

THE ARTISTIC AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS

A STUDY OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD AND USE OF THE ARTS IN TEACHING

Barry Oreck

University of Connecticut

During the past decade, the arts have been increasingly included in professional development programs for general education teachers in the United States. Little is known, however, about teachers' attitudes toward the arts in education or the applications of arts processes in their teaching practice. In this mixed-methods study, data collected from 423 K-12 teachers indicated that teachers believe the arts are important in education, but use them rarely. They are hindered by a lack of professional development and intense pressure to teach the mandated curriculum. Awareness of student diversity and the need for improved motivation and enjoyment in learning were the most frequently cited motivations for using the arts. Teachers' self-efficacy and self-image relating to creativity and artistry influenced arts use more than any other personal characteristic. Surprisingly, neither prior arts instruction, current artistic practice, nor years of teaching experience were significant predictors of arts use in the classroom.

Keywords: *arts in teaching; arts-based professional development; arts in the classroom; teacher attitudes; teacher education; arts in education partnerships*

The arts have played a role in general teacher education since Dewey and the beginning of the progressive education movement. During the past 80 years, the status of the arts in the curriculum has ebbed and flowed, increasing in eras of progressive reform and decreasing during back-to-basics movements and when funding is tight (Goodlad, 1992). In the past decade, national school reform efforts based on educational research (Gardner, 1983, 1993; Renzulli, 1994; Sizer, 1984), public/private partnerships between schools and cultural institutions (Remer, 1996), and new national standards in the arts (Consortium of National Arts Education Organizations, 1994) have fueled a significant increase in the arts as part of in-service professional development programs for classroom

and academic subject-area teachers (Fowler, 1996). In addition to courses specifically focused on the arts, artistic processes and related teaching methods are often included in pre- and in-service programs on multiple intelligences theory (Gardner, 1993), literacy education (Calkins, 1994; Crafton, 1996), and performance-based assessment (Wiggins, 1998; Wolf & Reardon, 1996). The primary purpose of most arts-based teacher education programs is not to transform academic classroom teachers into arts specialists. Rather, the general aims are to increase teachers' understanding of and efficacy in using the arts as part of an expanded repertoire of teaching techniques and to promote active, creative, teaching and learning (Fowler, 1996; Torrance & Myers, 1970).

Despite the presence of the arts in professional development initiatives across the country, little data exists about the use of the arts by regular classroom teachers. One obstacle to such a study is the sheer breadth of the subject. The arts exist as distinct subjects and disciplines and as intrinsic parts of culture, history, and literature, with potent links to math and science. Students may be exposed to works of art through field trips, visiting artists, or media including videotape, computers, or books. They may create their own works of art or participate in exploratory activities using movement, dramatic play, music, or art materials. Discussion, reflection, and analyses may be part of any of these activities. In the continuum of arts activities in the classroom—from playing background music, to discussing a painting or a play, to mounting a full-fledged student-created opera complete with costumes and sets—there is no absolute way to classify what is and what is not “art.” We cannot simply look at how often students sing a song or draw a picture to gauge the frequency of students’ arts experiences. Dewey (1934) placed art in the realm of experience rather than product. In this view, almost any classroom activity can potentially provide an artistic experience if it involves attention to aesthetic qualities and the intentional application of artistic skills interacting with a symbolic object or idea (Eisner, 1985; Gardner, 1973; May, 1993). When teachers are aware of and can engage their students in appreciation and exploration of the aesthetic characteristics of experience in the world around us—the form and shape, dynamics and color, feelings and communication in many symbol systems—they can find artistic experiences in virtually any topic or subject area.

To design effective professional development programs using the arts, it is essential to understand the personal and institutional factors that enhance or undermine teachers’ efforts to use the arts in their own practice and to look at the characteristics and attitudes of teachers who have been able to successfully implement the arts in various ways in their classrooms. Does one need a strong arts background to learn to employ the arts in the classroom? What atti-

tudes seem to promote creative and artistic methods in teaching, and can those attitudes be developed through professional development? How can teachers be encouraged to attend professional development workshops and make use of the methods they learn there in a time of increased pressure for test score results and standardized curriculum?

This study gathered data on teachers’ attitudes and practices to investigate the factors that support or inhibit arts use. The objective was not to evaluate the effectiveness of any specific professional development program but to better understand the subject from teachers’ points of view. By examining the perspectives of teachers who have had access to arts-based professional development programs, this study can offer empirical data to strengthen the link between professional development and teaching practices in the arts.

BACKGROUND

Learning to use any new, creative teaching approach requires a level of personal motivation and willingness to take risks. However, the arts, more than most other activities, demand a significant shift in attitude toward the students and toward the curricular objectives (Fuller, 1969; Smith, 1966; Torrance, 1970). Creative arts experiences involve open-ended discovery and encourage unique, personal responses, as opposed to predetermined objectives and right or wrong answers (Eisner, 1994; Gardner, 1973). For a teacher to make the commitment to use a new approach, particularly in a discretionary area of the curriculum such as the arts, he or she must understand the instructional purpose, recognize the benefits, and feel confident in the skills required to teach it (Clark & Joyce, 1981; Hord, Rutherford, Hurling-Austin, & Hall, 1998). As Torrance (1970) and many others have demonstrated, creativity and creative self-image can be developed and nurtured to a great extent through professional development (Smith, 1966; Starko, 1995). The ability to facilitate arts activities and adapt curriculum to include the arts, however, are more specific skill sets, which may require more specialized

instruction to adopt into one's own teaching practice (ArtsConnection, 1996; Sarason, 1999; Spolin, 1986).

