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Methodologies for research should be chosen that suit the questions that are asked and not the reverse. To establish a research agenda for the 21st century, content questions of direct concern to the role of art in education should be identified, then investigated through appropriate research methodologies.

—Zimmerman, 1994b, p. 10

The matching of an important problem to research questions and then to methodology constitutes one of the major issues to be encountered and resolved in the development of a coherent research agenda in teacher education.

—Yarger & Smith, 1990, p. 30

INTRODUCTION

Research should be conducted not merely to describe but to ground theory and inform practice. General educational research regarding teacher education contains major gaps in the content of existing studies and in recommendations for what should be studied about teacher education in the future (Yarger & Smith, 1990). Research in art education regarding teacher preparation has followed this national trend. Over the past 2 decades, this notion has been increasingly supported by several noted art education researchers (Davis, 1990; Day, 1997; Eisner, 1979, 1993a; Galbraith, 1995; Stokrocki, 1995a; Sullivan, 1996; Zimmerman, 1994a).

In this chapter significant research about preservice and inservice art teacher education will be discussed from the point of view of selected research methodologies rather than from a content or contextual focus. These issues are inextricably related, however, so no discussion can occur about art education research methodology without links to content of the research and to research contexts. Although minimally addressed in this study, chapters by Burton; Erickson; Galbraith and Grauer; Sabol; and Stokrocki, in this section on art teacher education of the Handbook of Research and Policy in Art Education, provide in-depth discussions of relevant issues, practices, perceptions, and contexts in which art teacher education research occurs.
The parameters for this chapter include an overview of selected studies from *Studies in Art Education* prior to 1991 that extended our knowledge of methodologies used in research about the education of teachers who teach art, as well as a more detailed review of methodologies used for significant research about teacher preparation and education published in that journal over the last decade. A review of methods used in studies about teacher education published 5 years prior to 2001 in *Visual Arts Research* also is provided. Central to this effort is research devoted to the preparation of K-12 art specialists at a preservice level and continued professional development of art educators at graduate or inservice levels. The chapter attempts to acknowledge methods used in those research efforts and further attempts to highlight emerging collaborative efforts at action research, where appropriate, conducted by university researchers and K-12 art education professionals. Review of the last decade of research conducted by art education doctoral candidates regarding teacher education adds to this body of knowledge. An overview of methods of research used for presentations about teacher preparation at National Art Education Association (NAEA) annual conferences in selected years in the last decade also provides insight into the shifts and trends of research methodology appearing in research forums about art teacher education.

**SOME ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to rate or rank each study for methodological rigor or quality of methodological fit relative to its research questions or hypotheses. The cited studies’ publication in the art education research literature served as basic acknowledgment of their contributions to the field. A critical assessment of this body of literature from the perspective of methodology could be a starting point for further and more in-depth research on methodology in research about art teacher education. In some reviewed studies, descriptions of methodology were sketchy or lacking altogether in either the abstracts or in the actual text of presentations, forums, or research papers.

This list of cited studies and their subsequent methodologies are by no means comprehensive. An informal review of the journals *Arts Education Policy Review, Journal of Aesthetic Education,* and *Art Education* revealed a number of studies written about methodology or art teacher education. Several of those are mentioned in this chapter when relevant to a particular discussion. An in-depth content analysis of method also was not conducted for research published in special-interest journals or in journals outside the venue of art education. This omission was considered in the interest of the length of this chapter. A systematic content analysis of methodological content within these documents is recommended for continued research.

Such publications recommended for continued research, but not part of this chapter, include research journals from NAEA affiliates, divisions, and partners, such as Women’s Caucus (*Journal of Gender Issues in Art and Education*), Social Theory Caucus (*Journal of Social Theory in Art Education*), Seminar for Research in Art Education (Annual Abstracts), United States Society for Education through Art (formerly *Journal of Multicultural and Cross-Cultural Research in Art Education* now *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education*), and Canadian Society for Education through Art (CSEA Journal and Canadian Review of Art Education). Other journals, including *Journal of Art and Design Education* (published in Great Britain), *Australian Art Education Journal,* and *Arts and Learning Research,* a special-interest-group (SIG) journal publication of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), are further possibilities for analysis of trends in methodology. Journals that do not directly focus on art education but sporadically emphasize art teacher education such as *Harvard Educational Review, Educational Leadership, Educational Horizons, Phi Delta Kappan,* and *Change* are also not included in this chapter. Another potential future research endeavor from data in this
chapter would be a meta-analysis of each study’s methodology focusing on which methods were selected by researchers across similar subject matter content and research contexts.

OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGICAL TRENDS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

A significant shift in thinking about approaches to research, subsequently its methods, occurred in general education and in art education as well over the last quarter of a century (MacGregor, 1998). Researchers found that quantitative methodology based on a scientific inquiry model, and once the only respected methodological standard for educational studies, did not always offer an effective means of studying important questions arising in naturalistic settings (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002; Eisner, 1991; Ettinger, 1987; Galbraith, 1995; Pring, 2000). According to Eisner and Peshkin (1990), “the judgment that qualitative research is either beyond the pale or substandard no longer generally holds with overwhelming force. Not only is the contemporary interaction between quantitative and qualitative researchers less lopsided, it is increasingly less an encounter and more an interface” (p. 3).

Researchers apply quantitative research methods in controlled settings to test theory, to answer questions about relationships among variables, to analyze cause and effect, or to determine the current status of a situation or problem through a variety of statistical analyses of numerical data. Quantitative studies can be predictive and experimental in their approach or descriptive and observational (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997). Because quantitative studies are deductive in nature, research design is determined prior to the study and standardized testing procedures are often applied to large populations. Quantitative research is based on philosophical views that emerged in the 19th century and include the positivistic notion that both scientific and social worlds are bound by recognizable and consistent principles. Within that context, hypotheses can be systematically tested as well as replicated by other researchers, and results can be applied to larger settings. Quantitative approaches to methodology include descriptive and causal-comparative designs, correlational research, and experimental designs. Meta-analysis is the most useful means of synthesizing statistical results from a number of studies focused on the same research problem. It often is used as a method for drawing conclusions across a variety of statistics and measures. It is important to realize that numerical data and statistical analysis are not exclusive to quantitative research design (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; LaPierre, 1997).

Qualitative research methods, on the other hand, address questions directed toward a deeper understanding of social phenomena, providing thick (rich, detailed) descriptions of settings and participants in a specific context (Eisner, 1991). A qualitative study is inductive, in that it often generates theory rather than tests an existing theory. Qualitative methods emerge from a phenomenological approach, in which each social setting is unique. It is the researcher’s task to richly describe human behaviors within that setting: behaviors determined by beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes of individuals existing in that context. Because variables unfold as a result of the research process, these studies do not begin with a hypothesis and are usually conducted with small populations (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002). Eisner (1991) attributed six features to qualitative research design: The studies are focused in naturalistic settings, use the researcher as the instrument, are interpretive in their quest to find meaning, use expressive language to communicate—allowing for voice to emerge—and pay attention to detail and subtleties within a particular context. They also are insightful, believable, and serve a purpose of finding meaning. Qualitative categories for methods often described in introductory research texts include ethnography, case study research, content analysis, participant observation, narrative, and historical research (Ary et al., 2002; Gall et al., 1996).
Choice of methods drawn from these two approaches is no simple matter. Prinz (2000), reflecting on the work of John Dewey (1934), cautions researchers to not get caught up in a “false dualism” (p. 33) by regarding quantitative and qualitative methodology as dichotomous ends. Eisner (1993b), referring to acceptance in the last 2 decades of qualitative research methodology (including the introduction of visual, narrative, and poetic forms of research) into the greater educational research community, reflected:

If there are different ways to understand the world, and if there are different forms that make such understanding possible, then it would seem to follow that any comprehensive effort to understand the processes and outcomes of schooling would profit from a pluralistic rather than a monolithic approach to research. How can such pluralism be advanced? What would it mean for the way we go about our work? (p. 8)

A decade ago, Yarger and Smith (1990) designed a research framework for general study of teacher education that included three overarching themes or foci: antecedent conditions, process, and outcomes. They suggested that studies linking these foci, rather than treating them as distinct items, strengthen results of a research study. Within this framework, they described methodological domains that have been used as a means of conducting research in the previously mentioned arenas. Those methodological approaches are narrative research, case study research, survey research, correlational research, and causal/experimental research. La Pierre and Diket (1995) corroborated this framework by describing categories for art education research methodology as historical, descriptive, ethnographic, correlational, causal/comparative, and experimental.

