosophical aestheticians were involved in designing the program. Most states have now adopted a discipline-based approach to their art curricula and include aesthetics as one of the components (NCES, 1999).

Rationale for Teaching Aesthetics

The rationale for including aesthetics as the fourth discipline is attributed to the unique contributions that aesthetics makes to the *curriculum* and to the *metacurriculum* (Ackerman & Perkins, 1989). The curriculum is built upon the content and concepts of a discipline that provide its underlying structure. The metacurriculum concerns the cognitive skills necessary for acquiring content and concepts and is based upon behaviors of professional models in each discipline. The curricular concerns of aesthetics are grounded in both philosophy and science. Sharer (1986) discussed the dual nature of aesthetics by pointing out that the adjective *aesthetic* refers to areas of empirical inquiry, and the noun *aesthetics* refers to areas of philosophical inquiry. Philosophical aesthetics is speculative and examines the nature and meaning of art and concepts basic to art production and criticism. Scientific aesthetics explores empirical matters, such as the dynamics of creation, appreciation, and context (Smith, 1987). Scientific aesthetics as

sensory perception and response to objects in the environment is a form of cognition and the subject of inquiry of philosophers such as John Dewey, Susanne Langer, and Nelson Goodman. To Dewey (1934), art, the subject of aesthetics, is a source of knowledge and insight. According to Langer (1953), aesthetics as a mode of cognition utilizes a symbol system that is distinct from the symbol system of language. Goodman (1968) elaborates this theory by developing a system to explain the intrinsic and extrinsic symbolic functions of art. The symbol system approach to intelligence is the basis for Gardner's (1983) Theory of Multiple Intelligences upon which much current educational reform is based. In Gardner's theory, aesthetics in the visual arts corresponds to spatial intelligence, which is tied to the concrete world of objects and their location in the world. Aesthetic perception is one of several domains of intelligence through which students learn and, therefore, a vital consideration in curriculum design and teaching philosophy (Csikszentmihalyi & Schiefele, 1987; Geahigan, 1987; Parsons, 1994; Reimer, 1987; Smith, 1987).

The assumption that aesthetics has identifiable content and appropriate models and resources is complicated from the outset because of the lack of consensus on its definition. It is what philosopher George Dickie calls "an untidy discipline" (1974, p. 109). The word *aesthetics* is derived from the Greek *aisthetikos*, meaning sensitive, and *aisthanesthai*, meaning to perceive or feel (Webster's, 1997). The term *aesthetics* was first used by the philosopher Baumgarten in 1735 in an attempt to describe the science of sensory cognition (Dickie, 1997). The more recent and broadest application of the term *aesthetics* defines it as that branch of philosophy that deals with the nature of art.

Philosophical aesthetics addresses questions such as, “What is art? What is the role of art in society? How do we respond to art? What is the nature of creativity?”

Until the eighteenth century, the theory of art was primarily an object-centered theory of beauty. During the eighteenth century, the focus of theories of art shifted from the art object to the response to art, what we now call the aesthetic experience, and theories of taste evolved, followed in the twentieth century by the aesthetic attitude theory (Dickie, 1997). Subsequent to Baumgarten, attempts to define *aesthetics* have struggled with the task of applying philosophical rationalism to the feelings and emotions in human thinking (Townsend, 1997). Traditional conservative aesthetic theories that ascribe necessary conditions for art are now challenged by a new aesthetics that is open-ended (Weitz, 1968) and contextual.

Van de Pitte (1994) articulates the problem of defining aesthetics for art educators. She cautions that teaching only the new aesthetics may tend to trivialize art because the focus of the new aesthetics is on the contextual and instrumental aspects of art, rather than on its conceptual, formal, or expressive qualities. Van de Pitte recommends attending to both the new and the traditional classificatory views in attempting to describe the nature of art. Eaton (1994) offered a more inclusive definition. She defined philosophical aesthetics as the study of the nature and components of aesthetic experience. The aesthetic experience is a complex cognitive and affective response to visual objects (Csikszentmihalyi, 1978). Focusing on the aesthetic experience admits both an open-ended concept of art and consideration of other objects and the environment. Berleant (1992) advocated a general theory that encompasses both art and nature based on the premise that perceptions of both are cultural constructs. Drawing

from the work of several modern philosophers and educators (Crawford, 1987; Dickie, 1977; Efland, 1979; Greer, 1987; Hamblen, 1987; Lanier, 1986), Eaton identified the components of aesthetic experience as the objects (the artworks), the makers (the artists), the attenders (the viewers and critics), and the context (society) (1994).

In art education, one misuse of the term *aesthetics* derives from metacriticism, the philosophy of criticism, which analyzes concepts of description, interpretation, and evaluation used by critics (Dickie, 1997). In practice, aesthetics for many has become synonymous with aesthetic scanning, Broudy's model for art criticism popularized in art textbooks (Eaton, 1994). Contributing to this misuse of the term, the newly revised art curriculum for Georgia (Georgia Department of Education, 1998) links criticism and aesthetics in a single strand, but the content standards have to do primarily with judging works of art. Armstrong (1996) noted that unless roles and standards are clearly defined in curricula, art teachers can easily ignore aesthetics. Until recently, available textbooks, such as *Art Talk* (Ragans, 1988) and *Art in Focus* (Mittler, 1989), defined aesthetics as having to do with what makes art beautiful or satisfying and aesthetic qualities as literal, visual, or expressive cues within a work of art. Both books associated aesthetics only with the perception or the response to visual qualities of works of art and subsumed aesthetics under art criticism. Neither the student textbooks nor the resource materials addressed aesthetics as philosophical inquiry. With so little information available, most art teachers had little upon which to base the teaching of aesthetics in the classroom (Van de Pitte, 1994). Lankford (1992) pointed out the dilemma of the art teacher whose only exposure to aesthetics might have been an occasional reference in college courses and who is confronted by the specialized and unfamiliar language of books on aesthetics.

The content of aesthetics, according to Erickson (1986), centers upon the concerns of the professional aesthetician. These concerns are concepts such as aesthetic experience, theories such as expressionism, and issues such as classification of the arts. However, formal aesthetics must be translated for art education (Broudy, 1988). Children can learn aesthetics if the language is simplified and clarified for their developmental level (Adler, 1982; Bruner, 1960; Lanier, 1985).

The metacurriculum of aesthetics assumes that students learn by emulating the behavior of aestheticians (Bruner, 1960; Foshay, 1966; Miles, 1964). The goal of emulating professionals is to develop behaviors and patterns of thinking that remain after specific study in a discipline has ended and to provide learning strategies that can be applied not only to artworks, but to other objects in the environment as well (Barkan, 1962; Greer, 1984; Hamblen, 1997). These qualities have also been called “dispositional outcomes” by Eisner (1998, p.14) and “traits of mind” by Paul (1994, p. 318). The tasks of the discipline-based art curriculum designer are not only to define the content of the four component disciplines, but to identify behaviors and thought processes of professionals in each.

Among the behaviors and skills of aestheticians are critical thinking skills associated with all philosophy. The general skills of philosophy include listening, making distinctions, identifying assumptions, reasoning, questioning, evaluating, defining concepts, drawing conclusions, and imagining (Erickson, 1986; Stewart, 1997) These skills are among those that Eisner (1998) called the “cognitive dispositions” (p. 15) basic to the arts and first tier aims of art education. The problem for curriculum designers is to determine the curricular organization that best facilitates the development of these critical

skills. If the critical skills of aesthetics are the core of the art curriculum as Eisner suggested, then the other three disciplines might be subsumed under aesthetics.

Conversely, if the critical skills of aesthetics are at the core of the other three disciplines, then aesthetics might be absorbed into each of them. The third alternative, to teach aesthetics as a separate discipline, would be impossible because aesthetics cannot be separated from its subject, the other three disciplines of studio production, art history, and art criticism. Hamblen (1987) suggested that the integrated art curriculum has served to obscure the individual disciplines and recommends having lessons specific to the four areas. Otherwise, teachers with limited understanding of aesthetics or lack of confidence in their ability to deal with philosophical inquiry can easily exclude aesthetics altogether.

Models and materials for teaching aesthetics are few, but within the last two decades some writers have begun to address the need for resources. One model for instruction has been produced by Lipman (1988) and the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children (IAPC). Philosophers at IAPC have developed a series of novels and child-centered stories with teacher's manuals that deal with issues from a variety of fields of philosophy, including aesthetics. The objective of the program is to stimulate critical thinking and philosophical inquiry through dialogue in a community of inquiry (Hagaman, 1990). More recently, Lankford (1992) and Moore (1995) have produced practical resource materials that address the theoretical foundations for teaching aesthetics and the content of aesthetics for teachers. Others have produced practical resources that contain activities for teaching aesthetics (Battin, Fisher, Moore, & Silvers, 1989; Stewart, 1997). The development and availability of other materials such as these may help to facilitate the teaching of aesthetics as a discipline.

Models and materials for teaching are constructed around goals, objectives or outcomes for instruction in a discipline, and in a formal educational setting, attainment of these goals is measured in terms of observable behaviors. The final assumption upon which this study is based is that there are observable behaviors associated with teaching and learning aesthetics. Art teachers do not need to be aestheticians (Lankford, 1992), but they must have a basic understanding of aesthetics along with the attitudes and skills they want their students to learn (Erickson, 1986; Kaelin, 1990; Lankford, 1992). For example, the teacher must be adept in the Socratic method (Adler, 1982). In his famous dialogues, Socrates used questioning strategies in seeking definitions for important concepts. Although concepts such as the nature of art cannot be defined, the Socratic method of philosophical inquiry is a valuable tool for the teacher of aesthetics. Adler (1982) has identified 18 behaviors associated with the Socratic method that could easily be identified in a clinical observation. Pretending not to know the right answer and repeating and rephrasing questions are two examples of these observable teaching behaviors.

Erickson (1986) has compiled an extensive list of attitudinal, skill, and knowledge objectives for the learner of aesthetics and has developed a detailed curriculum around them (Erickson & Katter, 1986). Since these objective behaviors associated with aesthetics are based upon dialogue and inquiry, then language activities can be used as a measure of the mastery of the vocabulary and the underlying thinking skills of aesthetics. Oral and written activities using case studies are one method that can be adapted for this purpose (Battin, Fisher, Moore & Silvers, 1989; Moore, 1993; Stewart, 1997). The

observer or assessor must first be able to identify the vocabulary associated with aesthetics and to classify students' responses.

The problems of defining the content of aesthetics as a discipline, defining the role of aesthetics in the curriculum, and providing models and materials for instruction must begin with an analysis of current understandings and practices of classroom art teachers. Little information exists about the interpretation and implementation of aesthetics by classroom art teachers whose responsibility it is to implement the discipline-based curriculum. The problem remains to determine if there is a relationship between theory and practice in aesthetics. That determination can only be based on knowledge of how art teachers currently interpret and implement aesthetics in art instruction. This study will contribute to that determination by describing, analyzing, and evaluating art teachers' understandings of aesthetics, the role of aesthetics in their organizing philosophy and curricular structure, constraints that guide choices regarding aesthetics, and teaching methodologies for aesthetics.

Aesthetics and Cognitive Developmental Theories

In his statement, "Artistry is first and foremost an activity of the mind," Gardner (1983, p. 103) at once provided the rationale for teaching aesthetics in an integrated art curriculum. Eaton (1994) agreed that thinking about art is crucial to artistic activity and that it "stimulates and reinforces creativity" (p.20). Crawford (1987) also stressed the interrelationship of aesthetics, the critical reflection on art, and the art disciplines of production and appreciation, art history, and art criticism, which are its subject matter.

Children can be introduced to critical thinking about art as soon as they begin to ask “Why?”. Eaton (1994) explained as follows:

The why-question is at the heart of philosophy, and the readiness with which it is asked is the sure sign that all human beings are philosophers by nature. When “Why?” is directed at artworks, students are able and willing to do philosophy of art or philosophical aesthetics. (p. 21)

Henry (1995) supported early instruction in aesthetics. She found that middle school children who had little background in art nevertheless revealed personal concepts of art as they recounted a museum visit. The responses of these children paralleled four major aesthetic theories: mimesis, formalism, expressivism, and institutionalism. Henry concluded, “Introduction to aesthetic theory, presented in an age-appropriate manner and made relevant to students’ lives, can then be an integral component of the school art curriculum” (p. 54).

Adler (1982) proposed teaching philosophy to students beginning at age 12, but Hagaman (1990) disagreed. She said, “It may be true that this [age 12] is the appropriate time to teach formal logic, but it is late to *begin* dialogues with children about issues from aesthetics” (p. 1).

The first step in finding ways to teach aesthetics to children is to align instruction with the students’ stages of cognitive and emotional development (Moore, 1994). Many educators, psychologists, and philosophers have explored the developmental aspects of cognition in philosophical aesthetics. Some have applied developmental theory to aesthetics and have identified and classified various cognitive stages that have significance in planning for aesthetics instruction. The remainder of this section

describes and compares some of these theories that contribute to a developmental rationale for aesthetics instruction.

Responding to the need for a common language for communication among college evaluators, Bloom and his colleagues (1956) created a taxonomy of cognitive educational objectives. This taxonomy classified educational objectives in terms of observable and assessable student behaviors grouped in a hierarchy from simple to complex. The idea behind the taxonomy is that complex behaviors build on the simpler ones and that weakness at the lower or simpler levels can inhibit the development of more complex behaviors. The six major classes identified in the taxonomy and ranked from simple to complex are the following: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Although the taxonomy was not directed at the arts, the behavioral objectives it identifies have driven instructional planning and curriculum design in all academic disciplines since it was introduced.

Parsons (1987) felt that behavior was not equivalent to understanding. He focused on the different forms of knowledge and meaning in art and the kind of cognition associated with each. Parsons identified three kinds of cognition in art and the worlds they deal with: the empirical, the external world of objects; the moral, the social world of norms; and the aesthetic, the inner world of self. Parsons offered a theory of aesthetic cognition that has five stages, or sequential clusters of ideas, loosely organized around a dominant insight. These stages only generally correspond to age until adolescence, when circumstances become more important than age. At each stage, Parsons discussed aesthetic topics that are understood differently at each stage: subject matter; emotional

expression; medium form and style; and the nature of judgment. The five stages and a brief summary of some of the characteristics of each are as follows:

1. Stage One: Favoritism. Preschoolers fall into this stage. They are highly egocentric, enjoy appearances for their own sake, and have little awareness of the point of view of others.
2. Stage Two: Beauty and Realism. This category describes elementary school students. The dominant idea is the subject. Realism, skill, and beauty are criteria for judgment. Students begin to acknowledge the viewpoint of others and to associate some aesthetic qualities with the artwork.
3. Stage Three: Expressiveness. This stage may begin in adolescence. The important element here is the quality of the feelings experienced by the artist or the viewer. Students look beyond beauty, skill, and realism for criteria for judgment.
4. Stage Four: Style and Form. If stages four and five appear at all, it is usually in adulthood. Art exists in a tradition, and its meaning is socially constructed. Because the viewpoints of others are important, art criticism can be useful. Judgment can be objective.
5. Stage Five: Autonomy. Judgment is both an individual and a social responsibility. The student questions established views.

As students develop through these five stages, they move from dependence to autonomy.

As autonomous adults, they are capable of mature aesthetic responses.

Informed by Gardner (1983), Lankford (1992) identified three developmental levels of aesthetic inquiry. At the Foundations Level, roughly corresponding to the

primary grades of K-4, students begin to develop a vocabulary of terms and concepts through involvement in media and production and looking and talking about art. At the Vivid Case Level, associated with the upper elementary and middle school grades, students begin to form judgments and explore the expressive and social functions of art by examining issues of limited scope, such as those in the puzzles assembled by Battin, Fisher, Moore, and Silvers (1989). At the third level, the Complex Issue Level, adolescents extend their thinking beyond the particular and into the general. Students explore multiple points of controversy and deal with ambiguities.

Lipman (1988) was concerned with teaching philosophy in school, not specifically with aesthetic inquiry. However, the five stages of philosophical inquiry he described have similarities to those of Parsons and Lankford. Some points of emphasis of each stage are as follows:

1. Grades K- 2. Language acquisition, perceptual awareness, child's own implicit reasoning skills
2. Grades 3-4. Language acquisition, semantical and syntactical structures, philosophical notions such as causality
3. Grades 5-6. Beginning of formal and informal logic, development of alternative modes of thought, scientific inquiry
4. Grades 7-10. Elementary philosophical specialization as in ethics, social issues, giving reasons to justify beliefs
5. Grades 11-12. Advanced philosophical specialization in ethics, epistemology, metaphysics, aesthetics, and logic

Lipman and his colleagues developed appropriate materials for instruction in philosophy for the first four stages. Materials for grades 11 and 12 are currently being developed.

Paul (1995) identified and ranked seven critical thinking abilities: identification and recognition; comprehension, comparing and clarifying; application; analysis; synthesis; evaluation; and creation or generation. These abilities are nearly identical to Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of behaviors except that Paul added the category of creation as a seventh ability that follows evaluation. This addition is significant because it recognizes that all of the other activities culminate in the autonomous and forward directed activities of creation as seen in theory forming or making art. Creative thinking may be one common skill that links and promotes transfer between philosophy and production.

The table that follows (Table 2.1) synthesizes the ideas about aesthetics and cognition that were discussed above. The grade level designations are an attempt to give a sense of the progression of cognitive development and should not be interpreted literally. Most of the writers specifically stated that cognitive development is more dependent upon experience than upon age. Hamblen (1985) addressed this issue in her framework for teaching aesthetic literacy. Hamblen's framework identifies six levels of experience or readiness. Levels one through three, which Hamblen says are appropriate for any age or readiness level, apply the cognitive functions associated with perception and criticism. Levels four through six, which are optional in her plan, involve inductive theory forming characteristic of philosophy.

Table 2.1. A Synthesis of Developmental Cognitive and Behavioral Theories
With Implications for Aesthetics Instruction

Grade Level	Cognitive Skills of Aesthetics Lipman (1988) and Parsons (1987)	Behaviors Bloom (1956), Lankford (1992), Paul (1994)
PK-4	Egocentrism ; favoritism; appearances enjoyed for own sake; unaware of point of view of others; perceptual awareness; language acquisition, semantical and syntactical structures, judgment equals liking	Knowledge : Uses vocabulary of terms and concepts; produces art Comprehension : Looks at and talks about art
5-6	Realism , skill and beauty are criteria for judgment; subject is of primary importance; begins to acknowledge point of view of others; some aesthetic qualities associated with artwork; form is a function of subject; formal and informal logic begin; scientific inquiry	Application : Applies studio techniques; examines issues of limited scope; forms judgments; solves puzzles
7-10	Expressiveness ; feelings of artist and viewer are important; look to ideas and effectiveness of work for criteria for judgment; aware of own interpretation; elementary philosophical activity; open-mindedness; able to give reasons	Analysis : Explores expressive and social functions of art; recognizes style
11-12	Style and form are significant; familiar with traditions in art; understands art as a social construct; viewpoints of others are important; art criticism is useful; judgment can be objective; advanced philosophical specialization	Synthesis : Explains significance of style; relates art form to context Evaluation : Compares and contrasts ideas
Adult	Autonomy ; judgment is both an individual and a social responsibility; established views are subject to question; mature aesthetic judgment	Creation : Generalizes and theorizes; makes art

The information compiled in this table leads to conclusions that have implications for aesthetics instruction. First, the skills of aesthetic cognition progress from simple to complex. The teacher must aim instructional content at the level of the students, wherever they may be on the progression. This means, for example, that teachers of

seniors may have to teach lessons that stress the vocabulary of art or the style of expressionism before their students can progress to the more aesthetically complex activity of relating form to content. Second, students progress through stages that begin with egocentrism, develop into empathy, and mature with autonomy. Teachers must formulate questions, set goals, and choose exemplars that are suitable for their students' level of understanding of others.

The content and skills of aesthetics, as discussed in this section and outlined in Table 2.1, are one important organizing center for curriculum design. They can be the links that facilitate transfer in an integrated art curriculum.

The Georgia State Visual Art Curriculum

The intent of the Georgia Quality Core Curriculum (QCC) is to provide a theoretical and practical framework upon which local systems may build entire art programs and structure individual courses. Understanding the underlying framework of the art curriculum is necessary in order to identify structural weaknesses that may contribute to problems that classroom art teachers encounter in teaching aesthetics. The following discussion of the QCC analyzes curricular materials available to art teachers at their schools or on the Georgia Department of Education (DOE) website.

The current status of aesthetics in the visual art curriculum for Georgia results from reform introduced by the Georgia Quality Basic Education (QBE) Act of 1986. Among other reforms, the QBE Act requires the development of a uniformly sequenced Quality Core Curriculum (QCC) for grades K through 12. The original QCC, which was implemented in 1988, specifies 76 competencies that students must master before

graduation and provides a framework for achieving them. Content standards at each grade level or for each high school course define what students should know and be able to do towards attaining the competencies. The QCC reflects a discipline-based approach to teaching and learning in the visual arts.

The introduction to the visual art section of the 1988 QCC identifies four strands: perceptual awareness, production of artworks, artistic heritage, and art criticism and aesthetics. These four strands vary from the four disciplines of studio, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics introduced in DBAE in 1984. The obvious differences are that in the QCC, perceptual awareness is treated separately from criticism and aesthetics, and criticism and aesthetics are combined into one strand.

