

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

SCHOOL OF VISUAL ART

PERSONAL AND CULTURAL INTRICACY IN ART HISTORY CLASSROOMS

MINSOO KIM
Summer 2010

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

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Kimberly Ann Powell, Ph. D.
Assistant Professor in Art Education and Curriculum and Instruction
Thesis Supervisor

Christine Marmé Thompson, Ph. D.
Professor in Art Education
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

The field of art history in the United States, as well as the teaching of the subject in American universities, rapidly developed during and after World War II, with immigrating scholars from Europe as the catalyst for the discipline. In contrast to the fast development of the field of art history over the years, little has been investigated about teaching and learning beyond the delivery of information in the discipline and the implications of engagement and disengagement in art history classrooms. This thesis examines through class observations and interviews the teaching of art history in a large lecture setting, supplemented by weekly classes in small groups, at a Big Ten university. The interviews of educators and students reveal student needs for interactive engagement through participation, the positive and negative impacts of technology in teaching art history, and the effects of non-verbal factors, such as class content and the pace of the course. The survey textbook of the class is examined under the theoretical framework of postmodern multiculturalism. The goal of this thesis is to obtain a new perspective on verbal and non-verbal narratives in art history classrooms on an individual and cultural level. Through the examination for the current scholarship and interviews with instructors and students, I hope to contribute to envisioning a new perspective on art history education.

Key words: art history; art history education; postmodernism; multiculturalism; aesthetics

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Research Questions and Rationale	2
Goals	4
Chapter 2 Literature Review: Dialogues on Art History Education	5
Art History Education at the High School Level	6
Art History Education at the University Level	11
Conclusions	19
Theoretical Framework	21
Chapter 3 Methodology	22
Validity	25
Interview Questions	26
Chapter 4 Findings	28
Story of Classrooms	29
Story of Professors	32
Story of Students	35
Personal Dis/engagement	36
Cultural Dis/engagement	43
Conclusions	48
Chapter 5 Summary of Findings & Implications	52
Summary of Findings	52
Implications	53
Appendix 1 Interview Protocols	58
Appendix 2 College-Level Survey Art History Courses and High School AP Art History Classes	61

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Above all, I dedicate this thesis to my Father and my dear family on the other side of the earth who have shown endless support for my growth and study. I would like to thank my classmates and inspiring professors at Penn State, especially Dr. Kimberly A. Powell, Dr. Mary Ann Stankiewicz and Dr. Christine M. Thompson for making this thesis possible through sharing rich knowledge, insight, and experience in the field.

Chapter 1

Introduction

In a huge lecture hall with over two hundred students, numerous hands were moving fast, thanks to the light provided by the bright projected screens which broke the darkness in the room. Some students could not avoid the temptation of dim lights, and they were unconsciously nodding to questions yet to be asked. The endless stream of information coming from the podium left little room for discussion, personal opinion, or time to ask questions in class.

Thankfully, I had very engaging art history professors in college who encouraged personal interactions despite the challenge of large class size. They walked between the aisles of fixed chairs and encouraged students to speak up. Nevertheless, it was very easy for me to be like a ghost in class; I was there, but at the same time, I was not there. Regardless of whether someone actually had any thoughts at all, very few things were said or heard among students, or between students and professors.

Before coming to college, I had two semesters of art history courses during my senior year in high school. I did not know until much later that I was taking advantage of a rare opportunity because not many high schools offer art history. The privilege, however, was a tough one to enjoy for a high school student. It exhausted my energy to take notes line after line and to read a two-inch-thick textbook that weighed five pounds. One very sad thing for me was that I did not retain most of the information after taking quizzes and tests; after all the studying, the “knowledge” disappeared magically. Other assignments and in-class activities, such as writing papers, putting together presentations, and working in groups, guided students to the ocean of art historical information, but the focus rarely went beyond when, who, what, where, why, and how.

I did have some favorite artists that I wanted to know everything about, but it was a mystery to me what I could do with facts and terms.

Experiencing art history survey courses in two different levels of American educational institutions made me ask questions to myself: How much do I actually remember from all the slideshows that I sat through in high school, and could secondary art history classes have prepared me more effectively for studying art history in college? Would there have been other ways for me as a high school student to learn about art history? Have art history classes always been taught the same way? Is art history important at all in our education system? What kinds of struggles do art history educators in secondary and higher education institutions experience while teaching? What would make art history information more meaningful to students?

My thesis, *Personal and cultural intricacy in art history classrooms*, is the result of my journey in attempting to answer some of these questions. As an art history major who moved beyond the drowsy threats of slideshows in a dark lecture hall among hundreds of comrades, I have learned that art history is more than a mere delivery of information from one brain to another. Art historical inquiries entail finding correlations between artists and cultures, gaining historical understandings, and investigating ideas and visuality of artworks. As a bridge between the arts and the humanities, art history provides depth in art-making, as well as conceptualization and appreciation of art. As a tool to foster an analytic and creative mind, art history possesses a great potential to encourage students' intellectual growth, lifelong love for art, and keen eyes for observing cultures.

Research Questions and Rationale

The two research questions that I address through this research are: *How does an introductory art history class in a university setting personally engage or disengage students?* and *How does an*

art history survey course discuss culture as a creative endeavor of individuals from society?

These questions rise from a hope of providing insight for the future of art history education in the 21st century.

Art history has been a part of formal art education in the United States since art instruction was introduced into public school curricula in the 19th century. Historically, the audience for art history education has been privileged people, and they were put in charge of directing and escorting the cultural streams of the society. Even though the focus and the role of art history education has been changing along with the paradigm shifts in the fields of art education and of art history, the significance of art history education has remained, if not increased, functioning as a link between artistic creations and social studies, history, literature, and many other disciplines.

In the 21st century that we now live, the realm of the visual has grown larger compared to any precedent period in history due to the development of technology. The current era challenges the notion of canon and authority, and high social and financial standings do not ordain anyone to study what has been created through the pursuits of visual thinking, the expressions of identity, ideology, and ever-evolving ideas. Learning about the visual legacy of the past will help students situate themselves where they belong within the multi-dimensional map of our visual creations and the recreated (Addiss & Erickson, 1993). Such reason offers a foundational rationale for art history education; another dimension of meanings in art, provided through art historical study, leads students to in-depth inquiries about images, ideas, and identities as more than a mere alternative to art-making.

Goals

Based on qualitative research data focusing on teaching art history in a higher education institution, I aimed to achieve the following objectives: 1) to examine relationships within art history classrooms in relation to student learning; 2) to suggest changes and challenges in art history education through perspectives obtained from related literature and research and 3) to analyze personal experiences and indicate implications for teaching art history.

As I aspire to become an educator who embraces individuality built upon cultural diversity, my thesis has broadened my understanding on how various kinds of cultures represented by art history are taught and how students personalize and internalize the teaching. Classroom observation and follow-up interviews have provided insight into what needs to be improved and what makes art history valuable for students. Personal stories of students and art history educators have offered me the perspectives of people who work with and through curricula while learning and teaching. Observations through a field study functioned as a window to me to indirectly live through their experiences while critically analyzing the implications.

Chapter 2

Literature Review: Dialogues on Art History Education

The beginning of art history can be traced back to Giorgio Vasari's *The Lives of the Artists* in the 15th century, a collection of biographies of artists and descriptions of the works of arts that he admired. His writing created a canon for high quality art and distinguished artists with genius who are capable of producing such works from other artists, influencing the aesthetic eyes of his readers (Ferne, 1995). Since then, the field of art history has continued to change over the course of time. Under the influence of other disciplines, such as archeology and history, art historians have disrupted and reestablished boundaries of their field by writing narratives with different characters (Ferne, 1995). The literature produced by art historians varies as a result of such development of the field: biographical information, formal analysis, cultural context study, iconography, etc.

To some artworks and artists, art history means more than stories or analytical studies about the created and the creators of art. Gerald (1995) acknowledged the indispensable relationship between art-making and art history by observing influences of artworks from the past—traces of aesthetic history—on new art-making processes. Artists, such as Robert Colescott, Kathleen Gilje, and Ken Aptekar, created their works in reference to well-known works of art, using their reputation as a part of their statement and also as a stepping stone to convey their ideas.

Art History Education at the High School Level

The richness of art history, a means broadening the understanding of art and culture, inspires art-making, while documenting perspectives and influences of societies. Nevertheless, the importance of implementing art historical contents has not been widely recognized in the field of art education. Compared to any other time period in the history of art education, the late 20th century witnessed the most discussions and interest regarding art history education in schools through the implementation of Discipline-Based Art Education. Among many art educators who supported DBAE, Addiss and Erickson (1993) especially argued that art history education is crucial in primary and secondary education curriculum, not only in higher education setting. By teaching art history as an inquiry and engaging students in problem solving, art history education could provide students with a discerning mind and broader perspective, which is critical in the visual and multicultural society of the 21st century (Addiss & Erickson, 1993). Art history provided distance in time and space, assisting students in appreciating their own cultural, social, and personal background. Development of inquisitive mind and various levels of understanding through art history have implications not only for primary and secondary schools, but also for higher education institutions.

Citing Michael J. Parson's study on developmental aesthetic experience, Addiss and Erickson argued that learning about art history can benefit the students in various age groups (1993, p. 137). Art historical information presented according to the appropriate level of understanding of students will deepen student comprehension of art, resulting in greater student interest. Even though the development stage required some caution to avoid broad generalizations, Parson's theory supported the necessity and the value of art historical instruction which suits the students in elementary schools and secondary schools (Addiss & Erickson, 1993).

Replicative inquiry and generative inquiry are two modes for investigating art history in classrooms. Replicative inquiry allows students to explore what has been done in the field of art history by scholars (Addiss & Erickson, 1993). Rediscovering the traditionally accepted knowledge, students will gradually become more equipped to participate in dialogues in the field. Generative inquiry encourages active student participation through questions and discussions. Although the inquiry processes might lead the class to unexpected discussions, generative inquiry fosters student understanding of the roots of studies in art history.

Addiss and Erickson suggested teaching the skills and attitudes toward art history through establishing facts, focusing on interpretation, and developing art historical explanation and narratives (1993, pp. 126-132). Beyond information oriented teaching, bringing an understanding of what art historians do could assist students to become participants of history writing in the art world. The skills and attitudes Addiss and Erickson proposed originate from a modernist perspective, seeking to stay within the pre-existing boundary of art history (1993, p. 200). Nonetheless, teaching through information investigation, interpretation, explanation, and narratives is still valuable, engaging students to art historical studies through artworks across the cultures as well as everyday objects.

By explaining what art historians do through an example of art historical research, the authors demonstrated the roles of art historians dealing with “raw visual information” in many ways (Addiss & Erickson, 1993, p. 82). Art historians discover through biography, literature, cultural context, and works of art in order to exhibit and publish their findings. Encouraging students to “think for themselves,” the authors emphasized that it is crucial to understand the methods art historians use, not only the results of studies (Addiss & Erickson, 1993, p. 126).