According to Yarger and Smith (1990), narrative studies are basic to teacher education research. They are descriptive, inform readers with rich detail, and are often qualitative. However, they have a history of being not highly respected due to their lack of validity or reliability in the research field. Case studies are more organized in their structure than narratives and are usually written to shed light on a specific context. Although they are the most frequent form of research using qualitative methods in teacher education, case studies can function as only descriptive studies or they are capable of generating hypotheses.

Survey research poses questions rather than hypotheses, and results are most often reported in quantitative terminology. Information from survey research can lead to possibly significant hypotheses if a researcher builds that capability onto a research design. Correlational studies create relationships between two or more significant variables, and research results are also most frequently reported in quantitative form. Causal/experimental research, although the most respected and sophisticated in its initiation, is rarely effective in field settings; so its use has been limited in teacher education research—particularly in the last decade.

I (Thurber) thought it surprising that inquiry frameworks for philosophical and theoretical research were not routinely mentioned along with others previously mentioned in overviews of methodology in educational research and introductory research texts; however, description of methodology in philosophical inquiry occurs later in this chapter.

Summary of Conceptual Frameworks for Research in Art Teacher Education

It is, in fact, the nature of research questions that should determine whether the research design would be quantitative or qualitative in design (Wilson, 1997a; Zimmerman, 1997a). In studies about art teacher preparation, researchers have asked:

- What was? (uses historical research framework as methodology)
- What is observable? (uses descriptive research such as demographic surveys, longitudinal or cross-sectional studies, opinion surveys, ethnographic studies, qualitative
analyses including case studies, action research with participant/observer, content or trend analyses)

- What will occur under controlled conditions? (uses experimental and quasi-experimental studies such as single group, control group designs, or baseline studies)
- What is possible or proposed? (uses paradigm research or theoretical inquiry such as application of critical theory or feminist perspectives to research methodology or design)
- What is meaningful, beautiful, good, true, or real? (philosophical, theoretical, conceptual, evaluative, or prescriptive research such as posing a theory, policy statements, needs assessments, formative evaluations, program evaluations, curriculum evaluations)

I note that the last area of inquiry is somewhat problematic for contemporary researchers who determine that research settings and findings are highly contextual and socially constructed and that fixed constructs of goodness, truth, et cetera, may be readily and rightly challenged in today’s research forums.

Figure 22.1 reproduces and expands Zimmerman’s conceptual model (1997a) that described a spectrum of research methodologies appropriate for art education research. In order to ground discussion of emerging research methodologies used in research about art teacher education in this chapter, some additions have been made. Segmented lines and italicized text in the figure represent additional contemporary methodologies that researchers of art teacher education also are selecting as those methods continue to become increasingly acceptable choices in the evolving research landscape of general education. Thus, a variety of methodological choices are available to art education researchers within a broad quantitative–qualitative framework. La Pierre (1997), in fact, suggested that research methodology is actually a continuum and methods can be used in various combinations rather than in discreet designs.

A HISTORICAL CONTEXT FOR METHODOLOGY IN ART TEACHER EDUCATION

In the mid 1980s when a heightened concern for educational reform or renewal emerged in professional dialog and in general education research literature, a shift in the nature and methods of educational research also occurred. Chapman (1982) categorized research methodology into historical, philosophical, or observational (empirical) genres and addressed the difference between basic and applied research. Selected themes evolved beyond the issue of quality control or technical assessments of model practice and teacher performance. These themes included the purposes of teacher education, content and pedagogy of teacher education programs, characterization of successful teachers, and alternative means for teacher certification. An emerging emphasis on the importance of teacher knowledge and empowerment also caused a significant shift in the operant themes of national educational research (Doyle, 1990). Methodology for these studies underwent a shift as well, moving from an emphasis and occurrence of psychometric or quantitative research to a greater appreciation and occurrence of socioanthropological or qualitative approaches (Eisner, 1993a; Zeichner, 1978, 1999).

Art educational research in teacher education appears to have followed a similar evolving trend. A major factor in the last 2 decades affecting content, context, and methodology of research about art teacher education was the advent of a discipline-based approach toward teaching art; referred to as DBAE, and often labeled in recent literature as CAE (comprehensive art education). CAE’s conception of visual art, shifting from a rather singular, but entrenched view of art only as art making, also embraced content and modes of inquiry from art history, art criticism, and aesthetics or philosophies of art. Sevigny (1987, 1988) pointed out that preservice teacher training became poised for significant change with the onset of a discipline-based approach to art education at all schooling levels (pre-K to postgraduate). An emphasis
FIG. 22.1. Research methodologies for art education: Research Inquiry (What is the case?).
on and support for content-centered curriculum frameworks developed, particularly in the 1980s and onward. The nature of research questions—thus methodology—shifted as well, beginning with questions about the direction of preservice art education (Bolin, 1988). In 1986, ten national sites were selected by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts to explore possibilities for systemic change in existing preservice programs, including my campus (Thurber, 1990). Issues from this brief national preservice initiative were refined by 1988 and the Getty Center’s attention began to be directed toward inservice education of teachers of art (Day, Gillespie, Rosenberg, Sowell, & Thurber, 1997; Wilson, 1997b).

According to Davis (1990), three ongoing concerns existed at that time in art education research regarding art teacher education. They included a content knowledge base, a professional knowledge base, and conceptions of quality teacher education in the visual arts. In his review of existing research, he concluded that that a limited number of studies attempted to explore content knowledge relative to art teacher education at preservice and inservice levels—particularly in the areas of studio art and art criticism (for example, Day, 1986). Research literature since the 1970s regarding art content had shifted to include content from aesthetics and disciplines of art history as well as art criticism. In the area of a professional knowledge base for teacher preparation in the visual arts, Davis indicated that this arena until 1990 was also limited in scope. It included studies relating to teacher values, attitudes, and perceptions; the nature of creativity and art education practice; teaching strategies; modes of inquiry; and pedagogical curriculum content. Regarding conceptions of quality teacher education in the visual arts, Davis suggested four major classifications: relationships and responsibilities among art educators, artists, and professional educators in preparation of both art specialists and art generalists; the level of entry for art teacher preparation; validation of general preparation of educators; and the role of teacher preparation in bridging the gap between theory and practice. The aforementioned issues are contested and continue to be debated in the 21st century.

In an effort to tighten the gaps in art education research, including research on preservice and inservice teacher education, the NAEA took the initiative in 1994 to establish an agenda and funding support for ongoing art education research, including research issues about teacher preparation (Zimmerman, 1994b, 1996, 1998). Research task forces were established to oversee major agendas for research. The task force on teacher education was one of eight task forces created by the 1994 NAEA research agenda.

Prior to that time, the NAEA annual conference hosted sporadic sessions on methodological approaches to art education research, but the new agenda provided impetus to involve more educators in the research process. In 1994, in collaboration with the new research agenda, the Seminar for Research in Art Education (SRAE), an affiliate group of NAEA, held a preconference at the NAEA conference in Baltimore at which several active researchers held sessions specifically focused on the use of contemporary methods in art education research. Topics relating to methodology included sessions on historical research, authentic performance assessment, qualitative and feminist forms of research methods, artistic research method, and action research.

The SRAE, with the exception of a few years in the late 1980s, has published yearly monographs of research abstracts presented at NAEA conferences (Smith, 1992). In 1995 the abstracts also became available as ERIC documents (Connors, 1997). For example, in a review of the 1997 monograph, content in 11 of 72 research sessions dealt directly with issues or questions relative to preservice or inservice art teacher education. In the 11 sessions concerning preservice teachers and teaching, methodological approaches included historical research/autobiography (2), survey research (3), collaborative field-based research (2), as well as action research (4).

