

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

ART-INTEGRATED SOCIAL STUDIES METHOD:
INTEGRATION OF ART IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSROOM THROUGH
ADAPTATION OF DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION

KRISTEN N. BURNETT
Fall 2010

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in Secondary Education
with honors in Secondary Education

Reviewed and approved by the following:

Scott A. Metzger
Assistant Professor of Social Studies Education
Thesis Supervisor & Honors Adviser

Stephanie C. Serriere
Assistant Professor of Education and Social Studies
Education
Faculty Reader

*Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College

ABSTRACT

This thesis proposes the integration of analytical art study into the social studies classroom. The art-integrated social studies method is an adapted from of the Discipline-Based Art Education method (DBAE). DBAE is a four-prong methodology, which includes art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and creation. Art-integrated social studies method excludes the creation prong and details how to apply the remaining three to historical study. The adapted method is intended to demystify art study for social studies teachers and encourage the use of analytical methods to develop visual literacy. Also, the method is intended to provide more tools to strengthen the use of systematic, evidence-based reasoning focusing on historically significant questions and universal themes in the pre-collegiate classroom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Scott A. Metzger and Dr. Stephanie C. Serriere for their feedback and patience on this long exploration into both educational research and my own educational philosophy. Their experienced input and knowledge of the field of social studies has been invaluable.

I would also like to thank Mr. and Mrs. Schreyer for their endowments to the Schreyer Honors College. Their graciousness and caring for the education of others has allowed me to learn more about my field and step beyond its boundaries. I would also like to thank Mr. and Mrs. Rudnitsky for their gracious contributions to the College of Education. Their scholarship has allowed me to pursue academic interests beyond my major and continue to study social studies education.

Finally, I would like to thank the library staff at the Pattee and Paterno Libraries on the University Park campus for holding and retrieving books and helping me search for many of the books that I needed for my research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Introduction	1
What is art?	5
Why is art absent from the academic curriculum?	12
Why is art absent from the social studies?	19
Art-Integrated Social Studies Method	27
Purposes and Assumptions	27
Art-Integrated Social Studies Method and DBAE	32
Differences in Art-Integrated Social Studies Method and DBAE	49
In Combination: Art-Integrated Social Studies and Reasoning	51
Conclusion	56
References	59

INTRODUCTION

To students in a social studies classroom, art and history seem to be separate and unrelated subjects. Their notion of the “study” of art includes the creation of perspective drawings and pinch pottery; while their conception of the study of history resembles a progression of events across a timeline (Duke, 1990/2000). Unfortunately, these narrow definitions are widely held by students, education professionals, and the public (Duke, 1990/2000). Though the notion of keeping areas of study separate and clearly defined seems well intentioned and rational, the complete separation of art and history is not rational, and represents a deep bias within and out of the educational system. In fact, the two subjects are irrevocably intertwined. Depriving one of the other reduces the usefulness of both subjects and provides only partial and limited generalizations and understandings.

History is the study of connections and evolutions across time, not simply the study of a list of events and dates. Art serves as snapshots of individual and popular reactions to moments and ideologies in time providing fuller pictures (both literal and ideological) of each of the connected and evolving points. Narrow views of art and art education have prevented the subject from being interspersed in academic study and have stranded it solely in the realm of production (Duke, 1990/2000). Analyzing and studying art in the social studies is crucial for the development of critical thinking about history, especially when considering analysis of visual stimuli and the connection between broader societal movements and images.

The desire to explore how art can help in the development of historical critical and systematic thinking arose while I was student teaching in a middle school world

history classroom. The students read every day from textbooks filled with beautiful works of art from the golden ages of each major civilization from the dawn of time until the Renaissance. Unfortunately, students rarely analyzed imagery. Their textbook's idea of "art analysis" was usually a low order of thinking activity for which consideration or deep thought about the civilization at hand was unnecessary. As a student of art history and an artist, my own experience with art told me that these students were missing out on a valuable experience in the study of history. Through art history, I had learned to consider the study of history in a different light—images, buildings, and sculpture allowed me a window through which past societies' ways of life were visible. Therefore, I was compelled to seek out whether the academic community supported a broader application of my own experience. The following paper presents my findings as well as connections I made within and between the fields of art and social studies education.

My goal in this paper is not to turn the social studies—specifically, history—into art history. Rather, I wish to illustrate to classroom teachers and teacher educators within the social studies the usefulness of art as an implement in thinking about history. Art acts as a supplement to illustrate historical themes (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/1989). In an art history classroom, theme of religious iconography in the Middle Ages and Renaissance serves as the focus. In the art-integrated history classroom, symbols in art (such as religious symbolism or symbolic displays of power) would facilitate historical study of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, while providing deeper and more advanced the historical context. The difference between the two is that in the art history classroom, art is the main medium of study, with history explaining the development of the art; in

the social studies classroom, the main topic of study is history with art to supplement historical understanding and thinking (Clark, Day, Greer, 1987/1989).

It is necessary begin by developing a definition of “art.” In order for arts-integrated classrooms to be successful, the teacher must understand the implications of their choices of art. The types of art that are most appropriate for art-integrated social studies will be discussed at length. The exclusion of art forms will be based on their modes of analysis and the particular challenges inherent in their use.

After an understanding of what constitutes “art” in the context of the art-integrated history classroom, a discussion about the societal and curricular treatment of art is necessary. This discussion will shed light on why in particular that the art-integrated social studies method is necessary. The problem presents itself as much as a social and political question as one of curriculum development. First, the development of the perception of art’s role in society compounded by paradigms in art education methodology will be explored to explain the marginalization of art in the general education curriculum. Then, consideration of the development of social studies methodologies and teaching practices (particularly after standardization) will be explored to discuss how integration of enrichment materials, such as art, have been problematic.

After laying out background information, it will then be possible to delve into the use of art as a critical thinking tool. Due to its development as an interdisciplinary curricular model, much of the theory for art-integrated social studies is based on Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) (Boston, 1996/2000). The modification of the DBAE model’s four-pronged structure will be discussed at length. Particularly, modifications will focus on the elimination of the art production aspect and the

conjunctive use of art history and art criticism. The problematic treatment of aesthetics will also be discussed. Through citing DBAE literature, and explanations of how it can be modified to fit the social studies, I will attempt to present a stronger pre-collegiate aesthetics program.

Finally, the usefulness and implications of this method in the social studies must be considered. Using research on systematic reasoning, I will discuss how the use of art analysis can improve the study of history. While specific terminology to the social studies may not be used, generalization, visual literacy, and critical thinking will also be discussed.

The intended target for this method is a world history classroom. However, the reader should not feel limited to this scope. I have chosen to include world history examples because my specialty in art and history fall in the world history scope. I have studied these areas most extensively in art and therefore will use my expertise to create practical examples scattered through the text.

WHAT IS ART?

DBAE generally defines art as the visual and architectural arts, which include sculpture, painting, and buildings. Due to the heavy emphasis on art history and criticism, much of the DBAE methods arise from conventions within these two areas of academia—both of which focus mainly on the visual and architectural art forms (Eisner, n.d./2000)(Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/1989). Some scholars attempt to include the living—musical and performance—arts¹, in acknowledgement of Gardner’s musical and kinesthetic intelligences. Because of the divergence in the natures of the visual arts and the living arts, the proposal of including both is problematic. While this diversity allows the teacher to pick and chose, it also requires a vastly larger skill set. Understanding of the terminology, methodology of analysis, conventions, history, and technique poses a problem of expertise—the teacher cannot be the master of everything. Realizing that a smaller and more concentrated skill set is better than a broad and less well defined one, the art-integrated social studies method will include only visual art, as per the dominant definition of DBAE present in many of the scholarly entries in Ralph A. Smith’s *Readings in Discipline Based Education* and pursuant with the study of art history and criticism, around which this method revolves (2000).

By constraining the definition of arts in the social studies classroom, we are allowing a specialization in the analysis and identification of specific art forms as well as familiarization with certain patterns of iconography. Therefore, we must consider art from the technical point of view, which sheds light on why the included art forms have been chosen. The arts-integrated method would work best focusing mainly on the visual

¹ The musical and performing arts will be referred to as the living arts. When this term is used, it includes both. When one is referred to, it will be referred to by name.

arts. The visual arts include painting, architecture, architectural sculpture, sculpture, fabric design, tapestry, pottery, metalwork, jewelry, decorated practical objects (spoons, bowls, oil lamps), etc (Stockstad, 2008).

Before a full discussion on the visual arts, it is necessary to consider why the living arts (performance and musical art) have been excluded from art-integrated social studies.² The answer lies in the survival of the two different art forms. In truth, much art has been lost since ancient times, and many copies have been made. For example, most of the statues that “survive” from ancient Greek are actually Roman marble copies. Greek statues—until late in Greece’s artistic development (around the Late Classical Period)—were bronze, which was melted down to make weaponry in times of war. The early Romans, who frequently traded with Greek colonists in southern Italy and regarded Greece as a high-status luxury culture, collected marble copies of Greek bronzes and placed them in their villas (Stockstad, 2008). These marble copies are seen in museums. Also, many marble statues and architectural sculptures were painted; but due to environmental wear the polychromy has disappeared (Stockstad, 2008). So, to preface the discussion of survival of the living arts, the visual/architectural arts also face a problem of survival and authenticity.

One of the largest problems with studying ancient works of literary and living art is that many have been lost, physically or in translation. It is undoubted that they existed, because the surviving works that we do have reference hundreds of non-surviving or

² An exception should be for the living arts in the study of modern history after the dawning of the recorded sound bit and the moving picture. Often, the content of these forms reflects society’s opinion more so than modern art. I am not suggesting the abandonment of music and moving picture in historical study. Rather, I am highlighting the limitations of musical and performance art, especially in the study of ancient history. While the method proposed and the following discourse are based on visual art analysis, the reader is free to adapt this method for the living arts.

undiscovered texts. Also, the knowledge of hundreds of libraries and literary centers, which have been destroyed by natural disaster and war, imply that there were thousands of works that have not survived to the present day. But, the comparative number of literary works that have survived and been successfully translated is much smaller and of a much more limited academic use considering their content. I mention translation because of the discovery of a plethora of micro-civilizations that have complex written works. The major problem, that has been a commonality among these discoveries, is the inability to translate most of their languages. For example, ancient Crete had multiple languages, but only one, Linear B, has been translated. Linear B's translation was facilitated by the fact that it was a form of proto-Greek, or the predecessor to the Greek language. Other surviving texts written in Linear A and other languages have no base in any surviving language or any language that can be linked in a Rosetta stone-like document (Stockstad, 2008). Also, it is believed that Linear A was the more important of the two languages. Because surviving Linear B texts are mostly shopping lists, government purchase orders, and quick notes and to-do lists, it is believed that government documents and other important texts were recorded in Linear A.