Separating perception from aesthetics is problematic because, as discussed earlier in this chapter, perception is a form of cognition and one of the concerns of aesthetics. In fact, some of the objectives for the perceptual awareness strand overlap those for criticism and aesthetics. For example, objective five, “Explains how compositional principles contribute to an artwork’s expressive content,” is an activity normally associated with art criticism. Objective six, “Explains the relationships of decorative and functional qualities in utilitarian artworks,” goes beyond mere perception and into speculation about form and function (QCC, 1988).

The nature of the standards in the combined art criticism and aesthetics strand shifts dramatically between grades eight and nine, the point at which art becomes fragmented into separate course offerings. The QCC concepts for K-8 specifically include philosophical aesthetics. For example, one standard for grade two states, “Discusses own definition of art,” and a standard for grade 8 states, “Reads statements on

the nature of art by philosophers giving reasons for agreement or disagreement with each philosopher” (QCC, 1988). Beginning with grade nine, however, standards for the criticism and aesthetics strand are specific to particular artworks and exclude those that are general or philosophical in nature. The eight content standards in the QCC for high school visual art courses are as follows:

1. Identifies and describes the specific medium(s) and technique(s) used in the creation of artworks
2. Classifies selected artworks according to their functions and justifies the choice based upon evidence within the artwork
3. Proposes interpretations regarding the meaning of an artwork and cites evidence in artwork to support interpretations
4. Applies criteria appropriate for the evaluation of specific artworks
5. Describes feelings about an artwork, citing those specific qualities within the work which elicit the response
6. Makes and supports judgments about selected artworks based on analysis of evidence in the artwork
7. Differentiates between judgments of artworks based on personal preference and those based on critical analysis
8. Uses appropriate art vocabulary throughout the process of critically analyzing an artwork.

The standards for this strand are aimed predominately towards criticism. Only standards four and seven invite students to speculate about the criteria for judging art. The general

and philosophical investigation into the nature and purposes of art that appear in the QCC for grades K-8 is now absent. Philosophical aesthetics is not directly addressed.

In the QCC, the high school visual art curriculum is organized around the media and methods of production. The introductory paragraphs declare a focus on personal communication through studio production. Of the eleven courses offered, the only non-studio course is Art History/Criticism, the goals of which are to study the historical perspective of art and “to develop the skills of art criticism through describing, analyzing, interpreting and evaluating artworks” (QCC, 1988). Aesthetics is absent as a point of focus and is not specifically mentioned.

The current visual art curriculum for Georgia is a revision that began in 1995 and concluded with its adoption in 1998. The reference document for the revision is the *National Standards for Arts Education* (1994), which was compiled by a consortium of educators from all of the arts disciplines and provides content standards for each of the arts. The revision specifically cites a discipline-based approach with strands that represent the four major ways of responding to or creating art: artistic skills and knowledge [production], historical and cultural context [art history], critical analysis and aesthetics understanding [art criticism and aesthetics], and connections. In this revision, *connections* replaces perceptual awareness as the fourth strand with the intent of promoting transfer and interdisciplinary teaching between the visual arts and other subjects. Although aesthetics and art criticism are still linked in a single strand, the introductory material and an extensive glossary do clearly articulate the definitions of perception, criticism, and aesthetics as follows:

Responding to the visual arts involves *perception*, which is a precursor to the creative process of thinking, imagining, and designing. Perception is the visual and sensory awareness of impressions, images, relationships, experiences, and feelings. The process of visually perceiving encompasses an awareness of the elements of art and the principles of design and how they function and interrelate. (QCC, 1998, p.1627)

Criticism is describing and evaluating the media, processes, and meanings of works of visual art, and making comprehensive judgments. (QCC, 1998, p. 1631)

Aesthetics is a philosophy concerned with determining the nature and value of art; it is a means of interpreting the deepest human expressions. Methods of inquiry that allow for the examination of complex ideas in structured, sequential ways provide the basis for aesthetic education. (QCC, 1998, p. 1627)

In summary, the QCC assumes that perception, criticism, and aesthetics represent a sequence of cognitive responses to visual art that should be addressed by the classroom art teacher. Perception is the initial sensory response to the elements and principles of design in a particular work of art. Criticism is the interpretation and evaluation of a particular work of art based on perception of the elements and principles. Finally, aesthetics may use a particular work of art as a point of departure into speculation about the nature of art, but it is philosophical and general, not specific.

The revised visual art QCC contains many inconsistencies in the use of these terms in the course guides. Despite the emphasis on perception in the introductory materials, only two content standards in all of the thirteen course guides are explicitly

labeled as such. One standard in the Art History and Criticism course guide states, “Compares general perceptions used in everyday living and aesthetic perception” (QCC, 1998, p. 1643). Without clarification, this standard assumes that the teacher has a sophisticated understanding of the psychology of perception and cognition. Another standard in the Photography guide reads, “Makes informed aesthetic responses by relating their own photographs to photographs by major 20th century photographers” (QCC, 1998, p. 1668). This second standard is more a function of criticism than of aesthetic perception because it involves interpretation and evaluation more than sensory awareness.

Throughout the thirteen course guides, concept standards that deal with perception consistently fall under the criticism strand, but they are labeled with several different topic descriptors or are included in broadly encompassing standards. For example, one standard with the descriptor *composition* states, “Analyzes artists’ use of the art elements and principles of design to communicate expressive ideas or content” (QCC, 1998, p. 1650). Another reads, “Explains how elements of art and principles of design contribute to expressive content and/or formal unity in ceramic work from varied cultures and historical periods” (QCC, 1998, p. 1647). The latter standard contains elements of perception, criticism, aesthetics, and art history in one objective.

Some standards are labeled differently in different course guides. For example, one standard asks students in different courses to self-evaluate by comparing their work to that of major artists. Four guides identify the self-evaluation as an aesthetic activity, and two identify it as a criticism activity (QCC, 1998, p. 1659-1676).

Aesthetics is specifically addressed in all of the course guides in the revised curriculum, an improvement over the original QCC. All but two of the guides contain thorough standards in aesthetics that raise important philosophical issues. However, the inconsistencies and ambiguities that exist in the guides readily available to art teachers can be a source of confusion to teachers with insufficient training in aesthetics, making it difficult for them to distinguish aesthetics from criticism and serving as an ineffective tool for teachers seeking guidelines. As the next revision cycle approaches, an important goal for the visual arts curriculum should be clarity and consistency in its language.

Qualitative Methodology

Qualitative research is a term for the many forms of inquiry that “help us to understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible” (Merriam, 1998, p. 5). It is also based on a distinct methodological tradition (Creswell, 1998). Denzin and Lincoln (2000) trace the development of qualitative research from early field ethnographies that date before the 17th century. Field research evolved over the centuries, fraught with debate over the polarized theoretical and methodological considerations of positivist and postmodern perspectives. Attempting to define the field, researchers have confronted, among other issues, multiple criteria of evaluation and multicultural influences on the inquiry process. Today, “an embarrassment of choices” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 18) characterize the field of qualitative research.

Merriam (1998) summarized the essential characteristics of all qualitative research: “the goal of eliciting understanding and meaning, the researcher as primary

instrument of data collection and analysis, the use of fieldwork, an inductive orientation to analysis, and findings that are richly descriptive” (p. 11). Although writers vary in the number of types of qualitative research they recognize, most writers agree that all qualitative traditions share these essential characteristics.

According to Creswell (1998), there are five assumptions that shape qualitative research:

1. Ontological: What is the nature of reality?
2. Epistemological: What is the relationship between researcher and that being researched?
3. Axiological: What is the role of values?
4. Rhetorical: What is the language of research?
5. Methodological: What is the process of research?

Answers to these questions define the researcher’s paradigm, or view of the world. For example, a study with the goal of understanding a phenomenon from multiple points of view assumes a constructivist paradigm, or worldview. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) define a constructivist paradigm as follows:

The constructivist paradigm assumes a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities), a subjectivist epistemology (knower and respondent cocreate understandings), and a naturalistic (in the natural world) set of methodological procedures. (p. 21)

The subjectivity of the constructivist researcher is an important issue in qualitative research.

The phenomenologist Husserl (Creswell, 1998) addressed the issue of subjectivity in proposing that there is an essential, invariant structure, or central underlying meaning of experience. Reality, according to Husserl, is a product of intentionality; that is, reality of an object is a product of one's consciousness of it, whatever one perceives it to be. Therefore, he reasoned, the researcher must bracket, or set aside, all prejudgments and interpret the phenomenon as much as possible through the eyes and the voices of those who have lived the experience. Husserl called this bracketing "epoché" (p. 52).

Eisner (1988) encouraged researchers to utilize their subjective expertise in what he calls "educational connoisseurship" (p. 146). Educational connoisseurship means critically describing, interpreting, and evaluating social phenomena using techniques similar to those of art criticism (Tesch, 1990). Connoisseurship enhances the researcher's ability to empathize with those who experience the phenomenon and to understand the meaning that they attach to the experience.

Another method for enhancing understanding of an experience is to look at it from multiple points of view using triangulation. Methodological triangulation is the use of two or more methods of data collection or analysis in order to explain more fully the complexity of a phenomenon (Cohen & Manion, 1995; Mathison, 1988; Merriam, 1998). This multi-method approach makes use of both quantitative and qualitative data. If the findings of both methods are similar, then the researcher can have greater confidence in the results than if only one method is used (Cohen & Manion, 1995). If qualitative researchers in education seek broader applications of their research, then it stands to reason that using a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative methods can contribute to that goal.

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Two ontological and epistemological assumptions shaped this research. First, this research assumes a constructivist paradigm in that reality exists only as what we perceive it to be, and our perception of reality may be socially constructed. The second assumption concerns my relationship to the phenomenon under study. As a connoisseur (Eisner, 1988) in the field of secondary art education, I have lived the same experience that my participants have lived. Both of these assumptions influenced my research design and the interpretation of the results.

Because the purpose of this study is to describe, analyze, and evaluate the current interpretation and implementation of the aesthetics component by high school art educators in Georgia, it will entail a triangulation of methods to provide a holistic understanding of the phenomenon (Cohen & Manion, 1995; Mathison, 1988; Merriam, 1998). Although this study is primarily a qualitative study, it will use both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis to provide corroborating evidence that will enhance the credibility of the study (Creswell, 1998; Frankel & Wallen, 1996; Merriam, 1998). Although true objectivity can never be achieved in a qualitative study, using a triangulation of methods is a strategy that can add “rigor, breath, complexity, richness, and depth to an inquiry” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 5). The three instruments used for the three phases of this inquiry are personal interviews, a survey questionnaire, and documents, all of which are designed to describe the

phenomenon of teaching aesthetics by providing both factual and interpretive information.

As a qualitative study, this research is rooted in the philosophy of Husserl (1970) and the interpretations of Moustakas (1994) and Tesch (1990). Husserl proposed that researchers bracket, or set aside, their prejudgments in order to interpret the phenomenon from the viewpoint of those who lived the experience. Bracketing is necessary in this research because as an experienced high school art teacher, I have an insider's knowledge about the field and personal issues about teaching aesthetics. However, according to Eisner (1988), personal bias must not be ignored. Instead, it must be identified and used as a check and an interpretative tool at every step of the research process.

In order to reduce the effect of personal bias, I employed several strategies. In designing the schedule of interview questions and the survey questionnaire, I used peer review. Two of my professional colleagues who are doctoral students with experience in research design read the schedule of questions to check for content and personal bias in the questions. During the analysis of survey data, I examined results from different points of view to guarantee that my interpretations were not self-fulfilling, but reflected the participants' perceptions about teaching aesthetics. Additionally, using triangulation helped to compensate for and reduce the effects of researcher bias that could threaten confidence in the research results.

Although the theoretical foundation for this research is qualitative, I triangulated both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis of the three instruments. I used constant-comparative and content analysis techniques to analyze the interviews and the documents. In order to analyze the survey data, I compiled frequency tables that tally all

responses to all categories for all items on the survey. Next, I created contingency, or crossbreak tables and used chi-square and Spearman's correlation as quantitative methods for determining relationships among variables. Whereas the interviews provided information about the depth of practice of aesthetics, the survey and related documents provided information about the breadth of practice. Each method will be discussed in greater detail in corresponding chapters that follow.

CHAPTER IV: PILOT STUDY INTERVIEWS

The pilot study was undertaken for two purposes. As an exploration into the perceptions about aesthetics of selected high school art teachers, it was designed to determine whether my personal concerns about aesthetics warranted further research. Second, if the interviews verified the need for further research, then the responses from the interviews were intended to generate questions for a survey of high school teachers across Georgia. This chapter describes the pilot study and the conclusions that emerged from it.

Methodology

The participants in the personal interviews comprising the pilot study are five purposefully chosen high school art teachers whose selection was based on four criteria. The qualifying assumptions were derived from my personal observations over 28 years of high school teaching experience: (1) They are certified art teachers with a minimum of five years of teaching experience. Certified, experienced teachers are more likely to be informed about aesthetics and to have established patterns of teaching. (2) They have advanced degrees in art education. Art teachers with advanced degrees are more likely to have experienced some formal training in aesthetics. (3) They are active in their professional organization. This involvement suggests interest and dedication beyond the classroom and exposure to best practices through workshops, seminars, and publications. (4) They have been recognized by their peers for personal accomplishments or the

accomplishments of their students. Such recognition is one indication of success in teaching. It may be in the form of an award or an office in an organization.

Access to the participants was facilitated by the fact that, as a fellow art teacher, I have had a friendly and professional relationship with each of them for several years. I initially contacted the participants with a letter (Appendix A) and a sample consent form (Appendix B) and followed up with a telephone call to arrange the interviews at times and locations that were most convenient to them. Two interviews took place in the participants' homes, two took place in schools before the fall term began, and one took place in a private dining room of a restaurant. Each participant signed a consent form (Appendix B) before the interview. In order to maintain a casual and non-threatening atmosphere, I explained to each participant that my research had grown out of my own insecurity about teaching aesthetics and my desire to find out how other art teachers were dealing with aesthetics. All of the participants seemed interested in exploring the subject. One participant, however, admitted an aversion to being interviewed and asked not to be audio-taped. Although I willingly complied, he appeared uneasy throughout the interview.

Each personal interview took the form of an active interview, which "cultivates meaning-making as much as it 'prospects' for information" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, p.5). The active interviewer assumes a constructivist perspective in that the respondent's feelings and interpretations of reality are as significant as the factual information he or she communicates. The questions the interviewer asks become the structure for each respondent's story. In this respect, the interviewer is a participant in the narrative of the interview by directing turns in a rich, multi-layered plot.

The interviews consisted of a brief demographic survey (Appendix C) followed by 20 open-ended, probing questions (Appendix D) that were designed to uncover the respondents' understandings of aesthetics and how they addressed aesthetics in their classrooms. However, because the interviews were semi-structured and emic, that is, they were driven by the responses of the participants (Merriam, 1998), the order of the questions varied as each participant gave direction to his or her own interview.

The interviews were audio-recorded, personally transcribed using a dictaphone, and analyzed using the constant comparative method of data analysis developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). In this method, units of meaning are coded and extracted from an interview transcript, and similar units of meaning are clustered together into categories in order to identify emerging themes. Common and unique themes from all five of the interview transcripts became the organizing structure for data analysis. All relative responses were grouped and organized under each theme to provide the foundation for the discussion and conclusions that followed. Nonverbal cues, such as pacing, silence, body movements and posture, and voice quality were a source for additional data for analysis (Gorden, 1980).

Data and themes from the personal interviews in the pilot study also generated questions for a survey questionnaire (Appendix F) to be mailed to a random sample of 100 high school art teachers in the state. Whereas the interviews provided information about the depth of the practice of aesthetics, the survey questionnaire was designed to provide information about the breadth of practice. The survey is discussed in Chapter V.

Description of Pilot Study Participants

All five participants in the pilot study conformed to the criteria I determined to be characteristic of master teachers. They were all certified art teachers with teaching experience ranging from 19 to 42 years, exceeding the established criterion of 5 years. They all had advanced degrees in art education. All were and still are active in the Georgia Art Education Association (GAEA). All five have gained recognition in their professional field by receiving awards or being elected to leadership positions in GAEA. Demographic information about the participants is summarized below. Participants are identified hereafter with letter designations A, B, C, D, and E.

The average number of years of teaching experience was 27. All five of the participants held master's degrees in art education; one held a specialist's degree in art education; and one held a doctoral degree in art education. One participant is currently enrolled in a doctoral program at UGA. The participants obtained all of their degrees at five colleges and universities within the state of Georgia, with the exception of one participant, who obtained his two degrees in Tennessee and Kentucky, respectively. All participants obtained their undergraduate degrees before 1980 and their masters degrees by 1981, except participant E, who earned her masters in 1987. The significance of these dates will be discussed in the limitations section below.

All of the participants are active members of the Georgia Art Education Association (GAEA). They all receive professional publications from the national and state organizations and participate regularly in the annual state conferences. In addition, all five have presented workshops at the state conferences, and four have hosted the fall conference. All have established chapters of the National Art Honor Society (NAHS), an

arm of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) for outstanding high school art students. In this capacity, they regularly participate with their students in the annual NAHS state conference.

All participants have held or are currently holding leadership positions in state and/or national professional organizations. Among the offices they have held in GAEA are the following: President, Secondary Division Chairperson, Conference Chairperson, Historian, Legislative Task Force Chairperson, National Liaison/ Projects and Legislature.

Summary of Interview Responses

The five personal interviews consisted of 20 open-ended questions. These questions were designed to provide data that would describe the best practices in aesthetics by master high school art teachers and to generate more honed and relevant questions for a survey of high school art teachers across the state of Georgia. This section summarizes the participants' responses to the 20 questions. Responses to the questions are summarized and analyzed in the order in which they appeared on the schedule of questions. The actual order in which each question was discussed varied as each participant gave direction to his or her own interview. Following this summary section is a discussion of data that will identify major and minor themes.

Question 1. To what extent do you use the Georgia State Quality Core Curriculum (QCC) concepts and standards in planning for instruction?

Participant A first provided a rationale for the QCCs: They make teaching art a real profession by providing structure to the discipline, a basis for assessment, and a

sequence for student growth. Opinions about the role of the QCCs in planning ranged between two extremes. At one extreme, participants called the QCCs “a starting point” and “suggestions” (A). At the other extreme, participants said that they regularly designed lesson plans focusing on them and that they “have to use it because coordinators check” (E). Most, however, regard the QCCs as a guide or “a skeleton to hang your program on” (B).

Participants referred to the QCCs infrequently, perhaps only at the beginning of the year, but certainly not daily. Participant C refers to them only when she has to turn something in. She added, “I don’t think about them. They’re incorporated intuitively.” None of the participants are required to code lesson plans with QCC numbers. Participant B regarded the required coding of lesson plans as a “waste of time.”

Although the participants indicated earlier that they regarded the QCCs as a guide or framework, some later remarks suggest otherwise. Participant B appeared to regard the QCCs as an unattainable goal, saying apologetically, “You do what you can to meet them.” Participant D also doesn’t always follow them. Participant C regarded them as “too limiting” and reducing spontaneity. She also believed that the QCCs were structured by those not knowledgeable in the field.

Question 2. What is your opinion about the inclusion of aesthetics as one of the four components of Georgia’s discipline-based art education (DBAE)?

All participants felt positively about the inclusion of aesthetics in the curriculum. Their responses ranged from a mild “I don’t see anything wrong with it (D)” to an emphatic “It’s important! (E).” Participants A, B, and C offered rationales for

including aesthetics that centered upon developing a personal aesthetic, learning about oneself, and learning to think better. However, Participants C and D expressed some reservations. They felt that instruction in aesthetics required the students to have some prior background in studio and art history. They also believed that although aesthetics will come naturally to more advanced students, it is difficult for students with less ability.

Question 3. What is your understanding of DBAE?

Participants A, B, and D described the goals and benefits of DBAE as giving structure, sequence, and purpose to art instruction, thereby legitimizing art as a subject and the art teacher as a professional. Participant A also indicated that DBAE offers the instrumental advantages of improved citizenship, better SAT's and study skills, and increased visual acuity.

Participant C felt that DBAE "forces art into the mold of other subjects," and that art shouldn't be taught that way. She added that DBAE isn't the only way to teach art, but "if you're taught to teach that way, it's ideal." Participant A also referred to teacher training, "Without staff development, it's just rhetoric." Both of these respondents seem to have the perception that DBAE is a prescribed curriculum with prescribed methods, rather than an approach to curriculum. Participant E was admittedly unsure about the meaning of DBAE.

Question 4. Do you plan for instruction in aesthetics? How do you go about planning for aesthetics?

Responses to this question focused on the frequency, the extent, and the nature of

planning for aesthetics. Planning for aesthetics appeared to be minimal. Participant A indicated that aesthetics is an integral part of any lesson, but it is not something the teacher has to check for daily. It may be “in your head” and, therefore, not written. Participant B plans “now and again,” perhaps once or twice a year. He doesn’t think he could write a lesson plan for aesthetics. Both B and D said that aesthetics just “pops up” during criticism or art history lessons. Participant C said that during criticism, “maybe some aesthetics will come out.” Participant C indicated no formal planning for aesthetics, an area in which she is “lacking.” Participant E thinks about end results and assignments to “get you there.” The desired outcomes expressed by all participants will be discussed in Question 10.

Question 5. Relative to the other three components (art production, art criticism, and art history), how much planning and instructional time do you devote to aesthetics?