The messages that teachers receive about the educational priorities and value of the arts in their schools come from many sources—from direct supervisors to state and national politicians. The effectiveness of arts-based professional development must thus be evaluated in light of the current national movement for high stakes testing and centralized control of curriculum. The arts remain largely outside of the core curriculum despite their inclusion as a core subject in the current No Child Left Behind Act (2000). Even in schools with a strong commitment to the arts, pressures to raise test scores and adhere to a standardized curriculum can undermine teachers' creativity and autonomy (Amabile, 1996; Gordon, 1999). Limits on space and time and lack of ongoing training and support can further inhibit teachers' efforts to use artistic methods in classroom practice (Baum, Owen, & Oreck, 1997; McKean, 1998; Stake, Bresler, & Mabry, 1991). A teacher may feel that the arts are enjoyable and recognize potential cognitive and social benefits for students but still be unconvinced that learning and enjoyment in the arts is a judicious use of time.

Despite the adoption of national and state arts standards (Consortium of National Arts Education Organizations, 1994), few schools have increased the number of arts specialists (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998). The burden for reaching the standards falls primarily (as is so often the case) to the classroom teacher. Given the time pressures that most teachers face, it is unlikely that the arts will be added as separate subjects in the regular classroom. Clearly, for the arts to be used they must fit into the existing curriculum in an integrated way. The term *arts integration* (Fowler, 1996; Remer, 1996) can encompass a range of objectives and purposes, summarized by Goldberg (1997) as teaching about, with, or through the arts. Teaching about the arts focuses on the discipline and history of the art forms themselves. Teaching with the arts uses artistic processes to teach other academic subjects (Cecil & Lauritzen, 1994), and teaching through the arts

focuses on the development of basic learning and communication skills (Gallas, 1994). In the simplest sense, arts activities can be separated into two categories: creating/producing activities (e.g., singing, painting, dancing, acting) and observation/exposure activities (e.g., listening to music, visiting an art exhibition, watching a videotape). Verbal response, discussion, analysis, and reflection are a natural part of producing and exposure experiences and are given equal weight in the National Standards for Arts Education (Consortium of National Arts Education Organizations, 1994).

METHOD

Data were collected from 423 urban, suburban, and rural K-12 teachers with a newly developed 48-item survey (Teaching with the Arts Survey, TWAS; Oreck, 2000). TWAS provided information on teacher demographics (15 items), frequency of use of the arts in the classroom (8 items), and attitudes toward the arts that may be related to arts use in teaching (25 items). TWAS was developed based on an extensive review of literature and a prior survey instrument, the Arts in the Classroom Survey (Oreck, Baum, & Owen, 1999), and tested over the course of two 2-year U.S. Department of Education projects (U.S. Department of Education Grant #R206A00148). The current version of TWAS was pilot tested with teachers in schools similar to the study sites and revised after review by content experts.

Research Questions

Three major research questions guided the study:

1. What attitudes related to arts use in teaching can be identified and interpreted from teachers' responses on the Teaching With the Arts Survey (TWAS)?
2. To what extent can variance in teachers' self-reported frequency of use of the arts in their teaching be explained by demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, grade level taught), personal experience with the arts (i.e., past and current involvement in the arts, attendance at arts-based professional development), and their scores on attitude measures on the TWAS?

-
3. What do teachers consider to be the primary issues related to the use of the arts in their teaching?

Question 1 identified and clarified the dimensions of the constructs involved through the development and testing of a new survey instrument. Question 2 looked at the relevance and relationships of those attitudes and experiences to teachers' frequency of use of the arts, and Question 3 explored and described the issues in context, in the teachers' own words.

Data Sources

Schools were solicited to participate in the study through the arts-based professional development providers with which they worked. This guaranteed that teachers in the sample had access to arts workshops whether they actually attended or not. The 11 service providers included five arts-in-education organizations—ArtsConnection, Lincoln Center Institute, and City Center in New York City; Higher Order Thinking Schools (HOTS) in Connecticut; and Arts Resources in Teaching (A.R.T.) in Chicago, five school districts in Arizona, Colorado, Minnesota and New York (2); and one university education program at the College of New Rochelle. Of the respondents, 56% ($n = 235$) of respondents had attended arts-based staff development in the previous year.

The sample ($N = 423$) consisted of public school classroom teachers ($n = 250$) and specialists ($n = 173$) in gifted, arts, and special education, representing 97 schools in six states. The demographic makeup of the sample in terms of age ($M = 39$), gender (86.8% women), ethnic group percentages (73% White), years of teaching experience (12), and average class size (23) closely resembles the national averages for teachers (National Center for Education Statistics, 1995). The sample was primarily made up of elementary school teachers (Grade K to 3: 47%, Grade 4 to 6: 24%, Grade K to 6 specialists: 14.7%) that generally reflects the grade levels of the schools in which the arts-based professional development programs were offered.

Teaching with the Arts Surveys were distributed to all teachers in the participating schools but were completed and returned voluntarily,

so the sample of teachers is a purposive or non-probability sample (Babbie, 1990; Rae & Parker, 1997), which limits the generalizability of the results. The relatively low overall response rate (43%) caused concern that the respondents were not representative of the faculty as a whole. To test this external validity threat, a variable (SchLN) was used in multiple regression analysis to compare schools with high and low response rates. Response rate was not found to be a statistically significant variable.

Data Analysis

Principal components analysis (PCA) (SPSS, 1998) was employed to provide validity evidence for the TWAS and to identify interpretable components that explain significant variation among the responses. PCA was selected to identify components that account for the greatest portion of total variance in the data for later use in a regression analysis (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). Two separate analyses were conducted: one with the 23 attitude items and another with the 8 frequency-of-use items. After initial component extraction (oblique rotation, oblimin with Kaiser normalization), alpha reliability estimates were obtained for the derived components.