The absence of an actual readable product presents challenges to analytical and rigorous classroom study especially in the case of ancient civilizations. The student is not able to analyze the work beyond a scholar's interpretation of what the work might have been like. While scholarly analytical discourse is valuable, it does not allow students to fully develop the analytical tool belt that art-integrated method intends. Rather than executing a reading comprehension exercise on a modern document, students should take on the role of historian or art historian by analyzing primary source artifacts

that they can see and study themselves. As will be discussed in a later section, students need to engage in the process of analysis and historical inquiry in order to develop visual literacy and analytical ability.

Another factor to consider in the survival of the living arts is tampering and quality of translation. As mentioned above, historically, art has been censored or altered in order to fit the morality and norms of a particular society (clothing was painted on nude figures, some Roman copies of Greek statues have an obvious Roman influence). Generally, this tampering has either become a subject of art historical study or is noted so that the viewer can accommodate the adaptation made to the work (if they know where to find information about it). Without a doubt, most plays provided to students in a middle or high school classroom have been altered for both the suitability of the language and the content. In other words, unsavory moral issues, vulgarity, and philosophy—that at the time was not controversial, but now represents taboo—are excluded. Language is changed to make it more “readable” for the younger audience. Content is cut out to suit the moral dispositions of parents and the acceptable norms of society. In some cases, the alterations render the work unrecognizable from the original.

For example, *Arabian Nights* has been translated and modified hundreds of times—the same story can read differently depending on the era in which it was translated and the translator himself. Supposed literal translations were often not very literal; they were modified to suit Victorian morality (there was a boom in *Arabian Nights* publications in the late 1800s and early 1900s). Also, the lists of stories included in the general work and content of the stories themselves are variable. What most readers do not understand about this work is that it is a collection of stories related by subject that

were written in multiple countries by multiple authors over a span of thousands of years. Many authors in the 18th and 19th century capitalized on the popularity of the stories and the constantly growing collection of authentic tales by fabricating their own fantastical, escapist literature that we would easily recognize today—such as *Aladdin* (Haddaway, 1990). The translation and consequent adaptation of the work have changed the story to more represent the society from which the translator emerged. In the case of *Arabian Nights*, this heavy adaptation is present in editions intended for adult mass consumption. Having read both censored and more candidly translated versions, this does not even speak of the censorship that would be necessary to include this work in a public school curriculum.

These two items, survival and modification, cause the authenticity of the work to be questioned. If a work has survived the test of time and found its way into a classroom, the chances of the work's modification and restoration are high. Languages evolve over the centuries. Considering *Arabian Nights* once again, the evolution of written Arabic language has been fairly constant since the adoption of Islam, but the standardization of the language itself came much after inception of its use. As such, many translators have remarked on the difficulty in interpreting early Arabic and Islamic literature due to the lack of diacritic marks that distinguish vowels and consonants. If marks were there, they were sometimes haphazard and non-uniform (in one place, but not another). Translators were required to locate the most likely places for vowels or decipher consonant clusters; and then they were required to decipher early Arabic words that either have different meanings today or have completely fallen out of use (Haddaway, 1990). This is not a case unique to Arabic, this occurs in the translation of most languages before their

standardization—which usually does not occur until thousands of years after initial use. Linguistic standardization generally occurs after the establishment of a central government or religious system with the power over academic and intellectual institutions. So, the risk of diluting the work via modification and difficulties in translation are doubly high.

While authenticity can be a definite issue in the study of the visual and architectural arts, survivability is less so of an issue. Visual art, including architecture, survives from many dominant ancient civilizations across the world. Art dating as far back as the prehistoric era is constantly being discovered as industrial development forces us deeper into the earth for building and mining. In many cases, written inscriptions on art still survive as well. The ability of these forms of art to survive the test of centuries of wear and abuse by natural and human forces is a boon to the classroom teacher. Also, with the increased availability of the internet, museums have responded to the educational demand for art by putting many of their collections online. Mini-histories and explanations are available as well as biographical information about most of the identified pieces. This facilitates the contextualization and academic study of art and art history.

To summarize, art-integrated social studies defines art as the visual and architectural arts, based on the conventions of art analysis and the widespread consensus by many proponents of the DBAE method. While some scholars attempt to include the living arts, DBAE was created for specific use as an interdisciplinary method for rigorous pre-collegiate study of the visual arts. Also, while the visual arts are not free of the issues of survival and authenticity, the study and acknowledgement of their implicit and explicit

modifications in art history textbooks or in online biographical information make the study of art more transparent. Considering the wide availability of art, why have classrooms in the United States been reluctant to adopt interdisciplinary or fusion programs, such as the one that I am proposing?

WHY IS ART ABSENT FROM THE ACADEMIC CURRICULUM?

While there are many answers for the conspicuous lack of art in core subject programs, the most telling are the current state of the arts education methodology and the historical outlook on the arts in the United States. I hold that, due to the above two factors, the arts are currently regarded as an affective subject in a second-class curriculum (one that is the first to experience budget cuts or elimination from a school course catalog), rather than as a mainstay in the core academic curriculum.

Disregard for the importance of art lies in the underpinnings of American society. In Europe, the arts have a higher station and broader public appeal than in the United States (Elkind, 1997). This is not an insult towards American art historians' work ethics, rather it is an acknowledgement of the undeniable fact that many of the great masters of classical and modern art hail from the European continent. While the United States has Warhol and Rothko (who has become more of a British staple in the Tate Modern), Europe has, among others: Cézanne, Klimt, Van Gogh, Da Vinci, and Michelangelo. Understandably, with possession of these great masters, Europe cannot underplay its role as an artistic powerhouse. It would be denying thousands of years of artistic excellence; and a great majority of the content of Western art history study. As an infant nation, the United States cannot boast a similarly long artistic history. It has been exposed to fewer celebrated artistic movements from dominant civilizations (the Greeks, the Romans, Louis XIV's France).

Elkind holds that the newness of the United States in conjunction with the circumstances of its founding have led to different artistic circumstances than those that developed across the centuries in Europe. While Europeans in major cities were working

on art masterpieces, innovators and the creative population of the American culture were focused on developing their unshaped landscape and surviving in a completely new environment (Elkind, 1997). Due to this “frontier mentality,” the idea of classical education, dominant among the European well-to-do (who were the art appreciators), focusing on Greco-Roman philosophy, history, and artistic study, was wasteful of productive capacity (Elkind, 1997, p. 14).

More important in the United States’ context were the ideas of work ethic and efficiency. Elkind identifies that American development coincided, partly, with the rise of mechanized production. Thus, “American modern culture was built on the basic tenets of industrialization...machine-made goods often were seen as ‘better’ than handmade” (Elkind, 1997, p. 14). The idea of the superiority of mass production was “translated into many Americans’ attitudes towards the arts” (Elkind, 1997, p. 14). Instead of being attracted to rich Baroque masterpieces, the American eye shifted toward the ever-evolving intricacies of machine-produced goods. While beautiful, Baroque art would have been a consumable for the American elite, who tried to imitate the European elite down to their classical education. For the masses, “art form emerged that exemplified the incorporation of aesthetically pleasing forms that were also highly functional and efficient” (Elkind, 1997, p. 15). It is possible to argue that American “art” is more exemplified in car show displays or a museum exhibit containing kitchen appliances from the 1950s. These items were at one time valued for some utilitarian purpose, but were made so that frequent contact was aesthetically pleasing and desired.

Cars, blenders, and packaging for consumables have become the unsung American art form. While this may force those in the highbrow art community to look

down on American mass artistic exploration, it is necessary to realize the nation's developmental context was vital for the forging of a unique new art form apart from traditional art. It is also necessary to realize that this separation has created an indelible mark on the American perception of art in the reverse context (Americans considering traditional European art). The emphasis on practical goods explains the presence of seemingly mundane furniture from the early Colonial Period in art museums containing American art collections. In comparison to the European art scene, there is less "art" in the traditional sense of paintings and sculpture that survives from the first half of American history (painting and portraiture become incredibly popular in the United States, but out of European influence). As such, quite a few paintings that survive reflect the nature of mass production and efficiency in their methods (Elkind, 1997). For example, while still incredibly expensive, many portraits would arrive at the homes of wealthy patrons with standard template bodies already painted—only awaiting faces (Elkind, 1997).

This love affair with practicality cannot fully explain why Americans have pushed art study to the fringes of the curriculum. After all, classicists and Europhiles have dominated the collegiate circle since the founding of the United States. There must be a deeper reason. Elkind asserts that the practicality problem is further exacerbated by religious and political manipulation in the curriculum (Elkind, 1997). And, while this is true, in that one must receive parental permission to show students artistic nudity (i.e. non-pornographic displays of the human body in nude form not meant to hold sexual connotations), I would assert that it is only half of the educational argument. The other half, the more important one, is the current art education methodology.

Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) was founded to address weaknesses in the affective arts education movement. Many DBAE scholars assert that art has not been integrated into interdisciplinary or core curriculums because of its focus on introspection. Current art education focuses on creation and aesthetics. And, while aesthetics can be a rigorous form of philosophical study, it is often reduced in pre-collegiate curriculums to a weak form of “art appreciation.” In other words, looking at art, acknowledging its existence, and talking about how it makes one feel. This also falls into the realm of diaristic criticism, “the most common and the most informal kind and in many ways the most difficult to write” (Wolff, 1993/2000, p. 88). This form of criticism, “tends to be quite loose, overly personal, and even given to gossip” (Wolff, 1993/2000, p. 88). It is self-centric, which matches well with the educational paradigm of introspection and self-exploration until late in a student’s educational career. Outside of pre-collegiate institutions, many art critics discourage the use of this form of criticism because “it opens the door to the expression of mere opinion” (Wolff, 1993/2000, p. 91).

