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ESTABLISHING AN AESTHETICALLY

RESPONSIVE CURRICULUM

Abstract

by Adam Imbrogno Attwood, Ph.D.
Washington State University
May 2015

Chair: Anthony G. Rud

The purpose of this exploratory case study is to identify, develop, and posit an aesthetically responsive curriculum theory as a praxis approach for preparing K-8 pre-service teachers in aesthetic literacy throughout their teacher education program. I explore two approaches in the literature that have thus far consisted of the (1) practitioner and (2) theorist models of arts-integration. In this study, these two approaches are fused together as a praxis to posit a solution to the problem of the arts being removed from the curriculum in times of budget cuts. From my analysis of the survey data from pre-service K-8 teachers (n = 37 in 2012; n = 34 in 2014) and my analysis of a broad selection of the literature in curriculum theory, aesthetics, and teacher education, I developed what I call archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory for a praxis model of arts-integration for social studies in particular. I designed an ArchPM-based curriculum product in the form of an illustrated book as an example to begin implementing a new aesthetic literacy through the integration of the arts into social studies and language literacy. Through this
theory-driven practice of aesthetic literacy development, teacher educators may foster exploration of aesthetics as an applied philosophical inquiry in which its application is in the form of curriculum products for teaching aesthetic literacy.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Aesthetics is comprised of the preferences of the individual and the group for visual decoration, music, and the decorative arts in general as they are applied to the built environment and the social environment. A classroom may be decorated according to the teacher’s aesthetic; therefore, the classroom—and any built environment or visual medium, such as clothing and wall decorations or posters—is an aesthetic “text.” The aesthetic affects perception and, thus, has communicative power for curriculum design and implementation (Parsons, 1990; Blumenfeld-Jones, 1997, 2012; Jalongo & Stamp, 1997; Greene, 2001; Oreck, 2004; Wiebe et al., 2007; Sameshima & Vandermause, 2008; Sameshima & Sinner, 2009; Thomas & Beauchamp, 2011; Gelineau, 2012; Lindström, 2012; Costantino, 2013; Frawley, 2013; Nathan, 2014; Strickfaden & Vildieu, 2014).

Background for Why this Study Matters

In times of budgetary and fiscal pressure, art has tended to be among the first programs removed from school programs (Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Apple, 2004; Gelineau, 2012) and so art programs will tend to rely more heavily on external organizations for funding (Burton, Horowitz, & Abeles, 1999). This has long been a problem because when the arts are not a part of the curriculum then some children are excluded who would otherwise engage with the course content if the arts were integrated into the curriculum in ways that encourage children to create materials while the teacher serves as a guide (Haynes & Murris, 2013). There was no second edition of Jalongo and Stamp’s (1997) textbook on aesthetic early childhood education, and the general lack of aesthetics education textbooks seemed to coincide with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) after 2001.
The apparent paucity of *aesthetics education* textbooks for general K-8 pre-service teachers and the tendency to reduce art programs during times of budgetary pressure in schools should matter to educators, because many students can benefit in applying the concepts learned in social studies, science, mathematics, and language through the arts when the arts are integrated into and across those subjects in the K-8 curriculum (Smithrim & Upitis, 2005; Lynch, 2007; Furniss, 2008; Hartjen, 2012; Rex & Woywod, 2014). Although aesthetics education is predicated on the arts and artistic expression in general, aesthetics education is not necessarily synonymous with art education. Aesthetics is also a philosophical study in addition to being a fine arts-based study (Jalongo & Stamp, 1997; Blumenfeld-Jones, 2012). Aesthetics is a conduit for creativity broadly defined and, as such, aesthetics has perhaps the greatest potential for an inclusion praxis in which all students’ creative abilities are encouraged across the curriculum.

This study applies the avant-garde, which is the quasi-experimental in aesthetic theory, to address the problem of the arts tending to be immediately vulnerable in times of budget cuts in schools. Aesthetics is both art inquiry and philosophical inquiry (Berlyne, 1974; Parsons, 1990; Seifert, 1992; Marsh, 2004). The visual, musical, and lyrical portrayals of content in subjects taught in schools—and in teacher education programs—can be better understood through an aesthetic approach to investigating phenomena and developing curriculum that is responsive to each aesthetic brought into the classroom by students and by teachers (Jalongo & Stamp, 1997; Gelineau, 2012; Frawley, 2013).

This dissertation is primarily a contribution to aesthetic curriculum theory (see, for example, Sameshima & Sinner, 2009; Shockley, Bond, & Rollins, 2008), aesthetics in teacher education (see, for example, Jalongo & Stamp, 1997; Oreck, 2004; Frawley, 2013), and philosophy of education (see, for example, Garrison & Rud, 2009; Rud & Garrison, 2010;
Woodruff, 2001). The intended audience for this study are aesthetic curriculum theorists as philosophical inquirers and arts-informed inquirers who are interested in the implications of applying an aesthetic theory to K-8 teacher education curricular practice.

In sum, this study matters because it is an exploratory research study for promoting understanding of aesthetics as an important component for teaching and learning all content areas of the K-8 curriculum. This should begin in K-8 teacher education programs so that pre-service teachers become comfortable with the arts. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) stated in 2006 that “Arts Education is a universal human right, for all learners, including those who are often excluded from education” (p. 3). Arts-integration specialist R. Phyllis Gelineau (2012) asserted that “a teacher need not be an artist, musician, dancer, or other arts professional in order to provide a nurturing arts climate that will vitalize the learning process” (p. 12). This study provides a theory and practice curriculum example to promote this understanding that all generalist K-8 teachers can and should use the arts to promote learning in social studies, language literacy, and all the subjects of the elementary school curriculum.

**Research Problem**

Following Kilbourn’s (2006) suggested outline for the qualitative dissertation, this chapter is organized around the research problem, questions, and background. The research problem is that the arts tend to be among the first programs reduced during budgetary pressure and this has continued for decades (Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Gelineau, 2012), despite studies that suggest that the integration of the arts across the K-8 curriculum fosters learning and engagement in all subject areas (Smithrim & Upitis, 2005; Lynch, 2007; Furniss, 2008; Hartjen, 2012). With this problem identified, the following problem comes into focus: There have been two
approaches to how to increase the role of the arts in K-8 curriculum, but there has been very little research on how to fuse the two approaches together based on the teacher education vantage point in which pre-service teachers themselves are asked about their own K-12 experience with the arts. The two approaches are the (1) theoretical approach and the (2) practitioner approach. I posit an aesthetic theory-driven praxis approach to “bridge” arts-integration theory with practice.

A gap identified. Lars Lindström (2012) suggested an aesthetic framework for K-8 praxis, but Lindström’s framework still lacked a comprehensive theoretical framework for teacher education programming and lacked a curriculum product example for pre-service teachers. The Sameshima and Vandermause (2008) model of “parallaxic praxis” is primarily a fully developed aesthetic research model. My theory—archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory (that I explain in Chapter Two)—fills a gap in the aesthetics education spectrum as a comprehensive theoretical framework within which a curriculum product was developed and posited for practice as an example for aesthetics preparation for pre-service teachers in their teacher education program. ArchPM is posited as a way to fuse the two approaches or “bridge” the practitioner and theoretical models together to generate exploration of how to increase arts-integration across the K-8 curriculum through an aesthetically responsive curriculum in teacher education.

From a teacher identity standpoint, I submit my analysis as part of the discussion that Beatrice Avalos (2011) noted in her meta-analysis of teacher identity studies: “The road starts with informal exchanges in school cultures that facilitate the process, continues in networking and interchanges among schools and situations and is strengthened in formalized experiences such as courses and workshops” (pp. 17-18). Aesthetic identity development was absent from Avalos’s (2011) meta-analysis of ten years of teacher identity studies in the journal Teaching and
Teacher Education, presumably because aesthetic education tended to be on the “borderlands”—to borrow Hokanson and Karlson’s (2013) metaphor—in general research journals. Aesthetics education should have a systematic place in teacher education. With this study, I provide a survey of the literature on aesthetic education as it relates to its potential for teacher education and curriculum design. As such, aesthetically responsive curriculum research may be modelled on this study for larger studies that may be considered for general research journals.

Defining aesthetics within the Common Core State Standards. Currently, it does not seem feasible to ignore the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) when discussing the place that the arts has had in K-8 curriculum and the possibilities for where it can go when informed by a fused practitioner-theoretical model that I posit in this dissertation. This is not an “efficient” process in the twentieth century notion of efficiency that was tied to the “factory” school model (Waks, 2014). ArchPM is exploratory. It is avant-garde, and as such, its foundations are nebulous and not factory-based, because the aesthetic is itself nebulous.

Maxine Greene (2001) defined aesthetics education as: “an intentional undertaking designed to nurture appreciative, reflective, cultural, participatory engagements with the arts by enabling learners to notice what is there to be noticed, and to lend works of art their lives in such a way that they can achieve them as variously meaningful” (p. 6). In the context of trying to design a teacher education course focused on aesthetics, Frawley (2013) discussed aesthetics as an arts-informed “interactive production of knowledge” (p. 23). Lindström (2012) considered aesthetics education to be a facilitation process for elementary students to learn about multiple disciplines in “a balanced curriculum based on teaching and learning about, in, with and through the arts” (p. 178). I conduct this study with the main goal of providing a specific example of how these definitions can be operationalized for an arts-integrated learning environment for pre-
service K-8 teachers when curriculum is theorized around a unified value channeled through an aesthetic design based on that value aesthetically—visually and lyrically—presented in a modern context. This project is also intended to promote additional research that can operationalize arts-integration and, in doing so, celebrates diversity through aesthetic experience—posing and exploring a technique in which aesthetic inquiry is a pathway for individual and societal creativity.

Maxine Greene’s (2001) definition of “aesthetics education” is an avant-garde process of participatory engagement with core content areas—such as social studies, mathematics, science, and language literacy. Greene’s (2001) portrayal of aesthetics education is suggestive of the inherent difficulty in making aesthetics “neat” or “tidy” or even efficiently translatable to fit into a regimented, dichotomous, and hierarchical knowledge transmission paradigm upon which standardized tests tend to be predicated. Nevertheless, Greene (2001) intoned that the challenge to advance aesthetics for a new curricular model should be taken up for the twenty-first century. My study is a contribution to the effort to establish an aesthetic praxis.

I use James Paul Gee’s (2011a, 2011b) discourse analysis method on the survey data collected from pre-service K-8 teachers to address this research problem from the pre-service teacher point of view on their own experience with the arts prior to taking the survey in an arts-integration methods course in their teacher education program. I use Gee’s (2011a, 2011b) method that focuses on grammatical person usage in response to the survey prompts because this is suggestive of their immediate sense of efficacy in relation to the prompt.

Goffman’s (1959) exploration of aesthetic theory was disconnected from the school context; nevertheless, his discussion of performance identity in which the public persona is seen as a performance is very applicable to school environments. Although Goffman (1959) explored
the concept of public identity as performance art, he did not ground his concept in the environment of schools. Aesthetic curriculum design may be considered a third way or intentional supplementary practice that augments standards-based curriculum. Measuring aesthetics is, however, an extremely challenging process. Few scholars have combined the concepts of philosophical aesthetics with arts-based aesthetic curriculum design. This project is important for its theorization of aesthetic education grounded in a series of methodologically diverse case studies that themselves build upon the literature mentioned above and below this line in a way that forms a nexus between lenses. This study is the test case—or first case study—of the aesthetic curriculum theory that I call archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory.

**Purpose**

In summary, this dissertation provides an example of how to address this research problem by an exploratory case study approach (see Yin, 2014) in which varying theoretical and the practical ideas are discussed together based on perspectives in the literature as context for surveying pre-service K-8 teachers for their experiences with the arts and discussing aesthetic literacy. The two approaches in the literature have thus far consisted of (1) practitioner models or (2) theoretical models. There has, however, been very few studies that explore the potential for a fused approach to arts-integrated praxis in social studies. Frequently, this problem is compounded by the tendency to remove the arts from the curriculum during budget cuts (Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Apple, 2004; Gelineau, 2012). The linking of funding of school programs to their test results after the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has been discussed in the fields of educational philosophy (see Rud, 2011, p. 132), as well as the application of NCLB testing standards to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). This put further downward pressure on the arts to find a place in an increasingly
testing-centric STEM curriculum and further pressured by budgetary restructuring (see Sousa & Pilecki, 2013; Shapiro, 2010; Gelineau, 2012; Apple, 2004; Cahan & Kocur, 1996).

**The Importance of Reverence to this Aesthetic Theory for Teacher Education**

According to Paul Woodruff (2001), reverence is an ancient value that is founded upon “a sense that there is something larger than a human being, accompanied by capacities for awe, respect, and shame; it is often expressed in, and reinforced by, ceremony” (p. 63). For example, the visual arts convey meaning that when coupled with certain types of music will form a cohesive aesthetic environment for teaching and learning. I developed what I call archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory to particularly address how to celebrate the individual’s aesthetic in social studies curriculum. This can also be applied to other content areas such as mathematics (e.g. Pythagorean theorem). When the ArchPM-based book designed as part of this study is read aloud with a musical introduction and background music playing, there is an augmented ArchPM effect in which the visual and musical horizons fuse together as a cohesive aesthetic teaching tool to introduce the concept of aesthetics for teaching and learning.

The concept of reverence is threaded throughout this study because of the emphasis of ArchPM as an aesthetic theory for social studies curriculum in particular. Social studies and literacy in grades K-8 are a large component of how values are represented in school curriculum. As such, ArchPM is an aesthetic literacy that combines the arts with social studies. The individual student’s aesthetic work can be celebrated in concert with a teacher’s guidance so that aesthetics is envisioned as a form of curricular equity in which the student co-constructs knowledge. This is a change from the rigidly hierarchical standard imposed by what Waks (2014) suggested was a twentieth century factory-based model of schooling that seemed to have little reverence for the individual aesthetic.
Aesthetically responsive curriculum products are a form of curricular listening. To view a painting at a museum is to “listen” to the artist who created that painting (Dudley, 2010). Likewise, to encourage students to develop their personal aesthetic within the community of the classroom by creating and presenting arts-informed products to demonstrate their learning is to “listen” to that student’s perspective. AG Rud and Jim Garrison (2010) asserted: “Reverence is central to the kind of teaching and leadership we need in today’s schools and listening is one of the prime activities of reverence” (p. 2778, emphasis in original). ArchPM for social studies lessons is a way for teachers to listen to students through aesthetics, which is to say, artistic communication. The ArchPM-based book included as part of this study is an example of a teacher making an esthetically responsive curriculum product (see Appendix D). As a visitor to a museum listens to the artists whose works are on display, a teacher listens to the students whose work is submitted for assessment. Haynes and Murris (2013) suggested that there is “a kind of reverence for what emerges” (p. 217) when “adults are engaged in exploratory conversation or, for example, the practice of philosophising with children” (p. 217). For Haynes and Murris (2013), a student-centered approach is deemed beneficial in which the teacher listens to students so as to adapt education for each students’ creative interests. Pre-service K-8 teachers can be “listened to” through the encouragement of their creativity in designing aesthetic curriculum products. As contributors to aesthetic curriculum, their emerging teacher identities are fostered. They are not merely receivers of static knowledge; rather, they become inventors.

Aesthetically responsive curriculum products should be part of curricular ritual. Curriculum in school is a ritual. There are daily lessons within units aligned to state learning standards written at the top of each syllabus and lesson plan. Pre-service teachers should be encouraged to explore their aesthetic by drawing, painting, digitally designing, and other media
of creative endeavor throughout their teacher education curriculum so that the arts are not just believed to be valuable but are made part of the curriculum ritual so that the arts are more likely to have intrinsic value as an embedded component of school for the individual and the group. Woodruff (2001) contended: “Ritual is more robust than belief and has more staying power, but wherever there is ritual, there must be the reverence to take that ritual seriously” (p. 135). The teacher educator, then, should listen to students through the aesthetic that includes combinations of visual arts and performing arts. When teachers are comfortable with artistic expression, they will be more likely to integrate the arts across the curriculum (Gelineau, 2012; Jalongo & Stamp, 1997). The co-construction of knowledge in aesthetics education conveys meaning through the ritual of the aesthetic—which is to say the process of illustrating the book, adding poetry to the pages of the book, and reading it aloud—and through the teacher listening to each student by validating their aesthetic creations (such as an illustrated book, a drawing of the water cycle, or other similar aesthetic products) as part of the curriculum.

Research Questions

Two research questions are the focus of this study: (1) How can an aesthetic theory be applied to teacher education? And, (2) how can teacher candidates develop their aesthetic identity? These two questions prompted three ancillary questions: (1) Why is aesthetic teacher identity development important? (2) How is aesthetic teacher identity developed? And, (3) what are the implications of aesthetically educated teacher candidates for K-8 curricular practice?

Significance

The significance of this study is in its exploration of fusing the theoretical with the practical. ArchPM is posited as a theory for curriculum design in which I provide a curriculum product example (see Appendix D) based on this theory that helps establish praxis—the bridging
of theory and practice as it relates to arts-integration in social studies. This praxis is an aesthetic way to address the problem of why the arts have tended to be among the first programs cut when a district or school is under budgetary pressure (see Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Apple, 2004; Gelineau, 2012). In terms of school practice, this study provides an aesthetically responsive curriculum product example in the form of an illustrated book for teaching a social studies lesson on medieval culture integrating the subjects of literacy and social studies with visual art and poetic curation of the social studies content. In terms of advocating for aesthetics education, its primary component—arts-integration—can be envisioned on the basis of this study and its ArchPM-based product so that funding may be sought on the basis of ArchPM curriculum, because it is an aesthetic theory with an operational curriculum example (see Appendix D). Taken together, implications are addressed for promoting aesthetic awareness in pre-service teachers. Ideas are generated for teachers to effectively integrate arts-informed perspectives across curriculum from a systematic, theory-driven approach for an aesthetically responsive curriculum design. This study is conducted (1) to renew interest in aesthetics education in K-8 teacher education, and (2) provide an example of an aesthetic curriculum product informed by ArchPM theory.

**Conceptual Framework**

*Like puzzle pieces, this study’s elements fit together on specific sides.* This is a qualitative study within aesthetic theory. The theoretical framework (Chapter Two), the literature review (Chapter Three), and the discourse analysis and discussion based on the survey findings (Chapter Four) can each be viewed as an individual “puzzle piece” and, as such, they are each autonomous studies within this larger study. When read as puzzle pieces that fit together—on their specific “sides”—they link together to form a cohesive “portrait” of a sample of pre-service
K-8 teachers’ perception of the arts. This portrait consists of a sample of K-8 pre-service teachers (n = 37 in 2012 and n = 34 in 2014) for their responses to survey prompts on their experiences with—and points of view of—the arts. Each component is like a puzzle piece that all fit together for the development of ArchPM theory as an aesthetic theory for arts-integration across subjects, especially social studies. The “puzzle pieces” are explored in this study in which I found which sides fit together and, in doing so, a portrait emerged in the form of ArchPM theory with implications for aesthetic curriculum theory and practice that are discussed in Chapter Four and Chapter Five.

Specifically, I first establish Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutical style to contextualize my implementation of James Paul Gee’s (2011a) discourse analysis method to address the research problem in Chapter Four—fusing the theoretical with the practical to develop a theory to bridge the two approaches and identify pre-service K-8 teacher self-efficacy toward arts-informed approaches to teaching and learning from their own stated perspectives. Gadamer (1975/2013) is essential to the theoretical framework of this study because, as Tracie Costantino (2013) noted of Gadamer, his “epistemology of aesthetic experience asserts that the knowledge gained from a work of art is one of insight into the self in relation to the socio-historic context in which one is situated” (Costantino, 2013, p. 209). Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutical style, then, is discussed in Chapter Two against the background of the concept of isomorphism from Gestalt psychology (see Lehar, 2003) in which the isomorphic image can be what may appear as either an optical illusion giving form to shape, or it may be that another form emerges from a different form depending on the vantage point of the trained observer, or it could be the replication of an image in reverse whereby one half of the image mirrors the other half when folded. When the two are fused together, they form the framework for ArchPM theory.
Lehar’s (2003) discussion of Gestalt psychological imagery has roots in the relatively recent subfield of “experimental aesthetics” (Berlyne, 1974) that sought empirically-based assertions in art theory. As such, experimental aesthetics developed following Glaser & Strauss’s (1967/2012) founding of grounded theory. I contextualize the lineage of experimental aesthetics in Chapter Three as an empirically informed process of understanding aesthetics education. As such, the origins of Berlyne’s (1974) “experimental aesthetics” are in grounded theory. Grounded theory, broadly speaking, is a concept of research in which data is typically collected first before the other elements of research so that the data may guide the researcher forward into the potential for developing a new theory from that data (Charmaz, 2006, 2014).

The various potential Gestalt images are themselves allegorical to the combination of the two fields of Gestalt psychology and Gadamer’s hermeneutics. The reason these are allegorical is because the Gestalt image—mirroring of an image so that it is represented in reverse along a horizon—has meaning that can be uncovered or interpreted through Gadamer’s hermeneutical concept of the fusion of horizons or vantage points. ArchPM is this combination in which the aesthetic is the image—visual and audio texts—that have meaning rooted in the past, mirrored onto the present but changed through mirroring. As portrayed in the ArchPM-based curriculum product example, the owl and the related text are allegorical representations of aesthetic communication of history, literacy, and cultural continuity and change.

The combination of Gestalt imagery and Gadamer’s hermeneutics is necessary for this inquiry because it allows me to posit ArchPM theory as a systematic technique for establishing an aesthetically responsive education through a curriculum design that is the product or effect of ArchPM theory itself. The complexities of the proverbial image of what aesthetic education looks like and how an aesthetic teacher identity can effectively augment student learning are the
Gestalt image here that I posit and analyze here through Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutical style. Survey instruments were used to identify themes from a sample of pre-service K-8 teachers in autumn 2012 ($n = 37$) and autumn of 2014 ($n = 34$) and are analyzed in Chapter Four. The surveys are the empirical foundation for ArchPM theory contextualized with the literature.

**Efficiency re-purposed within context of the avant-garde.** Words such as *efficiency* are re-purposed within the ArchPM context. Such words are used because of their ties to the STEAM acronym (science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics) now popular in the discourse surrounding the Common Core State Standards Initiative (see Sousa & Pilecki, 2013). An analysis seemed called for that incorporates both the aesthetic representations of values and the hermeneutical background—that is discussed in Chapter Two—of the given set of values in, from, and of the teacher education vantage point. This dissertation is to be a contribution at the nexus of three fields: (1) philosophy of education and (2) aesthetic curriculum theory with implications for (3) teacher education. This dissertation is *avant-garde*—which is to say an unusual or experimental arts-informed—way of theorizing and practicing aesthetic curriculum theory for the purpose of making aesthetic curriculum design more identifiable and systematic for inclusion in teacher education programs. The avant-garde is itself nebulous and resists reductionism and, yet, the avant-garde can seem ironic. Thus, individual statements from participants’ survey responses can be used as a data collection technique within the context of positing empirically-informed understandings to address research questions focused on aesthetic topics (Seifert, 1992). This dissertation addresses the avant-garde as a generative aesthetic process for teacher education.

**Reading format.** This study is written in a threaded format in which elements are echoed throughout the chapters in this study. The reason for this is that this study is written on the basis
of Ziming Liu's (2005) findings of reading habits in the digital age, because as Liu (2005) stated: “In an increasingly digital environment, readers (especially younger readers) are likely to gradually develop the screen-based reading behavior, and to increasingly use a variety of strategies (e.g. browsing and keyword spotting) to cope with the information-abundant environment” (p. 709, parentheticals in original). With this understanding, I sometimes will echo selected quotes—refer to the same quotes more than once—from theorists and other scholars throughout this study to emphasize their points of view in relation to this study’s theoretical framework, analysis, and discussion.

The method and format are like puzzle pieces that are turned to fit together. Grounded theory informs the research design and why I used surveys for background (see Charmaz, 2006, 2014). In particular, I used surveys as part of a process inspired in Gee’s (2011a, 2011b) discourse analysis method for collecting text upon which to perform a discourse analysis. Some interpretations are explained succinctly and repeated—or echoed—as needed across the chapters in this study to reinforce conceptual understanding by directly bridging the introduction with the theoretical framework and the critical literature review. This succinct scaffolding of analysis is done intentionally to reinforce the reader’s understanding of a complex concept, and this is done on the basis of Liu's (2005) suggestions for effective writing in response to the “evolution of reading” (p. 703) in the twenty-first century context of the busy digital environment.
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory, as an aesthetic curriculum theory situated in a student-centered educational model. As an aesthetic curriculum theory with particular application for the K-12 subject of social studies, ArchPM has application for philosophers of education to process the cultural understandings brought into the classroom by every student. In parallel with Jalongo and Stamp’s (1997) contention that every pre-service K-8 teacher should integrate the arts across the curriculum they teach, Donald Blumenfeld-Jones (1997) noted: “An hermeneutic description of process reveals that consciousness of hermeneutics provides critical and generative aspects for aesthetic experience” (p. 319). An aesthetically responsive curriculum places teacher and student as co-constructors of curricular content, and it is in this process that the celebration of the individual within the group can generate aesthetic understandings of each other.

Jenna Shim (2011) called for the following: “We, as a collective of scholars, researchers, and practitioners committed to diversity and equality, must continue to search for a more realistic and more responsible way to move us forward” (p. 755). With this in mind, I suggest that an aesthetically responsive curriculum design is a tool for accomplishing that “forward” movement in celebrating diversity, because ArchPM as an aesthetically responsive curriculum is co-construction of understanding that provides a foundation for the celebration of the individual as a unique contributor to the community while simultaneously being based on state learning standards and the Common Core State Standards. I provide an example of this on the basis of ArchPM theory and discuss the process of an ArchPM-based curriculum product in Chapter Four.
The theoretical framework is organized as follows: I will explain what I call archeophisomorphic theory on the basis of Gadamer’s (1975/2013) “fusion of horizons” (pp. 313, 317) concept combined with the concept of Gestalt isomorphism (see Lehar, 2003). First, I provide context for this theoretical framework as it pertains to archeophisomorphic theory (or for short, ArchPM theory). Second, I explain my theory by detailing each of the two foundational components—Gadamer’s fusion of horizons and Gestalt isomorphism—and why combining the two is important for identifying how an ancient value may persist into the present. Third, I list and then explain the three definitional assumptions and the elements that comprise those assumptions. Fourth, I explain the archeophisomorphic effect within the context of the theory being an aesthetic educational theory to explain how an ancient social value may persist into the present through artistic (multimedia) representations—visual and textual. Fifth, I detail a limitation of the theory.

**Context**

Archeophisomorphic theory is posited as an aesthetic theory that establishes a praxis under the auspices of a definition, assumptions, elements, and example of aesthetics education. Aesthetics is avant-garde creativity and, as such, tends to be idiosyncratic when students are not required to replicate a template but are instead given examples (such as the book designed as part of this study, see Appendix D) to prompt exploration of their own style. As such, this theory is part of a larger discussion. Jenna Shim (2011) suggested:

*Progressive change* is predicated on (although never guaranteed by) *uncovering* and *understanding* as fully as possible the social, political, and economic organization of the world, which is always mediated by individual selves who are located within the world in specific ways. (p. 742, parenthetical and emphasis in original)
The product tends to matter more than the process in audience perception when artistic representation is focused through a curricular lens. This may be seen when analyzing media portrayal of values—mediated through artistic representation—where the product is the representation itself. The theory that I have developed is what I call archeophisomorphic theory.

As a form of communication, the arts have substantial potential as a teaching and learning process to augment learning across the curriculum. In this study, I focus on an example of applying ArchPM to a social studies unit on medieval culture for middle school students. The implementation of this theory on curriculum design should prompt the archeophisomorphic effect in which learning outcomes are achieved through an aesthetic design that integrates the arts with core subject content, such as social studies. This re-contextualizes Gadamer’s (1975/2013) notion of the “genuine knowledge of essence” (p. 119) to apply the theory developed in this study. ArchPM theory addresses the essence—or end objective of a core subject lesson—through an aesthetically responsive design, in that students achieve the goals consistent with state learning standards while the individual aesthetic may be celebrated concurrently. The learning standards are the essence from the state perspective while the creativity of students are simultaneously the essence from the perspective of an aesthetics educator. A harmony is thus achieved between two vantage points. Both the state and the classroom are revered together and aesthetics is a connector between and across different cultural zones, from the legislature to the classroom. This researcher uses archeophisomorphic theory to unpack artistic presentation of a social value to operationalize aesthetics as a way to achieve learning goals across core K-8 subjects. The picture book that I designed as an application of my theory is an example of operationalization of archeophisomorphic theory—in other words, it is an example of its effect.
Gadamer (1975/2013) suggested that what “is operative in artistic presentation is recognition, which has the character of genuine knowledge of essence” (p. 119). My theory—ArchPM—operationalizes this concept by fusing the concept of the Gestalt isomorph and the cardinal virtue of reverence as an ancient value that is based on this will persist into the present through a systematic artistic representation. The Gestalt image can be what may appear as either an optical illusion giving form to shape, or it may be that another form emerges from a different form depending on the vantage point of the trained observer, or it could be the replication of an image in reverse whereby one half of the image mirrors the other half when folded (Lehar, 2003). The third variant of the Gestalt image is most applicable because of its metaphor for cyclical time in which an ancient value such as reverence is mirrored across time—reverence persists with similar characteristics, but those characteristics are expressed differently.

Archeophisomorph (ArchPM) theory is the conceptual framework of the study and is simultaneously itself a finding in this study. It as an aesthetic curriculum theory for establishing an aesthetically responsive curriculum. This adds specifically to the lines of inquiry into arts-integration for K-8 generalists discussed by Oreck (2004) and Frawley (2013). Establishing aesthetics across teacher education programming likely necessitates an efficient praxis—the bridging of theory and practice—that is a change in process of curriculum design that this study posits. What Joseph, Mikel, and Windschitl (2011) called “reculturing” (p. 57) applies to this study, because implementation of an aesthetically responsive curriculum in K-8 first requires a critical understanding of K-8 pre-service teachers’ perceptions of the arts as an integral component of aesthetics. This study addresses this critical component.

Teacher education, and more specifically, teacher induction programs (see Ingersoll, 2012) is the structure in which creativity should be introduced, because it here where teachers
can explore aesthetics more safely as a quasi-experimental space for creative curriculum.

Induction programs in teacher education prepare newly admitted students for their practicum and coursework and include professional development for first- and second-year in-service teachers (Ingersoll, 2012). Induction introduces a systematic introduction to becoming a teacher and for teachers early in their career, and so it is through induction that the style of the teacher education program is set (Ingersoll, 2012). Michael Parsons (1990) suggested that there was a duality in aesthetic literacy in which the art histories were malleable and dynamic rather than fixed which formed a basis for the call “that a knowledge of aesthetic development is necessary for curriculum planners” (p. 146). Timothy Frawley (2013) called for discussion in ways teacher-researchers may apply aesthetics to teacher education. This dissertation is primarily an answer to that call. With this in mind, this study establishes a theory and technique of initiating an aesthetically responsive curriculum design. I theorize how aesthetic teacher identity can be fostered in teacher education through the philosophically arts-informed perspectives of aesthetics. The goal is to generate aesthetic awareness in pre-service teachers through artistic representations across curriculum from a systematic, theory-driven approach. This is what I call the archeophisomorphic effect that establishes an aesthetically responsive curriculum design.

**Archeophisomorphic Theory**

The foundations of archeophisomorphic theory are influenced by the concept of isomorphism in Gestalt psychology (see Lehar, 2003) and Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutical concept of the “fusion of horizons” (pp. 313, 317) and its related practice in ontological “play” (p. 107). I acknowledge Gestalt theory’s limitation as a theory rarely if ever used in the context of clinical psychology; however, for the purposes of this sociocultural study, Gestalt isomorphism has relevance (see van Leeuwen, 1989; Lehar, 2003; Köhler, 1947/1992; Stadler &
Kruse, 1994, for discussion of the evolution of Gestalt psychology). Gestalt isomorphism—from the Greek *isos* ("same") and *morphe* ("form")—is of value here primarily for its use in the visual arts where an image is mirrored on the other side of the paper forming a cohesive image—seemingly historical, yet flipped, and thus different (Lehar, 2003). This has particular application to teaching social studies content in which history is one of the subjects of the field of social studies.

**Toward combining the Gestalt isomorph and Gadamer’s “fusion of horizons”**. The Gestalt image is a metaphor for how historical concepts can be presented today in the classroom in which manifestations of history—how society arrived at this point—can be bridged with current culture so that students may be able to identify how the past may still be relevant to understanding why society is the way it is today. Although there are other Gestalt isomorphs, this is primarily the basis of its understanding. This study is at a nexus between identifying and examining a cultural value both historically and philosophically, and examining a cultural value as influential today. However, Gestalt isomorphism and Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutics are insufficient in and of themselves to explain: (1) the persistence of material culture as ways of expressing identity, and (2) how and why those values retain similar form yet manifest in practice through different expression in the modern context—the isomorphic image in social studies curriculum. Therefore, I posit archeophisomorphic (or ArchPM) theory.

The basic morphology of ArchPM is as follows: *archeo* for ancient, prehistoric, or “long ago;” *phi* for philosophical; *iso* for same; *morph* for form (see Figure 1).
Figure 1. The morphology of the conceptual term archeophisomorph.