Question 2 was investigated using stepwise hierarchical multiple regression analysis to ascertain the degree to which the demographic and attitude variables contributed to variance in the level of self-reported use of the arts in the classroom. Selection and order of independent variables entered into the model were determined by the researcher prior to the analysis based on theoretical grounds (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Demographic variables (gender, years teaching), teaching characteristics (grade level taught, attendance at arts-based staff development), and personal arts experiences (length of past arts instruction, frequency of current arts involvement) were entered first. The attitude components were entered in the last step of the model. Ethnicity was not included in the regression analysis because the extreme differences in group sizes (White = 309, Latino = 63, African American = 36, Asian = 9) would

make the variable unstable as a predictor. All categorical variables were dummy coded. Potential interaction effects (gender/grade level, years of teaching experience/attendance at arts workshops) hypothesized to have a relationship to the dependent variable were tested along with main effects. Sample size was more than adequate for principal components and multiple regression analysis (Gable & Wolf, 1991). There were no significant violations of the multivariate assumptions for principal components and multiple regression. Tolerance levels for all predictor variables were greater than .75 indicating low multicollinearity. Six outliers (Mahalanobis $D^2_{30} = 59.703, p < .05$) were identified but retained in the analysis after examination to ensure that they were valid and reflected an intentional response pattern.

To address Question 3, data from two open-ended short answer questions ($n = 389$) were coded with an open-coded, emergent classification system (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993), analyzed for patterns and themes using QSR Nudist 4.0 (SCOLARI, 1996) software, and combined into patterns with an axial coding schema (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

RESULTS

Question 1: Investigation of Teachers' Attitudes and Uses of the Arts

The first research question sought to identify and define psychological constructs that have a bearing on teachers' use of the arts and quantify the frequency of their self-reported arts use in the classroom. The analyses were conducted in two separate stages—first with the 23 attitude items and subsequently with the 8 frequency-of-use items.

In the initial principal components solution for the 23 attitude items (using the Kaiser eigenvalue > 1 criterion), six components were obtained. Two of those components, #4 and #5, were loaded on by only three and two variables, respectively, and had a clear conceptual relationship to other obtained components. Inspection of the scree plot suggested the restructuring of components for a final four-component solu-

tion. When the analysis was rerun forcing four factors and using an oblique rotation (direct oblimin method), the total variance explained decreased from 60% in the six-component solution to 51% in the four. The improved interpretability of the results, however, supports the more parsimonious solution. The values of the squared multiple correlations (SMC) for most of the items were in the moderate range (.30 to .50) with a few high (.70) and low (.06) SMCs. Table 1 presents the loadings for the 23 attitude items after rotation.

Alpha reliability estimates for three of the four derived components were between .74 and .92. Lower reliability for the constraints component (.55) appeared to reflect significant differences in school environments and the specific circumstances encountered by the teachers in the study. Scales means and reliability estimates for the four components are presented in Table 2.

The teachers' sense of importance of the arts in the curriculum was the first derived component. The importance component included nine items concerning the four art forms and art-making (doing) and exposure-type activities that reflects a high level of consistency in teachers' value for all of the arts and various instructional purposes. The high average scores for importance ($M = 4.28$ out of 5) demonstrates that the arts are valued by teachers as part of the educational experience of students, regardless of other constraints, concerns, or external pressures that limit their use. It should be noted that these teachers say art is important, not necessarily that they should be the ones teaching it.

The items concerning self-image and self-efficacy combined to form a second component with loadings of .65 to .75 (alpha reliability = .79). Similar to the importance component, responses seem to be clearly based not on a specific art form or type of activity but on a more general sense of artistic self-efficacy. The results of the TWAS suggest that although the teachers regard themselves as slightly more creative than artistic, these are correlated constructs ($r = .574$). In the short answer responses, teachers tended to use the terms *artistic* and *creative* interchangeably.

TABLE 1 Structure Matrix for Attitude Items

Item Stem	Component			
	1	2	3	4
i4. (I feel it is) Important for students to read or attend a play	.789			
i6. Important for students to look at works of art	.779			
i7. Important for students to engage in theater activities	.759			
i2. Important for students to listen to a piece of music	.749			
i5. Important for students to engage in music activities	.732			
i8. Important for students to engage in visual arts activities	.696	-.309		
i3. Important for students to engage in dance activities	.655			
i1. Important for students to view a videotape of a dance	.621			
i28. I feel that there are many students in my class who would especially benefit from more arts activities in the curriculum.	.485		-.342	
i30. I consider myself a highly creative person.		-.747		
i19. I consider myself an artist.		-.747		
i26. I feel confident in my ability to facilitate theater activities.	.312	-.696		
i21. I feel confident in my ability to facilitate music activities.		-.695		
i24. I feel confident in my ability to facilitate visual arts activities.		-.681		
i17. I feel confident in my ability to facilitate dance activities.		-.651		
i27. In general, my school is supportive of innovative teaching approaches.			-.885	
i29. I am free to use new teaching approaches in my classroom as I see fit.			-.865	
i22. My supervisor encourages teacher creativity.			-.766	
i31. I feel constrained by the demands of the curriculum I have to teach.				.701
i18. I feel that I don't have enough time to teach the arts along with the rest of the curriculum.				.641
i23. I don't have enough space to use movement effectively in the classroom.				.603
i25. My students have trouble concentrating on other work after an arts activity.				.556
i20. I am concerned that music, dance, and theater activities are too noisy or disruptive for the classroom.	.332			.425

NOTE: Extraction method: Principal component analysis. Rotation method: oblimin with Kaiser normalization.