A more academically preferred, though still contested, form of criticism is formalistic criticism, which (as its name suggests) focuses on the form of the art in relation to the larger artistic movement in which it is embedded. This requires academic knowledge and a keen eye for aesthetics. Because it does not match the educational paradigm of individualization in the arts—it requires much more rigidity and less self-expression—it has failed miserably in its integration into the current arts education curriculum. And, while it does not deny the individual his or her own emotional reaction, it places this reaction behind reaction to form.

The heavy use of diaristic criticism (if criticism is asked of pre-collegiate students) originates in the philosophy of self-expression that many art educators have adopted. Some scholars have called this movement the creative self-expression approach (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/2000). It focuses on art “as an instrument for developing what is assumed to be each child’s inherent creativity and expressive abilities” (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/2000, p. 28). As such, the main focus of this movement is allowing the child to express him or herself freely, without intervention of adults holding knowledge of form and style. This could have also emerged from the child-centered progressive educational movements of the early half of the twentieth century.

Due to its focus on self-expression and creation, art very seldom presents opportunities for integration into core academic courses. Art education’s own philosophy, in effect, created its isolation and demotion from the core pantheon of courses. While creative self-expressionist art education is more student-centered, core classes such as literature and history are more teacher-directed (even if they are student centered). This split makes combination difficult, requiring overly cautious implementation with a keen knowledge of both subject matters and their educational methodologies and fundamental philosophies. While some educators (specifically, constructivists) feel that the use of child-centered, child-driven methods in both contexts would eliminate this barrier, fundamental challenges still exist. Creative self-expression focuses on the creation of something where there was nothing. Other subjects, such as math or literature, necessarily have content that pre-exists the child or their creative thought process, unless content is disregarded in favor of exploration of self. So, it is obvious that the combination of the two presents a formidable problem. When one

subject focuses on the already there and the other on the to-be-made, one cannot simply stick them together without experiencing a clash of fundamental philosophies.

Considering this emphasis on production alone, the American pragmatist mentality, concerned with efficiency and practicality, would have found arts education to be an idle pursuit. While students learn creativity and discovered themselves in art class, these skills and philosophical understandings would not be useful in a 9-5 factory or office job, where conformity is expected and a uniform product is necessary—little “personal touch” is needed. Understandably, reading, science, and arithmetic take center stage as presenters of logic and necessary skills, and social studies is attached to them to instill necessary patriotism (I am not saying that patriotic indoctrination is the point of social studies, I am solely interpreting public opinion of the school’s role).

Because of the perceived “uselessness” of art education in the curriculum, DBAE scholars began working in the 1960s (also the height of the creative self-expression approach), on a more academic form of art study that represented more balance.³ Their efforts heightened in the 1980s, when a clearer vision of the DBAE approach was formed (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/2000). But, when “[our] society tends to regard the arts as intellectually undemanding...and to require little exercise of discrimination, interpretation, and judgment,” it is difficult to convince them otherwise—in spite of new methods and research (Duke, 1990/2000, p. 15). And, while there has been a wealth of research on DBAE and its academic underpinnings, actual implementation of the method

³ Neither I, nor DBAE, contend that creation is useless. As an artist, I feel that creation is incredibly useful. But, I realize that in the academic context, creation alone is weak. While it allows self-discovery, it is too introverted and denies the child the ability to interpret the outside world. DBAE scholars, who incorporate creation into DBAE’s four-pronged method, contend that creation alone is unbalanced and prohibits the arts from being taken seriously in the school context.

itself has been sparse and limited. Therefore, the arts continue to hold a second-class position in the American curriculum.

WHY IS ART ABSENT FROM THE SOCIAL STUDIES?

If art-integrated social studies holds that art and social studies are not separate domains, it is necessary to analyze factors specific to the social studies that have prevented art integration. Most of these factors are general policy or methodology issues that affect other aspects of social studies methodology, such as evidence-based reasoning within inquiry-based curriculums centered around subjective assessments; they are by no means specific to art integration. Because art integration into the social studies requires processes similar to evidence-based, systematic reasoning and generalization thinking, it is effected by the same problems as these forms of historical higher-order thinking.

Art-integrated social studies methodology, as will be discussed in depth later, requires more student-centered exploratory activities. This requires considerable time devoted to specific theme-oriented units, covering a smaller scope of material in greater depth. While these extended exploratory activities would be ideal, prescribed and standardized curriculums act as a major barrier to extended evidence-based reasoning and generalization activities (Levstik & Barton, 2003). In theory, prescribed curriculums have the potential to be a major boon to classroom teachers. They can help teachers identify historical events with greater significance in relation to a theme. Unfortunately, state-mandated curriculums often require an unrealistic amount of content to be covered in a short period of time (Levstik & Barton, 2003). For example, in the state of Pennsylvania, world history is usually broken into two subjects: prehistory to the Renaissance and Reformation to Modern day. Anyone who has taught either portion of this subject knows that it is difficult to get from beginning to end in 180 days. If all topics in the standards are to be covered by the end of the 180 days, it is necessary to

cover each topic in painful brevity that leaves the students with little enrichment or understanding of the evolution of historical themes (VanSledright, 1997).

Due to the brevity which a social studies teacher must adopt, higher-order thought activities (considered enrichment) are often cut. “Learning how to construct historical accounts from evidence might be nice, but it will almost always take a back seat to coverage of textbook or curriculum content” (Levstik & Barton, 2003, p. 359). Often the teacher defaults to coverage of the brief descriptions of the textbook, which is popularly misconceived as the correct means of studying of history (Levstik & Barton, 2003). In the state of Pennsylvania, the new requirement that students take Keystone exams, which will eventually serve as a large part of the child’s final grade, requires that the teacher cover all topics within the standards. If they do not, their students’ performance on the Keystone exam (and their final grade in the course) will suffer, which schools and statistical batteries will equate to teacher incompetence. The adoption of this test solidifies and condones the popular misconception that historical study is a collective of facts and dates that a student needs to memorize. And, while I understand that states desire accountability measures, I also contend that the resultant curricular brevity prevents in depth study and true historical mastery.

That the process of historical inquiry and development of historical understanding can be reduced to fact memorization represents a grave misunderstanding and disconnect between those who teach history and those who determine what is taught and means and media through which it is taught. Levstik contends that, “As any historian would argue, there is no such thing as just the facts” (1997, p. 48). Rather, she states that history is the assignment of significance and meaning to facts and occurrences that are continually

being discovered (Levstik, 1997). It is impossible to argue that facts serve no importance whatsoever in the educational process. Shiveley and Misco argue that “[facts] do not, in and of themselves, provide meaningful understanding, nuance, or applicability for novel situations” (2009, p. 73). It must be noted that the perception of the usage of facts speaks to the individual’s idea of the purpose of social studies. Politicians who argue that history is “just the facts—information about the past unencumbered by interpretation and free of ‘revisionism’” would also most likely state that history serves the purpose of cultural preservation (Levstik, 1997, p. 48). Shiveley and Misco’s, as well as Levstik’s, ideas align with the idea that history study is for the creation of competent, independent thinkers who can interpret events in a democratic society (Shively & Misco, 2009).

Resultant of the fact-based standardized curriculum, students come to accept the falsity that facts weave together into a singular narrative delineating historical truth (Levstik, 1997). Most textbooks present one singular state- or organization-approved narrative that “implies that every historical problem ‘has already been solved or is about to be solved...this attitude misrepresents the dynamic nature of history...[and] it limits the uses of history to what Loewen calls a ‘simple-minded morality play’” (Levstik, 1997, 48). It provides little to no variance in perspective, thus deceptively creating the idea that the narrative is truth. “Children are trained to seek correct answers to their questions more often than they are asked to consider multiple perspectives” which means that historical approaches necessitating multiple perspectives and lacking definitive answers are “unfamiliar and even threatening” to the student (Levstik, 1997, 50). Those involved in the professional study of history often find this alarming because they are more familiarized with the more amorphous history lacking definitive truth.

Related to the convention of perceiving nothing as definitive truth, historians also contend that history is more complicated than the simplistic dichotomies touted in pre-collegiate history classrooms. As I will describe later in terms of art criticism, classroom history is rife with moralistic dichotomies. Good-bad, winner-loser, wrong-right, students are continually being asked to assign events, facts, and people to polar extremes. Rather than taking on multiple perspectives and evaluating evidence, students are forced into quick judgments that require them to set aside some aspects in favor of others. For example, Abraham Lincoln is either good or bad. Most portray him as good because he pushed through the Emancipation Proclamation and ended slavery. But, what most history textbooks do not say about him is that he wanted to end slavery as long as African Americans did not integrate into his lily-white nation—he was a strong supporter of re-colonization in Africa. If this were included in textbooks, the American public, which thinks on a dichotomy, would have to change their perception from good man to bad man, which they would be loath to do considering Americans hold him as one of the greatest presidents. Or, they would be confronted with the idea that they would have to adjust their schema for Abraham Lincoln from mythical do-gooder to human being who cannot be placed on one end of the moral spectrum for the sum of his actions.

When students familiar with the idea of the moral narrative of historical truths are exposed to multiple perspectives, they will either attempt to cling to one perspective as truth or describe the variance between perspectives as lies or inaccuracies—not as differences in perception (VanSledright, 2004). They “often approach sources as decontextualized, disembodied, authorless forms of neutral information that appear to fall out of the sky ready made” (VanSledright, 2004, Section: “Learning to Think

Historically”, para. 4). This is most likely due to the impersonal nature of textbooks that attempt to tell history from a seemingly objective standpoint. Also, students, because of their lack of exposure to primary resource documents and the lack of emphasis on analysis, rarely learn heuristics for interpreting historical information. These heuristics provide a framework for interpreting primary resource documents as personal artifacts that can be contextualized based on the author’s standpoint (VanSledright, 2004).

Because they are not provided with these heuristics and have little experience with multiple perspectives, students also assume “[differences] that arise among sources are associated with gaps in information or simple mistakes” (VanSledright, 2004, Section: “Learning to Think Historically”, para. 4). Or, they assume that the people telling these varied accounts are untrustworthy. They become preoccupied with the detection of bias and discrepancies, thus failing to realize that these multiple perspectives actually represent differences in perception that are culturally and socially embedded.