The potential of art historical contents as a part of interdisciplinary curricula—literature and social studies, for example—is an advantage of teaching art history in schools. Art history education fosters learning beyond shapes and colors of artworks because religious, political,

economical, philosophical, and many other aspects of a society also consist of works of art (Addiss & Erickson, 1993). Providing links from art to other disciplines, art history builds ground for comprehensive points of view through gathering and synthesizing information from numerous aspects of life and art-making from many cultures. Addiss and Erickson noted that goals of The National Council for Social Studies and The Pennsylvania Board of Education, such as appreciating differences and similarities of cultures and gathering and critically examining information, can be fulfilled through knowledge and understanding of art history as a discipline (Addiss & Erickson, 1993).

The blueprint of the 20th century art history education, suggested by Addiss and Erickson, has not been implemented in school classrooms. According to the current literature on art history education, the means for teaching and learning art history, such as the Advanced Placement Art History Test, offered by College Board and art history survey textbooks, could function as obstacles hindering inquiries in the discipline. As a high school art history teacher, Stastny (2000) addressed his challenge of preparing students according to the requirements of the Advanced Placement Art History Test and the standards offered through National Assessment of Educational Progress, while adopting a culturally diverse curriculum. One of his struggles in teaching art history was the selection of course content within limited instructional time. The purpose of the Advanced Placement Art History Test is to benefit high school students by cultivating “an understanding and knowledge of architecture, sculpture, painting, and other art forms within diverse historical and cultural contexts,” much like an introductory art history course in college by setting up similar contents (College Board, 2006, p.4). The College Board guideline for developing an AP art history curriculum encouraged teachers to include the study of artworks in local collections to provide students with opportunities for personal experience with artworks (College Board, 2006). However, the amount of material to be covered easily

overwhelms high school teachers, making it difficult to even consider locality and meaning-making through personal engagement.

The making of art history survey texts reflects “the nineteenth-century vision of history to unify the art of the past into a coherent and relevant story for the present” (Schwarzer, 1995, p. 24). Schwarzer (1995) stated that survey textbooks strive to create one articulate narrative of various artistic movements, sacrificing the cultural diversity and the beauty of individuality to one single narrative with a hierarchy. The sense of power is inevitable in such representation from a Western perspective for a certain audience because the pursuit of perfection through complete chronology results in the exclusion of non-European art, which does not fit into the perfect picture frame.

Art history survey books were originally written in Germany as a means to create the modern identity of the nation, regarding the educated public as the audience (Schwarzer, 1995). Survey texts were published before the establishment of art history departments in universities, and they were not originally intended for classroom teaching (Schwarzer, 1995). The German precedents of 21st century survey books, such as Winckelmann, Rumohr, Kugler, and Schnaase, exhibit a strong inclination towards Greek and medieval Christian art in Germany. The lingering remnant of such power relationships and linear presentation of various movements of art is entailed in the survey books used in American high schools and colleges today (Schwarzer, 1995).

According to Graham (1995), art history survey books failed to represent the most current and advanced scholarship in the field of art history, but their canonical status in classrooms is still maintained regardless of the criticism on the authoritative voice of survey texts. Survey textbooks are often used in high school art history classrooms, which could leave improper imprints in student experience with art history. The biased standpoint of the texts could also impact aesthetic values of students, not recognizing the existence of different artistic traditions from non-Western art.

Taylor (1996) challenged assumptions underlying the choices of content in art history curriculum, especially for Modern Art. Pointing out the firm relationship between ideology and history in modern and contemporary art-making, Taylor cautioned against the simplification of art into visual elements, the formation of distorted cultural norms, and the uncritical acceptance of mechanically reproduced images in teaching younger students. While Taylor had concerns with art history education in British classrooms, the implications carry over to teaching art history in the United States, as well as other countries.

The attempts to diversify contents of art history education have appeared in different areas in art history education. Starting from 2010, College Board has decided to require students to use an example from the “art beyond European artistic tradition” in one of the two 30-minute essay questions in the Advanced Placement Art History Test (College Board, 2009). Overall, the AP test has dedicated 20 percent of its content to art from Africa, the Americas, Asia, Islamic cultures, and Oceania, while devoting 30 percent to ancient through medieval art, and 50 percent to art from Renaissance to present (College Board, 2009, pp. 6, 25).

While having a committed portion of content within a test is better than nothing, simply covering materials for non-mainstream art generates room for excluding some cultures from reflection, appreciation, and potential personal engagement. Stastny cited Lee B. Wencker, one of the authors of *Teacher's Guide to the Advanced Placement Course in History of Art*, published by College Board, who argued that the selection of course content is inevitable as long as survey courses exist (Stastny, 1995). Survey courses will hopefully encourage students to pursue further study in art history, and in such cases, the introductory courses will be only the beginning of student experience with art history, not the end (Stastny, 1995). It is hard to say, however, that skimming through the exterior of cultures without attempts to think critically and engage personally will motivate students to study the history of art. The stated goal of an AP Art History course, to “[involve] critical thinking and [develop] an understanding and knowledge of diverse

historical and cultural contexts of architecture, sculpture, painting, and other media” (College Board, 2009), might require a different approach to art history education.

In summary, instead of guiding students to acquire the ability to critically appreciate and participate in art history, classroom curricula which encourage passive learning have dominated art history education until today. In particular, high school art history courses and introductory level instructions in college are molded by survey books, which demonstrate an embedded canonicity, a pursuit of a linear and clear chronology, a narrative with a closure, and the existence of authoritative subjectivity (Graham, 1995). The 21st century visual culture of the society requires even more student initiatives to reexamine the direct and indirect art history education in and outside of the classroom, but a preeminent gap exists between the reality and the necessity.

Art History Education at the University Level

In some college art history departments, introductory courses with a strong focus on Western art were supplemented by art from non-Western cultures. For example, according to Cothren (1995), the amount of Western art covered in the survey course at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, was reduced to a little over one-fourth by the mid-1980s and replaced by lectures on art of Asia, Islam, and Africa. Such reform, however, brought discomfort and dissatisfaction because of how the course presented art from cultures beyond the canonical boundary of art history, such as Greek and Renaissance art. Even though the new curriculum was pedagogically efficient, enabling the instructor to go over a large quantity of information, the course was packed with “unexplored and ultimately dishonest generalizations” (Cothren, 1995, p. 58).

While many art history survey courses still uphold the hierarchical transmission of information today, a postmodern approach to art history curriculum could be a viable alternative. Efland, Freedman, and Stuhr (1996) argued for the need of little narratives rather than meta-

narratives in art education. A paradigm shift occurred in the field of art education as people started doubting the linear-progress oriented, authoritarian, and non-engaging view of Modernism. Postmodernism challenges the notion of boundaries, reexamines relationships between the past and the present, and breaks the status quo for social reconstruction. In comparison, the art educational movements of the past—such as teaching elements of design, structuring curriculum around self-expression, focusing on practical and decorative art, and implementing Discipline-Based Art Education—are based on the belief that art can be approached through scientific and universal rules and as an agent of social progress, seeking to maintain the comfort within a discipline.

Regarding the essence of multiculturalism as postmodern, the authors state that multicultural art education can be approached either through modernist or postmodernist methods. The five different models of multicultural education are: teaching a “culturally different” approach, a “human relations” approach, a “single group studies” approach, a “social democracy” approach, and a “social reconstruction” approach (Efland et al, 1996, p 90). Among the five approaches, the postmodern multicultural methods (“social democracy” approach and “social reconstruction” approach) examine power relationships, suggest the possibility of negotiation, and break down the hierarchy of the classroom. Simply exposing students with different cultural background to the mainstream culture or recognizing cultural differences on a superficial level can hardly foster an understanding that anyone can be an “other” to others and that diversity and individuality are acceptable qualities of life. Based on modernist ideals, teaching a “culturally different” approach and a “human relations” approach avoids conflicts and reinforces one’s accepted point of view, which resemble the effects art history survey books bring through one tinted narrative.

Desai (2000) challenged multicultural art education that authenticates and reduces the meanings of cultures through political subjectivity. Especially focusing on multiculturalism in

museums and in aesthetic values, the author argues that the act of speaking for and about others results in second-hand representations, which inevitably reflect power relationships. Authentic representations of major museums frame cultures within an authoritative and distorted perspective in the interest of influential groups in the society. The authority of major museums helps in legitimizing their collections and the portrayals of art from non-European civilizations, even turning art into an object of tourism for the financial merit exoticism might bring (Desai, 2000). Desai's arguments can also be applied to art history education, for putting legitimized artifacts on a pedestal in major museums is not very different from including excerpts of cultural studies in well-bound survey books. The names of survey book authors—for example, Janson, Hartt, Gardner, and Gombrich—have become brand names known for authority, popularity, and informativity, often not engaging the audience in active thinking processes. Providing general information on many works of art with European roots, the books provide “right answers” to questions on a test, rather than encouragement for in-depth inquiries.

Desai was also critical of the West versus non-West division within multicultural education. Noticing the absence of Western aesthetics is different from acknowledging the existence of artistic principles which are not the same as that of Western culture. Hart (1991) stated (as does Desai, 2000) that non-Western art systems cannot be appreciated through Western aesthetics, through concepts such as individuality, originality, permanence, and distinction between high and popular art. Nevertheless, discussions on non-Western art ironically often involve works of crafts or fine art mediums of Western art, such as painting, sculpture, and drawing. To encompass the multi-linear formation of art-making processes in cultures around the globe, originality within cultural contexts should be considered beyond the simple Western or non-Western dichotomy (Desai, 2000).

The desire to bring art from various cultures and nations is a positive start for broadening the cultural horizons of teachers and students; however, it is also important to

examine and comprehend two different aspects of multicultural art education. Desai (2000) criticized multiculturalism that merely skims through the surface of cultures while emphasizing differences, rather than embracing and trying to understand unfamiliarity. Such making of otherness inevitably implies power relationships between cultures. Presenting, experiencing, and studying cultures require mindfulness on the part of educators because partial perspectives, as well as incomplete understandings of cultures, can influence not only the aesthetic values of the public, but also attitudes towards “others.”

Dimitriadis and McCarthy (2001) challenged the presentation of “cultural identity, cultural difference and cultural community” to foster “homogeneity, normalization, and the production of the socially functional citizen” by the mainstream education system through post-colonial eyes (pp. 2-3). With the manifestation of cultural diversity and plurality in our society today, classrooms are facing an emergent necessity to break away from any implication of unbalanced relationships such as found between the colonizer and the colonized, developed and Third World nations, or the cultured and the exotic. Art history education is certainly not an exception in this reassessment. Rather than disregarding the aesthetics of unfamiliar cultures, art history can be used to encourage people to reexamine their preconceptions and broaden their cultural horizon.

Throughout history, art history as a discipline established traditional views on art that privilege white male artists and Western art. Such conventions have been challenged by different groups since the 20th century through new methodologies, such as Marxism, feminism, psychoanalysis, deconstruction, and semiotics. These recently adopted perspectives introduce a new standpoint on art historical investigations (Addiss & Erickson, 1993, pp. 52-69). Addiss and Erickson also considered folk art and popular art as other types of art that deserve attention and recognition as a genre with their own tradition of aesthetic principles (Addiss & Erickson, 1993, pp. 41-43). The study of art and culture needs to be our own, not from the government, the social

elites, or a particular group (Addiss & Erickson, 1993, pp. 43). The process of questioning and reevaluating what defines the boundary of art and what makes “good” art is an educational process, which enriches our depth of understanding of art (Addiss & Erickson, 1993, pp. 42).