TABLE 2 Alpha Reliability Results for Four Component Solution for Attitude Items

Component	Name	No. of Items	Alpha Reliability	Scale Mean	SD
1	Importance of Arts	9	.87	4.29	.58
2	Self (efficacy and image)	6	.79	3.12	.86
3	Support	3	.83	3.99	.92
4	Constraints	5	.55	2.75	.74

The support component derived from the TWAS involved three distinct issues—general school support, specific supervisor support, and sense of autonomy. These three aspects of support loaded on a single component with alpha reliability of .83, quite high for a three-item component. The responses to these items suggest that teachers perceived that they have a relatively high level of support and autonomy to try new, innovative, and creative approaches in their classrooms (mean support score = 3.98 out of 5).

The constraints component had a wide spread of loadings (.42 to .71) and lower alpha reliability estimates than the other components but did emerge as a distinct construct. Responses concerning major issues—such as demands on time, pressure for test results, and expectations to teach a mandated curriculum—varied greatly among teachers from different schools and districts. A number of specific issues, such as the physical layout of classrooms, noise problems, and the availability of materials and resources, appeared to be of high concern only in certain schools and were not consistent across the sample.

In the second principal components analysis, the eight frequency-of-use items loaded on a single frequency component, encompassed the exposure and art-making activities in dance, music, theater, and visual arts. High alpha reliability of .83 for the eight frequency items reflects overall consistency in teachers' use (or nonuse) of the arts in their teaching. This consistency supports the use of the single frequency




FIGURE 1: Frequency of Use of the Four Art Forms in Doing and Exposure Modes

component (scale mean = 2.63) as the dependent variable in the regression analysis. Figure 1 shows the teachers' self-reported frequency of use of the arts.

As reported in prior studies (Oreck, Baum, & Owen, 1999), visual arts was the most frequently used participatory arts activity. Whether this reflects actual instruction or simply an enjoyable use of free time, teachers seem more comfortable with the visual, as opposed to the performing, arts. Music was rated highest in the exposure mode. Again, it is unclear if self-reported use reflects focused, active listening activities to live or recorded music, or more passive activities, such as playing background music at various times during the school day.

Question 2: Personal Characteristics and Experience That Influence Arts Use in Teaching

Question 2 investigated the relationship of teachers' personal characteristics and attitudes to their self-reported arts usage. Of the 13 variables in the multiple regression analysis, 7 were found to be statistically significant (adj. Bonferroni alpha < .005). Demographic and personal experience variables were entered first and accounted for 20.2% of the variation in the dependent variable (frequency of arts use). The four derived attitude components accounted

for an additional 18.4% of variance. Overall, the model explained 38.6% of the variation in self-reported arts usage, which represents a large multivariate effect size (Cohen, 1992) ($F_{13, 388} = 18.113, p < .001, R^2 = .386, \text{Adj. } R^2 = .364$). The four-step regression model is presented in Table 3.

Two of the attitude components—self-efficacy/self-image and constraints—made the greatest unique contributions to overall variance. Not surprisingly, the other most significant contributor was grade level taught, with early childhood teachers (Grades K to 3) using the arts most frequently and middle and high school teachers least. As expected, participants in arts workshops in the last 12 months used the arts more frequently; however, because attendance tended to be voluntary, no causal inference can be made. It is likely that teachers who were already most inclined toward the arts participated in arts workshops. The difference in frequency of use between workshop participants ($M = 2.8$) and nonparticipants ($M = 2.4$ out of 5) was statistically significant ($t_{1,418} = 5.3, p = .001$) but still placed workshop participants between "rarely" and "monthly" in the frequency-of-use scale. Coefficients for the variables entered in the final model are presented in Table 4.

Gender initially appeared to be a significant predictor with women in the sample using the arts more frequently than men, however this difference was not significant when the other predictors were entered into the regression model. Lack of significant interaction effects between gender and grade level showed that the differences between genders could not be explained by the higher percentage of women teaching in the early grades. The extreme inequality in group sizes in this study (86.8% women) makes any conclusions speculative, at best.

Surprisingly, neither prior formal arts instruction nor current artistic practice outside of school were found to be significant predictors of arts use in teaching. Years of teaching experience (highly correlated with age) and subject-area specialties were also not significant in the model. Some age differences might have been expected, given that teachers currently in their

TABLE 3 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Model Summary

Model	Incremental Validity Statistics				Change Statistics				
	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	SE Estimate	R ²	F	df1	df2	Significant F
Step 1 ^a	.275	.075	.066	.7485	.075	7.836	4	384	.000**
Step 2 ^b	.318	.101	.087	.7400	.026	5.430	2	382	.005**
Step 3 ^c	.450	.202	.183	.6999	.101	16.018	3	379	.000**
Step 4 ^d	.621	.386	.364	.6174	.184	28.012	4	375	.000**

- a. Predictors: (constant), grade level, SchlN (school response rate).
 - b. New predictors: gender, years teaching.
 - c. New predictors: Level of past instruction, attendance at art workshop, level of current practice.
 - d. New predictors: Support Component, Constraints Component, Importance Component, Self-Efficacy-Self-Image Component.
- **significant at alpha = .005.

TABLE 4 Summary of Coefficients for the Hierarchical Regression Analysis (n = 389)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Significance of the Slope		Correlations		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	SE	β	t	Sig	Zero Order	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1. Grade level (4 to 6) ^a	-.121	.080	-.068	-1.509	.132	-.048	-.061	.812	1.232
2. Grade level (K to 6)	-.371	.099	-.165	-3.732	.000	-.088	-.151	.843	1.186
3. Grade level (7 to 12)	-.449	.103	-.191	-4.367	.000	-.181	-.177	.857	1.167
4. School N ^b	-.044	.066	-.028	-.664	.507	-.131	-.027	.943	1.061
5. Gender ^c	-.265	.098	-.116	-2.719	.007	-.171	-.110	.905	1.105
6. Years teaching	.064	.004	.082	1.941	.053	.083	.079	.917	1.090
7. Level of current practice ^d	.064	.032	.095	2.037	.042	.216	.082	.754	1.325
8. Level of past instruction ^e	-.014	.029	-.024	-.510	.610	.162	-.021	.755	1.324
9. Art workshop Y/N?	.228	.067	.147	3.391	.001	.273	.137	.873	1.145
10. Component 1 — Importance ^f	.118	.033	.152	3.578	.000	.173	.145	.907	1.103
11. Component 2 — Self	.260	.034	.337	7.678	.000	.373	.311	.851	1.175
12. Component 3 — Support	.098	.032	.127	3.055	.002	.149	.124	.949	1.054
13. Component 4 — Constraints	-.203	.033	-.260	-6.231	.000	-.290	-.252	.940	1.063
Constant	2.611	.087		29.886	.000				

