

Review of Research in Education

<http://rre.aera.net>

The Arts and Education: Knowledge Generation, Pedagogy, and the Discourse of Learning

Vivian L. Gadsden

REVIEW OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATION 2008; 32; 29

DOI: 10.3102/0091732X07309691

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://rre.sagepub.com/cgi/content/full/32/1/29>

Published on behalf of



American
Educational
Research
Association

<http://www.aera.net>

By



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Review of Research in Education* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://rre.aera.net/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://rre.aera.net/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.aera.net/reprints>

Permissions: <http://www.aera.net/permissions>

Chapter 2

The Arts and Education: Knowledge Generation, Pedagogy, and the Discourse of Learning

VIVIAN L. GADSDEN
University of Pennsylvania

Within the past 20 years, the arts have gained increasing prominence in educational discourses as well as public arenas. At the same time that traditional genres of art (e.g., music, visual art, and performance) are being taught as part of school curricula, the study of the arts in education has taken on new venues in supporting learning and teaching through technology and multimedia (Carey, 2005; Eisner, 2002; Flood, Heath, & Lapp, 2005). These new foci are especially critical in bridging the local and the global, and in linking cultures and worlds across age, time, and space that in earlier periods in history would have been virtually impossible to connect. Moreover, they portend opportunities for enhancing learning and improving pedagogy and practice (Bresler, 2001; Bresler & Ardichivili, 2002). They call attention to the ways in which these opportunities are constructed across place and culturally diverse groups, how knowledge (and what counts as knowledge) is defined and shaped within and outside of formal classrooms, and the ways in which reciprocal relationships across different settings are (re)formed and sustained. In short, they prompt us to examine critically how patterns of practice in areas outside of the arts are supported through the arts. They urge us to take up questions about the role the arts play in linking students' knowledge outside the classroom with the knowledge gained through the official curriculum and, in turn, about how such knowledge contributes to the formation of student and teacher identities.

This chapter focuses on the arts within a social–cultural–contextual framework, examining their role as a (re)source in educational theory, research, and practice. Rather than highlighting individual disciplines within the field, typically referred to as “the arts,” the chapter is concerned with the changing nature of the arts and what counts as the arts.¹ The chapter has a six-part structure that begins with an overview of issues that are central to redefining the relationship of the arts and education. This is followed

Review of Research in Education
February 2008, Vol. 32, pp. 29–61
DOI: 10.3102/0091732X07309691
© 2008 AERA. <http://rre.aera.net>

by a discussion of power, culture, and engagement, which is, in turn, followed by a discussion of epistemological considerations. The next section focuses on arts learning and dispositions, followed by a section that describes research issues in arts learning, including challenges in and to current conceptualizations of the arts. The chapter concludes with a focus on ways of expanding the role of arts education in schools and other learning and teaching communities.

SHIFTING DEFINITIONS AND REFERENCES TO THE ARTS

It is not surprising that definitions and references to the arts have shifted in the past 20 years, particularly at the beginning of what Gardner (1989) described as the “renaissance of interest in education in the arts” (p. 71) and the emergence of initiatives created by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Arts Education Partnership (www.aep-arts.org). What was described once as art education has been revised to focus on *arts education*, denoting the multiplicity of art genres; *art learning*, denoting the intersections of cognitive and social dimensions of students’ engagement, creativity, and imagination; *arts in education*, denoting the centrality of art as both precipitator and repository of learning, teaching, and schooling; and *the arts and education*, denoting the reciprocal and interactional relationship that exists between the two areas of inquiry.

This conceptual and semantic shift is important for several reasons. First, what has been described as arts education has a historical life in education and schooling that extends beyond what the recent attention might suggest (Dewey, 1934; Eisner, 1982, 1994; Smith, 1872). Art courses were either discrete offerings in schools, or a focus on art was integrated into courses such as literacy, math, and science. The scope and substance of the integration continue to vary sufficiently enough so as to make a systematic analysis of whether and how the arts are experienced in classrooms difficult, though not impossible (Bransford & Schwartz, 1999; Kalin & Kind, 2006; Larson & Walker, 2006).

Efforts at such integration are perhaps most evident in early childhood programs, which have long focused on children’s grasp of aesthetics (Schirmacher, 2002; Thompson, 2006). Yet early childhood teachers, not unlike teachers of higher grades, differ, sometimes significantly, in how they interpret the developmental needs of children, in what they prepare as stimulating activities for children, and in the degree to which they infuse the arts into other foundational areas of learning, (i.e., literacy, math, and science), using content and approaches that promote children’s dispositions for the arts.

Variability in how the arts are understood, how knowledge of the arts is gained, and how pedagogical approaches are crafted is not limited to early childhood (Bresler, DeStefano, Feldman, & Garg, 2000). It may be seen as a source of concern or a source of possibility, depending on the lens one brings to the task. In this chapter, it is seen as a source of possibility that the field holds for creating rich and expansive conceptualizations of learning and teaching art. It has the potential to contribute to textured analyses of the processes by which knowledge of the arts, art forms, and art media are generated and used and the social contexts in which participation in the arts takes place.

Second, a casual observer of education in the United States might well argue that although the idea of arts education is embraced, it does not own a space in American schooling—that we have not taken up the affordances and possibilities of the arts in education. Eisner (1997) a decade ago provided a poignant picture of the place that the teaching of art held in American elementary and secondary schools. He notes that in Grades 1 through 6, “on the average less than one-half hour is devoted to the teaching of art each week . . . less than three percent of school time per week” (p. 61). Despite the apparent infusion of new programs designed to enhance the arts in schools since Eisner’s writing, for example, those inspired by efforts such as the Arts Education Partnership, the arts occupy a precarious and uncertain position in schools and school systems, and empirical research on the arts is relatively limited compared to other areas of inquiry.

Third, references to the arts in education denote a shift in epistemological grounding. At one and the same time, there is movement toward expansive and multilayered ways of thinking, centered in cultural and social practices and diversity of visual texts and art forms, and there is movement away from codifying the arts into discrete categories (Alim & Baugh, 2007; Dartnall, 2002; Flood, Heath, & Lapp, 2005; Greene, 2000; Hull & Nelson, 2005). These new references highlight the organic nature of the arts, challenge simplistic notions of product and process, and promote a view in which the varied substance and enactments of the arts are studied and understood in relationship to where and how they are situated in the human experience and in individuals’ experiences as members of cultural and social collectives (Begoray, 2001). In describing the varied substance of the arts, Dewey (1934) noted that our reference to activities that are typically considered art (e.g., singing, acting, and dancing) actually reflect art in the conduct of the activities and that the product of art is not the work of art.

Dewey’s (1934) argument is central to understanding the importance of the three ways of referencing the arts and education presented earlier and visible in current discourses, that is, the focus on the arts in education, education in the arts, or art and education. These different ways of conceptualizing the relationship between education and the arts point to the plurality of art experiences. They remove the adjectival status of the arts (e.g., art education) in schooling, teaching, and learning and assign the arts equal status to education. Those advocating this perspective see this linking process as setting a tone that encourages learners to be co-constructors of a dynamic education rather than recipients of schooling and shapers of knowledge rather than recipients of knowledge shaped primarily by forces external to them (Gee & Green, 1998). Moreover, they embrace a kind of public engagement that gives equal weight to art experiences and human experiences of both those who create and those who live in the settings where such experiences are created, that is, of artists and audiences (e.g., students and/or community members).

Fourth, current discourses that focus on educational contexts where oppression and marginalization have been the order of the day for children, their families, and the schools and communities that support and house them argue that the experiences that inform and are informed by the arts and the creativity they potentially nurture

become paramount. This public engagement takes on a new urgency, when diverse communities of learners—often with few financial resources and victimized by acts of injustice and violence—are invited into conversations about what counts as knowledge and become enactors of a new experience of learning, teaching, and schooling. In this way, the arts act as a venue for social justice and a platform for those often invisible in traditional classroom settings (Cochran-Smith, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 2006; Lee, 2007).

A common theme in the work that has been described in this section is the need to (re)frame research and pedagogy to focus on understanding the possibilities for learning and teaching in the arts. Understanding the arts is predicated on understanding cultural and social contexts that shape and sustain them (Gadsden, 2003): the processes of learning, teaching, and seeing the world that are valued in these contexts (Green & Dixon, 2003); the relationships that exist in them and their relative nature to the arts, art forms, and interactions; the products that emerge from them; and the sense of self, possibility, and learning that is experienced in and through them (Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001). The arts in this instance are both representative of social institutions and social life (Rostvall & West, 2006a) and unique in their representations (Efland, 1990). They offer a lens into historical and contemporary issues while, at once and through interpretation, challenging such issues, on the basis of the generational moment—that is, practices, beliefs, and structures that are associated with a specific set of circumstances, age, and sociopolitical activities.

The Arts, Policy and Research Contexts: A Further Framing of the Issues

Despite the shifts described in the previous section and greater attention to the arts by researchers and teachers, the arts in education reside in a relatively small space in educational policy, which acknowledges the importance of the arts but has not matched, until recently, this acknowledgement with funding. The incongruence (i.e., between public appreciation and lack of funding support) raises questions about what constitutes academic achievement and the value of the arts to students' academic achievement and educational success. Academic achievement is increasingly defined in relationship to students' gaining proficiency in specific "skills," for example, reading, writing, and arithmetic. In such cases, the unfolding of thinking processes often appears secondary to the act of producing "the right answer" and ultimately an outcome. There is no doubt that developing these abilities is foundational and fundamental to learning in school and encompasses essential knowledge and skills that contribute to students' intellect, purpose, and thriving in the world. Hence, the choice should not be supporting students' foundational abilities versus supporting students' imagination, artistry, and learning of art.

The situation of policy support for the arts and education may be likened to discussions about multiculturalism and education. On one hand, academic and political commentaries refer to the increasing cultural, ethnic, and social diversity in the United States and in American schools; on the other, educational and social

policies and public practices often demonstrate a striking lack of urgency to address diversity in the United States or abroad. The two areas—the arts and multiculturalism—are also similar in that neither has a corpus of empirical work that shows a causal relationship to students' achievement or that can be measured in ways that have come to define achievement. If such a relationship could be established, both areas of inquiry would likely assume a more tenable place in policy plans and would increase the range of research studies. Such a proposition is inherently problematic, however, if the only relationship sought is a causal relationship or one that demonstrates a clear case of transfer. Any failure to find such a direct relationship puts the arts in the untenable position of being labeled soft, inexact, emotional, and inaccurate—in other words, unscientific.