Among 21st century art educators, Congdon (2005) acknowledged folk art as a mode of art which challenges the traditional notion of the educated, the creative, and the beautiful. While defining what art educators learn and teach in schools as the mainstream that speaks a separate language, the author brings the art of folk artists into our attention through their own qualities, such as originality, creativity, communal connectivity, distinctive communicability, transcendental quality, and non-traditional sensitivity regarding education (Congdon, 2005). Reexamining our notion of what is worth learning and teaching is an emerging topic in art history education as well as art education. Challenging the tradition of teaching fine art within the Western boundary brings meaning into art history education. It is not only an opportunity to appreciate the diversity of existing aesthetics, but also a means to promote understanding of deconstructing the prejudiced status quo of art history education.

Likewise, teaching such a tremendous quantity of information with some curiosity-provoking impact on students’ lives is not an easy task for college professors who teach survey courses, from which the AP Art History Test is modeled. Cothorn (1995) stated that especially after the inclusion of art from other parts of the world, “the [introductory art history] course soon collapsed under its own weight” (p. 58). Instead of taking an enjoyable walk through the history of art, sprinting from Ancient art to Contemporary art left students short of breath with only shallow knowledge.

Addiss and Erickson (1993) also acknowledged the necessity of appropriate guidance for teachers required to select class content. While recommending teaching “traditionally well-known artists,” the authors emphasize teachers’ firm understanding of the purpose of art history education (p. 121). The solution to the discussions regarding organizing a curriculum—what

needs to be mentioned in the classroom and how much time is appropriate to cover art of a particular culture—will differ from one educator to another. Especially when the canonized art history textbooks are being questioned, conscious judgments of art history educators matter more than any other period in the history of art history education.

The postmodern view on art education is one of the perspectives that challenge the art history that survey books are bringing to classrooms. Elkins (2002) suggested his book, *Stories of Art*, as an alternative to *The Story of Art* by Gombrich, which has never been out of print since its original publication in 1950. Encouraging constructing personalized outlines of art history through diagrams and illustrations, based on his teaching as a college professor, the author proposed the making of individualized narratives, thus disrupting one story with authority, coherence, and generalization.

Since the early 1980s, problems regarding how art history is being taught to high school students and undergraduate students have been discussed, acknowledging the need for improvement. Considering how such issues could be addressed within the discipline, Elkins proposed six potential solutions, such as: avoiding the establishment of new structures; creating one chronology including a variety of world cultures; contributing equal amount of space according to the passage of time; acknowledging the diversity of art and culture beyond Europe; considering multiple languages besides French, Italian, and German to reduce the emphasis on certain European art, and using the relative complexity of cultures as a measure of gauging to organize a text (Elkins, 2002, pp. 131-147).

Regardless of his numerous ideas to implement impartiality in art history education, Elkins's view on the fulfillment of genuine multiculturalism is not optimistic. The author called multiculturalism an “untroubling form of guilt for the choices we continue to make” (2002, p. 148). The recent interest in culturally diverse and impartial narratives is not strong enough to redirect the streams of academic interest from Western art to art from the other parts of the world,

especially considering the purpose of art history—to record, to preserve, and to indicate a support for a certain culture (Elkins, 2002). Citing Stanley Fish, Elkins stated that understanding other cultures involves giving up a part of what is crucial to one's own cultural identity (Elkins, 2002, p. 148). In addition, because art history survey books from numerous countries promote their own ideologies and beliefs, such as socialism, religion, personal taste in art, and nationalism, the texts from other countries cannot simply replace survey books published in the Western hemisphere of the field to bring fairness to the field

The “enterprise” of art history, which hires people and fills classrooms, challenges implementation of multiculturalism in a practical sense (Elkins, 2002, p. 147). Art historians with various cultural backgrounds study in the style of Western art history and produce works within this framework. As scholars in academia, art historians publish in journals and organize exhibitions in which European aesthetics dominate, despite the traditional perspectives on art from their own culture (Elkins, 2002, p. 150). The discipline of art history itself requires an immersion in Western aesthetics.

Stastny (2000) noted the preface of the fifth edition of *History of Art* by A.F. Janson, one of the popular art history survey texts, demonstrates its belief in the importance of an uninterrupted quest for “Truth” in the midst of numerous approaches to art history like Marxism, psychology, feminism, multiculturalism, and deconstructionism. Janson acknowledged people's efforts throughout history to seek objectivity and establish validity within the understanding of art history, even though art history has changed over the course of time. The existence of “Truth” in art history, however, is unquestionable for him. Nevertheless, the problem lies not only in the opinion of an artist, an art historian, or an author of an art history survey book (Graham, 1995). As Hartt acknowledged (as cited in Graham, 1995), the entire art community, including artists, audiences, patrons, institutions, and scholars, did not properly consider certain groups of artists, such as female artists, within the major stories on art.

As an attempt to avoid the curriculum structure that itself depends on a chronology of canonized Western art, Elkins suggested alternative ways to teach art history. One of the ways is organizing thematic art history courses, which Elkins (1995) argued for while discussing the implementation of the Integrated Art History/Studio Art Program at The Art Institute of Chicago. He emphasized the coherence that thematic curriculum could bring by extending the range of the topics covered in thematic introductory classes into classes offered in Junior and Senior years of college. Thematic courses embrace the potential of structuring more impartial courses, being less sexist and racist than traditional art history courses, because instructors need to reorganize courses outside of the boundary of Western-art oriented chronology (Elkins, 1995). Even though there have been cases where students were confused due to their familiarity with chronologically structured courses, making efforts to reexamine the construction of art history is more significant than practical concerns. Additionally, art educators need to be mindful that the goal is not to establish another canon of art history rooted in a thematic structure (Elkins, 2002, p. 132).

Some universities have taken initiatives to deconstruct lower-level survey courses and reconstruct the introductory courses in order to improve student learning and to present art history through a respectful perspective towards art from non-European traditions. Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, is an example of an institution that restructured introductory art history courses in the 1980s and experienced a rise in the number of students who take the basic-level art history courses and got positive feedback. Even though the new structure for the courses gave instructors the right to decide their own course contents, agreements, such as covering core areas, set boundaries for the freedom for designing courses (Cothorn, 1995). Emphasizing the characteristic of art history as an interpretive discipline, the new introductory art history courses focused on teaching students “how” rather than “what” (Cothorn, 1995). The aim of such transformation in curriculum structure was to help students cultivate the ability to participate in the process of making art history, instead of simply bombarding them with endless information on artworks,

artists, cultural context, political or religious implication, etc. By creating an environment where students are encouraged to actively analyze and translate through their own lens, the course prepared a foundation for students to further engage in and outside of the field.

Conclusions

From the late 19th century until the early 20th century, art history education was a part of student moral education and a reflection of high social standing (Addiss & Erickson, 1993). Until Discipline-Based Art Education aroused the interest in teaching art history in public school art classes in the late 20th century, child-centered art education discouraged teaching the history of art created by adults (Addiss & Erickson, 1993). Moving onto the 21st century, the boundary of art history as a discipline and the authority of canonized Western art history have been challenged through the postmodern perspective of art education. Currently, art history education is encountering a new stage of life as an academic discipline. Constant questioning and deconstructing of the contents and the viewpoints in art historical narratives ask for restructuring art history, especially for the educators who need to understand 21st century art history before bringing the stories of art into classrooms.

The presence of the Western-centered perspective is still dominant in art history survey books. Even though the field of art education—not only art history education—attempts to bring attention to the artists who have been marginalized, the authority of the canon is fortified with art history instruction which does not bring any personal meanings into student life. Active student engagement that considers individuality and respects others is the source of reexamining “the story of art” which is distant from us, but world famous.

Addiss and Erickson (1993) acknowledged that through art history, students could appreciate art as “manifestations of values held in different cultures and different time,” and also

as “an important part of human accomplishment” (p. 118). Teaching art history as an inquiry process, not a pre-set list of information, art history educators can provide students the tools to understand art from various cultures and time periods. The narrow-minded art history narratives need to be overcome, not to judge which accomplishment is better than others, even though it is not an easy task to embrace differences. While being deeply rooted in who we are without the sense of privilege, we need to respect the beauty of otherness.

Teaching art history both in high school and in university share some common ground through the use of survey textbooks and the emphasis on replicative inquiries, while gaining cultural appreciation and understanding of what art historians do has been a necessity in both levels of art history education. In high schools, Discipline-Based Art Education in the 1980s and 1990s provided an opportunity to reflect upon art history in school art curriculum. Even though high school teachers face challenges teaching a large quantity of information during limited class periods, especially for AP Art History Test, art history can generate student aesthetic interests providing a cultural distance in time and space.

In a university setting, with the emergence of postmodernism, multicultural art education has been advocated to embrace diversity and plurality without authenticating differences. Confronting the sole authority on aesthetics of art, art history educators like Cothorn (1995) and Graham (1995) acknowledged the need for art historical narratives with respect for diversity and multiplicity since the late 20th century. While a number of art history classes attempted to incorporate art with non-western art traditions, the Western foundation of the field of art history can be an obstacle to fostering an unbiased understanding of cultures. “Engaging cultures from different parts of the world” might sound simple and linear to some ears, but some scholars in the field of art education call for caution while implementing multiculturalism in classrooms.

A new structure of art history instruction is less important than challenging the current one. Instead of avoiding the canonized traditional art historical narratives, reflecting on and

confronting problems in art history education will provide a meaningful bridge between the reality and the potential of learning and teaching stories of art. While the interest in art history is rising along with academicization and evaluation of school subjects through testing, the 21st century necessity in the field of art education is art history which fosters stories of art by students.

Theoretical Framework

My theoretical framework is based on post-modern multicultural art education. The concept of meta and little narratives, preeminent in the writings of Efland, Freedman, and Stuhr, and Elkins, advocated personal inquiries of arts and cultures, rather than relying on cultural representations by an authority. Especially in art history classrooms, such notions encourage generative inquiries built upon replicative inquiries through participation and investigation of students. Various forms of student participation, like discussions, can bring individuality into learning processes in group settings, imprinting on the students' memories a personally meaningful understanding of art history. Elkins (2002) stated that the ability to produce stories of art with personal significance will make the study of art history dynamic and interesting, rather than a discipline made up of predetermined information.