- NOTE: VIF = variance inflation factor.
 Italic = statistically significant at Bonferroni alpha = .005.
 Dependent variable (average of 8 frequency-of-use items).
- a. Dummy coded (kindergarten to third grade = reference group).
 - b. Dummy coded (schools with n > 10 = reference group).
 - c. Dummy coded (females = reference group).
 - d. An interval variable representing current arts involvement (4 levels: rarely, never; occasionally; weekly, monthly; daily).
 - e. An interval variable representing past arts instruction (4 levels: none; 1 year or less; 2 to 4 years; more than 4 years).
 - f. Continuous variables: Mean scale scores calculated for each of four factors on the Teaching with the Arts Survey (TWAS).

20s were elementary school students in the 1980s, after the severe cutbacks in many school arts programs across the country.

Question 3: Motivations and Constraints to Using the Arts in the Classroom

The two open-ended, short answer responses allowed the teachers to respond in their own words about their primary motivations to arts use (Q.31: “What do you feel is the strongest current motivation for you to use the arts in

your teaching?,” Q.32: “What do you feel would motivate you to use the arts more often?”). Analysis of responses to these questions revealed four major themes related to: (a) self, (b) students, (c) curriculum and pedagogy, and (d) external factors. Each of the four themes contained 8 to 15 specific categories of responses. Responses were also coded along a positive (motivation)/negative (concerns or constraints) axis. The relative importance and power of each issue was analyzed by (a) frequency of the response, (b) context and intersections between

TABLE 5 Sample Responses Concerning Self-Issues, Student Issues, Curricular Issues, External Issues

<i>Motivation</i>	<i>Concern</i>
<i>"My strongest current motivation is . . ."</i>	<i>"I would be motivated more often if . . ."</i>
<i>Self-issues</i>	
Q32: For myself, the arts are the most stimulating activities that I undertake. Approaching life through movement and new ways of seeing expand me and allow me to be a more creative and effective person and teacher.	Q33: I need training in how to integrate the arts, since I was never taught how to teach/use music/art/movement in the classroom.
<i>Student issues</i>	
Q32: My strongest past and current motivation for using the arts in teaching is twofold: It taps into one of those multiple intelligences (other than academic), and it helps students who have different learning styles.	Q33: Having a class where arts would not interfere with basic math, reading, and writing time. Having a class that was not so academically needy in fundamental areas.
<i>Curricular issues</i>	
Q32: It is fun! We learn so much about cultures, time periods, ourselves, and curriculum through the arts. We open our creative channels, add to our learning strengths.	Q33: I would use arts more often if it was directly tied into my curriculum. I don't want to (or can't) design projects to go along with my curriculum.
<i>External issues</i>	
Q32: The fact that our principal is very supportive of the arts.	Q33: I would need fewer curricular requirements and unnecessary paperwork, as well as more time to plan and complete activities with the inclusion of the arts.

the issue in question and other major issues, and (c) the issue in question in relation to the respondents' frequency-of-use scores and other grouping variables (demographics, personal experience, teaching experience).

Self issues. The most frequently mentioned issue in the open-ended responses was the need for more training to gain skills and build self-efficacy in using the arts ($n = 114$). Teachers specifically expressed the need for additional techniques and knowledge to make connections with other areas of the academic curriculum. The responses concerning oneself frequently combined specific self concerns (e.g., self-image, self-efficacy) with more general statements about personal experience, interests, and background. The two constructs of attitudes toward the self, personal characteristics, and background, handled separately in the statistical analyses, were frequently linked in the teachers' own words and are clearly interrelated. Teachers' lack of confidence, for example, was most often ex-

plained by their lack of specific training or prior arts instruction.

Teachers were motivated to use the arts by a desire to increase their enjoyment in teaching ($n = 25$), and to enhance their own creativity ($n = 18$). Their motivation also reflected their personal values about art and education ($n = 30$). High arts users were most likely to mention educational philosophy as a motivation, particularly multiple intelligences theory (Gardner, 1983), aesthetic education (Schubart, 1996), and a general philosophy of teaching the whole child. The existence of national, state, or local standards in the arts was not mentioned as a rationale for arts use. Examples of responses about self are shown in Table 5.

Student issues. The teachers' comments about students overwhelmingly focused on the positive value of the arts, citing a wide variety of instructional and social benefits. Their awareness of the diversity of student strengths, learning styles, and intelligences ($n = 85$) was the stron-

gest motivation mentioned. They also discussed the benefits of the arts for students who speak English as a second language ($n = 30$), those with various special therapeutic needs ($n = 16$), and artistically talented students ($n = 16$). They expressed the belief that the arts increase intrinsic motivation ($n = 78$) and enjoyment ($n = 50$) in learning and observed increased thinking and problem-solving skills ($n = 18$), memory ($n = 8$), and discipline ($n = 14$). Students' need to express their feelings ($n = 35$) and physical needs ($n = 19$) were also mentioned. Only five teachers in the survey expressed concerns about arts activities acting as possible distraction or conflict with other academic work. Table 5 also presents examples of teachers' comments concerning student issues.

