

“The third cultural factor indicating that now is a critical moment for research of college studio art teaching and learning concerns the intense debate taking place within the art community itself: What is the nature and purpose of an undergraduate art education?”

Studio Interior: Investigating Undergraduate Studio Art Teaching and Learning

STACEY MCKENNA SALAZAR

Maryland Institute College of Art

The author contends that what is taught and learned in contemporary undergraduate studio classrooms has been largely unknown because research of teaching and learning in undergraduate studio art is under-researched. The author describes several cultural phenomena that suggest an urgent need for research of college studio art pedagogy. A brief overview of the literature in undergraduate studio art education is provided, as well as relevant theory and practice from other disciplines. The author argues that the literature currently available could provide an appropriate foundation for future research of college studio art teaching and learning. The article concludes with recommendations for future scholarly investigation.

Correspondence regarding this article may be sent to the author at ssalazar@mica.edu

Research of Teaching and Learning in Undergraduate Studio Art

In 2010, as part of my doctoral research, I conducted a review of the published literature in undergraduate studio art education. This review revealed that very little scholarly research in the United States has focused on teaching and learning in college studio art classrooms.¹ Therefore, much of what occurs inside the college studio art classroom—the studio interior—has remained hidden from those not enrolled in, or teaching, a particular class.² Historically, neither formal research of teaching, nor informal discussion of pedagogical practice, has been part of the post-secondary institutional culture (Bok, 2006; Singerman, 1999).

Some recent conferences and online publications indicate that instructors of undergraduate studio art are beginning to share curricular ideas and pedagogical experiments, though these are few and tend to be anecdotal in nature (See AICAD, 2007; Veon, 2010; also www.foundations-arts.org). In 2011, at the three largest national art education conferences, there were only two presentations about post-secondary studio art pedagogy: one at the National Art Education Association, one during the National Association of Schools of Art and Design, and none at the College Art Association (CAA, 2011; NASAD, 2011; NAEA, 2011).

Scholarly research of post-secondary studio art pedagogy, while similarly sparse, includes a few relevant studies. The creative development of an undergraduate student new to artmaking, the teaching and learning dynamic of an undergraduate sculpture class, and an interdisciplinary pre-college summer workshop were the focus

of studies by art educator Patricia James (1996, 1997, 2000, 2004). Another researcher reported on the development of a group of painting students as they progressed through their 4 years at a prominent U.S. art college (Bekkala, 1999). Two doctoral dissertations, 3 decades apart, focused on the dialogue and critique dynamic found in college studio settings (Kent, 2001; Sevigny, 1977). Most recently, a doctoral student explored the curricular changes taking place in foundation studio art programs in two post-secondary settings (Kushins, 2007). It is my view that these studies—spread out over several decades, conducted in a wide variety of educational contexts, and using various research methodologies—are not sufficient to inform today's college administrators and faculty as they make decisions for the structure and content of 21st-century studio art curriculum and pedagogy.³ Furthermore, several cultural phenomena suggest an urgent need for research of college studio art teaching and learning: the emerging importance of creativity, the changes and challenges confronting higher education, and the debate about the content and delivery of an undergraduate studio art education.

Why Research Is Needed Now

Emerging Importance of Creativity

In the last 10 years, scholars of creativity, researchers in art education, and contemporary artists, aware of the visual and technological changes taking place in our society, have pondered the meaning of being creative in the new millennium, especially as it may differ from conceptions of creativity in the last century, and affect policy in the current one (Freedman, 2007; Zimmerman, 2009).

In the 21st century, it is apparent that students need to be prepared for a new information age and that educational interventions... that foster creative thinking, imagination, and innovation are important for generating solutions to real life problems both now and in the future. Creativity in the visual arts can no longer be aligned only with conceptions about creative self-expression. Researchers and practitioners need to conceive of creativity as multidimensional with consideration of how cognitive complexity, affective intensity, technical skills, and interest and motivation all play major roles. (Zimmerman, 2009, p. 394)

Teachers and researchers in K-12 art education have articulated the dispositions of creative thinkers: taking risks, being passionate, having self-discipline, being open and flexible, and understanding multiple points of view (Burton, 2005, 2009; Eisner, 2002; Hetland, Winner, Veenema, & Sheridan, 2007; James, 1996, 1997; Zimmerman, 2009); the conditions conducive to developing artistic dispositions in learners, such as exploration, play, and dialogue (Burton, 2000, 2005, 2009; Eisner, 2002; Gude, 2010; Hetland et al., 2007; Walker, 1996, 2001, 2003, 2004; Zimmerman, 2009, 2010); and, the ways in which engaging students with visual culture and contemporary art may enhance student creativity and cognition (Boughton, Efland, Freedman, & Zimmerman, 2009; Burton, 2009; Freedman, 2008, 2010; Hetland et al., 2007; Kindler, 2008; Sullivan, 2010; Zimmerman, 2009, 2010).