In this era of high-stakes testing, policies that are single-minded or one-dimensional in determining measurable change, accountability, and standards are likely to disadvantage the arts. These policies are especially important at this moment of increased efforts at the federal level and in selected states (Ruppert & Nelson, 2006). In 2007, the Arts in Education program at the U.S. Department of Education was funded at \$35.3 million; the U.S. Congressional Arts Caucus has called for an increase in funding, to \$53 million, in 2008. In the absence of such support, the result will be an increasingly wide gulf between the study and practice of the arts in education and policies that seek uniformity. As the gap widens, school programs focused on the arts may be reduced or eliminated completely.

In posing the question, What can education learn from the arts about the practice of education? and in noting the current emphasis on research that meets the standard of science, Eisner (2002) proposes a way of reenvisioning the issue of research, accountability, and evidence. He points to the ways in which science and the arts have been constructed as oppositional. He similarly describes the tensions between science and the arts, emanating in part from psychology's influence, on the study of the arts, and the lower status to which the arts have been relegated over time:

Science and art became estranged. Science was considered dependable; the artistic process was not. Science was cognitive; the arts were emotional. Science was teachable; the arts were matters of preference. Science was useful; the arts were ornamental. . . . One relied on art when there was no science to provide guidance. Art was a fallback position. (p. 6)

As Eisner (2002) implies, the arts must be studied not as a contrast to science or as a failure to be scientific but as a primary area of inquiry that draws on a range of conceptual frameworks. Although the arts and art forms adhere to a kind of precision and require systematicity, they do not readily submit to the accepted scientific order expected in many other fields (Dartnall, 2002; Eisner & Powell, 2002; Rauscher et al., 1997). However, it is not too dramatic to suggest that not offering students the opportunity to experience a broad array of thinking, social, and emotional dispositions through art—to reorder their habits of mind—is to deny them the full experience of learning and deny teachers the full opportunity to understand the breadth of possible knowledge.

Although the body of empirical research on the arts is relatively small, the number of conceptual and theoretical analyses, dating back to Dewey, as well as instructional and curricula discussions has increased with time, as have the forms of creativity that have come to be included in the arts. However, the lack of empirical work is both the subject and object of concerns and raises a range of questions about the arts: What is the nature of the empirical work that should be conducted? What are the questions that must be framed? What are the contexts to be studied and with what approaches? What interpretive lenses will emerge, and with what accuracy? What are the other ways (e.g., approaches, continua) that we can use to learn about, chart, and understand change? To the degree that questions are posed about the effects of the arts on student achievement, they may need to be reconceptualized and rewritten to ask what constitutes a well-educated student, a successful learning and teaching experience, successful schooling, or educational success. In other words, what are the broad and nuanced learning and teaching opportunities that prepare students to think broadly while honing in on the foundational abilities of reading, writing, and arithmetic and the thinking, social, and emotional dispositions that allow for learning?

By dispositions, I am referring to the tendencies toward different patterns of behavior. Lewis (1997) argues that dispositions are intrinsic to the entity but that they are subject to the laws of nature (Mellor, 1974; Molnar, 1999; Ryle, 1949). Educational philosophers (e.g., Ennis, 1962, 1994) and educational researchers (e.g., Facione, Facione, & Giancarlo, 2000; Facione, Sanchez, & Facione, 1994) have focused on thinking dispositions as a special subset of human dispositions, arguing that thinking dispositions require time and space for reflection. Salomon (1994) describes dispositions as a cluster of preferences, attitudes, and intentions, complemented by a set of capabilities that allow preferences to become realized in a particular way. In much the same way, Facione et al. (1994) refer to such dispositions as being represented in a core of attitudes for schools, intellectual virtues, and habits of mind. One example of how these interpretations of disposition is being enacted can be found in *Art-Works*, part of Harvard's *Project Zero*. In this project, four dispositions are highlighted: (a) the disposition to explore diverse perspectives; (b) the disposition to find, pose, and explore problems; (c) the disposition to reason and evaluate, and (d) the disposition to find and explore metaphorical relationships. (See www.pz.harvard.edu/Research/Artwks.tm)

Last, any focus on the arts must consider the ways in which questions of difference, diversity, and change are imagined. That is, how are issues related to ethnic background, class, culture, gender, and sexual orientation are woven into the fabric of academic and public discourses, and how are the everyday issues of racial discrimination and exclusion in a national perspective examined and addressed. These issues are used often to make the case for the infusion of the arts in curricula and the increase of arts programs. The emphasis on them and the students, families, and communities affected by them is not misplaced, as researchers and educators alike seek ways to enhance the experience and engagement of students who are marginalized in multiple ways in schools and society. It speaks as well to the limitations of existing paradigms to engage students whose experiences differ from dominant practices and whose knowledge,

understanding, and interpretation of art and the arts may similarly differ. Arts education and the experience of the arts in learning and teaching, not unlike learning and teaching science, math, reading, and writing, are inextricably tied to the identities that learners and teachers assume and imagine are possible. Where policy fails to attend to these issues, the role of research becomes more critical.

POWER, CULTURE, AND ENGAGEMENT IN THE ARTS

The study of the arts encompasses a range of genres, foci, and methodological approaches that are used to examine academic achievement and school engagement. As stated in the section on shifting definitions, academic achievement is more than the collection of individual learning of foundational skills. Rather, it is the collective of experiences to which students are exposed, through “reflective shaping of media: paint, clay, musical sound or written words, bodies in movement” (Greene, 2001, p. 1) as well as those who work to engage students in and out of classrooms. The arts represent a broad expanse of work, ways of doing, talents, and knowledge that can be nurtured by institutions and promoted by those in them. Mostly, however, the arts are reflective of a freedom to imagine—to place oneself in the center of a work as observer and actor. In other words, they allow individuals to place themselves in the skin of another; to experience others’ reality and culture; to sit in another space; to transport themselves across time, space, era in history, and context; and to see the world from a different vantage point.

Several nagging questions emerge when we consider how the arts might be nurtured (for those who believe that the arts cannot be taught) or taught in classrooms and what we know about how they are taught: Are some arts and art forms more valuable than others to promote expression and reflection and to engage students in learning, for example, painting, film, dance, music, or photography? Greene (1997) suggests that if the experience includes creative or expressive adventures in any of the art forms, understanding and the ability to notice and to respond can only be enhanced. Although most of us are inclined to accept this powerful statement, the on-the-ground realities of what is valued in society, how it comes to be valued, and for whom it is valued raise questions about whose art counts. References to high and low art, for example, denote a hierarchy or assessment of the cognitive value of an art form and a kind of art. Some art may be seen as unique for the sake of art whereas other forms of art may be labeled as utilitarian. This assessment may result in certain art forms being used and valued in mainstream curricula and others excluded or certain arts experiences provided for some children and different arts experiences for other children.

Whether one chooses one approach versus another may be indicative of the chooser’s awareness of and breadth of exposure to diverse genres and groups and the valuing assigned to both by teachers, schools, and other social institutions. Such choices appear in everyday life as well as research. For example, I recently attended commencement exercises at a prestigious, progressive, private middle school. Throughout the ceremony, the music teacher played several popular songs. An African American parent leaned over

to me and pointed out that none of the songs had been written or performed by people of color. Both disappointed and frustrated, the parent noted that the music teacher had consistently demonstrated a remarkable lack of sensitivity to the diversity of the students. We were left wondering, What does the teacher understand about diversity, the cultures of the students, and their relationship with the arts? What exposure had the students had to different art forms, what discussions ensued, and what was the scope of their exposure?

This kind of questioning is not unlike the questioning that led to research projects such as talent development (Boykin & Bailey, 2000; Jordan & Plank, 1998; Madhere & MacIver, 1996; McPartland, Legters, Jordan, & McDill, 1996) and Project Zero (e.g., Perkins, Tishman, Ritchhart, Donis, & Andrade, 2000; Tishman, Perkins, & Jay, 1995). Research on talent development at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk is developed around the idea that schools and classrooms have yet to understand and build on the abilities, artistry, and talents that students from diverse backgrounds bring to the classroom. Attempting to use talent, broadly defined, as a basis for understanding how to engage students in classroom activities, research on talent development questions whether and how schools are prepared to welcome the early signs of talent in students whose learning and artistry fall into different hierarchies of tradition, genres, and acceptance or who represent different ethnic backgrounds. In other words, what are the values assigned to different genres and to students who appear to be more readily engaged in one versus another? (Greene, 2001)

It has been a failure of schools and those in other institutions designed to support schools to think broadly about diversity and practices that perpetuate the dual identities that many students of color experience, irrespective of social class, in schools. Two examples come to mind. First, many prestigious institutions of higher education have allowed students of color, mostly students of African descent, to hold alternative commencements in addition to the formal university commencement exercises. In these alternative commencement exercises, not only are the students more visible but they also take opportunities to express their own artistic preferences—found in their choices of music and performances—and to reflect on their art, their histories, their ways of seeing the world, and their negotiations between and across their different worlds. Through these exercises, the students attempt to demonstrate publicly and personally (through the planning and preparation of the activities) their cultural power in settings where such power appears to be ignored. Second, similar responses may be found in work that commits to community action research. Mercado and Santamaria (2005) identified the arts as one of four areas that Latino community members identified as important to the education of their children. In a volume edited by Pedraza and Rivera (2005), Mercado and Santamaria address the inherent complexity of addressing the issue of the arts as well as teacher preparation and related issues for those who are new to speaking English and those who have lived in multilingual, multidialectal communities.

The question of power—who has it and how it is used—is as embedded in discussions of the arts as any other area of inquiry, particularly, multiculturalism in education. In describing visions of arts education, Eisner (1994, 1999, 2002), as do others

(e.g., Messaris & Moriarty, 2005), focuses on visual art, using it as a framework to discuss how to engage students in an appreciation for the diversity of the arts and the diversity of artists. As he notes, in American society, money and position make a difference, and the powerful control which images will be shown. As he also suggests, many art forms are being regarded as texts to be read, where students bring a critical eye to the messages conveyed and the values communicated. In this way, each person—representing diverse racial, gender, class, cultural, political, and social experience—exerts power in framing new discourses. Eisner (2002) appropriately refers to the ways that a critical reading of visual text is a way of protecting personal rights but also a way of “determining whose interests are being served by the images that surround us” (p. 29).