All five participants acknowledged that they spend most of their planning and instructional time on production, but some seem to feel guilty about doing so. Participant A seeks a balance of about 25% for each discipline, but doesn’t achieve it. Participant B said that production is the biggest part of his instruction, although “they say” it shouldn’t be as big a part. Participant C spends not as much time as she “should.” Participant D spends the least amount of time on aesthetics, and Participant E spends equal amounts of time on aesthetics and art history. All participants seem to believe that the curriculum dictates an equal amount of time for each of the four components and that they are somehow deficient because they spend a majority of their time on production. The reasons given for the relatively small amount of time devoted to aesthetics will be discussed in the summary of Question 6.

Question 6. What factors influence the degree of emphasis you place on aesthetics in your curriculum?

Responses to this question revealed the teachers' attitudes about the students and about aesthetics. Without exception, the participants indicated that the make-up of a particular class determines the amount of time spent on instruction in aesthetics. According to Participant A, the time spent on aesthetics depends on the students' ability to understand the concepts of aesthetics, because aesthetics is the hardest of the components to "get across." Participant B takes his cues from the students and introduces aesthetics when he feels that they're ready for philosophy. Participants A and D pointed out that having large numbers of special education students and students from other cultures who are not fluent in English inhibits instruction in aesthetics. Participant E, on the other hand, views a weak class as needing more aesthetics. According to E, the teacher has to "play with aesthetics more, like strengthening a weak muscle."

Two divergent attitudes about aesthetics emerged in responses to this question. Participants A, C and D seem to regard aesthetics as a distasteful activity. For example, if Participant A's students pass a test on aesthetics, they are "rewarded" with interesting studio activities. If they fail the test on aesthetics, they must copy all of the elements and principles until they learn them. These three teachers share the opinion that students want instruction only in studio and that teachers can "lose" the students if there is too much non-studio instruction. Participant A stated, "It's strong medicine to have a lesson purely on aesthetics." However, Participant E considers

dialogue one of the “fun” things that can be done with aesthetics. She said, “The more fun you’re having, the more fun the students will have.”

Question 7. How would you describe your understanding of aesthetics?

Responses to this question ranged from “evolving” to “very minimal.” None of the respondents expressed confidence in his or her understanding of aesthetics. Some expressed some reservations about teaching aesthetics that centered upon its ambiguity. For example, Participant B said, “No one has a concise definition of it.” Both A and B indicated that aesthetics is a “vague idea” with “no right or wrong” answers. Participant B also expressed concern that the teacher “can’t test on it” and has to rely on essays for assessment. Reservations about teaching aesthetics will be discussed in further detail in the discussion section at the end of this chapter.

Question 8. How would you describe your ability to teach aesthetics?

Participant D described his ability to teach aesthetics as “OK.” Participant C didn’t think that she was well qualified because she has no background in aesthetics, and “it’s difficult to teach what you know very little about.” Participant B didn’t think he could write up lessons for aesthetics because teaching aesthetics just “flows” and is “student driven.” Participant E felt that she is better and more confident in teaching aesthetics now that she is working in a more stimulating environment.

Question 9. Please describe any training you have had that prepared you to teach aesthetics.

Although none of the participants had training specifically in aesthetics in their undergraduate degree programs, Participant A acknowledged that all classes contribute indirectly to developing an understanding of aesthetics. Participants A, B,

and D were exposed to aesthetics at the graduate level in an art criticism class or in International Baccalaureate and Advanced Placement training courses. Participants A and B also participated in workshops and seminars at the state and national levels. Participants C and E received no formal training in aesthetics and rely solely on textbooks for information on aesthetics.

Question 10. What do you believe are the objectives or desired outcomes for teaching aesthetics?

Responses to this question group themselves into three categories: content-related objectives, skills-related objectives, and instrumental outcomes. Desired content-related objectives include knowledge, understanding, and perception of art (C), an understanding of the relationship of art to culture (B), and knowledge and understanding of cultural and ethnical diversity (E). Participants mentioned more skill-related objectives than content-related ones. They include art appreciation and developing a personal aesthetic (A); thinking outside the box, questioning motives, and intellectual stimulation (B); looking at art in a different way (C); training the eye, appreciating diversity, and understanding and appreciating beauty in ordinary, unfamiliar, and different things (E). Participant A focused on the instrumental outcomes of teaching aesthetics, such as adding a deeper dimension to life, contributing to good citizenship and morality, and making the world a better place. Participant D offered no objectives, saying that objectives for teaching aesthetics depends on the individual teacher's definition of aesthetics.

Question 11. What teaching methods are you most likely to employ when teaching aesthetics?

Participants mentioned a variety of teacher-centered, student-centered, and interactive teaching methods. Teacher-centered methods included lecture (A) and using objects or visuals as prompts for discussion (E). Student-centered methods ranged from group activities (A, E) and student questioning of the teacher and each other (B) to writing assignments (B, C, D). With classes of lower academic ability or a high percentage of students who are not fluent in English, teachers employ less writing, perhaps an occasional paragraph (B, D). In more advanced classes, especially in IB or AP level classes, teachers employ essays, analyses, and reports (B, C, D). Open discussions (A, B, C, E) and defense of one's own ideas (B) are interactive methods used by the participants.

Question 12. What specific resources (books, journals, textbooks) do you use in preparing to teach aesthetics?

Participants mentioned four textbooks: *Art Talk* by Ragans (A, E); *Art in Focus* by Mittler (A, B); *The Visual Experience* by Hobbs and Salome (E); and *Discovering Art History* by Brommer (B). Participant A photocopied worksheets from the *Art Talk* teacher's materials on using the Feldman method for art criticism. Other resources included *Art Synectics* by Roukes (B), *Scholastic Art* magazine (C), Shorewood prints (B), slides (B), the internet (D, E), catalogs (E), and *National Geographic* magazine (E).

Question 13. Briefly describe one of your lessons that deals specifically with aesthetics. Can you provide me a copy to examine?

Participant B described a lesson on the role of art in the Aboriginal culture. He introduced the unit with a video and reproductions of Aboriginal map, dream, and x-

ray paintings. Students compared the role of art in the Aboriginal culture with its role in the Western culture. The students argued at length the possible significance of the dot technique before the teacher informed them that the dot is merely the mark made by the chosen painting tool, the stick. The culminating activity was for students to produce their own “aboriginal” style painting.

Participant D introduced a unit on found objects with a lesson and visuals on how contemporary artists use found objects in their art. Students then gathered their own found objects to create their own artwork.

Participant E introduced the concept of “aesthetic experience” to her beginning classes by means of a very informal discussion. She gathered students away from their tables and shared a personal aesthetic experience with them. Using rich details, she described watching the fireworks on the Fourth of July at Lake Burton, the sounds of the water lapping against the boats, the patterns of the lines of boats tied together, and the bright explosion of the fireworks against the dark sky. She gave a second more mundane and humorous example of a pool of gravy in a pile of mashed potatoes. Students then took turns sharing their personal aesthetic experiences. She informed them that they had just learned a new “SAT” word. To follow up, she required them to turn in a weekly aesthetic experience in the form of a sketch with commentary.

The two other participants, A and C, have no lessons specifically on aesthetics. Participant A feels that aesthetics should be incorporated into other lessons because it’s “strong medicine” to have lessons purely on aesthetics.

Question 14. What are your desired outcomes for this lesson?

Participant B identified three desired outcomes for his lesson on Aboriginal art: to see how art varies in different cultures; to see how art is universal communication; and to understand that context determines how we see art. Participant D's objectives for the found object lesson are production oriented and focus on completion of the project and meeting specific objectives for the project. The objectives for Participant E's lesson on the aesthetic experience are "noticing things, appreciating beauty in unusual things, getting your juices going."

Question 15. What are students doing when they are engaged in this lesson?

During the aesthetics lesson identified, students are engaging in open discussion (B), expressing feelings (B), thinking (D,E), critiquing (E), learning from others (E), using sketchbooks and viewfinders to isolate something aesthetically stimulating (E), and creating artwork (D).

Question 16. Has this lesson been successful? How can you tell?

Teachers can tell if the lesson has been successful by means of formal assessment, such as tests and short answer discussion questions (B), informal assessment, such as oral or written critiques (D), and the students' artwork itself (B, D, E). All three of the participants who had lessons specific to aesthetics felt that a deeper understanding of art translates into more meaningful artwork. Participant B prefaced his statement to that effect with, "DBAE and aestheticians would hate this, but [I can tell that the lesson is successful] if the projects are successful."

Question 17. What means of assessment do you use for this lesson?

Participants use formal assessment, such as tests and short answer discussion questions (B), informal assessment, such as oral or written critiques (D), and the

students' artwork itself (B, D, E). Participant D does not assess specifically for aesthetics.

Question 18. What personal attributes and skills do you think are important for teachers of aesthetics?

Teachers of aesthetics should have knowledge of art and aesthetics (A, C, D) and understand the creative process (A, C). They should have strong verbal skills and use the Socratic method of teaching (C). They should not just lecture (B), but should be able to conduct and monitor an open discussion (B, C), involving even the reticent students (B, C). Teaching aesthetics requires determination and patience (D) and a special love of subject and students (C). In addition, teachers of aesthetics must produce art themselves (A, C, E) and excel in some area (C). They should pursue their own passion and share their mistakes as well as their successes with their students (A, E). They should remain stimulated by producing art, attending exhibits, and being around creative people (E).

Question 19. From your perspective, what is the value in having high school students learn about aesthetics?

Aesthetics makes students more informed about the visual arts (C) and, therefore, better able to justify their choices and judgments (B). Aesthetics prepares students for a lifelong process of looking at and judging art and the visual world (B). It helps them to appreciate beauty and adds a deeper dimension to their lives (A, C).

Aesthetics helps students develop into good citizens and good individuals (A).

Question 20. Define aesthetics as you understand it.

Aesthetics is the philosophy of art (B). It is the philosophy of beauty and the appreciation of beauty in all things (B, E). It is thinking (B, C), thinking like Socrates (B), questioning (B), creative problem solving (B), and decision making skills (B). It is an experience of understanding and truth, the “Aha!” (A). It is perception of the visual elements and how they are used to convey emotions (C). Aesthetics is self-knowledge shown in one’s artwork (B, D).

Discussion and Conclusions

The schedule of interview questions was designed to elicit responses on four predetermined themes: the role of aesthetics in the art curriculum, teachers’ understanding of aesthetics, teaching methodologies for aesthetics, and problems that influence the teaching of aesthetics. Each of these themes is discussed below.

Aesthetics has a very tenuous role in the art curriculum. Responses to the first six interview questions reveal a strong contradiction between the perceived expectations of the curriculum and the reality of the classroom. Although teachers characterize the state curriculum as merely a framework, their responses suggest that they regard it as a mandate. Although they believe that there should be a balance of the four components, their classes are predominately production oriented. Although they regard aesthetics as important, they rarely plan a lesson specifically on aesthetics, relying instead on teachable moments that occur during production, history, or criticism to introduce aesthetic concepts. They consider their lack of emphasis on aesthetics to be a personal weakness or a failure to meet expectations.

None of the teachers felt especially confident about his or her understanding of and ability to teach aesthetics, citing a lack of training or the ambiguous nature of aesthetics itself as reasons. Although all five teachers defined aesthetics as a form of philosophy, the use of higher order thinking skills applied to art, or as sensory perception, only two teachers could actually describe lessons in which they gave instruction in the philosophy, skills, or perception associated with aesthetics. This apparent discrepancy between knowing about aesthetics and teaching aesthetics suggests the gap between theory and practice that will be discussed below.

Teaching methods employed by the two teachers who described lessons in aesthetics included a variety of oral, interactive activities that utilize the skills associated with aesthetics. At the heart of both lessons was a teacher who was confident enough to initiate student directed discussions and capable enough to keep students focused on aesthetic issues. Both teachers shared their own passion and sense of excitement. The other three teachers revealed throughout their interviews that if they taught aesthetics, they relied on traditional, more didactic teaching methods, such as worksheets on criticism and reports on artists. It is puzzling that of the five interviewees, the teacher who seems to be the most knowledgeable and effective teacher of aesthetics and another teacher who seems to be one of the least effective, relying on didactic and rote methods, have experienced almost identical formal graduate courses and informal workshop training in aesthetics. The difference in their effectiveness must be attributed, therefore, to some factor other than educational background.

Problems encountered in teaching aesthetics emerged as the most dominant theme of the pilot study, even though only one interview question (number six) directly

addressed that issue. It is more accurate to say, however, that the teachers' responses described problems that prevent the teaching of aesthetics more than they identified constraints that influence the teaching of aesthetics. Unsolicited remarks on constraints and problems appeared in twelve of the twenty questions. The largest number of remarks concerned the ability or readiness of particular classes. According to the five teachers, advanced students can participate in aesthetics easily, but students of lower ability, such as special education students or those with limited English proficiency, cannot. Most art classes are composed of students with a wide range of abilities, and that makes teaching aesthetics very difficult. Another consideration is that in order for students to participate in a lesson on aesthetics, the students must have a prior background in production and criticism. If a class is deficient in either, the teacher must begin where the students are and progress into aesthetics. According to these responses, students only want to do production. Pure aesthetics can be boring and difficult for students to understand. A teacher who spends too much time on non-studio activities will "lose" the students.

Many other unsolicited remarks identified additional problems that prevent the teaching of aesthetics. The lack of a concise definition makes aesthetics difficult to teach and assess. Most teachers have little or no formal training in aesthetics and can't teach what they don't know. Time is another critical problem. The teachers feel so pressed for time to complete production, that other non-studio activities, such as aesthetics, are neglected. They feel that those who designed the curriculum to include four components have unrealistic expectations of the classroom art teachers. Production remains their top priority.

Another emic theme from the pilot study and the second most frequent unsolicited response was that art teachers focus on the practical applications of teaching instead of the theoretical ones. Although only four of the interview questions prompted responses on teaching methods, the teachers' responses to ten questions, even theoretical ones, returned to the practical subject of methods. Along with a shift in subject, the teachers exhibited a shift in pace and demeanor as they discussed theoretical and practical subjects. As they responded to questions that dealt with more theoretical subjects, such as the role of aesthetics in the curriculum, their faces tensed and the pace slowed, as if they were tentatively searching their way. When they responded to questions that dealt with more practical subjects or when they self-directed a response into a practical realm, their faces relaxed and the pace quickened confidently. If the assumptions are correct that teachers choose to teach subjects in which they have the most competence and confidence and that it is desirable for art teachers to teach aesthetics, then this study suggests that teachers need more training in the content, skills, and methods of aesthetics.

Limitations

Two major limitations surfaced during the analysis of the data from this pilot study. The assumptions upon which my sampling was based may be flawed. During the analysis of the interviews I discovered that all of the participants had received their undergraduate and masters degrees before or soon after the critical date of 1984. This date is significant because it marks the inception of DBAE and the subsequent emphasis on non-studio disciplines such as aesthetics in the secondary curriculum. It is unlikely that the participants could have received any substantial training in aesthetics as a subject

for students to study because it was a relatively new concept in art education at that time. Even though they all may be master art teachers according to my criteria, their responses failed to provide as thorough a description of the depth of practice in aesthetics as I had anticipated. Replication of this study targeting master art teachers who received their degrees at least ten years after 1984 might produce valuable information about trends in teacher training in aesthetics in addition to best practices by master teachers.

Another sampling flaw emerged from the assumption that art teachers who are active in professional organizations may be better informed about aesthetics through professional periodicals and workshops. Although these teachers certainly have access to such periodicals and workshops, apparently only two have availed themselves of these resources. It appears that art teachers receive training in aesthetics in degree programs or not at all. The reasons that teachers may have for not pursuing an independent study of aesthetics are beyond the scope of this study.

The second limitation of this study regards my skill as an interviewer. My lack of experience in conducting interviews and data analysis may have caused me to overlook bits of information that may have enriched my description of the interpretation and practice of aesthetics in the classroom. These two limitations notwithstanding, this pilot study indicated the need for further research and served to generate and hone questions for a general survey of high school art teachers in Georgia.

Questions for Future Research

This pilot study has generated several questions for future research, especially regarding curriculum, teacher training, and the nature of aesthetics. Questions that most directly relate to this study are the following:

What curricular structure best serves the goals of art education?

Who reforms state art curricula and upon what research is the reform based?

How do teachers perceive and use the state curriculum guidelines?

What is the status of teacher training in aesthetics?

Does an understanding of aesthetics translate into more meaningful artwork?

What do students need to know about aesthetics?

How can teachers assess for aesthetics?

These questions and the themes that emerged from this pilot study guided the development of the survey instrument for the broader research that follows in Phase II of this study.

CHAPTER V: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The second phase of this study is a survey designed to determine the interpretation and implementation of the aesthetics component by a random sample of high school art teachers in Georgia. This survey describes, analyzes, and evaluates their understandings of aesthetics, the role of aesthetics in their organizing philosophy and curricular structure, problems they encounter in teaching aesthetics, and their chosen teaching methodologies for aesthetics instruction.

Methodology

The target population for this survey is all art teachers in traditional public high schools in Georgia. The study sample is limited to teachers in traditional public high schools because the education offered in these schools is typical for the vast majority of high school students in the state. A traditional public high school is a comprehensive school that includes at least grades ten through twelve. Special entity schools, such as alternative, vocational, agricultural, and special education schools are not included in the study because they are not typical and are less likely to have art teachers.

From the Georgia Department of Education website, I compiled a database of the 315 traditional public high schools in Georgia. Using a table of random numbers, I selected a random sample of 100 high schools from the database and mailed the survey questionnaire (Appendix F) with a cover letter (Appendix E) to the art teacher of each of

the sample schools. The first mailing produced 35 responses, and a second mailing produced 13, for a total of 48 responses. The 48 respondents represent a 48% response rate and are 15.2% of the target population. One respondent returned a nearly incomplete survey but included, instead, a lengthy personal commentary on aesthetics. Her response is included in the content analysis of documents in Chapter VI but not in the statistical analysis of the survey. Therefore, the total number of responses available for statistical analysis was 47.

The survey questionnaire (Appendix F) is composed of three components that provide a variety of descriptive information. The cover sheet consists of five coded demographic items relative to the respondents' highest art degree, degree institution, year graduated, teaching experience, and current teaching position. The back of the cover sheet contains a designated space for writing additional comments or concerns about aesthetics or the art curriculum. These freely-written comments are treated as written documents and are analyzed and discussed in Chapter VI along with an analysis of written lesson plans.

The survey itself is an attitude scale intended to measure each respondent's attitude towards some aspect of aesthetics as represented in the Georgia Visual Art Curriculum. The items on the survey reflect the respondent's attitude about one of the four themes that emerged from the pilot study. The four themes are the role of aesthetics in the curriculum, understanding of aesthetics, teaching methodologies, and problems with teaching aesthetics. These themes provided the structure for the survey and for the analysis of survey data that follows.

The survey consisted of 40 Likert-type items that required respondents to circle one of five responses to indicate how they felt about each statement: SA=strongly agree, A=agree, U=undecided, D=disagree, and SD=strongly disagree. A design error, the duplication of one item, invalidated item 40 and reduced the number of useable items to 39.

Responses to all demographic and Likert items on the survey are categorical, and therefore dictate categorical techniques for summarizing and analyzing the data. I entered all survey responses into SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences), a computer program that aids in data analysis. With SPSS, I generated frequency tables to tally responses to items on the survey and contingency, or crossbreak, tables to help identify relationships among the categorical variables under investigation.

A contingency table is a useful tool for identifying patterns of responses within the table and relationships between the categorical variables. I used the chi-square test (χ^2) as a correlational probe to determine whether a statistically significant relationship existed at the .05 alpha level between the two variables of each table (Huck, 2000). For every identified relationship, I computed a contingency coefficient (C) to determine the degree of the relationship. The strength of C is expressed as a value between .00 and .99 (Frankel & Wallen 1996). For this study, the strength is designated as follows: .01-.50=very small; .50-.74=moderate; and .76-.99=strong.

For each frequency and contingency table, demographic items from the survey were designated with the letter D, as in D-1. The Likert-type survey items were designated with the letter Q, as in Q-1. In all of the tables, the number in each cell represents the actual number of responses for that category. Any number in parentheses,

unless otherwise noted, represents the percentage of total responses for that table, rounded to one decimal place. The numerically coded column headings for the contingency tables are as follows: 1=SA, strongly agree; 2=A, agree; 3=U, undecided; 4=D, disagree; 5=SD, strongly disagree.

The total number of responses (N) may vary from table to table because of item non-response. This variation in the total number of responses may produce apparent discrepancies in percentages between tables. For example, data from frequency table 5.20 reveal that 60.5% of respondents plan lessons on aesthetics (Q-32). However, data from contingency table 5.21, which compares planning lessons on aesthetics (Q-32) to using the state curriculum guide (Q-1), reveal that 63.6% plan lessons on aesthetics. This difference in percentages is attributed to the fact that in a contingency table, lack of response on one of the two variables under examination invalidates that individual's responses and removes them from the total number of responses for that table. Therefore, the total number of responses for Q-32 on frequency table 5.20 is 46, and the total number for Q-32 on contingency table 5.21 is 44. Percentages naturally vary according to total number of responses for an item in a table.

Description of Survey Sample

Information from this section has two functions. It describes the sample group, and it helps to identify demographic categorical variables used to determine relationships between teachers' background and their understanding and methodologies for aesthetics. Numerical column headings in Table 5.1 are codes for responses to the demographic items on the survey (Appendix F).