Creativity has become a hot topic beyond the field of art education as well. A number of businesses, such as Google and Zappos, have created participatory organizational structures intended specifically to enhance employee creativity and agency (Amabile & Khaire, 2008; Bryant, 2010; MacGregor, 2009). Popular science publications like *A Whole New Mind* (Pink, 2006), *Outliers* (Gladwell, 2008), *The Rise of the Creative*

Class (Florida, 2001), and *Imagine* (Lehrer, 2012) describe substantial cultural and societal shifts that have led the authors to rethink the skills and dispositions conducive to living and working creatively in the 21st century. Daniel Pink (2006) contended that we are in a new Conceptual Age in which creativity and innovation are more essential than ever to business and society. Richard Florida (2001) argued that one-third of the American work force is engaged in creative problem solving as part of their professional lives. Malcolm Gladwell (2008) made the claim that 10,000 hours within an endeavor or discipline, and an enriching, supportive environment, appear to be necessary for an individual to develop the potential to innovate within a field of inquiry. Jonah Lehrer (2012) concluded that recent discoveries in neuroscience suggest educational policy changes might facilitate creativity. These examples from popular science and business suggest that contemporary cultures value a creative citizenry.

In the first decade of this century, jobs for individuals educated in the visual arts, such as graphic design and animation, grew at a much faster rate than jobs in most other fields, like accounting and law (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). Such growth may be one factor contributing to the steady increase in applications to post-secondary visual arts programs during that time (Capriccioso, 2006; Cullen, 2009; Fears, 2009; Luftig, Donovan, Fambaugh, Kennedy, Filicko, & Wyszomirski, 2003; Tepper & Kuh, 2011). As applications to college visual arts programs have grown, so too have job-related studio course offerings in the visual arts. Today's college course catalogs list art or visual communication courses in web design, gaming, graphic design, industrial design, environmental design, videography, digital imaging and animation, photography, film, fiber and fashion, augment-

ing the traditional fine arts courses of painting, printmaking, drawing, and sculpture.

Thus, one wonders, does taking college studio art help students be creative and, therefore, better prepare them to be successful in contemporary life? Scholarly research of teaching and learning in undergraduate studio classrooms could provide important information about the ways in which college instructors nurture creative skills and dispositions in their students, as well as the ways in which students with varied personal and professional goals develop as creative individuals.

Challenges and Changes in American Higher Education

Challenges to, and changes in, American post-secondary education represent the second of three cultural phenomena that make research of college studio art education importunate. These challenges and changes include: institutional and pedagogical accountability, disciplinary specialization, an aging professorate, and an increasingly diverse student body.

Institutional and pedagogical accountability. Due to the escalating cost of attending college, concern about the quality of professor pedagogy, and an increasingly diverse student body (Babcock et al., 2011; Madoff, 2009; Neumann, 2010), institutions of higher education face the possibility of government-imposed accountability standards (Bok, 2006; NASAD, 2011; Tepper & Kuh, 2011), perhaps similar to the state standards, curricular blueprints, and mandated textbooks currently circumscribing K-12 education. Implementing assessment practices that such accountability entails may be difficult for college studio art departments. Where other disciplines may be able to measure success by ascertaining the number of graduates with careers in their fields of study (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005), such criterion may not be well suited to college art departments

since a small percentage of art majors make a living as professional artists after completing their art degree (Bayles & Orland, 1993; Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1976; SNAAP, 2011; Luftig et al., 2003). Another assessment model, identifying learning outcomes, may be equally problematic for art programs. Unlike most academic disciplines, like religion or biology, in which instructors profess their subjects (Neumann, 2010; Taylor, 2009), studio art faculty sometimes claim that art cannot be taught (Belzer & Birnbaum, 2007; Elkins, 2001; Fendrich, 2007, 2009; Roth, 1973; Singerman, 1999; Singerman et al., 2007) and “evaluate by saying, ‘this one works’ or ‘sorry, this one just doesn’t work for me.’” (Fendrich, 2007, para. 5). This pedagogical framework is not conducive to articulating specific learning outcomes and may hinder a college art program’s ability to account for the quality of its teaching and learning—and its value within the larger academic community. Research of teaching and learning in the college art classroom could identify and articulate the educational values provided by undergraduate studio art programs—and thereby allow studio art instruction to become accountable.