Again, it is worth pointing to the similarities between the criticisms of the arts and the criticisms of multiculturalism in education as “soft” and unscientific. Neither responds well to standardization, neither has standard curricula, neither results in instructional efficiency, neither is affirmed through measurable outcomes, both are conceptualized and taught differently than other content areas in classrooms, both ask teachers to consider knowledge and issues that are unfamiliar and uncomfortable, and both are best studied in social contexts. Increasingly, theory in multiculturalism focuses on how educational and societal practices, including various forms of racial discrimination, evolve and are translated into structural barriers (Zuberi, 2001). As is true for multiculturalism in education, fundamental to the expansion of theory and pedagogy in the arts is the notion that educational institutions and educators themselves must support students in transforming existing practices for academic achievement, cultural understanding, social equality, and social justice.

What is the nature of interaction and engagement needed in classrooms to promote imagination, thinking, and learning in the arts? What values and ways of chronicling learning, teaching, and experience matter? What are the curricular, pedagogical, and practical issues that we can address through research? Several documents (e.g., Deasy, 2002; Fiske, 1999) have been written about programs that have strong arts components. Many examples can be found in early childhood education, where programs often include an aesthetics component, described typically in terms of its goal to enhance young children’s awareness and appreciation of beauty and the merging of the cognitive and affective (Bradley & Szegda, 2006; Schirmmacher, 2002; Welch, 2006). The Reggio Emilia schools, started by parents of the villages around the area of the same name in Italy after World War II, are regaled for their focus on the arts (Cadwell, 2003; Clemens, 1999; Glassman & Whaley, 2000; Katz, 1990; New, 1993) and for their ability to draw on what we know about sensory stimulation, to promote creative expression, and to build on social, contextual, and cognitive factors in teaching.

Other early childhood programs, such as those using the Montessori method, place considerable emphasis on the arts in instruction. Still other programs, such as Head Start (see Fantuzzo, Gadsden, & McDermott, 2007; Gadsden, Frye, & Wasik, 2005), are attempting to integrate into a single program of teaching and learning cognitive and social-emotional curricula, with the arts—child art and art created for

children—as an embedded dimension of the curriculum. Fantuzzo et al. (2007), for example, have initiated such a project in which literacy, math, and social-emotional development are arts based, designed in collaboration with teachers and teaching assistants, and situated in contextual learning and learning communities. Using experimental and qualitative methods, the study holds promise in demonstrating the success of both the research approach and the collaborative context. Such projects are examples of efforts that make the arts a seamless part of learning and teaching.

Bresler (1998) provides a glimpse of the experiences of arts specialists in schools and outlines the ways that different purposes for the arts are approached:

- (1) “Child art,” meaning original compositions created by children in dance, drama, visual art, and music;
- (2) “fine art,” meaning classical works in the different arts media created by established artists; and
- (3) “art for children,” meaning art created by adults specifically for children. (p. 3)

She found child art to be the most prevalent in using the visual arts, secondarily in dance and drama when they were taught. However, she did not find child art in music instruction. In addition, she found that when the arts were taught by arts specialists, the specialists typically focused on the elements of a specific form of art, whereas classroom teachers focused on themes associated with holidays, seasons, and special events, not unlike the tendency for teachers to focus on costumes, holidays, and related events when they address multicultural issues. Bresler’s observations of the different types of knowledge and expertise that arts specialists bring should be not a surprise but confirmation. On the other hand, data on the activities that classroom teachers use suggest a need for observations that can yield information about classroom practices and teacher knowledge and inquiry, particularly on topics about which teachers are not particularly knowledgeable.

As Bresler (1998) suggests, teachers make the many choices because resources are not available and inquiry is not supported, not because they are unable to create more provocative, sustainable instruction. She similarly argues that school art functions in contexts that are neither artistic nor elitist and points to the slow, painful rise of school art during the past century. Writing that the “contemporary reality of school arts is tinged with the bare necessities of educational settings” (p. 8), she describes interactions with principals and administrators who, when asked about the importance of the arts in their schools, responded that the arts existed primarily to comply with union requirements of release time for classroom teachers. In no way should we think that most principals take this position; however, the comments of the principals to whom Bresler spoke indicate a clear subset of views.

The problem here is a policy problem. We have no way of knowing how these principals would respond if policies governing their districts and schools took greater measure to demonstrate the significance of the arts to students’ learning and to teaching and commitment to improving them. Bresler (1998) notes this problem and asserts the need for more targeted instruction in teacher education programs—instruction that focuses on the three genres of school art and that prepares teachers to address them. She writes that policies should reconcile the constraints of arts

education in school contexts, recognizing the interplay between “artistic notion and pluralistic community values and desires” (p. 11).

Hull and Nelson (2005) present a core of compelling arguments in an article on multimodality—speech, writing, image, gesture, and sound. Although it is not described in terms of the arts, I include it here because of its focus on literacy and performance and because of the complexity of the work that emerged from youth in an out-of-school program as they created a kind of textual art. The process through which the work was achieved privileges the diversity of language and literacies. The article is a masterful example of the weaving of different genres of thought and draws on different art forms. Noting that visual methods have made their way into the social sciences, the authors point to the fact that literacy studies until recently have “eschew[ed] the pictorial in favor of the verbal” (p. 232). The research study is based in a program in Oakland, California, and was started as a center to teach digital storytelling. The multimedia composing consists of images and segments of video combined with background music and a voice-over narrative. The author narrates a personally composed story and an assemblage of visual artifacts, taken from personal collections, the Internet, and other sources.

Through this work, Hull and Nelson (2005) offer a perspective on methodology—their own described as “roughly within the tradition of design experiments, whereby program development is intertwined with continual attempts to assess and improve . . . efforts and document what participants . . . learned” (p. 232). The authors chronicle the purpose, process, and product of engagement; the approaches participants used to gather and use data to tell their stories; the ways in which art was understood and created; and the uses of multimedia and multimodalities. The study provides a good example of innovative research that brings to the forefront the life experiences of learners and their voices and contributes to a curriculum of thought and substance that has application to in-school classroom experiences. Their work raises the question, Is it possible to take these learnings back to formal schools? If yes, with what expectations, trade-offs, and possibilities?

Other researchers on the international front have also focused on multimodality, for example, Rostvall and West (2006b), whose work resulted in a framework to study interaction in music education, and Kenner and Kress (2003), whose work focused on young children in London. In a study that examined young children’s engagement in writing and how to respond to varied multimodal experiences, Kenner and Kress found that children gain access to a wider range of communicative resources when they have familiarity with multiple writing systems. Chinese was used as a logographic script, Arabic was used as a non-Roman script, and Spanish was used as a Roman script with differences from the English writing system. The 5- and 6-year-old children in the study possessed a range of multisemiotic resources and were able to switch between and among them as they used multiple visual and actional modes.

In Sweden, Rostvall and West (2006b) have focused on teaching and classroom interactions in music. Instrumental music, they write, engages hundreds of thousands of Swedish children and thousands of music teachers, with every municipality having

its own music school for school-age children. The teaching is provided through private lessons primarily. The authors attempted to capture the nature of interaction and the frequency of it, because the role of the music teacher in engaging and sustaining students' engagement was limited if it existed at all. The authors note that student achievement and dropout had traditionally been explained away by attributing both to students' inherent musical aptitude. Using data collected from 12 hours of video recording, they were interested in challenging this explanatory model by examining how different interaction patterns during instrumental music lessons affect students' as well as teachers' opportunities to learn. The results of the analysis are discussed and interpreted from a historical and sociological perspective. The authors also used an institutional perspective as their interpretive framework, with lessons viewed as social encounters and performances in which participants act to create and recreate social orders at different institutional levels, using communication routines of speech, music, and gesture. Findings show that music during the lessons was broken down into separate note symbols as read from the score, rather than the expected musical phrases, rhythms, or melodies. Expressive qualities of music performance were, surprisingly, not addressed at all. Most unsettling, the authors report, was the finding that teachers controlled the interactions and either ignored or ridiculed students' initiative.

These and many other studies (Burkhart, 2006; J. Burton, Horowitz, & Abeles, 1999; Chessin & Chessin, 2006; Strasser & Seplocha, 2007; S. A. Wolf, 2006; Wright, Lindsay, Ellenbogen, & Offord, 2006) reflect the diversity and potential interdisciplinarity possible in examining issues related to teaching and classroom interactions in the arts. However, none was conducted in a public school classroom, raising pedagogical questions; issues of structure, form, and process; questions about the content of classroom instruction; and issues of methodology—how should the arts be studied in classrooms? Last, the proverbial elephant in the room is the question of how, whether, and with what purpose and content are prospective teachers prepared to teach and infuse the arts into their instruction. A fundamental question concerns what teachers and those who prepare teachers count as knowledge and how different epistemological stances matter.

WHAT COUNTS AS KNOWLEDGE: EPISTEMOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Epistemology may be described as a theory of knowledge. It is included here to connote the expansiveness of emerging theories of knowledge and the need to reconcile new theories with old conceptualizations of the arts. Based on the Greek words *episteme* (knowledge or science) and *logos* (account or explanation), it has more commonly been used to denote how people know what they know and the processes by which they come to know. Extended to current debates in education, it also stimulates questions about who decides what others know, what knowledge counts as important, and how the value of knowledge is determined (Dartnall, 2002). Defined more narrowly, epistemology is the study of knowledge and justified belief. As the

study of knowledge, it is concerned with questions such as What are the necessary and sufficient conditions of knowledge? What are its sources? and What is its structure, and what are its limits? As the study of justified belief, epistemology aims to answer questions such as How do we understand the concept of justification? What makes justified beliefs justified? and Is justification internal or external to one's own mind? Understood more broadly, epistemology is about issues having to do with the creation and dissemination of knowledge in particular areas of inquiry.

Epistemology has been primarily concerned with propositional knowledge, that is, knowledge that a certain core of information exists and is true, rather than other forms of knowledge such as applied knowledge (e.g., how to do something). A likely focus for such applied knowledge in education would be teacher education and research on teaching in which pragmatic knowledge may be expected to supersede propositional knowledge. Yet the work of researchers in teacher education and teaching through foci such as teacher inquiry remind us of the significance of epistemology at all levels of research—whether by teachers in classrooms or researchers working with teachers—to examine teachers' own inquiry and the ways students inquire into the world and their learning. In these and other interactions, knowledge of how to do something requires us to unpack assumptions about what constitutes reality for students and is as critical as the content of our teaching. Similarly important is uncovering the process by which emerging and practicing teachers come to know what they know about the content and nature of classroom interactions and the students, families, and communities whom they support.

Epistemology also attempts to raise questions that help us to distinguish true (adequate) knowledge from false (inadequate) knowledge. As Sleeter (2001) suggests, this question translates into issues of scientific methodology. A clear epistemological trend began with a view of knowledge that stressed its absolute, permanent character. The result has been clear focus on normative approaches to identifying the needs and abilities of learners through standards and measures of change. The alternative form is a focus on the social and contextual and acknowledges issues of temporality, relativity, and situation dependence—from a static, passive view of knowledge toward a more adaptive and active one.