To date, just one former volume of Studies in Art Education (White, 1977) categorized research articles by methodology as well as by content. Those 20 studies were categorized
as follows: 6 studies were identified to be descriptive/experimental; 1 study was historical; 2 studies were considered philosophical research; and 11 were placed in the category of tests and measures. (I found that volume’s categorization to be very accessible, and helpful, and I recommend that a yearly breakdown by methodological category be reinstated and published in future years.) Research articles from Studies in Art Education recently have been classified by methodology in an online database on the Web site of the NAEA (National Art Education Association, 2002). In cross-checking my categorization of methodology for selected studies from the last decade, I found that very few method classifications of the studies yielded a discrepancy in opinion. Categorizations of methodology and methods in this database included “theoretical inquiry, philosophical inquiry, curriculum policy, and historical inquiry. The database used research design terms “descriptive, correlational, and experimental” to define research design for each of the studies found in the volumes. The following categorizations also were used: “exposition, survey, case study, interview, ethnography, action research, meta-analysis, and reviews/commentaries.”

In the field of art education, researchers have challenged their colleagues to define and continue to refine methodological approaches in studies and texts they have written or edited. Eisner’s text, The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice (1991) gives researchers a virtual site map for using approaches of educational connoisseurship and educational criticism described later in this chapter. Eisner discussed methodologies for research that draw on the researcher’s abilities to conduct research in artful ways, just as other researchers might conduct their research in a skilled scientific or mathematical manner. For thoughtful methodological approaches to educational criticism and program or process evaluation, researchers Boughton, Eisner, and Ligtvoet’s text Evaluating and Assessing the Visual Arts in Education (1996) is valuable reading. Stokrocki’s innovative monograph New Waves of Research in Art Education (1995b) and LaPierre and Zimmerman’s, (1997) text Research Methods and Methodologies for Art Education provide comprehensive overviews of methodological frameworks discussed in this chapter that have been relevant to art education research. The texts discuss methodologies for research involving testing and authentic assessment; generation of theoretical or metaphorical research frameworks or paradigms regarding art education; and several other qualitative research approaches including phenomenology, ethnography, visual sociology, and case study methodologies. Readers of these texts will encounter a discussion of various aspects of descriptive versus predictive methodology and a comprehensive review of historical methodology. Action research as methodology and feminist approaches to research design also are issues explored in these texts.

Several books and other studies about art teacher education have helped inform art education researchers how to investigate, record, analyze, and interpret data about art teacher education as well as how to report results. Yakel’s book (1992), The Future: Challenge of Change, offers contemporary discourse on emerging issues in art teacher education and other areas of concern in the field of art education. The texts Preservice Art Education: Issues and Practice (Galbraith, 1995), Preparing Teachers of Art (Day, 1997), and Real Lives: Art Teachers and the Cultures of School (Anderson, 2000) offer several examples of contemporary methods used in research on art teacher education. Anderson’s book, for example, allows us to look deeply into the lives of six art teachers through his field observations and their own narratives. It was his intent that readers gain a deeper theoretical understanding of teaching through patterns of meanings that emerged in their stories.

Several notable articles from the last decade published in the journal Art Education are exemplars of applied research regarding research methodologies and the content of art teacher education: Szekely (1990) on the construct of teaching as performance; Parks (1992) on the artistic model as a framework for teaching; Eisner (1993a) on a shifting paradigm for arts
education research; Smith-Shank (1993) on narrative methods used in preservice elementary education; Ryder (1994) on linking college classrooms to the community; Zimmerman (1994a) on case studies of students reflecting concerns of preservice teachers; Keifer-Boyd (1996) on postmodern thinking and preservice art education; Bergman and Feiring (1997) on a model for collaborative team research; Ament (1998) on feminist approaches to art education; Geahigan (1998) on classroom applications of critical inquiry; Henry (1999a) on reflective practice for art student teachers; Leshnoff (1999) on applied research in elementary art classrooms; Yokley (1999) on critical pedagogy; and ending with an exposition on cultural competencies of art educators (Andrus, 2001). Andrus defines cultural competency as a critical component of art teacher education in which art teachers have examined their own biases and understandings about cultural diversity and made a commitment to pursue ongoing multicultural education for themselves as well as for their students.

I wish to note that the journal Educational Researcher, published by the American Educational Research Association, consistently contains excellent research about methodology for research about teacher education. Examples include Cochran-Smith and Lytle’s studies, conducted 10 years apart (1990, 1999), on issues that divide research on teaching and teacher education. I commend them for providing philosophical and historical overviews of key issues in research on teacher education and then revisiting them a decade later; reconceptualizing and rethinking these issues in a contemporary context. Art education researchers could follow such a model with extant literature on art teacher preparation. Another exemplar is Zeichner’s article (1999) on methodology for a new scholarship in teacher education research. The previously mentioned studies, and others of their caliber, should encourage art educators to begin to look outside literature directed only at art education for innovative methodological advances in research. Postmodern, poststructuralist, and semiotic approaches to research are beginning to surface in mainstream educational research literature about teacher education, but not in an accelerated way (Grauer, 1999; Jeffers, 2000b; Smith-Shank, 1995).

In raising the question about which research design frameworks would best suit a comprehensive overview of research methodology for studies about art teacher education, many choices became apparent as evidenced in this discussion (Figure 22.1). This array of choices indicates a broad variance of perception for classification of art educational research methods by various research theorists.

In an analysis of recent and contemporary research methodology for studies about art teacher education, I found little evidence of empirical experimental research, although researchers still use empirical research employing descriptive methodology often. For example, over the last 2 decades, several comprehensive demographic studies about preservice teacher preparation and inservice education programs for teachers of art have surfaced (for example, Brewer, 1999a; Burton, 2001; Davis, 1990; Galbraith, 1997b; Jeffers, 1993a; Lampela, 2001; Newby & Carli, 1987; Rogers & Brogdon, 1990; Zimmerman, 1994a, 1994c, 1997b).

Beyond demographic and other descriptive statistical methodology in recent research literature about art teacher education, conceptual frameworks often emerged using the following research methods: phenomenological research, particularly regarding teacher attitudes and beliefs; hermeneutics; constructivist or naturalistic analyses such as ethnographies or case studies; connoisseurship; content or trend analysis; critical theory; feminist approaches to research; historical research; paradigm research; philosophical/theoretical research; action research; and collaborative research among theorists or with art teacher practitioners. A brief description
of these various approaches is necessary to set the groundwork for classification by methodology of current research centered on the preparation and continuing education of teachers of art.

The most helpful conceptual framework that I found for situating the “overarching purposes” (p. 191) of contemporary qualitative research methodology with choices of method was the recent work of Donmoyer (2001), wherein he matched (a) “truth-seeking purposes” with methods situated in grounded theory; (b) purposes of thick description to anthropological and ethnographic methods; (c) purposes of measuring change among entities (people, groups, organizations) over time with quasi-historical methods; (d) purposes of personal interpretation with educational connoisseurship; and (e) purposes of social change with feminist, collaborative, postmodern and action research methods.

SOME CONTEMPORARY METHODOLOGIES BRIEFLY DEFINED

Phenomenology
Phenomenological research is an approach, often used to gather and interpret data about teacher attitudes and beliefs wherein the researcher is let in on an individual’s own understandings and realities. Phenomenology focuses on the philosophical notion of consciousness and how that affects our capacity for understanding factual knowledge. It also supports the role of individual perceptions and recollections in the creation of meaning (Greene, 1995; Grumet, 1992; Jeffers, 1991, 1992; Walker, 1996). Reflection on the nature of mental acts, therefore, has for its subject matter the phenomena of consciousness. Prejudices should be set aside so researchers may be free to examine issues they select to study.

Hermeneutics
The term hermeneutics is best explained as an art and science of interpretation. It is a philosophical stance that provides a series of questions about interpretation basic to a particular mode of inquiry. Its original use focused on interpretation applied to sacred writings; however, it is still extant in the 20th century and is applied to notions of reality and interpretation of meaning (Gall et al., 1996; Hamblen, 1989). According to Carreiro (2002), two opposing hermeneutical methods exist. He suggested that one method views interpretation from a scientific basis when it is used in historical and human sciences, whereas the other is based on the work of the philosopher Heidegger (1996), who described what is being understood historically as an interchange between an interpreter and a text. Maitland-Gholson and Ettinger (1994) also examined hermeneutic methodology and its application to research in art education based on their earlier research about text analysis as a methodology (Ettinger & Maitland-Gholson, 1990). A brief discussion of their conceptual framework regarding text analysis appears later in this chapter.