Table 5.1. Demographic Profile of Survey Participants

ITEM	1	2	3	4	5	6	Totals
D-1 Highest Art Degree	BFA 6 (12.5)	BEd 9 (18.8)	MFA 5 (10.4)	MEd 25 (52.1)	EdS 2 (4.2)	EdD 1 (2.1)	48 (100)
D-2 Institution	In-state University 17 (36.2)	Out-state University 6 (12.8)	In-state College 20 (42.5)	Out-state College 3 (6.4)	Art School 1 (2.1)		47 (100)
D-3 Year of Highest Art Degree	Before '83 14 (30.4)	'83-'88 10 (21.7)	'89-'92 8 (17.4)	'93-'96 4 (8.7)	'97- 2001 10 (21.7)		46 (100)
D-4 Years Teaching Experience	0-1 0 (0.0)	2-10 12 (25.0)	11-20 16 (33.3)	Over 20 20 (41.7)			48 (100)
D-5 Teaching Position	Full-time certified 45 (95.7)	Full-time not certified 0 (0.0)	Part-time certified 1 (2.1)	Full-time Provisional 1 (2.1)			47 (100)

Results of Survey by Theme

Theme 1: The Role of Aesthetics in the Curriculum

The survey items in this section are designed to determine the role, if any, that aesthetics plays in high school art teachers' curricular choices by describing their use and interpretation of the state discipline-based art curriculum in general and the aesthetic

component in particular. In doing so, this section will contribute to an understanding of high school art teachers' philosophical stance on teaching aesthetics.

The assumptions that ground the items in this section are as follows:

1. The Georgia state art curriculum guide is intended as a foundation for planning.
2. The art curriculum guide specifies the role and content for each of its four components.
3. Art teachers are familiar with the art curriculum and informed about all of its content.
4. Because aesthetics is one of the four components in the state art curriculum, teachers plan some regular instructional time for aesthetics.
5. The integrated art curriculum assumes transfer among the four art disciplines.

Responses to the ten survey items that deal with the role of aesthetics in teachers' curricular choices are discussed below.

Q-1: I use the Georgia state art curriculum for planning art instruction. 42.2% agree, 35.6% strongly agree, 15.6% disagree, 4.4% are undecided, and 2.2% strongly disagree.

Q-4: Some form of aesthetics should be taught to students of all ages. 53.2% strongly agree, 40.4% agree, and 2.1% each are undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Q-5: Production consumes most of my instructional time. 55.6% agree, 28.9% strongly agree, 11.1% disagree, 4.4% are undecided, and none strongly disagree.

Q-9: The four components of the art curriculum (studio, history, criticism, aesthetics) should be given equal emphasis. 44.7% disagree, 29.8% agree, and 8.5% each strongly agree, are undecided, or strongly disagree.

Q-13: Most art teachers do not teach aesthetics. 42.6% are undecided, 36.2% agree, 10.6% disagree, 8.5% strongly agree, and 2.1% strongly disagree.

Q-18: Art teachers are expected to meet all of the state QCC concepts and standards. 42.6% agree, 25.5% strongly agree, 19.1% disagree, 8.5% are undecided, and 4.3% strongly disagree.

Q-22: I refer to the state art curriculum guide frequently. 34.8% agree, 30.4% disagree, 19.6% strongly disagree, 10.9% strongly agree, and 4.3% are undecided.

Q-25: High school art students should be taught the aesthetic theories that have influenced production, history, and criticism. 56.5% agree, 17.4% each strongly agree or are undecided, and 4.3% each disagree or strongly disagree.

Q-32: I plan lessons that specifically address aesthetics. 47.8% agree, 32.6% disagree, 13.0% strongly agree, 4.3% are undecided, and 2.2% strongly disagree.

Q-38: I do not assess for aesthetics. 48.9% disagree, 26.7% agree, 13.3% strongly disagree, 6.7% strongly agree, and 4.4% are undecided.

The two tables below illustrate the relationship between use of the state curriculum (Q-1) and background variables of degree (D-1) and experience (D-4).

Table 5.2. Comparison of Highest Art Degree (D-1) and Use of Curriculum Guide (Q-1)

Highest Art Degree	Use of Curriculum Guide					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	2			1	5
2	2	6				8
3	1	1	1	1		4
4	10	8	1	6		25
5	1	1				2
6		1				1
Total	16	19	2	7	1	45

Table 5.3. Comparison of Experience (D-4) and Use of Curriculum Guide (Q-1)

Use of Curriculum Guide	Experience					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		3	6	7		16
2		8	6	5		19
3				2		2
4			3	4		7
5				1		1
Total		11	15	19		45

Although the chi-square test indicates no relationship between highest art degree (D-1) and use of the curriculum guide (Q-1) ($\chi^2=21.165$; $df=20$; $p=.387$) or between experience level (D-4) and use of the curriculum guide (Q-1) ($\chi^2=10.261$; $df=8$; $p=.247$), examination reveals a decline in the use of the curriculum guide between the bachelor's and master's levels and with higher levels of experience. Table 5.2 shows that use of the curriculum guide declines from 80% for BFA's to 50% for MFA's and from 100% for BSEd's to 72% for MAEd's. All three teachers with specialist or doctoral degrees use the curriculum guide. Table 5.3 shows that use of the curriculum guide declines from 100% for teachers with 2 to 10 years of experience to 80% for those with 11 to 20 years of experience, and to 63% for those with over 20 years of experience.

Table 5.4. Comparison of Use of State Curriculum Guide (Q-1) and Perceived Expectations of Curriculum Guide (Q-18)

Use of Curriculum Guide	Perceived Expectations of Curriculum Guide					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	7	5		3	1	16
2	4	10	2	3		19
3			1	1		2
4		4	1	2		7
5	1					1
Total	12	19	4	9	1	45

Table 5.4 compares use of the state curriculum guide (Q-1) with belief that teachers are expected to meet all of the state QCC concepts and standards (Q-18). Of the 33 (73.3% of total responses) who do use the curriculum guide, 26, or 78.7%, do believe that teachers are expected to meet all state QCC concepts and standards, and 7, or 21.2%, do not. The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2=17.923$; $df=16$; $p=.328$).

Table 5.5. Comparison of Equal Emphasis of Components (Q-9) and Dominance of Production in Instruction (Q-5)

Equal Emphasis of Components	Dominance of Production in Instruction					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	1	1			4
2		8		4		12
3	2	1	1			4
4	7	13		1		21
5	2	2				4
Total	13	25	2	5		45

Table 5.5 compares belief that the four art curriculum components should be given equal emphasis (Q-9) to belief that production consumes most instructional time (Q-5). Of the 16 (35.5% of total responses) who believe that the four components should be given equal emphasis, 11, or 68.7%, also agree that production consumes most of their instructional time, and 4, or 25%, disagree. Of the 25 (55.5% of total responses) who believe that the four components should not be given equal emphasis, 24, or 96%, agree that production consumes most of their instructional time, and 1, or 4%, disagrees. Of all responses, 38 (84.4%) say that production consumes most of their instructional time.

The chi-square test indicates that there is a relationship between those who believe that the components should not be given equal emphasis and those who say production consumes most of their instructional time ($\chi^2=23.926$; $df=12$; $p=.021$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.589$) suggests a moderate relationship.

Table 5.6. Comparison of Belief that Aesthetics Should be Taught (Q-4) to Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32)

Aesthetics Should Be Taught	Planning Lessons on Aesthetics					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	6	11	2	6		25
2		10		8		18
3		1				1
4				1		1
5					1	1
Total	6	22	2	15	1	46

Table 5.6 compares belief that some form of aesthetics should be taught to students of all ages (Q-4) to planning lessons specifically on aesthetics (Q-32). Of the 43

respondents (93% of total) who believe that aesthetics should be taught to all students, 27 (58.6% of total) actually plan lessons specifically on aesthetics, and 14 (30.4% of total responses) do not.

The chi-square test indicates a relationship between belief that aesthetics should be taught in some form to all students and planning lessons on aesthetics ($\chi^2=56.933$; $df=16$; $p=.000$). The contingency coefficient suggests a moderate relationship ($C=.744$).

Table 5.7. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief that Aesthetics Has No Concise Definition (Q-6)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Belief That Aesthetics Has No Concise Definition					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	1		2	2	6
2		5	2	12	2	21
3		1		1		2
4		7	2	4	2	15
5	1					1
Total	2	14	4	19	6	45

Table 5.7 compares planning lessons on aesthetics (Q-32) with belief that aesthetics has no concise definition (Q-6). Of the 25 who plan lessons on aesthetics (55.5% of total responses), 18 (40.0% of total responses) disagree that aesthetics has no concise definition, and 7 (15.5% of total responses) agree. Of the 14 who do not plan lessons on aesthetics (31.0% of total responses), 8 (17.7% of total responses) agree that aesthetics has no concise definition, and 6 (13.3% of total responses) disagree.

The chi-square test indicates that there is a relationship between planning lessons on aesthetics and belief that aesthetics does have a concise definition ($\chi^2=32.821$; $df=16$; $p=.008$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.649$) suggests a moderate relationship

Theme 2: Teachers' Understanding of Aesthetics

This section examines high school art teachers' understanding of the nature of aesthetics. It describes their training to teach aesthetics, their knowledge about the content and skills associated with aesthetics, and their attitudes about teaching aesthetics.

The assumptions upon which the items in this section are based are as follows:

1. Teachers are trained to teach aesthetics and understand aesthetics well enough to teach it.
2. Aesthetics has a concise definition and specific content, skills, objectives, and outcomes.
3. Aesthetics is different from art criticism.
4. Aesthetics in some form is teachable to students of all ages.
5. Engagement in aesthetics cultivates higher order thinking skills and may cause frustration as pre-conceived notions are challenged.

Responses to the ten items in this section that address respondents' knowledge about aesthetics are discussed below.

Q-2: My degree program(s) prepared me to teach aesthetics. 38.3% agree, 25.6% disagree 17.0% each strongly agree or are undecided, and 2.1% strongly disagree.

Q-3: Instruction in aesthetics is based on specific objectives or desired outcomes. 48.9% agree, 23.4% are undecided, 17.0% disagree, 10.6% strongly agree, and none strongly disagreed.

Q- 6: Aesthetics has no concise definition. 41.3% disagree, 32.6% agree, 13.0% strongly disagree, 8.7% are undecided, and 4.3% strongly agree.

Q- 10: Aesthetics is the analysis of the visual elements in a particular work of art. 40.0% agree, 37.8% disagree, 8.9% strongly disagree, and 6.7% each strongly agree or are undecided.

Q-19: One example of a lesson on aesthetics is to describe, analyze, interpret, and evaluate a particular work of art. 46.7% agree, 24.4% disagree, 11.1% strongly disagree, and 8.9% each strongly agree or are undecided.

Q- 28: Aesthetics is the philosophy of art and the philosophy of beauty. 62.2% agree, 26.7% strongly agree, 6.7% are undecided, and 2.2% each disagree or strongly disagree.

Q-33: I understand aesthetics well enough to teach it. 47.7% agree, 27.3% are undecided, 15.9% strongly agree, 9.1% disagree, and none strongly disagree.

Q-34: A good lesson in aesthetics may sometimes cause students to feel frustrated or uncomfortable. 40.0% agree, 26.7% disagree, 17.8% are undecided, 8.9% strongly agree, and 6.7% strongly disagree.

Q-35: Aesthetics has its own unique content and skills. 53.3% agree, 17.8% are undecided, 15.6% disagree, 13.3% strongly agree, and none strongly disagree.

Q-39: Aesthetics cultivates higher order thinking skills. 50.0% strongly agree, 45.7% agree, 4.3% are undecided, and none disagree or strongly disagree.

The survey items discussed below address the respondents' attitudes about aesthetics.

Q-4: Some form of aesthetics should be taught to students of all ages. 53.2% strongly agree, 40.4% agree, and 2.1% each are undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Q-8: A knowledge and understanding of aesthetics is evident in students' art work. 42.6% agree, 27.7% are undecided, 14.9% disagree, 12.8 strongly agree, and 2.1% strongly disagree.

Q-16: Students need a background in production and criticism before engaging in aesthetics. 34.0% agree, 29.8% disagree, 21.3% are undecided, 10.6% strongly agree, and 4.3% strongly disagree.

Q-29: Aesthetics is too difficult for most students. 53.3% disagree, 20.0% are undecided, 17.8% strongly disagree, and 4.4% each strongly agree or agree.

Q-36: Students don't like lessons that deal with aesthetics. 47.8% disagree, 23.9% are undecided, 13.0% agree, 8.7% strongly agree, and 6.5% strongly disagree.

Table 5.8. Comparison of Preparation in Degree Program (Q-2) and Highest Art Degree (D-1)

Highest Art Degree	Preparation in Degree Program					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	3		1	1	6
2	1	2	3	3		9
3		2	1	1		4
4	5	10	3	7		25
5	1		1			2
6		1				1
Total	8	18	8	12	1	47

Table 5.8 compares belief that degree program(s) prepared the respondent to teach aesthetics (Q-2) to the highest degree attained by the respondent (D-1). The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2=17.643$; $df=20$; $p=.611$). However, examination of the categories within the table provides some interesting information.

Of the total responses, 26 (55%) feel that their degree program(s) prepared them to teach aesthetics, and 21 (45%) either feel unprepared or are undecided. Of the 37 teachers with art education degrees, 3, or 33%, of those with 4 year degrees feel prepared, 15, or 60%, of those with masters degrees feel prepared, 1, or 100%, of those with specialist degrees feel prepared, and 1, or 100%, of those with doctoral degrees feel prepared. Of all categories, teachers with only a four year art education degree feel the least prepared.

Table 5.9. Comparison of Highest Art Degree (D-1) and Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33)

Highest Art Degree	Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		2	3	1		6
2	1	5	3			9
3	1	2	1			4
4	5	10	4	3		22
5		1	1			2
6		1				1
Total	7	21	12	4		44

Table 5.9 compares highest art degree (D-1) and understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it (Q-33). The chi-square test indicates no relationship between those two variables ($\chi^2=8.308$; $df=15$; $p=.911$). This means that teachers in all six degree categories are about equal in feeling that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it.

Table 5.10. Comparison of Institution of Highest Art Degree (D-2) and Preparedness to Teach Aesthetics (Q-2)

Institution of Highest Art Degree	Preparedness to Teach Aesthetics					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	7	4	2	1	16
2	1	3	1	1		6
3	4	5	3	8		20
4	1	2				3
5		1				1
Total	8	18	8	11	1	46

The chi-square test for Table 5.10 indicates no relationship ($\chi^2=11.025$; $df=16$; $p=.808$) between the variables of institution (D-2) and preparedness to teach aesthetics (Q-2). However, an examination of relative percentages *within each degree category* indicates that fewer graduates of in-state colleges (45%) feel prepared to teach aesthetics compared to graduates of in-state universities (56%). Graduates of out-of-state universities (67%) and out-of-state colleges (100%) feel more prepared than their in-state counterparts.

Table 5.11. Comparison of Year of Highest Art Degree (D-3) and Preparedness to Teach Aesthetics (Q-2)

Year of Highest Art Degree	Preparedness to Teach Aesthetics					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	4	4	1	3	1	13
2	2	4	2	2		10
3		5	1	2		8
4		1	1	2		4
5	2	4	2	2		10
Total	8	18	7	11	1	45

Data from Table 5.11 indicate no relationship ($\chi^2=9.688$; $df=16$; $p=.882$) between year of highest art degree (D-3) and respondents' belief that their degree program prepared them to teach aesthetics (Q-2). In fact, relative percentages of responses in four of the five categories vary from 60% to 62.5%, a range of only 2.5%.

Table 5.12. Comparison of Year of Highest Art Degree (D-3) to Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33)

Year of Highest Art Degree	Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	6	4	1		13
2	3	3	2	1		9
3		4	2			6
4	1	2		1		4
5	1	6	3			10
Total	7	21	11	3		42

Table 5.12 compares year of highest degree (D-3) to understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it (Q-33). The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2=8.52$; $df=12$; $p=.743$). Relative percentages *within each year of highest degree* show an increase in understanding from 1983 to the present. 61.5% of teachers who graduated before 1983 feel that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it, and 70.0% of teachers who have graduated since 1997 feel that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it. 75% of teachers who graduated from 1993 to 1996 feel that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it.

Table 5.13. Comparison of Perceived Preparedness (Q-2) and Belief that Aesthetics is Analysis of Visual Elements (Q-10)

Preparedness to Teach Aesthetics	Aesthetics is the Analysis of Visual Elements					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	1		3	2	8
2	1	8	2	5	1	17
3		3		4	1	8
4		5	1	5		11
5		1				1
Total	3	18	3	17	4	45

Table 5.13 compares perceived preparedness (Q-2) with belief that aesthetics is the analysis of visual elements in a particular work of art (Q-10). In variable Q-2, respondents indicate the extent to which their degree programs prepared them to teach aesthetics. In variable Q-10, respondents express agreement or disagreement with the statement that aesthetics is the analysis of the visual elements in a particular work of art. The definition provided in Item 10 defines art criticism. Therefore, agreement with the definition may indicate confusion about the definition of the term *aesthetics*.

The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the variables ($\chi^2=14.868$; $df=16$; $p=.534$). It is interesting to note, however, that of the 25 who feel that their degree programs prepared them to teach aesthetics (55.6% of total responses), 12, or 48%, agreed or strongly agreed with the definition given.

Table 5.14. Comparison of Perceived Preparedness (Q-2) and Belief that Aesthetics is Description, Analysis, Interpretation, and Evaluation (Q-19)

Preparedness to Teach Aesthetics	Aesthetics is Description, Analysis, Interpretation, and Evaluation					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	1		2	8
2	1	8	1	5	1	16
3		3	1	3	1	8
4	1	7	1	3		12
5					1	1
Total	4	21	4	11	5	45

Table 5.14 also compares perception of preparedness (Q-2) with belief that aesthetics is the description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of a particular work of art (Q-19). Variable Q-2 indicates the extent to which respondents feel that their degree programs prepared them to teach aesthetics. Variable Q-19 indicates agreement or disagreement with a statement that an example of a lesson on aesthetics is to describe, analyze, interpret, and evaluate a particular work of art. The example provided defines a popular model of art criticism. Agreement, therefore, may indicate a misunderstanding about the definition of aesthetics.

Of the 24 (53.3% of total responses) who feel that their degree programs prepared them to teach aesthetics, 14, or 58%, agree that the example given is an example of a lesson on aesthetics. The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the variables ($\chi^2=18.112$; $df=16$; $p=.317$).

Table 5.15. Comparison of Preparedness by Degree Program (Q-2) and Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33)

Preparedness by Degree Program	Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	3	5				8
2	2	11	3			16
3	2	2	3	1		8
4		3	6	2		11
5				1		1
Total	7	21	12	4		44

Table 5.15 compares preparedness by degree program to teach aesthetics (Q-2) with understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it (Q-33). Of the 24 who feel prepared by their degree programs to teach aesthetics (54.5% of total responses), 21, or 87%, feel that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it. Of the 12 who feel that their degree programs did not prepare them to teach aesthetics, 3, or 25%, feel that they do understand aesthetics well enough to teach it, and 3, or 25%, feel that they do not.

The chi-square test indicates a relationship between perceived preparedness and understanding ($\chi^2=27.503$; $df=12$; $p=.007$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.620$) suggests a moderate relationship.

Table 5.16. Comparison of Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33) and Identifying Analysis of Visual Elements as Aesthetics (Q-10)

Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It	Belief that Aesthetics is Analysis of Visual Elements					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		1		4	2	7
2	3	9	1	6		19
3		6	2	3	1	12
4		1		2	1	4
5						
Total	3	17	3	15	4	42

Table 5.16 compares respondents' perception that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it (Q-33) with responses to the statement that aesthetics is the analysis of the visual elements in a particular work of art (Q-10). Of the 26 (61.9% of total responses) who feel they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it, 13, or 50%, agree with the definition. The chi-square test, however, indicates no relationship between the variables ($\chi^2=15.055$; $df=12$; $p=.238$).

Table 5.17. Comparison of Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33) and Belief that Aesthetics is Description, Analysis, Interpretation, and Evaluation (Q-19)

Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It	Belief that Aesthetics is Description, Analysis, Interpretation, and Evaluation					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	2	1	2	1	7
2	3	10	1	4	1	19
3		5	2	4	1	12
4		2			2	4
5						
Total	4	19	4	10	5	42

Table 5.17 compares understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it (Q-33) with agreement that one example of a lesson on aesthetics is to describe, analyze, interpret, and evaluate a particular work of art (Q-19). Of the 26 (61.9% of total responses) who feel they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it, 16, or 61.5%, agree that the example given is an example of a lesson on aesthetics. The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the variables ($\chi^2=12.019$; $df=12$; $p=.444$).

Theme 3: Teaching Methodologies

This section contains an exploration of variables associated with teaching methodologies. The particular variables under examination are planning strategies, resources, activities, and assessment.

The assumptions that generated the items for this section are as follows:

1. Instruction in aesthetics assumes certain teaching methods and styles. Among these are using the Socratic method of inquiry in student-driven discussions.
2. Teachers write lesson plans for whatever they teach, including aesthetics.
3. Teachers assess student performance and progress in areas of instruction they consider to be most important. The instrument used is appropriate to the content and skills addressed in instruction.
4. Students should be aware of the content and skills of the four separate art disciplines. They should know the definition of aesthetics and know when they are engaged in aesthetics.

Following is a discussion of responses to the six survey items on planning for aesthetics.