Curricular and pedagogical issues. Most teachers who mentioned curriculum said the arts enhanced the academic curriculum ($n = 68$), particularly in the areas of literacy ($n = 30$) and cultural awareness ($n = 13$). The most common concerns mentioned were lack of materials ($n = 53$) and lesson plans ($n = 24$), and lack of opportunities to collaborate with colleagues ($n = 47$) and visiting artists ($n = 32$). The demands to cover the curriculum (related to time issues) were another common concern.

Teachers' comments related to curriculum and pedagogy often encompassed other themes—self-issues (involving the need for more training to integrate the arts into the curriculum), student issues (regarding motivation and diversity of learning styles), and external issues (reflecting the pressure to cover the mandated curriculum). The teachers emphasized the need to fit the arts into the existing curriculum rather than teach it as a separate curricular area. Table 5 also presents an example of responses concerning the curriculum.

External issues. Time was the most frequently mentioned external source of concern. Comments about time were most often made in the context of pressure to teach the mandated curriculum (65 of 105 responses) and were also related to issues of autonomy and perceived support for creative teaching methods.

External support was mentioned in relation to direct supervisors, school and district administrators, and colleagues. The responses to the items on the TWAS concerning support from supervisors for creative and artistic teaching methods were positive and relatively high, however the short-answer responses revealed teachers' concerns that they lacked support from supervisors to use the arts more frequently ($n = 43$). After time and support, lack of space was mentioned most frequently as a limitation to arts use ($n = 29$). The space problem may partially explain why teachers used the visual arts most often. Teachers also mentioned lack of arts supplies and money for additional supplies and field trips ($n = 46$) as current and increasing obstacles. Table 5 also presents sample responses about external issues.

DISCUSSION

Staff developers and arts educators may find the results of this study encouraging and troubling. Although the majority of the teachers in this sample report having had 1 year or less of formal arts instruction in their lifetime, they value the arts in education. They believe in its importance in the curriculum and recognize its potential benefits for students. They also express the desire for more artistic and creative experiences in their own lives. Despite these values and attitudes, however, and despite the fact that the arts are offered by their schools or districts as part of professional development, these teachers rarely use the arts in the classroom. There are many reasons for this. Teachers report being hindered by lack of time and by pressures to cover the prescribed curriculum and to prepare students for standardized tests. They express a lack of confidence in their facilitation skills in the arts. Space and materials are in short supply, and support from and collaboration with arts specialists, teaching artists, and experienced colleagues is often absent. Teachers have conflicting perceptions about their own autonomy and the support they have from supervisors to use the arts in the classroom. Responses on the survey reflected generally positive support for innovation and creative

teaching methods, whereas many answers to the open-ended questions focused on the pressure to conform. This apparent contradiction can be interpreted in a number of ways. Despite external pressures, teachers may actually have more freedom to innovate than most take advantage of. Or, the opposite may be just as likely—that teachers' perceptions of support from supervisors and principals would evaporate if they tested the limits by employing the arts in the classroom more frequently.

High-use teachers did not share a common, specific profile in this survey. Women were slightly higher arts users than men, however the differences were small. The attitude components, particularly those related to self-image and self-efficacy, had the strongest relationship to frequency of arts use in teaching. This can be seen as highly encouraging to those interested in developing greater arts use among classroom teachers. If artistic attitudes and self-confidence—rather than arts-rich backgrounds or previously developed sets of skills—are the critical elements for arts use in teaching, then professional development can make a difference in promoting arts-inclusive pedagogy.

The surprising finding that prior arts instruction was not a significant predictor of current arts use might appear to contradict the intuitive assumption that a person's value for and skills in the arts would have been established, to a great extent, through formal arts experiences in childhood or young adulthood. The statistical result is more understandable in light of the fact that with so many teachers (53%) in the lowest level of involvement (less than 1 year), there was relatively little diversity in the sample to explain significant variation in art use.

In the open-ended question segment of the survey, the need for more training to gain skills in teaching the arts ($n = 114$) was the most frequently cited concern. Pressure to teach the mandated curriculum ($n = 105$) was the second most frequently mentioned hindrance to arts use. Despite their belief in the importance of the arts for all students and a sense that many students could especially benefit from artistic approaches, teachers appear to lack the confidence and/or the autonomy to include the arts

in their teaching. Teachers' ability to overcome these impediments is likely tied to Huberman's (1992) concept of "personal teaching efficacy" and Ashton and Webb's (1986) ideas of "general teaching efficacy." Teaching efficacy links the self-perception of competence with the situation-specific expectation that the teacher can successfully influence student learning. Teachers may comprehend the general importance of the arts for students but must have evidence that their own successful inclusion of arts processes will have a positive impact on student performance. They must attempt some aspect of artistic processes or methods on a regular basis (certainly more frequently than the "monthly to rarely" average in this sample) to gain the confidence and gather the evidence of student learning needed to achieve teaching efficacy.

The teachers' personal/self-motivations and concerns are difficult to separate from the curricular and institutional priorities of the schools in which they work and in which they themselves were educated. Concerns about lack of training, for example, appear to reflect the low priority given to the arts in preservice and inservice teacher education. Instructional time in the school day is always a central issue for teachers. The arts take time, however, even more critically, they require a change of pacing, expectations, and methods on the part of teachers. The nature of learning through the arts is fundamentally contrary to the single-right-answer mentality of a test-driven curriculum. Teachers need the motivation and the pedagogical skills to make the transitions within the school day from more didactic processes to the more open-ended approaches found in arts teaching and learning. They also need the autonomy and encouragement from supervisors to alter and adapt their curriculum to include the arts.

