

1985

Effect of Professional Training of the Secondary Art Teacher on the Quality of Learning Experiences Provided in the Art Program

Julie D. McAloon
University of North Florida

Suggested Citation

McAloon, Julie D., "Effect of Professional Training of the Secondary Art Teacher on the Quality of Learning Experiences Provided in the Art Program" (1985). *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 300.
<https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/300>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).

© 1985 All Rights Reserved

Effect of Professional Training of the Secondary Art Teacher
on the Quality of Learning Experiences
Provided in the Art Program

By

Julie D. McAloon

A Project Submitted to Dr. Michael Smith
as Partial Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Education

University of North Florida
College of Education

July, 1985

Signature Deleted

Dr. Michael Smith

Signature Deleted

Dr. Marianne Betkouski, Committee

Signature Deleted

Dr. David Jacobsen, Committee

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. <u>Introduction</u>	1
II. <u>Review of the Related Literature</u>	5
Professional Training of the Art Teacher	6
The Quality Art Program in the Secondary School	7
Summary of the Related Literature	11
III. <u>Design of the Study</u>	12
The Survey	12
The Criteria	13
Validation of the Study	13
Hypothesis	14
IV. <u>Analysis of the Data</u>	16
V. <u>Conclusions and Recommendations</u>	24
References	26
Appendix	28

Abstract

An art teacher currently acquires professional training through one of two schools: the department of education or the department of fine arts. Do the differences in training of the art teacher affect the quality of learning experiences provided in the secondary art program? A questionnaire was designed to survey the type of professional preparation of the teacher, as well as specific aspects of his or her art program. The survey was mailed to 85 secondary art teachers in the surrounding area. Surveys returned were grouped according to background: teachers having a degree in education and teachers having a degree in fine arts. Item scores for the responses were then tabulated for both groups and subjected to t-tests for significant differences in group mean scores. The resulting information revealed differences for the majority of the survey items, which suggest that the quality of learning experiences are in part affected by professional training of the art teacher.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express her sincere thanks and appreciation to the following individuals who helped make this project possible:

To Dr. Michael Smith for his valuable assistance and guidance, not only during this project, but during my years of study at UNF.

To my husband, Stephen, for his undying patience, support, and understanding-- always.

To my dear friends, Karen and Alison, for the support and assistance they provided during the final stages of this project.

To Michelle, for being the excellent companion that she was during our joint venture.

Chapter I

Introduction

Background and Rationale

There are currently two avenues by which a student becomes an art teacher: (a) by receiving a four-year degree in education with art courses in the interim; or (b) by receiving a four-year degree in the fine arts, followed by teacher certification.

Due to the individual nature of their roles as professions, the two fields of study are clearly different in regard to emphasis on education, technical training, philosophical indoctrination, and professional prerequisites (Anderson, 1981).

Do the differences in training of the art teacher influence the quality of the learning experiences provided in the art program?

A primary concern of the art educator is the effect the artistic process has on the individual; the student being the product and the art object the by-product of an art experience. The artist, although his or her main concern may be the end product, also values the learning process, considering learning to be a life-long, on-going process (Anderson, 1981).

The artist in education has valuable contributions to make to art education through the knowledge, understanding, and skills drawn from training in the specific areas of art history, art criticism, artistic production, and aesthetics. Instruction in these areas is particularly applicable to the secondary level

for it is at this stage of development that the student is beginning to approach art experiences as an adult (Michael, 1970).

From the time the child is first able to scribble until around the age of 12 to 14, he or she goes through a series of developmental stages in visual artistic expression. Having grown through these stages, the individual arrives at a stage of reasoning where he or she is intellectually, consciously, and critically aware (Michael, 1970). It is then possible for the individual to consciously develop artistic skills, bridging the gap between the natural, spontaneous artistic expression of children and the art of the professional world.