Q- 3: Instruction in aesthetics is based on specific objectives or desired outcomes. 48.9% agree, 23.4% are undecided, 17.0% disagree, 10.6% strongly agree, and none strongly disagree.

Q-7: I use professional periodicals and journals as a source of information about aesthetics. 54.5% agree, 20.5% disagree, 15.9% strongly agree, 6.8% are undecided, and 2.3% strongly disagree.

Q-12: Teaching aesthetics requires careful planning. 57.4% agree, 19.1% strongly agree, 12.8% are undecided, 10.6% disagree, and none strongly disagree.

Q-17: If requested, I can provide a written lesson plan on aesthetics. 37.0% agree, 23.9% disagree, 21.7% are undecided, 10.9% strongly agree, and 6.5% strongly disagree.

Q-32: I plan lessons that specifically address aesthetics. 47.8% agree, 32.6% disagree, 13.0% strongly agree, 4.3% are undecided, and 2.2% strongly disagree.

Q-38: I do not assess for aesthetics. 48.9% disagree, 26.7% agree, 13.3% strongly disagree, 6.7% strongly agree, and 4.4% are undecided.

Following is a discussion of responses to the eight survey items on teaching methods for aesthetics.

Q-11: I am confident in my ability to use the Socratic method of inquiry with my students. 37.8% agree, 26.7% are undecided, 22.2% disagree, 8.9% strongly disagree, and 4.4% strongly agree.

Q-14: I use worksheets and quizzes as means of assessment for aesthetics. 46.8% disagree, 27.7% agree, 12.8% are undecided, 10.6% strongly disagree, and 2.1% strongly agree.

Q-15: My students know the meaning of the term *aesthetics*. 53.2% agree, 19.1% disagree, 14.9% are undecided, 12.8% strongly agree, and none strongly disagree.

Q-20: Because aesthetics is so complex, most teaching methods are necessarily teacher-centered. 32.6% agree, 28.3% disagree, 23.9% are undecided, 10.9% strongly disagree, and 4.3% strongly agree.

Q-26: Lessons in aesthetics may be student driven. 58.7% agree, 23.9% strongly agree, 17.4% are undecided, and none disagree or strongly disagree.

Q-27: My students know when they are involved in a lesson on aesthetics. 34.8% are undecided, 32.6% agree, 28.3% disagree, 4.3% strongly agree, and none strongly disagree.

Q-30: I am confident in my ability to conduct student driven discussions. 58.7% agree, 19.6% strongly agree, 10.9% each are undecided or disagree, and none strongly disagree.

Q-31: I use essays or short written discussions as a means of assessment for aesthetics. 66.7% agree, 20% disagree, 6.7% strongly agree, 4.4% are undecided, and 2.2% strongly disagree.

Table 5.18. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Using the Curriculum Guide (Q-1)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Using the Curriculum Guide					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	4	1		1		6
2	8	11	1	2		22
3		2				2
4	3	5	1	4	1	14
5						
Total	15	19	2	7	1	44

Table 5.18 compares planning lessons specifically on aesthetics (Q-32) to using the state curriculum guide in planning lessons (Q-1). The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2=11.219$; $df=12$; $p=.510$). However, 54.5% of the total number of respondents indicated that they both use the curriculum guide and plan lessons specifically on aesthetics. The remaining 45.5% do one or the other or neither. It appears that the state curriculum does not strongly influence teachers to include aesthetics in their planning.

Table 5.19. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Preparedness by Degree Programs (Q-2)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Preparedness by Degree Program					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	3	2		1		6
2		10	4	4		22
3		1		1		2
4	1	3	4	6	1	15
5		1				1
Total	8	17	8	12	1	46

Table 5.19 compares planning lessons specifically on aesthetics (Q-32) and preparation to teach aesthetics provided in degree programs (Q-2). Of the total responses, 19 (41.3%) indicated that they feel that their degree program prepared them to teach aesthetics and that they plan lessons specifically on aesthetics. The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2=14.901$; $df=16$; $p=.532$).

Table 5.20. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	4	2				6
2	2	16	2			20
3		2				2
4	1	1	9	4		15
5			1			1
Total	7	21	12	4		44

Table 5.20 compares planning lessons specifically on aesthetics (Q-32) to understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it (Q-33). Of the total responses, 24 (54.5%) indicate that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it and that they plan lessons specifically on aesthetics. The chi-square test indicates that there is a relationship between understanding and planning lessons ($\chi^2=42.17$; $df=12$; $p=.000$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.703$) indicates a moderate relationship.

Table 5.21. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Ability to Conduct Student-Driven Discussions (Q-30)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Ability to Conduct Student-Driven Discussions					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	4	1	1			6
2	2	17	2	1		22
3		1	1			2
4	2	8	1	4		15
5	1					1
Total	9	27	5	5		46

Table 5.21 compares planning lessons on aesthetics (Q-32) to perceived ability to conduct student-driven discussions (Q-30). Of the total responses, 24 (52%) both plan lessons in aesthetics and are confident in their ability to conduct student-driven discussions. The chi-square test indicates that the two variables are related ($\chi^2=24.469$; $df=12$; $p=.018$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.589$) indicates a moderate relationship.

Table 5.22. Comparison of Assessment for Aesthetics (Q-38) and Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32)

Assessment for Aesthetics	Planning Lessons on Aesthetics					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		1		1	1	3
2	2	2		8		12
3		1		1		2
4		16	2	4		22
5	4	1		1		6
Total	6	21	2	15	1	45

Table 5.22 compares assessment for aesthetics (Q-38) and planning lessons for aesthetics (Q-32). The survey item (Q-38) is stated in the negative, “I do not assess for aesthetics.” Therefore, a positive response (1 or 2 on the scale) indicates that the respondent does not assess for aesthetics, and a negative response (4 or 5 on the scale) indicates that the respondent does assess for aesthetics.

Of the total responses, 21 (46.6%) indicate that they both plan and assess for aesthetics, and 10 (22.2%) indicate that they do neither. Curiously, 5 (11.1%) indicate that they do assess but do not plan for aesthetics. The chi-square test indicates that there is a relationship between assessment and planning ($\chi^2=45.565$; $df=16$; $p=.000$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.709$) indicates a moderate relationship between the two variables.

Table 5.23. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Providing Written Plans on Aesthetics (Q-17)

Providing Written Plans	Planning Lessons on Aesthetics					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	4				1	5
2	1	12	1	3		17
3		8		2		10
4	1	2		7		10
5			1	2		3
Total	6	22	2	14	1	45

Table 5.23 compares planning lessons on aesthetics (Q-32) with ability to provide a written lesson plan on aesthetics (Q-17). Of the total responses, 17 (37.7%) both plan lessons and can provide a written lesson plan on aesthetics, and 11 (24.4%) plan lessons

but disagree or are undecided if they can provide written lesson plans on aesthetics. The chi-square test indicates a relationship between planning lessons and being able to provide a written plan ($\chi^2=52.273$; $df=16$; $p=.000$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.733$) shows a moderate relationship.

Table 5.24. Comparison of Not Assessing for Aesthetics (Q-38) and Using Written Assessments for Aesthetics (Q-31)

Not Assessing for Aesthetics	Using Written Assessment for Aesthetics					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		1	1	1		3
2	1	5		5		11
3		1	1			2
4	1	19		2		22
5	1	4			1	6
Total	3	30	2	8	1	44

Table 5.24 compares not assessing for aesthetics (Q-38) with using essays or short written assignments as a means of assessment for aesthetics (Q-31). Of the 28 who do assess for aesthetics (63.6% of total responses), 25, or 89.2%, do use essays or short written assignments as a means of assessment. The remaining 16 (36.3% of total responses) either do not assess for aesthetics or are undecided on one of the two variables. The chi-square test indicates that there is a relationship between assessing for aesthetics and using essays or short written assignments as a means of assessment ($\chi^2=33.978$; $df=16$; $p=.005$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.660$) shows a moderate relationship.

Table 5.25. Comparison of Not Assessing for Aesthetics (Q-38) and Using Worksheets and Quizzes (Q-14)

Not Assessing for Aesthetics	Using Worksheets and Quizzes for Assessment					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1				3		3
2	1	2	1	7	1	12
3			1	1		2
4		9	4	9		22
5		1		1	4	6
Total	1	12	6	21	5	45

Table 5.25 compares not assessing for aesthetics (Q-38) with using worksheets and quizzes as means for assessment in aesthetics (Q-14). Of the 28 (62.2% of total responses) who do assess for aesthetics, 14, or 50%, do not use worksheets and quizzes, and 10, or 35.7%, do use them. The remaining 17 (37.7% of total responses) either do not assess for aesthetics or are undecided in one of the two variables.

The chi-square test indicates that there is a relationship between assessing for aesthetics and not using quizzes and worksheets ($\chi^2=33.508$; $df=16$; $p=.006$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.653$) indicates a moderate relationship.

Theme 4: Problems With Teaching Aesthetics

This section addresses problems with teaching aesthetics that surfaced during the pilot study interviews. The tables and discussions that follow explore relationships between these perceived problems and teachers' understanding and methodologies for teaching aesthetics.

The assumptions upon which the items for this section are based are as follows:

1. Some teachers may experience obstacles to teaching aesthetics.
2. Adopted textbooks and accompanying teacher resource materials reflect the content of the state art curriculum.
3. Language fluency and ability level of students may influence instruction in aesthetics.

Following is a discussion of the seven survey items that address problems with teaching aesthetics.

Q-5: Production consumes most of my instructional time. 55.6% agree, 28.9% strongly agree, 11.1% disagree, 4.4% are undecided, and none strongly disagree.

Q-16: Students need a background in production and criticism before engaging in aesthetics. 34.0% agree, 29.8% disagree, 21.3% are undecided, 10.6% strongly agree, and 4.3% strongly disagree.

Q-21: Time constraints prevent me from teaching aesthetics. 58.7% disagree, 15.2% agree, 10.9% are undecided, 8.7% strongly agree, and 6.5% strongly disagree.

Q-23: The adopted textbooks and teachers' guides provide sufficient material on aesthetics. 31.8% disagree, 29.5% agree, 22.7% are undecided, 13.6% strongly disagree, and 2.3% strongly agree.

Q-24: Students who are not fluent in English cannot engage in aesthetics because aesthetics is language-based. 39.1% disagree, 30.4% are undecided, 17.4% strongly disagree, 10.9% agree, and 2.2% strongly agree.

Q-36: Students don't like lessons that deal with aesthetics. 47.8% disagree, 23.9% are undecided, 13.0% agree, 8.7% strongly agree, and 6.5% strongly disagree.

Q-37: Having art classes with students of mixed ability is an obstacle to teaching aesthetics. 37.0% disagree, 23.9% agree, 17.4 strongly agree, 13.0% are undecided, and 8.7% strongly disagree.

Table 5.26. Comparison of Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33) and Belief That Aesthetics Has No Concise Definition (Q-6)

Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough To Teach It	Belief that Aesthetics Has No Concise Definition					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		2		3	2	7
2	1	6	1	10	2	20
3	1	4	3	3	1	12
4		2		1	1	4
5						
Total	2	14	4	17	6	43

Table 5.26 compares understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it (Q-33) with the belief that aesthetics has no concise definition (Q-6). Of the 27 (62.7% of total responses) who believe that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it, 17, or 62.9%, believe that aesthetics does have a concise definition, and 9, or 33.3%, believe that aesthetics does not have a concise definition. The remaining 16 (37.2% of total responses) either do not understand aesthetics well enough to teach it or are undecided regarding the definition of aesthetics. The chi-square test indicates no relationship between understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it and the belief that aesthetics has no concise definition ($\chi^2=9.263$; $df=12$; $p=.680$).

Table 5.27. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief that Students Need Background in Production and Criticism (Q-16)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Belief that Students Need Background in Production and Criticism					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	1	1	1	2	6
2	4	8	3	7		22
3			1	1		2
4		6	5	4		15
5				1		1
Total	5	15	10	14	2	46

Table 5.27 compares planning lessons on aesthetics (Q-32) with belief that students need a background in production and criticism before engaging in aesthetics (Q-16). Of the 28 (60.8% of total responses) who plan lessons on aesthetics, 14, or 50%, say that students do need a background in production and criticism before engaging in aesthetics, and 10 (35.7% of total responses) say that they do not. The remaining 18, or 39.1%, either do not plan lessons on aesthetics or are undecided regarding students' needing a background. The chi-square test indicates no relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2=23.264$; $df=16$; $p=.107$).

Table 5.28. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That Time Is a Constraint (Q-21)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Belief that Time Is a Constraint					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1				3	3	6
2	1	2	2	17		22
3				2		2
4	3	5	2	5		15
5			1			1
Total	4	7	5	27	3	46

Table 5.28 compares planning lessons on aesthetics (Q-32) with belief that time constraints prevent teaching aesthetics (Q-21). Of the 28 (60.8% of total responses) who plan lessons on aesthetics, 23, or 82.1%, say that time constraints do not prevent teaching aesthetics, and 3, or 10.7%, say that time constraints do prevent teaching aesthetics. Of the 16 (34.7% of total responses) who do not plan lessons on aesthetics, 8, or 50%, say that time constraints do prevent teaching aesthetics.

The chi-square test indicates a relationship between planning lessons on aesthetics and the belief that time constraints do not prevent teaching aesthetics ($\chi^2=41.079$; $df=16$; $p=.001$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.687$) indicates a moderate relationship.

Table 5.29. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That English Fluency Affects Readiness (Q-24)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Belief that English Fluency Affects Readiness					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		1	2	1	2	6
2		2	6	12	2	22
3				1	1	2
4		2	6	4	3	15
5	1					1
Total	1	5	14	18	8	46

Table 5.29 compares planning lessons in aesthetics (Q-32) with the belief that students who are not fluent in English cannot engage in aesthetics because it is language based (Q-24). Of the 28 who plan lessons in aesthetics (60.8% of total responses), 17, or 60.7%, believe that students not fluent in English can engage in a lesson on aesthetics, and 3, or 10.7%, believe that they cannot. Of the 16 (34.7% of total responses) who do not plan lessons on aesthetics, 3, or 18.7%, believe that lack of fluency is a problem. An

unusually large number of respondents (14 or 30.4% of total responses) are undecided whether students who are not fluent can engage in aesthetics.

The chi-square test ($\chi^2=53.473$; $df=16$; $p=.000$) indicates that there is a relationship between planning lessons on aesthetics and the belief that non-fluency does not prevent engagement in aesthetics. The contingency coefficient ($C=.733$) indicates a moderate relationship.

Table 5.30. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Belief That Academic Ability Affects Readiness (Q-37)

Planning Lessons on Aesthetics	Belief that Academic Ability Affects Readiness					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	2			2	6
2	3	3	1	14	1	22
3	1		1			2
4	1	6	4	3	1	15
5	1					1
Total	8	11	6	17	4	46

Table 5.36 compares planning lessons on aesthetics (Q-32) with the belief that having students of mixed ability is an obstacle to teaching aesthetics (Q-37). Of the 28 who do plan lessons on aesthetics (60.8% of total responses), 17, or 60.7%, say that mixed ability is not an obstacle, and 10, or 35.7%, say that mixed ability is an obstacle. Of the 16 (34.7% of total responses) who do not plan lessons, 8, or 50%, feel that mixed ability is an obstacle. Of the 19 who feel that having students with mixed ability is an obstacle to teaching aesthetics (39.1 % of total responses), 10, or 52.6%, do plan lessons on aesthetics, and 8, or 42.1%, do not.

The chi-square test indicates that there is a relationship between planning lessons on aesthetics and disagreement that mixed ability is an obstacle to teaching aesthetics ($\chi^2=30.775$; $df=16$; $p=.014$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.633$) suggests a moderate relationship.

Table 5.31. Comparison of Belief that Students Dislike Aesthetics (Q-36) and Use of Worksheets and Quizzes (Q-14)

Use of Worksheets and Quizzes	Belief that Students Dislike Aesthetics					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1			1			1
2	2	1	4	5		12
3	1			5		6
4	1	4	6	11		22
5		1		1	3	5
Total	4	6	11	22	3	46

Table 5.31 compares belief that students do not like lessons on aesthetics (Q-36) to use of worksheets and quizzes for assessment in aesthetics (Q-14). Of the 25 who disagree that students do not like lessons on aesthetics (54.3% of total responses), 5, or 20%, do use worksheets and quizzes for evaluation, and 15, or 60%, do not. Of the 10 who feel that students do not like lessons on aesthetics (21.7% of total responses), 3, or 30%, use worksheets and quizzes for assessment, and 6, or 60%, do not. Additionally, 17 (36.9% of total responses) are undecided about one of the variables.

The chi-square test indicates a relationship between disagreement that students do not like lessons on aesthetics and not using worksheets and quizzes for assessment

($\chi^2=30.775$; $df=16$; $p=.014$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.633$) suggests a moderate relationship.

Table 5.32. Comparison of Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It (Q-33) and Use of Worksheets and Quizzes for Assessment (Q-14)

Use of Worksheets and Quizzes	Understanding Aesthetics Well Enough to Teach It					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		1				1
2	1	10	1			12
3		1	3			4
4	3	9	7	3		22
5	3		1	1		5
Total	7	21	12	4		44

Table 5.32 compares understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it (Q-33) with use of worksheets and quizzes for assessment in aesthetics (Q-14). Of the 28 who believe that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it (61.3% of total responses), 12, or 42.8%, do use worksheets and quizzes for assessment, and 15, or 53.5%, do not.

The chi-square test indicates a relationship between understanding aesthetics well enough to teach it and not using worksheets and quizzes for assessment ($\chi^2=22.359$; $df=12$; $p=.034$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.580$) suggests that the relationship is moderate.

Table 5.33. Comparison of Planning for Aesthetics (Q-32) and Students' Liking Aesthetics (Q-36)

Planning for Aesthetics	Belief that Students Dislike Aesthetics					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1		2	1	1	2	6
2	2	1	5	14		22
3			1	1		2
4	1	3	4	6	1	15
5	1					1
Total	4	6	11	22	3	46

Table 5.33 compares planning for aesthetics (Q-32) with belief that students do not like lessons in aesthetics (Q-36). Of the 28 who do plan lessons in aesthetics (60.8% of total responses), 17, or 60.7%, disagree that students do not like lessons in aesthetics, and 5, or 17.8%, agree that students dislike lessons in aesthetics. Of the 16 who do not plan lessons in aesthetics (34.7% of total responses), 7, or 43.7%, disagree that students do not like lessons in aesthetics, and 5, or 31.2%, agree.

The chi-square test indicates that there is a relationship between planning lessons on aesthetics and disagreement that students do not like lessons on aesthetics ($\chi^2=26.702$; $df=16$; $p=.045$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.606$) indicates that the relationship is moderate.

Table 5.34. Comparison of Planning Lessons on Aesthetics (Q-32) and Difficulty of Aesthetics (Q-29)

Planning for Aesthetics	Belief that Aesthetics is Too Difficult for Students					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1			1	2	3	6
2	1	1	1	14	4	21
3		1	1			2
4			6	8	1	15
5	1					1
Total	2	2	9	24	8	45

Table 5.34 compares planning lessons on aesthetics (Q-32) with the belief that aesthetics is too difficult for most students (Q-29). Of the 27 who do plan lessons on aesthetics (60.0% of total responses), 23, or 85.1%, disagree that aesthetics is too difficult for most students, and 2, or 7.4%, agree that it is. Of the 16 (35.5% of total responses) who do not plan lessons on aesthetics, 9, or 56.2%, disagree that aesthetics is too difficult for most students, and 1, or 6.2%, agrees that it is. 10 (22.2% of total responses) are undecided about one of the variables.

The chi-square test indicates a relationship between planning lessons on aesthetics and disagreeing that aesthetics is too difficult for most students ($\chi^2=46.313$; $df=16$; $p=.000$). The contingency coefficient ($C=.712$) indicates that the relationship is moderate.

Discussion of Results by Theme

Demographic Information

Analysis of the data from the demographic profile section of the survey provides a composite description of public high school art teachers in Georgia. Most high school art teachers in the survey are full-time certified art teachers (95.7%) with at least 20 years of experience (41.7%). Most of the teachers in the survey hold master's degrees in art education (52.1%), which they received before 1983 (30.4%) from an in-state college or university (78.7%).

Two factors may explain the large number of high school art teachers with advanced experience levels. Principals may prefer to hire older, more experienced art teachers to work with high school students because of their perceived mature perspective and ability to maintain discipline. Another possible explanation is that beginning art teachers who aspire to teach at the high school level work and gain experience at the elementary or middle school levels where jobs are more plentiful until secondary positions become available. These two observations are my own and are not addressed in this research.

The Role of Aesthetics in the Curriculum

A majority (77.8%) of high school art teachers use the state curriculum, but they are nearly evenly divided about how frequently they refer to it. Although most (53.2%) of the teachers disagree that the four components (production, art criticism, art history,

and aesthetics) should receive equal emphasis, they (68.1%) do feel that teachers are expected to meet all of the state QCC concepts and standards, which include aesthetics. Although an overwhelming majority of teachers (93.6%) feel that some form of aesthetics should be taught to students of all ages, only 46.6% both plan and assess for aesthetics. Most (84.5%) teachers indicate that production consumes most of their planning and instructional time.

It is revealing that 87.3% of the teachers in the survey are undecided or agree that most art teachers do not teach aesthetics. Certainly, art teachers cannot be expected to know what other teachers are doing, but their responses suggest a general lack of awareness about what is going on in aesthetics. That item on the survey is based on the assumption that critical areas in art education, such as pluralism, are treated thoroughly by teacher training programs and publishers (See discussions in sections that follow). If we consider the relatively meager emphasis placed on aesthetics in textbooks, resource materials, catalogs, and periodicals, it is understandable that aesthetics might not be in the forefront of their consciousness.