My research investigates art history education based on postmodern theories embraced by multicultural art education, advocating cultural plurality and diversity. Personal and cultural engagement and disengagement in art history education generate dialogues that challenge the hierarchy in course curricula and a sense of cultural superiority. While various alternatives have been suggested to replace art history survey textbooks with an emphasis on art rooted in European tradition, the structure and the content of art history curricula still have room for investigation and will be explored in depth throughout this work.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This research consists of two parts: a field study and interviews. The selected field study site is an introductory level art history classroom with 240 students at a Big Ten university. Out of five large survey courses (each with more than one hundred students in the class) being offered in the spring semester of 2010, a course was selected based on whether my schedule for the semester allowed me to observe the course on a regular basis without interfering with my courses. The observed course consisted of two lecture classes per week where 240 students met in one lecture hall and one small class—sections—per week for which the students were divided into ten different groups. I attended four one-hour-long lecture classes and two one-hour-long small sections over two and a half weeks, while making observations without participating in the class.

The original plan for the field study was to observe both a college introductory-level art history course and a high school art history class and compare the data from two different levels of educational institutions. Unfortunately, however, I encountered difficulties trying to obtain permission by the school district of the chosen high school and was not able to conduct a research with the school students. The modified field study, solely exploring art history education in higher education, serves the following purposes: 1) to analyze how students interact with each other and with the instructor; 2) to observe the culture of contents that students learn during the class, and; 3) to acquire a sense of the class for more effective interviews with the students and the instructor of the class. According to my theoretical framework based on postmodern multicultural art education, I closely observed the singularity or plurality of individuals participating in personal interactions in the observed classroom. Investigating the perspective of

course materials through the postmodern lens, the dominant cultural narrative in the classroom with a western point of view has been examined under the categories of textbook, potential influence, and pedagogical structure.

Interviews of art history educators and students followed the class observation to inquire about their personal experiences beyond a spectator's perspective. A total of thirteen interviews, after recruitment via emails and class announcements, provide discourses on personal experience in art history classrooms. The seven interviewed educators, who were also selected through voluntary and purposeful sampling considering the proximity to the research site and their professions, included three art history college professors, one of which taught the observed art history class, a teaching assistant who taught one of the small groups, and three high school art history teachers, who were also studio art teachers. The interviews of the high school art history teachers were to provide diverse perspectives on the correlation between introductory art history classes in college and high school art history classes. In order to maintain the focus on in-school art history education, the instructor interviewees were limited to educators in high schools and college professors, rather than including art history educators outside of a school system, such as museum educators. The length of interviews ranged from twenty-five minutes to over an hour.

With a prerequisite of having pre-college art history experience, student interviewees were recruited through verbal announcements in their sections and follow-up emails. Interviews were conducted on a one-on-one basis, except one interview carried out with two students simultaneously. The interviews with students lasted from eleven minutes to twenty-two minutes.

The decision to interview students with pre-college art history experience was based on three reasons: 1) their repeated choices to take art history classes in different stages of their education indicate students' interest in art history; 2) a foundation with which to compare and contrast their experience in high school and college-level art history classes, and; 3) the condition

provides the researcher with a focused group with a similar background. Interview questions are further discussed in the section below.

I originally coded my data with the four main categories—personal dis/engagement, cultural dis/engagement, similarities between art history education in secondary and higher education, and difference between the two levels of education systems. After the modifying the research from a comparative study to an in-depth study of one college-level art history class, I analyzed collected data under three categories—classroom, professors, and students—to provide a thorough understanding of the research site and of interviewees before focusing on personal and cultural implications of the observed classroom as it relates to student engagement and disengagement. The two categories from the previous data coding—personal dis/engagement, cultural dis/engagement—have been further investigated through detailed subcategories, such as textbook, technology, and pedagogical structure.

The compound term dis/engagement indicates the close relationship between engagement and disengagement observed in the art history classroom chosen as the research site. Engagement and disengagement occurred simultaneously through student participation, the use of technology, and the process of teaching and learning in class. For example, a student who was a part of the class as a community could easily disengage from the class using a cell phone, a laptop, or any other electronic device and engage into the personal space with the help of technology. Considering the concurrent nature of engagement and disengagement, I concluded that it would be suitable to visually demonstrate the relationship between the two terms.

I used concepts from grounded theory as a method of data analysis. According to Schram (2005), the goal of “grounded theory is to develop a substantive theory that is derived from and grounded in data” (p. 100). Grounded theory analyzes data in comparison to substantive theories, even though the theories do not restrict the outcome of the research and can be modified (Schram, 2005). Reoccurring themes and threads observed in my data (interview transcriptions

and field notes) were examined according to the core concepts from my theoretical framework, such as replicative and generative inquiries, meta and little narratives, post-modernism, and multiculturalism.

In addition, the analysis of the 13th edition of *Gardner's art through the ages: The western perspective*, the textbook for the class, provided an overview of the role and the impacts of the text in the classroom. Reflecting upon the interviewed students' and professors' opinions on the book, as well as the presentation of the book by the author, this thesis will present the book's influence on personal and cultural engagement and disengagement.

Validity

If a field study is conducted again in a similar setting, the individuality of students and instructors might direct class discussions in different directions. Nonetheless, curriculum structures of introductory survey courses in college, whether they utilize a conventional art historical canon or not, will enclose the overall perspectives of students and instructors, leading observations for a field study to similar results.

While informing the participants regarding the research is a crucial part of qualitative research ethics, such knowledge of the participants can cause reactivity, "the influence of the researcher on the setting or individuals studied (Maxwell, 2005)." My presence in the classroom conducting field observation could have affected the flow of the class and the student, which could risk the validity of the research. Nevertheless, considering the size of the observed classes, especially the lecture class with over 200 students, the impact of my presence is anticipated to have been minimal.

Maxwell (2005) cautions against researcher biases that might bring a negative impact in the conclusions of qualitative research. I predict that my potential bias could come from my

undergraduate background as an art history major. While such experience can provide an insight of the field of art history, my previous experience as a student and the corresponding perspective could also function as a bias, influencing observations and interviews. Being mindful of my background throughout this research, I was able to use the knowledge of the discipline as an advantage to enhance the depth interviews and class observations, rather than an obstacle that narrows my perspective.

Through the field study, supplemented by interviews, I wish to focus on specifics that reflect the embedded theoretical elements of art history classes. The particulars of the courses, uncovered and analyzed in my qualitative research, could bring out the matters that the field of art history education needs to address. The research effort is far from concluding any generalized assumptions, but the observations could lead to implications for overall art history education.

Interview Questions

Interviews were conducted with two groups: educators and students. Among the educators, there were three subgroups: college professors of art history, high school art history teachers, and a teaching assistant of an introductory-level art history college course.

During the interviews, questions such as the following were asked to educators:

- Why do you think students should learn art history?
- In what ways do you believe art history education in high school prepares students for further study at the university level?
- What do you intend for your students to learn from your class beyond art historical information?
- What do you find particularly rewarding teaching college students?

Students were interviewed using questions such as:

- Why are you taking art history courses in college as well as in high school?
- If you could change one thing about your class, what would that be?
- How would you like to be evaluated in your class?
- Among the things that you have learned from your class, what was the most meaningful to you?
- How do you participate in class and make what you learn personal?
- What were the challenges you have encountered in your art history class?

The interview questions are attached as Appendix 1.

Chapter 4

Findings

The first day of class observation—before the class started, I walked passed hundreds of students and approached Professor Dickinson.¹ After getting a signature on a consent form, I introduced myself to the class as I was to join the class for the next two weeks. Looking into the eyes of the students in a lecture hall, I recalled myself as an undergraduate art history student taking survey classes in a lecture hall. As the professor started the lecture of the day, I opened up my notebook as a researcher, not a student in the class.

Supporting Stories

Before discussing the two main themes of the research findings—Personal Dis/engagement and Cultural Dis/engagement—I would like to provide further accounts on the observed classroom and the interviewees. By providing focused narratives on classroom, professors, and students as the locus of the research, this section will function as the foundation for gaining an in-depth and complete understanding of thematic findings in the following section.

¹ All the names appearing in this thesis are pseudonyms to protect the identities of the participants.

Stories of Classrooms

Over the two-week-long observation period, two non-verbal elements accompanied my journey as a researcher in an art history classroom: noise and light. Various kinds of sounds quietly resonated in a classroom with over two hundred people, as students typed on keyboards, laughed, shuffled pages, and packed their bags when the end of a class period was approaching. The projected voice of Professor Dickinson, a professor with 18 years of teaching experience, lecturing through a microphone made these scattered noises vulnerable; however, like more than 400 eyes were working diligently without being noticed very much, the gentle breaking of silence reminded me of students' presence in the room.

The classroom, with little luminance, also embraced the bright light of a projector, launching bright images to the front of the room, as well as a choir of lights, coming from laptop screens, cell phones (appearing and soon disappearing like fireflies), and red exit signs. In the midst of two hundred companions, a few students decided to dis/engage (engage into one space and disengage from another simultaneously themselves into individual spaces), such as personal email accounts, Facebook, instant messenger programs, and text messaging through written dialogues with the help of technology and the dim lights. Rather than having person-to-person conversations in the communal place, students traveled back and forth between various personalized spaces. As students moved between the public realm—the projected screen, the class as a community, and the information transmitted through the professor's verbalized words, and the private realm—notebooks, laptop computers, and cell phones, their heads continued to dance up and down. The verticality of individual students' upright posture sitting down in their seats, the professor standing in front of the class, and the gaze onto the screen contrasted with the horizontal plane which a group of students created as they sat collectively in a large space, while the public information become private through writing on flat notebooks and typing on horizontally arranged keyboards.

One weekly class session for which students were divided into ten small groups supplemented what was discussed in two lectures by reviewing and building upon the class content and also occasionally by the discussion of assigned articles written by art historians. In one small section class, about twenty students sat around long tables, arranged like a horseshoe, with their notebooks or laptops. When Brooke, the teaching assistant who led two of the ten smaller classes, changed the slides, students simultaneously turned their notebook pages, visually engaged with the course material, and raised their hands to express their curiosity and understanding. Brooke personalized the classroom as a community by using the students' names, encouraging students to visit museums, and sharing her experience visiting various architectural structures and museums with the works of art discussed in class.

While the learning processes highly depended on a vertical instructor-student relationship hierarchy in the lecture hall, discussions in the small classroom enabled interactions based on horizontal relationships in a learning community. As a discussion facilitator rather than a lecturer, the teaching assistant disseminated class content through dialogues. By means of verbal engagement, she gently stepped into students' personal spaces of understanding, which might disengage without any involvement, and helped stimulate their minds through investigation, juxtaposition, and reflection. For example, students were intellectually challenged to compare different works of arts and artistic movements, exposed to elaborated art-making processes, and provided with time and room to ponder upon what was covered during lectures.

While no students asked questions in lecture classes during the observed sessions, some of the students were not afraid to raise their hands and contribute to the ongoing discussion in the small group class. In the community of learners, Brooke encouraged students to share ideas, questions, and observations through by positive reinforcements, using phrases such as "good", "right", and "excellent." She also conversed with students through follow-up questions. For

example, she asked her students to further demonstrate their observation using the images projected on the screen.

While some students remained quiet in both types of learning environments, others gained their individual voices in the small group setting and in the large lecture hall before and after the class. Even though the students as a whole outnumbered the five teaching assistants and the professor, only a fraction of the students initiated personal communication and acquired identities as individual learners. I observed that students who engaged in conversations and asked questions after class also frequently contributed to discussions during sections. Inquisitive minds harvested more through interactions with the instructors, and insensitive minds disposed of room for thoughts in silence.