Disciplinary specialization. The traditional post-secondary structure of specialized knowledge within bounded disciplines has been criticized recently for failing to meet 21st-century needs (Alexenberg, 2008; Friedman, 2005; Levine, 2006; Orr, 1994; Taylor, 2009). Some claim that in order to address the demands of living in a *flat*⁴ world, higher education in America must become more interdisciplinary, less hierarchical, and more technologically savvy (Alexenberg, 2008; Buckley & Conomos, 2010; Friedman, 2005; Orr, 1994; Pujol, 2009; Taylor, 2009). Research of teaching and learning in the college studio art class would allow art educators to understand whether visual art is similarly stratified, or is perhaps more interdisciplinary, less hierarchical,

and more technologically savvy than other post-secondary disciplines.

An aging professorate. The majority of the American fine arts professorate began teaching college in the middle of the 20th century as higher education expanded during post-WWII America, a time when many post-secondary institutions began offering studio and advanced art degrees for the first time (Singerman, 1999). It was assumed that these professors would teach directly out of their professional art expertise; there was no expectation that these artists have teaching preparation (1999). In addition, studio faculty were hired and promoted primarily based on their recognition as professionally active artists—as documented by grants, fellowships, exhibitions, and critical reviews—just as their fellow professors in other disciplines were promoted based on their success as researchers (1999). Indeed, in all disciplines, a professor's effectiveness as a teacher appeared to have very little influence on promotion and tenure (Bok, 2006; Deasey, 2009; Singerman, 1999; Skipper, 2005). Having had little pedagogical preparation, and no institutional incentive to develop their pedagogy, most studio art faculty adopted and maintained—intentionally or not—the pedagogical style of an influential teacher (Daichendt, 2010; Dickey, 2010; Fendrich, 2007; Gregg, 2006; Kushins, 2007; Madoff, 2009; Risenhoover & Blackburn, 1976; Singerman, 1999).

As there are so few studies of teaching and learning in post-secondary studio art, it is difficult to know if the pedagogical practices of those first-generation professors were effective. Furthermore, it is not known whether the pedagogies of today's professors have evolved over time or if current pedagogy is effective with today's students. Without careful documentation of current teaching practices, it is likely that influential professors will remain the sole peda-

gogical resource for future teachers of college studio art. Research could explore the ways in which current college studio instructors develop and practice the teaching of studio art. More specifically, scholarly research of the teaching practices of soon-to- retire artist-teachers may prove to be a valuable resource for the pedagogical development of novice studio art professors.

Diverse students. At the same time that the majority of studio art professors are nearing retirement-age (but not necessarily retiring), students entering undergraduate schools are more ethnically, socio-economically, and culturally diverse than ever before (Knefelkamp, 1999; Skipper, 2005). This diversity raises the not insubstantial problem of how professors who came of age in very different cultural moments teach such students. Perhaps of special relevance to today's studio art students and faculty is the digital culture in which most young adults are immersed:

At the dawn of the twenty-first century, American middle-class students now enter art [class] with eight evolving tools including: (1) cable, satellite, and Web-accessible televisions; (2) laptop computers; (3) cell phones, and particularly smart phones; (4) DVDs and game players, portable and stationary; (5) MP3 devices and iPods; (6) credit cards and ATM cards; (7) digital cameras, integrated and standalones; and (8) scanners. All generate information, communication, and currency to goods, and several include image capture. A pivotal historical perceptual change is taking place among us, making the abyss between past and present modes of perception greater than ever before in terms of attention, translation, forms, aesthetics, and production. (Pujol, 2009, p. 167)

If, as Pujol states, present and past generations have different modes of perception, what might be the implications for faculty teaching

studio art to 18-year-olds in 2013? Bridging gaps created by differences in age and culture challenges veteran professors to adapt in order to remain relevant to today's college students. Research of post-secondary studio art teaching and learning might provide some insight into whether or how professors and students develop teaching and learning strategies to successfully bridge those gaps.