Teachers' Understanding of Aesthetics

Of the teachers in the survey, 55.3% feel that their degree programs prepared them to teach aesthetics. Preparedness in this discussion refers to instruction in aesthetics during degree programs. Graduates of four-year in-state colleges feel least prepared. Teachers with advanced degrees are more likely to feel prepared, suggesting that aesthetics is taught more in graduate programs than in undergraduate programs.

Contrary to what might be expected, there has been no increase in perceived preparedness since aesthetics was introduced into the curriculum nearly 20 years ago. One would expect the percentage to be small before 1983 and gradually increase until the present. Findings, however, reveal that teachers in four of the five year of highest degree categories feel nearly equally prepared to teach aesthetics.

Preparedness appears to increase with an advanced degree, but teachers' perception that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it does not. All degree categories are nearly equal in understanding of aesthetics. Understanding is more related to year of highest degree than to the degree itself. Statistics show a very slight increase in understanding since 1983.

Just over half (54.3%) of the high school art teachers feel that aesthetics does have a concise definition. A large majority (88.9%) agree that aesthetics is the philosophy of art and the philosophy of beauty. However, an apparent discrepancy appears between perceived understanding of aesthetics and ability to recognize an example of a lesson on aesthetics. The two examples given on the survey are variations of a commonly used art criticism activity, the analysis of the visual elements in a particular work of art and a description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of a particular work of art. In fact, on the survey, some teachers inserted comments in the margin that these are examples of art criticism and not aesthetics. However, 50% of the teachers who feel that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it identified the analysis of the visual elements in a particular work of art as aesthetics, and 62% of them identified the description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of a particular work as aesthetics. The intent of these two survey items was not to trick teachers, but rather to

determine their ability to distinguish between philosophical aesthetics that is general in nature and the applied aesthetics of criticism that is specific to particular works of art.

Whereas 54.3% of the teachers feel that aesthetics does have a concise definition, 66.6% of them believe that the discipline of aesthetics has specific content and skills, and 59.5% feel that aesthetics has specific objectives and outcomes. Teachers apparently feel that aesthetics is more teachable than definable.

The survey findings reveal that teachers' attitudes about teaching aesthetics are generally positive. A large majority feel that aesthetics should be taught to all students (93.6%), that it is not too difficult for most students (71.1%), and that it develops higher order thinking skills (95.7%). A little more than half (54.3%) disagree that students don't like aesthetics, and a little less than half (44.6%) believe that students need a background in production and criticism before engaging in aesthetics. About half (48.9%) agree that engagement in aesthetics may sometimes cause students to feel frustrated or uncomfortable.

An interesting statistic that emerges from this section on teachers' attitudes about aesthetics is the unusually large number of undecided responses on the five items. Undecided responses averaged 18.9% of total responses for the section. Reasons for an undecided response cannot be ascertained from the available data, but speculation suggests that lack of information, lack of an opportunity to observe, or lack of time to consider a response may contribute to an undecided response.

Finally, 55.4% of the respondents indicate that an understanding of aesthetics is evident in a student's artwork. None of the other survey items probe deeper into this

topic. Further research into transfer among art disciplines can provide critical information for discipline-based curriculum design.

Teaching Methodologies

Most teachers in this study believe that teaching aesthetics requires careful planning (76.5%) and that instruction in aesthetics is based on specific objectives or outcomes (59.5%). Most (60.8%) of the participants plan lessons on aesthetics, but only 37% of all respondents both plan lessons and can provide written plans.

Slightly more art teachers feel that instructional methods for aesthetics are not teacher-centered (39.2%) than feel that they are teacher centered (36.9%). Lessons in aesthetics may be student-driven, and most teachers (78.3%) are confident in their ability to conduct student-driven discussions. Less than half (42.2%), however, are confident in their ability to use the Socratic method of inquiry. Although most teachers (66%) say that their students know the meaning of the term *aesthetics*, only 36.9% say that students know when they are engaged in aesthetics. Most teachers (62.2%) assess for aesthetics and use essays or short written discussions (73.4%), rather than quizzes or worksheets (29.8%), for assessment.

Whereas 77.8% of the respondents use the curriculum guide, only 54.5% of teachers who use the curriculum guide also plan lessons on aesthetics. Although 55.3% of the respondents feel prepared to teach aesthetics and 63.6% feel that they understand aesthetics, only 41.3% of the former and 54.5% of the latter actually plan lessons on aesthetics. These differences suggest that the curriculum guide may not be a strong influence in planning for instruction in aesthetics. Although this research does not

directly address reasons that art teachers may have for not teaching aesthetics, some obstacles to instruction in aesthetics are discussed below.

A majority (60.8%) of art teachers do plan lessons on aesthetics, but less than half (46.6%) also assess for aesthetics, and only slightly over one third (37.7%) can also provide lesson plans on aesthetics. If assessment of students and ability to write plans are indicators of the importance that teachers place on particular curricular content, then it appears that aesthetics has relatively little importance in art instruction.

Although 78.3% of responding teachers are confident in their ability to conduct student-driven discussions, 52% of them also plan lessons on aesthetics and 30% do not. These figures suggest that more teachers conduct student-driven discussions than actually plan lessons on aesthetics. As the data from Table 5.25 suggest, teaching aesthetics may be related to teaching style. That is, teachers who are comfortable with the exploration and risk-taking inherent in student-driven inquiry are more likely to plan lessons in aesthetics. Similarly, teachers who plan lessons on aesthetics are more likely to be comfortable with conducting student-driven discussions.

Chapter VI contains an analysis of lesson plans that provides a more specific description of methodologies that high school art teachers use for instruction in aesthetics.

Problems with Teaching Aesthetics

In general, time is not a constraint that prohibits instruction in aesthetics, but 60.8% of teachers who do not teach aesthetics say that time is a problem. Of all respondents, 84.5% agree that production consumes most of their instructional time.

Resources are a problem for instruction in aesthetics. Only 31.8% of the respondents believe that the adopted textbooks and accompanying resource materials have sufficient material on aesthetics. Most teachers (70.9%) use periodicals and journals for information on aesthetics.

Most of the problems that teachers encounter with teaching aesthetics are centered on the students themselves. Of the teachers who plan lessons on aesthetics, 50% feel that students do need a background in production and criticism before engaging in aesthetics. If prior experience is a prerequisite to aesthetics instruction, then this belief challenges the notion that aesthetics can be taught in some form to students of all ages.

Language proficiency is another concern because aesthetics is a language-based discipline. A slight majority (56.5%) of all respondents disagree that students who are not proficient in English cannot engage in aesthetics. However, of those who do not plan lessons in aesthetics, 18% feel that non-proficient students cannot engage in aesthetics, and 30.4% of all respondents are undecided on the issue.

Two observations may explain the large number of undecided responses on this item. First, many teachers may not have experienced teaching aesthetics to non-fluent students. This survey item emerged as a concern from a pilot study of art teachers who live and work within a 60-mile radius of metropolitan Atlanta. The rapid influx of immigrants has had a tremendous impact on teachers of all disciplines who struggle to meet the needs of their increasingly diverse students. Teachers in other areas of the state may not yet have experienced this challenge.

Another explanation for the large number of undecided responses may be political. Many teachers may consider agreement with the statement to be an indication

of discrimination. The intent of the item, on the contrary, is to address whether teachers adapt instruction in aesthetics to the needs of the students rather than to reflect upon the student's perceived ability. For whatever reason, the large number of undecided responses suggests that aesthetics instruction for the non-fluent student may be an area in need of further research.

Art teachers are almost evenly divided on whether having classes of mixed ability is an obstacle to teaching aesthetics. However, most (60%) teachers who plan lessons on aesthetics think that mixed ability is not an obstacle, but 50% of the teachers who do not plan lessons on aesthetics think that mixed ability is an obstacle.

Art teachers' perceptions about problems with teaching aesthetics follow a definite pattern. Teachers who do plan lessons on aesthetics do not consider time, language proficiency, or ability level to be problems. Teachers who do not plan lessons on aesthetics tend to think that time, language proficiency, and ability level are obstacles to instruction in aesthetics. Cause and effect cannot be ascribed to these variables based on this study, but the possibility that such a relationship could exist suggests an area for further research.

Conclusions and Implications

A superficial reading of this study might promote a sense of satisfaction or, at least, complacency about the status of aesthetics in the high schools of Georgia. *Most* art teachers in this study plan and assess for aesthetics, and *most* feel prepared to teach aesthetics. Translating *most* into useable figures reveals that 60.8% plan, 62.2% assess, and 55.3% feel prepared. Now we must ask if an implementation rate of approximately

60% is acceptable for a state curriculum component and why nearly 40% of high school art teachers are not teaching aesthetics.

The apparent discrepancy between the theory that places aesthetics in the art curriculum and actual practice raises several important issues about curricular reform. Informed decisions about the curriculum must begin with an examination of who initiates and conducts curricular reforms and upon what philosophical and methodological foundations these reforms are made. For example, research is needed first to determine what the common skills are that promote transfer between the components of the discipline-based curriculum. Then research is needed to determine whether the content and language based thinking skills of aesthetics do, in fact, transfer to studio production and if the content and skills of production transfer to aesthetics. Finally, if these skills are intended to be the foundation for Georgia's integrated DBAE curriculum, then they must be identified and communicated to the classroom art teachers if theory is to be aligned with practice.

Agencies of reform must insure that theory is aligned with practice by revising the curriculum to reflect the prevailing philosophy and methodologies of knowledgeable art teachers whose responsibility it is to implement the curriculum, and by providing art teachers with additional training to assure that they understand the existing structure and the methods for achieving its goals. It is precisely because of their experience that high school art teachers should have a voice in curricular reform. Classroom teachers have a valid, informed perspective on what students need and what they can do. Teachers should be involved in more than rewriting course outlines to align with a new curriculum structure that is imposed from the top down. Initiation and implementation of reform

should be a collaborative effort by theorists, schools of art education, state agencies, and practitioners. Adding the classroom teacher's perspective to every phase of curricular reform may help to make the state curriculum guide more functional.

Limitations

Limitations of this survey research center upon problems with the form and content of the survey instrument that became apparent during the data analysis. The cover sheet of the survey contained items that provided demographic information about the respondents to be used in determining relationships between background and teaching practices. Including other items dealing with the demographics of the respondents' schools might have revealed additional factors that influence teaching practices.

Two of the items on the survey contained unclear terms. In Q-22, the term "frequently" is used in reference to how often the respondent uses the curriculum guide. That term, of course, is subject to interpretation and should have been omitted.

Frequency of use is not necessarily important, but whether it is used is important. The ambiguity of the term may have affected responses and, consequently, the findings.

Another unspecific term is the "Socratic method of inquiry" targeted in Q-11. Teachers may be using the Socratic method without knowing what it is called.

As analysis of the survey data progressed, the need for additional, more probing items emerged. Including items designed to directly address the following questions could enhance the survey:

1. Did the teachers receive training on the structure, content, and implementation of the revised curriculum?

2. What specific instruction in the content and methods of aesthetics did the teachers receive in their degree programs?
3. How, specifically, does an understanding of aesthetics show in a student's artwork?
4. What are the specific objectives and outcomes for instruction in aesthetics?
5. What specific criteria for assessment do teachers use for aesthetics?

The survey, as it was administered, did serve to describe the general interpretation and implementation of aesthetics by the respondents. Anyone desiring to replicate just this survey should consider making the modifications suggested above for a more specific description. The other two phases of this study, the pilot study discussed in Chapter IV and the documents discussed in Chapter VI, provide additional detailed information not included in the survey.

CHAPTER VI: DOCUMENTS AS DATA

The final phase of this study was the examination of comments that were voluntarily written on the survey form and of lesson plans that some of the survey respondents provided. The purpose of this phase was to provide information that may not have been addressed by the survey itself and to determine if actual practices, as evidenced in lesson plans, coincide with teachers' beliefs about aesthetics. This chapter discusses the comments and lesson plans in separate sections but combines the conclusions of the two.

Methodology and Procedure for Written Comments and Lesson Plans

Sixteen, or one third of the survey respondents wrote comments about aesthetics or the visual art curriculum in the space provided for free writing, and seventeen others wrote comments in the margins of the survey itself. Using content analysis of the comments, I coded each comment and grouped all of the comments into the four categories, or themes, that emerged from the pilot study and also served as the basis for the survey. The four themes were the role of aesthetics in the curriculum, teachers' understanding of aesthetics, methodologies for teaching aesthetics, and problems encountered in teaching aesthetics. The comments reinforced the survey findings and enriched them by providing some insights not directly addressed by the survey items themselves.

On the returned survey forms, nineteen teachers indicated that they could provide written lesson plans on aesthetics if requested. I mailed a letter (Appendix H) to each of the nineteen requesting a copy of one of their lesson plans on aesthetics and enclosed a sample lesson plan form (Appendix I) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for their convenience. Four teachers responded. I examined the four lesson plans according to title or subject, objectives, resources and materials, methods, and assessment in order to determine what the art teachers consider to be lessons on aesthetics. Finally, I examined the responses of the four teachers to items 10, 17, and 33 on the survey along with their plans to determine if their perceived understanding of aesthetics is reflected in their lesson plans.

Summary of Written Comments

Eleven of the respondents wrote remarks related to the role of aesthetics in the art curriculum. According to these teachers, an integrated, discipline-based art curriculum is very important. In a truly integrated curriculum, students are encouraged to stretch their thought processes beyond the norm. Doing so allows students to apply information to new situations. Aesthetics is an extremely important part of the integrated curriculum for all students, not just those engaged in studio art. However, not all teachers teach aesthetics, and, as one teacher commented, “We teach what we don’t teach.” The emphasis given to each of the components depends on the class. Block scheduling facilitates a discipline-based art program.

Although the visual arts curriculum guide is monotonous to read and has an impractical format, there is some “good stuff if you dig deep.” Only “in an ideal world”

can art teachers meet all of the state QCC's. Not all teachers have a copy of the guide. One teacher feels that the Georgia Visual Art Curriculum is weak, but another is optimistic about its future. She comments, "I hope that in the course of developing the greatest fine arts curriculum, we remember just how central we are to learning across the curriculum. The fine arts have no boundaries. Let's use that!"

Remarks by ten teachers give insight into their understanding of the nature of aesthetics. Some teachers openly admit a lack of understanding of aesthetics because aesthetics was either "vague" or absent in their college courses. They acknowledge that they "should" read periodicals and journals for information on aesthetics. One teacher indicates that she reads art and political periodicals, but not art education ones. Nevertheless, many teachers "do" aesthetics and don't know it. One teacher observes that there is not a direct relationship between understanding aesthetics and being able to teach it.

Nine of the respondents remarked in margin comments that items 10 and 19 on the survey are activities associated with criticism and not aesthetics. Those two items concerned the analysis of the visual elements or the description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of particular works of art. One teacher commented, "I'm so sick of that stupid DAIE [sic]. My major taught me to *teach*, not employ silly rote strategems."

Most of the writers acknowledge that aesthetics promotes higher order thinking skills and encourages students to "think outside the box." Aesthetics can be enjoyable and meaningful and appeals to students' inquisitive nature. One teacher, however, believes that aesthetics is only for "rich" programs or doctoral candidates and not for high school students. Aesthetics has many definitions, but one teacher believes that aesthetics

is beauty, adding that all her instruction relates to teaching students to see what is beautiful.

Several teachers mentioned a range of methods for teaching aesthetics and the materials they use. One teaches aesthetics through making art because there is little time for anything else. Another uses no “systemized approach” because form then becomes a substitute for substance. Some use games or discussions to stimulate students’ thinking. Others expose students to challenging art and ask them to be open-minded. Students look at art in slides, reproductions, museums, and art books and “Keep looking at the good stuff until it sinks in.”

One teacher wrote that she teaches the elements and principles of design before she introduces criticism and aesthetics. She questions the placement of chapters on criticism and aesthetics at the beginning of the textbooks. “How can a student judge the elements and principles of design without learning about them first?” *Art Talk*, *Art in Focus*, and *The Visual Experience* have a little information on aesthetics, but the specialized books, such as those for printmaking or sculpture, have none.

Discussion of Written Comments

Most of the written comments focus on problems with teaching aesthetics. According to the twelve teachers who discuss problems with teaching aesthetics, students are not prepared academically to engage in aesthetics. They cannot use higher order thinking skills, they don’t like books, and they don’t like pure aesthetics. According to these teachers, prior knowledge of the elements and principles of design is important. Many students lack previous aesthetic experiences upon which to build. Factors in

students' backgrounds, such as parental influence, socio-economic status, and travel, affect their ability to benefit from aesthetics instruction.

These teachers also believe that the ambiguous nature of aesthetics makes it difficult to teach. Some think that aesthetics is biased culturally for the rich. Others believe that the analysis of beauty is a waste of time for high school students. Having little time, large classes, and mixed cultures all prevent teaching aesthetics. Textbooks have little information on aesthetics.

Finally, teachers want to know what other teachers are doing. They want to share ideas and discuss problems. They fear that the current educational reform initiatives endanger art because they may eliminate programs or place unqualified teachers in art positions.

Summary of Lesson Plans

The first lesson plan is titled "Masterwork Critique," and its expressed objectives are to appreciate masterworks, to discuss artworks using appropriate vocabulary, and to describe, analyze, and critique an artwork. In effect, the subject of the lesson is criticism. Materials include slides of masterworks and critique handouts to be completed by the students. Methods are a pre-instruction discussion of an artwork followed by a teacher directed lesson on how to critique art. The students then complete a critique worksheet on a particular art reproduction. Students are assessed on correct completion of the worksheet and on class participation.

Although the second lesson plan is called "3-D Philosophy: Hands on Art Theory," it is an activity designed to introduce and reinforce vocabulary. Its objective,

written in terms of teacher behavior, is to introduce the abstract art terms *universal themes* and *metaphor*. Materials include vocabulary cards, building blocks, and fine art reproductions. The method is predominately group work. After a brief introduction of the terms by the teacher, students study art reproductions to identify metaphors. Then each group of students selects a work and constructs a metaphor for that word using building blocks. Assessment consists of students evaluating each of the sculptures with brief written notes.

Another of the lesson plans appears to be a reproducible, published plan for five days titled “The aesthetic experience: Using color to create emotion.” It identifies objectives for each of the four DBAE components as follows: to discuss artists who used color to evoke emotion (art history); to define the aesthetic experience and to write an aesthetic response to a selected artwork (aesthetics); to paint a composition based on responses to a painting proposal (production); to write a critique about the completed composition (criticism). Resources and materials include tempera painting materials, art prints, worksheets, and the textbook *Exploring Painting* (Brommer, 1995).

After a review of a previous lesson on emotional responses to color, students discuss the definition of aesthetics and aesthetic experience. They critique a painting as a group and then individually critique a painting of choice using a worksheet. Next, the students create a painting that reflects an emotion using appropriate colors. Finally, they write compositions about their paintings and share them with the class. The final assessment tool is an evaluation sheet with ten criteria: color appropriate to mood, skills with media, neatness, design quality, creativity, composition, completeness, written composition, self-critique, and work ethic.

The fourth lesson plan is titled “Reflecting on artwork and developing ideas for a body of work.” Its three objectives are to develop ideas for a series of artworks on a theme, to discover themes from throughout art history, and to study ways different artists have communicated their ideas or themes. Materials and resources are thematic art postcards, personal journals, a copy machine, and glue. Students select artworks on a theme that appeal to them and discuss with their groups the formal, sensory, expressive, and/or symbolic qualities in the artworks that appeal to them. They make copies of the artworks with the copy machine, attach the copies to pages in their journals, label them with pertinent information, and then add written reflections on what appeals to them about each work. Finally, students create thumbnails with verbal notes to plan original artworks informed by the art postcards copied in their journals. Assessment is based upon completion of all tasks, reflection upon preferences shown in written entries, thumbnails, and journal pages as compositions themselves.

Discussion of Lesson Plans

The twelve combined objectives for the lesson plans are aligned, either implicitly or explicitly, with the four components of DBAE. Six, or half, of the stated objectives deal with some aspect of criticism. That is, they involve analysis of the formal or expressive properties of specific artworks. Two of the objectives directly address art history by requiring students to search for themes throughout art history or in the work of different artists. Production is also an objective in two of the lesson plans. In these two plans, student produce art prompted by the study of themes or of expressive color. Only the third lesson plan has objectives directly associated with aesthetics. The third lesson

plan specifies that students define *aesthetic experience* and write an *aesthetic response* to perceived objects.

Although none of the objectives explicitly require philosophical speculation on the general nature of art, this is implicit in lessons one, three, and four in which criticism activities assume an understanding of the philosophies of art that serve as the bases for judgment. It is also implicit in lessons three and four in which student are encouraged to develop a personal voice. Personal voice is the activation and visualization of personal philosophy.

The materials and resources used in these lesson plans are similar. All four plans utilize reproductions of artworks in the form of slides, prints, or postcards. Two plans use handouts for supplemental information or for worksheets. It is unclear whether these handouts are teacher-made or published. All four plans require writing materials. Two of the plans require painting materials, and one requires blocks for a hands-on activity.