Clearly, the constraints of time, space, curricular demands, and testing will not disappear anytime soon. A teacher's ability to change gears, to take risks, to encourage artistic explorations and expression, and to employ open-ended, creative curriculum and pedagogy is an individual endeavor driven by personal commitment. Despite obstacles, some teachers find

ways to integrate the arts on a regular basis. Teachers who have evidence that artistic approaches aid student learning are more able to justify the time spent on the arts and to articulate the benefits to supervisors and parents. In a follow-up interview to the TWAS, one of the high-use teachers in the study explained why her students did improvisational theater games in the week leading up to the state reading exams, whereas the other fifth grades were in intensive test preparation:

It was like an ice-breaker. How can you cram something into a week's period? You just say, "Since we worked so hard since September, let's have some fun expressing ourselves." And [my students] did extremely well in both English Language Arts and in the math. So [the principal] can't really complain. I show them the results. (Oreck, 2001, p. 126)

Although each art form requires certain unique facilitation skills, effective teaching of the arts shares many basic features with good teaching in other subjects. Many current approaches to literacy, science, social studies, and math promote active, student-centered, differentiated, discovery-oriented approaches and involve many of the same specific facilitation skills. A number of teachers referred in the short-answer responses to their training in the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project (Calkins, 1994), hands-on science curricula (Kendall & Marzano, 1997; Saul & Reardon, 1996), and the development of classroom learning and interest centers (Renzulli & Reis, 1997), as preparation for using the arts in their classrooms. These approaches require teachers to act more as facilitators and coaches than purveyors of information, to assist small groups working at different speeds and on different topics, to create flexible and changeable classroom configurations, and to encourage student problem solving and problem finding. Furthermore, the processes used to develop concept-based curricula that encourage higher-order thinking skills (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998) ask teachers to think of curriculum in more integrated, holistic ways. A high-use teacher in the survey referred to her use of the arts in teaching as "finding an alternative way to deliver the same concept using different ideas and methods." She continued:

Everything's connected. . . . I like this concept of teaching not subject by subject but teaching by concept. If we're talking about patterns, let's talk about patterns in all subject areas. If we're talking about the concept of before and after, let's talk about it in all subject areas. . . . If I have a strong handle on the concept, I could basically link to any subject matter and that's where I get the creativeness out. (Oreck, 2001, p. 134)

Ultimately, the ability and motivation of teachers to use the arts as a tool in their practice is related to their complete education—from childhood arts experiences, to preparation in preservice courses, to in-service experiences in the arts and in other subjects. It is difficult to generalize from these results to the larger teacher population because we do not know how many schools include the arts in their professional development program for teachers. This sample was chosen specifically because they worked in a diverse group of urban, suburban, and rural schools where the arts were at least offered. The results suggest some general recommendations for the design of and recruitment for in-service and preservice staff development in the arts.

Recommendations for Professional Development

1. Teachers need ongoing support for their own creative and artistic development. The predominance of self and personal issues throughout the study strongly supports a concentration on teachers' own creative and artistic skills, attitudes, and behaviors. Most arts workshops share this goal to a greater or lesser extent; they tend to include active participation with the teacher's role primarily as the learner. However, the excitement, creativity, and supportive environment generated in an arts workshop is difficult to maintain amid the pressures of the school day. Ongoing support for teacher creativity can take many forms—regular professional development workshops, arts classes for teachers, meetings with colleagues, observations of arts classes and arts-infused lessons, sharing and celebrations of teachers' artistic accomplishments, reading and study groups, and direct encouragement from supervisors.
2. Professional development should help teachers recognize and articulate the impact of the arts on students. The impact of the arts on students was identified as the most powerful motivator for arts use.

Unfortunately, empirical evidence of this impact is scarce and often does not address the primary issues that concern teachers. The oft-cited observation that the arts build self-esteem, although undoubtedly true in many cases, is difficult to measure and does not directly address academic performance issues that concern teachers on a daily basis. Teachers who have seen specific academic and behavioral improvement appear to have the strongest commitment to using the arts on a regular basis.

3. School and district administrators should make in-service arts workshops a higher priority for teachers. Even in schools involved in ongoing partnerships with arts organizations such as ArtsConnection and Lincoln Center Institute, attendance at arts workshops tends to be voluntary (ArtsConnection, 1996). Joyce and Showers (1995) directly linked faculty participation rates with successful implementation of new approaches. The closer a school is to 100% faculty involvement, the higher the level of transfer to the classroom. The low participation rates in arts workshops reported for the schools in this study thus pose a serious obstacle to implementation of the arts.

CONCLUSION

The arts exemplify the conflict between active, open-ended, constructivist approaches and prescribed, narrowly defined objectives of a test-based educational culture described by Dewey 80 years ago. The current educational climate only deepens the rift and raises the stakes for teachers who dare to try new, creative, and artistic teaching methods and approaches. The findings of this study indicate three critical challenges for teachers in using the arts: (a) to nurture and maintain their own creativity and artistic skills, (b) to develop facilitation skills in the arts, and (c) to find a balance between their artistic values and the pressures of their jobs.

As in any professional development initiative, learning to use the arts in teaching has personal and pedagogical components. In the arts, the personal aspect is magnified. To teach artistically, whether engaging in specific arts activities or attending to the aesthetic qualities of experience, a teacher must trust his or her intuition and respond to the individuality of students. He or she must also be able to facilitate confidently, creating an atmosphere in which

artistic attitudes, behaviors, and expression can flourish.

The inner resources of teachers; their attitudes toward art, creativity, and innovation; their commitment to personal growth; and their educational and life values all need nurturing within the school and in professional development programs. The arts, Dewey (1934) contended, can be a model of the kind of experiences we most value in education. Now, more than ever, teachers need support and training to make all teaching more artistic.