Archeophisomorphology is the study of cultural values as expressed through contemporary curricula within current and recent cultural context. This includes studying how cultural values have been and continue to be expressed and applied in contemporary time through philosophical preference for grafting cultural components of the past into the present. Such a value or value matrix—such as the chivalric ethos—is an archeophisomorph (see Figure 2).

The curricular archeophisomorph can be studied in alignment to K-12 state learning standards or Common Core State Standards through archeophisomorphic theory. This is an aesthetic curriculum theory in which its effect can be implemented in curriculum design, such as a sixth grade arts-integrated social studies unit on medieval culture. The process transforms retro components as they merge with a modern democratic society. Although this may appear anachronistic at first, such values tend to enter the present in modified or reimagined forms through the informal curricula of popular audio-visual media (Ashton & Kline, 2012; Pugh & Aronstein, 2012).
Figure 2. Visual outline of archeophisomorphic theory.

Gadamer (1975/2013) asked: “Why do we speak of the fusion of horizons and not simply of the formation of the one horizon, whose bounds are set in the depths of tradition?” Gadamer posited that “understanding becomes a scholarly task . . . necessary to work out these circumstances as a hermeneutical situation” (p. 317), and the projection of a “historical horizon, then, is only one phase in the process of understanding” (p. 317). Lehar (2003) similarly suggested of Gestalt isomorphic visual representation that:

In a global sense there are peculiar distortions apparent to the percipient which are caused by this deformation of Euclidean space, for although the sides of the road are perceived to be parallel, they are also perceived to meet at a point on the horizon. (p. 399)

The Pythagorean theorem is a mathematics concept, for example, that can be taught through an ArchPM approach in which the reverence for numbers is a basis for the Pythagorean concept.
Fuse the initially disparate horizons of perspective together and a new pattern emerges for application to arts-integrated social studies curriculum in how to understand why a social concept could persist through preservation in artistic representation that was aesthetically conveyed through the updated expression of the value of the chivalric ethos in the present. Such a preservation could be possible because the “same form”—the isomorph—was established through Disney’s artistic representation of the chivalric ethos based on its history but transformed through an updated expression of the underlying value that generated the desirable attributes of a given value. Just one of many examples, was Disney et al.’s (1937) movie character Prince Charming which was recently updated again in the television series Once Upon a Time (see Kitsis et al., 2012). This is one representation and there are competing negative portrayals, including Giroux and Pollock’s (2010) critique of Disney as a corporation that promulgates stereotypes through movies and toys marketed to children.

The artifacts of values promulgated through the Disney aesthetic are suggestive of what Blumenfeld-Jones (1997) called a “species of play” (p. 319) in which making art and perceiving works of art are a dialogical process that generates new meaning. It is important for pre-service teachers to be encouraged to make art as part of the process of understanding core subjects so that they may be more comfortable with the arts as a form of teaching and learning in their future classrooms. “This suggests that the arts may be educationally justified,” according to Blumenfeld-Jones (1997), “because of the ways we can understand ourselves and live in a particular way through the making of our own art works” (p. 319). ArchPM is a theory for this understanding of the force of aesthetics in teacher education for promulgating and changing perceptions, and here is why ArchPM is of particular relevance for social studies curriculum and why the making of art and the critique of art is integral to the process of ArchPM (see Figure 2).
**Assumptions.** Reverence is assumed here to be a cardinal virtue, because it is a virtue or value shared across civilizations and across time, though its *expression* differs according to the local culture (Woodruff, 2001; Garrison & Rud, 2009; Rud & Garrison, 2010). Three definitional assumptions form the superstructure of archeophisomorphic theory: (1) The past is part of social awareness in which ancient or even prehistoric cultural values continue to be applied (in modified forms) in contemporary society, (2) values tend to retain some of their root characteristics through artistic expression even as other components of the expression of that value evolve, and (3) social thought tends to be cyclical rather than strictly linear. The archeophisomorph is a more-or-less ancient value or value matrix that is melded into the present culture. These three definitional assumptions of superstructure are summarized into definitional efficiency terms: (1) continued application, (2) root characteristic retention, and (3) cyclicality through aesthetic representation. Within those definitional assumptions of superstructure, there is one primary assumption: The assumption of modified persistence. This assumption consists of two elements: (1) An ostensibly anachronistic value must be founded on the cardinal virtue of reverence to persist into the present (see Woodruff, 2001; Garrison & Rud, 2009; Rud & Garrison, 2010, for discussion of reverence as a cardinal virtue), and (2) the value will retain its core characteristics on the basis of the cardinal virtue of reverence through a modified aesthetic expression or aesthetic manifestation of the given value.

**The Archeophisomorphic Effect**

The ArchPM effect is the creative product of the theory—primarily, the effect is a curriculum product that features the characteristic elements of ArchPM that fosters aesthetic awareness and development. It is important to understand this effect as being potentially enacted by just about any teacher who—as Robinson (2009) suggested—finds their “passion.” This
passion is then put into practice—the ArchPM effect—regardless the factory school system that, according to Waks (2014), tended to emphasize rigid credentials over creativity. Gelineau (2012) asserted that teachers do not need to be professional trained studio artists “to provide a nurturing arts climate that will vitalize the learning process” (p. 12). An arts-integration course that promotes aesthetic education broadly is important for developing pre-service teachers’ efficacy with arts-integration. Through this inclusive approach to celebrating creativity, the ArchPM effect is not isolated to any one particular individual or group but, rather, is an equitable possibility across groups who can accomplish the effect by fostering each student to create by exploring various media—paint, drawing utensils, music, et cetera—and then allowing everyone to share so that all listen.

**Symbolic irony as aesthetic teaching and learning.** With this study and the positing of ArchPM theory, I bring into focus that which has been on the “borderlands” of teacher education: aesthetic development, aesthetic training and presentation, and the generative potential of an aesthetically responsive curriculum. In doing so, teacher educators may achieve what Tough (2012) suggested of “grit” for improving quality of life and what Hokanson and Karlson (2013) called “grit or creativity in a knowmadic society” (p. 112). In this section, I discuss various art theorist-practitioners who perform applied aesthetics. As such, they provide examples of aesthetics education. Specifically, I discuss art theorist and historian Anne D’Alleva (2012), singer and performer Madonna Ciccone (1990/2009), and aesthetic performer Marina Abramović (2010; Marina Abramović Institute, 2013). A teacher who is aesthetically aware—who has developed their aesthetic identity within their teacher education program—performs in their own customized or couture way not unlike these three aesthetic communicators for maximizing learning through arts-informed expression.
Art theorist and historian Anne D’Alleva (2012) suggested this “knowmadic” grit in taking the imagination and applying it to knowing a phenomenon:

Ideally, working with theory enables you to think more deeply and critically about your research topic and better prepares you to analyze arguments in the literature, synthesize different perspectives, evaluate arguments, and develop your own interpretation with subtlety, rigor, and imagination. (p. 156)

Through her iconic lyrics in the song “Vogue,” Madonna Ciccone—usually referred to only by her first name—popularized imagination as a ‘high fashion’ concept that could be for everyone. If an individual would explore their creativity through an identification of their preferred style or styles, then those individuals may apply their imagination to be a part of high fashion. In Madonna’s song, “Vogue,” lyrics emphasize that through the celebration of the individual:

And you long to be something better than you are today … / Come on, Vogue, let your body move to the music, hay hay hay / Come on Vogue, let your body go with the flow /

. . . All you need is your own imagination / So use it, that’s what it’s for . . . Your dreams will open the door. (Ciccone, 1990/2009)

The lyrics are up tempo and in avant-garde celebration of the individual aesthetic. “Vogue” is symbolic of the popular culture than many students bring with them into the classroom; therefore, a teacher may utilize popular cultural aesthetics in an ArchPM-based curriculum. This song, in particular, is emblematic of inviting everyone to use their imagination, which in turn, can be curated to support equity and access in and through the arts. The key is in the curation of the imagination and applying imagination to create services or products. The evocation of an aesthetically responsive curriculum is to acknowledge and celebrate the efficacy of the individual to create.
Madonna may seem a controversial choice as a popular cultural symbol for aesthetic responsiveness, because the Madonna aesthetic may be critiqued on the basis of Hebdige’s (1985/1999) critique of the magazine *The Face*, for example. Hebdige (1985/1999) suggested that magazines and, in particular, the imagery in magazines tends to transmit fantasy in which a magazine such as *The Face* “is not a ‘just’ magazine” because “in the depths of the recession, it renounces social realism, liberation theology and the moralists’ mission to expose and combat social ills and promotes instead consumer aesthetics and multiple style elites” (Hebdige, 1999, p. 106). It may be, however, that this ostensible irony is itself the very vanguard of aesthetic awareness in that its shock value may outweigh its immediate veil of irony to encourage the viewer forward out of curiosity to experience the aesthetic not as a nebulous entity but, rather, as a personification of aesthetic identity. In the case of Madonna’s “Vogue,” it can be used as a beginning popular culture bridge with students to discuss topics in the social studies through a critical lens that has more resonance with the aesthetic “irony” of Madonna’s “Vogue” to begin class discussion.

Part of the teacher identity is the symbolism of educative authority that tends to be imbued with praxis identities of advocate, nurturer, and judge. These are aesthetic “masks,” because the teacher rarely would be overtly labeled as such but, rather, would communicate those roles through various aesthetic accoutrements, such as certain types of clothing, classroom decoration, and even the color of pen used with which to grade papers. Conscious and subconscious choices are used when choosing such ostensibly basic grading tools—such as whether to use a *red* pen or a *blue* pen. These are aesthetic choices with which the teacher communicates to the student their role.
To celebrate tends to infer a judgment of acceptance and it is in that power that the legal authority of teachers resonates through the symbolism (see Burnett, 1987, for discussion of ancient justice symbolism). With this understanding, the importance of celebrating children’s creativity through arts-integration across curriculum becomes more urgent because art-making is part of identity-making. Burnett’s (1987) example of the symbolism of justice is important in discussing aesthetic teacher identity, because teachers are authority figures who are expected to sit in judgment of student’s behavior and work performance. Twentieth century symbols of the teacher in American culture tended to be the red apple, ruler, and chalk board. The ruler is akin to the scepter, the chalk board to the blindfold—of “objective” knowledge transmission or knowing—and the apple to the nourishment of the bench upon which “Lady Justice” sits. Justice is represented through the aesthetic in which teacher’s grade students which is a form of judgment. The two semiotic clusters of authority and justice coincide and are communicated not so much through spoken words or written text, but through the symbolic—visual and musical—transmission of words and texts that can have resonance in conveying the logic of the teacher identity as a judicial authority figure. The teacher acts as judicial authority over the work submitted by students.

The performance art of Marina Abramović (2010, Marina Abramović Institute, 2013) featured at the Museum of Modern Art, New York City (MoMA-NYC), was an example of public performance curriculum in teaching and learning about aesthetic awareness. It was a performance piece in a visual arts museum. At first, this may be ironic, but the authority of Abramović’s (2010) aesthetic was a socially magnetic performance exhibition in which the MoMA-NYC seemed to become a place of aesthetic judgment in which the general public would line up for hours to interact with the high fashion at the nexus of performance art and visual art
as an exercise in a personified aesthetic interaction. The audience could interact directly with Abramović to co-construct a *couture* aesthetic piece inside the MoMA-NYC. A member of the audience would sit in front of the seated Abramović and she would stare at them for as long as they could bare the aesthetic gaze. This interactive couture aesthetic is a process of aesthetic ritual—as ritual is a component of reverence (Rud & Garrison, 2010)—that can be adapted to teacher preparation in that the curriculum design and implementation itself is an aesthetic performance. When understood in this way, pre-service teachers in an ArchPM-based model are educated in aesthetic performance as creators of couture curriculum as much as, if not more than, technical replication of curricular templates.

**The avant-garde is to aesthetics as the scientific method is to science.** Fostering creativity in K-8 teacher education is likely to be an avant-garde process, because, as D’Alleva (2012) suggested, arts-informed theories of a phenomenon may be partially predicated in poststructural notions. The avant-garde is to aesthetics as the scientific method is to science, which is to say: The uniquely unusual is to the nebulous symbolism of the visual and musical as rigid normativity is to the observably replicable. As such, this section explores a summary of what contextualizes ArchPM.

Teaching creativity can sometimes have opaque outcomes that are not readily recognized by pre-determined formal assessment measures such as standardized tests and similarly static evaluation instruments. Nevertheless, formal assessment of creativity is needed for validation and transferability. This challenge is in the intellectual risk-taking of creating and presenting arts-informed theories such as ArchPM. According to D’Alleva (2012), arts-informed methods have intellectual roots in multiple dimensions such as those of Deleuze’s discussion of imagination and temporality. Barthes’ (1971/ 2007) discussion of the signified and the signifier
is also of note here because of an understanding of how a work tended to either be understood mostly through philology or through hermeneutics. And so, this discussion comes full circle back to aesthetics as both philosophical inquiry and art inquiry. Philosophically—or the phi in archeophisomorphic theory—is more about hermeneutical approaches to knowing (see Gadamer, 1975/2013) and applying aesthetics to, and across, the curriculum.

Aesthetics is part of quality of life, because aesthetics is learning through application of the imagination, the entertainment of the senses, and the development of style. These things are not separate from time or place and so the archeo in ArchPM theory is necessary for understanding retro style and ironic style that can juxtapose media to challenge the senses to learn and adapt. Part of the learning process, then, is through the stimulation of the visual and auditory senses to provoke thought or, in the words of Hokanson and Karlson (2013), learning is through knowing. And to know, is to do—even if that doing is in the imagination only (Holmes, 2010). While evaluating the visuals of the picture book with the accompanying text (see Appendix D), the reader and viewer are engaged in a semiotic process dialoguing with the text through the Consilio owl character in which the name and owl mean “wise advice” (see Figure 3).
According to D’Alleva (2012), the reader and viewer of an illustrated book interpret the images or pictures, “because pictures are not natural or self-evident, but created according to a ‘pictorial language’ that must be deciphered” (p. 37). Some picture books “are so rich that they spark endless debate and interpretation” (D’Alleva, 2012, p. 37). The many possibilities that artistic representations allow are foundational to arts-integration being important as a generative process in teaching and learning (Blumenfeld-Jones, 1997). Sometimes, a teacher will want to encourage long processes of interpretation, because the challenge of interpretation is like a puzzle in which students must adapt their skills to the ever-emergent challenge of interpretation of that which is both pictorial and contextually ambiguous because of temporal shift in which
what was created years ago may have a different context when placed in the present. Sometimes, though, a teacher may want to provide relatively quick approaches to interpretation in which students learn patterns and apply those patterns to images so as to efficiently identify and categorize. Both approaches are important for identifying and interpreting templates of old and identifying potentially new processes.

To emphasize that the arts are within everyone, arts-integration should be systematically embedded in teacher education, beginning with induction. Pre-service teachers and in-service teachers can enact creativity when teacher educators explore the arts themselves and then foster that exploratory creativity across subjects. ArchPM theory—when viewed as a part of what Rud and Garrison (2010) called a reverence for teaching and leading—undergoes modification through formal and informal curriculum to an original form of what Lave and Wenger (1991) suggested of the apprenticeship. What P. B. Joseph (2011) called the “implicit”—or informal—curriculum has some intellectual roots in the apprenticeship model that combined training and education into one component that was called the apprenticeship in which one or two apprentices worked under the direction of a master at the given craft. The credential was not in the form of a diploma, per se, but was in the experience of the apprenticeship in which the completion of the apprenticeship conveyed a skill set that the individual could then independently conduct the craft and improve through its practice.

The arts are very much at the nexus of training and education in which a practitioner of the arts need not necessarily have what Waks (2014) alluded to as “factory school” (p. 188) credentials. The autodidactic potential of the arts is a major example of why internships or apprenticeships tend to make more sense in what Waks (2014) calls the emergence of “Education 2.0” in which: “The Internet, in short, has dramatically reduced transaction costs for bringing
even those without diplomas onto work teams. It has also sharply reduced management costs, as workers use it to self-organize for collaboration” (p. 61). The modification of the apprenticeship is to foster what I refer to as the “sandbox” style of teaching and learning in which the teacher provides materials, tools, and an introduction to those materials and tools while the students create from their own aesthetics. The same applies to teacher educators who can create curriculum as a product based on aesthetic awareness, which itself means that teachers experiment with the arts and become artsy. The product of ArchPM theory is what I call the archeophisomorphic effect. The isomorphic image of a past style of art, such as intaglio, can be modified by a creative inquirer into a new impressionism or perhaps something without a label of the past. This is to say that the image of the past—that which is considered a “traditional” or “established” art form—is mirrored onto the present. This mirroring creates a similar, yet differently situated imaged, and so the isomorph is formed.

To teach arts-integration is not to teach fine art; it is to teach creativity in which the fine arts and craft arts are part of the process of learning and applying that learning to create (Jalongo & Stamp, 1997). It is in the fostering of creativity, that teachers may be released in part from the burden of the factory school’s rigid credentialism (see Waks, 2014, for discussion of the factory school model) and what philosopher Jacques Rancière suggested—according to Tyson Lewis (2014)—was the “ossification, or institutionalization of certain sensible hierarchies” (p. 3). Lewis (2014) summarized a purpose of educative creativity based on the work of Rancière. For Rancière:

The rupture that defines politics is always an aesthetic disfiguration of conventional distributions of who can speak and think, what can be seen, and finally, what can be heard. In other words, what genuine political and artistic acts share is a creative labor to
introduce new forms of speech and activity that challenge the distribution of allotted roles in a given society. (Lewis, 2014, p. 3)

Echoing a related application to K-8 teacher education, Gelineau (2012) asserted: “a teacher need not be an artist, musician, dancer, or other arts professional in order to provide a nurturing arts climate that will vitalize the learning process” (p. 12). With an understanding that all teachers have the arts within, they should be encouraged to unlock their creativity and teach through the arts. In doing so, they will likely encourage their students to be creative. Didactic learning is, thus, mediated through individual creativity. Indeed, Mary Renck Jalongo and Laurie Nicholson Stamp (1997) championed the notion that teachers who are not arts professionals can and should foster aesthetics in the classroom through arts-integration across the curriculum. For example, Jalongo and Stamp (1997) explain: “Mr. Brody, a student teacher, is a good example . . . By sharing his enthusiasm for art with the children (rather than by being a professional artist himself) Mr. Brody has contributed to children’s aesthetic education” (p. 17, parenthetical in original). Aesthetics can improve quality of life, and elementary teacher education programs should promote aesthetics as an integral component of teacher education so that when they become in-service teachers they will celebrate students’ creativity as aesthetic process and aesthetic product. This is an important consideration that should be integral to elementary teacher education.

Aesthetic representations of a value—as expressed through artistic representation—also seems to have parallels in theories of biological evolution that Jablonski (1986) called the “Lazarus effect” (also see Evans & Hecht, 1993, p. 323) to describe how a species can reappear after a long absence from the known ecosystem. The cultural equivalent of this seemed to need a name, so I posit that a social value can reappear after a long absence from the known cultural
system and this can be called the *archeophisomorph.* This is a cultural reimagining based on cyclical reanimation based on material culture as much as on the social culture that material artifacts represent. In other words, ancient social values and cultural elements can be partially reanimated—though not fully replicated—by grafting ancient elements onto the present culture. It is in that which was perhaps taken only on face value, that Liz Rex and Christine Woywod (2014) suggested: “A basic concern of material culture studies is that there are objects so integral to our lives that we sometimes forget to consider their meanings” (p. 40). For example, scrapbooking was noted by some respondents to the 2012 survey in the data analysis section in the next chapter. Scrapbooking may not initially be considered a fine art in the traditional high fashion sense; however, it seems to be what Rex and Woywod (2014) called “vernacular” art. It is vernacular art that forms a part of the foundation for material culture in which generalist pre-service K-8 teachers can immediately see themselves as members of the arts world. Rex and Woywod (2014) asserted that: “Material culture approaches to art education broaden the scope of relevant objects and practices considered” (p. 40). Emphasizing and celebrating every students’ vernacular art is a way to encourage K-8 teachers to integrate the arts across the curriculum.

What I call the archeophisomorphic effect is more than the mere reappearance of a social value; it is a cultural retrieval, reestablishment, and modified reanimation of a value perhaps thought to be anachronistic but actually still able to take root in the present. This is much like the reemergence of Leonardo da Vinci’s artwork going from obscurity to prominence (Bark, 2009). The archeophisomorphic effect is when artistic representation of an ancient or older social value is modified for enactment in the present by aesthetically accentuating its perceived desirable characteristics—that may be ahistorical—thus promoting the persistence of that value. With this
in mind, social “evolution” may be contextualized as a cyclical process rather than a simple linear process.

Gadamer (1975/2013) suggested ideas that partially prompted this path with his discussion of “ontological play” (p. 106) which can be a horizon upon which an individual and, perhaps more importantly, a group can engage in aesthetic ways of operating within social structures (Blumenfeld-Jones, 1997). John Dewey (1934/2005) suggested: “There is always a gap between the here and now of direct interaction and the past interactions whose funded result constitutes the meanings with which we grasp and understand what is now occurring” (p. 284). My application of Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutical perspectives are central to this theoretical framework. Hamlin, Wynn, and Bloom (2007) suggested further context—that may be adapted to Gestalt isomorphism—in their study of social encoding in preverbal infants based on visual cues. The formal curriculum can be modified through an informal curricular process. It is in the social curriculum of formal and informal sources that cyclicity may be analyzed for identifying whether an ancient social value has been modified for present use.

In sum, the archeophisomorphic effect is the outcome of the theory in which I provide an aesthetic curriculum product example. An archeophisomorph is its operationalization in curriculum. Archeo is used on the basis of Hawkes’ (1954) contention and spelling: “Archeology can create what anthropology cannot escape [in] the intellectual need of, namely, a sound critique of the comparative method in its reasoning” (p. 168). In other words, there is always possibility for new interdisciplinary approaches that adapt archeology. Michel Foucault (1972/2010) applied creative discursive analysis in The Archaeology of Knowledge. The philosophical inspiration is derived from Gadamer’s (1975/2013) discussion of “ontological play” (p. 106) and the “fusion of horizons” (p. 317) in the hermeneutical sense where
dichotomous values and labels can become disrupted and even transformed. Aesthetic education is important for pre-service teachers to become more invested in arts-integrated methods of teaching and learning as they can engage in ontological play through the arts and develop their aesthetic identities in practice to foster creativity across the curriculum.

The phi in archeophisomorphic theory. Archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory is situated in the field of aesthetic theory which is both philosophical inquiry and arts-informed inquiry (see Goffman, 1959, for performance identity; Greene, 2001, for a definition of aesthetics education; Wiebe et al. 2007, for the arts as a lens of understanding; Frawley, 2013, for aesthetic theory in teacher education). Greene (2001) suggested that an aesthetic approach to learning is to notice seemingly isolated incidents or cases and then identify potential intricacies of pattern. As such, this is in the tradition of qualitative inquiry that is avant-garde and at home in the Deweyan style. Angela Marsh (2004) contended that “John Dewey mandated the repositioning of our experience of art within the realm of the everyday” (p. 91). Jim Garrison (1997) noted that Dewey’s influence on qualitative inquiry defied “prevalent assumptions about the nature of thought” (p. 101) because, for Dewey, “existence is an event, an indeterminate temporal process, defined as a transaction between organism and environment” (Garrison, 1997, p. 101). This study is further rooted in a qualitative inquiry that Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (2005) defined as: “A complex, interconnected family of terms, concepts, and assumptions” (p. 2) to explore and examine social phenomena through the use of “semiotics, narrative content, discourse, archival and phonemic analysis, even statistics, tables, graphs, and numbers” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 7). As such, ArchPM theory itself engages in ontological play with memory (Gadamer, 1975/2013). This is exemplified in the ArchPM illustrated book
for an arts-integrated social studies lesson on the medieval imaginary as it emphasizes literacy across time as the present emerged from the past (see Appendix D).

Grounded in aesthetic theory, this study’s theoretical framework is predicated on archeophisomorphic theory that is rooted in a combination of (1) Gestalt isomorphism (see Lehar, 2003) and (2) Gadamer’s (1975/2013) “fusion of horizons” concept. I intertwine these two perspectives to establish identification and analysis of the latent value of the chivalric ethos surviving into the twenty-first century context of classroom life based on society’s tendency to maintain certain values through a veiled sameness. To combine these perspectives is—taking Gadamer’s metaphor to its next iteration—to imagine and cross a conceptual event horizon where a latent value is identified and brought to the surface for analysis. The use of discourse analysis methods (see Gee, 2011a; Foucault, 1972/2010; Iverson, 2010) in this study further pushes Gadamer’s (1975/2013) assumption of the heuristic hermeneutic beyond its borders toward a conceptual event horizon that promotes creativity in curriculum development. As such, the concept of the conceptual event horizon is theorized here on the basis of approaching the theoretical limits of Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutical concept of what he called the “fusion of horizons” (Gadamer, 1975/2013, p. 317). This concept was a “basis for intersubjective understanding” (Burbules, 1993, p. 113) that I combine with isomorphism—the same form expressed differently depending on visual perspective (see Lehar, 2003) or, stated another way, the isomorph is the sameness between two phenomena in a different context (see Stadler & Kruse, 1994). By doing so, a core understanding of the persistence of an ancient ethos in the United States may be elucidated and implications for curriculum may be established.

Gadamer (1975/2013) applied the concept of *horizons* as a way of understanding situational social complexity. Gadamer (1975/2013) noted:
Every finite present has its limitations. We define the concept of ‘situation’ by saying that it represents a standpoint that limits the possibility of vision. Hence essential to the concept of situation is the concept of ‘horizon.’ The horizon is the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point. Applying this to the thinking mind, we speak of narrowness of horizon, of the possible expansion of horizon, of the opening up of new horizons, and so forth. (p. 313)

I posit that archeophisomorphic theory is a new horizon in aesthetic curriculum theory in which the hermeneutic of an ancient value can be identified through a survey instrument in which participants inform the researcher of their vantage points. The researcher then contextualizes participants’ particular vantage point through an evaluation of informal and formal curriculum. Gadamer (1975/2013) framed the concept of horizon within hermeneutical terms:

Since Nietzsche and Husserl, the word has been used in philosophy to characterize the way in which thought is tied to its finite determinacy, and the way one’s range of vision is gradually expanded. A person who has no horizon does not see far enough and hence over-values what is nearest to him. On the other hand, ‘to have a horizon’ means not being limited to what is nearby but being able to see beyond it. A person who has an horizon knows the relative significance of everything within this horizon, whether it is near or far, great or small. Similarly, working out the hermeneutical situation means acquiring the right horizon of inquiry for the questions evoked by the encounter with tradition. (p. 313)

Applying Gadamer’s (1975/2013) concept of the horizon to education is important for providing a framework for conceptualizing the intricacies of the crisscrossing psychological and sociological pressures. This has implications for understanding aesthetic identity as a temporally
disjunctive process based on the textual, the audio-visual, and what Lisa Mazzei (2004) called the “silent listening” in discourse analysis.

The present educational context tends to be in continual flux; therefore, identity in education is rarely static. In describing an experience of understanding identity as process, Gadamer (1975/2013) posited that “the horizon of the present is continually in the process of being formed because we are continually having to test all our prejudices” (p. 317). Gadamer (1975/2013) asserted:

An important part of this testing occurs in encountering the past and in understanding the tradition from which we come. Hence the horizon of the present cannot be formed without the past. There is no more an isolated horizon of the present in itself than there are historical horizons which have to be acquired. Rather, understanding is always the fusion of these horizons supposedly existing by themselves. (p. 317, emphasis in original)

I identify an aesthetic horizon in the vantage points of pre-service K-8 teachers based on survey instruments and the aesthetically responsive curriculum product (see Appendix D). It is in Gadamer’s (1975/2013) following question and response that the framework for ArchPM fuses with Gestalt isomorphism:

If, however, there is no such thing as these distinct horizons, why do we speak of the fusion of horizons and not simply of the formation of the one horizon, whose bounds are set in the depths of tradition? To ask the question means that we are recognizing that understanding becomes a scholarly task only under special circumstances and that it is necessary to work out these circumstances as a hermeneutical situation. (p. 317)

This is the central tenet of the phi in archeophisomorphic theory. Gadamer’s (1975/2013) concept of fusion of horizons (German: *Horizontverschmelzung*) suggests that individual
existence is neither totally unique nor is it without uniqueness. It is, rather, a middle way that disrupts binary thinking. Inferred in Gadamer’s (1975/2013) concept of fusion of horizons seems to be that individuals tend to be situated within a dialogical context. With this understanding, survey instruments are a major part of the inquiry for this study to provide additional evidence for the archeophisomorphic effect that is situated as a contribution primarily to aesthetic curriculum theory in teacher education (see Frawley, 2013).

The isomorph in archeophisomorphic theory. The archeophisomorph, as I call it, is an ancient or prehistoric or “long ago” value that temporally ricochets through aesthetic representations of components of the value’s iso (‘same’) morph (‘form’) today. The limitation—or caution—for archeophisomorphology is rooted in its partial reanimated anachronism in the aesthetic form of the visual and performing arts, because artistic representation of texts can be far more powerful than a written text by itself (Strickfaden & Vildieu, 2014). ArchPM, then, is rooted in isomorphic imagery—a visual representation mirrored similarly between and across times to replicate portions of informal and formal curricula. Implications are especially prominent for arts-integrated social studies curriculum.

The material culture of the past—the artistic representations of culture—are celebrated in museums while simultaneously being cherished and debated as the media of intra-cultural and inter-cultural communication (see Dietler, 1994; Marsh, 2004; Nystrom, 2006; Price & Feinman, 2008; Dudley, 2010; Strickfaden & Vildieu, 2014), and reified in popular media while subsequently interfacing within formal curriculum and informal curriculum of the classroom and the household. Popular media is a representation of informal social studies curriculum, because popular media uses the visual arts and musical arts to convey social expectations and generate social desire for material and non-tangible goods. In short, popular media—such as Disney et al.
(1937)—have long appealed to the visual and musical representations of the past for a monolithic aesthetic in which philosophy and the arts are united toward an informal curricular goal. It is in that fusion of horizons—to use Gadamer’s (1975/2013) terminology—that the one mirrors onto the other, as a Gestalt isomorph, and projects across the social environment of the school.

A key example of an archeophisomorph is the Disney aesthetic. For example, Disney et al.’s (1937) *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* was mirrored into the twenty-first century in Mercer, Patel, Roth, and Sanders’ (2012) adolescent remake *Snow White and the Huntsman*. The dynamics of the characters, such as Snow White and the Prince were mirrored—similar archetypes, yet situated with some variation of perspective in which the values remained essentially unchanged while their representation in visual and lyrical linguistics were updated for the twenty-first century.

Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Ron Suskind (2014), for example, suggested that students brought Disney culture with them into school and that it was helpful for some students with autism because of Disneyland’s cohesive artistic and upbeat atmosphere that translated the form of the movie into the form of a physical person in Disneyland. Gillian Furniss (2008) included a Disney-inspired drawing—made by a student with Asperger’s Syndrome—on the front page of her article “Celebrating the Artwork of Children with Autism” published in *Art Education*. The Disney aesthetic is generally unitary and its strength tends to be in its integration of the visual, musical, and performing arts into a cohesive culture that acts as an informal curriculum synchronizing effectively with the formal curriculum of the school.

**The archeo in an archeophisomorph.** The arts tend to be both enmeshed in history and simultaneously part of society’s process of redefinition and future (Carrier, 1987; Gelineau, 2012). Gelineau (2012), in particular, suggested that art communicates stories as much, if not
more than, history. Art and history are communication and, as such, are fused together. How this fusion is used has been under debate. Berk and Galvan (2009) called for a “rethinking” of institutions and the influence of the individuals who comprise them “experientially, and as Dewey does, conceptualizing rules as skills” (p. 575). John Dewey (1934/2005) suggested in *Art as Experience*: “There is always a gap between the here and now of direct interaction and the past interactions whose funded result constitutes the meanings with which we grasp and understand what is now occurring” (p. 284). Therefore, according to Dewey (1934/2005), that “gap” between the past and present has “risk” (p. 284).

Likewise, some scholars in anthropology (see Dietler, 1994; Nystrom, 2006) have identified “appeals” to the past based on material culture as risky, and cautioned against “paradoxical” (Dietler, 1994, p. 584) identity construction based on combinations of current political ideology with an incomplete understanding of the archaeological and ancient historical records of indigenous societies. Dietler (1994) was essentially criticizing propaganda—itself an art form—claiming that prehistory and history have power when reanimated by politicians; therefore, anyone using such intellectual tools for political purposes should undergo critical review based on archeological research (based on research studies such as Becker, 2000).

**The “DiNy Caution”**. Similarly, Nystrom (2006) noted in a study of the infamous case of the controversial origins of the Chachapoya culture (see Gregor, 2014; Hirst, 2014, for update on the controversy) that scholars “should approach research agendas that purport to elucidate the nature of prehistoric ethnic groups with caution” (Nystrom, 2006, p. 340). Thus, the cautions of Dietler (1994) and Nystrom (2006) are what I collectively refer to as the *Dietler-Nystrom caution* or the *DiNy caution*. This is a central limitation of archeophisomorphic theory and its product, the archeophisomorph. It is good practice to consider the *DiNy caution* when discussing the
effects of an archeophisomorph and its visual representations in both the informal curriculum of popular media and the formal curriculum of workbooks, worksheets, classroom design, and instructional style.