Debate About the Content and Delivery of an Undergraduate Studio Art Education

The third cultural factor indicating that now is a critical moment for research of college studio art teaching and learning concerns the intense debate occurring within the art community itself: What is the nature and purpose of an undergraduate art education? (Baas & Jacob, 2010; Becker, 2009; Buckley & Conomos, 2010; Lupton, 2005; Madoff, 2007, 2009; Singerman et al., 2007). Several arguments within that debate are considered here: the nature of skills; the persistence of traditional Academy and Bauhaus curricular models; and the influence of the contemporary professional art world.

Skills. In 2005, renowned curator and college professor Ellen Lupton (2005) proposed the "re-skilling of the American art student" by outlining an expansive vision of skills to be incorporated into undergraduate art education that included: getting and realizing ideas, building a discourse, working collaboratively, and operating within the working world. Art education, she argued, is "a physically engaged, skill-based alternative to the liberal arts education" (para. 3). At about the same time Lupton published her article, a number of college and university art programs were modifying their first-year curricula: decreasing drawing, color theory, and other traditional media and technique courses, and, in their place, piloting curricular models organized around concepts (Kushins, 2007; Tavin, Kushins, & Elniski, 2007). Indeed, nearly all presenters

at a recent conference of art colleges showed how their foundation programs departed from media-centric curricular structures, prioritizing instead skills in concept development, creative thinking, and collaboration (AICAD, 2007). Though a glance through college course catalogs confirms that most studio art programs continue to organize curricula around the division of media disciplines, the shifts noted above suggest that skills in idea generation are replacing traditional skills in making as the core of college studio art curricula. As art historian Howard Singerman noted:

As a complaint, deskilling suggests that there are essential skills every artist should have. But it is no longer clear what an artist needs to know, or needs to know how to do. It's not so much that we have nothing to teach, but rather that, in relation to the art of the recent past, there is no particular thing that needs to be learned. (Singerman et al., 2007, pp. 100-101)

The result appears to be that some professors teach technical skills, others teach professional skills useful in the commercial art world, and still others aim at developing students' creativity or critical consciousness. Research conducted in studio art classrooms would reveal the kinds of skills that are valued, taught, and learned in today's post-secondary studio art classrooms. Perhaps research might even describe the variety of ways in which professors teach—and students learn—this great variety of skills.

Departure from traditional Academy and Bauhaus models. Some of the changes in curricula described above represent departures from the traditional models of the Academy (structured around an *atelier* model of master and apprentice, with appropriate subject matter determined by senior artists) and the Bauhaus (focused on exploration of materials and working in two-, three-, and four-dimensions). A number of artists and educators have ques-

tioned the relevance of Bauhaus and Academy models in contemporary times when the influence of postmodern theory has challenged the hegemony of Western Art, universal knowledge, and hierarchical control of knowledge (Baas & Jacob, 2010; Becker, 1996; Buckley & Conomos, 2010; Madoff, 2009; Miles, 2004). These authors argue for a distributed knowledge paradigm that emphasizes construction and discovery, learner-centered education, the teacher as facilitator, and education as a lifelong—and fun—proposition (Buckley & Conomos, 2010). In this context, *fun* might be considered analogous to play, or as noted cultural critic, Carol Becker (2009), described it, “a way of working that to others might not seem like work at all... for artists and designers, play is understood as serious work” (pp. 54-55). What does studio instruction within these various curricular models look like in classroom practice? For instance: how might one construct discovery in studio art? How do professors structure opportunities to engage in serious play? What are some ways studio instructors inspire lifelong learning? If education is learner-centered, how might skills be effectively taught? It is my view, based on my years teaching studio coursework in a variety of undergraduate institutions, that many answers to these questions exist right now in studio art classes. In exploring those classrooms—across institutional contexts, studio art and design content, and grade levels—researchers of teaching and learning in post-secondary studio art could make important contributions to the debate about the nature and content of an art education.