Constructivist or Naturalistic Analyses
A constructivist methodological approach ensures that the researcher not only views his or her own perceptions as constructed phenomena but also regards future readers’ views and perceptions as their own constructed realities (Schwandt, 1994). According to Stake (1995b) “the researcher needs to decide what effort to make to understand what potential readers already know, how they construct the world, and how new data and new interpretations can facilitate that construction. It calls for new interpretations of interpretation” (p. 4). Based on
the work of Nelson Goodman (1978), Stake was convinced that constructivist methodology, in its validation of interpretation by the researcher, seeks to unearth undiscovered realities in a dynamic relationship.

Ethnography, Ethnology, and Ethnomethodology

Ethnography is a form of qualitative and constructivist research methodologies. Bresler (1994, 1996) described ethnographic research as an in-depth means of discovering shared values, knowledge, and practices of one culture or a specific group of people. Occurring in naturalistic settings, data can be interpreted through political, artistic, cultural, and psychological as well as sociological or anthropological lenses (Eisner, 1991). Ethnography is a way to study a human culture’s uniqueness, universality, and emerging patterns from within those features of that culture (Gall et al., 1996).

Ethnology, frequently found in anthropological studies, is most often used as a method to study similarities and differences between or among various cultures. The purpose of ethno-

tological research is to develop theories of culture as a result of a comparative analysis of data from two or more naturalistic settings (Chalmers, 1981).

Ethnomethodology, another constructivist methodology that is often used in sociology, espouses the notion that reality is developed or interactive rather than fixed or merely experienced and that socially constructed realities are a result of social practices by members of a culture. In an ethnomethodological approach, the researcher carefully attends to data unfolding as a person’s story is told. This research attempts to study ways that individuals attempt to make sense of their everyday social lives, particularly in the tasks of communicating and decision making (Gall et al., 1996).

Narrative and Visual Sociology

Stokrocki (1998), in her explanation of ethnographic storytelling as a form of narrative method, stated that this “research is a kind of unraveling of meanings that warp around each other and conceal their identity. . . . Researchers re-weave meanings back together again into some whole. The historical story is the warp and the cultural meanings are the weft” (p. 66). Zurmuehlen (1991) also conducted much of her research using narratives as methodology for research about experiential aspects of art teacher education (Ulbricht, 1998).

Stokrocki (1995b) also defined visual sociology as an arts-based research method such as the use of photography as research instrument for analysis, elicitation of accurate information from those subjects photographed, and artful interpretation of data with an ultimate goal of moving beyond discreet findings to a rich sense of the character or essence of the observed context. Green (2000) further explored ethical issues arising in uses of imagery in art education settings.

Case Studies

Case studies are in-depth analyses of individuals, groups, or settings. These studies use several data-retrieval and analysis techniques to gather and triangulate significant data including interview, video, participant observation, and artifact collection (Doyle, 1991; Galbraith, 1991; Stake, 1995a; Stokrocki, 1997). Case study research is becoming a prevalent methodology in art education research on teacher education in the form of single-case, multiple-case, and cross-site analyses. Interest in this method was apparent in reviewing studies from the last decade, particularly when research questions addressed model teaching, exemplary art teacher education, or teacher attitudes and preferences.
Connoisseurship and Educational Criticism

Both connoisseurship and educational criticism are approaches to research in which the researcher is able to apply theory through his or her perception of subtleties within complex social settings or interactions. The aspect of connoisseurship allows a researcher to be very aware of nuances within an educational program, and the aspect of educational criticism provides a means for a researcher to describe and evaluate the appreciated entity (Bresler, 1994; Gall et al., 1996).

Eisner (1991) indicated that researchers using connoisseurship as a methodological approach are “aware that we have antecedent knowledge that informs our abilities to conduct the research” and that researchers have an obligation “to critically examine assumptions and values into which they have been socialized.” Gaining expertise for conducting research in this mode of inquiry comes with repeated experiences “in description, interpretation, and appraisal of educational situations,” and researchers must have an ability to “appreciate various uses of different forms of representation” (p. 239).

Educational criticism is important as a complementary methodology to connoisseurship in that it draws on an inquiry model from art criticism (analysis, interpretation, evaluation, and thematic). It can be complex, is able to expand in several directions, and is effectively employed in evaluation research. Evaluation research differs from assessment research in that it is normative rather than descriptive. Evaluation research methodology is put into place when a researcher wishes to assess quality of programs, serve as a gatekeeper for that quality rating, find out the level of quality existing within a program, ascertain the level of performance that students have attained relative to the goals of the program, identify trends in student performance (strengths and weaknesses) for that program, and most importantly, illuminate teachers’ perceptions about their own teaching performances as integral to a program (Boughton et al., 1996).

Critical Theory: Critical Social Theory

In the formulation of critical theory, many contemporary research theorists in education and art education (Blandy & Congdon, 1987; Emme, 1995; Freedman, 1994; Hicks, 1994; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Nadaner, 1984; Stokrocki, 1997; Stuhr, 1994) ascertained that research and research contexts must be critiqued. The individual perceptions, beliefs, and values of both researcher and research subjects need to be recognized within collaborative efforts at interpretation and evaluation. Further, critical theory is based on a set of principles that attempt to identify and critique relationships of power and resulting areas of oppression in social settings. According to Carreiro (2002),

This methodology grapples with the social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender factors which shape the structures that are taken as “real” and immutable. The researcher and the researched are assumed to be interactively linked, with the values of the investigator influencing the inquiry. In critical theory the distinction between ontology and epistemology seen in positivism and post positivism gives way to a view that what can be known is intertwined with the interaction between a particular researcher and the particular group under study. (p. 2)

In actions beyond critique, critical social theory provides grounding for critical pedagogy, which is an opportunity for those identified as oppressed to experience possible emancipation from oppression and empowerment through their collaboration with researchers and teachers in the formation of knowledge (Giroux, 1988; Yokley, 1999). I have observed that action research efforts based on critical social theory are becoming increasingly more frequent in published art education literature. Although a thorough discussion of this trend is beyond the space limits
of this chapter, the *Journal of Social Theory in Art Education*, an NAEA publication, is a worthwhile source of investigation for studies based on critical social theory.

**Critical Theory: Feminist Approaches to Research**

Defined at its most concrete level, feminist research is conducted by women, directed toward women and women’s issues as subject matter in its content and research questions, and is often targeted for a female audience (Blaikie, 1992). It in its zeal to be part of the changing landscape of notions of culture, moving from canons that are fixed and immutable to canons that are live and agents of social change, feminist research methodology perhaps initiated some intellectual waves of consideration regarding ontological and epistemological issues in research (Collins, 1977; Garber, 1992; Irwin, 1997a; Oleson, 1994; Sandell, 1997; Zimmerman, 1990). Feminist methodology encompasses new and valid interpretations and perhaps has allowed researchers to solidly confront sexism in content and to challenge male-centered educational contexts in the field of art education (Ament, 1998). Feminist research, although often conducted collaboratively (for example, Sandell, Collins, & Sherman, 1985; Thurber & Zimmerman, 1996), is not typically recognized by specific methods used within its approach. Rather, selected methods remain somewhat unique to questions posed as they do in other research methods just discussed (Collins & Sandell, 1995, 1997). Sandell (1979, 1997) applied theoretical constructs from feminist research to arrive at an understanding of the nature of feminist pedagogy and its ramifications in teacher education and art education classrooms.

**Historical Research**

Historical research about art teacher education serves to inform theorists and practitioners of art education about chronologies, key persons, events or issues, what they meant in their own time, and what they might mean today (Korzenik, 1985; Smith, 1995). Stankiewicz (1997) proposed that two processes operate in historical research: compilation of facts and shaping of findings into credible patterns of interpretation. Four styles of investigation usually are operant in historical research methodology. They include (a) a realistic approach, whereby the researcher seeks accurate facts as the focus of investigation; (b) a formal stance, through which an investigator is concerned with an order or structure that he or she can construct from analysis of past events; (c) an expressive mode, where the investigator is interested in making a critical interpretive statement about selected events from the past; and (d) a pragmatic interpretation, which is concerned with the past in order to confront issues and problems of the present (Erickson, 1985). Strategies for this methodology are drawn from historical or art historical strategies for data gathering and interpretation. Histories may be oral, written, or visual. As in all historical research endeavors, external criticism focuses on authenticity and originality of documents and artifacts when possible and internal criticism focuses on credibility of or believability of the source.