The lesson plans employ seven different teaching and learning strategies. Students are required to respond individually in writing on handouts, on evaluation sheets, in journal entries, or in brief personal responses. Two other methods are also employed. First, teachers conduct lessons on review, give instructions, or explain material. Second, students engage in group activities. General class discussions and studio production are also used. Finally, students responding individually during a critique is used in one instance. In summary, the activities are equally divided between those that are teacher-driven and those that are student-driven. Eight activities involve the teacher talking to the class or involve the students responding in writing to teacher-

generated questions on handouts. Eight other activities are student-driven and involve interacting in groups, free writing journal entries or brief essays, or producing art.

Assessment in three of the four lessons is based on the teacher's evaluation of written compositions. Two of the lessons assess worksheets or critique sheets. Two lessons assess the artwork produced during the lesson. One lesson assesses class participation. Only lesson plan three specifies the general criteria used for assessment.

A comparison of lesson plans and survey responses reveals that all four of the teachers feel that they understand aesthetics well enough to teach it. However, two of them identified the survey items on criticism as lessons on aesthetics. All four of them agreed that aesthetics is the philosophy of art and the philosophy of beauty. All four of them use the curriculum guide, and production consumes most of their instructional time.

Conclusions: Written Comments and Lesson Plans

Art teachers generally accept the concept of integrated learning within the visual art program and across the curriculum. They subscribe to an integrated approach because it reinforces and extends understanding. Block scheduling, which has been adopted by many school systems, encourages a discipline-based approach to art because the extended daily class periods permit time for engagement in non-studio activities, such as art criticism, aesthetics, and art history.

The form and content of the discipline-based Georgia Visual Arts Curriculum Guide, however, make it difficult to use in implementing a discipline-based program. Each course guide is divided into four strands that roughly correspond to the components of DBAE. Lacking guidance on the intent and use of this format, teachers might

naturally assume that each strand should receive equal emphasis. This misconception can be the source of undue stress to teachers who feel that they must meet all of the QCC objectives in the course guides. Although art teachers agree in theory with DBAE, they find it cumbersome to practice as written in the state curriculum guide.

The written comments and the lesson plans suggest that art teachers have a sense of the nature of aesthetics, but they are not quite able to define it. Although the teachers whose responses are included in this section believe that they understand aesthetics, their comments and plans most often associate aesthetics with perception, the initial sensory response to visual objects, and with criticism, the analysis, interpretation and judgment of what is perceived. Neither the comments nor the lesson plans associate aesthetics with philosophy, although philosophy is inherent in the criticism and production that dominate the four activities described.

Art teachers continue to cite the lack of class time as a problem with teaching aesthetics. Obviously, production still dominates art programs, and the non-studio activities are worked in when time permits. Teachers on a block schedule find it easier to include instruction in non-studio activities.

The background of the students is another factor that can be problematic in teaching aesthetics. The assumption is that in order to participate in an aesthetics lesson, students are expected to have had prior academic, social, and aesthetic experiences upon which to build. This line of thinking suggests that students with poor socio-economic backgrounds are unprepared for engagement in aesthetics and, thus, aesthetics becomes an elitist activity.

The language proficiency of students is a very real concern for many art teachers. Students who are attempting to learn English in the school setting might naturally have difficulty understanding the abstract and language-based content of aesthetics. Teachers may choose to eliminate aesthetics rather than exclude these students from participation or to devote excessive class time attempting to communicate the abstract content. The issue here is one of communication, not of culture.

Lack of information about aesthetics appears again as a concern of art teachers. General textbooks have little information on aesthetics, and specialized textbooks have none. The state curriculum guide offers little guidance regarding the role, content, and methods for teaching aesthetics. Art teachers feel the need to communicate ideas and discuss problems with each other. As art teachers ride the wave of educational reform, the need to communicate intensifies as they and their programs face an uncertain future.

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

This chapter contains a consolidation of the conclusions from the three phases of this study: the pilot study, the survey questionnaire, and the documents. This consolidation is followed by a conceptual model for teaching aesthetics and the implications and contributions of this research.

Conclusions

The aim of this research, to describe what high school art teachers know and do about aesthetics, demanded a multi-method approach in order to determine the depth and breadth of their practice. The interviews, the survey, and the documents provided some very personal insights in addition to the objective responses. However, analysis of all three produced similar results; that is, the same themes that emerged from the pilot study interviews also emerged from the survey responses and the document analysis. The repetition of themes enhances the rigor and credibility of this research. Following is a distilled, composite summary of the results of this study.

Uncertainty about the role of aesthetics in the Georgia Visual Art Curriculum may be linked to uncertainty about the curriculum itself. The curriculum guide has little influence on what and how art teachers teach. The guide is cumbersome and difficult to

understand. Teachers have apparently received little guidance on its content and use. Consequently, an analysis of teachers' responses about the role of aesthetics reveals many contradictions. Although high school art teachers generally support a discipline-based approach to teaching art, they feel that the curriculum guide places undue emphasis on art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. Although they support a discipline-based curriculum because it promotes transfer, they are unsure whether an understanding of aesthetics transfers into better artwork. Production is their main focus, and they feel guilty that they cannot meet the perceived expectations for the other three components of the curriculum. Art teachers feel that aesthetics should be taught to all students, but they generally do not write plans and assess for aesthetics themselves.

Planning and assessing for aesthetics are strongly related to understanding of aesthetics. If art teachers have training in aesthetics, it is usually in graduate school. The meaning of aesthetics remains ambiguous to many teachers. Most art teachers associate aesthetics with philosophy and recognize that it develops higher order thinking skills and has its own content and skills. However, the analyses of the survey and the lesson plans both suggest that although teachers believe that they understand aesthetics, they often confuse aesthetics with criticism. The lesson plans that were submitted focus on criticism and perception and only hint at philosophy.

Preparing a lesson on aesthetics requires careful planning that includes determining objectives for the lesson. Although most teachers profess to teach aesthetics, few can provide written plans. For those who do plan for aesthetics, the employed teaching methods are equally teacher-centered and student-centered. Teacher-centered methods involve direct instruction. Student-centered methods are both individual and

group activities that include looking at, writing about, and making art. Student response is centered more upon individual written response than on whole group discussions.

Teachers are unsure about their ability to use the Socratic method of inquiry in discussions. Adopted textbooks commonly used in high schools are a poor source of information on aesthetics.

Problems associated with teaching aesthetics may stem from the perceived unrealistic expectations of the curriculum. Lack of time is one factor, especially for those who do not teach aesthetics. Production consumes most instructional time. Aesthetics is an ambiguous discipline, and some teachers feel that it may be too difficult or boring for students who only want to make art. Many teachers cite a range of readiness issues as problems with teaching aesthetics. Among those problems are low ability or academic levels, lack of prior experience in production and criticism, poor socio-economic background, lack of prior aesthetic experiences, and poor English fluency. Materials and resources provide insufficient information on the content and methods for instruction in aesthetics. Teachers feel that they have weak training in aesthetics and need to find out what others are doing about aesthetics.

Recommendations

How have high school art teachers in Georgia translated the theory about teaching aesthetics into practice? That question has provided the focus for this dissertation, and its answer rests on determining how art teachers interpret and implement the aesthetics component of the QCC. This research has shown that the aesthetics component has not been widely implemented for many theoretical and practical reasons. The concerns about

teaching aesthetics that emerged from this research may spring from a common problem: the QCC has adopted the form of a discipline-based art curriculum that includes aesthetics without articulating its substance.

Articulation of any curriculum should begin with statements of rationale based on a thoroughly researched theoretical foundation. It should include an explanation of terms that goes beyond mere definitions to delineate roles and relationships within the curriculum. The final and most important step towards an articulated and functional curriculum is communicating its rationale, scope and sequence, content, and use to all pre-service and in-service teachers who are responsible for its implementation. Weaknesses in all three of these areas have contributed to the inefficacy of the aesthetics component of the QCC.

A solution to the problems associated with the aesthetics component begins with reevaluation of the theoretical foundation for the DBAE structure itself. Anyone attempting to compartmentalize art into four components soon faces a conundrum. Consider the following. Production is technique informed by perception, criticism, history, and philosophy. The goal of the student working on the wheel is to produce a pot that conforms to certain standards of form, creativity, and craftsmanship that have evolved over time and are generally accepted. The other three components are even more entwined. Criticism is applied philosophical aesthetics. It applies a philosophy of art to a specific perceived artwork using deductive reasoning strategies. Philosophy uses inductive reasoning strategies that may originate with perceived artworks but soon transcends them into the realm of philosophy. Art history orients perceived artworks in a philosophical and socio-political continuum. Perception, art criticism, art history, and

philosophy are inextricably entwined, and the common thread in this great knot is the artwork itself. The studio component produces it, and the language based components talk about it.

A well-integrated art curriculum can untangle the knot of the components and weave their threads into a glorious tapestry. The individual threads alternately surface in a burst of color or texture and then withdraw to the underlying structure. A curriculum that attempts to balance the components equally is more like a plain-weave fabric, mechanically produced and uninspired.

The proper role of aesthetics in the tapestry of the curriculum is broad rather than narrow. In fact, a semantic shift produces a simplified and functional conceptual model for teaching aesthetics (See Table 7.1). Aesthetics is any inquiry about art, and the sub-disciplines of perception, art history, art criticism, and philosophy of art represent the different forms, simple and complex, that inquiry may take. This model clarifies the relationship among the non-studio components and makes three changes in the structure of the current Georgia Visual Art Curriculum. It returns perception as a separate area of inquiry because perception is the gatekeeper to all other forms of aesthetic inquiry. Next, it removes *connections*, which is not a discipline-specific component of art, but a component of learning instead. Finally, it adds philosophy of art as a separate sub-discipline. The philosophy of art represents the highest level of aesthetic inquiry. It is easy to see that the cognitive functions, or skills, of philosophy of art closely resemble those of the creative action of production, facilitating transfer between the two.

Table 7.1. The Structure of Aesthetics in the Art Curriculum

AESTHETICS			
Language-based inquiry <i>about</i> visual objects			
Target: All students			
Focus: Response to visual objects			
<u>Perception</u> Initial sensory response	<u>Art History</u> Historical and cultural traditions	<u>Art Criticism</u> Interpretation and judgment	<u>Philosophy of Art</u> Inquiry into the nature of art
Some Key Cognitive Functions			
Identify Describe	Classify Organize	Compare Evaluate	Question Synthesize Theorize Create

Aesthetics in this model derives from Baumgarten’s original definition that aesthetics is the science of sensory cognition (Dickie, 1997), or more simply put, in the visual arts, aesthetics is thinking about what we see. Baumgarten’s definition focuses on the affective cognitive response to visual objects rather than on the objects themselves. The aesthetics component of this model emphasizes the cognitive skills rather than the content of the language-based disciplines and encompasses the hierarchy of increasingly complex cognitive functions from visual perception to philosophy of art. The model also reflects the influence of Lanier’s (1980) dialogue curriculum for aesthetic literacy in that it distinguishes the unique language-based skills and content of aesthetics from those of studio production. In doing so, it reconciles the differences between aesthetic education, whose aim is aesthetic sensitivity, and aesthetics education, whose goal is philosophical inquiry. This model is a general framework for thinking about Western aesthetics in art education and does not promote a particular philosophy or approach. Teachers are

responsible for teaching students that there are many different philosophies that influence the way we think about art.

A note is appropriate here about the role of the affective domain in this model that is structured around cognitive behaviors. The dichotomization of affective and cognitive domains is a “theoretical convenience” (Eisner, 1973, p. 199) that facilitates curriculum construction. The reality, according to Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia (1964), is that “the two domains are tightly entwined. Each affective behavior has a cognitive-behavior counterpart of some kind, and vice versa” (p. 62). The objectives in each domain can evoke responses in the other.

Krathwohl et al. (1964) characterized the affective objectives as those that “emphasize a feeling tone, an emotion, or a degree of acceptance or rejection” (p. 7). Like the cognitive objectives, the affective objectives are ordered in a hierarchy from simple to complex, but they are structured around the internalization of values regarding interests, attitudes, values, appreciation, and judgment. Internalization includes the increasingly complex responses from a vague awareness to “a point where the individual responds very consistently to value-laden situations with an interrelated set of values, a structure, a view of the world” (p. 35). The five general categories of affective objectives, arranged from simple to complex, are receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization.

These categories are not language based, as are the cognitive categories. Eisner (1993) observed that cognition has become synonymous with linguistically mediated thought, and that assumption has produced a curriculum that is “linguistically saturated”

(p. 200). The Georgia Visual Art Curriculum is cognitively and linguistically oriented, and the model for aesthetics in Table 7.1 reflects this language-based orientation.

A high school art curriculum must address the needs of the general student population, which are different from those of the studio art students. Therefore, it should provide a separate introductory aesthetics course that is required for graduation, or at least offered as an elective. This course would complete the education of all students by introducing them to the language-based skills and content of art. Early engagement with aesthetics in the primary grades can develop those skills that are foundational for the more complex skills that are taught in high school. High school students are eager to express their personal voice. Instruction in aesthetics encourages students to develop into autonomous individuals who are capable of complex responses to art and the visual world.

This aesthetics course would integrate the teaching of perception, art history, art criticism, and philosophy of art. Occasional studio experiences should be provided to deepen the students' understanding of the processes and products of art, but the primary focus of this course should be the language-based disciplines organized around essential questions:

1. What is art?
2. Where does art come from?
3. Why is art important?
4. What do I need to know about art?
5. How do I respond to art?
6. What is my philosophy of art?

Confronting questions such as these in an aesthetics course would help all students to become aesthetically mature adults.

Studio courses teach the skills and content of production, informed by aesthetics, and target the art students who will produce art. Aesthetics factors into studio art courses in many ways, the most important of which is in teacher planning. Studio courses spring from historical, cultural, and philosophical traditions of production. The studio teacher must set goals that relate students to these traditions and link them to the larger world, thereby attaching additional layers of meaning to their work. Aesthetics provides that link. However, as Lanier (1987) stated 25 years ago, and this research continues to support today, there can be no universal aesthetics curriculum. An aesthetics curriculum must be flexible enough to accommodate the different needs of specific groups of students or individual teachers. Hamblen (1985) assumes that readiness is a factor for engagement in theory forming, and many teachers in this study seem to agree. Knowing that the aesthetics component is flexible enough to accommodate differences among students and teachers frees the art teacher from feeling guilty, as many now do, about not meeting all of the content standards in the curriculum guide.

Although production naturally dominates instructional time in a studio course, the studio art teacher must incorporate some form of aesthetic inquiry wherever it is appropriate and relevant to the work at hand. However, no attempt should be made to balance the time spent on the aesthetic components with that spent on production. The studio students will take the same required aesthetics course as the rest of the general student population, and, therefore, will have a basic understanding of the content and skills of each of the sub-disciplines. Aesthetic inquiry conducted in a studio class will

not only reinforce that learning, but it may also transfer into more meaningful artwork. Studio art teachers must carefully plan meaningful and relative lines of inquiry that will incorporate basic aesthetic understanding and build upon it.

Readiness of the art teacher is another critical issue regarding instruction in philosophical aesthetics. Most art teachers have had weak preparation in the content, skills and teaching methods of philosophy. They feel unsure about their ability to use the Socratic method, the foundational method for Western philosophical inquiry. In his dialogues, Socrates asked questions that guided him towards definitions of concepts. For example, in philosophical aesthetics, students seek an answer to the question, “What is art?” There is, of course, no one correct answer because art is an “open-ended” concept (Weitz, 1968), and to define it is to end it. The journey, however, is as important as the destination. As Townsend (1997) says about Socrates,

Socrates’ failure to discover the definitions he sought should not be taken as a philosophical failure, however. As Socrates argues, the only total failure would be if there were such definitions but we had not even tried to find them.

The attempt to formulate definitions, even if it does not succeed, may increase our understanding of the term and object. (p. 42)

If all of education is a search for truth, then the truth in art can only be an essential question.

Implications and Contributions

This research raises many questions about the role of aesthetics in the art curriculum and identifies the need for a widespread initiative to clarify the aesthetic component by addressing the following concerns:

1. Define aesthetics and identify the content and skills appropriate for instruction in aesthetics. Art teachers need to know what their students are expected to know and do in aesthetics.
2. Define the role of aesthetics in the art curriculum and how it relates to the other components. A re-examination of the theoretical and methodological foundations of the discipline-based approach to art education and its assumption of transfer among the disciplines is long overdue. Teachers need to know that aesthetics is important in its own right, and not just for its contributions to production. This study does not directly address transfer among the disciplines, and I believe that to be a critical area in need of further research. I have offered one framework for aesthetics as a stimulus to a new dialogue.
3. Identify appropriate methodologies for instruction and assessment of aesthetics.
4. Provide training and resources to promote instruction in aesthetics. Pre-service and in-service teachers should receive instruction in aesthetics and aesthetics methodology at the undergraduate level or in staff development.

5. Establish a multi-directional web of communication to facilitate the alignment of theory and practice. A collaboration of theorists, schools of art education, state agencies, local agencies, and practitioners should initiate responsible reform. Local agencies should provide coordinators responsible for communicating the curriculum and curriculum reform to the classroom art teachers.

Some of the questions about art teachers' perceptions and training that emerged from the pilot study have been answered in the course of this research and have been discussed in these conclusions. Those questions and summary answers are as follows:

1. What curriculum structure best serves the goals of art education?

The curriculum structure should be simple enough to be understood and flexible enough to allow for differences. It should focus on studio but infuse aesthetics whenever possible and appropriate.

2. Who reforms state art curricula and upon what research is the reform based?

Reform of the Georgia Visual Art Curriculum was initiated at the State Department of Education and carried out by classroom teachers from around the state. The revised curriculum is based largely on the National Standards. The problem, it seems, is not in the revision itself, but in the lack of staff development to communicate it to the classroom art teachers.

3. How do teachers perceive and use the state curriculum guide?

They find the curriculum guide cumbersome and they use it infrequently. It expects too much of the classroom art teacher.

4. What is the status of teacher training in aesthetics?

Teachers have weak backgrounds in aesthetics. Training is generally limited to graduate courses.

5. What do students need to know about aesthetics?

Students need to know that aesthetics is inquiry, and, therefore, they need to know which questions to ask and how to engage in inquiry. They need to know the language of art and its forms and to have the skills to interpret them for meaning. They should understand the significance of context and the theories that influence judgment.

Other questions from the pilot study remain unanswered, and I offer them here again with others as questions for further research.

1. How can art education programs train teachers of aesthetics?
2. How can teachers assess for aesthetics?
3. Does an understanding of aesthetics transfer into more meaningful artwork?
Does engagement in studio transfer into a deeper understanding of art?
4. How do we plan and assess for an integrated curriculum?

I undertook this research journey because of a personal need-to-know, fully expecting to arrive at a narrow definition of aesthetics that could fit comfortably into the four-component art curriculum. I emerged, on the contrary, rejecting the current curriculum structure and offering a broader and more functional definition of aesthetics. My sights have always been set on the needs of the classroom art teacher who struggles alone to interpret theory. This research has confirmed the findings of Jewell (1990) that art teachers need more training in aesthetics and a clearly articulated curriculum based on

sound research. It also documents the still existing gap between theory and practice in the art curriculum in Georgia. It is my hope that this research will stimulate a new dialogue to find ways to bridge that gap.