This shift raises several questions about the evolution of epistemologies for arts and education, among them, the following:

1. In what ways has the implementation of empiricism in the experimental sciences led to new views of knowledge that encompass the arts?
2. In what sense does proposed knowledge in education and the arts truly correspond to a part of external reality of the institutions in which they are situated to achieve increasing promise and result in negotiated realities?

There are characteristics of the arts in education that cohere with epistemological frames (e.g., Kant, 2001) and that accept the subjectivity of basic concepts, such as space and time, and the impossibility of reaching purely objective representations of things as

they are. Two stages of epistemology are relevant to discussions of art. First, pragmatic epistemology constructs knowledge as consisting of models that attempt to represent the environment in such a way so as to maximally simplify problem solving (Klein, 1998; Rand, Tannenbaum, & Feuerstein, 1979). Pragmatic epistemology does not give a clear answer to the question about the source of knowledge or models. There is an implicit assumption that models are built from parts of other models and empirical data on the basis of trial and error, complemented with some heuristics or intuition.

In contrast, constructivism offers a more acceptable frame and assumes that all knowledge is built up from scratch by the subject of knowledge. There are no “givens,” neither objective empirical data or facts nor inborn categories or cognitive structures. The idea of a correspondence or reflection of external reality is rejected. Constructivism then may include two component features: individual constructivism, in which an individual attempts to reach coherence among the different pieces of knowledge, deleting from mind and action pieces of knowledge that are inconsistent, and social constructivism, which seeks consensus between different subjects as the ultimate criterion to judge knowledge. “Truth” or “reality” is accorded only to those constructions on which most people of a social group agree (Maturana & Varela, 1987). These constructivist approaches put much more emphasis on the changing and relative character of knowledge. A broader, synthetic outlook is offered by different forms of evolutionary epistemology in which knowledge is constructed by the subject or group of subjects to adapt to their environment in the broad sense; construction is seen as an ongoing process at different levels, biological as well as psychological or social.

Epistemologies that drive the study and practice of the arts have a long history in educational scholarship—from the study of aesthetics and imagination (Greene, 1994) to debates on the cognitive dimensions of art (Catterall, 2002; Eisner, 2002) to discussions about dispositions (Perkins & Tishman, 2001). Recent studies on multimodality, digital literacy, and hip-hop culture have also captivated scholarship not simply as newly recognized art forms but mostly as complex art forms that cannot be situated neatly in categories. In their 2005 article, Hull and Nelson argue that in “this age of digitally afforded multimodality” (p. 224), there are unmistakable signs that what counts as a text and what constitutes reading and writing are changing. They note that rather than privileging a single mode of language, art, and experience, new genres “draw upon a variety of modalities (speech, writing, imagine, gesture, and sound—to create different forms of meaning” (p. 225). The same can be said of the arts in education. What Hull and Nelson, among others, suggest is the need to extend our notions of creativity—to seek a non-atomistic, combinatorial theory of knowledge that can account for the fluidity and flexibility of human thought and learning. The epistemological issues in the arts then may be combined into at least four areas that raise questions about reality and who defines reality, with what knowledge of the reality and tools, and with what interpretive agendas:

1. The arts as a way of human knowing—of imagination, aesthetic knowledge, and translation to practical knowledge;

2. The arts as cultural knowledge and as differential cultural knowledge;
3. The arts as traditional (visual, musical, dance, theater, and aesthetics) and emerging genres (e.g., new modalities, media, and technologies); and
4. Interpretation and performance as fundamental concepts.

Moreover, what counts as art and the arts is an equally and increasingly complex question. How do the arts include performance or engagement with diverse media? The arts in education have taken on a range of meanings, and not everyone concerned with the study of the arts agree on what constitutes the arts. What are the characteristics of the knower of the arts, a learner of the arts, or a classroom that engages students through the arts? What socially constructed sense of the world does the learner, teacher, and researcher bring to the study and teaching of the arts?

ARTS LEARNING AND DISPOSITIONS

In both of the previous sections, the assumption was that the individual has certain dispositions that invite engagement in the arts. In this section, we focus on thinking, social, and emotional dispositions as contexts for arts learning. In considering good thinking as more than cognitive ability and skill, it is equally important to address questions of motivation, social and emotional well-being, and attitudes. We are then able to determine how judgments are made about the value of different issues as people approach thinking, whether and how they make choices about their approach(es), and how they move from a state of superficial interest and thinking to more deepened analysis, including questioning, reflection, and inquiry about nuanced problems and issues.

The concepts of thinking, social, and emotional behaviors take on a more complex and interesting meaning when they are considered as dispositions. It is this idea of dispositionality, of tendencies or inclinations toward patterns of behavior, that allows us to learn more both about the processes of thinking and the interrelationships between thinking, emotional (as part of personality) engagement, and social engagement and about how learners build on and implement learnings in different settings, under different conditions or circumstances, and with different outcomes (i.e., with outcomes being more than a single, correct response or a simple, desired result). Much of this view of dispositionality coheres with ideas about writing and literacy processes, inquiry and reflective practice, and critical thinking and reinforces the significance of questioning, worldviews, values, and uncovering of essential beliefs (Costa & Kallick, 2000). In this way, the discussions are extended beyond notions of metacognition, theory of mind, or habits of mind to identify the goal of learning—to unmask pathways to the goal, expectations and changes in expectations along different pathways, and uses for learning for multiple purposes. Learning for a given task is not finite; rather, it is open, continuous, and complex—salient features of life-long learning, learning across the life cycle, and life-course development (Gadsden, 1999).

In education, thinking is often taken for granted. At the same time, understanding is seen as critical to learning, and critical thinking is seen as a goal of schooling.

However, as Tishman and Andrade (1995) suggest in their writing on thinking dispositions, one can have the ability to think critically and not be disposed to thinking critically. Another less illustrative example focuses on children, adolescents, and college-age students who can read but do not—a long-standing and unresolved question in the study of literacy. Thus, what is necessary is a stronger grasp on how people learn, when, how, and under what conditions they are disposed to learning, uncovering an issue, and engaging in critical analysis.

There are many areas (traditional and contemporary) that the work on dispositions might inform more directly and effectively in the arts and education, five of which include our understanding of (a) persistence—how it develops and is revised with time, the conditions and contexts that foster it, and the factors that militate against it; (b) creativity, its unfolding, and its applications; (c) language, literacy, and math; (d) self-regulation, approaches to learning, and learning behaviors; and (e) students' development of critical reflection and introspection, particularly as these relate to empathy and understanding others. A major area of focus in which this work might be examined is in relationship to different groups of learners—for example, hearing-impaired children or autistic children—and to the act and processes of instruction itself, an area that Frye and Ziv (2005) and others have addressed. Another area of considerable importance is a focus on students' understanding, uncovering, and manipulation of complex issues of access and justice, for example, the kinds of issues that might be addressed in questions of racial privacy, its relationship to ethnic and cultural identity, and discussions of race and racial discrimination; students' aversive racism (McGillicuddy-De Lisi, Daly, & Neal, 2006); and related issues of human experience within a range of literary and scientific genres.

RESEARCH DISCOURSES ON LEARNING AND THE ARTS IN EDUCATION

What do we mean by arts learning? Are we referring to building students' knowledge about different art forms? Are our aims about helping students to think like artists and understand their motivations; the broader realm of the arts, culture, and art work; performance and performative acts; or visual and media texts? Or, are we attempting to address the complex role of arts engagement in children's cognitive development and academic achievement? Eisner's (2002) chapter on visions and versions in arts education addresses some of these issues and highlights some of the prevailing tensions and possibilities in the field, including the quandary about cognition and the impact of the arts on children's academic achievement. A critical analysis by Dartnall (2002) also seeks to reveal connections between creativity and cognition, whereas others, such as Thornton (2002), raise questions about learning in the context of creativity and the degree to which learning speaks to the task, not the process.

The cognitive and social dimensions of learning have been a source of tension but not only in relationship to the arts (see Pellegrino, Chudowsky, & Glaser, 2001). One source of the tension in the arts and education stems from isolation of cognitive and

social dimensions and concerns about the lack of strong designs and impact data to determine the efficacy of the arts in classrooms. Another is the result of a tendency for those concerned with these measures to conflate evidence of cognitive change with change in children's academic performance in the foundational areas (see commentary and response by Eisner, 2002, and Catterall, 2002). There are data to suggest that a relationship exists between students' engagement in the arts—as learner and performer—and their engagement in learning and school (Rauscher, 2003). There are also qualitative data that show change in the kind of engagement, for example, students' creation of visual texts and digital renderings and performances as well as their ability and willingness to write about their changing identities, their life experiences, and their neighborhoods and to reconnect with the enterprise of learning (Fisher, 2004, 2006; Vasudevan, 2006).

Haney, Russell, and Bebell (2004) provide an interesting compilation of works in which students' drawings are used to document change and to enact change. Their analysis points to the importance of children's drawings as a medium of research. For example, they note that in times of war and crisis, "children's drawings have frequently been recognized as offering a unique window on events and their meaning" (p. 241). However, as they argue, educational research has generally not paid serious attention to the ways in which children's school art can be used for this purpose. Children's school art also tells us something about the children—who they are, the contexts and issues that are most prominent, and the ways in which learning in the classroom can interrupt potentially debilitating tensions and build on the strengths outside of the classroom (Gadsden, 2006).

In a 2004 report, *The Arts and Education: New Opportunities for Research*, conducted in collaboration with the Arts Education Partnership (2004), the editors note that reliable information is "unavailable about student access to arts instruction, about current and predicted availability of qualified teachers, and about student performance" (p. 28). They examine cognition within the realm of multiple forms of expression but also speak to the importance of studying the arts in relationship to personal and social development, community democracy and civil society, and teaching and learning environments. Among the areas of study that they highlight in relationship to the arts and artistic expression are language and literacy, the arts in young children, and the arts and the transfer of learning. They also note that considerable attention has focused on the arts and the transfer of learning, with some specialists expressing concern that a one-to-one correlation between the arts and academic achievement will make the role of the arts in schools even more vulnerable. For example, as part of their review of 188 reports on the arts, Winner and Hetland (2000) argue that the arts would quickly lose their position if significant academic improvement does not result. They found 275 effect sizes, with three areas having the most reliable causal links: (a) listening to music and spatial-temporal reasoning, (b) learning to play music and spatial reasoning, and (c) classroom drama and verbal skills.