As is already visible, there is a severe disconnect between the study of history (collegiate/post-collegiate) and classroom history. Many of the tools that professional historians use to construct accounts of the past are absent in pre-collegiate study of history. Firstly, there is little to no use of the Wineburg’s four step heuristic that both VanSledright and Mayer use to illustrate how to best study multiple perspective and contextualization of historical accounts (VanSledright, 2004; Mayer, 1998). Application of the heuristic in pre-collegiate history classroom is problematic because firsthand evidence and evidence-based reasoning are seldom used (Levstik & Barton, 2003). Students are rarely asked to create generalizations based on analysis of primary source documents, whereas this is one of the main jobs of historians. In general, what Levstik

calls perspectival history is seldom used outside of collegiate and professional study of history (1997).

Some social studies educators and the general public might agree with the pedagogical decision to avoid perspectival history, source work, contextualization heuristics, and multiple perspectives because they feel that most students do not intend to become historians. Therefore, they contend that it is inappropriate to treat students as little historians. VanSledright contends that it is not necessarily appropriate to treat students as historical experts without any training (2004). The extensive training and study necessary to become a professional historian speaks to the difficulty of the task. But, basic skills, such as those mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph, can be taught to students, who can easily master them with guidance and practice. This runs counterintuitive to popular and pedagogical perception that students are unable to think historically. But, VanSledright also contends that students can begin to think historically with adult guidance as early as the age of seven (VanSledright, 2004). While a seven-year-old's historical thoughts are going to be much less complex than that of an adult who is relatively complete in their mental and socio-emotional development, students can nonetheless be groomed at a young age to start doing source work and looking for multiple perspectives through evidence.

Also separate from the study of professional history is the fact that pre-collegiate history is centered on coverage of broad swaths of historical content, rather than central and historically significant themes. Due to the increasing time spent on standardized testing and preparation for these tests, “[social studies] seems to have largely turned away from generalizations as a pervasive and fundamental learning activity” (Shiveley &

Misco, 2009, p. 73). Generalizations allow for the identification of universal or semi-universal themes that can aid in identifying historical significance across all eras (Shiveley & Misco, 2009). Also, most social studies programs are not organized by significant themes, such as those that VanSledright identifies: economics, social factors, and politics (1997). Rather, they are organized around chronological progression, which often fails to create coherence or meaning (VanSledright, 1997). In both of these cases, we can see how the tools to create and identify historical significance are rejected due to their time consuming, complex, and variable natures. Again, this can be related to standardization and the movement to make assessment more objective and quantifiable. The inquiry activities necessary to identify historical significance cannot easily be assigned a numerical percentage to be integrated into statistical data describing the quality of the school. Regardless, Levstik & Barton, VanSledright, Shiveley & Misco, Wineburg, and other social studies professionals are calling for a return to authentic, inquiry based assessment using methods similar to those of professional historians, which will require a complete paradigm shift.

How does this laundry list of absences and faults in the current implementation of history education relate to the absence of art in the social studies curriculum? The nature of contextualized art study is similar to that of evidence-based historical inquiry and systematic reasoning. Art historical study requires generalizations, contextualization, perspective taking, historical significance, and a keen knowledge of both factual historical information and historical analytical thought processes. It very much resembles historical study, differing only in the focus—visual mediums. Its absence is explainable, therefore, for similar reasons as those identified above for the absence of more advanced

methods of studying history. While art's position in social studies is influenced by the factors mentioned in the previous chapter, its position in the social studies is further degraded by the complex nature of its philosophies and interworkings. Because it requires in depth analysis and contextualization that a textbook cannot easily provide and cannot be easily assessed, art study in the social studies is similarly complex, if not more so, than non-visual historical evidence-based reasoning.

ART-INTEGRATED SOCIAL STUDIES METHOD

As mentioned in the introduction, art-integrated social studies is an adaptation of DBAE for the social studies. Considering that DBAE is an arts education methodology and my adaptation is intended for social studies, the reader might wonder why I chose a method completely out of my content area's discourse. My decision to use DBAE was based on its creation for interdisciplinary study of art. It realizes that students do not intend to become art historians, but can learn to value visual interpretation as highly as literary interpretation. Also, as shall be discussed below, I desired to use a method that aimed to help students become visually literate citizens capable of critically dissecting the world around them.

Purposes and Assumptions

Before I delve into art-integrated social studies method and its linkages to DBAE, it is necessary to discuss some assumption about this method. First, art-integrated social studies method is intended for historical study. It should not be construed as an attempt to turn the social studies classroom into an art classroom. In the art-integrated social studies classroom, the curriculum need not be based on visual analysis. Rather, the arts are a tool among many. This method solely allows the teacher and the student to realize the value of using visual subject matter—paintings and sculptures—to illustrate themes in history. For example, as will be discussed below, students can study symbolism in medieval art to discuss Christianity and its classical linkages (such as the personification of bodies of water). The study of visual symbolism allows deeper focus on and attainment of historical concepts. As such, the purpose of art viewing is for the collection of visual data on economic, political, and social conditions.

The second assumption concerns content. Like DBAE, this methodology does not suggest that one particular body of art content is studied. I refer mainly to Western art specifically because it is my area of specialization. In the particular context of any art-integrated classroom, “The artworks studied depend on the audience in the classroom. Selected artworks need to be rich in meaning and interpretation, unique or interesting, and engaging for students” (Dobbs, 1998/2000, p. 53). In other words, the art work that the specific teacher chooses should be appropriate to the topics of study, the students’ ability levels, and the willingness of the teacher to dive into visual/symbolic complexity. This can be applied to any genre of art from any part of the world, as long as historical study is the main goal.

Concerning historical study, art-integrated method provides a clear advantage. Advanced historical study involves the identification of generalizations and concepts related to these generalizations. Often on paper, these statements are complex (and sometimes verbose) and abstract because they tend to account for nuances and subtleties that are not readily visualized by a young learner (or even by older learners). Through allowing students to find generalizations in or apply generalizations to art, students can visually associate and explain these ideas. Comparing different genres or works of art makes seemingly abstract generalizations and concepts concrete. Seeing the nuances in art, for example the evolution portrayal of male figures in Greek art, makes the generalization tangible and more readily accessible to the student. And because art study is adaptable (due to its related nature to historical study), study of art form and iconography along side study of literary primary resource documents allows for fuller

systematic reasoning. A broader range of evidence with broader subject matter is now available to the student.

In terms of how art-integrated method might look in a classroom, I feel that it follows the DBAE model in its appropriateness for student inquiry and teacher-student discussions. Attempting to use solely a teacher-centered model might present difficulties in developing the skills desired in this method. As mentioned above, it is desired that students learn the skills necessary to visually interpret the world around them, which requires student application. This is not to say that the teacher should step back and allow students to do as they please. Many DBAE scholars acknowledge that their method is necessarily teacher-driven, yet student-centered. While this seems paradoxical, it is wholly understandable when considering the complexity of the proposed activities. The teacher acts as the specialist in art study; therefore, they drive the curriculum by choosing artworks that students would find interesting or useful and they also determine what skills students should learn. The teacher is the one who “provides motivation and support; helps [the] child understand valid art concepts; [and] uses culturally valued adult art images” (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/2000, p. 30). But, it is student-centered in that the student is developing the skill-set, rather than the teacher “giving” them the skill-set. Student must be engaged in the activities of criticism and art history in order to develop visual literacy (Dobbs, 1998/2000, p. 53).

Finally, it is necessary to look into why one would want to implement art-integrated social studies. As mentioned above, the desired result of this method/approach is visually literate citizens. Visually literacy is essentially the ability “to perceive and begin to understand visual statements and their constituent component relationships”

(Kleinbauer, 1987/1989, p. 207). And, with sufficient practice and application of visual literacy skills in the study of works of art, “[students] can learn to understand other kinds of imagery in their universe, whether it is to be found at the local football field, building of worship, or mall” (Kleinbauer, 1987/1989, p. 207).

While many visual literacy approaches are geared towards media literacy, art-integrated social studies and its progenitor, DBAE, focus on the study of the masters of art in relevant cultures. How does the study of seemingly remote historical art allow students to become critical analyzers of imagery? The use of aesthetics, criticism, and art history promote a sensitization to detail in art, changing the way the visual world is perceived. Without training, the main goal of viewing an image is identification or categorization. For example, using an advertisement, one is looking to see what is being advertised. As such, we usually ignore details that allow us deeper insight into the meaning of the image (Eisner, n.d./2000, p. 39-40). The visual structure, color scheme, and imagery used in the advertisement are ignored. It has already been identified as something selling a product, so the information harvesting process is over (the untrained eye does not require any more information). Aside from fleeting observations about the foreboding or annoying qualities of the imagery used (or a poor choice of color), the question why is not asked for any of the above reactions. In doing so, we “neglect vast arrays of visual information that are present in the world...that...we never see” (Eisner, n.d./2000, p. 40). But, training in the three fields mentioned above “expands our perceptual habits and teaches us how to look so that we may see more” (Eisner, n.d./2000, p. 40).

Learning to “orchestrate the eye” allows one “to reach out, describe, analyze, reflect, interpret, and make judgments—in other words to look and think more broadly, deeply, clearly, deliberately, adventurously, and holistically” (Boston, 1996/2000, p. 238). The mention of holistic viewing is vital. Studying the arts teaches one to consider small details, while forcing one to consider implications of those details in regard to the whole picture. For example, it is useless to consider the folds of the drapery on Michelangelo’s *Pieta* if one does not see the Virgin cradling Christ. Through learning to contextualize, criticize, and consider the meaning of a work of art, such as the *Pieta*, the viewer is forced to consider both the intrinsic and extrinsic factors pertaining to one work of art. In other words, how does societal context dictate the form and iconography of the *Pieta*, and vice versa? Returning to the *Pieta*’s drapery, what was Michelangelo’s implicit political or philosophical message stated through draping the folds in a classical wet drapery style?

The study of art in the social studies also prepares students for a very important aspect that they might not necessarily encounter in other disciplines. In an educational system that emphasizes getting it right, studying the arts allows students to realize that the real world is full of complexities that lack definitive answers (Boston, 1996/2000). While there are definitely wrong interpretations of history (JFK was not assassinated by the aliens who built the pyramids), history is wonderful and despicable in that hundreds of valid interpretations can be made on one event based on evidence. This forces students into historical and societal perspective taking, which will be discussed further in later sections.