**Paradigm Research**

According to Carroll (1995), paradigms are “constellations of beliefs, values, laws and practices that govern practice and theory” and they tend to separate the larger community into discreet rather than connected social contexts. The methodology of paradigm analysis is important because art educators do not often have an awareness of influences, values, and circumstances that influence their own behaviors. She further stated: “More than a method of examining the status quo of a professional community, paradigmatic research is concerned about the structure of revolution and change” (p. 41). A research paradigm directs an investigator’s approach
to studying essential properties and structures of being and meaning. This method requires research skills similar to those of content analysis, but the difference is that the researcher wants to know why certain educational communities understand reality in the ways that they do. Carroll affirmed that this methodology provides an occasion for rich dialog across separate communities of discourse.

**Philosophical/Theoretical Research**

Conceptual, theoretical, or philosophical research (Jansen, 1995; May, 1992) is a way to organize and make sense out of complex connections from a variety of sources in any given context. Geahigan (1992) suggested that this form of research is a means whereby researchers not only critique educational discourse but also generate new learning or constructs about knowledge. He encouraged art educators to become more grounded in philosophical knowledge and processes about teaching and other aspects of education. Lankford (1992) argued that philosophical stances aim to justify our reasons for being, clarify our ideas, synthesize those ideas, make recommendations, and raise key questions. He defined theory as a “synthesis of ideas and research whose purpose is to provide a thorough account of some subject or phenomenon” (p. 198). Wilson (1994, 1997a) called for a more coherent effort in conducting research within the art education community. He suggested that research has potential to have a greater impact than currently experienced by being an agent for creation and evolution of theory in visual arts education. Theory, therefore, can be generated or proven. In recent years, it appears that generation of theory rather than refutation of theory has become more prevalent in research methodology related to art teacher education.

**Content Analysis**

Content analysis focuses on research directed at any recorded documentation within a specified context that is deemed to be authentic and valid. Such documentation includes texts, videos, diaries, stories, and other artifacts. After collection, data are analyzed and interpreted. The intent is to identify trends, emergent themes, possible conceptual frameworks, or theories as a result of analysis. Ettinger and Maitland-Gholson (1990) offered a framework for deconstructing text or textual objects from several dimensions. They ascertained that analysis of text was a valuable means of interpreting complex data. Their conceptual framework included a continuum of five orientations to text that determined meaning of the text(s) being defined. Five orientations included literal, classic content, semantic, structural, and hermeneutic approaches. Across these orientations, the role of the researcher shifts from expert, to objective describer, to model maker of internal contextual connections, to revealer of ideological generative codes, and finally, to rebuilder and receiver of meaning. Deconstructed into eight dimensions across each of the five orientations, the framework draws on the fields of psychology, sociology, education, philosophy, linguistics, anthropology, and literary criticism. The eight dimensions address such issues regarding text such as underlying assumptions, functions of text, roles of researchers, and historical origins.

**Action Research and Other Collaborative Research**

Action research presents practitioners as well as research scholars with opportunities to explore ways to become active critics of the shape and direction of their own learning as well as to improve practice for the education of others (Bresler, 1994; Irwin, 1997b). Research methodology is most often naturalistic, in which collected data, in the forms of interviews, participant observation field notes, video recording, photography, content analysis of reflective
journals, and other artifacts, are analyzed and interpreted for emergent themes and issues that could initiate change or improvement within the research context. According to May (1993a, 1993b), these emergent issues are more significant than technical problem solving. In a recent review of research in art classrooms conducted since the 1960s, Colbert and Taunton (2001) found that much remains to be done in attempts at research within three areas of content: social contexts of art classrooms, portraits of effective teachers and competent learners, and planned instructional interventions. They, and other researchers (Hanes & Schiller, 1994; Irwin, 2000; Pankratz, 1989), encouraged collaborative methods of conducting action research as opposed to further idiosyncratic initiatives in art classroom contexts.

DISCUSSION OF THE METHOD FOR CATEGORIZING SELECTED STUDIES ACCORDING TO THEIR METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

After reading several research classifications or analyses of methodology in research texts, I decided to highlight the most frequently appearing categories as they emerged in a literature search of art education research. Those recurrences ultimately formed the basis for categorization of methodology and reporting research in this chapter. Thus, a review of the extant research literature informed the decision of which classifications to include.

My investigation of many worthwhile studies was greatly enhanced by looking at significant theme categories for research in art teacher education. Major themes now emerging in research on art teacher education call for appropriate research designs or methods. In the NAEA Research Agenda (Zimmerman, 1994b), research parameters are described for art teacher education as follows. I selected a few exemplary studies relative to their methodology for purposes of illustration of each thematic content area:

- Purposes, policies, and structure of teacher education programs (Duncum, 2001)
- Issues concerning preservice preparation of art teachers (Brewer, 1999a; Grauer, 1998; Short, 1993, 1995)
- Issues concerning inservice professional development of art teachers (Eisner, 1995a; Jeffers, 1994; Duncum, 1999)
- Alternative certification standards (Henry, 1999b)
- Lab and clinical experiences (Bullock & Galbraith, 1992)
- Post-baccalaureate certification and education (Anderson, Eisner, & McRorie, 1998)
- Diversity, special populations, and teacher education programs (Guay, 1993, 1994)
- Art teacher preparation for alternative settings—community centers, museums, or other public spaces (Stone, 1993)

Several research questions about art teacher preparation have appeared in research about art teacher education in the last 2 decades. These recurring questions can guide current researchers in their selection of content and appropriate methods for research (for example, Bolin, 1988; Chapman, 1982; Davis, 1990; Day, 1997; Doyle, 1990; Eisner, 1995a; Galbraith, 1996a, 1996b; Goodlad, 1990c; Henry, 1999b; Kowalchuk, 1999; May, 1993b; Zimmerman, 1994b, 1996). These broad questions include:

1. What do art teachers teach? (content: the disciplines of art, interdisciplinary content and art)
2. How do art teachers teach? (method: practices in art education including technology, learning and development, curriculum, and evaluation)
4. Who do art teachers teach? (contexts and populations for teaching)
5. How well do teachers teach? (evaluation of a variety of factors; for example, effectiveness of teacher education programs or teacher leadership profiles)
6. Where did art teachers learn to teach? In traditional or nontraditional programs? How well prepared were they? (preservice practices and policies)
7. What should happen to keep them prepared? (inservice practices and policies including use of technologies, issues of diversity, integration of the arts into core curriculum—all challenges in art teacher education)
8. What are barriers to the preparation of teachers of art? (effects of culture and community on art teacher preparation)
9. What historical trends have occurred in art teacher preparation? (standards and licensing, use of portfolio, etc.)
10. What can art teachers teach the field about art teacher preparation? (reflective practice, teacher stories as research)
11. How, what, and why have art teachers conducted (or not conducted) certain types of research? What new types of research would enhance art teacher education? (teachers as researchers)
12. What are future directions for the preparation of teachers of art?

REPORTING, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

What are the findings? What do these findings suggest? What implications emerge for art teacher preparation and professional development as a result of research highlighted in this overview? These questions surfaced as this author was constructing the content framework of this chapter regarding methodology.

One professional arena in which many art educators participate, but do not make a written or published research contribution to the field, is the annual NAEA convention. Some written information regarding details about presentations is available, but detailed descriptions of proposed research, in whatever form they take, are not the norm. Based on self-reported descriptions of methodology used to create presentations and categorized by group or caucus affiliation, some interesting trends surfaced in a comparison of conferences held in 1992, 1997 (75th anniversary of NAEA), and 2001. A sample of three conferences was chosen to compare recurring issues and methods in the past decade. In 1992, 534 sessions were held with 92 sessions (17% of them) focusing on some aspect of art teacher education. In 1997, 622 sessions included 88 teacher education sessions or 14% of the total. The 2001 conference held 748 sessions with 19% (142) of them focusing on teacher preparation and professional development. Across the 3 years reported, only 9 sessions were devoted to expositions of methodology, with 6 of those occurring in 1997. No sessions were apparent that focused on experimental research design. The highest frequency of methodology reported was in the area of program or process description followed by sessions devoted to policy discussion or model development.