The lecture portion of the course focused on delivery of one meta-narrative through a replicative inquiry (an inquiry that focuses on the effective deliverance of information previously established through research), while encouraging student engagement with the provided information. The course content consisted of major artistic movements of European art, and the dependency on the main narrative by the course instructor subdued students' interests and perspectives. The small group part of the course opened up room for little narratives, engaging students through inquiries and conversations. Even though the process was more inquisitive rather than being generative, leading to new discoveries and understandings in art history, students contributed to the classroom culture by sharing their ideas and opinions, and such participation facilitated active learning. (The idea of replicative and generative inquiries are discussed in Addiss & Erickson, 1993, and the notion of meta and little narratives are investigated in Efland et al, 1996.)

My two research questions, *How does an introductory art history class in a university setting personally engage or disengage students?* and *How does an art history survey course*

discuss culture as, a creative endeavor of individuals from society? are further investigated according to the data from the various interview groups in following sections.

Stories of Professors

The website of the university art history department described the type of the classes being offered as “lecture/discussion.” While the lectures provided a basis for the contents of the small group classes, maintaining the curricular coherence, the art history survey course consisted of two completely distinct teaching and learning environments, rather than being a fusion of the two. While demonstrating themes of the courses (art and architecture from various points of history and cultures), the introductory paragraphs to the art history program at the university put emphasis on research and publication by students and faculty members through lecture series and participation in academic symposia. Professors at the university were active in research and publication and had stronger identities as researchers rather than as an educator. During an interview with Professor Peterson, another professor in the art history department with eleven years of college teaching experience, she mentioned: “I certainly think.. probably I think of myself more as a historian than as a teacher of art of some sort (personal communication, December 2, 2009).” As trained scholars, historians, and researchers in the field of art history, college professors utilize their experiences with public speaking, personal relationships, and being in school as students as the foundation for their teaching, rather than formal education on teaching.

Starting from interests in art and culture, along with talents to pursue the discipline, the three interviewed professors have pursued their personal intellectual curiosity in art history. In their own teaching, the professors invested in personal growth through learning to draw relationships and to investigate, rather than detailed information, such as dates and names:

You can't really, you are not really teaching them anything specific besides few names and few dates. You are teaching them to be interested in it. to care about it, and that's really it. Maybe to be interested to try to make connections. Oh, that reminds me of something for some reason. Whatever might be—another work or art, and something else (Professor Lee, personal communication, January 26, 2010).

While mentioning that one of her colleagues actually enjoys teaching big lecture courses, Professor Lee, who had taught art history at the Big Ten university for 26 years and for another year previously at a different university, said she enjoys teaching concentrated courses that allow her to thoroughly investigate relationships rather than looking at a few points and moving onto another thing.

Discussing the survey courses they have taught and are teaching, three interviewed professors shared their opinions about the content range of the course and the textbook. Professor Dickinson and Professor Lee mentioned that they would prefer teaching a half of an introductory survey course within their specialty. Both of them had taken survey courses team-taught by specialists of the field when they were in school, and they shared how intriguing it was to them. In Professor Lee's words:

I think it was very well done. First of all, it was team-taught by four professors--two each semester. And it was roughly chronological, but we did what the professor thought was important or interesting to him or her. It was just spotlights on certain times and places. And I like that a lot, as a way, because, you see some of the problems. We didn't just see the continuum ... [the professor] would talk about things he found interesting, his problems, and I thought that was probably the reason I got interested in [art history]

(personal communication with Professor Lee, personal communication, January 26, 2010).

Regarding the textbook, Professor Peterson stated that the rich images of survey textbooks are useful, but the professor does not “even like the textbook that much” (personal communication, December 2, 2009). She has mentioned that using scanned images can be an alternative, and a professor in the department is planning on trying such method even though the limited online space can be problematic with high-quality images.

Discussing *Cultural Literacy* by E. D. Hirsch, Smith (1994) states the significance of achieving the balance between an *extensive* curriculum and an *intensive* curriculum. While an extensive curriculum defines the range of topics to be covered, an intensive curriculum allows in-depth inquires along with flexibility for content (pp. 26-28). (Smith gives an example of Shakespeare being a part of a domain of contents, and giving a choice of his works as the gateway for an extensive investigation.) Introductory art history classes focus on the extensive curriculum, providing an overview of many topics. Teaching the products of art historical researches conducted over the years, the survey courses broaden the range of student knowledge in art history. Even though the interviewed professors indicated their preference for in-depth inquiries, which can be achieved through an intensive curriculum, the purpose of college survey courses demanded the instructors to supply one meta-narrative for effective information delivery. Since the survey course curriculum is founded upon replicative inquiry (discussed in Addiss & Erickson, 1993), an art history survey course could easily adapt rigidity and lose the complexity and depth of the discipline. As established scholars of art history, the professors of the university faced the challenge of teaching an informative and inspiring survey course to a crowd of 240.

Stories of Students

The six students that I met in a well-lit room for interviews told me stories of individual experiences. None of them were art history majors, although four of them had art-related majors, such as art education, painting, and graphic design. Out of six student interviewees, who all had taken art history classes in high school, five of them were in the survey course that I observed. The student participants pointed out that having personal interests in art, especially art-making, was the major motivation in studying art history in high school, even though logistical issues such as having to fill up a schedule and having an honors class on a high school transcript influenced their decision making. Living in New Jersey, New York, and or Pennsylvania (in particular suburbs of Philadelphia), students were able to visit museums frequently with their families or on field trips. All of the students attended public high school, one of which was an arts magnet school. One out of the six students took the Advanced Placement Art History Exam. Two students had had an art history class integrated with studio art components.

While students had positive and negative impressions from their previous experiences in high school, having a pre-college art history experience also impacted how much the students involved themselves in their learning processes. Similarities between a high school class and a college course, such as textbooks and exam formats, and content helped students adjust to the college art history course and the evaluation method.

Differences provoked thoughts and reactions in students' minds. Some student interviewees mentioned that the subject knowledge and passion of their college professor and teaching assistant impressed them: "You can tell that [the teaching assistant] is so enthusiastic about everything. And she's just so knowledgeable and totally loves what she does. It comes across, and it's really effective" (personal communication, April 12, 2010). Students mentioned that while in high school they enjoyed the combination between art history and studio art, as well

as building a personal relationship with the teacher, which was challenging in a survey course with more than two hundred peers in the lecture hall.

The focus on replicative inquiries in art history, allowing meta-narratives to thrive with little investigation of previously established conventions and knowledge, challenged students to memorize information, rather than analyze for understanding. While all of the student interviewees mentioned that they are not good test takers, both the high school and university-level art history classes they have taken embraced knowledge-testing as a form of student evaluation. Such assessment influenced student engagement in the discipline by affecting students' focus of study. For tests and exams in art history classes, students concentrated on searching for the "correct" answers for potential questions, and the purpose of textbooks was reduced to an aid for gaining a good grade. One student stated that she uses the textbook only to prepare for the tests: "I never look at it until I need to study for the test" (personal communication, April 12, 2010). Reflecting on her high school art history experience, another of the students mentioned that her teacher distributed worksheets for each chapter in the textbook, and the students searched through the book to find the right answer for blanks (personal communication, April 9, 2010). Gaining understanding and appreciation in art history requires both cultural knowledge and historical familiarity; however, the emphasis on information acquisition affected student learning as well as their understanding of the discipline as attending to the meta-narrative provided by the course.

Personal Dis/engagement

Personal dis/engagement involves learning processes of individuals. Various factors, such as resources for learning, environment, and opportunities for student contribution, affect personal, social, and intellectual growth. Authority of a single meta-narrative and room for little narrative

also influence student learning, encouraging or discouraging students to participate in the community of learners. As participants or spectators, students engage or disengage in different forms in various classroom environment. During the class observations and interviews, the most apparent issue of personal dis/engagement in the art history class emerged in three distinctive ways: participation, technology, and the pace of the class.

Student disconnection from the learning environment and contents leads to shallow in-class inquiries. Replicative inquiries embedded in lecture format classes challenge student engagement because the structure can deprive of opportunities to examine the contents before accepting and understanding, and the content can remain isolated from active mind work for learning. During interviews, students shared their hardships trying pay attention during the lectures:

Yeah, in the lecture, I am going to admit. I do zone out. I mean I do better at going back to my place and looking at it and rereading it myself, and doing that, rather than in lecture classes. I don't do well in lecture classes. I don't focus, but obviously, in smaller classes, you have to focus because they call on you and you have to be prepared for what you say (personal communication, April 5, 2010).

In the lecture portion of the class, the verbal and non-verbal communications between the instructor and the students for the transmission of knowledge and enthusiasm occurred in various forms as the prerequisite of learning. Students responded to the instructor, Professor Dickinson, who mainly dominated the dynamics of the class, through gasping, laughing, and turning pages simultaneously. While the characteristics of a lecture course minimized direct interactions between the instructor and students in class and little narratives of students, few students sought out conversations with the professor and teaching assistants before and after the

class. Besides factors that draw students' attention, such as making eye contact, gesturing with hands, approaching student seats, and posing questions to students, Professor Dickinson promoted student thinking and breathed in life into her lecture by incorporating photographs from the current newspaper into slideshows, making reference to related literary works, and describing the physicality of artworks.

Student voices are not always silent in art history classrooms. During the interview with Professor Peterson, she mentioned that she gives her microphone over to students during her lectures. During one of the observed sessions, Brooke also gave her laser pointer over to a student, asking him to point out what he was mentioning. Within the boundaries of the course dialogue, students contributed to the learning community. While lecture classes offered students the opportunity to participate in the making of the class, small group classes provided a more inviting environment with a smaller group of peers.

Even though actively sharing opinions in class was not an easy task for every student, students spoke their minds as individuals in the small classes of about 25 people:

I really like the section just because it's so, it's a more engaging conversation. When I am in lectures, I definitely write more down, noteswise. But I remember everything in the section because we actually have discussions about everything ... but, I think even if you are, even if you have a tendency to be more shy, you will get a lot more out of it if you participate more in class (personal communication, April 12, 2010).

Making a piece of knowledge into an experience of speaking and sharing, students active in speaking engaged their minds in conversations. From the information that came from one main narrative by the professor, students acknowledged the necessity of making personal engagement and further developed individuality and plurality of the learning environment. Students

personalized inquiries, learn as they experienced, and engage themselves in meaning-making through little narratives.

While contributing to a learning community helps student grasp concepts and obtain understanding, technology influences both teaching and learning experiences.

Deeply embedded in many parts of our lives, including classrooms, technology could be a source of an empowerment for educators to thoroughly manage their forms of information delivery. For current students, a generation entrenched with new types of technology, the impact of technology in learning is even greater. According to their choices and resources, students can personalize what they learn with the help of technology or let technology become a distraction.

Starting from the substitution of PowerPoint images for slides, 21st century technology gave educators the ability to crop and edit reproductions of artworks. During her small group class, Brooke introduced armatures on projected images using geometric shapes to demonstrate movements within works of art. The articulated images visually guided students through the teaching assistant's explanation, and students tuned their eyes and ears to the images personalized for them.