The ability to consider a plethora of circumstances is necessary in visual literacy. Inability to utilize perspective taking and multiple interpretations leads to bitter polarization and ignorant insistence that either one's own opinion, or that of one with authority, is necessarily right. This is due to the fact that the person has either deluded him or herself or has been deluded into thinking that there are two ways to see—correctly and incorrectly. This pattern of thought is unacceptable in adult participation in government and the workforce. While teaching students to question the validity of “the one right answer” in interpretation-based exercises might be considered subversive, I feel that it is necessary for active and intelligent citizenship.

Art-Integrated Social Studies Method and DBAE

Art-integrated social studies method will utilize three of the four prongs of DBAE: art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The fourth prong, studio art, has not been included because creation of art is not necessary in the social studies classroom. While it can be useful, it will not be used on a regular basis. In my own classroom, I have used creation to a limited extent and have found that students can make similar generalization through the use of the other three prongs.

The first of the three prongs to be integrated into the art-integrated social studies method is aesthetics. Of all of the three preserved prongs, I would consider aesthetics the weakest in the pre-collegiate context because it is often reduced to appreciation of art. While it is much deeper in its collegiate circles, it is difficult to implement meaningfully because of its use of philosophy. Aesthetics is a philosophical method of inquiry used “to understand and appreciate the relationships between ideas and objects” (Duke, 1990/2000, p. 18). And, while this makes aesthetics seem simplistic, its philosophical

complexity arises in its demand to answer fundamental questions surrounding art, human nature, and visual experience through seemingly simplistic questions. Aestheticians ask: “What is art, What is aesthetic experience, What is aesthetic value, and finally, How are they identifiable...?” (Risatti, 1987/1989, p. 225). These questions do not necessarily have an answer, which blurs the line between the teacher as expert and the teacher as philosopher. The teacher cannot present an answer to their students, and would be doing a disservice if they did, which creates a problem. In the educational community, the idea that the teacher cannot provide an answer is shocking.

The complexity of the subject heightens in that aesthetics asks students to consider “the nature and meaning of art in life” (Eisner, n.d./2000, p. 43). This provides a basis for art criticism, in that it allows students to define criteria by which one should analyze art (Eisner, n.d./2000). It helps to decide what is beautiful and why, it explains emotions elicited. More importantly, it forces students to consider why art is created in the first place. Why were imposing Gothic cathedrals commissioned? What meaning did they have to the patron or the parishioners who attended masses in these mammoths of stone? As part of contextualizing an image, it allows students to consider the basic reasons as to why one would want this artwork to exist. Continually re-evaluating the meaning and purpose of a work of art is necessary when attempting to contextualize it socially, historically, and economically. Aesthetics facilitates deeper understanding of the context of the object and allows the viewer to adjust their perception in order to criticize/scrutinize it.

In regards to the appreciation aspect of aesthetics, it is necessary to consider the aspect of heritage. While the appreciation component of aesthetics is incredibly

simplistic, it is nonetheless an important component. Appreciation does not mean to developing a liking for something; rather, it means that one develops an awareness and basic understanding of a particular thing's existence. Solely knowing that something exists does not promote deeper analytical understanding or contextualization; however, it can be used to facilitate the employment of aesthetics' philosophical questions. Regardless, in developing appreciation of art, one is compelled to return to the fundamental philosophical questions of aesthetics to derive a deeper understanding. The use of appreciation in the pre-collegiate classroom does not mirror this complexity; rather it resembles a weak form art exposure, which has been the sum of many attempts to integrate art into the mainstream classroom.

In the social studies classroom, appreciation is useful in that it allows one to survey their heritage or the heritage of the people studied. It acts as a quasi-preservationist mechanism that allows for exposure to a group's norms and mores. The goal is not necessarily cultural transmission of heritage and preservation of cultural norms; rather, appreciation permits analysis of cultural identity. For example, students can identify traits that are considered part of their cultural identity. To test their hypothesis/generalization students can look at images from critical periods in the United States' development (Revolutionary War, Civil War, Westward Expansion, WWI, WWII, etc). They can see how the images differ across the development of the nation and discuss why the imagery or the identity might have changed (and how the change is visible in art).

Also, appreciation allows students to consider the how power is transmitted through visual heritage. Through the expository nature of art appreciation, one learns

about the existence of different patterns in images that they see. Considering this, students learn to seek out the dominant figure in the image and try to explain how they are visually portrayed as dominant (and develop a sense as to why they are dominant off canvas). Surveying images across the development of the United States to discover who holds power and sway in society, students become aware of the perpetual theme of power. They learn how power is portrayed universally across time (hieratic scale, for instance), and how power changes visually in different cultures and time periods. Students can learn to contextualize their perception through history, and critique the image as part of a body of work from a particular time period. In doing so, students will develop greater understanding of the evolution of society and the power groups that reside within it. Appreciation is the vehicle through which they achieve the exposure necessary to start analysis.

The second prong necessary for successful art analysis is art criticism. Through criticism, “students can develop critical judgment that makes them independent observers capable of making informed choices and reasoned judgments about art” (Duke, 1990/2000, p. 17). Art criticism allows the viewer to scrutinize the effort and merit of the artist. Unlike popular views of art criticism, it does not revolve around the simplistic dichotomy of good art/bad art. While art criticism is centered on application of aesthetic judgment and evaluation, neither of these aspects boils down to dichotomous statements of preference.

Criticism can take multiple forms, which are often combined. The two dominant forms of art criticism are formalistic and diaristic criticism. Diaristic criticism was discussed in the previous section. To review, it is a form of criticism that describes one’s

own personal reaction to a particular piece of art. It usually involves writing in the first person and description of the artwork in a personal/intimate matter. This form represents a personal journey through the work being criticized. The second form, formalistic criticism, was also briefly mentioned. Formalistic criticism, as its namesake suggests, is a criticism of the artist's adherence to the particular form and style under which the work was created. For example, one can criticize a painting that alludes to impressionistic style. This form of criticism is much less personal; in that the focus of the analysis is not on the viewer's reaction to the work but on the interplay of stylistic elements in the work. Often formalism and diarism are combined; it is very difficult to separate the two when reacting to a work of art.

There are problems inherent in both methods (for problems with diaristic criticism refer to the previous section). In formalistic criticism in particular, there is an emphasis on the "directly perceptible properties" of a work (Geahigan, 1997/2000, p. 174). Analysis of symbolism and iconography are discouraged because they require personal interpretation or interpretation beyond the intrinsic factors of the work (Geahigan, 1997/2000). As such, formalistic criticism is limited in scope; but, as mentioned previously, diaristic criticism and its personal emphasis is also limited. The combination of the two provides a more full form of criticism. Geahigan suggests the combination of formalism, diarism, and appreciation/aesthetics. Appreciation allows greater interpretation into the iconography and symbolism in a work (Geahigan, 1997/2000). This might be out of aesthetics' need to derive meaning from a particular work and situate the meaning of the work in a larger context.

Regardless of which type of criticism is used, another challenge presents itself. How do you allow 25 different students to criticize a work without meaningless and overwhelming redundancy? As I started my research into class-wide art analysis, this was one of my own major questions. Usually, as mentioned above, the difficulty arises because teachers look for a set of “right” answers when doing a comprehension or analysis exercise. If one wants to facilitate discussion on a work of art, the challenge of separating oneself from the one answer mentality is formidable.

Geahigan suggests a progression from individualistic to formalistic analysis to avoid repetition among students (1997/2000). Students are first allowed to react personally to a work of art. They detail their thought process as they scan over the details and the image as a whole. They record what struck them and what feelings they had as they viewed the work of art. While some educators might say that this is “soft,” I would argue that this personal reaction is necessary in order to allow for deeper analysis. To analyze factors outside the confines of our minds, we must first desensitize by realizing and detailing our personal, emotional reaction. History is independent of our emotions (though our perception of it is greatly effected by emotion); therefore, emotion’s effects must be reduced before serious historical inquiry is considered. For example, looking at graphic imagery (violent pictures, ex. Holocaust photographs), one must attempt to separate their own repulsion from criticism of the work itself. Also, returning to aesthetics, this personalized step gives insight into the purpose of the work.

After one’s personal reaction is considered, the teacher can instruct on various contextual factors surrounding the work and help to define any of the relevant art history/criticism/aesthetics vocabulary and concepts necessary for understanding the

work (Geahigan, 1997/2000). Geahigan focuses on the teaching of aesthetics, but I think that it would be relevant to provide methodological concepts from the other two disciplines (1997/2000). For example, when studying early Christianity, teachers can discuss and describe syncretic imagery, or imagery that has multiple meanings. Often times, the use of the shepherd in paintings was safe because it not only alluded to Christ but Mars/Apollo. This is also true of the winemaking scenes prevalent in early Christian churches and mausoleums. The activity of winemaking and consumption could either be associated with the blood of Christ or Dionysus—it depended on the viewer. Regardless, this art history vocabulary is necessary to understand the topic more fully.

The final step that Geahigan suggests is student research. This research allows students to acquire “biographical and contextual knowledge, which enhance a viewer’s ability to find meaning in works of art” (Geahigan, 1997/2000, p. 176-178). It allows further contextualization of the artwork through historical, art historical, economic, and social research. This allows deeper understanding of the work itself and the condition out of which it was born.

Again, it is necessary to ask how art criticism is helpful to the social studies. Like aesthetics, it provides a second degree of contextualization that allows for deeper understanding of imagery. Through criticism, students consider their own reactions and the reactions of those who viewed the artwork when it was created. The difference or similarity in reaction provides the student with evidence as to the perceptions, norms, and mores of their own society and the particular society to which the artwork belonged. This encourages students to apply Wineburg’s sourcing heuristic when considering factors as simple as emotional reaction. Often students take emotional reaction for granted and

assumed that people contemporary to the work reacted as they themselves do, failing to realize the process of cultural evolution and changes in norms and mores. Applying the sourcing heuristic allows students to further research the work to achieve a better understanding of how people reacted to it (VanSledright, 2004). VanSledright identifies that a major part of the heuristic is attempting to understand the position of the artist in society and the resultant effects on the artist's outlook on society (VanSledright, 2004). It is possible to go beyond the perspective of the artist in the heuristic by researching cultural factors of the society in which the work was produced. It is then possible to apply the heuristic from the perspective of a typical onlooker in various stations of society (wealthy, poor, government, religious, etc). This requires some perspective taking, in that it is necessary to switch from considering the effects of the artist's place in society on the work to considering the society's reaction to the work based on the effects of society's norms and beliefs. The use of perspective taking in art analysis will be discussed in depth in a later section.