REFERENCES

- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- ArtsConnection. (1996). *New horizons* (Report to the Jacob Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Program, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Education Research and Improvement, #R206A30046). New York: Author.
- Ashton, P., & Webb, R. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and students achievement*. New York: Longman.
- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baum, S., Owen, S., & Oreck, B. (1997). Transferring individual self-regulation processes from arts to academics. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 98(4), 32-39.
- Calkins, L. M. (1994). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cecil, N. L., & Lauritzen, P. (1994). *Literacy and the arts for the integrated classroom*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Clark, C., & Joyce, B. R. (1981). Teacher decision making and teaching effectiveness. In B. R. Joyce, C. C. Brown, & L. Peck (Eds.), *Flexibility in teaching* (pp. 228-235). New York: Longman.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159.
- Consortium of National Arts Education Organizations. (1994). *National standards for arts education*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Crafton, L. (1996). *Standards in practice*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Arts as experience*. New York: Minton, Balch & Co.
- Eisner, E. W. (1985). *The art of educational evaluation: A personal view*. London: Falmer Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (1994). *Cognition and curriculum reconsidered* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Fowler, C. (1996). *Strong arts, strong schools*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fuller, E. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-226.
- Gable, R. K., & Wolf, M. (1991). *Instrument development in the affective domain: Measuring attitudes and values in corporate and school settings* (2nd ed.). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Gallas, K. (1994). *The languages of learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gardner, H. (1973). *The arts and human development*. New York: John Wiley.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1990). *Art education and human development*. Los Angeles: Getty Education Institute for the Arts.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: Theory into practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goldberg, M. (1997). *Arts and learning*. New York: Longman.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1992). Toward a place in the curriculum for the arts. In B. Reimer & R. A. Smith (Eds.), *The arts, education and aesthetic knowing: 91st yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 192-212). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, E. W. (1999). Toward an equitable system of educational assessment. In E. W. Gordon (Ed.), *Education and justice* (pp. 119-136). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Hurling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1998). *Taking charge of change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Huberman, M. (1992). Teacher development and instructional mastery. In A. Hargreaves & M. G. Fullan (Eds.), *Understanding teacher development* (pp. 122-142). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1995). *Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Kendall, J. S., & Marzano, R. J. (1997). *Content knowledge: A compendium of standards and benchmarks for K-12 education*. Aurora, CO: McRel.
- May, W. T. (1993). Teaching as a work of art in the medium of curriculum. *Theory Into Practice*, 32(4), 210-218. Columbus: Ohio State University.
- McKean, B. (1998, April). *Teachers' conceptions of arts education: Fostering personal, social and cultural development through the arts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1995). *Degrees and other formal awards, conferred surveys, and integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *The NAEP 1997 arts report card* (NCES 1999-486). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2000, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 5551 (2000). Retrieved January 4, 2003, from www.ed.gov/policy/eseq02/pg80.html
- Oreck, B. (2001). *Teaching with the arts survey*. Unpublished survey instrument. University of Connecticut at Storrs.
- Oreck, B. (2000). *The arts in teaching: An investigation of factors influencing teachers' use of the arts in the classroom*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs. ProQuest Cat. #9999695.
- Oreck, B., Baum, S., & Owen, S. (1999, April). *The development of teachers' skills and confidence in using the arts in the classroom*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Rae, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (1997). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Remer, J. (1996). *Beyond enrichment: Building effective arts partnerships with schools and your community*. New York: ACA Books.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1994). *Schools for talent development*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (1997). *The schoolwide enrichment model* (2nd ed.). Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Sarason, S. B. (1999). *Teaching as a performing art*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Saul, W., & Reardon, J. (Eds.). (1996). *Beyond the science kit: Inquiry in action*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Schubart, M. (1996). Teaching kids to listen: A conversation with Mark Schubart. In J. Remer (Ed.), *Beyond enrichment: Building effective arts partnerships with schools and your community* (pp. 155-162). New York: ACA Books.
- SCOLARI. (1996). QSR Nudist software (Version 4.0). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sizer, T. R. (1984). *Horace's compromise*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smith, J. A. (1966). *Setting conditions for creative teaching in the elementary school*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- SPSS. (1998). SPSS 9.0 [computer software]. Chicago: Author.
- Spolin, V. (1986). *Theater games for the classroom*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Stake, R., Bresler, L., & Mabry, L. (1991). *Custom and cherishing: The arts in elementary schools*. Urbana, IL: National Arts Education Research Center at the University of Illinois.
- Starko, A. J. (1995). *Creativity in the classroom*. New York: Longman.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper-Collins.

-
- Torrance, E. P. (1970). *Encouraging creativity in the classroom*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. Brown.
- Torrance, E. P., & Myers, R. E. (1970). *Creative learning and teaching*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Wolf, D. P., & Reardon, S. F. (1996). Access to excellence through new forms of students' assessment. In J. B. Baron & D. P. Wolf (Eds.), *Performance-based student assessment: Challenges and possibilities: 95th yearbook of the National Society of Education* (part 1, pp. 1-31). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dr. Barry Oreck has worked in arts education since 1974 as a teaching artist, program director, staff developer, curriculum specialist, evaluator, researcher, and

consultant. He directed arts in education programs in more than 150 New York City public schools with ArtsConnection including research projects in talent identification, curriculum design, and student achievement funded by the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Juvenile Justice. He received his doctorate in Educational Psychology from the University of Connecticut and served as assessment chair for the 1997 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in dance. He is a consultant for school districts and departments of education in New York, Ohio, Colorado, and Mississippi and teaches at the University of Connecticut and Long Island University. His monograph, Artistic Talent Development for Urban Youth: The Promise and the Challenge, was published by the National Research Center for the Gifted and Talented and was honored as the best research paper of the year by the National Association for Gifted Children in 2000.