Dietler (1994) was rightly criticizing prejudiced ideological uses of the past for political brinksmanship, but this does not seem to be the case with much of the current literature from sources such as the Society for Creative Anachronism (SCA) (2009). The SCA seemed to have sought to coalesce the scattered constructive components of equity from past cultural elements and integrate them into an aesthetic form for an egalitarian and constitutional, democratic society. As such, the SCA is an example of an archeophisomorph because of the artistic approach that it took to design textiles on a visual theme linked to its historical roots. In other words, the SCA communicated through linguistic isomorphs and textiles, or what Strickfaden and Vildieu (2014) called the “tactile image.” When an observer sees a neo-medieval gown or suit of clothes, for example, the observer may consider that visual representation as both historical and contemporary—a “fusion” of both horizons, to borrow Gadamer’s (1975/2013) terminology.

The DiNy Caution as key term in the limitation of ArchPM theory. The DiNy Caution is envisioned within archeophisomorphic theory as a “key term” and “an anchor of scale” (American Psychological Association, 2010, p. 105) with the additional understanding that it is a term establishing that the researcher has checked for potentially regressive problems in the cultural syncretism (see Drell, 1999; Dunker, 2008) or reanimation phenomenon of template replication through visual representations in popular media. The DiNy caution should be addressed as part of sound practice in an archeophisomorphological study. This is in keeping
with the American Psychological Association’s (APA) statement in 1994 and its reiteration in
2010:

  The *Publication Manual* presents explicit style requirements but acknowledges that
alternatives are sometimes necessary; authors should balance rules of the *Publication
Manual* with good judgment . . . In that sense, it is a transitional document. (American
Psychological Association, 1994, p. xxiii; APA as cited in APA, 2010, p. 5)

Therefore, subfields may change or emerge and establish new vocabulary to explain the
phenomena that is studied in that subfield.

  I acknowledge Gestalt theory’s limitation as a theory rarely if ever used in the context of
clinical psychology; however, for the purposes of this sociocultural study in the field of aesthetic
curriculum theory, Gestalt isomorphism has relevance (van Leeuwen, 1989; Lehar, 2003;
Köhler, 1947/1992; Stadler & Kruse, 1994). Gestalt isomorphism—from the Greek *isos* (“same”)
and *morphe* (“form”)—is of value here primarily for the metaphor of its art in which an image is
mirrored on the other side of the paper forming a cohesive image—seemingly identical, yet
flipped, and thus different (Lehar, 2003). This study is at a nexus between identifying and
examining a cultural value both historically and philosophically, and examining a cultural value
as influential today.

  **The archeophisomorph in summary.** The present—when systematically understood
from an understanding of the past—can create a value matrix isomorph. In other words, the
scholar zooms out and a whole image comes into focus, but only after zooming out and
systematically identifying its characteristics (Lehar, 2003). The seemingly disparate occurrences
of artistic representations throughout informal and formal curricula may go unnoticed by the
casual observer. However, when systematically analyzed—as is done in this study—the occurrences are revealed to be a pattern of transformative reemergence.

I use a survey instrument that I designed because it efficiently extracts what Joseph, Mikel, and Windschitl (2011) called the: “Local experiences of visioning, experimentation, and reflection that reveal reculturing as a complex process involving interrelated elements” (p. 57). With this assumption, the critical literature review coupled with the survey data provides the analysis of literatures and empirical evidence to reevaluate and recontextualize what aesthetics can be for teacher education and, by extension, K-8 curriculum. This is under the heuristic concept of “fusion of horizons” (Gadamer, 1975/2013, p. 317) in which aesthetics—being about the philosophy of beauty and its manifestations in the built environment of museums, houses, offices, and schools (Blumenfeld-Jones, 2012)—is discussed here as a form of communication and, as such, is a literacy that can be operationalized through archeophisomorphic theory.

Addressing the debate about aesthetic portrayals of values in popular media. When considering the DiNy Caution, as I call it, for ArchPM theory’s limitation, it is important to address how social expectations are represented through the aesthetic of illustrated books, movies, and toys as part of the informal social curriculum. In this section, I apply the DiNy Caution to a few Disney examples of aesthetic portrayal. Giroux and Pollock (2010) and other scholars (see Coyne & Whitehead, 2008; Lehr, 2001) have critiqued modern revivals of medieval and ancient fairy tales. The debate seems to have polarized scholars. For example, Maryam Kia-Keating and Yalda Uhls (2015) and England, Descartes, & Collier-Meek (2011) critically advocated a positive, or at least nuanced, interpretation of some of Disney’s aesthetic portrayals of social values which are what I call archeophisomorphs, and England et al. (2011) claimed that Disney movies have portrayed “androgynous” characters. However, Giroux and
Pollock (2010) among other scholars have been sharply critical in another way, claiming that Disney is too often replicating outmoded social tropes.

ArchPM theory cannot fully avoid this debate, but ArchPM is not on either “side.” Instead, ArchPM is an aesthetic theory with vast implications for social studies curriculum in which aesthetically responsive curriculum design can go either way in the debate depending on the teacher who uses this theory. ArchPM is a tool and, as such, can be utilized for individual purposes that cannot be predicted. Tools do not “take sides.” However, ArchPM, as a tool, can be used by individuals who may or may not take a “side” to any given debate that usually pervades the social studies curriculum and, indeed, the entire curriculum across the subjects taught in school. ArchPM is a way to envision the arts for integration across the K-8 curriculum and especially in and for social studies. Nevertheless, the convention of critical theory in education (see, for example, Giroux & Pollock, 2010) stipulates that any curriculum theory intended for practice be placed within context of the critical debates surrounding schools. This section addresses this expectation.

Disney movies are an example of a popular aesthetic that forms a major component of the informal curriculum. The audio-visual combination with creative writing has fostered a highly influential aesthetic. Maria Tatar (2004)—for another example of one of the origins of Disney’s new mythology—suggested that ancient and medieval Germanic folklore, while sometimes having disturbing elements and partisan political agendas, tended to also originally emphasize values that were considered desirable for a pleasant world. In other words, the original fairy tales, such as Snow White were closer to the Disney versions, or at least they could be modified by Disney, which Disney et al. (1937) apparently did with the old Germanic fairy tale of Snow White (as one of many examples) to be more in parallel with contemporary vocabulary. The
seven dwarves (see Disney et al., 1937), for example, may have been interpreted as personifying a team whose duty it was to defend Snow White from unscrupulous people who might have been trying to take undue advantage of her. The original Germanic fairy tale, then, could be interpreted to have had elements of defense of honor. Identification of values in folklore or fairy tales is an important factor in trying to identify indigenous cultures, prehistorically speaking, in the context of a complex modern discourse (see Lehr, 2001; Tatar, 2004).

The idealized courtly life in Disney et al.’s (1937) *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* and the *Cinderella* movies for example, portray the knight as servant, defender, and entertainer. Although portrayal of gendered concepts tends to be uneven and not necessarily consistent, there tend to be patterns of children’s literature authors taking medieval fairytales and updating their language for contemporary audiences (see Lehr, 2001). It is with this understanding that children’s literature authors such as Munsch (1980/2002) and Hanel (2010) seemed to have written their books with a specific reimagining of the chivalric ethos for the present and, as such, contribute to the informal curriculum with Disney’s portrayal of knighthood.

Disney seems less concerned with historical presentation than they are with reimagining the past for the present (see Coyne & Whitehead, 2008; Giroux & Pollock, 2010; England et al., 2011; Padilla-Walker, Coyne, Fraser, & Stockdale, 2013; Suskind, 2014), and therein lies the key to unlocking the nexus between these above perspectives for part of the reason for the persistence of the language of chivalry into the present informal curriculum. Perhaps Disney—being one of the most influential players in the social informal curriculum—is not changing values but, rather, the expression of values. Disney’s market share of the youth consumer market was recently inferred by Suskind (2014) who suggested that Disney was an integral part of the informal curriculum for acculturating children (see Suskind, 2014; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013).
Popular songs in the twenty-first century mirror and interact with the Disney-fostered concept of the knight that re-envision and adapt the knight-errant portrayed in medieval secular poetry (see Zeydel, 1966). For example, Katy Perry’s 2013 song “Dark Horse” has lyrics directly referring to Disney et al.’s (1937) version of chivalry when male singer Juicy J (Perry’s co-singer) sings: “That fairy tale ending with a knight in shining armor” (Perry, 2013). The “knight in shining armor” stereotype seems to have been both championed and disrupted in Disney movies and is one of the most popular forms of transmission of the chivalric ethos in the modern age (see Giroux & Pollock, 2010; Coyne & Whitehead, 2008; England et al., 2011).

When considering “chivalry,” the Disneyesque portrayal of chivalry is generally linked to “princess” characters. Recently, the Disney movie *Frozen* (Del Vecho, Lasseter, Buck, & Lee, 2013) seemed to portray a version of androgyny that England et al. (2011) suggested disrupted an old stereotype of chivalry: “The princess characters were rescued 17 times and performed only 13 rescues in the films. However, the prince characters were more androgynous in the frequency of rescuing actions: the princes rescued 13 times and were rescued 13 times” (p. 560). Overall, those data seem to suggest a reanimation of the chivalric characteristic of service—in the cases England et al. (2011) reviewed, chivalric service was expressed through defending a peer who was in danger. England et al. (2011) suggested that some characters in Disney movies recently tended to have androgynous social characteristics, especially the male characters. The main protagonists in *Frozen* seemed emblematic of the new Disneyfied chivalry that is androgynous and focused on what psychologists Kia-Keating and Uhls (2015) called a “universally appealing desire to be happy and free” (para. 17) that underscored Walt Disney Pictures’ *Frozen* (Del Vecho et al., 2013).
In *Frozen*, the two princess characters did not have to say “chivalry.” They enacted the Disneyfied chivalric principles of loyalty and honor to what Kia-Keating and Uhls (2015) suggested were the key attributes exhibited by the two princess co-protagonists: familial loyalty, overcoming emotional challenges in constructive ways for the community, and being “happy and free” (para. 18). Commentators and scholars (such as Colazzo, 2013; Giroux & Pollock, 2010) have argued against the Disney aesthetic as an uncritically romanticized portrayal of inherited social expectations.

The aesthetic products of The Walt Disney Company are part of an aesthetically built environment that provides the context for children to play-act in the stylized toy-like “Magic Kingdom” of Disney Land in California and Disney World in Florida. Many parents tend to express the refrain: “We can’t help indulging in fantasy” (Suskind, 2014). Interest in artsy interpretations of prehistory and history today seems to be growing and inspiring new retro cultural syncretism that is rooted in a reimagined past emphasizing those aspects or characteristics perceived as beneficial for contemporary culture. This popular culture trend may perhaps be a new variant of “post-historical” (see Carrier, 1987) aesthetics. Dietler (1994) expressed the scholarly and systematic interpretation of archaeology and history as a static thing. However, some or possibly most people tend to interact with prehistory and the past on a dynamic basis rather than on a systematic basis.

**ArchPM as “catalyst” for arts-integration in social studies.** Some art historians, according to Parsons (1990), asserted a “dual focus in the history of art” (p. 146) in which an artist’s original intended meaning for an artwork is “irrelevant” because “the significance of the style” modulates depending on local culture (p. 46). Most individuals probably tend to use the past dynamically with their present context. Groups such as the Society for Creative
Anachronism (2009) may, perhaps, exemplify a reimagining of parts of past culture that are not really “past,” but are, rather, carefully curated for a pleasant present. Walt Disney, himself, seemed to try to do this through establishing a new mythology based on a romanticized cultural syncretism via The Walt Disney Company (see Suskind, 2014; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; England et al., 2011; Giroux & Pollock, 2010). The chivalric ethos, for example—as artfully portrayed in Disney and Reitherman’s (1963) movie *The Sword in the Stone* as well as Disney et al.’s (1950) *Cinderella* and its sequels—was one of those cultural components that seemed to be in process of being reimagined for a syncretistic culture rooted in a new mythology. It is with this understanding that ArchPM advances the arts as an aesthetic communication across time and subjects.

An aesthetic process seems beneficial for the K-8 school context, because of its adaptability across fields to address ways to foster creativity in the learning. This study is a reflection of this understanding that is—to quote Fainstein’s (2014) recent assertion about the interdisciplinary field of urban planning—“better defined by the issues it addresses than by any dominant paradigm or prescriptive approach” (Fainstein, 2014, para. 3). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) asserted practically the same for qualitative educational research, and Lather (1993; 1986/2001) suggested similar of poststructural validity. Through the surveys, I have come to posit archeophisomorphic theory in which Lather’s (1986/2001) concept of “catalytic” validity (p. 352) may be established through the curricular archeophisomorph.

Archeophisomorphic theory is a way to fuse horizons—to systematically analyze seemingly disparate aspects of a pattern. In this case, an ancient social value is identified and preserved through philosophical evaluation in which its form is the same but its expression is applied differently than in its original time. This is doing what Gadamer (1975/2013) stated of
establishing the hermeneutic experience of a continuing tradition: “It immediately recombines with what it has foregrounded itself from in order to become one with itself again in the unity of the historical horizon that it thus acquires” (p. 317). I am substituting the chivalric ethos for the “it” that Gadamer was discussing, because the chivalric ethos fits Gadamer’s aesthetic hermeneutic and is relevant for the ArchPM-based social studies curriculum product example in this study as it is both artfully portrayed and an archeophisomorph.

**Conclusion**

Gadamer’s (1975/2013) “fusion of horizons” (p. 317) concept together with Gestalt isomorphism (Lehar, 2003) form the framework for this study, because the two perspectives provide a foundation for an analysis of how an ancient social value may persist into the present through informal and formal curriculum. In summary, Gadamer’s (1975/2013) fusion of horizons is the combining of multiple points of view to focus attention on a pattern. Gestalt isomorphism is a critical nuance as I apply it to aesthetic theory, because the isomorph—as a visual representation—is the “same form,” but that same form may be expressed differently depending on the linear perspective from the point of view of the viewer in space and time.

Neither perspective is sufficient in isolation, but when they are combined—as I have done here—they provide a foundation for an aesthetic theory of education in which ancient values may be identified, preserved, and established through artistic representation and language in an informal and formal curriculum. I call this archeophisomorphic theory to provide a comprehensive theoretical framework for a systematic identification of ancient social values in the present for potential modification of the identified values for K-12 curriculum. I posited at the outset that if my attempt to identify a cultural norm in the interplay between formal and informal curricula were to be successful, then it would suggest that there are other ancient
cultural norms—such as the Japanese samurai ethos—to which this research process could also be applied to identify its place in the informal curriculum. As the data analysis will show, archeophisomorphic theory was successfully applied to create an example of the ArchPM effect as a curriculum product (see Appendix D).

**ArchPM Definition**

The definition of archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory is: A theory of aesthetic education in which teaching and learning across Common Core subjects is fostered in an individually unified audio-visual and textual style for the production of formal curricular products based on a representation of a modified ancient value for teaching multiple subjects that catalyze students to develop and apply their aesthetic to producing products. The ArchPM effect has one operational definition. The ArchPM effect is the product that is the result of a unified audio-visual and textual style (see Appendix D) that can cause a change in students’ perception to self-efficaciously enact their own personal style for the benefit of all students’ learning. As such, the ArchPM effect is a product of ArchPM theory that is intended to be a way for teachers to develop and apply their aesthetic to curriculum. This should then catalyze (see Lather, 1986/2001, for discussion of catalytic validity) students’ individual aesthetic awareness to develop and apply their aesthetic to the formal curriculum.
Overview of the Lineage of Modern Aesthetic Inquiry

Aesthetics has been called a type of literacy that, according to Parsons (1990), intertwined psychology and art history to make “style an important educational topic” (p. 145) for conceptual and experimental studies. The field of “experimental aesthetics” emerged in the latter twentieth century predominantly under the direction of Berlyne (1974) and ostensibly influenced by the founding of the grounded theory approach by Glaser & Strauss (1967/2012). Berlyne’s (1974) “experimental aesthetics” was originally an empirically-based or quasi-experimental form of inquiry through art theory that drew on the disciplines of art history and philosophy. One of the studies that set the stylistic tone for experimental aesthetics in educational research was conducted by Lauren Sue Seifert (1992) who concluded:

> Even naive observers who had had no formal courses in art or art history displayed aesthetic sensitivities to differences in works of art. Furthermore, they felt comfortable making judgments about the relative aesthetic values of paintings, and they freely expressed the reasons for those judgments. (Seifert, 1992, p. 77)

Seifert’s (1992) assertion can be seen as part of the foundation for how arts-integration was later conceptualized for generalist K-8 teachers. Nevertheless, there was still a gap in addressing pre-service teachers’ perceptions, understandings, and self-efficacy of—and with—the aesthetics of the visual and performing arts. This is particularly important, because it is the pre-service teachers who will influence children’s perceptions of their aesthetic self-efficacy. Five years after Seifert’s (1992) study, Jalongo and Stamp’s (1997) precedent-setting textbook for pre-service K-8 teachers was published in which aesthetics as artmaking-across-the-curriculum was
championed for all K-8 teachers to use the arts as a teaching tool in multiple subjects. This established a precedent in aesthetics education for K-8 teacher preparation programs to include an arts-integration course.

Maxine Greene’s (2001) work expanded the field of aesthetics education as both art inquiry and philosophical inquiry. Frawley (2013) suggested that pre-service teachers should have aesthetics education as part of their teacher preparation program. Such a course was envisioned, as noted by Frawley (2013), for the purpose of generalist K-8 teachers becoming creators of aesthetic content. This art production approach would be more exploratory than hierarchical with the intent of fostering student-centered creativity that would lead to self-efficacy for integrating arts-based approaches to teaching and learning the content of subjects in mathematics, science, social studies, and literacy. This, as discussed by Jalongo and Stamp (1997) in their textbook for pre-service teachers, can increase the likelihood of in-service teachers fostering and celebrating their students’ aesthetic learning through aesthetic content production in schools for and with multiple subjects. When teachers are encouraged to create and co-construct learning with their instructors, they will be better equipped to co-construct a student-centered learning environment in elementary school.

Pauline Sameshima and Anita Sinner (2009) brought aesthetics-based inquiry to another forefront to address pre-service teachers’ understandings through “dialogic inquiry” in which the allegory of soma heliakon (Greek for “the solar body of the sun”) was used as part of their application of Sameshima and Vandermause’s (2008) parallactic praxis research model. Aesthetic inquiry advances deeper understandings through creative communication and content creation that inspire through metaphor and allegory. Sameshima and Sinner (2009) specifically addressed this through the “interconnected artful expressions of a poem” (p. 272) that were developed from
“our e-letters, coding and collecting salient phrases and aspects that continued to resonate in relation to teacher education” (p. 272). This literature review summarizes themes in the field of aesthetics education as it relates to teacher education.

**Philosophical Context for Aesthetic Theory for Teacher Education**

The teacher as an individual is already aesthetic; however, the individual teacher may not be aware of, or know how to, develop and use their aesthetic. Frawley (2013) asserted that coursework in aesthetics can be a very important part of teacher education. Defining aesthetics and applying aesthetics in teacher education is a challenge that has been in need of additional inquiry, to which this study provides some of that additional analysis for addressing the great potential benefits of aesthetics for all pre-service K-8 teachers and their students. At first, aesthetics may seem like an abstraction, but when an aesthetic way of being is internalized it can then be a process of teaching and learning with realized change. Maxine Greene’s (2001) definition of aesthetics education is the working premise from which this discussion proceeds:

‘Aesthetic education,’ then, is an intentional undertaking designed to nurture appreciative, reflective, cultural, participatory engagements with the arts by enabling learners to notice what is there to be noticed, and to lend works of art their lives in such a way that they can achieve them as variously meaningful. (p. 6)

Frawley (2013) further suggested that “interactive production of knowledge is the hallmark of aesthetic education” (p. 23). The potential power of aesthetic theory for teacher preparation may further emerge in context with the work of Sameshima and Sinner (2009) whose work suggested a type of aesthetic practice for teacher-researchers in which analysis of student work can be done through artistic representations that emanated from learning more about the self, or *soma heliakon*. That is, the intentional aesthetic promotes learning to transcend rote
memorization and becomes an interactive process of intrinsic motivation to adapt, which tends to increase proactive learning and application of learning. This practice has implications in that theoretical reification of the identity of teacher is influenced by various strands—historical, contemporary, and the combination of the two for a reimagined identity aesthetic, or what Joseph, Mikel, and Windschitl (2011) called the process of “reculturing” (p. 55).

Joseph et al.’s (2011) conceptual process—reculturing—informs the context of this study in that the development of an aesthetically responsive curriculum tends to evoke the need for an intrinsic reculturing from pre-service teachers as they develop into teachers. This context sets the stage for shifting a paradigm of twentieth century curriculum that was influenced by Ralph Tyler (1949/2013). According to Peter Hlebowitsh (2013), critics of Tyler (1949/2013) claimed that his curriculum theory was an “atheoretical construct . . . controlling the school curriculum in ways that are unresponsive to teachers and learners” (p. viii). After collecting data through two different surveys (see Appendix A), I began to establish archeophisomorphic theory that formed a theoretical construct for an aesthetically responsive curriculum.

**Aesthetics for every pre-service K-8 teacher to explore.** To teach arts-integration is not to teach fine art; it is to teach creativity. Jalongo and Stamp (1997)—in what was a precedent-setting textbook on aesthetic education focused on early childhood education—championed the notion that teachers who are not arts professionals can and should foster aesthetics in the classroom through arts-integration across the curriculum. For example, Jalongo and Stamp (1997) explain:

> Mr. Brody, a student teacher, is a good example . . . By sharing his enthusiasm for art with the children (rather than by being a professional artist himself) Mr. Brody has contributed to children’s aesthetic education. With each of the activities listed, he
watched children’s interest in modeling and sculpting renew and expand” (p. 17, parenthetical in original)

Gelineau (2012) similarly asserted: “a teacher need not be an artist, musician, dancer, or other arts professional in order to provide a nurturing arts climate that will vitalize the learning process” (p. 12). In other words, a teacher can teach through the arts without being a professional artist or professional art teacher. Seifert’s (1992) study in experimental aesthetics suggested that students without prior training could analyze art. Thus, autodidactic learning of, and through, the arts can be fostered in pre-service teachers in an arts-integration course that combines constructivist approaches to teaching and learning to foster aesthetic development in students (Barry, 1996).

When students create content, they are more likely to be invested in the learning process. This can be particularly powerful for learning when combined with the teacher’s oversight in guiding students’ creative process (Berlyne, 1974; Jalongo & Stamp, 1997). If the professor of the arts-integration course is successful, the pre-service teachers will have a new or renewed confidence in their own process of art-making that leads to continued production of aesthetic curriculum products.

Jalongo and Stamp (1997) asserted that creativity is an aesthetic process that can be learner-centered and, when creativity is fostered by the teacher, the creativity is learner-directed. In particular, the benefits of aesthetics education may be seen in early childhood education through all grade levels. Aesthetic education utilizes multiple senses, arts, style, and design so that early learning can be as much “child-directed” as it is teacher-directed because:

Child-directed means that the child monitors his or her own progress and does not need excessive adult intervention to complete the desired task. In order for children to initiate
and direct arts activities, classrooms must create conditions for learning in the arts.

(Jalongo & Stamp, 1997, p. 15)

The same could also be said for pre-service teachers during their coursework. It is in the fostering of creativity, that K-8 students and pre-service teachers may be released from the burden of the factory school’s rigid credentialism that has historically stymied the self-directed learning of additional specialties throughout adulthood (see Waks, 2014, for discussion of the factory school model). Pre-service and in-service teachers may instead emerge, as if from a chrysalis transformed, to encourage students from a space of youthful naïve wonderment through their own exploration of learning through the arts.

A credential should not stop someone from exercising newly developed skills not listed on their curriculum vitae earned years ago. Stated another way and based on Waks’ (2014) discussion, the credential awarded in the factory school system was one-dimensional. The vitae of an ever-emergent curriculum should have wider recognition for just-in-time work on the basis of this dynamic credential. Instructors should be adaptable to asymmetrical skillset development through facilitated autodidactic learning. If curriculum is ever-emergent, then the access to a practice, service, or craft should be through practitioner demonstration of creative and not through static diplomas. This is important for practicing arts-integration in particular, because the generalist K-8 teacher is expected to teach multiple subjects and should have confidence in their creativity—and their style—to foster learning and innovation across multiple subjects through the arts.

**The subjectivity of style in aesthetic perception.** A sample of recent research suggested that a systematic analysis of teacher identity formation and self-reflective perception is important in K-12 systems (Cheng, Chan, Tang, & Cheng, 2009; Hall, 2010; Hong, 2010; Geijsel &
Meijers, 2005; Robinson & Timperley, 2007; Thomas & Beauchamp, 2011; Joseph & Heading, 2010; Shockley, Bond, & Rollins, 2008; Coldron & Smith, 1999). Style as aesthetic perception is part of teacher identity. Throughout the literature on aesthetics, the notion of style emerged, because style affects perception.

James Garrison (1995) agreed with Alfred Whitehead’s (1929/1967) emphasis on the importance of a teacher’s individual style, because personal style is a factor affecting the learning environment. “For Whitehead,” Garrison (1995) noted, “style was as much an intellectual and aesthetic as it was a moral virtue” (p. 41). Garrison (1995) further stated that “individual style should be among the most important aims of teacher preparation” (p. 41, emphasis in original).

The teacher is, in effect, on a curricular fashion runway in which the options tend to be adaptation to the du jour curriculum standards, or proactively responding to their current students in ways that evoke the reverence of school ritual. As Rud and Garrison (2010) noted: “Reverent teachers . . . understand the importance of ritual and ceremony in establishing classroom and school community” (p. 2780). The curricular fashion runway is a ritual of school in which teachers’ aesthetics are posed and on display in ways that can inspire students. If teachers are aware of their own aesthetic and able to unlock and channel it for responding to the classroom environment, they can foster aesthetic innovation. The teacher’s style is on display and under evaluation by students every class session, which is why it is important to understand and control classroom ritual.

Augmenting the aesthetic should inspire students in evaluating their own aesthetic, developing awareness of it, and practicing ways to create through learning about and channeling their aesthetic skills. With this statement forming the assumption of my theoretical lens of teacher preparation, it may be stated that exploring teacher identity is important for
understanding aesthetics as one of the variables for student success as well as teacher retention in the profession. In this section, I explore some of the teacher identity literature as it relates to potential relevance in establishing aesthetically responsive teacher education curriculum design.

Lave and Wenger (1991) contended: “Knowing a general rule by itself in no way assures that any generality it may carry is enabled in the specific circumstances in which it is relevant” (p. 34). In other words—and in application to this study—a general rule is that the aesthetic matters in teaching and learning, but translating its importance outside of the classroom to policy-makers is a challenge. Hence, I collected data that prompted this researcher to formulate an aesthetic curriculum theory to help explain the importance of aesthetics with implications for teacher education. Social studies curriculum, as an the example included in this study, is illustrative of ways that an aesthetically designed curriculum can help explain how an ancient social value—such as reverence—persists into the present (see Appendix D).

Teaching is a social phenomenon in which the professionalization of pre-service teachers into in-service teachers can often times be a highly complex process that has its roots in identity formation. There are quantitative and qualitative and mixed-methods approaches (Hong, 2010). Aesthetic theory can be seen as an acknowledgement of the centrality of the teacher’s role in a student’s identity formation when it is both art inquiry and philosophical inquiry fused together. Discussion of teacher identity studies is important here because aesthetic identity is itself very fragile.

Dewey’s (1934/2005) concept of the teacher’s style seemed to be a distinct psychological construct that should be intentionally and thematically fostered in teacher education programs. For Dewey, the arts were a vast horizon in which everyone was a denizen of the arts, because audio-visual representations are the world. Marsh (2004) stated: “By defining art as experience,
Dewey also sought to dissolve the binary structures of aesthetic rifts” (p. 91) so that all students could see themselves as artistic. Similarly, Nel Noddings (2012) stated: “Dewey insisted that teaching should induce learning, but he did not mean that it should cause every student to learn some piece of information or skill predetermined by the teacher” (p. 50). Aesthetics has perhaps some of the greatest potential in fostering learning that is not predetermined; therefore, there is very likely long-lasting benefit to teacher practice when they have an aesthetics-based course (Frawley, 2013). Establishing an aesthetically responsive curriculum—operationalizing aesthetics—is of key importance. Aesthetics in K-8 teacher education curriculum are beneficial for a number of reasons, including the notion that pre-service teachers need training and intentional time to develop an aesthetic teacher identity which the practitioner can incorporate their lesson plans.

The aesthetic is personal and yet part of the public persona. Bayles and Orland (2001) contended: “Nowhere is feedback so absolute as in the making of art” (p. 49), which was to say that the making of art is all reaction even if the outside world seems to take little or no notice. That which is of the aesthetic—whether fine art, decorative art, arts-informed curriculum, or indeed anything visual and tangible that an individual can interact with—does not exist in the vacuum of the individual mind, but instead affects others who interact with the aesthetic that the given individual represents in others’ perception. Goffman (1959) suggested that this was a “performance” of the self in the public forum. The aesthetic identity, then, is visual representation as well as the performance of perception. This perceptual performance can be from emotions as much as from professionalized rationality from the vantage point of the self, of the observer, and of the individuals who interact with each other. It is with this understanding of the aesthetic spectrum that Bayles and Orland (2001) suggested the potential perils and rewards
of artmaking, because the aesthetic identity is both visual art and performance art personified through the teacher character in which the emotional and the rational are in tension. This tension goes to the heart of the potential perils and rewards of transforming or what Joseph, Mikel, and Windschitl (2011) called “reculturing” the teacher identity from one context, such as the general K-8 classroom, to another context, such as the museum or public theatre stage (Hall, 2010; Joseph & Heading, 2010; Dudley, 2010; Geijsel & Meijers, 2005; Oreck, 2004).

The concept for what became ArchPM theory is informed by my reading of classroom life literature (e.g. Finnan, Schnepel, & Anderson, 2003; Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke, & Curran, 2004; Shockley et al., 2008), aesthetic theory (e.g. Goffman, 1959; see Frawley, 2013, for discussion of aesthetic theory in teacher education), conceptualizations of arts-integration that posit a reimagining of “rhizomatic relations of the everyday” (Wiebe et al., 2007, p. 263) for deeper learning across curricula, and anecdotal experience as a teacher. Some key examples of scholars who examine the aesthetics of teacher educator identities are Shockley et al. (2008), Oreck (2004), and more recently Frawley (2013)—but in the context of teacher training, rather than aesthetic teacher identity.

There are some studies on the concept of aesthetic theory and hermeneutical context in school using divergent methods of inquiry and definition (see similarities in Oreck, 2004; Wiebe et al., 2007; Shockley et al., 2008, for conceptual, qualitative methods; and see Burton, Horowitz, & Abeles, 1999; Smithrim & Upitis, 2005, for mixed-methods approaches). I add to the discussion primarily in the form a theory to fuse the theoretical with the practical for a curriculum design in which teaching and learning are aesthetically responsive. This study establishes an aesthetically responsive curriculum product example for a social studies unit on
medieval culture (see Figure 4). The fonts and illustrations are an ArchPM effect in which the imagery of a journey through a medievalesque literary path is evoked.

Figure 4. Aesthetically responsive curriculum product example, book cover.

**Cultural syncretism in aesthetic perception.** Children’s literature influenced the nexus between past and present that likely influenced creative cultural syncretism, because people tend to carry forward into adulthood their childhood understandings of the past (Lehr, 2001). Drell (1999) and Dunker (2008) suggested that cultural syncretism has been a powerful process for bringing the visual representations of values forward in the political sphere while combining their practices to form a new cultural whole. Kelley, Stair, and Price (2013) suggested how visual
art in children’s literature are laden with values, and it is the visual medium that communicates those values when combined with textual reinforcement.

The phenomena of children’s literature that romanticizes historical constructs in conjunction with living history societies, such as the Society for Creative Anachronism (2009), provide further context for ArchPM theory. Furthermore, this is in the related context to what Bernadette Baker (2013) asked of the purposes of history in twenty-first century society. If modern individuals “transition between two different conceptions of reality that redefine what a society is,” (Baker, 2013, p. 43) then aesthetics may be the transformative praxis of re-envisioning school in society.