The concerns about narrow views of transfer are addressed, in a particularly poignant way, by Bransford and Schwartz (1999), who write, "A belief in transfer lies

at the heart of our educational system” (p. 61). Bransford and Schwartz point to the disenchantment with the transfer literature, for example, work by Lave and Wenger (1991), Greeno (1998), and Wertsch (1998) on situative cognition, as well as questions raised in more traditional analyses of cognition (e.g., Detterman & Sternberg, 1993). Drawing heavily on work by Broudy (1977) on “knowing with,” the authors make a case for a focus on “preparation for learning,” citing the possibilities that exist for understanding the active nature of transfer and for providing perspectives on the arts and the humanities. They similarly make a case for possibilities of understanding learning by understanding and knowing about the lived experiences of learners, lived experiences that they suggest can be enriched by a study of the arts and the humanities. Bransford and Schwartz’s expansion of Broudy’s work offers a critical perspective not only on how we study learning but also how we understand change and progress in learning. As they write, “The arts and humanities offer a framework for interpreting experiences and helping people develop a more coherent worldview” (p. 85) and note that “the activities that prepare people for static tests may be different from those that best prepare them for future learning” (p. 93).

In highlighting the value of lived experiences and the potential for the study of the arts and the humanities, Bransford and Schwartz (1999) reinforce anecdotal reports and empirical studies alike that focus on the role of the arts in providing a venue for children in vulnerable situations or at risk for hardship. *The Arts and Education* (Arts Education Partnership, 2004) described earlier also focuses on the need to examine the arts in relationship to social and personal development, for example, arts learning and self-identity, arts learning and persistence and resilience, and arts learning and social skills. The focus on persistence and resilience are of particular interest in relationship to children placed at risk. Although our knowledge of the range of risk, vulnerability, and hardship has increased in education and we are paying more attention to the intersections of child well-being and child welfare, we continue to grapple with questions of how to respond to the needs of children coming from diverse home settings, many of which are unstable, or who are experiencing personal turmoil. Research by L. Burton (2007), on adultification of children, where young children take on the responsibilities and personas of adults in the household, and by Spencer (2006), on resilience among high school youth, are but a couple of poignant studies of how students persist. These and other studies might well beg the question of whether and how the arts contribute to children’s persistence and resilience in schooling—willingness and desire to persist in a setting in which many find incongruous with their lives (see also Cauce, Stewart, Rodriguez, Cochran, & Ginzler, 2003; Garmezy, 1993; Rutter, 1996).

If we were designing a study to understand the experience of and measurable change for children in such settings, we may find that many of them, because of their participation in the arts, come to school more often, get better grades, and/or graduate from high school. If we could peel away other possible influences (e.g., life-altering experiences, parent involvement, and academic epiphanies), we would have a measure, though not a precise one, of the effects of the arts on the students’ behavior and their

achievement. However, what we would mostly have is a measure of a relationship between participation and achievement, but not the nature of the participation, leaving us to determine whether the arts or some other part of the learner's experience may account for change.

One study consistently cited as an example of evidence of the effects of the arts on achievement, and a source of controversy, is Rauscher et al.'s (1997) experimental study on the effects of music on young adults' spatial task performance. The authors found that students' performance on the spatial task improved after listening to Mozart compared with when they were exposed to relaxation music or silence. Work by Rauscher et al. (1997) represents some of the tensions and concerns about an emphasis on the arts in which the sole focus is on transfer of the arts to other cognitive domains. Some argue that the goal of the arts is not to ensure transfer but that inherent to the arts and processes associated with them are a kind of engagement with the environment that prepares children to observe carefully the world around them, make sound decisions, and engage in both abstract and concrete thinking. Moreover, the argument is that the arts play to the imagination and images in ways that are often lost in many current-day academic practices.

NEW KNOWLEDGE BASES FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

The arts may be offered as individual courses or integrated into foundational courses that allow for learners and teachers to focus on representation. Representation, however, may serve multiple purposes; for example, in reports of fieldwork, researchers represent the renderings of their informants. As in the use of representation in the classroom, the learner is manipulating images and transactions of ideas, beliefs, practices, and ways of seeing the world that may cohere or differ dramatically from those of his or her peers. Learning, then, is both an individual act and a social act that draws on personal experience and social context.

There is agreement that the arts engage multiple skills and abilities rather than a set of discrete skills. They provide young people with authentic learning experiences that engage their minds, hearts, and bodies. Several of the strengths of the arts are described in the 1999 report *Champions of Change* (Fiske, 1999), which lists several shared perspectives emanating from studies conducted by well-known scholars and serves as a good framework to discuss a range of other issues in the study of the arts. The document suggests that the arts reach youth who are not otherwise reached, including those who are disengaged from schools and social institutions in the community and those at risk for hardship and alienation. A significant portion of this work focuses on learners in low-income, minority, oppressed communities—youth who are often labeled hardest to reach (D. P. Wolf, 2000).

The arts for these groups of youth often resemble traditional forms of engagement but are as likely if not more likely to take up new art forms that connect images, texts, music, and technologies in different ways. The activities in which students are engaged may take place in school or, more poignantly, after school in programs held on school sites or in community institutions. Much of this work is to be found

in literacy studies that bring to the surface the ways in which youth in difficult situations draw on their realities to demonstrate both problems and possibilities in the environments in which they live, that are friendly to them, and that often make them vulnerable. They are as likely to be located in discussions of popular culture, which has become the luminous example of bridging the global and local and the border crossings of class, race, and gender of youth and youth cultures.

Fisher's work (2004, 2006) on open mike in an Oakland, California, book store points to the opportunities afforded to children and adults through intergenerational activities that present their spoken art. Likewise, her work describing the written texts of high school students in New York City demonstrates the ways in which students, typically marginalized, assert an agentive self and in so doing create a valuable art form. Jocson (in press) examines students' use of digital literacies and the ways in which their sense of self unfolds. A core of emerging scholars, such as Stovall (2006) and Alim (2002), focuses directly on hip-hop and its strength as a medium and mediator for youth at risk. The concept of popular culture, Duncan-Andrade and Morrell (2005) would suggest, is the everyday social experience of marginalized students as they confront, make sense of, and contend with social institutions such as schools, the mass media, corporations, and governments. What these young researchers share is a keen understanding of the issues facing youth, many of them vacillating between multiple worlds similar to the experiences of the researchers. Each situates the issues within social and contextual processes to help us understand the individual and shared needs and possibilities as well as the ways in which they transform life experience into art, taking on, through lyrics and multi-images, institutions that fail them with vengeance and those that support them with skepticism. As Kress (2003) points out, such modal transformations are central in understanding education and learning from a multi-modal perspective.

Wissman's (2005) work with high school girls offers another example of literacy engagement that might be considered art. Using photographs, taken by the students over time, and their written and oral interpretations of these pictures, the students created new forms of visual art and text (Eisner, 2002). Wissman (re)presents intersections between and among the literacy practices and strengths of the adolescent girls, diverse cultural and social dimensions of their school and out-of-school lives, and the role of identity formation and revision. In studying the literacy and artistic practices of her students, she enhances, through students' personal expression and academic texts, our understanding of narratives as complex both in their purpose and in the identities they reveal. Drawing on a practitioner-inquiry methodological frame, she positions the issues of the students' self-perceptions and disclosures within the context of their school experiences. She then highlights otherwise understudied issues related to the experiences of girls in this context and makes the issues of their selfhood and their emerging, newly visioned, reshaped identities as part of how we understand and construct the cultural and gendered lives of students—specifically young women of color—in our research questions, studies, and pedagogy. Moreover, her work gives us a new way of seeing their experience (Eisner, 2002).

Brooks (2007) is engaged in similarly compelling work in which she examines the ways that adolescent girls in an urban setting read and interpret “street-lit” or street fiction novels as well as canonized young adult fiction. Here, she demonstrates the ways in which traditional art forms of fiction writing are being modified and how inner-city youth are taking up these works to become engaged in formal school curricula and to sustain their interests. She appropriately denotes both the rise in the focus on street-lit as a form of student engagement and the multiplicity of interpretations and applications that students make. She posits that adolescents examining of different genres is essential to engagement in the concepts, acts, events, and processes of literacy learning. Thus, she seeks to understand how and why students access different genres, how they read them, and how their interactions with them are translated into their experiences as learners within school. Appropriately, she draws from several areas of theory, research, and practice—an important and well-crafted mix of critical areas of inquiry—in an effort to create an expansive conceptual framework.

This and related work, such as Dyson’s (2003) *The Brothers and Sisters Learn to Write: Popular Literacies in Childhood and School Cultures*, build on and are distinguished from other recent writings and studies on contemporary literary genres in their clear focus on the ways in which students engage with multiple types of texts for the purposes of meaning making intellectually, academically, and personally. The issues that the research aims to address and the methodological approaches must respond to the increasingly apparent need to consider a range of data collection and analytic venues to understand the complex questions of student access, engagement, and negotiation in literacy. Despite considerable work in the past few years on literacy and various forms of contemporary genres, many of the issues that are raised continue to be contested domains of work, requiring us to expand and revisit our research and assumptions about cultural practices, gendered experiences, and student engagement. The range of this research offers broad perspectives on the ways that students take up through their reading what anthropologists such as Rex (1996) refer to as the tensions between public and private.

Unique across researchers whose work focuses on youth culture and schooling is the reality that schools do not take, have not taken, or have not been able to take advantage of the school setting itself as a place of creativity for new art forms. They are more likely to occur in structured and unstructured community programs (Heath, 2001; Hull & Nelson, 2005), after-school programs (Heath, 2001), and informal gatherings within communities. What is distinctive about the art produced is that it draws from multiple traditions, from Western genres of music and orality to storytelling associated with the Black diaspora. However, although much of this work addresses the needs of youth in low-income, minority homes and families, they are not isolated from the needs and problems facing youth in general. As Heath (2001) notes, there is an institutional gap that is resulting in a range of negative experiences and effects for children in school. Unlike youth of the past, who did not have access to the multimedia and technologies now available, these youth have access to the vagaries of institutional promises, failed efforts, and inequities of access and support.

What the studies on youth also share is the effective use of strong fieldwork, qualitative approaches, and interpretive lenses that privilege the experience that they observe while making public the limitations of the researchers as outsiders to this experience. The data from them demonstrate change in the language, problem solving, writing, and social-emotional lives of students. What the studies lack in large samples they offer in the depth, texture, and step-by-step chronicling of the experience of youth, whom Heath (2001) describes as invisible but whom I have also felt are a kind of academic throwaway. I have been struck, for example, in my own work with children of incarcerated parents, most of whom are children of color and all of whom come from low-income and working-class families, that the same opportunities to engage in the arts available to their imprisoned fathers are not available in the neighborhoods where the children live or in many of the schools that they attend. Programs such as those presented by Heath and Roach (1999), Catterall and Waldorf (2000), D. P. Wolf (2000), and others offer both opportunities for youth to engage in the arts and enhance their cognitive abilities and places of respite for them to reveal themselves through artistry.