It is at this stage of artistic development that the student needs specific direction in order to satisfy his or her intellectual needs. Effects of training can be seen in the quality of the student's work, therefore effective art learning experiences, which give form to the student's newly acquired perceptual awareness, are indispensable to the continuation of his or her mental growth (McFee, 1970).

Michael (1970) reasons that ideas and behaviors held important and practiced by the professional artist generally are important to those students learning about art and individual artistic expression on the secondary level. Teachers who have developed a high level of visual sensitivity and have experienced the process of artistic expression are more aware of the possibilities for art learning, and more capable in assisting the unfolding of their students' artistic growth and development (McFee, 1970).

Another concern addresses the current lack of definition for a discipline of art education in our nation's schools (Clark, 1984).

Twenty years ago, Barkan (1963) pointed out the need for art educators to define art education as a discipline in order for the profession to be worthy of the recognition that other disciplines in education receive. Defining such a discipline requires more clearly defined content as well as relationships between means and ends in the art program (Clark, 1984).

As of 1970, the teaching of art as a central part of the American school program had not been established, specifically due to the lack of year-to-year consistency of art instruction and the inability of art teachers to agree on what art content should be (McFee, 1970).

As of 1984, the issue of defining art education as a discipline is still not resolved (Clark, 1984).

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has recently completed two assessments surveying student achievement and attitudes. It appears that visual art students are not learning art knowledge and art skills in their classrooms (Zimmerman, 1984). According to Zimmerman (1984), the majority of art teachers do not teach the valuing of art, art history, drawing and design skills, or art criticism; areas which should be of primary importance in the art program for art education to be meaningful.

Are art teachers specifically trained in specific art content better qualified to identify the necessary means and ends of effective

art learning experiences required to define art education as a discipline?

In order to implement the project, a questionnaire was designed to survey the specific professional preparation of secondary art teachers in the surrounding area and the types of learning experiences taking place in their art programs.

The quality of the various learning experiences addressed in the survey was based on discipline-centered art education curricula, such as those designed by Chapman (1978), Clark and Zimmerman (1978), Efland (1970), and Eisner (1972).

Using the resulting information, it was the purpose of the project to determine if the quality of learning experiences provided in the secondary art program is in part affected by the type of professional training of the art teacher.

Chapter II

Review of the Related Literature

The questionnaire which was used to implement the project surveyed the type of professional training of the individual secondary art teacher as well as specific learning experiences provided in his or her art program.

Chapman reported to the 1978 Teaching Process and Arts and Aesthetics Conference that the background and values of the teacher influence both how they taught art and what they taught. She said that "it is typical for the art teacher to make significant decisions about aims, content, means, and evaluative techniques for the students' program of studies" Chapman's study (cited in Lahr, 1984).

Chapman (1979) continued her inquiry into the teaching process by publishing the results of a questionnaire survey in School Arts magazine which dealt with a variety of topics relating to art teachers and their art programs.

Baker, the editor of School Arts, commented in an editorial (Chapman, 1979) introducing the results of the survey:

Dr. Chapman has demonstrated that such efforts have many values; they create hard data for our arguments, illuminate strengths and weaknesses - and the distances between them - in our art programs, and they contribute to informed decision-making regarding program changes. Above all, her survey prompted self-reflection - something we all need occasionally. (p. 2)

Lahr (1984) states that future studies, such as Chapman's Teacher Viewpoint Survey, which focus on the professional status of art educators and the kinds of art programs in each state need to be conducted on a regular basis to reveal trends in the field, to serve as a basis for congruency in art programs between regions, and to serve as a useful data base for research in art education.

Professional Training of the Art Teacher

Currently, the art teacher is professionally trained through one of two schools: the department of education, or the department of fine arts. The differences in training are manifested in the relative amounts of work the two different fields require in professional preparation.

Munro (1966) claims that many teacher training institutions over-emphasize the course requirements in educational theory, while requiring too little preparation in art production, art history, and art theory.

The professional training of the artist, however, is specifically designed to develop the concepts, skills, and discipline of the professional artist (Finkelstein, 1984).