Living history societies (see, for example, Society for Cultural Anachronism, 2009) are not historical in the traditional sense but are, instead, an aesthetic embodiment of the present inferring parts of the past for a transformative future. This infers what Baker (2013) called “the cyborgic as constituting the new moral compass and the intensification of abilities” (p. 43) that popular culture celebrates in such quasi-revivalist aesthetic conceptions of reality as Crichton’s (1999) and Ovitz et al.’s (2003) Timeline in which a professor and some students go back in time to fourteenth century France. The characters literally wear some of the medieval aesthetic while retaining their late twentieth century linguistic aesthetic. Some of the medieval decoration comes back with them when they return to the twentieth century. Such phenomena combine the medieval with not just the present but also its potential future in what may epitomize the cyborg construct of regenerating and embedding components of the past onto the present aesthetic. With this in mind, I wrote and illustrated a book that is an ArchPM-based arts-integrated social studies product for teaching and learning literacy and social studies for an upper elementary—and up—audience (see Appendix D).
Aesthetics for social studies through the case of Matthew Arnold. In a social studies curricular context, for example, the nineteenth century British school inspector and poet, Matthew Arnold (1849/2008), seemed ahead of his time in advocating general inclusion so that all children would go through a similar formal education not only through the goal of increasing quality of life through wealth (Boyer, 1923), but also that quality of life could be aligned with an aesthetic sensibility that featured what could be called good “taste” (Gadamer, 1975/2013, p.38). The uniforms of schools began to change to acknowledge the growing inclusiveness of the common school movement. The aesthetic visually started to become more responsive—in the form of clothing—to wider social change. According to Boyer (1923), Arnold defined “perfection” as a “process” through which schooling and work are necessary components to reach that perfection (p. 284). Process essentially meant creativity. Boyer (1923) contended that “Arnold stated that [intellectual] expansion is a genuine need, that there can be no progress without it” (p. 284). Art and artistic expression, for example, were valuable as a means of expanding good taste. Mary Black (1987) summarized Arnold’s contribution to school reform as very important for the fostering of public comprehensive schools for all children in which school was not founded on “narrow ideology,” but was rather, “the ideal of an awakened intellectual life and an education for all children that is truly humanizing” (p. 21). In other words, Arnold’s legacy was a combination of creativity and standardized school that was itself a balance between training and education.

Chun Huang (2012) summarized the criticism of Arnold that many of Arnold’s contemporaries and later observers had of his “aesthetic perception” (p. 12). Huang (2012) suggested that Arnold’s reform movement was generally viewed to be too naïve by his contemporaries. Arnold seemed to want to base education on aesthetics more than on a
sociological view. Huang (2012) went further in his critique of Arnold than Boyer (1923) or Neiman (1957) did, because Huang (2012) critiqued Arnold’s legacy at the structural level. Huang (2012) suggested that Arnold’s emphasis on aesthetics in education—the beautification of education as a system—was a veiled attempt to essentially replicate the class structure of the status quo through what Schutz (2004) called “pastoral control.” Huang (2012) suggested a new criticism of Arnold’s educational reform movement: “Consequently, all the social disaffections avowed in the discussions of beauty also amount to nothing but an egoistic middle-class wish for control” (pp. 12-13). That suggestion seems overly reductionist in its cynicism. This harsh cynicism is apparently aimed at Arnold’s conception of an aesthetic education. Brendan Rapple (1989), in counterpoint, had a sanguine interpretation of Arnold’s legacy in suggesting that aesthetics has substantial potential to unlock human creativity. Aesthetics, like so many concepts, can be used as propaganda, but it can also be used for celebrating the individual’s power to contribute in ways that are meaningful to the self and to the community.

The ‘will’ of personified style. Some researchers (such as Geijsel & Meijers 2005) suggest the importance of emotions in the process of fostering a classroom community that allows for student-centered curriculum in which students are co-constructors of content. In particular, the benefits of controlling and containing emotions to stabilize professional identity, despite a view that identity formation may be a continual process (Kozulin, 1986; Duckworth & Allred, 2012). Vygotsky’s work, according to Alex Kozulin (1986), “suggests that to him psychology was a method of uncovering the origins of higher forms of human consciousness and emotional life rather than of elementary behavior acts” (p. xv). Emotions are generated through symbols and, as such, are a semiotic process as much as a cognitive process (Kozulin, 1986). Geijsel and Meijers (2005) suggested that “identities are resistant to change” (p. 423) but
simultaneously open to change when teacher educators practice mindfully at the crossroads of the lived curricular experience (Ek & Latta, 2013).

David Bayles and Ted Orland (2001) asserted: “Art is often made in abandonment, emerging unbidden in moments of selfless rapport with the materials and ideas we care about” (p. 37). Art is not necessarily made in abandonment—quite the contrary for some. But perhaps, most art is indeed an extension of the ideas that an individual or group cares about. Artistry and the paths that lead to becoming an artist are many, varied, and often personal in that artists produce pieces that may be extensions of themselves. The artful creation is of the “materials and ideas we care about” (Bayles & Orland, 2001, p. 37). Similarly, the noted representational painter Robert Henri (1923/2007) suggested in his 1923 book, The Art Spirit, that everyone has the arts within them; however, Henri claimed that “Few have the courage and stamina to see it through” (p. 12). To become acquainted with the self can be a lonely road that can benefit others, but at a cost to the self.

Henri (1923/2007) stated: “You have to make up your mind to be alone in many ways” (p. 12). This reminded me of personality case studies of artists. There is no one correct way to be an artist. There are many ways to be a “correct” artist. As Henri (1923/2007) stated: “All the past can help you” (p. 12). Here again is another link to the archeo in archeophismorphic theory as an aesthetic theory for teacher education curriculum. For an artsy individual to better know the self and, thus, teach students through a self-aware lens, the artist should be comfortable with apparent paradox of style in which the style may seem objectively like a shared reality and yet may be perceived differently depending on vantage point—or, as Gadamer (1975/2013) suggested, the “horizons” of personal and shared cultural knowledge. Every artist is correct to somebody. Perception depends on context to discern how each part of a thing (e.g. a representational
painting) goes together to form a cohesive whole that represents ideas that are part of culture and just about everything thought of in the mind. Again, the Gestalt image is helpful here for understanding the archeo in ArchPM theory for the image is mirrored to the other side from its past location. It is changed but retains characteristics so that the viewer may recognize the familiar while discarding the outmoded.

When the archeo is dismissed, what can happen is a devaluation of knowledge—itself transmitted as much through aesthetic representations (such as a painted portrait of a figure) as through written texts. James Garrison (1995) noted Dewey’s (1916) work in identifying the systemic problem that can develop when a society does not value its teachers highly:

Devaluation of the teaching profession increases the risk of destroying “the psychic rewards of teaching including creative autonomy, [and] is not simply a matter of teachers not feeling good and burning out” (p. 59). It is a matter of societal values. The archeo is likely discarded when the teacher is not respected. And part of that loss is when the teacher is not aesthetically aware and has not created aesthetically responsive environment or, at the least, placed a personally designed aesthetic product in the learning environment.

Bayles and Orland (2001) similarly noted the “perils and rewards” of artmaking, suggesting: “The irony here is that the piece you make is always one step removed from what you imagined” (p. 16). This suggested a deficit model as being a default for students. However, teachers are more likely to foster students’ creativity when they transcend the deficit model and instead celebrate individual creativity—especially in early childhood education (Jalongo & Stamp, 1997). What is learned in early childhood tends to multiply into adulthood and become engrained in the psyche, which is part of the reason why Tyson Lewis (2014) asserted:
we must pay careful attention to passion in education, not in order to reduce education to the alteration of the passions but rather in order to understand how education exists in the moment of an uncertain community poised between passion and logos—that is the space necessary to verify what I refer to as the ‘theatrical will.’ (p. 17)

Lewis’s (2014) “theatrical will” (p. 17) is suggestive of Goffman’s (1959) idea about everyday presentation, except that Lewis (2014) specifically echoed the notion that “education begins with a rupture of the partitioning of the sensible, the transcendental dimensions of space and time that form the basis of imaginative constructions” (p. 17).

I saw a need for articulating an aesthetic curriculum theory for teacher education. It is in the recognition of space and time in aesthetic presentation that a value can be analyzed within social studies curriculum. As Lewis (2014) and Goffman (1959) suggested, individuals perform values through aesthetics. This brings this researcher back to the research questions for this study, especially the first question: How can an aesthetic theory be applied to teacher education?

As discussed in the previous chapter, I posit archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory as a way to approach this question and address the potential benefits of this theory when applied to curriculum design that integrated the arts with the social studies, for example.

**Toward Aesthetic Identity Formation in Teacher Training**

Fostering teacher identity has been suggested as an important way to increase teacher effectiveness and retention (Hong 20110; Ingersoll, 2012; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Geijsel & Meijers, 2005). How teacher educators foster professional identity construction among pre-service teachers is complex with differing opinions based on different local contexts and goals. Although teachers leave the profession for many different reasons, Ingersoll (2012) suggested that this problem—if it even is a problem—is highly variable and dependent on individuals and
local culture. I suggest that teachers may potentially be more likely to foster an effective learning environment that students want to be in if teachers have an aesthetics-infused teacher education. Frawley (2013) called for more studies focused on developing a praxis of aesthetic training in teacher education programs, because there has been very little research on aesthetic identity in teacher training and because aesthetics as a field is generally not well understood—especially in the context of teacher education. The benefits of aesthetics in teacher education can potentially be profound for both teacher effectiveness through aesthetic approaches to teacher identity construction and the infusion of an aesthetic approach to curriculum design that may assist students in being more engaged in learning. When students make something that has aesthetic appeal—such as through the use of visual decoration—students are probably more likely to be more invested in the process of learning as well as the product of learning (Lynch, 2007; Furniss, 2008).

ArchPM theory for the environment of near-constant change in education reform. Teachers who do not know their professional identity to its core will probably not intrinsically adapt when their identities undergo the pressures of the first years of in-service teaching (Hong, 2010). Sue Lasky (2005) likewise suggested that reform mandates “affect teachers’ experiences of professional vulnerability” (p. 899). Nevertheless, teachers must be able to adapt, to overcome fear, and take command of reform. But this adaptation is usually only successful in terms of teacher retention if the adaptation itself does not destabilize the teacher’s intrinsic identity (Hong, 2010). It follows then, that the teacher’s identity formation should necessarily be analyzed as it has direct and indirect effects on students’ identity formation.

Shockley, Bond, and Rollins (2008) suggested: “If teachers teach who they are, then their hidden inner curriculum directly influences the students they teach” (p. 183). Hong (2010)
posed that each teacher’s sense of self is rarely static, because “teacher identity is in the process of being shaped by past experience and current circumstances” (p. 1535). Hong (2010) further suggested that expectations of the future are also intricately tied to teacher identity. Discussion in the literature (Hong, 2010; Cheng, Chan, Tang, & Cheng, 2009) emphasized the importance of teacher education programs in helping pre-service teachers to specifically not have expectations that are too idealistic, because pre-service teachers’ beliefs tend to be entrenched when they enter their programs.

The implication from this research study is that there should be a systematic approach to elucidating the realities of emotional and social stresses in the K-12 system before pre-service teachers become in-service teachers. This may help to increase the teacher retention rate (Hong, 2010). Ingersoll and Strong (2011) noted, though, that “teacher induction is distinct from both preservice and in-service teacher professional development programs,” (p. 203) because induction is in between the phases of student teacher and contracted professional. This further underscores the gap in the literature on aesthetic identity development in teacher education programs in the United States. My study articulated in this dissertation contributes to aesthetic curriculum theory and—in doing so—promotes a praxis of aesthetics that can potentially be integrated into induction programs even after pre-service teacher education.

AG Rud (2011) discussed historical and philosophical complexities of educational change, noting:

Educational models of change interact with each other, from top-down mandates of national accountability and assessment standards such as the No Child Left Behind act in the United States, to local innovations proposed by a few teachers to meet a specific need. (p. 132)
Rud’s (2011) research on nineteenth century educator, physician, and humanitarian Albert Schweitzer, provided a key pathway to answer the challenge of how teachers can meet a specific need in a complex environment of high-stakes testing: “Individual responsibility is paramount as one goes about using one’s own life to make a statement, not only to oneself, but to others” (Rud, 2011, p. 126).

Rud’s (2011) analysis is based on reverence, because being responsible to others and to self is a way of reverence and, as such, is part of how individuals see the world and communicate through audio-visual media that comprises part of a larger aesthetic. It is a way of knowing the self, which can allow for greater teacher-guided exploration of the personal aesthetic. The exploration of the personal aesthetic and establishment of an aesthetic identity both make a statement. ArchPM theory is a way of conceptualizing aesthetically responsive curricula that addresses a specific need—the need to celebrate students’ creativity across the curriculum through aesthetic responsiveness that can take the form of arts-integration that values individual creativity. In doing so, ArchPM theory works in and through reverence.

Ingersoll and Strong (2011), and later Ingersoll (2012), suggested a programmatic reform would likely assist pre-service teachers in being more effective when they begin teaching. Ingersoll (2012) called for teacher education to have “Induction” which “is an education reform whose time has come” (p. 51). Ingersoll (2012) noted that with increasing numbers of beginning teachers, induction is particularly important. Ingersoll’s (2012) implied question appeared to be: How do teacher education programs increase beginning teachers’ effectiveness? Ingersoll (2012) noted: “Thus far, we don’t have much data and research on the relative costs and benefits of induction” (p. 51). According to Ingersoll (2012), induction may be most effective when it is intermodal and interdisciplinary: “Collectively, getting multiple induction components had a
strong effect on whether beginning teachers stayed or left” (p. 50). When considering that implied question, effectiveness may be linked to aesthetic identity, especially with the new interest in the concept of aesthetic training outlined by Frawley (2013). Along this same thought process, my research question is: How can an aesthetic theory be applied to teacher education? The question that follows, then, is: How can teacher candidates develop their aesthetic identity?

This study provides an answer to these questions through archeophisomorphic theory as an aesthetic curriculum theory informed by the survey data from pre-service K-8 teachers. This study contributes to the field addressed by Frawley’s (2013) call for defining a praxis of aesthetic education in teacher training. Maxine Greene (2001) stated that imagination is “at the heart of aesthetic experience” (p. 65) and that imagination is an integral part of aesthetic education in “giving rise on all sides to suggestions that it be central in education and scholarship” (p. 65).

**ArchPM theory as bridge between vernacular and couture teacher identity.**

Aesthetic responsiveness in an educational environment may very likely link informal and formal identity with: style and fashion, art and emotion, and arts-integration and learning. This link may increase student interest in learning across the curriculum. According to Adam Geczy and Vicki Karaminas (2012): “In the twentieth century, fashion became a central concern of many artists who understood the provocative power of clothing in creating an identity” (p. 2). As the arts are a largely personal endeavor with social implications, it is the creation of a piece that is itself an extension or symbol of its author’s identity.

Establishing an aesthetically responsive curriculum in teacher induction will help foster confidence in pre-service teachers to design aesthetically consistent lessons and a classroom environment that are in harmony with state standards and Common Core curriculum. Blumenfeld-Jones (2012) noted: “The term *aesthetics* derives from the Greek and means ‘sense
perception or sensation.’ Immediately it is clear that we all have sense perception and sensations” (p. 43, italics in original). Through arts-integration and based on my ArchPM theory of aesthetic curriculum, teachers may more effectively develop their own aesthetic styles through a greater awareness of perception so that they are responsive to their students’ aesthetic styles. Part of aesthetic responsiveness in teacher education curriculum and in K-8 curriculum is to encourage and celebrate individual and group styles through creativity by beginning with artistic processes in lessons that students already are interested in—what Rex and Woywod (2014) called “vernacular” art. It is vernacular art that forms a part of the foundation for material culture in which generalist pre-service K-8 teachers can immediately see themselves as members of creative education who can make art and integrate that art across the curriculum.

**Toward an aesthetic couture or “unique” for all pre-service teachers.** Couture is that which is customized in the decorative arts. In the context of this study, ArchPM theory provides a basis for a couture curriculum. Rex and Woywod (2014) asserted: “Material culture approaches to art education broaden the scope of relevant objects and practices considered” (p. 40). Vernacular art suggests that there is another sociopolitical form of art, which is usually called “high fashion.” This is important to mention here because K-8 pre-service teachers are earning a multiple subjects endorsement in which they should be able to teach Common Core subjects with arts-integration. However, pre-service generalist teachers need to be comfortable with a wide range of visual and performing arts in order to teach through the arts. To achieve “comfort” with the arts, pre-service teachers should be encouraged to view their own creative endeavors or hobbies as foundations upon which to build arts-integration competencies. For some, that means exploring their unique “vernacular” arts-based hobbies so that they may foster learning across the curriculum with the arts as an integrated component (Jalongo & Stamp, 1997; Rex &
To borrow a term from the fashion industry of the wearable decorative arts, pre-service teachers should be encouraged to find their own couture, which is to say their unique aesthetic and place their aesthetic within the group aesthetic of their school.

I briefly outline the history of couture to establish the context of the concept as it related to ArchPM theory. According to Valerie Steele (2012), modern high fashion or haute couture was founded by the nineteenth century fashion designer Charles Frederick Worth—the House of Worth—and his son Gaston who founded the Chambre Syndicale de la Haute Couture. Within France, the French government regulates haute couture in which only firms meeting the government’s standards for high fashion are allowed to be designated haute couture firms. This term, however, is broadly used internationally to indicate fashion-as-fine art, which is to say finely crafted garments and clothing that may or may not be unique. Steele (2012) noted: “Although couture involves more handwork than industrially produced fashion, the popular belief that a couture dress is a one-of-a-kind object, like a work of art, is much too simplistic” (p. 14). After all, according to Goffman (1959) identity is a performance of the unique within the group and society exerting pressure to contain the unique.

High fashion and the fashion runways were trend-setting spaces intended to be widely seen, just not immediately widely available to purchase outside of the major couture fashion capitals. Initially, couture was more of an exclusionary wearable art exhibition intended to test the market rather than intended for wide distribution. However, according to Steele (2012), mass production was part of Worth’s goal so that couture could be available to many customers, and also part of Worth’s goal was that haute couture were test fashions that did sometimes develop into fine art pieces available only to a select few. Ultimately, high fashion or fine art were not
necessarily on a rigid hierarchical dimension to vernacular art. Rather, the two concepts were intended as symbiotic and inclusionary.

This idea, that art is both unique and rudimentary, is a corollary to reverence at the heart of ArchPM. The various art forms should work symbiotically within an arts-integration curricular environment of the elementary school and middle school. As Rex and Woywod (2014) asserted: “Material culture approaches to art education broaden the scope of relevant objects and practices considered” (p. 40). Both high fashion and vernacular art should be a part of arts-integration practice. It may be better to begin with vernacular art so that students without an extensive formal background in art can find a place for themselves in the curriculum from the very beginning while students with a more extensive arts background may explore with media and with processes familiar to them so that all students may learn the core subjects through the patterns and the everyday high fashion styles that each individual brings with them as part of the diversity of the arts.

An aesthetically-integrated curriculum fosters a more responsive learning and teaching environment because students are at the center and the teacher is a facilitator of a thematically unified audio-visual process. Students are ideally content-creators along with the teacher in aesthetically responsive curricular praxis of the ArchPM model. The teacher designs an aesthetically unified “sandbox” within which students explore their individual aesthetic through arts-integrated activities.

**Aesthetic fragmentation and unitary curriculum standards.** An aesthetically responsive curriculum design addresses the current balance debate in what Leonard Waks (2014) called “Education 2.0” whereby a solution is called for in re-envisioning the school between twentieth and twenty-first century point of view. Waks (2014) summarized one of the debates in
school reform between the views of curriculum essentialist Mary Warnock who seemed to support “a moral right to acquire basic facts and skills” (Waks, 2014, p. 13) while also fostering what curriculum theorist Richard Peters discussed as the “initiation” or “insider” model of education that may have encouraged more student-centered individualization in which students were encouraged to “know the traditions and rules, to understand its point, and to be able to participate as a social ‘insider’” (Waks, 2014, p. 12). Aesthetics is a way to bridge this gap between the industrial model and its Common Core curriculum model with the emergent technology-enhanced movement in education.

Aesthetics has historically had fragmented definitions rather than a unitary definition that could be more efficiently enacted for systematic implementation across the curriculum. By operationalizing Greene’s (2001) definition of aesthetic education with Frawley’s (2013) call for the integration of aesthetics in teacher education programs, I provide a curriculum product example and discussion of aesthetics in a systematized fashion within a cohesive theoretical framework. Aesthetically responsive curricula is rarely static and, as such, may be understood here as using emergent standards. Sydney Schwartz and Sherry Copeland (2010) suggested that the “creative-aesthetic” (p. 47) is an essential component of “emergent” curriculum and, as such, is an important component of heuristic learning. Waks (2014) explained that in heuristic learning students: “know that ‘I understand’ and ‘I can do’ are necessary elements that make ‘I know’ educationally meaningful” (p. 49).

My study in establishing an aesthetically responsive curriculum provides an example of how aesthetics can be applied in a systematically theorized fashion for an aesthetic curriculum design that fosters emergent learning in a proverbial “sandbox” while maintaining harmony with state standards and Common Core. In the metaphor of the sandbox, Common Core, the syllabus,
and the design of multiple project options form the border of the sandbox while students can take the multi-modality project options to create content and products using their own personal aesthetic. This creative process occurs in the proverbial sandbox so that individual creativity may be celebrated as part of the aesthetically attuned curriculum design in which the teacher is primary facilitator. As Elliot Eisner (2002) suggested: “The arts have an important role to play in refining our sensory system and cultivating our imaginative abilities” (p. 4). The constructivist process is an aesthetically responsive way to facilitate learning in which the student’s individual aesthetic can be celebrated as part of the very design of the curriculum and, simultaneously, students are more likely to be invested in the success of the classroom because they are co-creators of content that makes school more meaningful for them as individuals and as a group.

Additional inspiration for the benefits of developing an aesthetically responsive curriculum design come from a statement made by Eisner (2002) who noted: “Indeed, the arts provide a kind of permission to pursue qualitative experience in a particularly focused way and to engage in the constructive exploration of what the imaginative process may engender” (p. 4). Pre-service teachers should have a model of aesthetically responsive education in their teacher induction programs so that they have a space within which to explore the imagination for designing curriculum products that promote learning through aesthetics. The teacher is the authoritative guide to validate their products (Ornstein, Levine, & Gutek, 2011).

Costantino (2013) referred to Gadamer (1975/2013) when discussing aesthetic experience, because Gadamer’s epistemology of aesthetic experience asserts that the knowledge gained from a work of art is one of insight into the self in relation to the socio-historic context in which one is situated. In other words, developing meaning through one’s encounter with a work of art
helps the viewer come to know something about him or herself in relation to the human world they inhabit. Through this self-knowledge one may be more open to encounter others and relate to them with more understanding, or empathy. (Costantino, 2013, p. 209)

When teachers design and make their own aesthetic curriculum products, their understanding and empathy toward the creative process likely deepens. Through the making of aesthetic products, pre-service teachers may make learning more likely to be a creative process as much as—if not more than—a didactic process. As such, pre-service teachers can move beyond the static textbook model discussed by Friesen (2011, 2013) and its historical link to the factory school system critiqued by Waks (2014) before they become in-service teachers. Defining aesthetics is as much about showing examples as it is about providing long textual explanation. Explanation in conjunction with an example of an ArchPM-based curriculum product establishes responsiveness for implementation.

A Sample of Teacher Identity Studies from Around the World

Some researchers have suggested that teacher education programs should have a systemic approach to developing pre-service teacher identity to increase teacher retention or efficacy rates (Hong, 2010; Cheng, Chan, Tang, & Cheng, 2009; Milligan & Ragland, 2011), but the means to accomplish this through aesthetics education has had very few studies. According to Lindström (2012), the traditionally fragmented definitions of aesthetics education in relation to arts integration “has spurred heated debate in Britain” (p. 167). With that debate in mind, Lindström (2012) developed a framework to situate “aesthetic learning” (p. 167). Lindström (2012) cited Eisner (see Eisner, 2002, for his more recent work) to address “a medium-neutral (instrumental) strategy” (p. 169) in which:
the major goal is related, for example, to subject matter in academic disciplines (*learning with*) or to the all-round development of the child (*learning through*). This strategy is labelled ‘neutral’ because the same goal can be achieved in different media and by a variety of tools. (Lindström, 2012, p. 169, emphasis in original)

For Lindström (2012), aesthetics education was intended to “support and be facilitated by a balanced curriculum based on teaching and learning about, in, with and through the arts” (p. 178). As such, the Lindström (2012) framework was a praxis model for aesthetics education in K-8 curriculum, but still lacked a comprehensive theoretical framework for teacher education programming with a curriculum *product* example. The Sameshima and Vandermause (2008) model of “parallactic praxis” is a fully developed aesthetic research model. Therefore, my ArchPM theory fits into this spectrum as a comprehensive theoretical framework with which a curriculum product example was developed and posited for developing an aesthetics education for teacher preparation.

**Different teacher education studies seem to support a constructivist approach.** In a non-aesthetics study on student-teachers in China, researchers Cheng, Chan, Tang, and Cheng (2009) suggested that student-teachers believed that students’ hard work is the key to their success. Simultaneously, the sample of student-teachers in Cheng et al.’s (2009) study “strongly believed that the constructivist approach was the best teaching strategy” (p. 323) and “most of them believed that learning effort was more important than innate ability” (p. 325). The constructivist philosophy of education is a key foundation for arts-integration across curriculum, because teachers do not have to be professional artists to cultivate learning through the arts.

Through constructivist understandings of agency, teachers and students may be co-constructors
of course content and products so that they are fully invested in the teaching and learning process (Gelineau, 2012; Jalongo & Stamp, 1997; Barry, 1996).

Geijsel and Meijers (2005) suggest that there may be a paradigm shift in which teachers move “from primarily teaching to primarily coaching” (p. 419). This suggests an interesting corollary to Hong’s (2010) study on why so many new teachers leave the profession within the first five years in the United States. This corollary is that teachers who left the profession within five years seemed to all believe that the teacher had to hold the vast majority of the responsibility for students’ learning (Hong, 2010). In other words, Cheng et al. (2009) and Hong (2010) suggest that teachers who stay in the profession tend to believe that it is primarily the students’ responsibility to work hard vis-à-vis the teacher’s instruction—in which students take primary ownership of their learning—and it is the teacher’s responsibility to provide the environment and instructional structure for students internalize that ownership to foster an intrinsic work ethic.

Attitude seems to play a key role in teacher effectiveness. Hong (2010) suggested that teachers who believe that they must control nearly everything and have responsibility for nearly everything tend to become emotionally overwhelmed. And Lasky (2005) suggested that adaptation to new curriculum can be stalled if the teacher in question has a negative attitude. This can potentially cause a self-fulfilling prophecy—in either direction. Hong (2010) further contended that many teachers who leave the profession in their first couple of years do so partially because their teacher education programs lacked “systematic efforts to provide pre-service teachers with a realistic understanding of teachers’ emotional experiences and developmental stages” (p. 1540). This allows some teachers to remain locked in notorious preconceived idealistic notions of the K-12 environment (Cheng et al., 2009) that went unchallenged until these pre-service teachers entered the profession as in-service teachers. Many
may go into psychological shock and by then, Hong (2010) suggested, it may be too late: “Under the confusion and feeling of [being] lost, pre-service teachers may adapt strategically to the given context without confirming their beliefs and theories” (p. 1540). Hong (2010) suggested that each pre-service teacher should be confirming their beliefs and theories before and during their teaching practicum so that they may better know their teacher identity and, thus, can adapt intrinsically to the complex K-12 environment. Hong (2010) contended, therefore, that teacher education programs should systematically include “the practicality of teaching” that “increases awareness of the significance of emotions, and prompts pre-service teachers to reflect on their own professional identity formation” (p. 1540). In this way, teachers may know their core teacher identity intrinsically and may then better adapt to their environment.

The concept of fear in exploring aesthetic identity. A theme in the literature on teacher identity formation is the concept of fear. Pre-service teachers should self-evaluate their identity because if they do not then they are at high risk for dropping out of the profession within their first five years (Hong, 2010). The importance of intrinsic adaptation to changing school environments is echoed by Hong (2010), Thomas and Beauchamp (2011), Cheng et al. (2009), and Shockley, Bond, & Rollins (2008). Geijsel and Meijers (2005) specifically—and nearly uniquely—embrace the discourse analytics of fear as a part of teacher identity evaluation in a process they call “the formation of a reflexive consciousness” (p. 424). Geijsel and Meijers (2005) suggest that making room for fear in teacher identity formation confronts the reality teachers will face and allows pre-service teachers a contained space in which to learn how to stabilize their emotions and adapt systematically. Intrinsic adaptation may be seen as a circular process in which the individual must understand their emotions as they relate to the external factors of classroom environment, colleagues, students, and other stakeholders. The pressures of
competing external agendas should be understood as causing *emotional*—and in some cases political—effects and not merely cognitive effects on teachers (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005; Milligan & Ragland, 2011).

The painter Robert Henri (1923/2007) suggested that perhaps everyone has an aesthetic, few explore it because it has rarely been encouraged in school. After that conditioning, Henri (1923/2007) noted that it is subsequently perhaps not surprising that “Few have the courage and stamina to see it through” (p. 12) after school. To become acquainted with the self can be a lonely road that can benefit others, but at a cost to the self. Henri (1923/2007) stated: “You have to make up your mind to be alone in many ways” (p. 12). Teacher education programs should require an arts-integration course in which all students are encouraged to explore the aesthetic through various media and create arts-based products in the classroom. In this way, the classroom becomes a place of validation for exploring the arts in relation to the multiple subjects that elementary education majors are expected to learn about and be able to teach. The student is not alone. Instead all students are individually exploring the arts within the support structure of the teacher-guided classroom.

**Aesthetic teacher identity formation is an emerging field.** Highlighting teacher identity formation through arts processes is still an emerging field. ArchPM can be used to address what Rud (1995) called: “The goal of listening to oneself” (p. 122), though this goal tends to be deemed important in teacher education, it has tended to be a “tragic goal in that it can never be fully achieved, and is an ironic goal in that it has to be attempted at all” (p. 122). Using the arts to explore professional identity may be beneficial for pre-service and veteran in-service teachers as another tool and process with which to address the goal of self-knowledge that informs teacher practice. The arts may include artful linguistics, painting, and the many other
media that comprise the fine arts. Thomas and Beauchamp’s (2011) study on new teachers in Quebec, Canada utilized metaphor as an artful linguistic approach to exploring how teachers form their identities. Thomas and Beauchamp (2010) assert that some of “the complexity of identity can be revealed through metaphor” (p. 764) and that those metaphors may indicate that some teachers transformed during their teacher education programs. Thomas and Beauchamp (2011) conclude: “Development of a professional identity does not automatically come with experience, and that some form of deliberate action is necessary to ensure that new teachers begin their careers with the appropriate tools to negotiate the rocky waters of the first few years” (p. 767). This is in parallel with Hong’s (2010) recommendation and Cheng et al.’s (2009) similar recommendation to systematically implement a teacher education program that encourages pre-service teachers to critically reflect upon their professional identity development.

One proposed solution to decipher professional identity in pre-service and in-service teachers is to employ regenerative self-reflection through arts processes. According to Shockley, Bond, and Rollins (2008): “Whereas some teacher-students are able to begin a process of self-discovery through the arts, many find that for the first time” (p. 187). Hall (2010) suggests that artist teachers’ reframe their professional identities when they teach as fine arts practitioners. The same may be suggested about teachers in all disciplines and fields. Joseph and Heading’s (2010) study of music teacher identity in Australia parallels findings by Hall (2010) (art), Hong (2010) (science), and Thomas and Beauchamp (2010) (various academic courses). Joseph and Heading’s (2010) goal is to improve music pedagogy through narrative methodology in which pre-service teachers reflect on their identity as teachers by journaling. This case study indicates that other pre-service music teachers may use narrative methodology for self-reflection that assists them to “move from student identity to teacher identity” (p. 84). The implication is that
there is a line of demarcation between identities—that a pre-service teacher is transitioning from student to teacher.

Transitioning from student to teacher is a theme echoed in the other literature reviewed in this paper, but with the caveat that identity formation is probably never fixed in static stasis. Although the literature agrees that there is transition from student to teacher, teachers should probably not consider their learning “complete.” Oreck’s (2004) study suggested that generalist teachers should be encouraged to integrate the fine arts into curriculum, even if they do not have what may be considered extensive fine arts training by practicing professional studio artists. Many teachers feel the need to gain more training in arts-integration pedagogy, although this does not seem to negatively affect teachers’ initial self-efficacy in trying the arts on their own provided that teacher educators regularly encouraged pre-service teachers who “were motivated to use the arts by a desire to increase their enjoyment in teaching” (Oreck, 2004, p. 63). Regular encouragement is probably best accomplished—in large part—by requiring an arts integration methods course in teacher education programs.

Since learning seems to be dynamic, then teacher identity formation seems to be dynamic—in other words, not static (Hong, 2010; Thomas & Beauchamp, 2011; Hatfield, Montana, & Deffenbaugh, 2006; Burn, 2007). Thomas and Beauchamp (2011) concluded that there is a delineated “process of professional identity development during teacher education programmes” (p. 767). Likewise, Katherine Burn (2007) asserted that pre-service teachers are largely “constructors of their own professional knowledge” (p. 447), which should be guided by expert teachers in a systematic way for the purpose of establishing a teacher identity before in-service teaching while still maintaining adaptability. Cheng et al. (2009) note in their study that when teachers begin to evaluate their own epistemological assumptions, they tend to gravitate
toward a constructivist educational superstructure. In other words, they follow an identity
development path when the teacher education program intentionally guides them in constructing
their professionalized identity. Hong (2010) also noted: “Bridging the gap between theory and
practice is critical” (p. 1540) in teacher education programs so that students define their
professional identity by the time they become in-service teachers in order to adapt in ways that
maintain core identity stability. Thus, teachers are more likely to remain in the profession.