A recent volume edited by Hill and Vasudevan (in press) asks a salient question: What is at stake when media texts play a central role in teaching and learning processes? This question could be posed for a range of new ideas, concepts, and practices in education, particularly, those related to students' literacy engagement. However, for media, as a long-standing literary and performance genre, this question takes on and takes up a special poignancy because of the relatively limited ways media have been used in classrooms and by teachers and the (dis)comforts that they create. Such (dis)comforts are as likely as not to result from the new knowledge required of teachers to understand the multiple possibilities of media and media use in classrooms and media's situatedness in new technologies and modalities, whether accessing the evening news through MSNBC, peering into the hip-hop generation, or producing digital media.

In the same volume, authors respond to two other questions. First, the editors ask, What possibilities exist for engaging school learning differently when media and media texts are part of the learning fabric? Jocson (in press), in this volume, skillfully connects traditional ways of engaging students in poetry with state-of-the-art media approaches to expressing self. Hence, she complicates the idea of learning in isolation and the practices associated with teaching by positioning teachers' own learning and ways of seeing the world as a contested and public space for teachers and others to question. In my own pedagogy and work with teachers, I have found the processes of uncovering our own experiences as learners and intentions as teachers to be among the most challenging and enriching activities if we hope to make learning more transparent and the structures in which learning takes place less daunting for students. Jocson's work demonstrates the ways in which media push the boundaries of teacher knowledge to highlight transformations in teachers' learning and the strengths of using digital media to transform. The meticulous nature of her inquiry and the process of using digital media require teachers to wrestle with a range of complex issues in teaching—for example, race, class, gender, culture, sexuality, and difference in general—and difficult social problems—for example, crime, child abuse, policy

harassment, homelessness, and poverty; to map these against other real-world problems facing students, families, and communities; and to use them as forays into discourses about and action that promotes social transformation.

Second, Hill and Vasudevan (in press) raise questions about the types of relationships that are enabled and constrained as a consequence of the recognized presence of media and media texts (see also Staples, in press). The salient issue in this question is not simply media and media texts but the inextricability of current foci on media as learning and teaching contexts, texts, and tools to support youth. Meacham (2003), through his work with inner-city youth, using hip-hop as a musical genre and media as a primary venue, raises a similar issue, arguing that any response requires a focus on youth themselves. Through this research, he allows us to coexamine situated learning, students' engagement in school and transitions, and critique and revisioning of existing epistemologies and pedagogies. It is no surprise that even now, research and pedagogical activities on media take place primarily outside of regular school hours, as an addendum to sanctioned teaching activities, in after-school or alternative programs.

Media and the uses of media as scripted, performative, and personalized text have been at the heart of cutting-edge work in the field of literacy and education more broadly, particularly in the study of inner-city African American and Latino youth. The focus on media in the 1980s and 1990s was simply not the same as it is in 2007, as scholars of media, communications, education, and the social sciences find themselves uniquely linked to each other in the ideation, development, and implementation of different media forms and as teachers and students use these media as modes of self-expression, identity formation and revision, and personal and academic representation.

The work of the authors in the Hill and Vasudevan volume (in press) suggests that media images are at one and the same time narrowly defined and multifaceted, depending on the observer, and that by expanding historically accepted genres in literacy and learning, they invite students to develop and reconfigure literacy practices and behaviors and to create "media text" (Staples, in press). In particular, the focus of the work by newer scholars described earlier on middle and high school students recognizes the significance of adolescence as a particularly complex developmental period of youth, during which students use a range of intellectual abilities, negotiate emerging personal identities, and seek intellectual guidance and support to grasp and grapple with difficult issues.

Youth draw on and revise existing language and linguistic genres to construct their own language(s) and linguistic codes and to make choices about whether and how they enter or remove themselves from the familiar and the strange, irrespective of whether these sit in local or larger spaces. Media, messages of media, and the stories from media are critical to youth's engagement in the acts, events, and processes of learning. Thus, questions about how and why students access different forms of media, how they read media and the academic and personal texts that result, and how students' interactions with different forms of media in settings outside of school are translated into school experiences persist as complex terrains of study and interpretation.

The work on media offers a compelling and well-grounded argument for examining digital production within the context of situated learning, the agentic self, and

methodological frameworks that acknowledge the performance of media, the space they create for learners to explore meaning and symbolic images, and the layering of the meaning that results (Denzin, 1997; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Alvarez, 2001; Hull, 2004; Hull & Katz, 2006; Lave & Wenger 1991; Mahiri, 2004; Rogoff, 1990). Readers of this work immediately recognize these frameworks and ways of thinking about the questions, approaches to studying them, and interpretive lenses used to understand them as familiar and appropriate. Research in the arts and education (Eisner, 2002; Greene, 1995), arts and literacy (Bach, 1998), and media and literacy (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2005; Gee, 1992; Morrell, 2002; Staples, 2005) have taken on the intersections of the cultural, social, and cognitive dimensions of learning and the ways in which youth form, inform, and revise traditional genres of thought on literacy while engaging and being engaged by newer forms, created and defined by youth themselves.

This work is complemented by an emerging body of international research discussions often focused on traditional genres (e.g., in Israel, Africa, and Asia) and addressing particularly complex issues of resources (e.g., in India and Australia). For example, Flolu (2000), focusing on music education and visual arts in Ghana, offers an informative commentary on education policy and the absence of a philosophy of arts education (see also Mans, 2000). Research already described in Sweden and England, as well as work in Australia and Asia, focuses on media. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)-supported symposia in Australia, Hong Kong, and New Delhi reinforce the increasing attention and significance attached to this often-overlooked area of education (UNESCO, 2005).

ARTS AND EDUCATION: CLOSING CONSIDERATIONS AND POSSIBILITIES

This chapter used a social-cultural-contextual framework to examine issues in the study of the arts and education. It sought to address questions about the role that research on the arts has played and can play to uncover the real and potential contributions of the arts to and in education. A fundamental premise of the chapter is that the present is a particularly important moment to build on past work and to build a future, coherent body of research that complicates and improves the ways in which we create educational theory, conduct educational research, enhance practice, and deepen our understanding of learning and the arts. Perhaps more than any other area of study in education, the arts successfully merge the old and new, traditional and avant-garde, local and global, mainstream and cutting-edge. However, like other areas of inquiry, whether and how the arts are integrated into curricula may be tied to issues of power, cultural practices, and personal and political dispositions.

The arguments for the arts are situated within several different discourses, for example, those that focus on the arts for the sake of the arts (i.e., children's lives are expanded through exposure to the arts) and those that seek to give it credibility within the standards and high-stakes testing arenas. These foci are not always or necessarily polar opposites, however; that is, those who appear to sit in one camp may well sit, depending on

the circumstances, in another. One might argue, then, that the problem is not in the polemics but in the circumstances and demands set forth through policies that create the polemics in the first place. On the other hand, a considerable amount of the discourse on the arts and education is located in polemics, not unlike the points-counterpoints between qualitative and quantitative research or between the sciences and the humanities. This type of divide in the arts is augmented and further made problematic when the arts are constructed as oppositional to science.

The different sections of this review were designed to address the major themes that run through conceptualizations and discussions of innovative classroom practices. Not surprisingly, most of the writing, particularly writing about work in the United States, laments cutbacks in government and policy support for programs. Articles written about efforts abroad, including the UNESCO and Australia Council for the Arts Compendium project and symposia held in Asia, often demonstrate several similarities to the United States in the type and nature of problems regarding funding. More active discussions, such as Spain's controversy about whether art education should be more oriented toward the fine arts or toward craft, highlight the question of what counts as the arts. However, recent efforts suggest that some shifts are occurring and need to be sustained at federal and state levels of government.

What is consistent through the materials reviewed for the chapter is their discussion of the potential for the arts to be used more integratively in curricula and made an active part of the preparation of teachers. Other works argue that the problem lies in our failure to deconstruct the multiple dimensions of the arts, particularly as new genres emerge. The critical questions, then, in considering what counts as knowledge and how it is generated are centered, in part, on questions of how to study, hence preserve, historically valued genres such as visual arts and music performance while creating the necessary space for more contemporary and future-sensitive approaches.

The question of what counts as art and the arts is also addressed through the focus on new technologies and genres, some of which have made dramatic leaps within a short time, for example, in digital teaching, multimedia, and technology. None of us could have imagined the ways in which new genres might have expanded the arts: multimodality, diverse musical and literary genres that are attempting to uncover both process and product, and new twists on old genres such as storytelling that provide us with opportunities to understand the learner and build better learning environments. Moreover, these new trends in the arts and the research that is being conducted expand the reach of who is studied, with what facility and results, and with what emergence of new knowledge.

The focus on the arts and education suggests several lines of inquiry, many of which are discussed in documents such as *The Arts and Education* (Arts Education Partnership, 2004). Not unlike that document, the present chapter points to a need to examine critically multiple methodological approaches that draw on a range of disciplines—from the humanities, using historical and literary genres, to the social sciences, using empirical (quantitative and qualitative or ethnographic) methods. In other words, much of what we need to know about the arts and its place in education and schooling will

only be understood by considering the diversity of approaches available and the diversity of the contexts and people who will be engaged in the arts. Changes in technology and in “who” constitutes schools, the communities of artists, and art forms require that we revisit, possibly revise, our conceptualizations of art and, by extension, our views of education.

Existing work on the arts and education would be enhanced by an expansion and deepening of conceptual and theoretical analyses, particularly, work that demonstrates the historical and interdisciplinary nature of inquiry in the arts. Within this work, more targeted analyses are needed on the role of the arts in promoting social justice and democracy. The issues have reemerged as scholars from different disciplines demonstrate the ways in which the arts have become increasingly a site for intellectual and social activism (see Eisner, 2000; Levine, 2007).