Through the criticism of form, students learn more about the values of a particular society. As will be discussed below, art history and art criticism, in the art-integrated method, work in conjunction (though they do so reluctantly in DBAE). It allows students to see how perceptions of the human body, nature, the divine, and power—continual themes of historical and art study—evolve across time and through different civilizations. For example, in early Greek statues, *kouros*, there was little physical definition. In fact, they resembled Egyptian royal statues, which were characteristic for their blocky statures and rigid poses. This analytical small statement of the *kouros*' form tells quite a bit about Archaic Greek society. Obvious Egyptian influence opens discussion of the perception

of the body in art and the influence of powerful societies. But, what is even more telling is comparing the form of the *kouros* to the form of Greek statues in the late High and Late Classical periods. The body becomes obvious below clothing, muscles are toned on men and women are fleshy yet slender. Physical definition and fluidity of movement become the standard. Through critiquing the different forms and comparing them, vital questions about the evolution of Greek thought and society emerge. Why was there a change in the perception of the portrayal of the body between the Archaic period and the Late Classical period? What does this reflect about Greek society at large? As demonstrated here, the study of form leads to critical thought questions pertaining to the evolution of societies and their values.

Criticizing visual art through the frame of stylistic evolution allows students to center their study on historically significant questions. As VanSledright points out, there is too much information about the past for students to study (1998). When contextualizing stylistic change, students can use historically significant questions to guide their search. For example, stylistic change usually is a result of innovation in technique, shifts in belief, change in tastes, and demand of patrons. Forcing a student to study every aspect of a society to understand how the above factors influenced changes in visual art is too daunting for students who are just developing the ability to think historically. Asking students to compare evolutions in one society to those in another with the frame of cultural diffusion forces students to consider the historically significant question, how and why do societies influence each other? It limits their consideration of historical factors to shared influences between the two cultures. Also, it is possible to ask students to consider changes in government and religious beliefs considering the

historically significant question, how do centers of power within a society have a ripple effect on culture? Historically significant questions, though broad and universal in scope, allow students to focus on particular aspects of a society. It is not necessary to focus on all aspects of society because that could lead to students focusing on historical trivialities. Rather, allowing students to view art and nominate one to three historical questions based on changes in style or subject matter allow students to start using the sourcing heuristic in a limited and more focused way.

The final prong, and the crux of art-integrated social studies method, is the study of art history. “[Art] does not emerge in the proverbial vacuum. All art is part of a culture” (Eisner, n.d./2000, p. 42). The presence or absence of a particular person, object, or theme in art allows us to ascertain what a particular society valued or reviled (Eisner, n.d./2000) (Broudy, 1989/2000). As such, art history provides the larger historical context that shaped a particular artistic movement. It allows us to consider how art and the progression of history shaped one another (Duke, 1990/2000).

Before the effects of art history in relation to social studies are considered, it is necessary to consider methods of art historical study. While there are many ways to consider art history, I have found two particular means helpful: Dobbs’ four lenses and the use of extrinsic and intrinsic study. These two methods match almost completely to historical sourcing heuristics; they consider the same factors but are applied to a different medium. According to Dobbs’, there are four lenses with which one can consider art history: factual information, formal analysis, technical analysis, and contextual relations (Dobbs, 1998). The factual information lens, as it suggests, is the accruing of facts about the work. These include the date of production, the location of production, the

geographical factors, subject matter, and the situation that surrounded the creation of the object (Dobbs, 1998). Formal analysis is the analysis of work in relation to the artist's other works and to the movement or time period under which it falls. Also, formal analysis considers the interplay of color, use of dimension and perspective, etc (Dobbs, 1998). Technical analysis considers the tools and materials necessary to create the work and the means through which they were utilized to create various effects (ex. How were the upraised, sculpted bricks made on the Gate of Ishtar?) (Dobbs, 1998). Finally, the contextual relations lens considers contemporary factors that shaped the work and the influences that these factors had on the work. This lens considers the influence of other artists and political movements (Dobbs, 1998). All of the above lenses can be combined to create a rich, multifaceted history on a particular work of art and the time period surrounding it.

It is also helpful to consider art history study through the intrinsic and extrinsic perspective. While this might seem redundant, in that many of the factors that Dobbs' identifies are re-categorized, this second mode of analyzing reiterates that art history is much more complex than assumed and that its study can be framed differently. Clark, Day, and Greer present much more elaborate terminology (which Dobbs also presents in a different section) and relate each to an analytic effect. Intrinsic factors are ones that focus on the individual artwork itself, similar to Dobb's analysis of technique and form. Important to intrinsic analysis is connoisseurship, which is equivalent to technical analysis but focuses also authenticity and provenance. Style (equivalent to formal analysis) and iconography ("the examination of the subject matter or themes of the artwork") and function are included (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/1989, p. 156). The

discussion of iconography is incredibly important in the contextualization artwork. This was discussed above as symbolism in the criticism section.

As mentioned by Dobbs but elaborated on by Clark, Day, and Greer, the extrinsic analysis of an artwork is incredibly important. This is equivalent to contextual relations and factual information proposed by Dobbs. Extrinsic factors relate to the time period in which the art was created. Factors to consider in extrinsic analysis include: political situation, economic stability, the religious context, and intellectual contributions of the age (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/1989, p. 156).

Related to its focus on extrinsic factors (as well as intrinsic, though they are considered in relation to extrinsic factors), art history is the lynchpin of art-integrated social studies' contextualization aspect. It provides the tools necessary for students to consider history through a visual perspective. Students can learn to associate political, social, and economic movements with art throughout history. Also, art history is a powerful tool to gage the potency of a particular movement or the prevalence of a particular thought process. For example, while students always read in textbooks about classical references in the Renaissance, they are rarely asked to pick them out in the art of the time period. Referring to a unit on Classical Greece or Rome, teachers can help students to pick out elements of Renaissance style and form that affirm or deny the hypothesis that classicism had a heavy influence in this time period. Going beyond basic recognition of imitation, art history allows the student to consider *why* a particular style was used. For example, they are able to decipher the channeling of classical iconography and the related desire to emulate the cultural power of a different, romanticized time period. This can allow students to develop a deeper understanding of the motivations of

the Renaissance philosophical/intellectual movement. It also allows students insight into the patrons of the art. What were the patrons trying to say by commissioning a large bronze or marble statue in a particular style? Were they trying to display their wealth and style through emulation of Augustus' perpetual youth and masculinity or through aged and hyper-realistic verism? Did they use bronze because it was a Greek symbol of royalty and power? Reference to images allows students to figure out not only political and social climate but also economic allusions.

The study of art history in the history classroom also illustrates to students the symbiotic nature of art and history. "If students critically analyze a set of art images, then undertake historical inquiry about the same images, the first experience integrates with and enriches the second" (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987/1989, p. 170). The same conclusion is possible using the reverse, history then art. This illustrates to students that they can find valuable sources of information in places other than texts. Considering the dominance of literature in education, learning to garner information from visual sources is vital for the development of visual literacy.

Also vital to the development of visual literacy is use of historical perspective taking. Students learn historical perspective taking from studying history alone, but the use of art in historical perspective taking demands a more complex response. First, it requires that the student acquire sufficient knowledge about the society from which the work emerged. Then, the student must learn the symbols commonly used in that time period and why there were used. These two steps alone are incredibly complex and require considerable time researching and discussing with one more knowledgeable about iconography. This complexity is furthered when it is required that one link iconography

with societal movements and conditions. The highest amount of complexity is required to form a coherent picture/narrative of society based on the imagery and research. The most excruciating difficulty arises because the student must temporarily disband their thought process, which dictates how they would interpret the images and symbols based on their emersion in the modern world. Finally, they must also realize that there are multiple interpretations to the same symbol, thus the whole image's narrative may vary. Here, considering the complexity inherent in this process, it would be helpful for the teacher to guide students or to assign them to various lenses (ex. modern vs. contemporary).

The application of historical perspective taking in the social studies classroom is vital. As mentioned above in the chapter "Why is Art Absent From the Social Studies?", the use of historical perspective taking is underutilized in current social studies classrooms, though it is praised in the research community. Levstik points to the use of the unitary narrative in current history classrooms as problematic because it leads to students thinking in a dichotomous good/bad and true/lies alignment (1997). While art can be studied in the classroom using this unitary narrative method, students will find that some aspects of visual culture cannot be explained through a whitewashed, sanitized view of historical progression and improvement. It is more fruitful to disregard the unitary narrative in favor of multiple perspectives because it prepares students for the complexity of the world outside of their classroom doors. Using art as a means through which to study multiple perspectives allows students to concretely see the differences in perception about societal events.

Allowing students to study Picasso's *La Guernica* along side Spanish government propaganda during the Spanish Civil War forces them to consider the multiple reactions to the war itself. When viewing *La Guernica*, students consider the resistance movements against the dictatorial regime. They are forced to consider from the point of view of the resistance, "Why does the government think that it can justify all of this death and suffering? What gives the government the power to kill its own people?" When looking at the government propaganda, students ask themselves, "How does the government portray the resistance as traitors? How does it rationalize the bombing portrayed in *La Guernica*? Where is the government deriving its power?" If students were to only consider the government propaganda, they would not consider the effect of its atrocities on the everyday person and the resistance movement.

Another example from Spanish art that students can use to consider multiple perspectives is Francisco Goya's *Third of May 1808*. This painting depicts a massacre during the Napoleonic invasion of France. It can be contrasted with more valorous paintings of Napoleon and his troops marching to battle. In Goya's depiction, helpless men are cowering in front of guns held by rigid and merciless soldiers. One figure in a white shirt, with outstretched arms has been elevated to a Christ-like status by his pose and the stigmata marks on his hands (Kleiner, Mamiya, & Tansey, 2001). Contrast this with the famous painting *Napoleon Crossing the Alps* by Jacques-Louis David. In this painting Napoleon and his soldiers are going into battle. Napoleon is portrayed in the foreground using hieratic scale making him the most prominent figure in the painting. And, he is portrayed with references to classical drapery and pose. In the David painting, Napoleon and his conquests seem more glorious and heroic. Whereas, in Goya's

depiction, they seem fear-based, power-hungry, and blood-thirsty. While these two examples are extremes on the spectrum of perspectives, they nonetheless display the importance of considering the difference in perspective brought about by personal belief and culture.