In the Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education (1977) it was stated that the professional training of the art teacher should emphasize specialized study of the content of art appreciation, art history, aesthetics, art criticism, and of basic concepts and skills related to the processes of art production.

The Report further suggested that individuals specially trained in art, who are knowledgeable about subject matter, who can create as artists in their own right, and who have the ability to teach concepts and experiences in the visual arts should be teaching art in the classroom.

It seems that the art teacher trained specifically as an artist generally has a broader base of knowledge of art content and increased ability in skills and conceptualization required to implement learning experiences inherent to a quality art program (Finkelstein, 1982).

The Quality Art Program in the Secondary School

The content of a quality art program in secondary schools, as stated by the Report of the NAEA Commission of Art Education (1977), has two major components: the productive element (studio experiences); and the appreciative element (art history and art theory). Both components should use as their source of content the roles and activities of the professional artist, art historian, art critic, and aesthetician in order to directly relate the art program to the real world of the arts and work of the artist (Clark and Zimmerman, 1981).

Clark and Zimmerman (1981) also suggest that studio experiences addressing the activities of the professional artist should include instruction in concepts and technical skills related to the production of art and knowledge of design elements and principles of art.

Creation of expressive forms, according to the Report of the NAEA Commission (1977), should include the following: drawing,

painting, printmaking, sculpture, photography, film-making, graphic communication, and crafts (fibers, clay, stitchery, basketry, etc.)

The program should foster aesthetic and artistic development in the student through active exercise and application in observation, production performance and discussion of works of art, and that development of ideas should go hand-in-hand with the acquirement of skills (Munro, 1966).

Barkan (1970) said, "...the schoolboy learning art is an artist, and it is easier for him to learn art behaving like an artist than by doing something else" (p.242).

The quality of the secondary art program should help students gain respect for themselves as artists, as well as for professional artists and the role they play in society, making use of community resources, such as viewing art exhibits, inviting visiting artists into the school, and field trips to artists' studios to gain insight into how an artist works (Hathaway, 1977).

Barkan (1970) adds that creating an atmosphere of the artist's studio in the classroom, encouraging students to experiment with different media in order to discover the possibilities of each, and learning how to use media selectively helps students develop and awareness to dealing with important ideas and problems encountered in their own work.

The appreciative component of the quality secondary art program involves study in the roles of the art historian, art critic, and

aesthete. The NAEA Commission suggests that content should develop knowledge and understanding of traditional and contemporary art forms and how art contributes to the individual and society. Frequent visits to museums and galleries can facilitate awareness to the appreciative component of the arts.

The report also states that the quality art program should assist the student in acquiring critical art language in order to be able to analyze and make sensitive judgements about their own work and the work of others (Davis, 1981).

Eisner (1972) adds that sufficient continuity in the art program is necessary so that skills can be developed and refined by basing new experiences on previously learned skills.

Eisner (1972) also reports the value of a depth-approach in the teaching of content. A program of depth allows long-term concentration in one specific area of study, permitting transition from one problem to another. Eisner's findings suggest that students working in a depth-oriented program have a higher degree of spontaneity and aesthetic quality than students experiencing a wide variety of different activities in their work.

Innovative programs in the arts identify a quality art program, according to Davis (1981), for example: integration of other academic courses; studying the related arts (music, dance, drama, etc.); and involving local artists in the art program.

Promoting awareness of the arts through student exhibits (in-school

and out-of-school) adds to the quality of the secondary art program, as well as newspaper or television coverage of special projects or displays of the art program (Hathaway, 1977).

The NAEA Commission (1977) states that continuous evaluation is performed by the art teacher in a quality art program to improve the program itself, the character and quality of the teaching, and what the student learns and experiences; effective evaluation focuses on the attainment of desired goals and processes, not the product.