Nearly two dozen affiliate and partner groups coexist in NAEA. Within those groups, 3 affiliate groups reported the highest frequency of sessions, among other groups, on preservice or inservice art education. They were Higher Education, followed by Research, then Elementary Education. This ranking was consistent, and not surprising, across the 3 years reviewed. In 2001, a “Teacher Preparation Series” was featured as part of the conference agenda, with 22 sessions devoted to teacher education under that specific categorization. However, 16 of those were offered on the final morning of the conference. Also in 2001, nine student–member sessions regarding preservice art teacher preparation were held—up from 1 presentation in...
22. TEACHER EDUCATION AS A FIELD OF STUDY IN ART EDUCATION

Categories of methodology that surfaced in this analysis are listed across the top row of Table 22.1. All presentations were considered with the exception of meal functions and business meetings. Issues forums and program descriptions had the potential to stimulate healthy interchanges at these conferences. It is possible, with some direction or mentoring, that these informal encounters could develop into written and permanent research contributions to the field, much as is done at AERA annual conferences (via Educational Researcher, Arts in Learning Journal, and online summaries of annual conference proceedings and abstracts).

In a review of 4 decades of Studies in Art Education, reports from Brewer (1999b), Chalmers (1999), Chapman (1999), and Collins (1999) indicated an apparent shift in published research methodology in the field of art education. Chalmers reflected that during the first decade of the publication (1959–1969), “one type of research seemed to count more than others and perhaps more than it does today” (p. 3). He referred to the scientific paradigm and empirical research so common in that decade and prior to paradigm shifts in research methodology. According to Chapman (p. 8), of the 245 entries for the decade 1979 to 1989, twenty-five articles were editorials, but more than half the remaining ones were empirical studies (with three-fourths of those being descriptive and one-fourth experimental). Within that total of empirical studies, 38 were about teachers and teaching and one half of those were experimental. One third of the total entries constituted philosophical inquiry, and nine historical studies and two commentaries were found. New perspectives about methods began to appear in this collection, for example, with feminist views (Collins, 1977; Sandell, 1979) and sociological/anthropological approaches to research (Chalmers, 1978). Chapman suggested that another important shift occurred—that in this decade, some research “foreshadowed concern about the voice of the researcher, how it shapes and expresses values beyond the research itself” (p. 11).

Brewer discussed the impact of discipline-based art education on teaching and its research content and methods. In his overview of seminal research regarding methods during the decade, Brewer selected three studies to highlight emerging methodology. He noted Beittel (1979), who challenged researchers to reconcile truth, language, and method in art education research, recognizing that art and its contexts is not value free and can have primal meaning in people’s lives. Brewer highlighted Chalmers (1981) for his anthropological stance about research. He suggested a method modeled after ethnographers who study art and artifacts in a given culture in order to understand and appreciate the culture and its art. The third study stressed the importance of empirical evidence, involving testing and systematic evaluation (Hoepfner, 1984).

In Collins’s overview of the decade 1989 to 1998, she indicated that of the 156 articles published during that time in Studies, 67 were theoretical, 56 were empirical, 16 were historical in methodological approach, and 17 were reviews of literature. She reflected:

Perhaps a bit light on the empirical side, but from my point of view not too terribly so. Perhaps though there has been some talk of late about our research moving away from methodologies associated with the physical sciences to those associated with the social sciences and literary criticism, the empirical studies published during this period appear to be pretty evenly divided between those that are primarily quantitative and those that are primarily qualitative. If one sometimes gets the feeling that social concerns are beginning to outweigh subject matter concerns, if you’re counting, articles published during this time period strike a pretty fair balance between those related to DBAE subject matter concerns and those that emphasize what might be called social critical perspective. (pp. 19–20)

She indicated that in her review of content for the studies previously cited, preservice and inservice art education for teachers proved to be the least prevalent topic of concern.
### TABLE 22.1
Summary of Presentations on Teacher Preparation/Education at NAEA Reported by Method and Top Three Group Affiliations for Years 1992, 1997, and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NAEA Affiliation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Program/Project Description</th>
<th>Content Analysis</th>
<th>Historical/Auto-biography</th>
<th>Process Description</th>
<th>Action Research</th>
<th>Quantitative Studies</th>
<th>Theoretical/Philosophical/Model Development/Policy</th>
<th>Issues Forum</th>
<th>Interviews/Narratives/Case Study</th>
<th>Demographic Surveys</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Teacher preparation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the years prior to 1992, several studies appearing in *Studies in Art Education* contributed to the knowledge base about useful methodology for researchers in the area of teacher preparation. Chalmers (1981) explored the concept of art education as ethnology, and Rush and Kratochwill (1981) defined strategies for examining human behavior in classroom settings using descriptive research. Degge (1982) further examined patterns of inquiry used by classroom teachers. Part of Volume 26 of *Studies in Art Education* was devoted to historical research as a valid methodology, wherein Korzenik (1985) offered insights about quality historical research for preservice art education. Ettinger (1987), citing a tremendous increase in ethnographic research over the previous 20-year period (1966–1986), reinforced shifting trends in art education research by creating a taxonomy that defined styles of on-site descriptive research found in 31 existing studies. Text analysis and hermeneutics in art education research was also presented by Ettinger and Maitland-Gholson (1990) as previously discussed in the chapter.

Table 22.2 represents a classification by author and methodology of research about art teacher education in the journal *Studies in Art Education* published from 1992 to 2001. Note that out of concern for the length of this chapter, full citations for Table 22.2 (and Table 22.3) are not included in the reference section. The categories for classification in Table 22.2 surfaced as a result of reviewing each study for its approach and research design and creating an aggregate of those classifications. In terms of numbers of studies conducted, demographic studies—mostly surveys—are followed by conceptual/theoretical research in frequency of publication. Case study research, as well as other qualitative methods, is maintaining a steady presence in the journal. Very little historical or quantitative methodology was apparent across the decade’s volumes.

Applying a similar categorization process to *Visual Arts Research*, one does not see a flurry of research activity devoted to art teacher preparation or inservice education in this publication, nor is there any emerging pattern of methodology used across six recent volumes (1996–2001). Perhaps if any claim can be made, historical research maintained a healthy presence relative to other methodologies during the target years.

In what research methodologies are new PhD’s trained? This author would encourage continued tracking and dissemination of working papers presented yearly at NAEA conferences by graduate students from around the globe (Thunder-McGuire, 1997). One might assume that new researchers would continue to use methods in which they had developed some comfort in their graduate school or doctoral experience. However, it is hoped that their proposed research questions and content, as well as their knowledge of a wide variety of research protocols, will serve as primary determiners of methodology. Ideally, if content is informed by current issues in the disciplines of art and art education practice, recent graduates in art education should be familiar with an array of methodological approaches as they begin their work. In a recent survey of the most prestigious doctoral programs in art education, Anderson, Eisner, and McRorie (1998) reported that some responding institutions were unable to accurately describe methodological approaches required in their graduates’ course of study. An interesting follow up to the previously mentioned findings about methodology in art teacher research would be a comparative study targeting national and international universities comparing what methods dominate the research that is being conducted. Another interesting and potential meta-analysis would be to design a study comparing data presented in this chapter and similar data from the descriptive research of research trends described a decade ago by Thompson and Hardiman (1991).