Given the relatively narrow focus of research on the arts and education, our temptation is to provide a long list of options. In fact, the list of possibilities is long but not equally accessible in the short term. There are some areas in which there has already been important work in the past decade and that concurrently need to be broadened. Hence, there were difficult decisions to be made about the content of a review such as this. Issues in one of these areas—the role of the arts in learning and teaching among children living in poverty and placed at risk for school failure—are embedded in all the sections of the chapter, particularly in discussions of programs designed for students at risk. These areas suggest a need for (re)newed examination of the role of the arts and student persistence and resilience. A second core of important work not discussed as a separate area of study is the range of international studies and commentaries, including a recently edited volume by Bresler (2007). There are several other impressive bodies of work on multimodality that are emerging in Europe (Rostvall & West, 2006a, 2006b), studies of the arts and education in Asia (UNESCO, 2005), and work that questions the disjuncture between teachers’ knowledge of students’ cultures and students’ native artistry (Belver, Ullan, & Acaso, 2005).

In addition, research that examines the meaning of arts learning and how such learning is experienced by diverse learners would contribute to new lines of inquiry that have attempted to take up these issues in teaching, teacher education, teacher inquiry, and classroom practice. Such work would extend questions posed on cognition and the arts, with some researchers (e.g., Schwartz, Bransford & Sears, 2005) noting that traditional studies of transfer often limit themselves to direct application of theories that use tests of “sequestered problem solving.”

Last, research that examines the relationship that exists between culture and the arts would lend an especially critical dimension to the broad questions of schooling, the particular issues of classroom practice and student engagement, and the role of social contexts (such as families and communities) in shaping, nurturing, and supporting students’ engagement. In areas such as literacy, we know that such social contexts and the cultural experiences within them contribute in ways that we have yet to understand fully in students’ learning. The arts—neither the panacea to ameliorate all that troubles us in education nor the beacon of all possibility—offer us a lens through which to

examine long-standing questions, provocative ways to (re)consider creativity, opportunity to reimagine engagement, and a renewed sense of possibility that can lead us to the formation of new epistemologies.

NOTE

¹In much of the earlier work, authors use a range of descriptors to refer to what is described here as the arts and education and the arts in education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Penn graduate students Sue Bickerstaff, Cleo Jacobs, Shannon Kane, and Jie Park for their research assistance.

REFERENCES

- Alim, H. S. (2002). Street conscious coupla variation in the hip hop nation. *American Speech*, 77(3), 288–301.
- Alim, H. S., & Baugh, J. (2007). *Talkin Black talk: Language, education, and social change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Arts Education Partnership. (2004). *The arts and education: New opportunities for research*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Bach, H. (1998). *A visual narrative concerning curriculum, girls and photography etc*. Edmonton, Canada: QUAL Institute Press.
- Ballengee-Morris, C., & Stuhr, P. L. (2001). Multicultural art and visual cultural education in a changing world. *Art Education*, 54(4), 6–13.
- Begoray, D. (2001). Through a class darkly: Visual literacy in the classroom. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 26(2), 201–217.
- Belver, M., Ullan, A., & Acaso, M. (2005). Integrating art education models: Contemporary controversies in Spain. *Journal of Art & Design Education*, 24(1), 93–99.
- Boykin, A. W., & Bailey, C. T. (2000). *Experimental research on the role of cultural factors in school-relevant cognitive functioning: Synthesis of findings on cultural contexts, cultural orientations, and individual differences* (Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk [CRESPAR] Technical Report No. 42). Washington, DC, and Baltimore, MD: Howard University and Johns Hopkins University.
- Bradley, K., & Szegda, M. (2006). The dance of learning. In B. Spodek and O. N. Saracho (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of young children* (pp. 243–250). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bransford, J. D., & Schwartz, D. L. (1999). Rethinking transfer: A simple proposal with multiple implications. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 61–100.
- Bresler, L. (1998). “Child art,” “fine art,” and “art for children”: The shaping of school practice and implications for change. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 100(1), 3–11.
- Bresler, L. (2001). Agenda for arts education research: Emerging issues and directions. In M. McCarthy (Ed.), *Enlightened advocacy: Implications for research for arts education policy and practice* (pp. 43–71). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Bresler, L. (Ed.). (2007). *International handbook of research in arts education*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Bresler, L., & Ardichivili, A. (Eds.). (2002). *International research in education: Experience, theory and practice*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Bresler, L., DeStefano, L., Feldman, R., & Garg, S. (2000). Artists-in-residence in public schools: Issues in curriculum, integration, impact. *Visual Art Research*, 26(1), 13–29.

- Brooks, W. (2007). The literary voices of urban readers: Multi-factor influences on textual interpretations. In R. P. Solomon & D. Sekayi (Eds.), *Urban teacher education and teaching: Innovative practices for diversity and social justice* (pp. 195–206). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Broudy, H. S. (1977). Types of knowledge and purposes of education. In R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge* (pp. 1-17). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Burkhart, A. (2006). Object lessons: Thinking about material culture. *Art Education, 59*(2), 33–39.
- Burton, J., Horowitz, R., & Abeles, H. (1999). Learning in and through the arts: Curriculum implications. In E. B. Fiske (Ed.), *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning* (pp. 35–46). Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Burton, L. (2007). Childhood adultification in economically disadvantaged families: A conceptual model. *Family Relations, 56*(4), 329–345.
- Cadwell, L. (2003). *Bringing learning to life: The Reggio approach to early childhood education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Carey, J. (2005). Exploring future media. In J. Flood, S. B. Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts* (pp. 62–67). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Catterall, J. S. (2002). The arts and the transfer of learning. In R. J. Deasy (Ed.), *Critical links: Learning in the arts and student academic and social development* (pp. 151–157). Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Catterall, J. S., & Waldorf, L. (2000). Chicago arts partnerships in education: Summary evaluation. In E. B. Fiske (Ed.), *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning* (pp. 47–62). Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Cauce, A. M., Stewart, A., Rodriguez, M. D., Cochran, B., & Ginzler, J. (2003). Overcoming the odds? Adolescent development in the context of urban poverty. In S. S. Luthar (Ed.), *Resilience and vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood adversities* (pp. 343–363). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chessin, D., & Chessin, L. (2006). Every feather tells a story. *Science and Children, 44*(1), 48–51.
- Clemens, S. G. (1999). Editing: Permission to start wrong. *Early Childhood Research and Practice, 1*(1). Retrieved June 18, 2007, from <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v1n1/clemens.html>
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(4), 541–570.
- Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (2000). *Assessing and reporting on habits of mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dartnall, T. (Ed.). (2002). *Creativity, cognition, and knowledge: An interaction*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Deasy, R. J. (Ed.). (2002). *Critical links: Learning in the arts and student academic and social development*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Denzin, N. (1997). Performance texts. In W. Tierney & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice* (pp. 179–217). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Detterman, D. & Sternberg, R. (Eds.). (1993). *Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition and instruction*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Minton Balch.
- Duncan-Andrade, J., & Morrell, E. (2005). Popular culture and critical media pedagogy in secondary literacy classrooms. *International Journal of Learning, 12*, 1–11.
- Dyson, A. H. (2003). *The brothers and sisters learn to write: Popular literacies in childhood and school cultures*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Efland, A. D. (1990). *History of art education: Intellectual and social currents in teaching the visual arts*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Eisner, E. (1982). *Cognition and curriculum: A basis for deciding what to teach*. New York: Longman.
- Eisner, E. (1994). Revisionism in art education: Some comments on the preceding articles. *Studies in Art Education*, 35(3), 188–191.
- Eisner, E. (1997). The state of art education today and some potential remedies: A report to the National Endowment for the Arts. *Art Education*, 50(1), 61–72.
- Eisner, E. (1999). Getting down to basics. *Arts Education Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 33(4), 145–159.
- Eisner, E. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Eisner, E., & Powell, K. (2002). Art in science? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 32(2), 131–159.
- Eisner, E. W. (2000). Art education policy? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(3), 4–6.
- Ennis, R. (1962). A concept of critical thinking. *Harvard Educational Review*, 32(1), 81–111.
- Ennis, R. (1994, April). *Assessing critical thinking dispositions: Theoretical considerations*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Facione, P., Facione, N., & Giancarlo, G. (2000). The disposition toward critical thinking: Its character, measurement, and relationship to critical thinking skill. *Informal Logic*, 20(1), 61–84.
- Facione, P., Sanchez, C., & Facione, N. (1994). *Are college students disposed to think?* Paper presented at the sixth international Conference on Thinking, Boston.
- Fantuzzo, J. F., Gadsden, V. L., & McDermott, P. (2007). *Evidence-based program for the integration of curricula: Interim report to the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Fisher, M. (2004). “The song is unfinished”: The new literate and literacy and their institutions. *Written Communication*, 21(3), 290–309.
- Fisher, M. (2006). Earning “dual degrees”: Black bookstores as alternative knowledge spaces. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 37(1), 83–99.
- Fiske, E. B. (Ed.). (1999). *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning*. Washington, DC: The Arts Education Partnership and the President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities.
- Flolu, E. J. (2000). Re-thinking arts education in Ghana. *Art Education Policy Review*, 101(5), 25–29.
- Flood, J., Heath, S. B., & Lapp, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Frye, D., & Ziv, M. (2005). Teaching and learning as intentional activities. In C. Tamis-LeMonda & B. D. Homer (Eds.), *The development of social cognition and communication* (pp. 231–258). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gadsden, V. L. (2000). Intergenerational literacy within families. In M. Kamil, R. Tierney, and R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 871–887). New York: Longman.
- Gadsden, V. L. (2003). Expanding the concept of “family” in family literacy: Integrating a focus on fathers. In A. DeBruin-Parecki & B. Krol-Sinclair (Eds.), *Family literacy: From theory to practice* (pp. 86–125). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Gadsden, V. L. (2006). Educational equity in post-disaster New Orleans. In E. L. Birch & S. M. Wachter (Eds.), *Rebuilding urban places after disaster: Lessons from Hurricane Katrina* (pp. 201–216). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gadsden, V. L., Frye, D., & Wasik, B. A. (2005, June). *Evidence-based program for the integration of curricula: A partnership between research and practice*. Paper presented at the National Head Start Research Conference, Washington, DC.
- Gardner, H. (1989). Zero-based arts education: An introduction to ARTS PROPEL. *Studies in Art Education*, 30(2), 71–83.
- Garmezky, N. (1993). Children in poverty: Resilience despite risk. *Psychiatry*, 56(1), 127–136.
- Gee, J. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