The construction of teacher professional identities seems to be in the cultural milieu that
Geijsel and Meijers (2005) noted as a paradigm shift from teacher to coach. Coldron and Smith
(1999) similarly noted a shift, but unlike Geijsel and Meijers, the shift identified was defensive
in nature. Coldron and Smith (1999) assert that “respect” for the “various ingredients of
professional identity” means “not relegating the teacher as technician to an inferior status
compared to that of critical enquirer” (p. 711). The implication is that teacher identity is tied to
not just individual emotion (Hong, 2010) but also to collective emotion toward teachers’ role in
society. Coldron and Smith (1999) echoed the other researchers referenced here when they
suggest that teachers are more effective when they construct a “sustainable” (p. 714) professional
identity, and this is manifested in “their classroom practice” (p. 715). Hong (2010) suggests that
although there is no one guideline to teacher identity formation, there are “five interrelated parts”
that include “self-image, self-esteem, job-motivation, task perception and future perspective” (p.
More recently, Thomas and Beauchamp (2011) suggest that identity may be explored practicably
through metaphor that reveals “developmental process that new teachers go through, allowing
the researchers to focus on the teacher (‘the who’), rather than on the role or roles that teachers
assume, which can be too closely related to context” (p. 767). This implies a similar notion of temporality in identity development proposed by Hong (2010).

Professional teacher identity formation is complex and there is no monolithic pattern. However, there are patterns that researchers have identified (Hong, 2010; Cheng et al., 2009; Thomas & Beauchamp, 2011; Coldron & Smith, 1999). Researchers referenced in this paper suggest that teacher education programs should have an intentional curriculum that encourages pre-service teachers to explore their identity artfully with the goal of defining their professional identity so that it is intrinsic to them and sustainable. Shockley, Bond, and Rollins (2008) infer the ostensible consensus among education researchers: Teacher education programs should challenge pre-service teachers to “investigate . . . their own hidden inner curriculum” (p. 185). This can give them the mindset they need to maintain identity stability when they are in-service teachers in what could otherwise be a destabilizing emotional environment (Geijsel & Meijers, 2005; Hong, 2010).

**Embedding the apprenticeship model in the Common Core classroom.** There has been continued interest in an apprenticeship model for education that is in opposition to the industrial comprehensive K-12 formal system. Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991) noted of the apprenticeship model of education:

The uses of ‘apprenticeship’ in cognitive and educational research were largely metaphorical, even though apprenticeship as an actual educational form clearly had a long and varied train of historically and culturally specific realizations. (p. 31)

Lave and Wenger (1991) discussed the concept of “situated learning” (p. 31) within the context of their historical study of apprenticeship as a model of education. The apprenticeship model tended to foster closer ties. This seemed to influence the development of learning communities
or guilds. The “communities of practice” today share some of this intellectual heritage that encouraged social collegiality in common cause of learning together and working for each other. Sola Takahashi (2011) noted that: “Communities of practice theory illuminates the potential of the social context to play a key role in the development of teachers’ efficacy beliefs through its role of identity development” (p. 735). Establishing self-efficacy with the arts in general K-8 classroom should start in teacher education programs, because Takahashi’s (2011) “community of practice” notion does not emerge in a vacuum during a teacher’s first year of teaching. A community practice—and its foundational component of self-efficacy—must be nurtured in teacher education programs in which pre-service teachers are required to explore the arts as they relate to the core subjects of social studies, literacy, science, and mathematics. The pre-service teacher should take a course in arts-integration in which their aesthetic awareness is developed to apply their couture or “unique” expressions of design throughout the curriculum that they will teach (Frawley, 2013; Hall, 2010; Shockley et al., 2008).

Pamela Bolotin Joseph (2011) suggested similar ideas with a different, yet related, angle in that practice coexists within three curricular paradigms: explicit, implicit, and null. The explicit curriculum is publically and verifiably taught, implicit curriculum is informally taught and not necessarily measurable, while the null curriculum is that which is absent or excluded from the explicit and implicit curricula (P. B. Joseph, 2011). It is here, at the nexus of these three paradigms of curriculum, that ArchPM theory can have further resonance, because when—as Flinders, Noddings, and Thornton (1986) and P. B. Joseph (2011) similarly suggested more than two decades apart—“we understand curriculum as having diverse meanings, we develop lenses to ‘see’ curriculum as multiple layers of phenomena” (Joseph, 2011, p. 6).
Common Core-aligned lesson plans, for example, are an explicit curriculum that teachers and teacher educators are expected to implement in many states. The implementation of those lesson plans likely include implicit components as practice which can develop proactively to real-time dynamics in the classroom. A lesson plan in a Common Core subject without any arts-integration is a null curriculum (Flinders et al., 1986) in that it excludes the arts as an explicit modality of teaching and learning. This may be remedied through integrating the arts into the lesson explicitly and implicitly. ArchPM theory is illustrative of implicit integration of the arts across the curriculum (see Appendix D for curriculum product example). With these perspectives in mind, an understanding of aesthetic identity formation as part of professional teacher identity formation through aesthetic theory may be identified and reified in practice. ArchPM theory is aesthetic process for teacher education.

**Changing Perception through ArchPM Theory**

Perceptions of any given value, whether it is the chivalric ethos or something else, may be achieved through ArchPM approach. Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (1995) suggested that curriculum was in many ways a product of history, because curriculum was: “a series of narratives superimposed as upon each other, interlaced among each other, layers of story merged and separated like colors in a Jackson Pollock painting” (p. 448). Gelineau (2012) further suggested in an elementary arts-integration methods textbook that history may be better understood as an artistic representation, and it can be through such representations in media that additional understanding may be found.

ArchPM theory is further illustrated when considering the ways in which the informal curriculum of movies use audio-visual and musical elements to convey meaning and teach through entertainment. In a social studies arts-integration unit on medieval cultures, for example,
Michael Crichton’s (1999) book *Timeline* and its movie adaptation (see Ovitz et al., 2003) could set the stage for learning about fourteenth century France and England. In *Timeline* (Crichton, 1999; Ovitz et al., 2003), a professor uses a time machine and the professor and some of his students “go back” to the late fourteenth century. They find themselves in France during the Hundred Years’ War. This artistic representation of time seemed to be illustrative of learning theory itself. Teacher education has a curriculum that educates pre-service teachers to develop and implement K-12 curriculum. Each segment of this process seems to be historically influenced at every major step as inherited assumptions are passed on to the next generation. And, yet, change can and does tend to happen as each generation modified that which has been inherited. It is with this understanding that the connections between teacher education, the test case of the chivalric hermeneutic, and aesthetic theory in education may find resonance.

Psychologists Thomas Suddendorf and Michael Corballis (2007) and physicist Paul Nahin (1999) have theorized the potential of mental or virtual “time travel” similar to the fictional model in Crichton’s (1999) novel and Ovitz et al.’s (2003) movie adaptation. What is important to the discussion here is that the imaginary—reified through plausible fiction—generated interest in the general public that can expand scholarly discussions into a nexus with popular culture. Thus, a social gap may be bridged for this study to have wider impact. Researchers and other interested individuals and groups can rediscover ideals from the past with current research techniques, methods, and technology. Ideas from the past may be rediscovered and adapted to the present with what is already available to develop an aesthetically responsive curriculum for local, national, and international communities. This was accomplished through retro imaginaries—modern-day students and their professor travelling to medieval France—in which the aesthetic of medieval France was mirrored back into the present in ways that were
similar yet also familiar. The visual and musical representations of medieval France, continuing with the example of Crichton’s (1999) *Timeline* and its movie adaptation, fostered learning *through the aesthetic* rather than reading the primary texts or didactic teaching. Modern examples of what I call the archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) effect on a social level was the Society for Creative Anachronism (2009) in which the textiles of the past are retroactively adapted to present social customs in which colors, patterns, textures, and fabric type have a syncretistic symbolism.

Gelineau (2012) suggested that history and art are linked and probably best taught together, as this is part of the foundation of arts-integration: Teaching subjects with and through the arts. Movies as audio-visual interpretations of the past or present social studies are part of the process of encouraging students to imagine possibilities. A teacher need not be a professional artist to be an artist who fosters creativity (Gelineau, 2012). Robinson (2009) and Blumenfeld-Jones (2012) suggested that the arts are within everyone, and it is for each individual to find their passion. A teacher's role in aesthetics for the twenty-first century may perhaps be described as that of creativity facilitator. This is particularly important in elementary school when the general classroom teacher teaches multiple subjects and is in the position of being able to integrate the arts across the curriculum on a daily basis. It is, therefore, particularly important for teacher education programs to foster pre-service teachers’ efficacy with the arts through an arts-integration course and a systematic approach to what Ingersoll (2012) called “induction” programs. Systematizing *aesthetic* induction across an elementary teacher education program is part of the basis for ArchPM theory. With this aesthetic theory, educational products and lesson plans can be designed and implemented by K-8 teachers in ways that foster aesthetics across the curriculum.
**Conclusion: ArchPM theory and Reverence**

The connection between persistent social values and artistic expression is revealed through the investigative lens of what I call *archeophisomorphic theory* which attempts to amplify the effect of the relevant social values on the persona of the teacher and the student through the creative impulses of each stakeholder. The *phi* in archeophisomorphic is for philosophical evaluation which is needed to more holistically understand the *archeo* (ancient artifact) of the *isomorph* (Greek: ‘same form’). For example, chivalry has a basic ‘same form’ today in the lexicon and in children’s literature (see Hanel, 2010), but its personified expression—the archeophisomorph—is no longer the knight, although the knight is technically an “ancient” artifact of a certain *style* of personified reverence. The connection, then, is not in the replication of chivalry from a medieval concept to contemporary concept, it is, rather, in its “ontological distance” (Gadamer, 1975/2013, p. 119) from an informal and sometimes formal curricula of social behavioral expectations. Hans-Georg Gadamer (1975/2013) explained: “There exists an insuperable ontological difference between the one thing that is a likeness and the other that it seeks to resemble” (p. 119). Reverence included several principles, including the notion that the individual serves the group above the self and that ritual was part of maintaining respect through reverence (Woodruff, 2001; Garrison & Rud, 2009; Rud & Garrison, 2010). Artistic representations of values are a likeness of its personification that can be found in children’s literature (see Lehr, 2001), popular and scholarly literature, and in performing art—such as movies and theatre—as well as the vernacular language used by teachers. And recently, Frawley (2013) made a call for inquiry into researching aesthetics for teacher education. This dissertation is an answer to that call.
Aesthetics as a fusion of art inquiry and philosophical inquiry is possible in part through an informal curriculum of popular media-integration, because—as Gadamer (1975/2013) noted—what “is operative in artistic presentation is recognition, which has the character of genuine knowledge of essence” (p. 119). This is what the ancient Greek philosopher Plato suggested, according to Gadamer (1975/2013), and it is with this in mind that the connection can be made between teacher education, a social value, and aesthetic theory. In the context of aesthetic curriculum theory in teacher education, the “genuine knowledge of essence” can be when pre-service teachers make art and integrate the arts across the core curriculum intrinsically after extrinsic motivation through coursework and what Ingersoll (2012) more broadly discussed as teacher “induction.” In other words, when students make art and integrate art into their curriculum after the course is completed, they are demonstrating “the character of genuine knowledge of essence” (Gadamer, 1975/2013, p. 119). In the example in Appendix D, this essence is both the Common Core learning standards of literacy, social studies, communication, and the arts, as well as the aesthetics of medieval societies. To accomplish this, I posit the archeophisomorph in which values—such as reverence—are fostered through artistic expression whereby the “outmoded” value is renewed having similar form but adapted for the present society. The value was not so much what was outmoded but, rather, the expression or style of that value in practice. Through aesthetics, the style of a value can be reinvented, changed, and reapplied in new contexts.

Aesthetics as inquiry and process is a powerful tool with which to encourage an ArchPM-based curriculum—the goal being to increase intrinsic motivation to learn and apply that learning. The connection is what I call the archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) effect. In this case, aesthetics is the basis of artistic representation of a given value—such as reverence whether
expressed through the “Prince Charming” character or the character of “Snow White” character in Disney et al.’s (1937) *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* or other values and in other forms. Reverence—as the value—then recycles into curriculum through movies, picture books, and language that tend to represent a certain value—the aesthetic expression of reverence—as a favorable personification of the cardinal virtue of reverence in which reverence is the essence of the chivalric ethos. According to Dewey (1934/2005): “There is always a gap between the here and now of direct interaction and the past interactions whose funded result constitutes the meaning with which we grasp and understand what is now occurring” (p. 284). The implication of this example for K-12 curriculum is, in this study, an application of archeophisomorphic theory to teacher education programming that encourages an aesthetically responsive curriculum. The ArchPM theory provides basis for the product of this theory: aesthetically designed curriculum products. The example I provide in this study is for an arts-integrated social studies lesson (see Appendix D).

**Summary answer to the first ancillary question.** Aesthetic teacher identity development is important because it has historically been missing as an integrated element of teacher education and has tended, therefore, to be marginalized (Frawley, 2013). Part of the complexity of why this has occurred is because of the fragmentation in the definition of aesthetics which has resulted in its marginalization. Operationalizing Greene’s (2001) definition of aesthetic education is an important objective of the curriculum example as part of this study which is an aesthetically attuned social studies and literacy lesson plan for medieval culture designed for upper elementary and aligned to Common Core State Standards for teaching K-8 subjects. Frawley (2013) suggested that aesthetics is important for content area passion that may translate into greater student learning, but noted that there are few research studies in this area.
Greene (2001) suggested that understanding aesthetics can bridge the gap between the fine arts—or what may be referred to as high art or *haute couture* art—and “collaboration” with K-8 practitioners (p. 161). This study provides a way to approach such a gap and answer the *why* question—why a definition of aesthetics is important for establishing an aesthetically responsive curriculum. As Linda Nathan (2014) stated in *The Educational Forum*: “I want all schools to be places that are alive with color, sound, movement, passion, and creativity” (p. 354). And as Donald Blumenfeld-Jones (2012) stated: “I hope you will see the creative in yourself and that you and all the people you know can live life aesthetically” (p. 43). This study provides a systematic conceptual example to encourage that creativity in teacher education.

**Summary answer to the second ancillary question.** Integral to the answer of *how* aesthetic teacher identity may be developed is to require students to take an arts-integration course in a teacher education program. For a holistic answer, I further posit archeophisomorphic theory as a key for conceptualizing how to develop aesthetic teacher identity across a teacher education program. ArchPM theory is an aesthetic curriculum theory that can be systematized across curricular design and, by extension, across a teacher induction program. This may be accomplished by showing examples of aesthetic curricular products early in the teacher induction program to promote arts-integration early and systematically at various aesthetic milestones so that pre-service teachers see examples of aesthetic curricular products aligned to state learning standards. ArchPM fuses together the various “horizons” of the arts, the transmission of values through audio-visual representations, and acknowledges these together as a practiced “ontological play” (Gadamer, 1975/2013). Developing aesthetic identity then, is both a hermeneutical process as well as a practiced process of creativity.
Teacher candidates’ aesthetic curriculum should also be fostered throughout their teacher education program so that they are more likely to be invested in the process by being co-creators of aesthetic content. The teacher candidates’ individual aesthetic is fostered in alignment with state learning standards and the aesthetic products that they create throughout the program are celebrated. This investment in aesthetic theme-building in teacher education will then likely be modified for use by new teachers for practice in K-8. As stated by Blumenfeld-Jones (1997): “All of this suggests that hermeneutics is part of our daily existence” (p. 317). ArchPM puts art making into the hermeneutical process of understanding a value and how it is operationalized and translated through audio-visual representations. It is in the identification of the “vanishing point” where the “parallel” lines (art, music, value, and purpose) merge at the horizon that ArchPM provides a conceptual understanding from which point teacher educators can foster what Blumenfeld-Jones (1997) called the “critical and generative aspects for aesthetic experience” (p. 319).

**Summary answer to the third ancillary question.** When pre-service teachers learn in an aesthetically-integrated teacher education program, they may better understand how to use their creative talents to design a curriculum that utilizes audio-visual presentation as part of a unified aesthetic theme. To answer the question of what aesthetics can do across content areas in teacher education, I also provide evidence in the form of an illustrated book intended for grades five through eight that I have drafted on the basis of ArchPM theory (see Appendix). This book is an example of an aesthetic curriculum product that is aligned to state learning standards to fostering aesthetic literacy in pre-service teachers who will teach multiple subjects in upper elementary and middle school. Aesthetically educated teacher candidates will be more familiar with various art mediums and develop a sense of their own personal aesthetic. As Elliot Eisner
(2002) stated: “Transforming the private into the public is a primary process of work in both art and science” (p. 3). Some examples of a personal aesthetic are favorite colors, patterns, shapes, and forms. Once identified, they can apply those aesthetic components—whether those components are art elements, art principles, or similar constructs of aesthetic awareness—to a consistent teacher theme. Once the teacher candidate has identified an aesthetic theme, they can decorate their classrooms as in-service teachers in a consistent fashion that signal to students certain expectations. That teacher then will more likely foster a similar celebration of the individual aesthetic themes among their students so that their students become co-creators of aesthetic products.
There is evidence that the integration of the arts across the curriculum tends to increase many students’ creative engagement with course content (Smithrim & Upitis, 2005; Lynch, 2007; Furniss, 2008; Hartjen, 2012). However, art has tended to be among the first programs removed from school programs during times of fiscal stress in school districts (Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Apple, 2004; Gelineau, 2012). Aesthetics education may be more inviting to more students as it is predicated on creativity broadly defined rather than the more rigid notion of the fine arts. Despite this, there was no second edition of Jalongo and Stamp’s (1997) textbook on aesthetic early childhood education, and the general lack of aesthetics education textbooks seemed to coincide with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 that emphasized summative assessments in the form of multiple-choice tests. With this in mind, the two research questions are: (1) How can an aesthetic theory be applied to teacher education? And, (2) How can teacher candidates develop their aesthetic identity?

Participants and Protocol of the Two Surveys, the First in 2012 and the Second in 2014

On the basis of Yin’s (2014) and Fowler’s (2014) suggestions for alternative approaches for interview styles in which empirical data is part of the study design as a background and not the foreground for developing a new theory (Charmaz, 2014), I used what Fowler (2014) noted: “a good strategy may be to put the questions in a self-administered form either in a questionnaire or on the computer” (p. 64). That self-administered form in this study is the survey.

Participants were pre-service K-8 teachers (n = 37 in 2012, and n = 34 in 2014) at a public university in the United States in the required arts-integration methods course as part of the elementary education baccalaureate degree program. The 2012 survey was primarily a
qualitative short-answer survey and the 2014 survey was a quantitative survey. The two surveys were answered by two different groups of K-8 pre-service teachers in the same teacher education program at the same public university in the United States in which the two groups of participants were similar.

Participants were told to not write their name or any other identifying information on the survey. Participants were invited to complete the survey the first week of class and place the completed or non-completed survey in a file folder at a desk in the classroom. I was not at the desk that the file folder was located, so that I did not know who did or did not complete the survey, nor would I be able to link participants’ individual identity to any survey submitted. The first survey was conducted in autumn 2012. The second survey, different from the first was conducted in autumn 2014. The surveys form a cohesive backdrop for this exploratory case study.

**Procedures**

I use a qualitative case study design (drawing from Yin, 2014) using a critical approach based on the philosophical inquiry style of Gadamer (1975/2013). This is foregrounded on the concept of isomorphism from Gestalt psychology (see Lehar, 2003). The combination of these two fields for this study is necessary to posit archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory as a systematic technique for establishing an aesthetically responsive curriculum design that is the product, or effect, of ArchPM theory. This is an aesthetic theory.

The design of this study is not seeking to assert a specific causal relationship; therefore, the traditional empirical internal validity assumption is “inapplicable to descriptive or exploratory studies (whether the studies are case studies, surveys, or experiments)” (Yin, 2014, p. 47, parenthetical in original). This study is an example of that exception, because the

The definition of aesthetics education (see Greene, 2001) is applied in this study for teacher education and K-8 curriculum in which aesthetics is integrated throughout the core subjects to foster greater investment—passion—in learning and demonstration of learning through the design and production of aesthetic products. This is both an operationalization of aesthetics as art inquiry and philosophical inquiry for an ever-emergent curriculum.

**Addressing Validity**

As Kilbourn (2006) suggested, each dissertation tends to have a unique context within which to address its subjectivity. In the case of this study, I am positing an aesthetic theory for aesthetic curriculum design. This study is a conceptual, exploratory case study in which the empirical components—the surveys—are background from which archeophisomorphic theory emerged. This is in keeping with the convention of grounded theory in which data is not necessarily gathered on a pre-planned hypothesis model (Charmaz, 2006, 2014). Although internal validity is usually part of case study design, Yin (2014) suggested that there is an exception to traditional internal validity when the study is designed on an exploratory basis. Following Matthew Makel and Jonathan Plucker’s (2014) suggestion for noting limitations, I can assert that the results from this qualitative case study are technically limited to only the environment in which I originally collected the data. In other words, I am not claiming that my findings are generalizable outside its original domain. However, that is not to say that my findings are not locally or regionally generalizable either. Future research may provide basis for potential generalizability. According to Yin (2014), the logic of internal validity “is inapplicable
to descriptive or exploratory studies” (p. 47). Nevertheless, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that qualitative findings may be generalizable in similar contexts, just not on a quantitative basis.

The empirical component is part of the foundation for developing a theory— in this case an aesthetic curriculum theory—and that data is descriptive and exploratory for identifying how a theory may fill gaps in current understanding of a given phenomenon or field. In this study, the development of aesthetic identities in pre-service teachers and the implications for teacher education curriculum are broadly identified based in part on data collected through two survey instruments. Surveys were designed for this study “To meet analysis needs,” as stated by survey theorist and methodologist Floyd Fowler (2014), who concluded: “A special-purpose survey may be the only way to ensure that all the data needed for a given analysis are available and can be related” (p. 3, emphasis in original). In other words, the data in this study provides a baseline of the pre-service teacher vantage point in their prior experiences with the arts. This calls for an exploratory special-purpose survey research study (Yin, 2014; Fowler, 2014). Data is collected that is analyzed for a baseline direction which the researcher may utilize to develop a conceptual framework that informs an understanding of how to define, address, and guide aesthetic identity through teacher education. The type of study that is developed here can have the further purpose of adaptation for presentation to legislators and funding organizations to support arts-integration in schools.

In this study’s update to experimental aesthetics (Berlyne, 1974; Seifert, 1992), internal validity comes from the emergence of a theory supported by the data when contextualized with the extant literature. With the understanding that experimental aesthetics was rooted in a grounded theory approach, it may be stated that the emergence of ArchPM theory partially from the survey instrument “quickens the speed of gaining a clear focus on what is happening in your
data without sacrificing the detail of enacted scenes” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 14). Charmaz (2006) explained grounded theory through artistic metaphor: “Like a camera with many lenses, first you view a broad sweep of the landscape. Subsequently, you change your lens several times to bring scenes closer and closer into view” (p. 14). As Patti Lather (1993) posited: “the conditions of possibility for validity are also its conditions of impossibility” (p. 687). Gary Anderson (1989) suggested that Lather’s (1986) revision of validity for qualitative research set a new precedent in which “empirically grounded theory requires a reciprocal relationship between data and theory” (Lather, 1986, p. 267). What is particularly important for this study—as one influenced by grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006, 2014)—is Lather’s (1986) suggestion that: “The search is for theory which grows out of context-embedded data, not in a way that automatically rejects a priori theory, but in a way that keeps preconceptions from distorting the logic of evidence” (p. 267). The surveys that I designed for the background data for this study are rooted in those conceptualizations of qualitative exploration in which I seek to understand K-8 pre-service teachers’ perceptions of the arts from their point of view so that a systematic aesthetic curriculum may be designed that is responsive to them and generates eventual intrinsic interest in integrating the arts across the curriculum to foster students’ creativity in each subject of the elementary curriculum.

The discourse analysis that I conducted on the 2012 survey data—analyzed in the next chapter—is predicated on Gee’s (2011a, 2011b) discourse analysis method in which its intellectual antecedent may be traced in part to the similar qualitative paradigm of context-embedded data that Lather (1986) discussed as a new process in empirically-informed qualitative inquiry. In other words, as Yin (2014) explained of exploratory case studies, validity as a term under a quantitative definition just does not apply to a qualitative study even if the exploratory
case study draws inspiration for lines of inquiry from empirical data. Patricia Leavy (2009) stated it this way: “Qualitative researchers do not simply gather and write; they compose, orchestrate, and weave” (p. 10, emphasis in original). This is particularly appropriate considering that the participants in the surveys for this study were enrolled in an elementary arts-integration methods course. Bayles and Orland (2001) also suggested that the aesthetic identity is not only internal but has external consequences when making art is viewed as confronting fear and overcoming that fear; thereby, the art becomes a reward. With this in mind, aesthetically responsive curriculum in teacher education—in which pre-service teachers develop their aesthetic identity—is important, because aesthetics does affect that which it modifies. As such, this study provides a theory to explain how aesthetics can modify curriculum that teachers teach and students learn.

**Methods of Data Collection**

**Textual.** The emergence of ArchPM theory is illustrative of the potential of grounded theory-driven notions of analysis on the research spectrum of aesthetics as advanced by Sameshima and Vandermause’s (2008) *parallactic praxis* model. Sameshima and Vandermause’s (2009) poetic inquiry that was not “on a pre-planned hypothesis design,” but rather sought meaning-making “in juxtaposing and re-presenting artful interpretations next to each other, develop new, greater, and deeper understandings” (p. 278). Content analysis is done on a selection of scholarly and popular sources. Two survey instruments (See Appendices A-E) are used to (1) identify perception of the fine arts from a sample of pre-service K-8 teachers (autumn 2012, n = 37) which establishes a baseline for opinions of the arts in the locality of the study, and (2) to identify thematic perception categories of pre-service K-8 teachers’ “essential” perceptions of the arts (autumn 2014, n = 34).
Explanation of why survey instruments were designed and implemented. The survey instruments afford respondents an anonymity not possible through real time interviews. Although surveys may be considered reductionist for a qualitative research design, the use of surveys is an established design process across fields that can reveal patterns or information that may otherwise become obscured through overly dense interview data (Fowler, 2014). The surveys are well suited for what Yin (2014) outlined as an “exploratory” (p. 47) case study, because specific information can efficiently be identified and patterns revealed for further analysis. Pre-service K-8 teachers are the sample group for this study because they will likely design the next generation of standardized curriculum that will influence many students. There perceptions are essential for grounding ArchPM theory as a relevant curriculum theory for establishing an aesthetically responsive curriculum in local communities. ArchPM theory’s product example included in this study can then be utilized as an operational example for defining what an aesthetically responsive curriculum product can be when considering arts-integrated social studies curriculum. The surveys are not the focus of this study but, rather, provide additional context for the philosophical inquiry. As such, this design is within the tradition of grounded theory with a case study (Charmaz, 2006, 2014; Yin, 2014).

Explanation for why surveys were used rather than interviews. In addition to Charmaz (2006, 2014), Floyd Fowler’s (2014) discussion of survey design is noteworthy for additional context in why a survey was used—and interviews were not—for establishing background data for the grounded approach to find patterns in pre-service teacher perceptions of the arts from their experience. Fowler (2014) noted:

Having an interviewer read long lists of similar items can be awkward and tedious. On such occasions, a good strategy may be to put the questions in a self-administered form
either in a questionnaire or on the computer. Such an approach also provides a welcome change of pace for an interview. (p. 64)

This is the basis for why surveys were used for data collection in this study, as it allowed participants to answer questions so that their answers would not be traced back to them personally by the researcher who was in the room while the survey was administered; thus, the assumption is that participants answered frankly. A question may arise as to how survey methods may apply to aesthetic inquiry. This has partially been addressed by Smithrim and Upitis (2005) who conducted a mixed-methods research study to assess whether an arts-integrated program would improve standardized test scores in science, mathematics, and other subjects. Fowler (2014) was mostly addressing studies that used surveys for statistical purposes, but suggested other uses as well.

There are few empirical studies testing arts-integration, but there are some. Smithrim and Upitis’s (2005) study seemed to support arts-integrated teaching and learning in their study of arts-integration in Canada, as higher test scores appeared to correlate to the arts-integrated experimental group when compared to the non-arts-integrated control group. There are critics of differentiation, and some of the most notable are Pashler, McDaniel, Rohrer, and Bjork (2009). Their critique of the “learning-styles” approach to teaching—also known as differentiation—was critical of highly constructivist approaches, but ultimately concluded that there were likely benefits for students who did not seem to respond well to didactic teaching methods. Although not about arts-integration per se, Pashler et al.’s (2009) study actually seemed to support differentiation when observing “how often one student may achieve enlightenment from an approach that seems useless for another student” (p. 116). In other words, they acknowledged that some students learn differently than others; therefore, curriculum should have differentiated
pedagogical approaches. However, Pashler et al. (2009) also asserted that this was not to say that instructional differentiation was supported by empirical studies. Although, Pashler et al. (2009) concluded that the research is inconclusive on differentiation, also known as the “learning-styles concept” of instruction (p. 116), Smithrim and Upitis’s (2005) experimental study seemed to show several *statistically significant* benefits of arts-integrated approaches when correlated to some of the standardized tests. Furthermore, and contrary to Pashler et al.’s (2009) claims, Howard Gardner’s (2006) multiple intelligences theory, although conceptual and not scientifically-based, strongly supported the learning-styles, or differentiated, approach to constructivist models of education.

The survey data for the purposes of this study is for background and is not intended for any statistical conclusions. Instead, the survey data is for the *descriptive* purpose of establishing a framework with which to delineate the otherwise nebulous concept of aesthetic theory. In terms of efficient pattern identification, the survey method is an established approach that links in well with grounded theory. As Yin (2014) suggested of a general exemption that the exploratory case study has with regards to internal validity, Fowler (2014) similarly noted: “If the goal of a survey is to solicit the views of a broader spectrum of the population than would be readily at hand in some other way, such nonstatistical sampling procedures may serve the purpose well” (Fowler, 2014, p. 151). In other words, surveying a specific and limited population for the purposes of an exploratory case study need not have any statistical basis because descriptive data is what is important in such contexts. This is the case for this study. As Schwartz and Copeland (2010) suggested, emergent curriculum tends to be exploratory almost by definition. Aesthetics, as a field, has multiple definitions (see Greene, 2001; Frawley, 2013) and, as such, is ever emergent.
because of its development from individuals within their present context and not from a dehumanized static protocol merely inherited from an unknown ancestor.

Aesthetics has long lacked a universal or standardized definition, approach, or totalizing framework; therefore, aesthetic theory as it is applied to curriculum design is ever emergent. The potential of an aesthetically responsive curriculum does seem to call for some form of framework so that aesthetic theory may more readily be applied and be translated for funding, and it is with this in mind that I posit this study.

**Visual.** Evidence for my theory includes discussion of this researcher’s artwork to illustrate part of the visual process of archeophisomorphic theory. I include visual art that I made for my ArchPM-based aesthetic curriculum example. An example of a social studies arts-integration lesson on medieval culture illustrates part of ArchPM theory in which the aesthetic is used to evoke the learning goals for an arts-integrated curriculum unit for learning about medieval culture (see Figure 5). Consider each abstraction of the knight on each canvas. The canvas on the left is simpler while the canvas on the right has an additional foreground layer that adds complexity and is slightly less abstracted. Consider each canvas through a Disney-influenced lens and interpret each canvas on the basis of personal background knowledge of the representations of knights in the visual media. I present an illustrated book that combines the textual and the visual for the culminating aesthetic product of what archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory can be as an effect on curriculum praxis.
Figure 5. “Contrast Knight” acrylic on canvas (10x14”) by Adam I. Attwood. This is an example of integrating an acrylic on canvas activity with the book *Ode to the Pillars of Aesthetics* that is intended as part of a social studies unit on medieval culture.

The viewer does not need to know a given written language (such as English) to interpret the visual representation of the historical figure. The visual medium *is* the language that the eye can perceive without textual translation. Textual curation is helpful if a specific interpretation is expected, but not necessarily required for an interpretation.

Discussion of the survey data and the visual evidence in the form of a curriculum product in Appendix D is based on the conventions of aesthetic discourse in Bayles and Orland (2001) who posited as a basis for art inquiry: “Something about making art has to do with overcoming things, giving us a clear opportunity for doing things in ways we have always known we should
do them” (p. 4). Patricia Leavy (2009) similarly asserted that visual art is “an important medium through which struggles over representation occur” (p. 219). ArchPM theory goes to the heart of this, as Bayles and Orland (2001) stated of creative inquirers who reach the intellectual borderlands: “We do not long remember those artists who followed the rules more diligently than anyone else. We remember those who made the art from which the ‘rules’ inevitably follow” (p. 95). The aesthetically responsive curriculum is one in which the known is intrinsic, yet also translatable to the external product. When students design their own work and produce it they are exercising the aesthetic from an educator identity.