Influence of the professional art world and digital culture. Many college promotional materials extol alums and faculty who have found recognition and economic success in the professional art world (Fig, 2009; Madoff, 2007, 2009; Singerman, 1999). However, defining artis-

tic success and cultural agency only in market terms may be problematic for colleges for two reasons: a) many of today’s young artists do not view commerce as a viable framework through which to assess their professional success (Ault & Beck, 2005; Becker, 2009; Madoff, 2009; Buckley & Conomos, 2010); and, b) the influence of the professional art world may actually hinder continued artistic growth (Baas & Jacob, 2010; Storr, 2006). Other studio art educators have argued for a greater infusion of digital culture and new technology into the college art curriculum, believing such an emphasis is what today’s students expect and what will best prepare students for life beyond college (Alexenberg, 2008; Buckley & Conomos, 2010). Given the small amount of literature on the subject of college studio art teaching and learning, it is unclear to what degree the professional art world and digital culture affect contemporary curricula and pedagogy. Scholarly research could address this gap in the literature and, thereby, assist artist-teachers in inventing curricular models and pedagogical practices that take into account their own knowledge and skills, as well as the cultural realities of contemporary artmaking.

Teaching and learning in studio art, therefore, varies depending upon how art programs or individual professors define skill, to what degree curriculum and pedagogy depart from Academy and Bauhaus models, and in what ways the commercial art world and digital culture influence educational choices. It is important to note here that K-12 art educators base their pedagogical choices largely on their experiences as undergraduates in studio art courses (Carroll, 2011; Singerman, 1999). Thus, the choices undergraduate studio art instructors make for their curriculum and pedagogy influence generations of young artists—far beyond the undergraduates in their classrooms. Such exponential influence highlights the pressing

need for quality research. Reports on the teaching and learning that occurs in individual studio classrooms would build an informed dialogue about the studio art curricula and pedagogy appropriate for living, working, and creating in the 21st century.

Summary of Literature Relevant to College Studio Art Teaching and Learning

The few existing studies of college studio art teaching and learning provide a foundation for new research endeavors, while research and theory in related fields will further support investigations of post-secondary studio art education. Below, a brief summary of the literature is provided under two categories: teaching studio art and studio art learning. For each section, I begin with a survey of the research in college studio art and follow that with relevant research from other disciplines.

Teaching Studio Art

The research and theory relevant to teaching studio art at the college level includes studies of studio art professors, studies of teaching in other fields of inquiry, and theories of effective K-12 art education pedagogy. Reports suggest that studio pedagogy emerges from the professors' professional art practices (Campbell, 2003; Clausen, 2005; Fouquet, 1995; Kent, 2001); from academic and popular culture influences (Campbell, 2003; Cliff & Woodward, 2004; Fouquet, 1995); and from personal values or philosophical dispositions (Clausen, 2005; DiMarco, 2002; Fouquet, 1995; James, 1996). Since both studio art and non-art subjects exist in post-secondary institutional settings and serve adult learners, studies of undergraduate teaching practices in non-art subjects are useful. Research and theory of college pedagogical practice has become more prevalent in recent years (Bain, 2004; Shulman, 2004a, 2004b), though such

research has often relied on professor interviews, which, it has been argued, is insufficient to understand effective college instruction (Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2002). To better understand and articulate professor pedagogy therefore, a few studies complemented professor interviews with classroom observations, student input, and stimulated-recall interviews (Bain, 2004; Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2004). Reacting against the lecture model of instruction typical in academic coursework in the sciences and humanities, Donald Schön (1990) of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology advocated *atelier* or apprentice-style models of instruction similar to those found in art studios and music conservatories. Taken together, these sources suggest that effective college teaching practices include: creating a safe learning environment; encouraging risk-taking and inquiry; knowing the students; understanding the educational context; and maintaining a deep knowledge of one's field of expertise. In addition, findings indicate that some pedagogical practices are more effective than others and that, through the development of a reflective teaching practice, quality pedagogy can be learned.

Though the studies above signal that pedagogical practices can be cross-disciplinary, some have argued that quality pedagogical practices are content specific (Shulman, 1987), and that certain ways of knowing are unique to the Arts (Eisner, 2002). Therefore, a consideration of the literature pertaining to K-12 art education pedagogy is useful to research of art instruction in post-secondary settings. To engage students in art classrooms, K-12 sources recommend that teachers: know their subjects and students well; create an environment of trust; facilitate meaning making by connecting works and ideas with the world beyond the classroom; engage students in dialogue; create opportunities for students to explore materials and develop skills

in making, harness imagination and careful observation, and reflect on the varied contexts in which art is made and why it is made (Anderson & Milbrandt, 2004; Burton, 2000, 2005, 2009; Burton & Hafeli, 2013; Carroll, 2007; Gude, 2010; Hetland et al., 2007; The College Board, 2012; Walker, 2001; Zimmerman, 2009).