Another aspect of a quality secondary art program is the art teacher's personal involvement as an artist. The Report of the NAEA Commission (1977) states that an important goal of an art education program is to provide students with experiences in artistic creation and an understanding of the processes involved in making works of art. To do this successfully depends on the teacher's personal involvement in the activities of an artist. Through such an involvement, the teacher can gain an understanding of the processes of creation, from the initial idea to the final form of expression.

Lowenfeld (1975) adds that the art teacher should be active as an artist, continually adding to the knowledge acquired in professional training in order to be better able to provide these experiences for the students.

The art teacher should frequently exhibit his or her art work, as well as visit exhibits of other artists. Writing articles for professional magazines further publicizes the individual as a

professional artist. By being continually active as an artist, as well as an art teacher, the individual adds to his or her knowledge of art, refreshing ideas and keeping alive to all that is involved in creating art, thus making art more meaningful to the students (Lowenfeld, 1975).

Summary of the Related Literature

The professional preparation of the art teacher today varies, as do the types of art learning experiences being provided in the secondary art classroom. Many teacher-training institutions are not requiring adequate preparation of the student in necessary art skills, as reported by Munro (1966). Other such institutions, however, do require more of the specialized art courses necessary to develop these skills. Finkelstein (1984) claims that the professional training of the artist is specifically designed to develop the concepts, skills, and discipline of the professional artist.

Guidelines recommended for quality art learning experiences in the secondary art program, based on discipline-centered art education curricula were reviewed from The NAEA Commission (1977), as well as other notable art educators, such as Clark and Zimmerman (1981), Eisner (1972), and Hathaway (1977).

The effect of the professional training of the art teacher on the quality of art learning experiences provided in the secondary art program was the source of the project.

Chapter III

Design of the Study

The Survey

The purpose of this project was to determine if the quality of learning experiences provided in the secondary art program is in part affected by the type of professional training of the art teacher.

In order to implement the project, a questionnaire was designed (see Appendix) to survey the type of professional preparation of the art teacher, as well as specific aspects of his or her art program.

The survey was mailed to 85 secondary art teachers in the six surrounding counties, along with a self-addressed stamped envelope in which to return the completed form. The background information completed on the survey identified the individual as belonging to one of two populations: Group A- individuals having received a degree in education with art courses in the interim; or Group B- individuals having received a degree in the fine arts, followed by teacher certification.

Of the 42 surveys returned, 28 were identified as belonging to Group A; 14 as belonging to Group B.

Each of the 17 items on the survey and its responses were carefully examined to avoid vagueness in wording and to insure content validity.

The Criteria

Criteria for selecting items to assess the quality of art learning experiences provided by the individual art teacher in the art program were based on discipline-centered art education curricula, such as those designed by Chapman (1978), Clark and Zimmerman (1981), Eisner (1972), and McFee (1970), in addition to guidelines recommended by the NAEA Commission on Art Education (1977) for quality art programs, as discussed in the previous chapter.

Validation of the Survey

Eleven of the items responded to on the survey were subjected to statistical analysis due to the hierarchical arrangement of their responses. (Responses to items not included in the statistical analysis are observed in Chapter V.) Scoring of the items was performed by assigning a numerical value from one to six to the responses (depending on the number of responses in the item), then scoring each item accordingly. As the responses to the items were arranged in hierarchical order, a higher score indicated a higher degree of quality of learning experience surveyed in the item. Conversely, a lower score indicated a lower degree of quality of learning experience.

The item scores for both populations, Group A and Group B, were then tabulated and subjected to t-tests for significant differences between group mean scores.

Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis I- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of the amount of opportunities provided by the art teacher for student art exhibitions in school.

Null Hypothesis II- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of the amount of opportunities provided by the art teacher for student art exhibitions in the community.

Null Hypothesis III- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of class visits to galleries/museums provided by the teacher.

Null Hypothesis IV- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of integration of art into other subject areas, such as science, social studies, etc.

Null Hypothesis V- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of relating the visual arts with the related arts, such as dance, drama, music, etc.