**ArchPM Theory as a Finding**

Archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory is the conceptual framework of the study and is simultaneously itself a finding in this study. The emergence of this theory from the data sources is illustrative of Sameshima and Vandermause’s (2009) model of inquiry that is not “on a pre-planned hypothesis design,” but rather seeks meaning-making “in juxtaposing and re-presenting artful interpretations next to each other, develop new, greater, and deeper understandings” (p. 278). ArchPM theory is an aesthetic curriculum theory for multicultural education that addresses Shim’s (2011) call: “We, as a collective of scholars, researchers, and practitioners committed to diversity and equality, must continue to search for a more realistic and more responsible way to move us forward” (p. 755). With this in mind, I suggest that identifying ancient social values in local communities for local communities is a tool for accomplishing forward movement in celebrating diversity. Gadamer (1975/2013) suggested that what “is operative in artistic presentation is recognition, which has the character of genuine knowledge of essence” (p. 119). My theory operationalizes this concept by fusing the concept of the Gestalt isomorph and the
cardinal virtue of reverence so that social studies subject content is taught through artistic representation as much as through the written text (see Figure 6).

Figure 6. Example of an isomorphic or Gestalt “image” of reverence in an ArchPM-based curriculum product.

Reverence is “mirrored” like a Gestalt image in the illustrated pages of this arts-integrated social studies curriculum product—an ArchPM effect. Reverence existed for millennia as a cardinal virtue (Woodruff, 2001), and through ArchPM theory it can be aesthetically represented in the form of curriculum products that are used as an instructional medium.

The implementation of ArchPM theory on curriculum design should prompt the ArchPM effect in which learning outcomes are achieved through an aesthetic design that integrates the arts with core subject content (e.g. social studies). In other words, and taking Gadamer’s (1975/2013) notion to a theorized application for aesthetic curriculum design, the “genuine
knowledge of essence” (p. 119) applied to this curriculum theory context is that students achieve the learning goals in accordance with state standards. To achieve this and promote creativity, archeophisomorphic theory unpacks artistic presentation of values to operationalize aesthetics as a way to achieve learning goals across core K-8 subjects. The picture book that I designed as an application of my theory is an example of operationalization of archeophisomorphic theory—in other words, it is an example of its effect.

**Gadamer’s hermeneutic.** Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutical concept of the “fusion of horizons” (p. 313, 317) and its related practice in ontological “play” (p. 107) is the key influence on ArchPM theory’s connection to the survey data. Burbules (1993) suggested that Gadamer’s fusion of horizons concept is a hermeneutical “basis for intersubjective understanding” (p. 113). Gadamer (1975/2013) explained:

Every finite present has its limitations. We define the concept of ‘situation’ by saying that it represents a standpoint that limits the possibility of vision. Hence essential to the concept of situation is the concept of ‘horizon.’ The horizon is the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point. Applying this to the thinking mind, we speak of narrowness of horizon, of the possible expansion of horizon, of the opening up of new horizons, and so forth. (p. 313)

When intersubjectivities are merged, they create a unified picture which to understand a given phenomenon.

An important part of this testing occurs in encountering the past and in understanding the tradition from which we come. Hence the horizon of the present cannot be formed without the past. There is no more an isolated horizon of the present in itself than there are historical horizons which have to be acquired. *Rather, understanding is always the*
Aesthetic curriculum theory is itself a fusion of horizons; therefore, ArchPM theory emerged from multiple horizons—empirical data, art inquiry, philosophical inquiry of the ancient and the modern in the context of teacher education.

I acknowledge Gestalt theory’s limitation as a theory rarely if ever used in the context of clinical psychology; however, for the purposes of this sociocultural study, Gestalt isomorphism has relevance (see van Leeuwen, 1989; Lehar, 2003; Köhler, 1947/1992; Stadler & Kruse, 1994, for discussion of the evolution of Gestalt psychology). Gestalt isomorphism—from the Greek *isos* (“same”) and *morph* (“form”)—is of value here primarily for its use in the visual arts where an image is mirrored on the other side of the paper forming a cohesive image—seemingly identical, yet flipped, and thus different (Lehar, 2003). Although there are other related Gestalt isomorphs, this is primarily the basis of its understanding. This study is at a nexus between identifying and examining a cultural value both historically and philosophically, and examining a cultural value as influential today. However, Gestalt isomorphism and Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutics are insufficient in and of themselves to explain: (1) the persistence of ancient social values practiced in the present vernacular, and (2) how and why those values retain similar form yet manifest in practice through different expression in the modern context. Therefore, I posit: archeophisomorphic theory combining those perspectives in the operationalization of aesthetic practice in curriculum design.

The basic morphology of the term is as follows: *archo* for ancient or prehistoric; *phi* for philosophical; *iso* for same; *morph* for form (see Figure 1). Archeophisomorphology is the study of cultural values as expressed through contemporary individuals and groups within current and
recent historical societal context. Put another way, archeophisomorphology is the study of how ancient cultural values have been and continue to be expressed and applied in contemporary time through philosophical preference for grafting cultural components of the past into the present. Such a value or value matrix—such as the chivalric ethos—is an *archeophisomorph* (see Figure 2). The archeophisomorph can be aligned to K-8 state learning standards or Common Core State Standards through archeophisomorphic theory. This is an aesthetic curriculum theory in which its effect can be implemented in curriculum design. The process transforms retro components as they merge with a modern democratic society. Although this may appear anachronistic at first, such values tend to enter the present in modified or reimagined forms.

The role of ArchPM as an aesthetic theory for social studies curriculum is further implied in Gadamer’s (1975/2013) probe: “Why do we speak of the fusion of horizons and not simply of the formation of the one horizon, whose bounds are set in the depths of tradition?” Gadamer posited that “understanding becomes a scholarly task . . . necessary to work out these circumstances as a hermeneutical situation” (p. 317), and the projection of a “historical horizon, then, is only one phase in the process of understanding” (p. 317). Gadamer’s (1975/2013) hermeneutical lens to Suskind’s (2014) report that parents tended to promote historical “fantasy,” shows how fantasy is ontological play. The perception of medievalist fantasy, as an example in turn, seemed to be directly influenced by The Walt Disney Company’s reclamation of medieval to pre-modern fairy tales (itself a horizon of understanding). Lehar (2003) similarly suggested of Gestalt isomorphic visual representation that:

> In a global sense there are peculiar distortions apparent to the percipient which are caused by this deformation of Euclidean space, for although the sides of the road are perceived to be parallel, they are also perceived to meet at a point on the horizon. (p. 399)
Fuse the initially disparate horizons of perspective together—the Disney artistic representation of a value, the child’s perspective of the present, and the teacher’s use of picture books based on Disney—and a new pattern emerges to understand how reverence persists through preservation in artistic representation that was aesthetically suggested through the updated expression of that value in the present. The artistic representation acts as a catalyst for the value’s form to persist, but its expression to change. Such a preservation could be possible because the “same form”—the isomorph—of a value can repeat throughout the artistic expression of a given value.

Assumptions. Three definitional assumptions form the superstructure of archeophisomorphic theory: (1) The past is part of social awareness in which ancient or even prehistoric cultural values may be applied in modified forms in contemporary society, (2) values tend to retain some of their root characteristics through artistic expression even as other components of the expression of that value evolve, and (3) social thought tends to be cyclical rather than strictly linear. These three definitional assumptions of superstructure are summarized into definitional efficiency terms: (1) continued application, (2) root characteristic retention, and (3) cyclicality through aesthetic representation. Within those definitional assumptions of superstructure, there primarily one assumption: The assumption of modified persistence. This assumption consists of two elements: (1) An ostensibly anachronistic value must be founded on the cardinal virtue of reverence to persist into the present (see Woodruff, 2001; Garrison & Rud, 2009; Rud & Garrison, 2010, for discussion of reverence as a cardinal virtue), and (2) the value will retain its core characteristics but be expressed differently through the cardinal virtue of reverence and represented in artistic expressions.
Discourse Analysis of the 2012 Survey of Pre-Service K-8 Teachers

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) stated in 2006 that “Arts Education is a universal human right, for all learners, including those who are often excluded from education” (p. 3). This discourse analysis is written within a context of validating the academic and personal usefulness of arts-integrated education in a time of budget cuts (Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Apple, 2004; Gelineau, 2012). In the United States, the arts have tended be an addendum to STEM—becoming the acronym STEAM—to maintain relevance in general K-8 classrooms.

High-stakes testing and the decline in aesthetics education textbooks. The fact that Jalongo and Stamp’s (1997) textbook on aesthetics education in early childhood did not get a second edition from the publisher is likely not coincidental when considering that the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was passed into law in 2001 right around the time when a second addition would likely have been considered in the traditional textbook publishing cycle. NCLB increased the emphasis on high stakes testing that further focused on the subjects in the STEM acronym of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (Sousa & Pilecki, 2013; Shapiro, 2010). Although STEAM (science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics) has been proposed and implemented in some locales in which the arts are included in STEM (see Sousa & Pilecki, 2013, for discussion of STEAM), this integration has tended to be fragile for lack of a cohesive theoretical framework and, thus, the arts have tended to be marginalized in standardized curriculum.

The timing of NCLB and the lack of a second edition of Jalongo and Stamp’s (1997) precedent-setting book on aesthetics education for early childhood education may make sense considering the accelerated eclipsing effect that NCLB may have had on the fledging field of
aesthetics education in teacher education programs. STEAM specialists Sousa and Pilecki (2013) championed the potential benefits of integrating the arts across the STEM disciplines. STEM should have the individual and collective imaginations of its students and teachers to develop scientific, technological, and mathematical innovations to advance such disciplines toward new discoveries for the benefit of society and quality of life.

Aesthetics education can be and is a partner with STEM. With this background in mind, my study is focused on renewing interest in aesthetics education for elementary school by preparing elementary teachers with aesthetics-integrated teacher education programs. I propose ArchPM theory for a cohesive theoretical framework to reinforce, re-envision, and solidify aesthetics education so that it may be holistically integrated into STEM to create STEAM. This study examines pre-service elementary teachers’ responses to a survey on their perceptions and experiences with the fine arts in their education and how they may integrate the aesthetics into their teaching practice.

**Overview of the organization of the discourse analysis.** In the Fall of 2012, 37 pre-service elementary teachers at a public university participated in this study in which they completed a survey about their experiences and perceptions of the fine arts in schools. A discourse analysis is performed on their written responses (Gee, 2011a). This discourse analysis is organized in four parts: (1) the summary of findings from the discourse analysis, (2) conceptual framework, (3) methodology, and (4) a discourse analysis of written responses to survey questions on pre-service elementary teachers’ understanding of the fine arts in schools.

To conceptualize this discourse analysis, I metaphorically use the term *tesserae* (an ancient Latin word for cube-shaped tiles used in the making of mosaics) as a metaphor for each response from the pre-service elementary teachers who participated in the survey (see Appendix
A). Each survey participant’s response is like a *tessera*—each tile is distinct and different, yet have similarities in shape that can be put together to form a mosaic that communicates a message to the viewer. This metaphor could be used for this conceptual framework to put together seemingly disparate theorists (Foucault, 1972/2010; Giroux, 2001; Apple, 2004; Besley & Peters, 2007) to form a contextual mosaic for the social and political policy environment (Albert Shanker Institute, 2011) in which the contemporary school system operates.

Participants’ responses is analyzed using a discourse analysis drawing on the way Iverson (2010) conducted a discourse analysis of policy documents and is partially situated in Foucault’s (1998) work. Iverson (2010) situated the study by stating:

this study of the discursive framing of diversity draws upon the work of Foucault (1978/1990), who articulates a theoretical conception of power that is produced and transmitted through knowledge and discourse at the micro-levels of society. (p. 196)

The discourse analysis in this study likewise focuses on the “discourse at the micro-levels of society” (Iverson, 2010, p. 196), but to an even more localized extent. While Iverson’s (2010) study focused on policy documents from universities from all over the United States, my study is focused on responses to prompts about the conceptualization of the arts and experience with the arts. Theorists (Foucault, 1998; Besley & Peters, 2007) and policies noted here, too, can be metaphorically conceptualized as *tesserae*—each separate and different, yet they have, in this case, relevance to the subjectivity of the researcher (Besley & Peters, 2007). Therefore, history as art is discussed in context with theoretical ideas on uncovering why individuals think the way they do and how their interactions affect others through text and listening to various forms of text (Foucault, 1972/2010; Mazzei, 2004). There is a nearly inseparably intertwined relationship between history and the arts, because they inform each other as human civilizations create art to
communicate their stories, their cultures, and their way of being as cultural praxis (Gelineau, 2012; D’Alleva, 2012; Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Bayles & Orland, 2001; Price & Feinman, 2008; Kelley, Stair, & Price, 2013).

Method

I use James Paul Gee’s (2011a) discourse analysis method. The responses to the survey from the pre-service K-8 teachers who participated in this study were written responses and not verbally spoken. This researcher transcribed the responses manually. The text being analyzed is a conversation in that questions were “asked” in writing and answered in writing. Theoretically, they could have been verbally asked, answered, recorded, and then transcribed.

Validity statement for the discourse analysis. Gee (2011a) stated: “Validity is not constituted by arguing that a discourse analysis ‘reflects reality’ in any simple way . . . They must use some language or some other symbol system with which to interpret it and thereby render it meaningful in certain ways” (p. 122). This is partially why I use the metaphor of tesserae (and puzzle pieces) for each participant’s written responses. To understand the views of the arts from pre-service K-8 teachers, I have used Gee’s (2011a) discourse analysis method to get at what Gadamer (1975/2013) called “the genuine knowledge of essence” (p. 119) in artistic representation. I have included this validity statement in order to contextualize Gadamer (1975/2013) with arts-integration specialists (Gelineau, 2012; Jalongo & Stamp, 1997).

Procedure. I have followed the following steps outlined by Gee (2011a) for a researcher doing a discourse analysis. This is in keeping with procedural detail in grounded theory approaches to research (Birks & Mills, 2011). First: “Pick a piece of data (a big or small interaction, narrative or other extended piece of language, an interview, or a written text, for example) that both interests you and that you believe will speak to or illuminate an important
issue or question” (Gee, 2011a, p. 125). I surveyed pre-service elementary teachers on their conceptualization of the fine arts with the purpose of answering the question: How do pre-service elementary teachers conceptualize the fine arts? The findings may be important for understanding how the arts may augment learning and if there are any potential problems in current arts assessment. This may have implications for teacher practice.

Second: “Transcribe it as closely as you can, but with an eye to the features you think will be most important for the issue or question in which you are interested” (Gee, 2011a, p. 125). I transcribed the written responses and organized my analysis on the basis of what I believe to be important for the implications of arts assessment, teaching practice, and attitude disjuncture. (See Appendix A and B). What I mean by attitude disjuncture is when the response to one question contradicts a response to another question in which a particular attitude seems to be inferred through the use of specific “content words” (Gee, 2011a, p. 129) and in specific order in the response to the prompt. This will be explained in the discourse analysis section.

Third: “Pick some key words and phrases in the data, or related families of them, and ask what situated meanings these words and phrases seem to have in your data, given what you know about the overall context in which the data occurred” (Gee, 2011a, p. 125). Using Feinberg’s (2011) software program, I compiled a word frequency count and a word cloud on the basis of the word frequency count (see Figure 7). The word frequency is from the aggregated texts of participants’ responses to the prompts. Key words and phrases will be discussed in the discourse analysis section utilizing the tools noted by Gee (2011a) as “form-function correlations” (p. 63) and “situated meanings” (p. 65).
Figure 7. Frequency word cloud of the 2012 transcribed short answer survey data. This was created with *Wordle* (Feinberg, 2011) Web software. Font size of each word is determined by word frequency in the participants’ responses to the survey questions/prompts. The word frequency list was determined using *Wordle* (Feinberg, 2011). Common articles (such as “to,” “the,” “a,” et cetera) were omitted from the word cloud.

Fourth: “Think about . . . what and how social activities and socially situated identities are being enacted and/or recognized in your data” (Gee, 2011a, p. 125). The survey was designed to elucidate this, especially Question #8 of the survey: *Think of an activity that you enjoy (such as a hobby, game, sport, et cetera) and now consider how that personal passion could be translated into fine arts integration in a K-8 classroom. What activity would you choose to explore further for which you could potentially create an arts integration plan?* (See Appendix A).
This question is in alignment with Gee’s (2011a) assertion that “A discourse analysis argues that certain data supports a given theme or point (hypothesis)” (p. 124). I wondered if Common Core State Standards Initiative (Albert Shaker Institute, 2011)—also known as Common Core or CCSS—may affect pre-service elementary teachers’ discourse. Findings will be explained in the discourse analysis section on the “figured worlds” of social practice (Gee, 2011a, p. 69).

Fifth: “Think about the social languages and Discourses that appear to be relevant, in whatever ways, to your data” (Gee, 2011a, p. 125). This is why I include a conceptual framework that seeks to contextualize theorists (Foucault, 1998; Giroux, 2001; Apple, 2004; Besley & Peters, 2007) and policies (Albert Shaker Institute, 2011) that affect K-8 curriculum. The discourse analysis seems to reveal how the language of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (Albert Shaker Institute, 2011) may indirectly influence participants’ word choice and the power dynamics inferred in their written responses. Within the research question for this study, I considered the possibility that Common Core policy language—especially around Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM)—would affect the majority of student responses. The findings seem to largely contradict the assumption, which I will explain in the discourse analysis section.

And sixth: “You can, if appropriate, try to extend your analysis to other parts of your data or new sources of related data (or to data in the literature)” (Gee, 2011a, p. 126). Gee (2011a) is inferring that this may be done to establish implications or conclusions that have generalizable “validity” (p. 126). I briefly explain an implication for pre-service teacher education that the discourse analysis seems to reveal that is in parallel with some of the literature on the arts in pre-service teacher identity development. This ties back to the fourth step noted earlier in which
“socially situated identities” (Gee, 2011a, p. 125) may be gleaned from the participants’ texts. I also provide some anecdotal observations of the participants’ reaction to lesson plan standardization.

**Findings of the Discourse Analysis**

The first tool that is applied is the form-function correlation (Gee, 2011a). I identified key constructs of grammatical person and key action words and phrases on Question #3 (see Table 1). I coded the sentences and sentence fragments into key thematic understandings based on the “utterance-type” (Gee, 2011a, p. 64) and correlated the thematic categories with the utterance-type based on the use of grammatical person in the text (see Table 2). Question #3 of the survey is: “Please define ‘Fine Arts’ (What do the fine arts mean to you?).” The form-function correlation spotlighted three correlations for the overall study: (1) pre-service elementary teachers use certain linguistic constructions, such as first person pronouns, to associate themselves directly with positive information about their abilities entering the teaching profession; (2) they respond in the reverse to information that may be negative to their abilities entering the teaching profession; and (3) positive or negative content questions seem to correlate to the majority responses with words and phrases that indicate they are interpersonally oriented (when question is positive) or technically oriented (when question is negative).
Table 1

**Key Grammatical Person Usage and Key Action Words from Question #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant responses</th>
<th>Key Constructs of Grammatical Person and Key Action Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Person Pronoun</td>
<td>Second Person Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“I”)</td>
<td>(“you”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Person Pronoun</td>
<td>No Grammatical Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“one” / “oneself” /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“people” / “persons” /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“themselves” / “individual”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Grammatical Person</td>
<td>Word use: “Expression” and/or “Expressing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word use: “Create” and/or “Creativity”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| n         | 3 | 4 | 8 | 22 | 13 | 22 |

*Note.* See Appendix C for transcription that is color coded to the grammatical person categories.

Table 2

**Frequency of Key Thematic Understandings of the Fine Arts with Key Constructs of Grammatical Person from Question #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Thematic Categories</th>
<th>Mind-Ethereal (Intangible)</th>
<th>Practical (Tangible)</th>
<th>Combined Intangible &amp; Tangible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Constructs of Grammatical Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive grammatical third person subcategory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive grammatical second person subcategory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive without grammatical person subcategory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action oriented first person</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three key thematic categories emerged: (1) mind-ethereal (intangible); (2) practical (tangible); and (3) combined intangible and tangible. Four key constructs of grammatical person emerged: (1) passive grammatical third person subcategory; (2) passive grammatical second person subcategory; (3) passive without grammatical person subcategory; and (4) action oriented first person. I will now explain these categories and the form-function correlation.

Mind-ethereal (intangible) was derived from responses that included phrases such as “any expression,” “thinking outside the box,” and “express yourself” standing as a dependent clause that infer an assumption that the fine arts are ethereal and need no grounding in shared reality. The person in question did not need their art to be validated by another person. The inference is that the fine arts are all about the individual’s own internal world.

Practical (tangible) was derived from responses that included phrases or words grounded in shared realities. For example, expression through “music,” “dance,” “photo,” “painting,” “drawing,” and “sculpture” are tangible and, thus, verifiable by some community standard. Sentence structure indicated an assumption and assertion that a tangible medium must be used and visible to people other than the artist. Therefore, artful endeavors are “creative,” but only in so far as the products from that artful creation are useful to someone other than the artist.

The passive grammatical third person subcategory use “people,” “oneself,” or similar distancing pronouns. The passive grammatical second person subcategory is a different type of distancing technique in which the reader is “talked at,” so to speak, with an assumption that “you” know that the speaker does not really mean “you” personally, but generically. The passive without grammatical person subcategory completely leaves out any mention of a person. The reader is left with an assumption based on the context of the question. Finally, there is the action oriented first person subcategory in which the participant more definitively states their personal
stake in a “figured world” (Gee, 2011a, p. 76). I will discuss figured worlds in the next section on the researcher’s assumption of pre-service elementary teacher agency (See Table 6).

The three participants who were categorized as “action oriented first person” in their understanding of the fine arts were all also categorized as practical (tangible) (see Table 2). The combined intangible and tangible thematic category was derived from the responses that included phrases and words that were roughly balanced between what seemed to appear as the two opposite categories of mind-ethereal (intangible) vis-à-vis practical (tangible). The categories are not necessarily rigid, except I would suggest that the exception is the action oriented first person category. The grammatical structure is different from the second and third person in that “I” seems to assert a “claim” as an independent clause (Gee, 2011a, p. 64) or as the beginning to a second sentence. Even as the beginning to a second sentence, the use of the first person pronoun in this context essentially functions similarly to an independent clause. However, only three participants used the first person pronoun, despite the question specifically being phrased as: “What do the fine arts mean to you?” The last word in the question is “you,” and yet only three of thirty-seven participants used the first person pronoun in their response.

The other forms of response may suggest an inferred first person, but many more participants used the first person pronoun in the next question prompting them to “explain an experience you have had with fine arts.” The last word in the prompt is not “you,” but twelve participants used “I” in their responses. The reason(s) for this grammatical shift in pronoun use between Question #3 and Question #4 are inconclusive. However, the shift in pronoun use between Question #6 and Question #7 seem to be more closely correlated to allow for a conclusion on what emerged as the pronoun use question.
An implication for personal pronoun use and frequencies. The form-function correlation and then “situated meanings” (Gee, 2011a, p. 65) of Question #6 and Question #7 yield an interesting correlation. The participants’ grammatical person usage is nearly evenly split between grammatical first person and no person or inferred person, when they responded to Question #6 about their “greatest strengths entering the teaching profession.” And grammatical second person is absent (see Table 4). However, when participants respond to Question #7 about their “greatest challenge entering the teaching profession,” the use of the first person pronoun drops significantly and there is a corresponding increase in the use of no grammatical person at all nor what could be interpreted as an inferred first person (see Table 5). This suggests that pre-service elementary teachers more often prefer to distance themselves through the use of grammatical constructs from something personally negative than positive.

Table 5 shows the correlation of thematic constructs with personal pronoun use. Two thematic constructs emerged: (1) interpersonal and (2) technical. Interpersonal is defined here as responses that included words and phrases such as “patience,” “politics,” and other similar words that infer relational interaction. Technical is defined here as responses that included words and phrases such as “discipline,” “curriculum planning,” and other similar words or phrases that infer measurable production in a school.

Five of the six participants who used the first person pronoun in their response to Question #7 were categorized as technical. The vast majority of participants answered without any grammatical personal pronouns; however, they were close to an even split between interpersonal and technical. A small majority were technical. Overall, the majority of responses, eighteen, were coded as technical and thirteen were coded as interpersonal (See Table 5). However, this was inverted when comparing the numbers in the thematic constructs of
interpersonal and technical in Question #7 with the numbers in Question #6. The majority of the participants’ (n = 26) responses were coded as interpersonal and the remaining participant responses (n = 11) were coded technical (see Table 4).

The implication is that the number of participants responses about their perceived strengths use the first person pronoun with a response that suggests an interpersonal orientation more frequently and in opposite correlation to their responses to their perceived greatest challenge entering the teaching profession. Not only does their use of the first person pronoun differ in correlation, but their responses are also more focused in technical rather than interpersonal themes (see Table 4 and Table 5). In other words, when talking about their strengths, more participants were interpersonal using the first person pronoun (see Table 4 for words associated with the interpersonal code). However, when talking about their challenges, the numbers flip with more participants using an inferred third (perhaps first, but still only inferred) grammatical person. Ultimately, the implication is that the majority of participants linguistically disassociate themselves from their challenges, but linguistically associate themselves with their strengths.

Meaning and the imaginary. The discussion of the results thus far has focused on the correlation between first person pronoun form-function correlations to thematic constructs. Gee (2011a) asserts that in addition to the form-function correlation, there are two additional tools for discourse analysis: “situated meaning” (p. 65) and “figured worlds” (p. 76). The theme of the importance of educational environment emerged from the responses to Question #4 on participants’ personal in-school “experiences with the fine arts” (see Table 3). Although the question asked about participants’ experiences with the fine arts, nothing about context was stated. Participants seem to have situated the question within the context of formal schooling
environments, even though the question does not limit the response to discussing in-school experiences with the fine arts. The responses were significantly tilted toward experiences in schools with the majority mentioning “high school” as the center of their understanding of fine arts. This may indicate that students are approaching these questions with unconscious background knowledge of recent policy language, such as the Common Core State Standards Initiative (Albert Shanker Institute, 2011). Common Core has already been implemented for K-12 mathematics. A number of the participants mention “math” and “curriculum” in their responses, some positively and some negatively. Most mentions are positive, perhaps because of the emphasis on STEM training and the positive language used in various sources (National Council on Teacher Quality, n.d., 2012) for the importance of STEM.

Table 3

References to In-School Experiences with Fine Arts: Question #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Places Related to Educational Environment and First Person</th>
<th>“Elementary school”</th>
<th>“Middle school”</th>
<th>“High school” or “HS”</th>
<th>“College”</th>
<th>“school” written in response without specification of grade level</th>
<th>Begins response with grammatical first person (“I”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Participants could omit answer or mention more than one construct; therefore, responses may not total thirty-seven.
When participants reply to the question about their “greatest challenge” entering the teaching profession, the thematic correlation is the inverse of their response to their response to the question about their “greatest strength.” Two thematic categories were coded: (1) *interpersonal* and (2) *technical*. Each question was coded to include similar phrases, but slightly different. The “interpersonal” thematic category for Question #6 (“greatest strength” question) includes words such as “compassionate,” “enthusiastic,” and “patience.” The *interpersonal* thematic category for Question #7 (“greatest challenge”) includes words such as “patience” and “politics.” The “technical” category is essentially identical across both questions and includes words such as “curriculum” and “discipline.” *Patience* was the word used that overlapped the most between the two thematic strength categories. Not only do the participants tend to disassociate themselves from their “greatest challenge” through the use of the grammatical third person or non-person, but there is also an inverse correlation in the thematic categories based on their responses. The inverse correlation is that when responding to the question about their greatest strength, the majority is in the *interpersonal* category, indicating that compassion, enthusiasm, and passion are their greatest strengths. However, when responding to the question about their greatest challenge, the majority is in the *technical* category, indicating that curriculum planning, politics, and classroom management seem to be their greatest challenge entering the teaching profession (see Table 4 and Table 5).
Table 4

Frequency of Grammatical Person and Themes of Personal Strengths (Question #6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant responses N = 37</th>
<th>Key Constructs of Grammatical Person and Key Themes for Personal Strengths entering the Teaching Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Person Pronoun (&quot;I&quot; or &quot;My&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. See Appendix C for transcription and coding.*

Table 5

Frequency of Grammatical Person and Themes of Personal Challenges (Question #7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant responses N = 37</th>
<th>Key Constructs of Grammatical Person and Key Themes of Personal Challenges entering the Teaching Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Person Pronoun (&quot;I&quot; or &quot;My&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. See Appendix C for transcription and coding.*

**Assumption on Common Core and results implication to Question #7.** This researcher assumed that Common Core policy language—especially around science, engineering, technology, and mathematics (STEM)—would affect student responses more than it did on Question #7 about challenges entering the teaching profession. I began this research with
this assumption because of “nonpartisan” reports on STEM competency (National Council on Teacher Quality, n.d.) and case reports such as those from the National Council on Teacher Quality (2012). Common Core infers a power relationship in which state (Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2010) and, increasingly, nationally mandated curriculum language projects power downward. I coded participant responses to Question #7 into two thematic categories: “macro-level” and “micro-level” challenges. Most participants identify their “greatest challenge” at the “micro-level” and not at the “macro-level” (see Table 6).

Gee (2011a) asserted: “A figured world is a picture of a simplified world that captures what is taken to be typical or normal” (p. 71). What was “normal” for the participants seems to have been that their individual agency within their local school is their greatest challenge. I refer to the participants coded as “micro-level” for their “greatest challenge inference” as MicroGCIers. For most participants, macro-level challenges that will affect them—such as the Common Core State Standards Initiative—are apparently not of greatest concern at this stage in their career. These were the MicroGCIers. They used words and phrases that symbolically limited their agency or self-efficacy in designing curriculum.

However, of the participants who suggested that macro-level challenges were their greatest challenge—these participants will now be referred to as MacroGCIers—there was a correlation in their use of the grammatical first person. Only one of the six MacroGCIers used the first person pronoun, while five of the twenty-six MicroGCIers used the first person pronoun. (See Table 6). This is still a relatively small number but is significant in comparison of the two groups. This is also important for its implication for the participants’ view of their own personal agency as they enter schools as teachers that I discuss below.
My analysis earlier of the grammatical first person being an “action” is in parallel with Gee’s (2011a) assertion. The implication here is for pre-service elementary teachers’ view of their personal agency in the schools and how this may affect their artfulness. In this case, “artfulness” can mean “creativity” in general. I suggest that Common Core (Albert Shanker Institute, 2011) puts teacher agency/creativity at risk. Common Core standardization concerns me because of how it may affect teacher preparation programs—especially arts education and what arts integration would look like in a Common Core ecosystem.

Participants’ responses (see Table 6) indicate that the majority is not concerned with Common Core standardization, or at the very least the concern is not in the foreground. Interestingly, the MicroGCIsers (those who indicate that micro-level challenges are their greatest challenge) use first person pronouns far more than the MacroGCIsers. This may suggest that MicroGCIsers subconsciously practice personal agency. This correlates to their focus on micro-level challenges in that looking at the small challenges offers more opportunities to personally affect change. Macro-level challenges, however, may be seen as too big to affect change individually, and so the potential challenge of Common Core is too powerful for personal agency to have any affect. This would explain why the MacroGCIsers use the third person or no grammatical person at all. In both cases, the two groups suggest an understanding of their political limitations within the overall structure of the formal schooling system.
### Table 6

**Frequency of “Greatest Challenge” Themes with Grammatical Person Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant responses</th>
<th>Key Constructs of Grammatical Person and Key Themes of Personal Challenges entering the Teaching Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical Person Usage (coded from Question #7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Strength Inference (coded from Question #6, see Appendix C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Person Pronoun (“I” or “My”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Person Pronoun (“you”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without person or Inferred First Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal: patience, politics, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical: discipline, curriculum planning, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for Grammatical Person Usage and thematic Strength Inference categories</td>
<td>6 - 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>1 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>5 - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatest Challenge Inference (GCI) coded from Question #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-level (MicroGCI)</td>
<td>5 - 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-level (MacroGCI)</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for Greatest Challenge Thematic Categories</td>
<td>6 - 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* See Appendix C for coded transcription.

**Key words and motifs.** Gee (2011a) suggests that the researcher doing a discourse analysis should: “Pick some key words and phrases in the data, or related families of them, and ask what situated meanings these words and phrases seem to have in your data, given what you know about the overall context in which the data occurred” (p. 125). The top four words in the participants’ responses were: art, school, arts, and students. Participants’ mention of art seems to be geared toward the visual arts. The most commonly mentioned form of art other than the visual arts was the aural art “music” with sixteen mentions. “Dance” and “drama” also featured prominently with sixteen mentions and seven mentions respectively. The responses that included
dance and drama tended to come from the third question on definition of the fine arts, so the number of mentions for dance and drama is probably overrepresented in terms of actual interests of the participants long-term.

Of the visual arts, “painting” featured most prominently with eleven mentions, followed by “draw[ing],” “photography,” and “scrapbooking.” “Art” seemed to be a stand in term for any and all of the visual arts. Interestingly, ceramics was barely mentioned in the aggregate responses. Reasons for this omission are nebulous. An explanation is that participants inferred ceramics as part of the visual arts and so did not mention ceramics specifically in their responses; however, this explanation does not explain why other visual arts were specifically mentioned (such as painting and drawing) while ceramics was the only major medium of visual arts hardly mentioned at all. Speculative answers may be possible, but the data does not seem to offer any illumination on the question of the missing mentions on ceramics. Another speculative answer may be that materials for ceramics are perhaps not as easily acquired as drawing and painting materials. There may also be a perception that clay has to be fired in a kiln to be “finished,” and perhaps participants have not had easy access to a kiln.