Assistance from various devices and computer programs allows instructors to effectively present information in class; however, it can also be a challenge for teachers and students. Professor Dickinson pointed out that some students demand all the course materials be put on the class webpage, even though all the images could be easily found through a simple web search, and the textbook is on reserve in the school library. The professor mentioned such passivity and reliance on technology as a challenge in her teaching experience:

And it's perhaps ways students get distracted by technology that students expect that they can skip class and do well in the class. Students expect that I should be putting all the

materials online, when they have adequate materials to study from as it is (personal communication, March 16, 2010).

Even though technology could disengage students from making efforts to personalize the content of lectures and familiarize themselves with it, it also could equip students with tools they need to create their own study materials. During one of the lecture session visits, I observed a student recreating snapshots of lectures through internet search engines and a word processor during the class. One of the student interviewees also showed me a Livescribe pen that she uses in art history lectures. The pen records and replays sound, along with the functioning as a regular pen, and a special notebook that comes with the pen allows users to easily search through the recordings. Such technology allows students to more easily revisit and internalize course materials, compared to traditional note taking.

These two aspects of technology, opening up doors for both engagement and disengagement, existed in teaching and learning processes in the observed art history classroom. A wise usage of technology provided an efficient means of instruction for educators and valuable learning assistance for students, creating an engaging environment for visual, cultural, and historical inquiries. On the other hand, indulging in the convenience of easy access to information through technology was an obstacle and a frustration to the communication between the instructor and students. While demonstrating learning processes as traces of personal dis/engagement, technology could assist with catching the fleeting moments in class, especially in the observed art history classroom where numerous topics were swiftly introduced to students. Pre-existing knowledge embedded in replicative inquiry can be presented in a new pedagogical structure through technology, helping students personalize learning processes. Technology provides tools to transform content in one meta-narrative into little narratives of students. As Efland, Freedman, and Stuhr (1996) advocate for the need of little narratives in art education, the field of art history

also needs to give careful consideration to diversify the inquiry processes in the classroom, especially in introductory-level survey classes.

A general art history survey course allows students to browse a wide range of topics and obtain an overview. Having such a purpose for a course demands that the instructor move quickly to another piece of artwork in class, skimming through well-known works of art in history. By obtaining an overview of a wide range of artistic styles and time periods, students are able to decide which they would like to investigate more thoroughly if they decide to pursue a further study within the discipline. One of the student interviewees said:

I liked the survey. The survey obviously is good to get, but now, I can pin point which art like the most and focus on that, instead of going through the entire series (personal communication, April 5, 2010).

The fast pace of the course can be an attractive gateway for additional learning opportunities; however, it is more likely that students engage in a surface knowledge of the subject, while being given few opportunities to contribute to the class through comments and questions. As participants in one-way conversations, particularly in the lecture hall, observed students followed the structure and the speed of the course curriculum, while setting aside curiosity and potential for further in-depth inquiries:

I hope we get through Kandinsky—I love Kandinsky. ... Artists like that, I would really like to understand why, where, I mean, I understand where he got his inspiration through music. But like, why the line, and Miro, what's the significance to him, and artists along those lines. I mean, I hope we go into it, but I feel like we are not going to. We are going to be like, "he was really important and next" (personal communication, April 9, 2010).

It is hard to accommodate all the students in a class of more than two hundred students, and some students might be content walking in the shallow water rather than diving into the ocean. Nevertheless, disengagement with personal interest risks making a compromise to sacrifice student-led learning based on reflecting student interests. Additionally, learning about one culture without personal and cultural engagement can lead to an adulterated perspective towards geographically, emotionally, and intellectually distant cultures.

As Professor Dickinson mentioned during the interview, the school culture could provide a different environment in terms of teacher-student relationships, class size, and student motivation for study. Teaching and learning art, as well as its connections to cultures, history, aesthetics, politics, and many other aspects of society, demand that educators and students have sensitivity towards personal engagement and disengagement. Art history education can impart its influence to sustain and influence culture in future society, providing artists and members of a society with a critical and appreciative mindset towards art.

In the observed art history classroom, the lecture portion of the class provided a meta-narrative, and the small sections functioned as room for generating little narratives. While the lecture was the main source of class content oriented around replicative inquires, students benefited from opportunities to create personal accounts of art history.

In the following section, I will investigate the content taught and discussed in the observed art history course and the implications of the presentation of cultures generated by society.

Cultural Dis/engagement

Cultural dis/engagement reveals the depth of culture developed by society to the learners, establishes cultural norms in a society, and influences the participation in culture-making. Being immersed into certain norms signifies the possibility of becoming an “other” to people who belong to neighboring communities. In the 21st century, the access to a variety of cultures generated by people with different ethnic backgrounds within and beyond classrooms offers opportunities and a sense of necessity to gain a broad perspective on cultures as traces of creative endeavors and to accept and understand “others” beyond the boundaries of an idealistic canon. Technological innovations and the pedagogical structure of classes can play a role in student understanding of cultures from different societies by providing an easy access to information and supportive environment for cultural understanding through a study of art history. Among many factors, three aspects appeared as the most evident factors of cultural dis/engagement in this observed art history class: the textbook, art-making, and the range of content.

Even though the authority of survey textbooks as the unquestionable source of information has been challenged in teaching art and making art, the presence of heavy five-pound art history books which “you can kill someone with” has continued in classrooms (personal communication with a student interviewee, April 9, 2010). More than the intimidating weight or the thickness of such books, the selectivity that suits the purpose of the course to provide an overview of various cultures and time periods impacts student perspectives on art around and away from them. As Graham (1995) points out, linear and orderly narratives in art history survey books are rooted in authoritative subjectivity and canonicity. What is included and excluded in these overviews of art history bestows significance. Under the assumption that the survey book is a textbook, students do not consider whether the perspective of the author conveys a certain position, whether the book portrays cultural intricacies or simplifies them, and what is discussed

and what is omitted. While the course was supplemented by articles written by prominent art historians, none of the students remembered the title or the author of the book. Unlike novels or any other kinds of writings in which the perspective of the writer matters, textbooks are easily accepted by the readers with their authority often remaining unchallenged.

Regarding the textbook for the observed art history class, one student interviewee mentioned that she “likes the bigness” because “it’s all there” (personal communication, April 5, 2010). While students engage in a canon of the culture they are living in, as to which the textbook implies a particular cultural value and perspective, they simultaneously create the potential to disengage from what is not demonstrated in the book. Students form their social, cultural, and intellectual perspectives through their learning process (Taylor, 1996). Even though logistics such as limited class time and resources could hinder students from exploring a variety of cultures, the diversity and plurality embedded into 21st century education call for cultural mindfulness to be embraced in art history education.

For the observed art history class, one of the well-known survey books was used as a textbook. The most recent *Art through the ages: The western perspective*, published in 2009 after the first edition in 1926, is built upon the unchanged belief remained unchanged: the “primary goal of an introductory art history textbook should be to foster an appreciation and understanding of historically significant works of art of all kinds from all periods” (Kleiner, vii). This type of survey books are used both for high school art history classes (especially for AP level) and university level introductory art history classes. The title of the 13th edition, which was adopted when the 12th edition was published, suggests to the readers that this is the story of art from the Western roots and conventions. In the preface, the author also elaborates on his efforts to diversify and contextualize the stories of art in the book while maintaining the conventional view of art.

Further, I devote more space than previously to the role of women and women artists in diverse societies over time. In every chapter, I have tried to choose artworks and buildings that reflect the increasingly wide range of interests of scholars today, while not rejecting the traditional list of “great” works or the very notion of a “canon.” ... I treat artworks not as isolated objects in sterile 21st-century museum settings but with a view toward their purpose and meaning in the society that produced them at the time they were produced (Kleiner, vii).

The second volume includes twelve chapters, from Chapter 14 up to Chapter 25, covering European and American art, organized by geographic regions, major artistic styles, and the time period. Roughly 1,100 photographs, plans, and drawings occupy 832 pages, along with factual information, such as names and dates, a scale is provided to compare the dimensions of artworks covered in the chapter. Boxed essays throughout the book provide supplementary information on the basics of architecture, mediums and techniques, principles of religions and methodology, extra written sources, and artists’ ideas embedded in artworks. The textbook is also supported by Global Timeline, displaying main works of Europe, America, Asia, and African throughout history, and *ArtStudy Online*, a website with multimedia resources.

The survey textbook strives to maintain a consistent and coherent voice, organizing subjects in a roughly chronological order, mentioning student needs and providing assistance to master diverse materials as the reasons for such organization, especially for those who are studying art history for the first time. Such organization of the book is in opposition to what Elkins (2002) suggests through his *Stories of Art*, which emphasizes multiplicity of art and cultures. The survey book attempts to provide students with a meta-narrative (as mentioned in Efland, Freedman, and Stuhr, 1996) rather than encouraging little narratives reflecting student voice and interest. Considering that an art history survey textbook conveys a particular

perspective, preserving the traditional canon of art, the textbook needs to be examined with cautious cultural eyes, rather than with a sense of unchallenged authority.

Art history plants seeds in student creativity. Art-related majors at the university, such as Art, Art Education, and Graphic Design, require six to twelve credits of art history to provide an understanding of initiations and innovations in art throughout the history. Grasping the history of ideas portrayed through visual elements establishes a foundation for producing art and contributing to the culture of today. Among the six interviewed students, three students who were studying art-related subjects shared the impact studying art history had on their art-making:

In my junior year and senior year, I did all of my studio courses, and art history obviously helped, because I got ideas. I love modern art, and that's what a lot of my artwork is. It's very graphic, modern looking, bright and colorful, so obviously, influence with all the art history that I have taken. So, that's probably most beneficial and meaningful thing—art history has influenced my artwork and making it better and more myself, and personal and what not (personal communication, April 5, 2010).

Art history education is neither stale nor uninspiring; art historical knowledge nurtures cultural awareness and intellectual curiosity. The question is what type of cultural nourishment students receive and how they are provided with it.

Learning creates social and aesthetical norms for students. Even though having a cultural identity is natural and should not be criticized, fostering otherness and categorizing differences according to a particular perspective should be taken into cautious consideration. Desai (2000) argues against the custom of dividing art into two groups—western art and non-western art—and invites engaging new sets of perspectives to appreciate art beyond the western canonical measure. Beyond a matter of imposing any value judgment with a sense of superiority, teaching art history

requires the eyes to appreciate the cultural space and intricacy between engagement and disengagement.

Survey courses cover a wide range of artistic movements, and such broad spectrum of topics requires professors teach beyond their specialty. The observed art history course covered from Renaissance to Modern Art for a semester, and Professor Dickinson taught the course by herself, which required her to lecture beyond her area of research. During the interview, she mentioned how teaching a course on her research interests enriches the content of the course:

I know when I get to modern art in the survey, it's a whole different course. I am bringing in so much up to the minute research as opposed to speaking of broad, generalities in the Renaissance half of the class (personal communication, March 16, 2010).