Null Hypothesis VI- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of art history/art appreciation taught in the art program.

Null Hypothesis VII- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of importance placed on being a practicing artist/craftsworker in addition to being an art teacher.

Null Hypothesis VIII- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of art production/exhibition practices of the art teacher in the crafts (weaving, ceramics, basketry, etc.).

Null Hypothesis IX- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of art production/exhibition practices of the art teacher in the studio arts (drawing, painting, sculpture, etc.).

Null Hypothesis X- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of personal visits by the art teacher to galleries/museums.

Null Hypothesis XI- There is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of in-class art production by the art teacher.

Chapter IV

Analysis of the Data

This chapter deals with the analysis and results of the data assembled from the survey responses. The item scores for Group A and Group B were tabulated, then subjected to t-tests to determine whether significant differences exist between group mean scores of art teachers having degrees in education (Group A) and those having degrees in art (Group B). For research purposes, the Alpha level was set at .05.

Statistical Findings

Null Hypothesis I states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of amount of opportunities provided by the art teacher for student art exhibitions in school. A t-test performed for NH I (see Table 1) revealed significant differences between group mean scores: $t(34.0) = 4.57, p > .05$. As shown in Table 1, the difference in mean scores indicates that Group B appears to provide significantly more opportunities for students to exhibit their art work in school. NH I was therefore rejected.

Table 1

T-test to Test Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH I

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	2.80	1.21	Equal	4.57*	34.0
B	4.90	1.51			

* $p > .05$

Null Hypothesis II states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of amount of opportunities provided by the art teacher for community exhibits of student art work. Using the results shown in Table 2 of the t -test performed for NH II, it is evident that there is no significant difference between group mean scores: $t(11.5) = 1.86, p < .05$. Neither group provided significantly more opportunities than the other for student art exhibits in the community. Therefore, the study failed to reject NH II.

Table 2

T-test to Test Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH II

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	t	df
A	1.96	1.21	Unequal	1.86*	11.5
B	2.50	1.00			

* $p < .05$

Null Hypothesis III states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of class visits to galleries and museums. As shown in Table 3, a t -test for NH III revealed significant differences between group mean scores: $t(34.0) = 3.82, p > .05$. The difference in mean scores (see Table 3) indicates that Group B appears to provide significantly more frequent visits to galleries and museums for the students than does Group A. NH III was therefore rejected.

Table 3

T-test to Test Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH III

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	1.56	0.50	Equal	3.82*	34.0
B	2.33	0.65			

*p > .05

Null Hypothesis IV states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency that the teacher integrates art into other subject areas. Results of the t-test reported in Table 4 reveal a significant difference between group mean scores: t (34.0) = 5.72, $p > .05$. The difference in mean scores shown in Table 4 indicates that Group B seems to integrate art significantly more frequently than Group A. Therefore, NH IV was rejected.

Table 4

T-test to Test Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH IV

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	1.58	0.58	Equal	5.72*	34.0
B	2.92	0.80			

*p > .05

Null Hypothesis V states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency that the teacher integrates the visual arts with the related arts. A t -test for NH V (see Table 5) failed to reveal a significant difference between group mean scores: $t(34.0) = 0.73, p < .05$. Neither group integrated the visual arts with the related arts more frequently than the other. Therefore, the study failed to reject NH V.

Table 5

T-test to Test Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH V

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	t	df
A	1.63	0.49	Equal	0.73*	34.0
B	1.75	0.45			

* $p < .05$

Null Hypothesis VI states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency that art history/art appreciation is taught in the art program. A t -test for NH VI, as shown in Table 6, revealed significant differences between group mean scores: $t(13.9) = 2.68, p > .05$. The difference in mean scores (see Table 6) indicates that Group B appears to teach art history/art appreciation in the art program more frequently than does Group A. NH VI was therefore rejected.