In terms of aesthetic words, “creativity” featured prominently with thirteen mentions. The majority of participants indicated that they would prefer to teach in Grades 1-3 with a significant, yet smaller, number indicating Kindergarten and the upper elementary grades of 4-6. Only a few indicated preference in teaching Grades 7 and 8. Mathematics was indicated the most (N = 16) as the “favorite” subject that the participants wanted to teach. This is why I discuss STEM at various points in this paper and include STEM as having a certain situated power in the background of the survey responses. English/Language Arts was the second most indicated “favorite” (N = 13), followed by social studies (N = 10). Perhaps the increase in Science,
Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) discourse plays a role in mathematics being indicated the most by participants as their preferred “favorite” subject. Furthermore, only two of the written responses directly indicated that they thought teaching mathematics was one of their notable challenges entering the K-8 teaching profession. This could possibly be indicative of training in mathematics teaching methods or perhaps STEM training in general.

Participants seem to focus on the importance of creativity in their conceptualization of the fine arts. Assessment procedures should reflect this with an emphasis on individual student evaluation instead of teacher-centered grading. Perhaps this can be accomplished by asking the teacher to be a facilitator or coach-curator who fosters the development of individual creativity and expression. In this way, students may evaluate their own work according to an intrinsically developed aesthetic. The teacher would then record the student’s created art piece accompanied by a written reflection consistent with a rubric co-constructed with the student based on their own aesthetic. The teacher would record that the students have done these two assessment pieces and the grade is awarded on the basis of the student’s creativity and not wholly on the teacher’s own sense of aesthetics. In this way, there is a rubric that external evaluators can verify while students retain control over their intellectual work and still receive constructive feedback from the experienced teacher operating as a coach-curator.

I identified two major motifs from the text that the participants indicated in aggregate: (1) arts assessment and (2) attitude disjuncture. The two overall themes emerged from the aggregate analysis discussed. The participants did not specifically use those words/phrases.

The motif of arts assessment emerged in which participants noted their reaction to how their artwork was graded in their own K-12 experience. The majority of responses seem positive toward prior experiences with fine arts classes. However, there were some negative responses
that indicated that some of the fine arts courses taken in K-12 and college were “not as fun” (or similar allusions) to less than positive experiences with grading or instructional delivery. In parallel with these assertions from some participants, is the suggestion in the responses that the participants’ beliefs about their learning strengths and weaknesses were formed by the response from their teachers.

The aggregated responses suggest that participants believed that they were good at some subjects—such as mathematics—and worried about perceived weaknesses in teaching other subjects—such as English language arts. This is also suggested in their perceptions of what fine arts they believe they are good at or not so good at doing. If the arts are a diverse methodological, theoretical, and practical learning medium—and, as I suggest, the participants’ aggregate responses indicate—there is also a complication in that one medium may work for one student but not for another. When introducing an alternative form of papier-mâché, for example, one student may think it is great while another student may say that it does not work for them. The teacher’s grading and remarks tended to be associated with a particular medium and appeared to be a motivating participants’ responses.

Fewer than twenty-five percent of the participants indicated sharply negative experiences with fine arts instruction. However, there were a substantive number of comments that focused on the negativity of teacher assessment of their work as students. Participant 1 stated: “In younger grades I liked them a lot, but taking FA in college was not as fun.” Participant 9 stated: “My teachers were always correcting me w/ my art & calling it not art.” Participant 16 stated: “Took art classes throughout school but I’m horrible at them.”

Another motif to emerge was attitude disjuncture. Personal agency relative to the arts from the pre-service teachers’ perspectives varied depending on the question. As the sample
below suggests, the participants’ experience with prior arts-based courses seemed to reify *high fashion* as an exclusionary concept linked to “being artistic.” This seemed to suggest a more nuanced practical view when considering Bayles and Orland’s (2001) statement that “in most matters of art it is more nourishing to be a maker than a viewer” (p. 51). This may generally be the case, unless the teacher creates a negative assessment environment. The assessment of students’ work by an authority figure had a profoundly long-lasting impact years after the grade, as suggested in this sample of responses to Question #4: *What best describes your experience with the fine arts?*

Negative

1. “When I think of fine arts I first thinking of paintings and my lack of ability to create artistic things. I so appreciate art and learning art, but being artistic is a talent I lack.”
2. “In younger grades I liked them a lot, but taking FA in college was not as fun.”
3. “My teachers were always correcting me w/ my art & calling it not art.”
4. “Took art classes throughout school but I’m horrible at them.”

Neutral

5. “I have not taken any non-required art courses since I don’t really consider myself artistic. However, I do enjoy painting on my own.”
6. “Anything that has to do with using creativity and not only logical thinking.”
7. “Fine arts can be only expression of emotion or just interpretation through the use of different materials.”
8. “I took basic art throughout school. I love to do crafty things at home, but I have never done any actual fine arts as an adult.”
9. “I took only the required fine arts courses in middle and high school.”
Positive

10. “My teacher was very enthusiastic about teaching which made it fun.”

11. “I took 2 art classes in middle school & loved it. One project that was particularly memorable was doing mosaic benches for our school garden.”

12. “I have taken drama every year in high school. I also played the flute in high school, and I love to paint on my free time. I have never taken any classes but I enjoy doing it.

13. “I have taken drawing class at WSU and love to paint. I also played piano and done choir my whole life.”

As can be seen in the sample of participants’ responses above, emotions were associated with the fine arts (see Bayles & Orland, 2001, for discussion of the arts and emotion). Kozulin (1986) noted in discussing Vygotsky’s work that emotion tends to be an integral part of the work people do, even if emotions are not readily apparent to the casual observer. The tension of external standards and internal standards may help account for some of the respondents’ ironic assertions. For example, a participant stated: “I have not taken any non-required art courses since I don’t really consider myself artistic. However, I do enjoy painting on my own.” Even when not considering themselves to be “artistic,” respondents still identified a creative activity that they liked to do that was “artsy.” The disconnection here seemed to be from the assessment system utilized in schools that rigidly judged their artwork within deficit models. The pre-service teachers in this sample seemed to indicate that their artwork was personal; therefore, arts assessment that was critical of their work was seen as an *ad hominem* declaration of negative value. They seemed to see the grade they were given on their artwork as a personal judgment.
The survey responses further suggested that pre-service elementary teachers conceptualized the fine arts broadly, yet consistently, and they self-assessed their abilities with the fine arts within a hierarchical model. Some participants suggested that they were skilled in one arts field—such as dance—yet not skilled in another field and indicated that they were worried about other classroom factors such as classroom management and discipline. The participants’ responses to the eighth question on what activity or hobby they could specifically use in an artful way suggested that they were creative thinkers who were just beginning to see themselves as artistic whereas before they may not have viewed themselves as artistic.

Encouraging the participants to see that the arts are within their capability should be a systemic component in teacher education. The way to accomplish this is by requiring participants/students to do studio art labs as part of their teacher education program on the basis of ArchPM theory so that the art is an integrated process across the curriculum rather than a discrete process. In this way, pre-service teachers may better see some of their hobbies—such as scrapbooking (which was mentioned a number of times by participants)—as potentially a decorative arts practice under the auspices of the fine arts. Thus, pre-service K-8 teachers should be affirmed as artsy—as artistically efficacious individuals—who can and should integrate their creative talents into and across the curriculum.

Participants’ responses to Question #8 about what hobby they like that could be utilized as a fine arts practice featured the broadest mix of grammatical person pronoun usage. The majority of responses were again in the third grammatical person, but six participants “spoke” in the grammatical second person (see Table 7). This is the least used grammatical pronoun structure in the responses across all survey questions. The implication is that a question about personal interests triggered a voice from the teacher persona in six participants whereas all the
other questions never triggered a voice from the teacher persona, but instead maintained the voice of the student persona. This is especially interesting in comparison to the absence of the second person pronouns in the responses to Question #7 on participants’ perception of their “greatest challenge” entering the teaching profession. Six of the participants indicated that they are “speaking” to a student when discussing an activity or hobby that they like to do (when using the second person pronoun “you” in their responses). An implication for elementary teacher education programs to explore may be how to foster pre-service elementary teachers’ sense of personal investment in fine arts integration with core curriculum that encourages them to build upon one of their hobbies and/or activities that could be related to the fine arts.

Table 7

Frequency between Grammatical Person and Key Activities (Question #8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Person Usage (coded from Question #8, see Appendix C), N = 35</th>
<th>Thematic Strength Inference (coded from Question #6, see Appendix C), N = 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Person Pronoun (“I” or “My”)</td>
<td>Second Person Pronoun (“you”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest Challenge Inference (GCI) (coded from Question #7, see Appendix C), N = 37</th>
<th>Thematic Challenge Inference (coded from Question #7, see Appendix C), N = 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-level (MicroGCI)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-level (MacroGCI)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for Greatest Challenge Thematic Categories</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implication for pre-service teacher education with the arts. Highlighting teacher identity formation through arts processes is an emerging field. Using the arts to explore professional identity may be beneficial for pre-service and veteran in-service teachers. The arts may include artful linguistics, painting, and the many other media that comprise the fine arts. This line of inquiry may be of interest internationally. Joseph and Heading’s (2010) goal, for example, is to improve music pedagogy through narrative methodology in which pre-service teachers reflect on their identity as teachers by journaling. Although not specifically about teachers, Stanley Crouch’s (2006) narrative style in Considering Genius: Writings on Jazz suggests how jazz music can be a cultural teaching and learning method in an informal curriculum and potentially a formal curriculum.

Thomas and Beauchamp’s (2011) study on new teachers in Quebec, Canada utilized metaphor as an artful linguistic approach to exploring how teachers form their identities. Thomas and Beauchamp (2011) assert that some of “the complexity of identity can be revealed through metaphor” (p. 764) and that those metaphors may indicate that some teachers transformed during their teacher education programs. Thomas and Beauchamp (2011) conclude: “Development of a professional identity does not automatically come with experience, and that some form of deliberate action is necessary to ensure that new teachers begin their careers with the appropriate tools to negotiate the rocky waters of the first few years” (p. 767). This is in parallel with the recommendations of Hong (2010) and Cheng, Chan, Tang, and Cheng (2009) to systematically implement a teacher education program that requires pre-service teachers to critically reflect upon their professional identity development. The conclusion to be taken from the commentary cited above is that the vantage points of pre-service teachers are important for understanding the
role of the arts in the general classroom. The arts are also a tool that should be used by the pre-service teacher to communicate their own teacher identity.

**Summary of findings.** Within the research question for this study, I assumed that Common Core policy language—especially around Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM)—would negatively affect the majority of student responses. This data suggests the opposite conclusion to that assumption.

Participants who indicated that micro-level challenges are their greatest challenge (see Table 6) seem to exercise more personal agency *textually*, than do those participants who indicate that macro-level challenges (such as standardized national curriculum) are their greatest concern. This may have implications for their exercise of agency in practice. Most notable is the correlation between first person pronoun use and thematic categories of the participants’ understanding of the arts as either “tangible” or “intangible.” All of those participants who used the first person pronoun indicated the importance of the practical or tangible use of the arts rather than art for art’s sake (see Table 2).

The implications for personal agency with the arts are founded on the basis of a form-function correlation of their use of grammatical person with thematic categories (Gee, 2011a). The form-function correlation spotlighted three correlations for the overall study: (1) pre-service elementary teachers who used first person pronoun usage vis-à-vis the arts is suggestive of their self-efficacy with the arts by associating themselves directly with *positive* information about their abilities entering the teaching profession; (2) they responded in the reverse by using third person or omitting personal pronoun usage altogether to disassociate themselves from information that was viewed as a *negative* reflection on their abilities entering the teaching profession.
Each student’s written response is like a *tessera* tile: A mosaic is formed when the tesserae are put together which portrays an image greater in impact than the sum of its individual parts. The tesserae mosaic’s aesthetic is greater than its constituent elements apart. Seemingly disparate responses—when analyzed through the discourse analysis of this study—coalesce to form a cohesive mosaic inferred in this summary of findings.

**Findings in the 2014 Survey of Experience with the Fine Arts in K-12 and College**

**Participants and procedure.** In 2014, pre-service K-8 teachers (n = 344) completed a survey of their experiences with, and opinions of, the fine arts on Likert-type intensity scale questions/prompts so that a baseline could be established with which to further contextualize the discourse analysis of the 2012 survey results. There were six male and twenty-eight female survey respondents, as they self-identified gender. Sixteen of the respondents replied that they are most interested in teaching grades K-2—early childhood education (or ECE)—while the remainder indicated grades K-4 (ECE and elementary), 3-4 (elementary), 3-6 (elementary and upper elementary), 5-8 (upper elementary and middle school). Point-biserial correlations were run using SPSS; there were two significant findings which will be discussed here.

**Significant findings.** First, participants’ response to what was the grade level in which they last took an art class or had formal arts-based instruction had a significant correlation (at the .01 alpha level) to their response to the question of whether they visited an art museum in the past two years. The correlation suggests: If they had taken an arts-based course in school, then there is a likely increased chance that they have visited an art museum in the past two years. Second, participants’ response to indicate their *level of interest in learning about history of the arts* had a significant correlation (at the .05 alpha level) to their response to their *level of interest in the performing arts*. The correlation suggests: If participants’ were interested in history of the
arts, they tended to be interested in the performing arts. Reasons for these correlations may be rooted in the concept of performance identity (Goffman, 1959) in which the “embodied action” (Hartjen, 2012, p. 12) of learning through doing may increase interest in learning more about the subject area (see Table 8).

**Limitation of the Surveys**

The limitations of both surveys are that they are samples and do not have generalizable findings from a quantitative perspective. However, the findings from the analysis do have qualitative transferability to teacher education programs, especially for the region—the Pacific Northwest—in which the study was conducted. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested, qualitative findings can inform researchers in similar contexts. The surveys were taken by pre-service K-8 teachers enrolled in the required arts-integration methods course in their teacher education program and administered by this researcher.
Table 8

Point-Biserial Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Grade Level to Teach</th>
<th>Interest in Art History</th>
<th>Interest in Visual Arts</th>
<th>Interest in Performing Arts</th>
<th>Comfort Presenting Your Artwork</th>
<th>Visited an Art Museum in Past 2 Yrs</th>
<th>Visited an Art Museum during K-8</th>
<th>Last Art Class Taken</th>
<th>Course Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level to Teach</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Art History</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Visual Arts</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.289</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Performing Arts</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Presenting Your Artwork</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited an Art Museum in Past 2 Yrs</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.445**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited an Art Museum during K-8</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Art Class Taken</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>-.445**</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Section</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.360*</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Discussion

These findings seem to support Gelineau’s (2012) suggestion that history and art are linked and probably best taught together, which further supports my contention that arts-integration curriculum design may be envisioned through ArchPM curriculum theory as a framework with which to fuse the arts together and across the K-8 curriculum. Gelineau (2012) asserted: “The educational value of the arts lies in the process—not the product” (p. 12). This is generally agreed within the framework of Howard Gardner’s (2006) multiple intelligences theory, but the product can also be of major educational value since it is something that others can also use. With what seems like a new emphasis of the Common Core on product as much, if not more, than on process, it may be worth reconsidering if the products are perhaps more important now in arts-integration curriculum. With this caveat noted, these data do support the contention that: “a teacher need not be an artist, musician, dancer, or other arts professional in order to provide a nurturing arts climate that will vitalize the learning process” (p. 12). Indeed, teachers’ self-efficacy with the broad range of the arts should be encouraged throughout their teacher education program so that they create arts-integrated curriculum products that will encourage their students to be creative.

It is in the creative process, that arts-integrated products may have greatest influence on and for students' education. These results matter, because students will probably be more likely to continue to learn about art when generalist K-8 teachers are comfortable with aesthetic literacy and encouraged to explore and implement the arts across the subjects they teach. If students’ interest in the history of the arts was fostered then they are probably more likely to want to learn about the arts in adulthood and that artistic experience may encourage learning across subjects.
The aesthetic awareness of general K-8 teachers likely has long-lasting influence on students’ interests into adulthood.

The procedural steps for an ArchPM curriculum include three major steps aligned with the visual outline of ArchPM as portrayed in Figure 2. First, the teacher surveys the students for their background knowledge and their approach to art production. This data can be used for guiding the teacher in how reverence may be customized—as it is the foundation of ArchPM. Reverence as a value is highly customizable, and the survey data can be used by teachers to ascertain how constructivist students expect the teacher to be so that the teacher provides enough time for each student to contribute to the aesthetic dialogue from their own perspective. The survey would be modified based on grade level. For example, in a first grade classroom, student could be surveyed through two forms: a color-by-numbers worksheet and a one-question survey asking students whether they would prefer to draw or paint. The color-by-numbers worksheet would be for assessing whether students adhere to the directions of coloring in each section in accordance with the stated color key. If students do, then they may prefer more of a direct instruction approach in which the teacher would provide more structured guidelines for their aesthetic response to the teacher’s ArchPM curriculum product (e.g. the illustrated book designed by the teacher on mathematics, in this explanatory example). If students do not adhere to the color-by-numbers directions, then those students may prefer a more constructivist approach for their aesthetic response in which the teacher asks guiding questions but does not direct the student’s creative process in a prescriptive way.

Second, the teacher creates an ArchPM product, such as an illustrated book that the teacher writes and illustrates in which the book could be on any topic in the core subjects. The teacher-made ArchPM product serves as the prompt for students to create something from their
own understanding and their own cultural background to artistically “dialogue” with the prompt. The example that I made as part of this study is for an introduction to medieval cultures. Another example could be a book on kindergarten mathematics with a focus on fractions in which the characters are shapes (e.g. triangles, squares, circles, and rectangles) and the storyline revolves around one of the shapes trying to find its lost denominator. The title of this ArchPM mathematics book could be something like Shapes in Search of a Common Denominator. This mathematics example is representative of teaching new mathematics vocabulary (e.g. denominator and numerator) and art vocabulary (e.g. different shapes and lines). It is important that the teacher designs the book and then encourages the students to aesthetically dialogue with the book after the teacher reads the book aloud.

Third, students are invited to make their own aesthetic response to the teacher-made book on shapes that are searching for a common denominator. This is an aesthetic dialogue in which students make an artistic product in response to the teacher’s artistic product; thus, the student is a co-designer of aesthetic education with the teacher. They are in aesthetic dialogue on the basis of the visual arts, performing arts, and the core content area being studied—in this example, mathematics. This aesthetic dialogue is predicated on the Common Core learning standards for mathematics, language arts, and the relevant state-endorsed visual arts standards.

My ArchPM curriculum example for a middle school social studies unit on medieval world cultures that is the example as part of this study followed the steps outlined above. This ArchPM curriculum is intended to demonstrate aesthetically responsive curriculum design in practice, because the illustrated picture book is both aligned to state learning standards and is aesthetically integrated to foster advanced literacy in upper elementary and middle school
through the systematic aesthetic of the illustrations and poetic storyline that forms the book. Collectively, in other words, this is an ArchPM arts-integration curriculum example.

The illustrated picture book, *Ode to the Pillars of Aesthetics*, is an example of the ArchPM effect for teaching arts-integrated literacy and social studies. ArchPM works with the Common Core and state standards. The curriculum example presented here is the bridging of ArchPM theory with its practice. This example is mapped to fostering aesthetic literacy for pre-service teachers who will teach upper elementary literacy and vocabulary skills.

Specifically, the ArchPM-based curriculum example is an effect of this aesthetic theory and, as such, is arts-integrated and is aligned to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English Language Arts (ELA) and History/Social Studies, as well as Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) in Communication and the Visual Arts. The aesthetically-based—ArchPM—curriculum product example (see Appendix D) is aligned to meet the following learning standards: CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.L.6.3a “Vary sentence patterns for meaning, reader/listener interest, and style,” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, n.d., p. 30) and CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.6-8.7 for history/social studies: “Integrate visual information (e.g., in charts, graphs, photographs, videos, or maps) with other information in print and digital texts” (Common Core, n.d., “English Language Arts Standards – History/Social Studies”). These are aligned to the Washington State EALR Grade Level Expectations (GLE) and Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2010) guidelines.

Communication EALR 1 and Visual Arts EALR 3 are met. Communication EALR 1 states: “The student uses listening and observation skills and strategies to gain understanding;” Component 1.2 “Understands, analyzes, synthesizes, or evaluates information from a variety of sources;” Grade 6 GLE 1.2.1 “Analyzes relationships within and between visual and auditory
information” (Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, n.d., p. 18). Visual Arts EALR 3 states: “The student communicates through the arts;” Component 3.1 “Uses visual arts to express feelings and present ideas;” GLE 3.1.1 “Analyzes the ways that visual arts are used to express feelings and present ideas and applies his/her understanding when creating artworks” (A. Joseph, 2011, p. 23).

The State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education (2014)—also known by its acronym SEADAE—suggested that the field of the arts for K-8 education is trending toward the CCSS model of standards with the National Core Arts Standards (NCAS). Four domains are the focus of the NCAS: (1) “Creating,” (2) “Performing/Presenting/Producing,” (3) “Responding,” and (4) “Connecting.” This may be helpful in integrating the arts across the CCSS framework, because the arts-based standards and the other core disciplines will likely be able to harmonize. This process is more likely with a comprehensive theory such as ArchPM that I posit in this study. In addition to the Washington Art EALRs for the Visual Arts, the NCAS Anchor Standard 7 for “VISUAL ARTS – Responding” for Grade 5 is VA:Re.7.2.5a: “Identify and analyze cultural associations suggested by visual imagery” (State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education, 2014, p. 6). The “Enduring Understanding” of VA:Re.7.2.5a is: “Visual imagery influences understanding of and responses to the world” (State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education, 2014, p. 6). This Enduring Understanding is based on the “Essential Question” set: “What is an image? Where and how do we encounter images in our world? How do images influence our views of the world?” (State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education, 2014, p. 6). These new National Core Arts Standards appear compatible with ArchPM praxis. The ArchPM-based curriculum product included as part of this study applies this understanding (see Appendix D).
The ArchPM illustrated book—*Ode to the Pillars of Aesthetics*—is a curricular product example of what the ArchPM effect can look like (see Appendix D). See Figure 4 for an example of fine arts-integration activity could look like if the teacher were to have an activity using acrylic on canvas after reading aloud *Ode to the Pillars of Aesthetics*. In this example, it is of an arts-integrated social studies product that is intended as part of a lesson and unit on medieval cultures. Aligning the elements and assumptions of ArchPM theory to this example, it can be seen that Consilio the owl is an avatar to guide readers in highlighted information and encourage reflection on the illustrations on those pages. The character of Consilio (from the Latin for wise advice) is inspired by Merlin’s talking pet owl Archimedes (voiced by Junius Matthews) in Disney and Reitherman’s (1963) movie *The Sword in the Stone*, because the Disneyesque aesthetic has been a powerful informal curricular tool for teaching and learning across student groups (see Suskind, 2014, for discussion of Disneyland’s anecdotal usefulness with students with autism, for example).

My curriculum example, in the form of an illustrated book (see Appendix D), fulfills ArchPM’s assumption that the past is part of the aesthetic in which ancient or even prehistoric cultural values continue to be applied in modified forms within contemporary society, because of the ideas in the poetic writing and expressed though audio-visual media. For example, the medieval concept of European and Mediterranean chivalry is reimagined in *Ode to the Pillars of Aesthetics* to be one of an androgynous social concept in which equity is championed. This example fulfills ArchPM’s assumption that values tend to retain some of their root characteristics through artistic expression even as other components of the expression of that value evolve, because the illustrations of forest pathways and rolling hills evoke both the medieval landscapes of deciduous regions that are viewable today. This example fulfills ArchPM’s assumption that
social thought tends to be cyclical rather than strictly linear, because chivalry is reimagined in ways that are both recognizable and new—or even unrecognizable from a historical standpoint. Therefore, with these three definitional assumptions met, *Ode to the Pillars of Aesthetics* is an archeophisomorph predicated on the ArchPM definitional efficiency terms: continued application, root characteristic retention, and cyclicality through aesthetic representation. As such, it infers the reverence of the past while transformed into the new reverence of today by crossing the ArchPM horizon of the event illustrated by the book’s audio-visual stimulus. This is amplified when teachers design their own curriculum products with their own audio-visual aesthetic, and students can see and hear their teachers’ curricular creativity which can, in turn, catalyze the creativity of students.

The ArchPM effect in the social studies example on medieval culture may at first appear to be partially ironic. Partial irony is likely a byproduct of ArchPM, because—as is the case in this example (see Appendix D)—when an ancient value is modified for the present, then that value’s style partly changes. It is important to approach ArchPM-based curriculum from the vantage point of its assumptions; namely, that the value is modified for the present. This is not bringing “medievalism” forward. Rather, it is taking parts of the medieval *aesthetic* and applying the audio-visual and textual components of that time period’s art to a book that can be used to teach about the past while promoting social equity in the present. As suggested by D’Alleva (2012), Gelineau (2012), Parsons (1990), and Carrier (1987), the arts are dynamically intertwined with history; therefore, teaching social studies subject content may have maximum transformative potential when using parts of the past in aesthetically responsive ways. One of those responsive ways is to give form to the study of social studies through tactile imagery with textual references. My curriculum example—*Ode to the Pillars of Aesthetics*—does this, as it is
an ArchPM-based curriculum product. According to Strickfaden and Vildieu (2014): “Key concepts in art production and history can be transformed into strong messages in a tactile format that translate into specific kinds of experiences and understandings” (p. 120). ArchPM, then, is a curatorial process for the teacher that encourages students to creatively interact with the tactile content—the artistically rendered book in this case—that is an aesthetic literacy. This example is for an upper elementary and middle school unit on medieval culture, but this is one illustrative example and examples could be made on any culture and timeframe.

Disney’s influence in popular culture is widespread and is both critiqued for its social and cultural syncretism while also being celebrated in popular culture (see Suskind, 2014; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; England et al., 2011; Giroux & Pollock, 2010). This tension is noted here because ArchPM itself is an aesthetic theory that provides an answer for Disney’s resonance and success in the informal curriculum of popular culture while also being an aesthetic curriculum theory for fostering pre-service teachers’ aesthetic development, awareness, and, ultimately, their creativity. As such, Disney must be noted here, especially for the values, such as reverence, that Disney projects for its modified purposes. When the style—audio-visual and textual representation—of the value is changed, its essence remains the same but it is transmutable for continued relevance today.

Rob Gossedge (2012) suggested that Disney & Reitherman’s (1963) movie The Sword in the Stone was an example of Disneyan irony in celebrating a medieval aesthetic so that Americans would yearn for a romanticized ideal while simultaneously changing its emphasis, reordering its lexicon, and finally “maneuvered . . . its own medievalism” (p. 128) in ways that would be familiar to a modern American audience. The result in The Sword in the Stone, according to Gossedge (2012), was an eccentric mixture of the essence of a medievalist ideal of
education where the wise educator and the apprentice co-construct new praxis based on a backdrop of ancient knowledge that never seemed to technically be used. Its ostensibly peculiar endurance, however, makes sense when considering ArchPM as an answer. Through the ArchPM lens, Disney’s movies are avant-garde for their merging of dissonant times, styles, lexicons, and values in ways that promote a new hybridity or syncretism that aesthetically resonate across the informal curriculum and into literature and movies. By applying my theory of the archeophisomorph to The Sword in the Stone, Gossedge’s (2012) claim that Disney’s movie was “antimedievalist” is not the final answer, because even if it was antimedievalist it still promoted a syncretistic art based on a historical understanding of medievalism that itself is intertwined with artistic representations.

Disney seemed to draw on syncretistic aesthetics in drawing on the endurance of what Rud and Garrison (2010) explained as the cardinal virtue of reverence through the theory I posit here—ArchPM—in which Disney used the visual splendor of an idealized medieval aesthetic not to work against or for any “medievalist” notion but to create something vaguely familiar yet radically new. Disney curated an aesthetic that used a style of medieval art—visual, musical, lexical, and textual—to promote a new, syncretized education for the present. A medieval aesthetic was used as a style and not intended for technical, historical usage. It is the style that resonates and, as such, Disney was not being post-ironic in promoting what worked in practice as an aesthetic that resonated across inherited social borders and promoted a common dialogue that worked to dissolve—at least in part—those inherited borders.

I suggest that Disney’s The Sword in the Stone story continued to endure because Disney repackaged reverence in a syncretized aesthetic. Disney enacted what I identify here: the archeophisomorph. ArchPM is based on the understanding of reverence being what Woodruff
(2001) and Rud and Garrison (2010) referred to as a *cardinal* value, and thus a widely shared value, because reverence is transferable and malleable to local contexts since reverence may be expressed in every culture, but the expression is different depending on culture (Woodruff, 2001; Garrison & Rud, 2009; Rud & Garrison, 2010). Disney’s use of a medieval aesthetic was to use a stylistic understanding and not a historical understanding; therefore, *The Sword in the Stone* was retro styling rather than irony. Like Cervantes’ seventeenth century eccentric character *Don Quixote*, the Disneyan aesthetic portrayal of the knight in *The Sword in the Stone* was a juxtaposition of the contemporary with the past. Again, this is to say that Disney’s movie was an archeophisomorph. The audio-visual, musical, lexical, and textual portrayal of retro reverence—or the *phi* and *isomorph* of ArchPM—projected aesthetic resonance across the movie and into its related literature that was used to teach students literacy, social studies, and communication styles.

ArchPM, as a unified aesthetic curriculum theory, provides a cohesive explanation for the success of Disney’s aesthetic success across popular culture. Disney’s style is widely known internationally and is a way to communicate across cultures and student groups (Suskind, 2014). With this example from Disney considered, the ArchPM-based curricular product in this study comes into full focus for why the avant-garde can work; it is constructed on the unified aesthetic theory that is conceptualized here as ArchPM for an aesthetically responsive curriculum to celebrate the aesthetic of all students.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Key Outcomes

This dissertation addressed the research problem that the arts tend to be among the first programs reduced during budgetary pressure and this has continued for decades (Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Gelineau, 2012), despite studies that suggest that the integration of the arts across the K-8 curriculum fosters learning and engagement in all subject areas (Smithrim & Upitis, 2005; Lynch, 2007; Furniss, 2008; Hartjen, 2012). Aesthetics education may be a more inclusive way to envision artistic practice for pre-service K-8 generalists so that all teachers practice the arts within and across the content areas of science, mathematics, social studies, language arts, and other content areas.

Key outcomes of this study are: (1) a new aesthetic curriculum theory, archeophisomorphic (ArchPM) theory, that is posited as a way to fuse the practitioner and theoretical models together to generate exploration of how to increase arts-integration across the K-8 curriculum through an aesthetically responsive curriculum in teacher education, especially in social studies; and (2) an ArchPM-based curriculum product example (see Appendix D).

Teacher candidates develop their aesthetic identity when their teacher education program requires an arts-integration course in which they create aesthetic curriculum product examples. These should be alignment to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) as a way to include aesthetics in core curriculum. In aligning CCSS to Greene’s (2001) definition of aesthetics education, student teachers may see state support for aesthetics as an integral part of curriculum development. Teacher educators should explore their own aesthetic and experiment with arts-
based curriculum design to overcome any prior negative experiences with assessment of their art in their own K-12 experience.

**Key Findings**

Of the findings from this study, there were six key highlights. (1) Pre-service elementary teachers who used first person pronoun usage vis-à-vis the arts is suggestive of their self-efficacy with the arts by associating themselves directly with positive information about their abilities entering the teaching profession. However, (2) those participants who did not have confidence responded in the reverse by using third person or omitting personal pronoun usage altogether to disassociate themselves from information that was viewed as a negative reflection on their creative abilities entering the teaching profession. (3) Arts assessment produced ironic results. For example, one of the respondents stated: “I have not taken any non-required art courses since I don’t really consider myself artistic. However, I do enjoy painting on my own.” And (4), even when not considering themselves to be “artistic,” respondents still identified a creative activity that they liked to do that was “artsy.” The disconnection here seemed to be from the assessment system utilized in schools that assessed their artwork within a deficit model. (5) If participants had taken an arts-based course in school, then there is a likely increased chance that they have visited an art museum in the past two years. And, (6) if participants were interested in art history, they tended to be interested in the performing arts.

**Key Implications**

There are two major implications of this study for practice. (1) Assessment of aesthetic curriculum products should generally not be conducted within a deficit model. (2) All pre-service K-8 teachers should be encouraged to explore aesthetic curriculum design in an arts-integration course or similar arts-based course in which they explore aesthetic responsiveness by utilizing a
broad range of the visual and performing arts in the design of social studies curriculum and curriculum in the other content areas taught in elementary and middle school.

There are three major implications of this study for curriculum theory. (1) This study established a way for constructing an aesthetic curriculum theory that bridges theory and practice—especially for social studies—in a way that was inclusive of the arts for all. (2) The teacher can be a personification of an aesthetic that affects student perceptions of their own self-efficacy with co-constructing an inclusive classroom environment. Therefore, teachers should develop aesthetic awareness in their teacher education programs through an aesthetics education course or similar arts-integration course so that they project a learning environment in which student creativity is fostered across the curriculum. (3) ArchPM has an especially relevant approach for social studies curriculum in which students can be encouraged to explore their heritage and celebrate diversity together through the aesthetic of the visual and performing arts.