What current trends in methodology are research faculty and their doctoral or master’s candidates using in research about art teacher education? Does mentoring occur between faculty and their students as evidenced in similar or parallel methodological choices in their individual research? For example, in Anderson et al.’s (1998) aforementioned study, Penn State University was ranked as one of the three most prestigious graduate institutions for art teacher education in the United States. Their online information site (Penn State University, 2002) profiles the research interests of their faculty as well as those of nine current doctoral candidates. Doctoral
### TABLE 22.2
Classification of Methods Found in Studies on Art Teacher Preparation/Education From the Journal *Studies in Art Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Surveys Unless otherwise noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes biography and autobiography)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes program or process analyses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Analysis/Connoisseurship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text or Trend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative single or Multiple-Site Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Qualitative Traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes ethnography, cross-site analysis, narratives, analysis, phenomenology,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hermeneutics, semiotics, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 34(3), 189–191 Stokrocki, M. [NA] (Book Review)                                   |
| 35(2), 121–123 Gray, J. [NA] (Book Review)                                       |
| 36(3), 154–169 Short, G. [PS]                                                     |
| 37(3), 170–188 Stout, C. [PS]                                                     |
| 37(3), 170–183 Smith, P. [IS]                                                     |
| 37(2), 80–91 Hanes, J. M., & Schiller, M. [PS/IS]                                 |
| 38(4), 232–245 Wolfe, P. [IS]                                                     |
| 39(1), 24–36 Marché, T. [IS]                                                      |
| 39(1), 37–56 Anderson, R. [IS]                                                    |
| 39(4), 321–335 White, B. [PS/IS]                                                 |
| 40(2), 114–127 Smith, P. [NA]                                                     |
| 41(1), 51–66 Marché, T. [NA]                                                     |
| 42(4), 318–332 Eldridge, L. [NA]                                                  |

| Pariser (Book Review)                                                             |
| Congdon (Book Review)                                                             |
| LaPierre (Book Review)                                                            |
| 33(2), 86–97 Bullock, A. L., & Galbraith, L. [IS]                                 |
| 34(3), 174–185 Zimmerman, E. [IS]                                                 |
| 35(3), 218–227 Guay, D. M. [IS]                                                   |
| 36(3), 222–232 Bullock, A. L., & Galbraith, L. [IS]                               |
| 37(2), 92–100 Galbraith, L. [PS/IS]                                               |
| 37(3), 160–169 McSorley, J. [IS] (phenomenography)                                |
| 38(4), 100–113 Morris, C. B.; Mirin, K.; & Rizzi, C. [IS]                         |
| 41(1), 71–90 Kowalchuk, E. A., [PS]                                               |

(Continued)
TABLE 22.2
(Continued)

|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

**Action Research**
(includes teachers as researchers; collaborative research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary Research Method Lenses: Feminist, Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgendered, Post Modern, Critical/Social Reconstruction Theory, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garber&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanes &amp; Schäler&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galbraith&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36(2), 69–83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41(2), 146–163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, P. [PS]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampela, L.&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Indicates a study already placed in one category above. Code: PS, = preservice focus; IS, = inservice focus; NA, = not specifically assigned.
TABLE 22.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Experimental Research Designs Quantitative</td>
<td>22(1), 62–78 Alper, M. V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Philosophical/Theoretical/Conceptual/Model Development/Paradigm Research/Policy Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Historical Research (includes biography and autobiography)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Evaluation Studies (includes program or process analyses)/Critical Analysis/Connoisseurship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Text or Trend Analysis</td>
<td>Chalmers &amp; Chapman</td>
<td>Brewer &amp; Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Case Study Research</td>
<td>23(1), 1–30</td>
<td>Graham, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Multiple-Site Studies</td>
<td>24(2), 61–66</td>
<td>Stokrocki, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Qualitative Traditions (includes ethnography, ethnomethodology, cross-site analysis, narrative research, phenomenology, hermeneutics, semiotics)</td>
<td>25(1), 69–85</td>
<td>Stokrocki, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21(2), 66–74</td>
<td>Hawke, D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Action Research</td>
<td>26(1), 38–52</td>
<td>Guay, D. M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>includes teachers as researchers and collaborative research</td>
<td>26(2), 40–50</td>
<td>Wilson, T., &amp; Clark, G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Contemporary Research Method Lenses: Feminist, G/L/B/T, Postmodern, Critical Social Theory, etc.</td>
<td>26(2), 80–87</td>
<td>Anderson, T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Significant Research About Methodology</td>
<td>Bresler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Indicates placement in primary category but serves in another well.
students’ research included use of the following methodologies: development of conceptual frameworks; theoretical discourse grounded in contemporary critical theory, aesthetics, or cultural geography; case study; dramatic performance as research process; historical investigation; and ethnographic study.

During the period from 1994 to 2000, five hundred fifty-one art education dissertations were reported in the United States, and 87 of those focused on art teacher preparation or education. In Table 22.4, the frequency of dissertations about art teacher education is described from the pool of art education dissertations reported during 1994 to 2000. The mean for the frequency of those studies about teacher education occurring across those years was 14.5%.

In gathering data, I discovered that some abstracts were complete and clear in describing methodology applied to the study, whereas others were vague or unclear about reporting their design. However, Table 22.4 and Table 22.5 are offered to signify general trends in methodology

### TABLE 22.4

Frequency of Dissertations About Art Teacher Education Within Art Education Dissertations as Reported in *Visual Arts Research*, Volumes 20–26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Reported Teacher Education as Focus</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Teacher Education Dissertations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Teacher Education Dissertations as Focus</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>Mean 14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 22.5

Methodology for Dissertations About Art Teacher Education as Reported in *Visual Arts Research*, Volumes 20–26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ethnographic Studies/ Narratives/ Case Studies</th>
<th>Experimental/ Empirical Studies</th>
<th>Descriptive: Demographic Survey</th>
<th>Historical/ Biographical Studies</th>
<th>Theoretical/ Philosophical/ Model Development</th>
<th>Process/ Program Evaluations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relative to teacher education as research content. As a result of the overview, it became apparent that qualitative methods including case study research were most preferred. No evidence of experimental methodology was encountered. Some studies contained mixed designs but fell primarily into one major category.

PROFILES OF RESEARCHERS WHO USE CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH METHODOLOGY TO FOCUS ON IMPROVEMENT OF ART TEACHER PREPARATION THEORY AND PRACTICE

In considering possible future research initiatives, I reviewed research from several notable contemporary education researchers who not only eloquently address research questions regarding education for all teachers but also successfully model contemporary research methods as their conceptual studies unfold. Theoretical and philosophical contributions to an evolving research paradigm, reflective of the seminal work in art education research of John Dewey (1934) and Ken Beittel (1973, 1979), are found in the work of Eliot Eisner (1979, 1993a, 1993b, 1995a), John Goodlad (1990a, 1990b, 1991), and Maxine Greene (1986, 1993, 1995). Beyond the previously cited research, these scholars have contributed an extensive array of seminal research to the fields of art and education.

Several exemplary researchers of teacher education in art are currently informing the knowledge base about contemporary methodology (as well as conducting studies within those methodologies). The following roster is by no means fully comprehensive because several other notable art education scholars are conducting significant research in closely allied areas of content as well. Also, those mentioned herein continue to use other methodological approaches than those mentioned later, and the citations that follow represent only a small selection from their completed work.

Those scholars whose publication record and other evidence of scholarly leadership indicate an understanding of contemporary methodology and a repeated exploration of issues regarding preservice and/or inservice teacher education—and often in publications outside the field of art education as well as inside—include: Thomas Brewer (1999a, 1999b) and David Burton (1998, 2001), for descriptive approaches; Georgia Collins (1977, 1999) and Renee Sandell (1979; Collins & Sandell, 1995), for feminist approaches to methodology; Lynn Galbraith (1991, 1995), for case study methodology and other qualitative methods; Wanda May (1993a, 1993b), for action research and collaborative approaches; Mary Ann Stankiewicz (1997), for historical methods in research; Mary Stokrocki (1995a, 1995b, 1997) and Carol Jeffers (1993b, 1994, 2000), for constructivist and phenomenological approaches to research including narratives; and Sharon LaPierre (LaPierre & Diket, 1995; LaPierre, 1997), Brent Wilson (1994, 1997a, 1997b), and Enid Zimmerman (1994b, 1996, 1997b), for explication of appropriate theoretical research frameworks about art teacher education and issues of performance assessment for teachers. F. Graeme Chalmers (1978, 1981), Kit Grauer (1998, 1999, 2000), Rita Irwin (1997a, 1997b), and Ron MacGregor (MacGregor & Hawke, 1982; MacGregor, 1998), Canadian art education researchers, have informed art education’s research field about ethnographic and also innovative arts-based research in their studies about art teacher education. They continue to work collaboratively with several postsecondary colleagues and K-12 teacher researchers (both in the United States and in the United Kingdom) and are models for other researchers who wish to approach research via research team methodology in the future (Irwin, Rogers, & Wan, 1999).
Since the inception of NAEA Foundation research awards, several of the previously cited researchers have benefited from the funding initiative. One recent research award was given to Galbraith and Grauer for a proposed study on preservice art generalists who teach art. No research grants for teacher education were awarded in the round of proposals that took place in 2001.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this discussion of research—frequency, value of the research (idiosyncratic or long term), rigor, and the relation of research to praxis, I make the following recommendations. Art educators in general and art education researchers in particular need to:

1. Pay more attention to emerging or shifting trends in methodology found in general educational research about teacher preparation and inservice education (McKean, 2001). Institutions that are responsible for teacher preparation in art education need to do a better job of encouraging their students, both undergraduate and graduate, to become familiar with literature in sociology, anthropology, psychology, other arts, and philosophy. Studies whose research base included research from these areas were thicker and richer in framing the studies. Institutions teaching research methods also should include in their content such contemporary approaches to research as critical theory, queer theory, feminist methodology, semiotics, and so forth.