Table 6

T-test to Test for Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH VI

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	1.45	0.59	Unequal	2.68*	13.9
B	2.41	1.16			

*p > .05

Null Hypothesis VII states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of the importance placed on being a practicing artist/craftswoman in addition to being an art teacher. A t-test for NH VII (see Table 7) failed to reveal a significant difference between group mean scores: t (34.0) = 1.89, $p < .05$. As indicated in Table 7, neither group feels more strongly than the other that it is important to be a practicing artist in addition to being an art teacher. Therefore, the study failed to reject NH VII.

Table 7

T-test to Test for Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH VII

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	2.33	0.64	Equal	1.89*	34.0
B	2.83	0.94			

*p < .05

Null Hypothesis VIII states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of art production/exhibition practices of the art teacher in the crafts. As shown in Table 8, a t-test for NH VIII revealed significant differences in group mean scores: t (13.4) = 3.37, $p > .05$. The difference in mean scores (see Table 8) indicates that Group B appears to create and exhibit in the crafts more often than does Group A. NH VIII was therefore rejected.

Table 8

T-test to Test for Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH VIII

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	2.04	0.81	Unequal	3.37*	13.4
B	3.83	1.75			

* $p > .05$

Null Hypothesis IX states that there are no significant differences between Group A and Group B mean scores of art production/exhibition practices of the art teacher in the studio arts. A t-test performed for NH IX (see Table 9) revealed significant differences between group mean scores: t (34.0) = 7.56, $p > .05$. As shown in Table 9, the difference in mean score indicates that Group B seems to produce and exhibit studio art work more frequently than Group B. Therefore, NH IX was rejected.

Table 9

T-test to Test for Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH IX

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	2.16	0.92	Equal	7.54*	34.0
B	4.42	0.67			

*p > .05

Null Hypothesis X states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of personal visits by the art teacher to galleries/museums. Using the results shown in Table 10 of the t-test performed for NH X, it is evident that there is no significant difference between group mean scores: $\underline{t} (34.0) = 1.66, p < .05$. Neither group visited galleries or museums more frequently than the other. Therefore, the study failed to reject NH X.

Table 10

T-test to Test for Differences in Group Mean Scores for NH X

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	2.66	1.49	Equal	1.66*	34.0
B	3.50	1.24			

*p < .05

Null Hypothesis XI states that there is no significant difference between Group A and Group B mean scores of frequency of in-class art production by the art teacher. A t-test performed for NH XI (see Table 11) revealed a significant difference between mean scores: $\underline{t} (34.0) = 2.75, p > .05$. The difference in mean scores shown in Table 10 indicates that Group B appears to produce art in the classroom more frequently than does Group A. NH XI was therefore rejected.

Table 11

T-test to Test for Differences in Group Means Scores for NH XI

Group	Mean	SD	Variance	<u>t</u>	df
A	2.63	0.87	Equal	2.75*	34.0
B	3.41	0.66			

* $p > .05$

Chapter V

Conclusions and Recommendations

It can be concluded from the analysis of the data that significant differences exist between the two groups of art teachers surveyed in the quality of learning experiences they provide in the art program.

Art teachers with a degree in art had a much higher group mean score for providing opportunities for students to exhibit their art work in school and to visit galleries and museums than teachers with an education degree. Group mean scores for teachers having an art degree were found to be much higher for how often they integrate art into other subject areas and give instruction in art history and art appreciation. Higher mean scores for teachers with an art degree indicate that they tend to create and exhibit art work more often than teachers with an education degree, as well as more frequently produce art in front of their students.

There was no significant difference in group mean scores of opportunities provided by either group for student art exhibitions in the community, nor was a difference found in mean scores for frequency of integrating the visual arts with the related arts by either group. No difference was found between group mean

scores of how important the teacher feels it is to be a practicing artist as well as an art teacher. Subsequent studies might attempt to determine the reason that no differences were found in these areas.