Another popular example of perspective taking is interpreting Van Eyck's Arnolfini Wedding Portrait. This in particular is a very interesting example because it, as a singular work, can be analyzed from multiple different perspectives. While this is possible for all paintings, changes in cultural norms have made perspective analysis (based on time period) for this painting particularly telling. From our modern lens, we do not associate importance with many of the symbols in the painting. To the modern viewer, the painting shows a man, his pregnant wife, and their evil-looking dog, all convening in a bedroom. Why they are in the bedroom is a mystery. But, if the student learns to contextualize and employ historical perspective taking, the picture forms more complex meaning. Also, they learn to employ multiple meanings and consider other reasoned, evidence-based interpretations. Understanding the symbolism of the fruit on the windowsill and the bed behind Arnolfini and his wife as well as the marriage practices of the day shed light on the scene. But, the student must attempt to think like a person contemporary to the painting to understand the narrative that it tells as a whole (Erickson, 1993/2000).

The above example of historical perspective taking alluded to the possibility of analyzing images inappropriately from a modern perspective, or using presentism. Presentism, "is an enduring fallacy to believe one's own epoch singularly significant, eventful, or critical" (Lowenthal, 2000, p. 67). Lowenthal states that this outlook is

common in both children, young adults, and adults (2000). This might be due to the unitary narrative discussed by Levstik. Or, presentism could be a product of the absence of contextualization and sourcing work in schools. Lowenthal identifies that the imposition of moral judgments on the past as a major contributor to presentist thought. “Folk of past times are usually viewed in comparison with our own, as better or, more commonly, worse than ourselves: benighted, corrupt, evil, or just plain stupid” (Lowenthal, 2000, p. 67). The problem is that students assume that “Their own moralities become universal values, from which deviance is infamy [or backwardness]” (Lowenthal, 2000, p. 67). By allowing students to impose their own morality and to make judgments on cultures and time periods that do not match their morality, we are allowing students to disregard historical thinking in a manner that is self-serving and self-gratifying. The student learns in a rather xenophobic and ethnocentric way that they can judge other cultures and eras by their own “high” moral standards. That is why modern students often interpret the Arnolfini portrait as a man, his pregnant wife, and evil dog.

It might be helpful to have students analyze images from both a contextualized and presentist perspective. It shows the vast difference that an informed and analytic approach makes. Also, it shows how differently one’s own views are from the views of an artist or the society that commissioned the art—cultural differences are directly targeted and discussed. Most importantly, it highlights that a particular person that commissioned this artwork had a certain message that they wanted to portray based on intellectual inclinations or a social context. This forces students to consider that their own reaction and personal interpretation is not always the best and most accurate, and

prevents students from falling into the habit of accepting things at face value based on their own intuition.

Differences in Art-Integrated Social Studies and DBAE

As mentioned above, while the art-integrated social studies method is adapted from DBAE, I realize that the intended location for my method is not an art classroom, but rather a social studies classroom. Considering this, modification to DBAE theory was necessary. First, as justified above, creation has not been included in art-integrated social studies. Because the intended location for application is not an art class, I feel that it would be inappropriate to include this facet of DBAE theory.

It is also crucial to consider the difference in perception of the roles of history and art in each method. In DBAE, history is a tool for understanding and studying art in an academically rigorous context. In the art-integrated method, art is a tool for studying history in a more holistic and visually demanding context. It would be inappropriate for the art-integrated social studies method, as a method for the study of history, to align itself more closely to DBAE. Doing so would discount its ability to serve as a mainstay in daily history classroom activities. It would force history into a place of secondary importance in history's own domain.⁴

Finally, one of the largest differences between art-integrated social studies and DBAE is their considerations on art history and art criticism. While DBAE scholars acknowledge that each of the four prongs of their method (creation, art criticism, art

⁴ While the critical observer might point out that I have focused more on the study of art than social studies in this paper (making social studies seem secondary), it is necessary to acknowledge that at the present art is mostly a stranger to the history classroom. Because of that, it is necessary to elaborate and introduce the stranger, art, and why he is important rather than consider the host, history—which is already understood. Elaboration upon the utility of art in relation to history is the goal; rather than a rehashing of social studies education methods.

history, and aesthetics) mesh together, some contend that art history and art criticism are separate. This separation is mainly temporal: “Art criticism tends to favor contemporary and relatively recent art, whereas art historians principally study and document art of the past, seeking to find what it meant to viewer of its own time” (Dobbs, 1998, p. 36).

Dobbs also acknowledges that art criticism is often seen as “short-term art history” (Dobbs, 1998, p. 36). While art historians focus on reactions and processes contemporary to the work, art critics focus on present day artwork or the effect of past artwork on today’s (Dobbs, 1998). Kleinbauer reaffirms this barrier and adds: “If art historians make ethical or moral judgments without assessing historical factors, they are not infrequently identified by other art historians as critics” (Kleinbauer, 1987/1989, p. 214).

While this distinction is necessary in the art world, in art-integrated social studies the constraining temporal barrier has been removed in order to utilize methods from both disciplines in multiple time periods. And because aesthetics and criticism play off of one another and provide questions for art history, the separation and demarcation of criticism and history would hinder deeper analysis. The fruitfulness of criticism in regards to form analysis and the analysis of reaction is invaluable to the study of art history. Learning to criticize form and iconography leads naturally to the study of why they change. Consequently, the student is encouraged to discover the reasons within societal change that resulted in a shift in visual culture. Here, art history and art criticism are necessarily linked; it is impossible to understand artistic evolution its relation to societal evolution if one does not have methods suited for these purposes.

In Combination: Art-Integrated Social Studies and Reasoning

While no empirical research has been done to affirm that art-integrated social studies leads to improved higher-order thought, it is based on sound methods that have been proven effective from two different disciplines. In combination, the use of aesthetics, art criticism, and art history in the social studies classroom promote deep and complex analysis and reasoning.

According to Lienhardt, analysis and synthesis are commonly used in reasoning or hypothesis (generalization) testing exercises (Lienhardt, 1994). Due to the use of DBAE, which places high importance on analytic ability, both analysis and synthesis are present in the art-integrated social studies method. Analysis “requires the frame for the event to be clearly established” first (Lienhardt, 1994, p. 241). In art-integrated social studies method, the frame is presented when historical content knowledge is introduced, the theme is identified, and art is presented to the students. The goal is to provide detail as to what the specific topic for analysis is by providing: “[dates] and chronology...critical events and people...and thematic regularity over time helps specify fruitful lines of inquiry into complex historical phenomena” (Lienhardt, 1994, p. 241). For example, when discussing the Renaissance, it would be helpful to go over the progression of political and social movements as well as artistic ones, and to provide the names of important figures such as popes and artists. After the frame has been established, “an analysis of the key forces...can be sketched”; students can “inspect aspects of a particular constellation of events from the point of view of the political, social, scientific, and economic conditions prior to, during, and after their occurrence” (Lienhardt, 1994, p. 241). The reader will note that this is similar to Dobbs’ lenses of art

history; Clark, Day, and Greer's extrinsic and intrinsic factors; and Wineburg's sourcing heuristic. As in art history, social studies desires a careful dissection of an event through different lenses in order to fully contextualize it as much as possible.

In conjunction with analysis, students may also use synthesis, "a process that forms an idea by weaving together strands from separate sources" (Lienhardt, 1994, p. 242). From this method, students learn to create generalizations using conceptual and factual information from different sources. Lienhardt uses the example of attempting to find the causes of the Civil War by synthesizing compromises (such as the Three-fifths Compromise) (Lienhardt, 1994). Analyzing the widespread impact of a civilization (such as Egypt, Rome, or Alexandrian/Hellenistic Greece) on the European and Asian continent's development through the consideration of the adoption of these civilization's artistic styles provides a comparable example within the art-integrated social studies method.

The combination of analysis and synthesis, common in both systematically reasoned social studies and intensive art analysis, will allow students to develop cases to support or disprove generalizations. The use of this process promotes the exploration of ideas and events with greater historical significance. Centering the study of history on thematic questions about society, culture, politics, economics, power, and conflict allow students and teachers to discuss those events and people that are historically significant, or have made an indelible impact on the development of some movement or culture (Levstik & Barton, 2005).

Levstik and Barton assert that the use of imagery in historical inquiry presents different questions than the use of literature (Levstik & Barton, 2005). "A variety of

print sources...might help students respond to a question such as: Could the conflicts between Native Americans and European Americans in the post Civil War era have been avoided?" (Levstik & Barton, 2005, p. 190). Art on the other hand, provides a different lens to see the conflict between Native Americans and European Americans. "By working with the historical arts, students focus on a different...historical question [such as]: What was it like to be a Sioux or one of their allies during the period of surrounding the Battle of Little Big Horn?" (Levstik & Barton, 2005, p. 190). Using the literature and art in combination provides a more holistic approach to historical inquiry (Levstik & Barton, 2005).

Also, as an addendum to Levstik and Barton's discussion on the difference between visual and print sources, it is helpful to add that art study raises questions that literary study cannot (and vice versa). As Levstik and Barton and many DBAE scholars will affirm, "the arts are primary source documents that tell us about the time and place in which they were produced" (Levstik & Barton, 2005, p. 191). As such, they are markers or remnants of the visual culture of the era from which they emerged. And, this is helpful when considering that mass literacy was not common until 200 years ago (estimated, due to mass public schooling movements) and mass printing until about 500 years ago. This means that visual art and architecture provide incredibly important details into the lives and customs of civilizations. While their writings survive, the limited scope and range of literature from these cultures means that art and artistic display took dominance.

For example, in the Near East (modern day Middle East and Turkey), power and the ascription of power could be visually represented with bullhorns and beards. The Steles of Narim Sin and Hammurabi both illustrate this concept in that both of the rulers

are wearing bullhorn crowns and long, well-groomed beards. But, the relationship between the bullhorn crown, beard, and the ruler is more telling when one discovers that gods also wore these two accessories. Knowing this, it is necessary to ask what properties are these rulers trying to embody? Or, what properties are they trying to convince future conquered peoples that they have? This would be conspicuously missing from the writings that survive from these rulers. While the writings that survive try to affirm the divine right of these rulers and their greatness and power, there is a humble devotion to the gods that is also presented (such as on inscription dedicating temples or massive architectural feats). The elevation of many Near Eastern rulers to the propagandized status of god is a common feature in royal palace sculpture and statue art (Stockstad, 2008). This also brings up the historically significant question: why do absolute rulers invoke the divine in the iconography of their state-sponsored portraits and monuments to their legacy? Also, why do rulers try to emulate gods or their likenesses?