2. Expand and connect research, drawing on certain methods used successfully by prior art education researchers. There needs to be more connection and preparation with past endeavors rather than idiosyncratic attempts at studies that are not based on the history of research in art education.

3. Increase collaboration among researchers in conducting research. In the review of research studies in this chapter, most were written by single authors or by a pair of researchers, with some notable exceptions.

4. Increase interaction among researchers from university settings and pre-K–12 institutions to produce findings to inform teacher education theory and practice (Manley-Delacruz, 1997; May, 1994).

5. Develop methodology for research on the merging of content from visual art education with content issues from the other arts, interdisciplinary content, multicultural and cross-cultural issues (La Pierre, Stokrocki, & Zimmerman, 2000), and moral dimensions of teaching as they integrate with content for art teacher preparation programs (Goodlad, 1994).

6. Promote action research created by art teachers in K–12 classrooms. This is not a new phenomenon. Many researchers (Degge, 1982; Irwin, 1997b; May, 1993) have encouraged their colleagues and students to participate in action research in the art education field. Their views are supported by Seidel (2001), in a recent report from an AERA symposium on research in arts education, and by Greene (1995). According to Greene, such research may “be a provoking of dialogues within the classroom space” (p. 26).

7. Explore uses of digital media and Internet technology to further communication and collaboration between and among researchers and practitioners interested in the art education of teachers (Keifer-Boyd, 1996). For example, in a recent review of available online resources about research in art teacher education, I encountered a theoretically based study by Duncum (2001) on the relationship between global culture and the practice of art education in classrooms. His research, revealed through his choices about contemporary methodology, is
hopefully just the beginning of a new wave of accessible research and opportunity for disseminating significant global research about art teacher education.

8. Make a concerted effort to publish research about art teacher education in journals related to education but outside the field of art education. Other researchers may offer insights to the work of art education if they had easier access to such specialized literature (e.g., Jeffers, 2000a; Thurber, 1997; Zimmerman, 1991).

**FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

1. In a recent AERA research symposium, a group of well-known researchers debated the merits and challenges of using fiction as a methodological framework for conducting innovative and artful research (Hussey et al., 2001). This discussion, and others like it, is opening up new visions for the nature of acceptable research methodology. Although a thorough discussion of arts-based research is outside the limits of this chapter, active involvement by art education researchers in active research groups such as AERA’s Arts in Learning special interest group will be an asset to the future development of cutting-edge methods for art education.

2. As paradigms in education continue to shift, researchers and art teachers will need to collaborate more and to communicate more often to others the results of their collaborations. The NAEA Teacher Education Task Force has developed an interactive Web site (Krug, 2002) that includes a discussion board, an opportunity to publish research findings online, and access to others’ research about art teacher preparation. Brought about by technological advances and a continuing commitment from exemplary art education researchers in the area of teacher preparation, such efforts at communication and dissemination should be applauded and supported by art educators. Established by Lynn Galbraith and subsequently managed by Kit Grauer, then Don Krug, the task force currently has 129 members who are primarily postsecondary art educators. There is significant room for expansion of this online opportunity in the areas of collaborative and action research. Galbraith and Grauer (1998) expressed concern that it was difficult to engage teachers in collaborative research because it was more time consuming and not rewarded by university bureaucracies in the tenure and promotion mill. I was struck by the relatively few research studies regarding teacher education in art authored by more than one, or sometimes two, researcher.

3. The *Standards for Art Teacher Preparation* (Henry, 1999b) offer excellent criteria for assessing (a) programs for art teacher education, (b) effectiveness of faculty in such programs, and (c) professional development of teacher candidates in art education. This comprehensive list of guidelines addresses the role of research in teacher preparation; however, further criteria may need to be added and monitored if research—and teacher knowledge of research methodology—is to become a more cohesive element in art teacher education.

The second standard for programs supports the notion of reflective practice and values teacher candidates’ abilities for self-assessment as a part of their continuing growth. As an important extension, program standards could specifically “foster an appreciation for, encourage participation in, and provide access to appropriate research opportunities,” so even undergraduate students could be introduced to research methodology at an earlier time in their professional development. In the section on faculty standards, postsecondary educators are challenged to stay current with research literature and to collaborate with colleagues in research endeavors.

Another standard regarding research that might be added would be to expect faculty to “provide opportunities for teacher candidates—undergraduate as well as graduate—to gain
knowledge and an appreciation of research methodology” as an integral part of teacher preparation. Fortunately, in the third area (professional development of teacher candidates), Standards XII, XVII, and XIX specifically describe how teacher candidates should value research and its impact on classroom practice and should participate in action research in their classrooms. It is, however, the responsibility of faculty to initiate a focus on research in their art education preparation programs at all levels.

4. In recent reports (Arts Education Partnership, 1997; Arts Education Research Agenda for the Future, 1994), one of the highest priorities for future research, along with student learning, was for research identifying best practice in arts instruction and the most effective methods for ongoing professional development of teachers of art (Koroscik, 1994). Day (1997) and Wilson (1997a) suggested that there is little research theory—relative to praxis—that is useful, current, or reliable about teacher education. These key areas will provide research questions for future and needed research and concurrent methodologies.

Wilson offered the following themes for continued research: (a) types of teachers and the way they go about teaching—who they are—what motivates them—their gender/class and how this may affect teaching; (b) art teachers’ interests and abilities in the disciplines of art; (c) teachers’ conceptions of students and surrounding cultural contexts; (d) teachers’ formal and informal philosophies of art education and actual or implicit goals they set for their students; (e) teachers’ classroom behaviors, practices, instructional patterns; and (f) how art-teachers-to-be are prepared internationally, rites of passage into professionalization, professional development issues. These themes, and the research questions they will generate, will also determine future trends in methodological approaches to the education of teachers of art.

5. According to Hutchens (1997), many universities do not actually value collaborative or site-based research efforts on the part of their faculty. He stated:

It has been demonstrated that faculty who are highly active in scholarly research tend to be more effective teachers than faculty who practice scholarly abstinence. . . . But many legislators, members of state university governing boards, students and in-service teachers have come to believe that most faculty research lacks any educational utility, is unrelated to and detracts from teaching, and is only a vehicle to enhance faculty and university affluence. (p. 145)

He further noted, along with Pankratz (1989), that even though research can be highly valued as a pursuit, it is often conducted by individuals pursuing their own scholarly interests, which is unfortunate when collaborative methods and applied action research can actually enhance both teaching and learning.

6. One final evolving issue that I find intriguing is increased acceptance of new forms of methodology for educational research, for example, the notion of artistry as a valid research framework. As evidenced in recent professional dialog at AERA, and at the urging of such educational visionaries as Eisner and Greene, researchers are beginning to be more open to as yet unexplored methodological paradigms. To this end, at an opening session of AERA in 1994, Eisner (1995b) stated:

I think the question regarding what counts as research is a question of critical importance. I believe the answer turns on our conception of understanding. As I see it, the primary tactical aim of research is to advance understanding. The [art] works I have cited help us to understand because their creators have understood and had the skills and imagination to transform their understanding into forms that help us to notice what we have learned not to see. They provide us an image fresh to behold and in so doing provide a complement to the colorless abstraction of theory with renderings that are palpable. The consciousness and insight they provide make understanding possible. (p. 2)
Let us move forward—or within—as committed art education theorists and practitioners, to seek the knowledge we need for educating ourselves to receive and create research that will inform the practice of the next generation of educators who teach art. Let us all envision asking more questions about such intriguing ideas as semiotics, visual culture, and other poststructural issues, not as colorless theory but with the consciousness of our most colorful creative minds. Yet, at the same time we need to honor our past and make our research endeavors relevant to present concerns and future possibilities.
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