In some colleges, professors team-teach survey courses. Cothorn (1995) discusses the success in restructuring art history survey courses at Swarthmore College, while giving more freedom to the instructors to decide the classroom content in their area of research. Professor Dickinson and Professor Lee also shared that the survey courses they took when they were in college were co-taught by four professors per year. Professor Lee described her college experience with team-taught survey courses as a student as focused and intriguing:

It was just spotlights on certain times and places. And I like that a lot, as a way, because, you see some of the problems. We didn't just see the continuum, we got to the each professor, and he would talk about things he found interesting, his problems, and I thought that was probably the reason I got interested in it, you know, instead of just having boring survey (personal communication, January 26, 2010).

Incorporating professors' generative inquiries in curriculum, survey courses taught by specialists of the field allow students to experience ongoing inquiries in art history. Instead of a static transfer of existing information, students witness what art historians do with "raw visual information" (Addiss & Erickson, 1993, p. 82). Illustrating little narratives by various researchers of the field can influence students to participate in the production of generative inquiries as active learners.

Conclusions

About four years ago, when I was sitting in a lecture hall with more than 200 classmates as a college student, I thought of art history as transferring a truckload of information into my tiny brain. Since it was not very different from in high school, taking notes with my motorized hand, I believed that studying art history meant becoming a living encyclopedia without thinking about it twice.

In response to my request to share anything important that had not yet been mentioned during the interview, Professor Dickinson pointed out something that I learned years after my freshman year in college, when I stepped away from art history as a graduate student in Art Education:

One thing that I think students are often not aware of is that we don't just teach art history. We also do research ... it's exciting to feel like you are contributing something new; you are making new discoveries. I think students often feel like there are so much out there that they have so much to learn. There is, but even within the canon of works of art that we all know very well, there are still new things that need to be, new questions that need to be asked, new documents need to be come to light, new objects to come to light, all

sorts of things. So, research is something integral to what we do professionally besides teach what we already know. So, research is something that we don't quite know yet, and that's what's exciting about it (personal communication, March 16, 2010).

Art history should be synonymous to engaging in thoughts, inquires, and investigations on cultural, historical, and aesthetic terms. Brooke also mentioned that for her, art history is having an opportunity to think about something that she usually would not. Responding to the postmodern multiculturalism of the 21st century, art history educators need to consider the implication of Western versus non-Western dichotomy, the impact of survey courses on students' aesthetic norms, and the pedagogy focusing on replicative inquiries. Art history needs to be like moving water, observing the diversity and multiplicity embedded in classroom culture and society, rather than still water trying to sustain itself.

The relationship between engagement and disengagement is like a light switch—a simple gesture, a small difference in motion between the on and off stages, but the consequences are very different. The observed art history course provided room for both engagement and disengagement through the classroom structure. While the lecture class provided information for the students to contemplate and grasp onto, the small group classes provided a more comfortable environment for students to share their thoughts.

The boundary between engagement and disengagement is delicate. Personal dis/engagement influences cultural dis/engagement through reflecting and creating, and cultural dis/engagement impacts personal fostering through the cultivation of a critical mind and nurturing of a soul. The voice of multiculturalism in the 21st century emphasizes individuality and plurality based on the horizontal relationship. The sense of a self has become more closely related to culture making as individual inquires, and various cultures generated by creative activities produce multi-cultures reflecting distinctiveness of personalities.

In his book, *General Knowledge and Arts Education*, in which he examines the content and reception of *Cultural Literacy* by E. D. Hirsch, and the implication on arts education, Smith (1994) mentions that artworks provide a means to examine how we relate to a range of human sentiments and experiences. Without in-depth investigations of individuality and cultures, arts and humanities rest upon shallowness, taking on a lack of appreciation and sympathy.

Learning through making contributions to a community of peers, embracing the merits of technology, and developing a broad viewpoint on various cultures can lead to critical appreciation of presentations of aesthetics and active participation in culture-making. Yet, a lack of opportunities for participation in active learning, distractions offered by technical gadgets, and settling on cultural unfamiliarity and uncertainty can cultivate a distorted perspective on cultures and societies through written and visually-rendered forms of art. Over the years, the development of technology has influenced class presentations, textbooks, and student learning. As a support for effective teaching and understanding, technology enhances information accessibility and diversity; however, it can also lead to the expectation of easy learning as well as to distraction.

People create cultures as members of intellectual, social, and political communities, and cultures affect the upbringings of younger generations. The introductory art history class displayed the correlation between personal and cultural engagement and disengagement through verbal and non-verbal narratives of educators and students. From living cultures to a restrained curriculum, from educators' knowledge to students' understanding, from projected screens to notebooks and laptops, and eventually to visual and verbal participation in culture-making, finding a stimulating and creative balance in transition is challenging. In order not to be lost in the transition, it is necessary for both educators and students to embrace an acknowledgement in teaching and learning that art history is an effort to engage, examine, and understand art and humanity. Engagement and disengagement in art history education coexist in various forms. The

intricate balance between the two is to be closely observed to promote personal and cultural growth suited to the individuality and multiplicity of 21st century learning.

Chapter 5

Summary of Findings & Implications

Summary of Findings

By observing stories of students, professors, and textbooks in classrooms, I investigated personal and cultural dis/engagement in an introductory-level art history course at a Big Ten university according to the following two research questions: *How does an introductory art history class in a university setting personally engage or disengage students?* and *How does an art history survey course discuss culture as a creative endeavor of individuals from society?* Postmodern multiculturalism as the framework, I identified student participation, use of technology, and pace of the class as the analytical categories for personal dis/engagement, and textbooks, art-making, and range of content as the categories for cultural dis/engagement. The two parts of the observed course—lecture and section—served as a source of mega and little narratives. Oriented in replicative inquiries, the lecture provided one main account of the course, and the sections opened up opportunities for student contribution through discussion.

The three interviewed professors identified themselves as researchers in the field of art history, while they attended to personal growth of students in art history classrooms. Students who have pre-college art history experience indicated personal interests in art as the motivation for studying art history. Their positive and negative experiences in high school art history classes provided them a perspective by comparing secondary and college art history education. Students enjoyed interdisciplinary components and personal relationships with teachers in high school art

history classes, while they benefited from the enthusiasm and the profound knowledge of instructors in college art history classrooms.

In the personal dis/engagement section, I discussed meta and little narratives in pedagogical structure that provide dis/engagement in the classroom environment. Compared to lecture portion of the course, small sections more frequently provided gateways for personal inquiries through conversations and discussions. Technology enabled students to customize the class content, even though room for distraction increased along with technological advancement. The function of the survey class as an overview of a wide range of artistic movements allowed students to broaden their cultural horizons, but the fast pace of the course prevented in-depth investigations of topics dealt with in class.

Even though the large scope of topics the books cover can be an advantage, providing an overview of art history, the authority and canonicity of textbooks were challenged in the discussion of cultural dis/engagement of the art history course. Art history provided an inspiration for art-making as a contribution to a culture in the society to three student interviewees studying art-related subjects. As art history survey courses embrace a lot of content, professors can initiate making of little narratives by engaging the areas of expertise in the field because demonstrating generative inquiries can encourage students to be actively involved in their learning processes.

Implications

By identifying the types of inquiries in an art history classroom, I was able to acknowledge the strong presence of the replicative inquires in the observed classroom, even though the interviewed professors and students called for the significance of generative inquires. With the understanding that the lecture provides a mega narrative and the small group classes open up doors for little narratives, the field of art history and art education need to carefully address the necessity of

achieving a balance between replicative and generative inquiries, as well as mega and little narratives.

Opposed to the tradition of using one Western perspective oriented narrative to teach an introductory-level art history class, various alternative approaches have been suggested and implemented to teach art history. At Swarthmore College, art history professors co-taught introductory survey courses, minimizing teaching beyond professors' specialty, and it helped maintain the chronology and restructured the courses (Cothorn, 1995). Elkins (1995) taught thematically-organized survey courses, while deconstructing and restructuring the structure of art history classes to overcome the singularity of chronological narratives.

Even though various teaching methods have been suggested, reconsidering the pedagogy of art history is not a simple problem. Professor Lee stated during the interview that when she used a theme-based book for one of her upper level classes, some students found the book difficult to follow (personal communication, January 26, 2010). While there seems to be no simple solution to rethink the pedagogy of art history education, personal and cultural engagement needs to be acknowledged as a necessity and encourage student-led inquiries.

As an art history student and future educator, I have learned the importance of student participation in both replicative and generative inquiries, introducing student narratives in classrooms. Student engagement provides a foundation for multiculturalism by diversifying perspectives observing formations and functions of cultures in society, as well as opportunities for students to become active learners by initiating and critically participating in inquiries. Exposing students to generative research of art history professors can also reveal the depth of the discipline, emphasizing the process of art historical investigations rather than the result. While art history professors desire in-depth inquiries embedded in their teaching and students learn more effectively through making information into personal experience through participating in discussions, the reality of art history survey courses currently remain distant from teaching and

learning. The pedagogy of the observed art history classroom focuses on conveying visual information and related details, rather than teaching students to think like an art historian.

As the bridge between arts and humanities, art history entails the potential as a means to influence students' cultures, aesthetics, and ideas. The relationship between current culture as a product of creative investigations and the study of art history brings our attention to the meaning of cultivating eyes that analyze perspectives on art and culture, engagement and disengagement in the culture we are living in, and the essential nature of providing students with a critical mind that can reexamine traditions and conventions.