This also raises another historically significant question: how does cultural diffusion affect a culture? Using art to discuss this rather abstract question is particularly helpful. The Persian king Darius' monuments provide key points of consideration for this question. In the apadana (or receiving hall) of his ceremonial complex at Persepolis, there are various stone reliefs illustrating assimilation of diffused cultural traits. For example, among the various borrowed icons, the most recognizable is the winged sun-disk characteristic of ancient Egyptian religious iconography. Also, Stockstad notes that the "balanced composition, and sleek modeling of figures reflect the Persians' knowledge of Greek art and perhaps the use of Greek artists" (2008, p. 45). Another key factor in the apadana is a relief depicting Darius and his son Xerxes receiving tribute. Those

offering tribute are portrayed in their local garments suggesting a knowledge and awareness of the individual characteristics of each of those nations/groups loyal or conquered by the Persians. Finally, the general architecture of the ceremonial complex is borrowed from the upraised platforms characteristic of Assyrian temples and palaces (Stockstad, 2008). While the building is complex architecturally, its makeup is also culturally and historically complex.

The study of nuances and seemingly small details in art (hallmarks of particular visual cultures), which do not present themselves in literature, we are able to identify small, yet important, questions for analysis. These questions can lead into large questions that illustrate historical trends throughout multiple civilizations. In turn, the student uses their reasoning abilities to create generalization based on these questions.

CONCLUSION

In search of a way to help students develop visual literacy, I set out on a quest to incorporate art and history into the social studies classroom. As a social studies student teacher and artist, I found it troubling that hundreds of pages of art in history textbooks were going to waste and that students were unable to derive any meaning aside from escapism from these images. My search led me to the Discipline-Based Art Education method, which I adapted into the art-integrated social studies.

Before I started to adapt DBAE, though, it was important to delve into deeper questions surrounding the role of art in the curriculum and art as a subject of study. First, I wanted to create an operational definition of art that would allow me to narrow my research scope. While DBAE's focus on visual arts was helpful, I decided to limited art-integrated social studies to the study of visual arts due to the challenges of studying living art (making it more appropriate in an English classroom) and the issue of censorship and modification of living art. While the living arts are important, I felt that it would be too much to ask of teachers, who have little specialty in art at all to analyze an even larger set of art associated with each culture. And, I welcome anyone who can propose a suitable method of integrating the living arts into the art-integrated social studies classroom without overwhelming the already overtaxed social studies teacher. Considering that my specialty is in art that does not move, I will leave that challenge to another person.

After settling on visual arts, I wanted to explore why they were absent from the pre-collegiate curriculum. Having studied art-making techniques in high school and art history in college, I had a difficult time conceiving an artless existence. Through my research, I discovered that the context of the American society's foundation presented formidable challenges to extensive and elaborate artistic development. In the 1800s, 200

years after its first European settlement and 100 years after its founding, the United States was still trying to acquire land and setup basic settlement to acquire necessities. This differed greatly from its counterparts in Europe that had been building upon ancient towns and governments to create an increasingly complex society. Because of the need to survive, Americans developed art forms that were both practical and aesthetically pleasing. And, because they had seldom found time or energy for sculpture or portraiture, European-style art forms became regarded as idle and wasteful. This led to their shunting into the shadows of the American curriculum.

Also, within the social studies, the increased reliance upon a standardized curriculum has shut out enrichment activities such as art integration. This is due to the massive size and scope of the history curriculum, which teachers are required to cover in less than 180 days. Also, resistance to subjective assessment and the resultant underutilization of higher-order thought arise out of the factual nature of teaching styles that attempt to accommodate for this massive and unwieldy curriculum. Finally, the predominance of a singular, moralistic narrative of historical truth has impeded the development and widespread use of methodologies that require multiple perspectives.

Looking to prove that visual arts are a vital component of rigorous academic study, I finally started the task of art-integrated social studies. As mentioned above, it is a modified form of the DBAE curriculum, demystified and made readily usable for social studies teachers. The fundamental assumptions have changed slightly. For example, art-integrated social studies uses art as a tool to study history more deeply. It does not focus on symbolism solely within the context of historical development of art, but rather on why symbolism emerged from a particular historical context. The essential components

of the method include: art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. Aesthetics looks into the fundamental meaning of art and explores its purpose. This works in conjunction with art criticism and art history by compelling one to ask: Why was this found beautiful/important/terrifying? To explore this, one uses art criticism to discuss their reactions (and other's reactions) to the work and consider its form and style. Using comparative art criticism, it is possible to generate more questions about the evolution of form and style and the change in perception of iconography. This leads to art history, which is the final piece to allowing contextualization. It studies why evolution took place; it considers the outside forces pressing upon the artist.

This tripartite method allows for greater reasoning and analytical capabilities in the social studies. Because students are forced to analyze at every step of the art viewing and content acquisition process, they are constantly uncovering questions—some of which will be historically significant. The ability to generate deep, thoughtful questions around historically significant forces students to rigorously pursue and analyze a historical topic from multiple perspectives allows them intimate insight into the rational, reasoned, and systematic thought process of a professional historian. And, while it is not intended that students using this method will become art or history scholars, and as such they will need much scaffolding to acquire deeper levels of thought, the altered state of perception oriented toward holistic and linked consideration of detail and significance will allow them to independently scrutinize their environment more fully.

REFERENCES

- Boston, B.O. (2000). The arts and cross-disciplinary study. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 235-252). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published in 1996)
- Broudy, H.S. (2000). Art as general education. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 20-26). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published 1989)
- Clark, G.A., Day, M.D., & Greer, W.D. (1989). Discipline-based art education: Becoming students of art. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Discipline-based art education: Origins, meanings, and development* (pp. 129-193). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press. (Original work published in 1987)
- Clark, G.A., Day, M.D., & Greer, W.D. (2000). Discipline-based art education: Becoming students of art. *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 27-34). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published in 1987)
- Duke, L. (2000). Mind building and arts education. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 15-19). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published in 1990)
- Dobbs, S.M. (1998). Learning in and through art: A guide to discipline-based art education. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Institute for the Arts.
- Dobbs, S.M. (2000). The general characteristics of DBAE. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 52-60). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published 1998)
- Eisner, E.W. (2000). What is discipline-based art education?. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 35-45). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published n.d.)
- Elkind, D. (1997). The arts and humanities in postmodern education. In D.R. Walling (Ed.), *Under construction: The role of the arts and humanities in postmodern schooling* (pp. 7-23). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Erickson, M. (2000). Teaching art history as inquiry. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 162-170). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published 1993)
- Geahigan, G. (2000). Art criticism and art education. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 171-179). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published 1997)

- Haddaway, H. (1990). Introduction. In M. Mahdi (Ed.), *Arabian nights* (H. Haddaway, trans.) (pp. xi-xxxvi). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Kleinbauer, W.E. (1989). Art history in discipline-based art education. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Discipline-based art education: Origins, meanings, and development* (pp. 207-215). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press. (Original work published in 1987)
- Kleiner, F.S., Mamiya, C.J., Tansey, R.G. (Eds.). (2001). *Gardner's art through the ages* (11th ed., vol. 2). Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Levstik, L.S. (1997). Can more be less? The depth-breadth dilemma in teaching American history. *Social Education*, 61(1), 48-51.
- Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (2005). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle school* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (2003). Why don't more history teachers engage students in interpretation?. *Social Education*, 67(6), 358-361.
- Lienhardt, G. (1994). History: A time to be mindful. In G. Lienhardt, I.L. Beck, C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in history* (pp. 209-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Lowenthal, D. (2000). Dilemmas and delights of learning history. In P.N. Stearns, P. Seixas, S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing teaching & learning history: National and international perspectives*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Mayer, R.H. (1998). Connecting narrative and historical thinking: A research-based approach to teaching history. *Social Education*, 62(2), 97-100.
- Risatti, H. (1989). Art criticism in discipline-based art education. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Discipline-based art education: Origins, meanings, and development* (pp. 217-225). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press. (Original work published in 1987)
- Shiveley, J. & Misco, T. (2009). Reclaiming generalizations in social studies education. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 4(2). Retrieved n.d., from www.socstrp.org
- Smith, R.A. (Ed.) (2000). *Readings in discipline-based art education*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Stockstad, M. (2008). *Art history: A view of the West* (3rd ed., vol. 1). Upper Saddle River, NJ Pearson-Prentice Hall.

- VanSledright, B.A. (1997). Can more be less? The depth-breadth dilemma in teaching American history. *Social Education*, 61(1), 38-41.
- VanSledright, B.A. (1998). On the importance of historical positionality to thinking about and teaching history. *The International Journal of Social Education*, 12, pp. 1-18.
- VanSledright, B.A. (2004). What does it mean to think historically...and how do you teach it? (Research and Practice). *Social Education*, 68(3), Retrieved September 7, 2010, from Academic OneFile database.
- Wolff, T.F. (2000). Types of art criticism. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in discipline-based art education* (pp. 88-97). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association. (Original work published in 1993)

ACADEMIC VITA OF KRISTEN N. BURNETT

Kristen N. Burnett
P.O. Box 402
Pine Grove Mills, PA 16868
kdburnett4206@gmail.com

Education: Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education, The Pennsylvania State University, Fall 2010
Minors in History, Spanish, and English as a Second Language
Thesis Title: Art-Integrated Social Studies Method: Integration of Art in the Social Studies Classroom Through Adaptation of Discipline-Based Art Education
Thesis Supervisor/Honors Adviser: Dr. Scott A. Metzger

Related Experience: Student Teacher, Social Studies, Penns Valley Area School District, PA
Student Teacher, Social Studies, Bald Eagle Area School District, PA
Student Teacher, Spanish, Bennett Family Center (University Park), PA

Awards: College of Education Student Marshal, Fall 2010
Marvin J. and Carolyn (Raven) Rudnitsky Scholarship, 2008-2010
Evan Pugh Scholar Award, Fall 2009
Deans List, 2007-2010
Dr. Gilbert Kahn Scholarship for University Scholars in the College of Education, Fall 2007

Activities: Guest speaker for APLNG493 Curriculum Development Project, Spring 2010