References

- Ackerman, D. & Perkins, D. N. (1989). Integrating thinking and learning skills across the curriculum. In H. H. Jacobs (Ed.), Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation (pp. 77-95). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Adler, M. (1982). Teaching philosophy at the high school level. Education Digest, 47(8), 11-14.
- Armstrong, C. (1996). A choice: Comfortable ambiguity or clearly translated standards. Studies in Art Education, 37(4), 253-256.
- Barkan, M. (1962). Transition in art education: Changing conceptions of curriculum and theory. Art Education, 15(7), 12-18.
- Barkan, M. (1966). Curriculum problems in art education. In Mattil, E. (Ed.), A seminar in art education for research and curriculum development (pp. 240-255). U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. V-002. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Barkan, M., Chapman, L., & Kern, E. (1970). Guidelines: Curriculum development for aesthetic education. Central Midwestern Regional Education Laboratory, Inc.
- Battin, M. P., Fisher, J., Moore, R. M., & Silvers, A. (1989). Puzzles about art: An aesthetic casebook. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

- Berleant, A. (1992). The aesthetics of environment. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bloom, B. (Ed.). (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. New York: Longman.
- Broudy, H. (1966). The structure of knowledge in the arts. In Smith, R. A. (Ed.), Aesthetics and criticism in art education. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Broudy, H. (1972). Enlightened cherishing. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Broudy, H. (1977). Some reactions to a concept of aesthetic education. In Madeja, S. (Ed.) The arts, cognition, and basic skills. St. Louis, MO: CEMREL.
- Broudy, H. (1988). Aesthetics as foundations of art education. In Farley, F. & Neperud, R. (Eds.) The foundations of aesthetics, art and art education. New York: Praeger.
- Bruner, J. (1960). The process of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bullock, A. & Galbraith, L. (1992). Images of art teaching: Comparing the beliefs and practices of two secondary art teachers. Studies in Art Education, 33 (2), 86-97.
- Burton, D. (1998). Survey of current research in art education. Studies in Art Education, 39 (2), 183-186.
- Carroll, K. & Kay, S. (1998). Instruction. In Zimmerman, E. (Ed.), The NAEA research task force status report. Reston, VA: NAEA, 13-17.
- Clark, G. A. & Zimmerman, E. (1978). Professional roles and activities as models for art education. In S. M. Dobbs (Ed.), Research readings for discipline-based art

- education: A journey beyond creating (pp. 78-97). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1995). Research methods in education (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Crawford, D. W. (1987). Aesthetics in discipline-based art education. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21 (2), 227-239.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Csikszentmihaly, M. (1978). Phylogenetic and ontogenetic functions of artistic cognition. In S. S. Madeja (Ed.), The arts, cognition, and basic skills (pp. 325-339). St. Louis, MO: CEMREL.
- Csikszentmihaly, M. & Schiefele, U. (1987). Arts education, human development, and the quality of experience. In B. Reimer & R. A. Smith (Eds.), The arts, education, and aesthetic knowing (pp. 169-191). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Delacruz, E. M. (1988). A conceptual framework for teaching aesthetics to elementary students. Tallahassee, FL: The Florida State University School of Visual Arts.
- Delacruz, E. & Dunn, P. (1996). The evolution of discipline-based art education. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 30 (3), 65-81.
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2000). Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1934). Art as experience. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

- Diblasio, M. (1985). Continuing the translation: Further delineation of the DBAE format. Studies in Art Education, 26 (4), 232-240.
- Dickie, G. (1974). What is art? An institutional analysis. In M. Rader (Ed.), A modern book of aesthetics (pp. 459-472). New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.
- Dickie, G. (1997). Introduction to aesthetics: An analytic approach. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dobbs, S. M. (Ed.). (1988). Research readings for discipline-based art education: A journey beyond creating. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Drake, S. M. (1993). Planning integrated curriculum: The call to adventure. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Eaton, M.M. (1994). Philosophical aesthetics: A way of knowing and its limits. In R. Moore (Ed.). Aesthetics for young people. Reston, VA: NAEA.
- Efland, A. D. (1979). Conceptions of teaching in art education. Art Education, 32 (4), 21-33.
- Efland, A. D. (1984). Curriculum concepts of The Penn State Seminar: An evaluation in retrospect. Studies in Art Education, 25 (4), 205-211.
- Efland, A. D. (1995). The spiral and the lattice: Changes in cognitive learning theory with implications for art education. Studies in Art Education, 36 (3), 134-153.
- Eisner, E. (1998). Does experience in the arts boost academic achievement? Art Education, 51 (1), 7-15.
- Eisner, E. (1973). The intelligence of feeling. In L. J. Rubin (Ed.). Facts and feelings in the classroom (pp. 193-214). New York: The Viking Press.

- Erickson, M. (1986). Teaching aesthetics K-12. In M. S. Dobbs (Ed.). Research readings for discipline-based art education: A journey beyond creating (pp. 148-161). Reston, VA: NAEA.
- Erickson, M. & Katter, E. (1986). The MELD core curriculum for a balanced art education. Paper delivered at the NAEA Convention. New Orleans, LA.
- Farley, F. & Neperud, R. (Eds.) (1988). The foundations of aesthetics, art and art education. New York: Praeger.
- Feldman, E. (1981). Varities of visual experience. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.
- Fisher, L.M.W. (1991). A survey of the inclusion of aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production in art teacher preparation programs (Doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 08A:2797.
- Foshay, A. (1966). Educational innovation and art education. In Mattil, E. (Ed.). A seminar in art education for research and curriculum development. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.
- Frankel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (1996). How to design and evaluate research in education (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Galbraith, L. (1990). Examining issues from general teacher education: Implications for preservice art education methods courses. Visual Arts Research, 16 (2), 51-58.
- Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic Books.
- Geahigan, G. (1987). The arts in education: A historical perspective. In Reimer, B. & Smith, R. (Eds.), The arts, education, and aesthetic knowing: Ninety first

- yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press.
- Georgia Department of Education (1998). Georgia visual arts curriculum. Atlanta, GA:
Department of Education.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago:
Aldine.
- Goodman, N. (1968). The languages of art. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Gorden, R. (1980). Interviewing strategy, techniques, and tactics. Homewood, IL:
Dorsey.
- Greer, W. D. (1984). Discipline-based art education: Approaching art as a subject of
study. Studies in art education, 25 (4), 212-218.
- Greer, W. D. (1987). A structure of discipline concepts for DBAE. Studies in Art
Education, 28 (4), 227-233.
- Hagaman, S. (1988). Philosophical aesthetics in the art class: A look toward
implementation. Art Education ,41 (3), 18-22.
- Hagaman, S. (1990). The community of inquiry: An approach to collaborative learning.
Studies in Art Education, 31 (3), 149-157.
- Hamblen, K. A. (1985). Developing aesthetic literacy through contested concepts. Art
Education, 38 (5), 19-24.
- Hamblen, K. A. (1987). An examination of discipline-based art education issues.
Studies in Art Education, 28 (2), 68-78.
- Hamblen, K. A. (1997). Instructional options for aesthetics. Art Education, 50 (1), 75-
83.

- Henry, C. (1995). Parallels between student responses to works of art and existing aesthetic theory. Studies in Art Education, 37 (1), 47-54.
- Huck, S. W. (2000). Reading statistics and research. New York: Longman.
- Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). The active interview. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Husserl, E. (1970). The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Jacobs, H. H. (Ed.) (1989). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jewell, R. P. (1990). An investigation of the current aesthetics component in art education as perceived at the secondary school level in a select county in upstate South Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia, Athens.
- Kaelin, E. F. & Ecker, D. W. (1977). The institutional prospects of aesthetic education. In S. Madeja (Ed.), Arts and aesthetics: An agenda for the future (pp. 229-242). St. Louis, MO: CEMREL.
- Kaelin, E. F. (1989). An aesthetics for art educators. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kaelin, E. F. (1990). The construction of a syllabus for aesthetics in art education. Art Education, 43 (2), 22-24, 33-35.
- Krathwohl, D., Bloom, B. & Masia, B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

- Lanier, V. (1974). A plague on all your houses: The tragedy of art education. Art Education, 27 (3), 12-15.
- Lanier, V. (1980). Six items on the agenda for the eighties. Art Education, 30 (5), 16-23.
- Lanier, V. (1984). Eight guidelines for selecting art curriculum content. Studies in Art Education, 25 (4), 232-237.
- Lanier, V. (1985). Discipline-based art education: Three issues. Studies in Art Education, 26 (4), 253-256.
- Lanier, V. (1986). The fourth domain. Studies in Art Education, 28 (1), 5-10.
- Lanier, V. (1987). A*R*T*, a friendly alternative to DBAE. Art Education, 40 (5), 48-52.
- Langer, S. (1953). Feeling and form. New York: Scribner's.
- Lankford, E. L. (1992). Aesthetics: Issues and inquiry. Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Lifschitz, S. (1991). Self-realization through aesthetic experience: An examination of rasa theory with implications for aesthetic inquiry in discipline-based art education (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1999).
Dissertation Abstracts International, AAT 9919691.
- Lipman, M. (1988). Philosophy goes to school. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Madeja, S. (1977). Arts and aesthetics: An agenda for the future. St. Louis, MO: CEMREL.
- Marshalek, D. & Rayala, M. (1998). Conceptual. In Zimmerman, E. (Ed.) The NAEA research task force status report. Reston, VA: NAEA, 9-12.
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulation? Educational Researcher, 17, (2), 13-17.

- Mattil, E. (Ed.). (1966). A seminar in art education for research and curriculum development. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Miles, M. B. (Ed.) (1964). Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Mims, S. & Lankford, L. (1995). Time, money, and the new art education: A nationwide investigation. Studies in Art Education, 36 (2), 84-95.
- Mittler, G. A. (1989). Art in focus. Mission Hills, CA: Glencoe Publishing Company.
- Moore, R. (1993). Aesthetic case studies and discipline-based art education. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 27 (3), 51-62.
- Moore, R. (1994). Aesthetics for young people: Problems and prospects. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28 (3), 5-17.
- Moore, R. (Ed.) (1995). Aesthetics for young people. Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). Phenomenological research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.) Common core of data: State education agency sites. Retrieved September 6, 1999, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/ccseas.html>.
- Newfeldt, V. (Ed.) (1997). Webster's new world college dictionary (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, Inc.
- Parsons, M. J. (1987). How we understand art: A cognitive developmental account of aesthetic experience. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Parsons, M. J. (1994). Can children do aesthetics? A developmental account. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28 (3), p. 33-45.
- Parsons, M. J. & Blocker, H. S. (1993). Aesthetics and education. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Paul, R. (1993). Critical thinking: How to prepare students for a rapidly changing world. Rohnert Park, CA: Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique.
- Ragans, R. (1988). Art talk. Mission Hills, CA: Glencoe Publishing Company.
- Reimer, B. (1987). What knowledge is of most worth in the arts? In. B. Reimer & R. A. Smith (Eds.). The arts, education, and aesthetic knowing . Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Reimer, B. & Smith, R. A. (1992). The arts, education, and aesthetic knowing. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Richardson, A. S. (1982). Educators' attitudes toward goals and theories of art education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 10A:3191.
- Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1990). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Boston, MA.
- Schutz, A. (1962). The problem of social reality. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Sharer, J. (1986). Children's inquiry into aesthetics. Paper delivered at NAEA Convention. New Orleans, LA.
- Smith, R. A. (Ed.). (1966). Aesthetics and criticism in art education. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

- Smith, R. A. (1987). Towards percipience: A humanities curriculum for arts education. In B. Reimer & R. A. Smith (Eds.). The arts, education, and aesthetic knowing. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, R. A. & Simpson, A. (Eds.). (1991) Aesthetics and arts education. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Stewart, M. G. (1997). Thinking through aesthetics. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.
- Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools. Bristol, PA: Falmer.
- Townsend, D. (1997). An introduction to aesthetics. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Van de Pitte, M. M. (1994). Discipline-based art education and the new aesthetics. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28 (2), 1-14.
- Venable, B. (1997). Teaching and learning aesthetics: A qualitative study of the implementation of aesthetics in a middle school art class (eighth-grade, public education). (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 59, 01A:0060.
- Weitz, M. (1968). The role of theory in aesthetics. In F. Coleman (Ed.) Contemporary studies in aesthetics. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 84-94.
- Zimmerman, E. (Ed.) (1998). The NAEA research task force status report. Reston, VA: NAEA.

Appendix A

Delores M. Diaz

2719 Inglewood Drive
Gainesville, GA 30504
(770) 534-4964
delmdiaz@aol.com

July 17, 2000

(Participant's address)

Dear (Participant),

I am a doctoral student at UGA, and the subject of my dissertation is the interpretation and implementation of the aesthetics component of DBAE by high school art teachers. My research will consist of interviews with five master art teachers that will generate questions for a general survey of high school art teachers in Georgia.

You are one of the six master art teachers I would like to interview because of your educational background, your experience, and your active involvement in our field. Your contributions and insights as a master teacher are important and will give direction to the research. Would you be willing to participate in an interview to discuss the aesthetics component?

The interview will be conducted at a time and a location of your choice, preferably before school starts this fall. It will last about one hour and will be very informal. I will audio record the interview to facilitate note taking and analysis. Enclosed is a copy of the required consent form for your perusal. At the time of the interview, I will ask you to sign an official copy.

If you are willing to participate, would you please notify me by any means listed above and indicate your preferred time and place? I will contact you again in one week to verify that you have received this letter and to answer any questions that you may have.

Sincerely,

Delores M. Diaz

Appendix B

CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in the research titled *Aesthetics in the high school art classroom: A description, analysis, and evaluation of teacher understanding and methodology*, which is being conducted by Delores M. Diaz, Art Education Department, the University of Georgia, (770) 534-4964, under the direction of Dr. Candace Stout, Art Education Department, (706) 542-1640. I understand that this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and have the results of the participation, to the extent that it can be identified as mine, returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The following points have been explained to me. The reason for the research is to describe, analyze, and evaluate high school art teachers' understanding of aesthetics and the methodologies they use for teaching aesthetics. Although I will receive no direct benefits from my participation, I will contribute to research that may impact the design and evaluation of art curricula, teaching materials, and teacher training programs.

I understand that I will be interviewed personally by the researcher after school hours at an off-campus location of my choice. The interview will last about one hour. Questions will be general in nature, and the method will be informal. There will be no discomforts or stresses, and no risks are foreseen.

The results of this participation will be confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior consent, unless otherwise required by law. The interview will be audio recorded, but the tape and transcript of the tape will be destroyed after the analysis and evaluation are complete.

The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by phone at (770) 534-4964 or by e-mail at delmdiaz@aol.com.

Please sign both copies of this form, keep one, and return the other to the researcher.

Researcher

Participant

Research at the University of Georgia which involves human participants is overseen by the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding your rights as a participant should be addressed to Ms. Julia Alexander, M. A., Institutional Review Board; Office of V. P. for Research; The University of Georgia; 606A Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514.

Appendix C

Demographic Information for Interviews

Please complete the following questionnaire by checking each answer that applies.

1. Gender: male female

2. Age: 21-30 31-40 41-50 51-60 over 60

3. Number of years of teaching experience:
 0-1 2-10 11-20 21-30 over 30

4. Degrees held: Institution Year Awarded Major

 BA/BS _____

 MEd/MA _____

 EdS _____

 EdD/PhD _____

Appendix D

Schedule of Questions for Personal Interviews

1. To what extent do you use the Georgia State QCC concepts and standards in planning for instruction?
2. What is your opinion about the inclusion of aesthetics as one of the four components of Georgia's DBAE curriculum?
3. What is your understanding of DBAE?
4. Do you plan for instruction in aesthetics? How do you go about planning for aesthetics?
5. Relative to the other three components, how much planning and instructional time do you devote to aesthetics?
6. What factors influence the degree of emphasis you place on aesthetics in your curriculum?
7. How would you describe your understanding of aesthetics?
8. How would you describe your ability to teach aesthetics?
9. Please describe any training you have had that prepared you to teach aesthetics.
10. What do you believe are the objectives or desired outcomes for teaching aesthetics?
11. What teaching methods are you most likely to employ when teaching aesthetics?
12. What specific resources (books, journals, textbooks, etc.) do you use in preparing to teach aesthetics?
13. Briefly describe one of your lessons that dealt specifically with aesthetics.
14. What were your desired outcomes for this lesson?
15. What were students doing when they were engaged in this lesson?
16. Was the lesson successful? How could you tell?
17. What means of assessment did you use for this lesson?
18. What personal attributes and skills do you think are important for teachers of aesthetics?
19. From your perspective, what is the value in having high school students learn about aesthetics?
20. Define aesthetics as you understand it.

Appendix E

Delores M. Diaz
2719 Inglewood Drive
Gainesville, GA 30504
(770) 534-4964
delmdiaz@aol.com

Dear Colleague:

I am a full-time secondary art teacher at West Hall High School in Hall County and a doctoral student of art education at the University of Georgia. As you know, our state art curriculum is discipline-based and contains four strands: studio production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. My area of interest is to determine the extent to which aesthetics is being implemented in the total art curriculum.

You are among the group of secondary art teachers I am requesting to participate in my research. Your response is very important because it assures that your voice will be among those that represent all of the secondary art teachers in Georgia. Would you please share your insights by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me in the self-addressed stamped envelope by May 2?

You will notice that the questionnaire contains items about your professional background as well as about your teaching practices. Inclusion of these items will enable me to determine if there is a relationship among those two variables. Please be candid in your responses and do not consult references. In this survey, what you *do not* know or do is as important as what you *do* and may help to identify gaps in teacher training or weaknesses in the curriculum. Information you provide will remain strictly confidential, and you will never be identified individually in any way.

Completing the questionnaire will take only about twenty minutes, but it can contribute a great deal towards the improvement of our profession. I would truly appreciate your participation and will be happy to send you a summary of my research findings. Please contact me at the address above if I can answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Delores M. Diaz

Appendix F

Code No. _____

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The following information is very important because it will help me to determine if there is a relationship between art teachers' backgrounds and their teaching practices. All information will be strictly confidential, and you will never be identified individually in any way.

EDUCATION:			
Degree	Institution	Year	Major
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
Years teaching experience (Please check):			
_____ 0-1	_____ 2-10	_____ 11-20	_____ Over
20			
Current teaching position (Please check):			
_____ Full-time certified art teacher	_____ Part-time certified art teacher		
_____ Teaching art without art certification	Other _____		
Would you be willing to participate in a personal interview to discuss your teaching practices?			
_____ Yes	_____ No		
If yes, then please complete the information below so that I may contact you. All information will be strictly confidential.			
NAME _____			

Please circle your response to each statement as follows:

SA=strongly agree A=agree U=Undecided D=disagree SD=strongly

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. I use the Georgia state art curriculum for planning art instruction. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. My degree program(s) prepared me to teach aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. Instruction in aesthetics is based on specific objectives or desired outcomes. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. Some form of aesthetics should be taught to students of all ages. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. Production consumes most of my instructional time. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. Aesthetics has no concise definition. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. I use professional periodicals and journals as a source of information about aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. A knowledge and understanding of aesthetics is evident in students' art work. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 9. The four components of the art curriculum (studio, history, criticism, aesthetics) should be given equal emphasis. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 10. Aesthetics is the analysis of the visual elements in a particular work of art. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 11. I am confident in my ability to use the Socratic method of inquiry with my students. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 12. Teaching aesthetics requires careful planning. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 13. Most art teachers do not teach aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 14. I use worksheets and quizzes as means of assessment for aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 15. My students know the meaning of the term <i>aesthetics</i> . | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 16. Students need a background in production and criticism before engaging in aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 17. If requested, I can provide a written lesson plan on aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 18. Art teachers are expected to meet all of the state QCC concepts and standards. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 19. One example of a lesson on aesthetics is to describe, analyze, interpret, and evaluate a particular work of art. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 20. Because aesthetics is so complex, most teaching methods are necessarily teacher-centered. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 21. Time constraints prevent me from teaching aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 22. I refer to the state art curriculum guide frequently. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 23. The adopted textbooks and teachers' guides provide sufficient material on aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 24. Students who are not fluent in English cannot engage in aesthetics because aesthetics in language-based. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 25. High school art students should be taught the aesthetic theories that have influenced production, history, and criticism. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 26. Lessons in aesthetics may be student driven. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 27. My students know when they are involved in a lesson on aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 28. Aesthetics is the philosophy of art and the philosophy of beauty. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 29. Aesthetics is too difficult for most students. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 30. I am confident in my ability to conduct student driven discussions. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 31. I use essays or short written discussions as a means of assessment for aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 32. I plan lessons that specifically address aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 33. I understand aesthetics well enough to teach it. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 34. A good lesson in aesthetics may sometimes cause students to feel frustrated or uncomfortable. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 35. Aesthetics has its own unique content and skills. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 36. Students don't like lessons that deal with aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 37. Having art classes with students of mixed ability is an obstacle to teaching aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 38. I do not assess for aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 39. Aesthetics cultivates higher order thinking skills. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 40. If requested, I can provide a written lesson plan that deals with aesthetics. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it to me by **May 2** in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Delores M. Diaz
2719 Inglewood Drive
Gainesville, GA 30504

770-534-4964

delmdiaz@aol.com

Appendix G

Delores M. Diaz
2719 Inglewood Drive
Gainesville, GA 30504
(770) 534-4964
delmdiaz@aol.com

May 20, 2001

Dear Colleague:

It is the end of the school year, and I know that you are deeply involved, as I am, in final grading, organizing your room, and ordering supplies for next year. It is, therefore, with great respect and humility that I again ask for ten minutes of your time to complete the enclosed research questionnaire.

We all know that the actual art curriculum is what we choose to teach in our individual classrooms. Our choices are based not only on our own strengths, but also on knowledge of our students, what is of value to learn, and what will work in the classroom. Therefore, it is important for curriculum designers to know if what we teach differs from the adopted curriculum and the reasons for any differences.

This study is not designed to judge teachers, but to identify any gaps between theory and practice in the art curriculum. Your voice is critical in this study because you have been randomly chosen to help represent all of the public high school art teachers in Georgia.

Please take a few moments of your time to complete this short questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. Your response will be strictly confidential, and you will never be identified individually in any way. I will be happy to send you a summary of the findings. If you have any questions, you may reach me at the above address.

Sincerely,

Delores M. Diaz, Art Teacher
West Hall High School

Appendix H

Delores M. Diaz
2719 Inglewood Drive
Gainesville, GA 30504
(770) 534-4964
delmdiaz@aol.com

August 13, 2001

Dear Colleague,

Thank you so very much for participating in my recent survey on how high school art teachers interpret and implement the aesthetics component of our curriculum. You and the others who responded will, I believe, have a definite impact on future revisions of the state art curriculum.

In order to provide a richer description of what teachers are doing with aesthetics, I would like to examine sample lesson plans that art teachers actually use for teaching aesthetics. My goal is to produce something that is practical for classroom art teachers like ourselves.

You indicated on the survey that you could provide a lesson plan on aesthetics if requested. Could you now provide me with one? For your convenience, I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope and a sample lesson plan form, but I will gladly accept any form you choose to send. Any information that you provide will be strictly confidential and will never be identified with you in any way. I would appreciate your response by September 7.

This October I will be presenting a report of my research findings in a workshop at the joint GAEA/SCAEA State Conference in Augusta. I hope that you will be able to attend so that I can meet you and thank you in person for your generous contributions.

Sincerely,

Delores M. Diaz

Appendix I

Code: _____

LESSON PLAN-AESTHETICS

Title/Subject of Lesson:
Objectives:
Materials/Resources:
Methods (Please include specific content, concepts, and vocabulary. Indicate what the teacher and the students will be doing):
Assessment:

Please use back if additional space is needed.