- Gee, J., & Green, J. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education, 23*, 119–169.
- Glassman, M., & Whaley, K. (2000). Dynamic aims: The use of long-term projects in early childhood classrooms in light of Dewey's educational philosophy. *Early Childhood Research and Practice, 2*(1). Retrieved April 3, 2006, from <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v2n1/glassman.html>
- Green, J., & Dixon, C. (2003). Language, culture and knowledge in classrooms: An ethnographic approach to identity potentials, knowledge and language in a bilingual fifth grade. *Encontro International Linguagem, Cultura 3 Cognição, Belo Horizonte, 42*(6), 60–76.
- Greene, M. (1994). Carpe diem: The arts and school restructuring. *Teachers College Record, 95*(4), 494–507.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greene, M. (1997). Metaphors and multiples: Representation, the arts and history. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(5), 387–394.
- Greene, M. (2000). Imagining futures: The public school and possibility. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 32*(2), 267–280.
- Greene, M. (2001). *Variations on a blue guitar: The Lincoln Center lectures on aesthetic education*. New York: Teachers College.
- Greeno, J. G. (1998). Situativity of knowing, learning, and research. *American Psychologist, 3*(1), 5–26.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P., & Alvarez, H. (2001). Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. de la Luz Reyes & J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best of our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 122–141). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Haney, W., Russell, M., & Bebell, D. (2004). Drawing on education: Using drawings to document school and support change. *Harvard Educational Review, 74*(3), 241–272.
- Heath, S. B. (2001). Three's not a crowd: Plans, roles, and focus in the arts. *Educational Researcher, 30*(7), 10–17.
- Heath, S. B., & Roach, A. (1999). Imaginative actuality: Learning in the arts during the non-school hours. In E. B. Fiske (Ed.), *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning* (pp. 19–34). Washington, DC: The Arts Education Partnership and the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities.
- Hill, M. L., & Vasudevan, L. (Eds.). (in press). *Media, learning, and sites of possibility*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Hull, G. A., (2004). Youth culture and digital media: New literacies for new times. *Research in the Teaching of English, 38*(2), 229–233.
- Hull, G. A., & Katz, M. (2006). Crafting an agentive self: Case studies of digital storytelling. *Research in the Teaching of English, 41*(1), 43–81.
- Hull, G. A., & Nelson, M. E. (2005). Locating the semiotic power of multimodality. *Written Communication, 22*(2), 224–261.
- Jocson, K. M. (in press). Situating the personal in digital media production. In M. Hill & L. Vasudevan (Eds.), *Media, learning, and sites of possibility*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Jordan, W. J., & Plank, S. B. (1998). *Sources of talent loss among high achieving poor students* (Report No. 23). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.
- Kalin, N., & Kind, S. (2006). Invitations to understanding: Explorations in the teaching of arts to children. *Arts Education, 59*(3), 36–41.
- Kant, I. (2001). *The basic writings of Kant*. New York: Random House.
- Katz, L. G. (1990). Impressions of Reggio Emilia preschools. *Young Children, 45*(6), 11–12.
- Kenner, C., & Kress, G. (2003). The multisemiotic resources of biliterate children. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 3*(2), 179–202.

- Klein, P. (1998). The concept of knowledge. In E. Craig (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of philosophy* (pp. 266–276). London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3–12.
- Larson, R. W., & Walker, K. C. (2006). Learning about the “real world” in an urban arts youth program. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 21(3), 244–268.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, W. T. (2007). *Culture, literacy, and learning: Taking bloom in the midst of the whirlwind*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Levine, C. (2007). *Provoking democracy: Why we need the arts*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Lewis, D. (1997). Finkish dispositions. *Philosophical Quarterly*, 47, 143–158
- Madhere, S., & MacIver, D. (1996). *The talent development middle school: Essential components* (Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk [CRESPAR] Technical Report No. 3). Washington, DC, and Baltimore, MD: Howard University and Johns Hopkins University.
- Mahiri, J. (Ed.) (2004). *What they don't learn in school: Literacy in the lives of urban youth*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Mans, M. E. (2000). The African context. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(5), 9–10.
- Maturana, H., & Varela, F. (1987). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding*. Boston: Shambhala.
- McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. V., Daly, M., & Neal, A. (2006). Children's distributive justice judgments: Aversive racism in Euro-American children? *Child Development*, 77(4), 1063–1080.
- McPartland, J. M., Legters, N., Jordan, W., & McDill, E. L. (1996). *The Talent Development High School: Early evidence of impact on school climate, attendance, and student promotion*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.
- Meacham, S. (2003, April). *Hip hop literacies: Concepts and strategies for pedagogy and practice for the hip hop generation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Mellor, D. H. (1974). In defense of dispositions. *Philosophical Review*, 83, 157–181.
- Mercado, C., & Santamaria, L. J. (2005). A new vision for Latino/a education: A comparative perspective on research agendas. In P. Pedraza & M. Rivera (Eds.), *Latino education: An agenda for community action research* (pp. 11–43). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Messarís, P., & Moriarty, S. (2005). Visual literacy theory. In K. Smith, S. Moriarty, G. Barbatsis, & K. Kenney (Eds.), *Handbook of visual communication: Theory, methods, and media* (pp. 481–502). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Molnar, G. (1999). Are dispositions reducible? *Philosophical Review*, 49, 157–181.
- Morrell, E. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of popular culture: Literacy development among urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 46(1), 72–77.
- New, R. S. (1993). *Reggio Emilia: Some lessons for U.S. educators* (Report No. EDO-PS-93–3). Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.
- Pedraza, P., & Rivera, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Latino education: An agenda for community action research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pellegrino, J. W., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Perkins, D., Tishman, S., Ritchhart, R., Donis, K. & Andrade, A. (2000). Intelligence in the wild: A dispositional view of intellectual traits. *Educational Psychology Review*, 12(3), 269–293.

- Perkins, D. N., & Tishman, S. (2001). Dispositional aspects of intelligence. In J. M. Collis & S. Messick (Eds.), *Intelligence and personality: Bridging the gap in theory and measurement* (pp. 233–257). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rand, Y., Tannenbaum, A., & Feuerstein, R. (1979). Effects of instrumental enrichment on the psychoeducational development of low-functioning adolescents. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*(6), 751–763.
- Rauscher, F. H. (2003). Can music instruction affect children's cognitive development? *Eric Digest*. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from <http://www.uwosh.edu/psychology/rauscher/ERIC03.pdf>
- Rauscher, F. H., Shaw, G. L., Levine, L. J., Wright, E. L., Dennis, W. R., & Newcomb, R. (1997). Music training causes long-term enhancement of preschool children's spatial-temporal reasoning abilities. *Neurological Research, 19*(1), 1–8.
- Rex, J. (1996). Multiculturalism in Europe. In J. Hutchinson & A. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 241–245). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford.
- Rostvall, A., & West, T. (2006a). Multimodality and designs for learning. In J. Allwood, B. Dorriots, & S. Nicholson (Eds.), *Papers from the second Nordic conference on multimodal communication* (Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics 92). Gothenburg, Sweden: Göteborg University, Department of Linguistics.
- Rostvall, A., & West, T. (2006b). Theoretical and methodological perspectives on designing video studies of interaction. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 4*(4), 1–19.
- Ruppert, S., & Nelson, A. (2006). *From anecdote to evidence: Assessing the status and condition of arts education at the state level* [AEP research and policy brief]. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Rutter, M. (1996). Stress research: Accomplishments and tasks ahead. In J. Haggerty, L. R. Sherrod, N. Garnezy, & M. Rutter (Eds.), *Stress, risk, and resilience in children and adolescents: Processes, mechanisms, and interventions* (pp. 354–85). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryle, G. (1949). *The concept of mind*. London: Hutchinson.
- Salomon, G. (1994, April). *To be or not to be (mindful)?* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Schirmacher, R. (2002). *Art and creative development for young children*. Albany, NY: Delmar Thomson Learning.
- Schwartz, D. L., Bransford, J. D., & Sears, D. (2005). Efficiency and innovation in transfer. In J. Mestre (Ed.), *Transfer of learning from a modern multidisciplinary perspective* (pp. 1–51). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). *Culture, difference, and power*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Smith, W. (1872). *Art education: Scholastic and industrial*. Boston: James Osgood.
- Spencer, M. B. (2006). Phenomenology and ecological systems theory: Development of diverse groups. In W. Damon & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 829–893). New York: John Wiley.
- Staples, J. (2005). *Reading the world and the word after school: African American urban adolescents' reading experiences and literacy practices in relationship to media texts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Staples, J. (in press). What's possible: An African American urban adolescent boy's reading engagement through media text. In M. Hill & L. Vasudevan (Eds.), *Media, learning and sites of possibility*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Stovall, D. (2006). We can relate: Hip-hop culture, critical pedagogy, and the secondary classroom. *Urban Education, 41*(6), 585–602.
- Strasser, J., & Seplocha, H. (2007). Using picture books to support young children's literacy. *Childhood Education, 83*(4), 219–224.

- Thompson, C. M. (2006). Repositioning the visual arts in early childhood education: A decade of reconsideration. In B. Spodek & O. N. Saracho (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of young children* (pp. 223–242). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thornton, C. (2002). Creativity and runaway learning. In T. Dartnall (Ed.), *Creativity, cognition, and knowledge* (pp. 239–249). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Tishman, S., & Andrade, A. (1995). *Thinking dispositions: A review of current theories, practices, and issues* (ACCTION Report No. 1). Washington, DC: ACCTION.
- Tishman, S., Perkins, D., & Jay, E. (1995). The thinking classroom: *Teaching and learning in a culture of thinking*. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. (2005). *Educating for creativity: Bringing the arts and culture into Asian education*. Report of the Asian Regional Symposium on Arts Education. Bangkok, Thailand: Author.
- Vasudevan, L. (2006). Making known differently: Engaging visual modalities as spaces to author new selves. *E-Learning*, 3(2), 207–216.
- Welch, G. F. (2006). The musical development and education of young children. In B. Spodek & O. N. Saracho (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of young children* (pp. 251–267). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Winner, E., & Hetland, L. (2000). The arts in education: Evaluating the evidence for a causal link. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3), 3–10.
- Wissman, K. K. (2005). “Can’t let it all go unsaid”: *Self-definition, sisterhood, and social change in the literacy and artistic practices of young women of color*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Wolf, D. P. (2000). Why the arts matter in education or just what do children learn when they create an opera. In E. Fiske (Ed.), *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning* (pp. 91–98). Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership and the President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities.
- Wolf, S. A. (2006). “The mermaid’s purse”: Looking closely at young children’s art and poetry. *Language Arts*, 84(1), 10–20.
- Wright, R., Lindsay, J., Ellenbogen, S., & Offord, D. R. (2006). Effect of a structured arts program on the psychosocial functioning of youth from low-income communities: Findings from a Canadian longitudinal study. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 26(2), 186–205.
- Zuberi, T. (2001). *Thicker than blood: How racial statistics lie*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.