For the survey items not submitted to statistical analysis in this project, the following speculations were made:

- Art teachers with a degree in art appear to offer a wider selection of enrichment activities to their students, such as field trips to studios of local artists, art festivals, art club, etc. than did art teachers with a degree in education.
- The majority of art teachers with a degree in education feel the major goal of their art program is to present a good foundation in design elements and principles. The majority of art teachers with a degree in art believe their main goal is to develop openness to new ideas, originality, and imagination.

Future studies of a similar nature might address these observations in greater detail.

Factors which could possibly affect the conclusions inferred from the statistical segment of this project are the limited sample of participants and the limited return of responses to the survey. It is recommended that a similar study be performed on a larger scale- perhaps statewide- before more obvious conclusions can be drawn.

References

- Anderson, C.H. (1981). The identity crisis of the art educator: Artist? teacher? both? Art Education, 34(4), 45-46.
- Barkan, M. (1970). Guidelines: Curriculum development for aesthetic education. St. Louis, MO: CEMREL.
- Chapman, L. (1979). Teacher viewpoint survey. School Arts, 78(9), 2-5.
- Clark, G. (1984). Getting back on track. Art Education, 37(3), 4.
- Clark, G., Zimmerman, E. (1978). A walk in the right direction: A model for visual arts education. Studies in Art Education, 19(2), 34-49.
- Clark, G., Zimmerman, E. (1981). Toward a discipline of art education. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(1), 53-55.
- Davis, D.J. (1971). Artist-in-residence project: A report on training evaluations. St. Louis, MO: CEMREL.
- Efland, A. (Ed.). (1970). Guidelines for planning art instruction. Columbus, OH: State of Ohio Department of Education.
- Eisner, E.W. (1972). Educating artistic vision. New York: Macmillan.
- Feldman, E. (1970). Art in American higher institutions. Washington, DC: National Art Education Association.
- Finkelstein, L. (1982). Some preliminary considerations regarding the education of artists. Art Journal, 42, 39-42.
- Hathaway, W. (1977). Art education: Middle/junior high school. Washington, DC: National Art Education Association.

- Lahr, J.S. (1984). Who teaches art: A report of recent surveys. Studies in Art Education, 25(2), 115.
- Lowenfeld, V., Brittain, W.L. (1975). Creative and mental growth. New York: Macmillan.
- McFee, J. (1970). Preparation for art. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Michael, J.A. (1970). A handbook for art instructors and students based upon concepts and behaviors. New York: Vantage Press.
- Munro, T. (1966). Art education; Its philosophy and psychology. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- National Art Education Association. (1977). Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education. Reston, VA: NAEA.
- Zimmerman, E. (1984). What art teachers are not teaching, art students are not learning. Art Education, 37(4), 12-15.

Appendix

The Survey

SECONDARY ART TEACHER / PROGRAM SURVEY

Please complete the following background information, then reply to the questions by circling the response(s) most appropriate to you. Be sure to answer every question. Please return the completed survey as soon as possible.

BACKGROUND

Circle the grade level(s) you teach: 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Teaching experience: _____ years

Professional training:

_____ Junior college + upper division

_____ Private university or college

_____ State university or college

_____ Professional art school

_____ Other _____

Training sequence: (Check one)

_____ Education courses concurrent with art courses

_____ Education degree followed by art courses

_____ Art degree followed by education certification

_____ Other _____

Degree(s) held: _____

Year(s) received: _____

QUESTIONS

1. Which of the following art forms did you introduce in the past year? Circle the appropriate responses.

A- Basic design

B- Drawing

C- Painting

D- Mixed media

E- Collage

F- Printmaking

G- Lettering

H- Sculpture

I- Ceramics, pottery

J- Weaving, stitchery

K- Architecture

L- Other _____

2. Which of the following enrichment activities did you use in the past year? Circle the appropriate responses.

A- Local artists visited or exhibited work at school
B- Field trips to studios of local artists
C- Field trips to museums or galleries
D- Held a major festival or art exhibit
E- Sponsored art club
F- Other _____

3. Which of the following ways to publicize your art program have you used in the past year? Circle the appropriate responses.