There are two implications of this study for policy. (1) This exploratory case study establishes a precedent and foundation for additional research to be conducted in which larger sample sizes of pre-service K-8 teachers can be organized for developing aesthetically responsive curriculum design in social studies, mathematics, science, language learning, and health/physical education. (2) This study provides a new framework for discussing aesthetics education as that which can be defined and implemented across the curriculum.

In sum, for aesthetics to be applied across K-8 curriculum as a responsive praxis for all students, it must also be implemented in teacher education programs and ideally throughout what Ingersoll (2012) called teacher induction. Aesthetic theory can be applied to teacher education when it is a praxis model with an empirical foundation, such as ArchPM, in which the theory has a curriculum product example. Teacher candidates can develop their aesthetic identity through an
aesthetics education course or similar arts-integration course in which students are encouraged to explore the visual and performing arts through production-based inquiry. Students design arts-based products across the curriculum. Aesthetic teacher identity is important because it can increase teacher self-efficacy and “investment” in the classroom. When teachers design and create, they are infusing their own aesthetic into the curriculum. Aesthetic teacher identity is developed through learning with the arts and designing curriculum with arts-informed processes during their teacher education program.

Through aesthetics education envisioned on ArchPM theory, pre-service teachers may develop their individual and group styles based on their pre-knowledge. As they create, pre-service teachers can move beyond pre-knowledge and acquire new knowledge through creating aesthetic curriculum products. As they become more comfortable with the aesthetic, they are more likely to see themselves as efficacious creators of aesthetically responsive curriculum that adapts to their students in which creativity may flourish while simultaneously meeting the assessment protocols of the Common Core and celebrating the individual aesthetic of all students.

This “fusion of horizons,” as Gadamer (1975/2013) called the hermeneutic process of bringing multiple perspectives together and doing so across time from each individual, is part of what aesthetic literacy can be in daily curricular practice. When pre-service K-8 teachers create their own aesthetic products in response to the teacher educator’s aesthetic product—such as the illustrated book designed as part of this study—then pre-service teachers enter into an aesthetic dialogue in which they are producers of art and may see themselves as efficacious with various visual and performing arts. As the teacher educator models aesthetic dialogue, pre-service teachers will likely perceive their own creative work as artistic and, thus, be comfortable
bringing the arts into and across the multiple-subjects curriculum that they will teach as in-service teachers.
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APPENDIX A: Conceptual Diagrams

Figure 1. The morphology of the conceptual term archeophisomorph.

Figure 2. Visual outline of archeophisomorphic theory.
APPENDIX B: 2014 Survey and Data

2014 Survey: WSU IRB Number 13756

Integrating Fine Arts into K-8 Curriculum

- Completion of this survey is voluntary and anonymous. Completion or non-completion of this survey has no effect on your course grade.
- This survey is important for instructional improvement by adding to the field of education research.
- The purpose of this survey is to gather information on pre-service teachers’ perceptions of the arts.
- The data from this survey may be used for research project(s), and the researcher reserves the right to publish any and all findings from this survey.

1. What is your gender?

2. What grade levels are you most interested in teaching?

   K-2  3-4  5-6  7-8  9-12

3. On a scale of 1 (very uninterested) to 10 (very interested), indicate your overall level of interest in learning about the history of the arts.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

   Very Uninterested  Very Interested

4. On a scale of 1 (very uninterested) to 10 (very interested), indicate your overall interest in making visual art (drawing, painting, crafts, etc.).

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

   Very Uninterested  Very Interested

5. On a scale of 1 (very uninterested) to 10 (very interested), indicate your overall interest in designing performance art (theatre, dance, and music).

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

   Very Uninterested  Very Interested
6. On a scale of 1 (very uncomfortable) to 10 (very comfortable), indicate your overall comfort expressing yourself artistically (e.g. presenting your art to others) within a classroom environment.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Very Uncomfortable Very Comfortable

7. Have you visited an art museum in the past 2 years?
   Yes   No

8. Did you go on any field trips to an art museum during your K-8 education?
   Yes   No

9. What grade level did you last take an art class or have formal arts-based instruction?
   None   Elementary School   Middle School   High School   College

10. What type of artwork would you say you enjoy making the most?
    A. I cannot say because I have little experience making art
    B. drawing
    C. painting
    D. ceramics
    E. photography or digital art
    F. crafts
    G. Performance art (theatre and/or dance and/or playing a musical instrument)
    H. Other: ______________________
APPENDIX C: 2012 Survey and Data

2012 Survey: WSU IRB Number 12733

1. What grade level(s) are you MOST interested in teaching? (circle those that apply to your career goals/interests)
   - Preschool
   - Kindergarten
   - 1st Grade
   - 2nd Grade
   - 3rd Grade
   - 4th Grade
   - 5th Grade
   - 6th Grade
   - 7th Grade
   - 8th Grade

2. What is your favorite K-8 subject? (social studies; science; mathematics; English language arts; modern languages; health/fitness education; fine arts; other:________________________)

3. Please define “Fine Arts” (What do the fine arts mean to you?)
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

4. What best describes your experience with the fine arts? (Please circle one)
   - Extensive
   - Average
   - Very little
   Please explain an experience you have had with fine arts:
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
5. What type of high school (or other avenue to university) did you graduate from? (circle)

- Public high school
- Private high school
- Military academy
- Home School
- GED
- Other: ___________________

6. What do you see as your greatest strength entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind)?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

7. What do you see as your greatest challenge entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind)?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

8. Think of an activity that you enjoy (such as a hobby, game, sport, et cetera) and now consider how that personal passion could be translated into fine arts integration in a K-8 classroom. What activity would you choose to explore further for which you could potentially create an arts integration plan?

Activity: __________________

Briefly describe its potential for fine arts integration into a specific grade level:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Transcription of Short-Answer Responses (N = 37)

Survey (2012), WSU IRB Number 12733

Transcribed responses to Survey (toward beginning of Fall Semester 2012)
Survey designed, administered, and transcribed word-for-word by Adam Attwood
Transcribed responses are in sequential order: Response 1 comes from Participant 1; Response 2 comes from Participant 2, etc.

Survey Questions
1. What grade level(s) are you MOST interested in teaching? (circle those that apply to your career goals/interests)
2. What is your favorite K-8 subject?
3. Please define “Fine Arts” (What do the fine arts mean to you?)
4. What best describes your experience with the fine arts? (Please circle one)
5. What type of high school (or other avenue to university) did you graduate from? (circle)
6. What do you see as your greatest strength entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind)?
7. What do you see as your greatest challenge entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind)?
8. Think of an activity that you enjoy (such as a hobby, game, sport, et cetera) and now consider how that personal passion could be translated into fine arts integration in a K-8 classroom. What activity would you choose to explore further for which you could potentially create an arts integration plan?

Question #3: Please define “Fine Arts” (What do the fine arts mean to you?)

1. It is each persons ability to express themselves
2. Fine Arts means art, but not just paintings or drawings. I could mean photographs, dance, or anything that someone creates that they believe is beautiful
3. Allowing people to express themselves through different arts
4. Make people happy – cause an emotional response. Some sort of expression of a thought or feeling either through music, dance, photo, painting, etc.
5. Creative arts like arts & crafts, theatre, any way of expression
6. Expressing oneself through art (writing, music…)
7. The ability to be creative with whatever medium is given (be it paints, sensory items, musical instruments, acting, etc.)
8. Something that can be interpreted an is creative
9. Fine arts are is a subject that talks about art and shows how one student can learn shapes and color.
10. Being creative and thinking outside of the box.
11. Any expression in the art form.
12. Dance, music, crafts, art
13. Creativity, passion, drawing, painting
14. Fine arts are directly related to creativity
15. Anything that incorporates creativity. ie dance, music, drawing, painting, sculpture, even some writing. Where you can express yourself.
16. Creativity – art, dance, music
17. Anything that uses creativity
18. Anything that uses creativity
19. Anything creative – dance, singing, painting, sketching, theater
20. Any expression of one’s own creativity. E.g. theater/performance arts, (choir/dance), photography, print media, digital, etc.
21. Being able express your thoughts in drawings, painting, and many other ways.
22. Fine arts is the utilization of creativity and imagination that allows the individual to express themselves, their ideas, passions, or beliefs.
23. A creative piece of work that an individual worked on in which is created, studied, and viewed.
24. Either I think its English or I think it’s the actual arts = music, drama, painting, etc.
25. English, drama
26. Music, art, drama
27. Art, music
29. A way to creatively express yourself
30. Being creative
31. When I think of fine arts I first thinking of paintings and my lack of ability to create artistic things. I so appreciate art and learning art, but being artistic is a talent I lack.
32. An area where you can learn how to develop your creativity and be able to express it through painting, coloring, etc.
33. Fine arts is learning to do arts such as working with markers, clay, and other things. Anything that allows you to express your creativity.
34. Fine Arts is involving creativity to produce a work of art, music, movie, photograph, etc.
35. Anything that has to do with using creativity and not only logical thinking.
36. Fine arts is anything that results from creativity – visual arts, music, drama, etc.
37. Fine arts can be only expression of emotion or just interpretation through the use of different materials.
Question #4

What best describes your experience with the fine arts? (Please circle one)
Extensive, Average, Very little

Please explain an experience you have had with fine arts:

1. In younger grades I liked them a lot, but taking FA in college was not as fun.
2. I took dance for 9 years. I took piano for 10 years.
3. I’ve taken one fine arts class here @ WSU
4. I took basic art throughout school. I love to do crafty things at home, but I have never done any actual fine arts as an adult.
5. I took an art class every year from K to 8th grade
6. Arts classes I’ve taken in school
7. Many art projects w/ many age groups (newborn – 7th grade). 4 yrs of Drama class & many plays. Art classes. Dance when younger.
8. I was required to take 2 semesters at my high school
9. My teachers were always correcting me w/ my art & calling it not art.
10. A few art classes in elementary school.
11. Ceramics, advanced ceramics in high school. Very little experience before or after that.
12. I danced for 13 years & am an avid crafter
13. ---------
14. I took only the required fine arts courses in middle and high school.
15. Did dance & figure skating choreography. Have taken a few music classes, I like to doodle.
16. Took art classes throughout school but I’m horrible at them.
17. Dance in high school, music, etc.
18. Classes in high school and being “crafty”
19. Art classes in school
20. I took art classes my entire life through my senior year of HS. I also entered into art competitions. (fine printed media). I sang / did theater throughout HS. I also have worked extensively w/ digital art.
21. Some art classes in college.
22. I studied digital photography for 3 years & blk & white color film for 1 year in high school.
23. Took fine arts in elementary school.
24. My teacher was very enthusiastic about teaching which made it fun.
25. English in high school, music in elem.
26. I was a member of my high school band and took 2 years of art.
27. I took multiple fine arts classes throughout high school.
28. Participated in a couple musicals and digital photography.
29. I took 2 art classes in middle school & loved it. One project that was particularly memorable was doing mosaic benches for our school garden.
30. I took a few classes in high school & college with fine arts
31. As a freshman, I took a fine arts class.
32. Mostly painting in elementary school.
33. I have taken drama every year in high school. I also played the flute in high school, and I love to paint on my free time. I have never taken any classes but I enjoy doing it.
34. I have taken drawing class at WSU and love to paint. I also played piano and done choir my whole life.
35. Helping kids at the WSU Childrens Center.
36. I took a very limited, basic arts class in high school. I also played guitar for a very short period of time.
37. I have not taken any non-required art courses since I don’t really consider myself artistic. However, I do enjoy painting on my own.

Question # 6

What do you see as your greatest strength entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind?)

1. My fun-loving attitude towards learning and life
2. Kindness, caring, concern for others
3. My patience with children
4. My ability to connect and interact with children.
5. Love working w/ children & I have a passion for teaching
6. I love working with kids & have patience to guide/teach them
7. I have a great ability to keep kids interested in what is going on & to adapt a lesson to best fit their skills
8. Patient
9. My energy & enthusiasm to school
10. Flexibility
11. Organization! Planning ahead, using proper resources
12. Leadership abilities
13. Being able to relate to children and have the patience to work w/ them
14. My love for education & learning
15. Leadership
16. My love of children
17. My ability to teach the same thing in a variety of ways
18. Organization/creativity
19. Outgoing, understanding, patience.
20. I have been every type of student. (Below average, above average, ELL & minority).
21. Being able to communicate positively with my students when they are struggling with a subject
22. Empathy w/ students & Reading
23. Have developed a great love for helping children meet their fullest potential through the experience of tutoring at Read for Life.
24. Patience and creativity
25. I am compassionate
26. Connecting with students who struggle
27. Patience and organization
28. Very open down to earth hard working individual and I love math and hope to share my knowledge w/ others
29. My enthusiasm. Im very energetic and passionate so if im excited that gets the kids excited.
30. Creativity, management
31. I am patient, caring, and compassionate. I also love learning and hope to inspire the desire for education in my future students.
32. I have previously done substitute work, so I have a feeling of what it is like to teach a class.
33. My passion for wanting students to do there best and reach their own personal goals.
34. Using creative outlets to get kids excited about learning.
35. Very flexible
36. My experience & passion for working with children with special needs.
37. I think that I am really patient and caring which will for sure come in handy
Question #7

What do you see as your greatest challenge entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind)?

1. Keeping my cool at all times w/ my students
2. Coming from a small school (could be advantage or disadvantage)
3. Disciplining my students
4. I think my greatest challenge will be waking up every morning.
5. Being flexible when things don’t go as planned
6. Getting stressed too easily
7. Relatively low patience w/ disruptive kids
8. Finding time to meet with each student
9. Being confident in teaching & discipline
10. Meeting the needs of each student
11. Discipline. I need to practice.
13. Not being confident in myself.
14. Patience – or lack of
15. Remaining ever-patient
16. Remembering names
17. The lack of funds given to teachers to provide the tools that would make students’ learning easiest.
18. All the different personality types (students & teachers)
19. Creativity
20. The politics of interacting w/ parents/teachers/administration.
21. Not being able to provide alternatives for those who are struggling
22. Teaching math
23. Patience
24. Paperwork/planning
25. Meeting all state standards and dealing with angry parents.
26. TPAs
27. Engaging struggling students
28. All the bull shit of TPA, and political work that has been brought into the schools.
29. Greatest challenge would be being able to teach all the learning styles. AKA reaching all the students in my class.
30. Math!
31. Keeping up to date on educational methods and providing my students with all the information they need to succeed.
32. Trying to teach a little bit of everything.
33. My greatest challenge would be that sometimes I am not very organized.
34. Dealing with parents that may be unpleasant.
35. Teaching English classes.
36. Planning curriculum intimidates me a lot!
37. I lack organization skills.

Question #8

Think of an activity that you enjoy (such as a hobby, game, sport, *et cetera*) and now consider how that personal passion could be translated into fine arts integration in a K-8 classroom. What activity would you choose to explore further for which you could potentially create an arts integration plan?

Briefly describe its potential for fine arts integration into a specific grade level:

1. Swimming, water polo / I think art can be integrated into any subject matter
2. Piano / could be used for a classroom musical
3. Taking pictures / Allowing the students to create their own pictures by drawing, painting and photography
4. Baking cupcakes / I love decorating cupcakes and I think that could be considered a form of art which would be very fun for many children.
5. Outdoors / create a painting or picture/collage of your favorite activity outdoors
6. Baking / kids can get creative making their own edible treats.
7. Talk about dinosaurs 😊 / I would read a book about them and then have them draw a dino and use different materials to make what they think their skins felt. We would then pretend we were dinos.
8. Photography / Make collages, different angels, lighting, ect.
9. Scrapbooking / It allows kids to be creative and make their fringes w/ pictures.
10. Photography / Students could go into nature and take pictures of different topics we’re learning in science class.
11. Reading / Reading as well as incorporating illustrations or students could read about an art they enjoy.
12. Dance / Dance is always integrated into PE classes; however, it would be great to integrate into middle school as an elective. It would be a great way to express feelings & be a great activity.
13. Dance / Taking music & movement and combining them to get the children involved.
14. Reading / Students could create their own picture books.
15. Hiking / You could take students on a hike & have them draw inspiration from something they saw on the hike & paint or draw it. Or collect leaves & flowers and make a collage.
16. Reading / read a story and then have the students act it out.
17. Reading / Students could be given a story to read, and then asked to act it out.
18. Sports / scrapbook pages, drama
19. Photography / have students take pictures and create a collage
20. Playing zombies: Black Ops / have students discuss their favorite games (video or not) and then create a short play that shows their favorite aspect of the game. (Writing, set design, & acting).
21. Dance / Draw movements and explain what they might mean to them.
   Students will have the opportunity to write out & use their words to express what they see in photos; can be altered to use for any grade dependent upon photos.
23. Singing / listening to a piece of music & having the class draw out a scenery or image of how it makes them feel.
24. Music / draw how they feel, what they see in the music etc.
25. ------------
26. Scrapbooking / --------------
27. ------------
28. Volleyball / The sport can be described through a video or play and have a humorous approach to it.
29. Swimming / maybe water color or pastel depiction of water using all different colors of shades or movement drawings how to illustrate movement?
30. Scrapbooking / creating collages to express a unit visual. Ex) different pictures & words of the seasons to help K-2 students understand the differences.
31. Piano / music throughout art would provide an interesting lesson. My passion for piano/music could translate in a fine arts lesson.
32. Coloring / In the second grade, when you are studying an animal you could have the students draw the animal and then color/paint it.
33. Gymnastics / Rythmic gymnastics could be integrated into kindergarten so you can dance with ribbons and balls and the students would like it.
34. Dancing / students in 5th or 6th grade class could research different types of dancing across the world. Students would then perform their dances and make collages pertaining to the country of origin of each dance.
35. Camping / While reading a book that has to do w/ some sort of outdoor experience let the kids create scenes w/ classroom objects and use their creativity.
36. Watching college sports / With older elementary students, you could have the kids re-design local university mascots or logos with their own ideas, and choosing their own colors.
37. Golf / The students could design their own holes/golf course.
Survey Descriptive, Frequency Data

2012 Survey Descriptive

The following survey prompts questions are designated for descriptive statistical analysis.

Survey Questions
1. What grade level(s) are you MOST interested in teaching? (circle those that apply to your career goals/interests)
2. What is your favorite K-8 subject?
3. Please define “Fine Arts” (What do the fine arts mean to you?)
4. What best describes your experience with the fine arts? (Please circle one)
5. What type of high school (or other avenue to university) did you graduate from? (circle)
6. What do you see as your greatest strength entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind)?
7. What do you see as your greatest challenge entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind)?
8. Think of an activity that you enjoy (such as a hobby, game, sport, et cetera) and now consider how that personal passion could be translated into fine arts integration in a K-8 classroom. What activity would you choose to explore further for which you could potentially create an arts integration plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1 Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;L390.02 TUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5 Answer
(Tue section on left, Thu section center, Class Total on right)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Public high school</th>
<th>Private high school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Total: 57
Transcription with Qualitative Coding for Discourse Analysis

2012 Survey Transcription

Responses to Question #3 are coded. This coding corresponds to Tables 1 and 2. Participant use of the grammatical first person is highlighted in yellow; grammatical second person is highlighted in green; grammatical third person is highlighted turquoise; and responses without grammatical person are not highlighted. One asterisk (*) indicates that the response is coded as “Mind-Ethereal (Intangible);” two asterisks (**) indicates that the response is coded as “Practical (Tangible);” and three asterisks (***) indicates that the response is coded as “Combined Tangible and Intangible.”

1. It is each persons ability to express themselves*
2. Fine Arts means art, but not just paintings or drawings. I could mean photographs, dance, or anything that someone creates that they believe is beautiful**
3. Allowing people to express themselves through different arts*
4. Make people happy – cause an emotional response. Some sort of expression of a thought or feeling either through music, dance, photo, painting, etc.**
5. Creative arts like arts & crafts, theatre, any way of expression**
6. Expressing ones self through art (writing, music…)**
7. The ability to be creative with whatever medium is given (be it paints, sensory items, musical instruments, acting, etc.)**
8. Something that can be interpreted an is creative*
9. Fine arts are is a subject that talks about art and shows how one student can learn shapes and color.**
10. Being creative and thinking outside of the box.*
11. Any expression in the art form.*
12. Dance, music, crafts, art**
13. Creativity, passion, drawing, painting**
14. Fine arts are directly related to creativity**
15. Anything that incorporates creativity, ie dance, music, drawing, painting, sculpture, even some writing. Where you can express yourself.**
16. Creativity – art, dance, music**
17. Anything that uses creativity***
18. Anything that uses creativity***
19. Anything creative – dance, singing, painting, sketching, theater**
20. Any expression of one’s own creativity. E.g. theater/performance arts, (choir/dance), photography, print media, digital, etc.**
21. Being able express your thoughts in drawings, painting, and many other ways.**
22. Fine arts is the utilization of creativity and imagination that allows the individual to express themselves, their ideas, passions, or beliefs.*
23. A creative piece of work that an individual worked on in which is created, studied, and viewed.**

24. Either I think its English or I think it’s the actual arts = music, drama, painting, etc.**
25. English, drama**
26. Music, art, drama**
27. Art, music**
28. Music, drama, arts. Not the typical math science social studies,**
29. A way to creatively express yourself* 
30. Being creative***
31. When I think of fine arts I first thinking of paintings and my lack of ability to create artistic things. I so appreciate art and learning art, but being artistic is a talent I lack,**
32. An area where you can learn how to develop your creativity and be able to express it through painting, coloring, etc.**
33. Fine arts is learning to do arts such as working with markers, clay, and other things. Anything that allows you to express your creativity.**
34. Fine Arts is involving creativity to produce a work of art, music, movie, photograph, etc.**
35. Anything that has to do with using creativity and not only logical thinking,**
36. Fine arts is anything that results from creativity – visual arts, music, drama, etc.**
37. Fine arts can be only expression of emotion or just interpretation through the use of different materials.***
Responses to Question #7 are coded. Interpersonal is highlighted in yellow. Technical is highlighted in turquoise. An asterisk (*) indicates that the response was in the grammatical first person. No asterisk indicates that the response was without a grammatical person or inferred first person. This symbol (†) indicates that the response is coded to the thematic category of “macro-level” challenge is their “greatest challenge;” while all other responses are coded to the thematic category of “micro-level” challenge is their “greatest challenge.”

Question #7: What do you see as your greatest challenge entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind)?

1. Keeping my cool at all times w/ my students
2. Coming from a small school (could be advantage or disadvantage)
3. Disciplining my students
4. I think my greatest challenge will be waking up every morning. *
5. Being flexible when things don’t go as planned
6. Getting stressed too easily
7. Relatively low patience w/ disruptive kids
8. Finding time to meet with each student
9. Being confident in teaching & discipline
10. Meeting the needs of each student
11. Discipline. I need to practice. *
13. Not being confident in myself.
14. Patience – or lack of
15. Remaining ever-patient
16. Remembering names
17. The lack of funds given to teachers to provide the tools that would make students’ learning easier.
18. All the different personality types (students & teachers)
19. Creativity
20. The politics of interacting w/ parents/teachers/administration.
21. Not being able to provide alternatives for those who are struggling
22. Teaching math †
23. Patience
24. Paperwork/planning
25. Meeting all state standards and dealing with angry parents †
26. TPAs †
27. Engaging struggling students
28. All the bull shit of TPA, and political work that has been brought into the schools. †
29. Greatest challenge would be being able to teach all the learning styles. AKA reaching all the students in my class. *
30. Math! †
31. Keeping up to date on educational methods and providing my students with all the information they need to succeed.
32. Trying to teach a little bit of everything.
33. My greatest challenge would be that sometimes I am not very organized.*
34. Dealing with parents that may be unpleasant.
35. Teaching English classes.
36. Planning curriculum intimidates me a lot!* †
37. I lack organization skills.*
Responses to Question #6 are coded here and correlate to Table 4. Interpersonal is highlighted in yellow. Technical is highlighted in turquoise. An asterisk (*) indicates that the response was in the grammatical first person. No asterisk indicates that the response was without a grammatical person or inferred first person.

Question #6: What do you see as your greatest strength entering the teaching profession (What immediately comes to mind?).

1. My fun-loving attitude towards learning and life*
2. Kindness, caring, concern for others
3. My patience with children*
4. My ability to connect and interact with children.*
5. Love working w/ children & I have a passion for teaching*
6. I love working with kids & have patience to guide/teach them*
7. I have a great ability to keep kids interested in what is going on & to adapt a lesson to best fit their skills*
8. Patient
9. My energy & enthusiasm to school*
10. Flexibility
11. Organization! Planning ahead, using proper resources
12. Leadership abilities
13. Being able to relate to children and have the patience to work w/ them
14. My love for education & learning*
15. Leadership
16. My love of children*
17. My ability to teach the same thing in a variety of ways*
18. Organization/creativity
19. Outgoing, understanding, patience
20. I have been every type of student. (Below average, above average, ELL & minority).*
21. Being able to communicate positively with my students when they are struggling with a subject*
22. Empathy w/ students & Reading
23. Have developed a great love for helping children meet their fullest potential through the experience of tutoring at Read for Life.
24. Patience and creativity
25. I am compassionate*
26. Connecting with students who struggle
27. Patience and organization
28. Very open down to earth hard working individual and I love math and hope to share my knowledge w/ others
29. My enthusiasm. I’m very energetic and passionate so if I’m excited that gets the kids excited.*
30. Creativity, management
31. I am patient, caring, and compassionate. I also love learning and hope to inspire the desire for education in my future students.
32. I have previously done substitute work, so I have a feeling of what it is like to teach a class.
33. My passion for wanting students to do their best and reach their own personal goals.
34. Using creative outlets to get kids excited about learning.
35. Very flexible
36. My experience & passion for working with children with special needs.
37. I think that I am really patient and caring which will for sure come in handy.
Responses to Question #8 are coded. This coding corresponds to Table 7. Participant use of the grammatical first person is highlighted in yellow; grammatical second person is highlighted in green; grammatical third person is not highlighted; and responses without grammatical person are not highlighted.

Question #8: Think of an activity that you enjoy (such as a hobby, game, sport, et cetera) and now consider how that personal passion could be translated into fine arts integration in a K-8 classroom. What activity would you choose to explore further for which you could potentially create an arts integration plan?

Briefly describe its potential for fine arts integration into a specific grade level:

1. **Swimming, water polo** / I think art can be integrated into any subject matter.
2. **Piano** / could be used for a classroom musical.
3. **Taking pictures** / Allowing the students to create their own pictures by drawing, painting and photography.
4. **Baking cupcakes** / I love decorating cupcakes and I think that could be considered a form of art which would be very fun for many children.
5. **Outdoors / create a painting or picture/collage of your favorite activity outdoors**
6. **Baking** / kids can get creative making their own edible treats.
7. **Talk about dinosaurs 😊 / I would read a book about them and then have them draw a dino and use different materials to make what they think their skins felt. We would then pretend we were dinos.**
8. **Photography** / Make collages, different angels, lighting, ect.
9. **Scrapbooking** / It allows kids to be creative and maten colors w/ pictures.
10. **Photography** / Students could go into nature and take pictures of different topics we’re learning in science class.
11. **Reading / Reading as well as incorporating illustrations or students could read about an art they enjoy.**
12. **Dance** / Dance is always integrated into PE classes; however, it would be great to integrate into middle school as an elective. It would be a great way to express feelings & be a great activity.
13. **Dance** / Taking music & movement and combining them to get the children involved.
14. **Reading / Students could create their own picture books.**
15. **Hiking / You could take students on a hike & have them draw inspiration from something they saw on the hike & paint or draw it. Or collect leaves & flowers and make a collage.**
16. **Reading / read a story and then have the students act it out.**
17. **Reading / Students could be given a story to read, and then asked to act it out.**
18. **Sports / scrapbook pages, drama**
19. **Photography / have students take pictures and create a collage**
20. Playing zombies: Black Ops / have students discuss their favorite games (video or not) and then create a short play that shows their favorite aspect of the game. (Writing, set design, & acting).

21. Dance / Draw movements and explain what they might mean to them.

22. Photography / Emotion lesson – description of how scenes/people make you feel. Students will have the opportunity to write out & use their words to express what they see in photos; can be altered to use for any grade dependent upon photos.

23. Singing / listening to a piece of music & having the class draw out a scenery or image of how it makes them feel.

24. Music / draw how they feel, what they see in the music etc.

25. -----------------

26. Scrapbooking / ------------------

27. -----------------

28. Volleyball / The sport can be described through a video or play and have a humorous approach to it.

29. Swimming / maybe water color or pastel depiction of water using all different colors of shades or movement drawings how to illustrate movement?

30. Scrapbooking / creating collages to express a unit visual. Ex) different pictures & words of the seasons to help K-2 students understand the differences.

31. Piano / music throughout art would provide an interesting lesson. My passion for piano/music could translate in a fine arts lesson.

32. Coloring / In the second grade, when you are studying an animal you could have the students draw the animal and then color/paint it.

33. Gymnastics / Rythmic gymnastics could be integrated into kindergarten so you can dance with ribbons and balls and the students would like it.

34. Dancing / students in 5th or 6th grade class could research different types of dancing across the world. Students would then perform their dances and make collages pertaining to the country of origin of each dance.

35. Camping / While reading a book that has to do w/ some sort of outdoor experience let the kids create scenes w/ classroom objects and use their creativity.

36. Watching college sports / With older elementary students, you could have the kids redesign local university mascots or logos with their own ideas, and choosing their own colors.

37. Golf / The students could design their own holes/golf course.
APPENDIX D: ArchPM Aesthetic Curriculum Product Example

Illustrated Aesthetics Book

Ode to the pillars of the past;
a predication of parallax

The leaves of the great deciduous
oaks forespoke:
"Whither hath gone the winds of
winters with words withheld?"
Past: that which happened before now
Predication: a forecast of something to come
Parallax: way of looking at something
Deciduous: a tree that sheds its leaves annually
Whither: Old English word for “Where has (something gone)?”

Trumpets: a type of musical instrument
Tapestries: an ancient and medieval type of carpet sometimes designed to be like an illustrated story book.
Matrix: a combination of things
Memories: a person’s thoughts of things that happened before now
Manners: a set of behaviors that someone is usually expected to use to be respectful of others
Merit: being very good at something or worthy to receive an award that they have demonstrated talent in.
Knights: individuals who behave with honor (loyalty), courtesy (manners), and service (voluntarily helping others)
Nebulous: not easy to see something
Extolling: to celebrate
Virtues: beliefs expressed through language and actions that show a standard of excellence
Reverence: having deep respect for something or someone
Aesthetics: philosophical and arts-based ways of understanding beauty and design.
Courageous: being brave, and not distracted by danger.
Caring: being kind and showing concern for others wellbeing.
Androgynous: having both masculine and feminine characteristics

Rooted in a learned legacy of loyalty
Defending the individual's relevance, re-creating reverence
Retracing and reifying radical remembrance

Removing recalcitrance by transforming the past tense
To this task it is thought immense
But through this reference, perhaps an ethos of epics past...

Consilio the owl says...
This poem is based on the literary and linguistic concept of alliteration, meaning that the same letter or sound is at the beginning of adjacent words.
Removing recalcitrance by transforming

Removing: to take away
Recalcitrance: being uncooperative
Immense: very big
Reference: a source of information and knowledge
Ethos: the spirit of a culture
Epic: a long poem narrating the work and journey of individuals or groups from before now (the past)

Consilio the owl says...
Poetry has stanzas that are a groups of words that form a recurring unit thematically linked together to tell a story.

Rise renewed out of the timeline's twilight to transform team and tenacity

Disparate threads of traditions tacitly woven toward twilight’s twisting tempests

Reverence radically remembered through isomorphic immersion

Implied a new androgynous dispersion, a Gestalt isomorphic inversion

Of the aesthetic that the pillars of the past foretold for the bold

Chronicles to revise for the new inheritors wise, and that will now be told...

Renewed: to begin again
Twilight: a soft lighting of the sky as the sun goes below the horizon.
Team: a group of individuals who work together in common purpose.
Tenacity: being very bold and dedicated to accomplishing a task.
Disparate: separate things
Traditions: ways of behaving that are informed by the past
Tactily: influenced but not directly affecting it
Tempests: an old word for storms
Reverence: having deep respect for something or someone
Isomorphic: something now having a similar form to something from the past.
Immersion: being fully within something, such as a culture
Androgynous: both masculine and feminine, universally inclusive of and for all genders
Dispersion: something, such as a cultural characteristic, that spreads
Gestalt isomorphic inversion: from Gestalt psychology in which something has similar form to something else. Focused study should reveal the pattern that otherwise would go unnoticed.
Chivalric code: a team of individuals who agreed to the same set of values and often have the same goal.
Bold: a characteristic of being very confident in taking intellectual risks
Chroniclers: ancient and medieval story-tellers.

Suggested Reading

For students, see similarly themed children’s literature see:

For teachers, see links to theory and praxis:

Consilio the owl says...
During the Middle Ages, scribes wrote fancy books that sometimes had covers inlaid with jewels, and the pages were on parchment or vellum (a very expensive type of paper). The scribes would use a technique called “illuminated lettering” in which they wrote big fancy letters at the beginning of some sentences. This is the inspiration for “Parchment” font.