References

- Applied Arts Books. (1901). Vol. 1. No. 2. Worcester, MA: The Applied Arts Guild.
- Addiss, S., & Erickson, M. (1993). *Art history and education*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- College Board. (2006). *Setting a policy for AP Art History*. New York, NY: Author.
- College Board. (2009). *Art history course description*. New York, NY: Author.
- Congdon, K. G. (2005). What I have learned from “other” art educators. *Studies in Art Education*. 46(2).
- Cothren, M. W. (1995). Replacing the survey at Swarthmore. *Art Journal*, 54(3), 58-62. Retrieved December 7, 2009, from Research Library Core. (Document ID: 6964920).
- Desai, D. (2000). Imaging difference: The politics of representation in multicultural art education. *Studies in Art Education*. 41(2). 114-129.
- Dimitriadis, G., & McCarthy, C. (2001). Art as theory, practice, and reflection: The radical dimensions of a postcolonial imagination. *Reading and teaching the postcolonial* (pp.15-35). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Efland, A., Freedman, K., & Stuhr, P. (1996). *Postmodern art education: An approach to curriculum*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Elkins, J. (1995). Parallel art history/studio program. *Art Journal*. 54 (3). 54-57.
- Elkins, J. (2002). *Stories of art*. New York: Routledge.
- Fernie, E. (Ed.). (1995). *Art history and its methods: A critical anthology*. London: Phaidon Press Limited.
- Graham, M. M. (1995). The future of art history and the undoing of the survey. *Art Journal*. 54 (3). 30-34.
- Harris, N. (1977). Iconography and intellectual history. In Higham, J. and Conkin, P. K. (Eds.), *New directions in American intellectual history*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kleiner, F. S. (2009). *Gardner's art through the ages: The western perspective* (13th ed., Vol. 2). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2004). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morgan, R. & Ramist, L. (1998). *Advanced placement students in college: An investigation of*

- course grades at 21 colleges*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Unpublished Statistical Report.
- School Arts Magazine (1946). *Teachers Exchange Bureau*. Worcester, MA: Davis Press.
- Schwarzer, M. (1995). Origins of the art history survey text. *Art Journal*, 54 (3). 24-29.
- Silk, G. (1995). Reframes and refrains: Artists rethink art history. *Art Journal*, 54(3), 10. Retrieved December 7, 2009, from Research Library Core. (Document ID: 6964919).
- Smith, R. A. (1994). *General Knowledge and Arts Education*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Schram, T. H. (2005). *Conceptualizing and Proposing Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J: Prentice Hall.
- Stastny, K. (2000). Wrestling with the histories of art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34 (2). 81-88. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Taylor, B. (1996). Art history in the classroom: A plea for caution. In Dawtrey, L., Jackson, T., Masterton, M., & Meecham, P. (Eds.). *Critical studies and modern art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Appendix 1

Interview Protocols

College Professors

- What is the long-term goal of your curriculum?
- Have you had any training in the field of education? Have you experienced any benefits or difficulties because of it?
- Do you think students should learn art history, and why?
- For what reasons do you believe students choose to take art history classes as electives?
- Why do you think students study art history at length?
- What challenges do you face in your classroom that you would like to address?
- What criteria do you use to evaluate your students?
- What do you use for a textbook or outside resources? What are the advantages and disadvantages of either approach?
- In what ways do you believe art history education in high school prepares students for further study at the university level?
- What benefits are there for students who take the Art History AP exam in high school?
- What do you intend for your students to learn from your class?
- How do you expect your students to utilize what they learn in class?
- What do you find particularly rewarding teaching college students?

College Students

- Why are you taking art history course(s)? Was there anything that influenced your

decision?

- Among the things that you have learned from your class, what was the most meaningful to you?
- How do you participate in class and make what you learn personal?
- What were the challenges you have encountered in your art history class?
- Among the materials used in your class use (books, multi-media sources, fieldtrips, etc.) what do you prefer the most and why?
- How would you like to be evaluated in your class?
- If you took art history classes in high school, what influenced you to continue studying art history in college?
- If you could change one thing from your class, what would that be?
- Please comment or make suggestions about your college art history class and tell us more about your opinion about studying art history.

High School Art or/and Art History Teachers

- What are the long-term goals of your curriculum?
- Have you had any training in the field of art history? Have you experienced any benefits or difficulties because of it?
- Do you think students need to learn art history, and why?
- Do you think students would choose to take an art history class, and why?
- What challenges do you face in your classroom that you would like to address?
- How do you evaluate your students?
- What do you use for a textbook or outside resources? What are the advantages and disadvantages of either approach?

- To what degree are your lessons planned with the Art History AP exam in mind?
- What do you intend for your students to learn from your class?
- How do you expect your students to utilize what they learn in class?
- What part of teaching high-school students do you find particularly rewarding?

Appendix 2

College-Level Survey Art History Courses and

High School AP Art History Classes

As it was mentioned earlier, this research was originally designed as a comparative study between an introductory art history course at a university and an Advanced Placement art history class in a high school. Since the focus of the study shifted to art history education in higher education, the findings below with strong emphasis in high school art history education have been organized separately as an appendix.

Findings

While Professor Peterson and Professor Lee had noticed an increasing number of students who had studied art history before college and the potential being helpfulness of these pre-college classes for students, all three professors mentioned how they did not notice significant positive impact on students who took art history in high school compared to those who did not pre-college art history experience. Professor Peterson also shared her impression that a majority of students did not enjoy their art history classes in high school:

I would say, 70% of them did not like it that much, and 30% thought it was the greatest thing that they have ever had. And certainly, having had a class like that, they do know more. In fact, I think, through AP art history, you can place out of either one of 111

or 112, something like that. I am not quite sure, but also, ultimately, I don't think it is necessary (personal communication, December 2, 2009).

Interviews with three high school art history teachers provided rationale for teaching art history in the secondary education system. First of all, art history in high school was offered as an alternative for students without strong studio skills and confidence. An alternative artistic engagement engaged students visually and verbally. During field trips to local and major museums, Ms. Miller, who taught art history for three years out of her six years of experience as an art teacher in a high school near Philadelphia, recalled that students came alive: "I, actually, had to almost physically drag one kid out of the museum ... Those same kids who would have an amazing discussion, but if I give them written words, it will usually fall to all pieces. But when they were talking, they came alive" (personal communication, September 15, 2009).

Mr. Hahn, a first year high school art teacher with four years of teaching experience in a high school and a middle school, also pointed out "academic rock stars" and "high achieving studio artists" as other types of audiences for high school art history classes:

I am thinking of this particular group of students—they are very high achieving academic students ... And they maybe are unsure of how to pursue it. So, art history is, to them, a very safe way to kind of put their finger on to the world of creativity or creation ... Also, I think some of the kids in the class, kind of the other section of the class, they are naturally very creative, so, instead of coming from the end of academic perspective to a more creative perspective, they are coming from it as, they are high achieving studio artists who are considering studying art in college, considering a career in the visual arts, or art related. And they want to know more information academically ... (personal communication, October 23, 2009).

While the personal time put into preparation for art history classes through workshops and personal readings can be challenging for high school teachers, having AP Art History class elevated the status of arts in the school. The AP course put the test scores of students on teachers shoulders in the form of evaluation, but Ms. Miller and Mr. Walsh, a retired high school art teacher who taught art history for 6-7 years out of his 38 years of teaching, mentioned that motivating students to pursue a study in the arts or encouraging them to visit museums was as rewarding as having a student score 5 (full score) at the AP Art History exam.

College Board (2006) states that about 40 percent of students who obtain above passing grade (ranging from 3 to 5) on the AP Art History exam take art history classes in college, while only 20 percent of students who do not take the AP Art History test choose to take college art history classes. Through a qualitative research project, College Board claims AP Exams stimulate student interest in pursuing further studies and cause them to perform better in school, not only in art history, but also in other disciplines (Morgan & Ramis, 1998). This claim made by College Board, the sole provider AP Tests, is surely attractive to teachers and school administrators; however, it is necessary to examine what underlies the statistics and the stature high school AP curricula hold, especially for art history.

Over the past two centuries, the necessity for reexamining the curriculum structure of AP Art History classes has been brought to art history educators' attention. The content of the AP Art History test is selected based on introductory art history classes in college to offer high school students experience equivalent to college beginning-level art history courses (College Board, 2009). While the AP Art History test maintains the rationale for the test, the Western-art oriented chronology which consists of the foundation of art history survey courses has been challenged by postmodern voices in art education. The authority of the prejudiced canon of art history is shaken,

and discussions continue to question and demand the need for change that embraces cultural impartiality.

VITA

MINSOO KIM

670 E. Prospect Ave., Apt. H
State College, PA 16801
(814) 441-9411
mincorea@gmail.com

MAJOR PROFESSIONAL INTERESTS

Comparative and international education (especially between Korean and U.S. education systems); Informal learning space; Art history education;

EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Master of Science in Art Education, August 2010

Thesis: *Lost in Transition: Personal and Cultural Intricacy in Art History Classrooms*

Bachelor of Arts in Art History with minors in French and International Arts, August 2010

With interdisciplinary honors in Art Education (Schreyer Honors College)

Université de Nantes, Nantes, France

IES Abroad study abroad program in Fall 2008

Barnstone Studios, Coplay, PA

Drawing, Oil painting, Portrait curriculum in Summer 2006 & 2007

LANGUAGE

Native proficiency in Korean; near-native proficiency in English; intermediate written and spoken competency in French

AWARDS, SCHOLARSHIPS & HONORS

College Student Marshal, College of Arts and Architecture, The Pennsylvania State University
(Summer 2010)

Schreyer Honors College Summer 2009 Research Scholarship, The Pennsylvania State University
Alumni Society Scholarship, College of Arts and Architecture, The Pennsylvania State University
(2009)

Ardeth and Norman Frisbey International Student Award, International Student Services, The

Pennsylvania State University (2008)
William E. and Julia Nelo Clark Excellence Scholarship, College and Arts and Architecture, The Pennsylvania State University (2008)
Student Leader Scholarship, Center for Student Engagement, The Pennsylvania State University (2007)
1st Place International Education Week 2006 Essay Competition, International Student Services, The Pennsylvania State University
Dean's lists (Fall 2005-Spring 2010)

TEACHING

Art Instructor in Spring 2008 & 2009, Summer 2009 & 2010

Center for Arts and Crafts, University Park, PA

- Taught jewelry and origami making workshops and weekly lessons for two-hour long drawing and acrylic painting classes based on art history and geometry, and currently teaching theme-based art classes to 11-14 year old students

Saturday Art Class Instructor in Spring 2010

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

- Teaching two-hour long lessons weekly to 3-5 year old children, and interacting verbally and visually through sketchbook drawings and various types of art-making processes

Teaching Assistant in Summer 2007

Barnstone Studios, Coplay, PA

- Instructed students in a basic drawing class during the studio time, and after class, answered student questions by reviewing step-by-step what was taught during class and also provided students with feedback on assignment

Private English Tutor in Summer 2008 & 2009

JinHae, South Korea

- Planned individualized lessons for students of a various age groups from elementary students to adults

OTHER EMPLOYMENT

Essayist on English Education from January 2007 until September 2007

CEDU Inc., Korea - a highly respected Korean private English school in Korea

- Wrote monthly essays about how Korean students should approach English as a second language

Clerk from Fall 2006—Spring 2008, & Spring 2009—Current

Museum Store of Palmer Museum of Art, University Park, PA

- Answer visitors' questions, sell exhibition related products and catalogues, and open and close the museum store

EXHIBITION

Impression: Fall 2008 (Global Programs Lounge, Penn State University) (2010)
School of Visual Arts Undergraduate Juried Exhibition—Juror: Pavel Zoubok (2010)
Center for Arts and Craft at PSU Instructor's Exhibition (2008 & 2010)

SERVICE

Treasurer & Worship team member from Fall 2009—Spring 2010

International Christian Fellowship

- Worked with financial documents of the Fellowship and helped leading worship time at a weekly meeting playing guitar

Co-coordinator & Publicity Chair from Fall 2006—Spring 2008 & Spring 2009

Asha for Education, an organization that focuses on basic education in India to bring a fundamental change to the country

- Coordinated fundraisers and various events to enhance the awareness about modern slavery and designed fliers for the activities

President & Active Member from Fall 2005—Spring 2008 & Spring 2009

Penn State Swing Dance Club

- Led and organized officer meetings, contacted professional dance instructors and musicians to schedule events on campus, and instructed the Penn State and State College communities in dance lessons

Volunteer in August 2006 & January 2009

International Student Orientation at Penn State

- Taught swing dancing to engage student in various social activities, helped international students get their paperwork checked by International Student Services, and worked at a computer lab assisting students