A- Obtained TV or news coverage of art program
B- Held art festival or art exhibit in school
C- Held art festival or art exhibit in community
D- Published articles about art program in professional magazines
E- Other _____

4. How often were opportunities provided for your students to exhibit their art work in school during the past year? Circle ONE response.

A- Rarely
B- 1-5 times
C- 6-10 times
D- 11-15 times
E- 16-20 times
F- 21 times or more

5. How often did your students exhibit their art work in the community during the past year? Circle ONE response.

A- Rarely
B- 1-5 times
C- 6-10 times
D- 11-15 times
E- 16-20 times
F- 21 times or more

6. How often did your students visit museums or galleries in the past year? Circle ONE response.

A- Rarely
B- 1-5 times
C- 6-10 times
D- 11-15 times
E- 16-20 times
F- 21 times or more

7. How often do you integrate art into other subject areas, such as social studies, science, language arts, mathematics, etc? Circle ONE response.

A- Rarely, not that essential
B- Occasionally, when appropriate
C- Frequently, to stimulate creative thinking
D- Regularly, part of my program
E- Other _____

8. Do you relate your subject area (visual arts) with the related arts? (dance, drama, music, etc.)
- A- Rarely, not that essential
 - B- Occasionally, for perceptual awareness or motivation
 - C- Frequently, for perceptual awareness or motivation
 - D- Regularly, part of my program
 - E- Other _____
9. How often did you teach art history/ art appreciation in the past year? Circle ONE response.
- A- Rarely teach it, not that essential
 - B- Informally, in connection with related art activities
 - C- Regularly, as part of my program
 - D- Regularly, as a separate course
 - E- Other _____
10. Which of the following teaching resources did you use in the past year? Circle the appropriate responses.
- A- Slides
 - B- Filmstrips
 - C- Art reproductions
 - D- Work of local artists
 - E- Textbooks
 - F- Other _____
11. Which of the following methods for evaluating student progress did you use in the past year? Circle the appropriate responses.
- A- Informal discussions
 - B- Formal critiques
 - C- Objective test
 - D- Essay tests
 - E- Rating scales
 - F- Other _____
12. How important is it for the artist ALSO to be a practicing artist or craftsworker? Circle ONE response.
- A- Absolutely essential
 - B- Valuable, but not essential
 - C- Depends on teaching level
 - D- Not essential
 - E- Other _____
13. Have you exhibited your own craftwork (jewelry, weaving, ceramics, stitchery, etc.) in the past year?
- A- No, do not work in the crafts
 - B- Have produced, not exhibited
 - C- Exhibited, juried show
 - D- Exhibited, one-person show
 - E- Have received commissions and/or sold works
 - F- Other _____

14. Have you exhibited your own studio art work (painting, drawing, sculpture, printmaking, etc.) in the past year?

- A- No, do not work in studio areas
- B- Have produced, not exhibited
- C- Exhibited, juried show
- D- Exhibited, non-juried show
- E- Shown in sales gallery or sold works
- F- Other _____

15. How often do you personally visit museums or galleries during a year? Circle ONE response.

- A- Rarely, none in my area
- B- 1-5 times
- C- 6-10 times
- D- 11-15 times
- E- 16-20 times
- F- 21 times or more

16. How often do you provide opportunities for your students to see you creating art in the classroom? Circle ONE response.

- A- Rarely, not that essential
- B- Occasionally, to demonstrate new technique
- C- Frequently, to motivate student involvement with project
- D- Regularly, to involve students in my work
- E- Other _____

17. What do you feel is the major goal of your art program? Circle one response.

- A- To build perceptual skills and ability to use media
- B- To develop openness to new ideas, originality, imagination
- C- To increase awareness of the uses of art in everyday life
- D- To present a good foundation in design elements and principles
- E- Other _____

Thank you again for your time and assistance in responding to this survey.

Signature Deleted

Julie D. McAloon