Studio Art Learning

Studies in university studio art settings suggest that students and teachers interact frequently, often on a one-on-one basis and occasionally for a substantial length of time (Bekkala, 1999; James, 1996, 1997; Kent, 2001; Sevigny, 1977). Hence, a studio professor's personality, leadership, aesthetic criteria, and performance activities have been shown to strongly influence the learning in a studio course (Bekkala, 1999; James, 1996, 1997; Kushins, 2007; Sevigny, 1977). While the learning that took place was primarily behavioral—such as taking risks, persisting, and managing time—students also learned how to appreciate different kinds of art, see things from multiple points of view, and articulate their thoughts about art.

Along with these few studies of learning in college studio art classrooms, research of college student learning and theories of artistic development will be informative for future investigations of undergraduate learning in art. Theories of learning regarding college students (Belenky, Clichy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1997; Knefelkamp, 1999; Perry, 1999; Skipper, 2005), adults (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Gruber & Wallace, 1989; Kegan, 2000; Mezirow, 2000), and adolescents (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1984; Kroger, 2004) suggest that most college students will encounter dissociative experiences, need a safe place to handle change, learn holistically, and benefit from opportunities to imagine or explore many alternatives before choosing and proceeding with one.

While it is not clear to what degree artistic development may continue beyond early adolescence, an understanding of theories of artistic development may inform future studies of college studio art learning, just as it has for much of K-12 art education research and practice (Burton, 2009; Gardner, 1990; Hurwitz & Day, 2007). Artistic development, as one thread of human development, is a cumulative, culturally inflected, complex layering of re-presenting⁵ life's experiences and understandings (Burton, 2000, 2005). Artistic development is neither a linear, universal, nor age-determined unfolding of intrinsic traits (Burton, 2000, 2005; Kindler, 1999); instead, the process of artistic development might be conceptualized as the construction of new knowledge or the making of new meanings that occur during, through, or in response to the act of thoughtfully interacting with visual, sensual materials (Burton, 2000, 2005). While debate has continued regarding the ways to best conceptualize artistic development, most researchers agree that given optimal cultural conditions, artistic development does occur, and might be understood through changes in a variety of visual repertoires (Burton, 1980/1981, 2000, 2005, 2009; Hetland et al., 2007; Kindler, 1999). Optimal conditions for artistic development include: access to materials; interaction with more experienced others (artists, teachers); exposure to a range of visual forms; and encounters with role models of varying genders, races, and ethnic identities (Burton, 2005; The College Board, 2012). Qualities that emerge as typical of the artistic practices of adolescents—like taking risks, sustaining focus, and imagining divergent possibilities (Burton, 2005; Hetland et al, 2007; The College Board, 2012)—echo descriptions of adult and adolescent learning (Kroger, 2004; Mezirow, 2000). This overlap between artistic development and learning theory suggests that

these two bodies of knowledge may be particularly relevant to research of college-level studio art learning.

Conclusion

I began with a description of three cultural phenomena that together make evident the need for research that uncovers the teaching and learning occurring in post-secondary art. I then provided a brief summary of the research relevant to post-secondary studio art teaching and learning. In so doing, I demonstrated that there are some teaching practices that are recommended across disciplines and levels while there are other teaching concerns that may be unique to the visual arts. In addition, I noted that there are connections among theories of college learning and artistic development. This brief summary of the literature provides support for future scholarly investigation of teaching and learning in undergraduate studio art—such as:

1. In what ways do college studio art instructors nurture creative skills and dispositions in their students?
2. In what ways do studio art students, with varied personal and professional goals, develop as creative individuals?
3. In what ways might the intentions and practices of college art students, studied over their four years of college, enable us to better understand whether or how young adults develop artistically?
4. In what ways is the teaching and learning of college studio art interdisciplinary, hierarchical, and/or technologically relevant?
5. Which educational values are inherent in the teaching and learning found in today's college studio art classes?
6. In what ways do current studio art professors develop and practice the teaching of studio art?
7. In what ways do studio professors bridge cultural gaps in order to connect with their students?
8. Which skills are taught and learned in today's college studio art classrooms?
9. In what ways do studio professors engage students in serious play, discovery, risk-taking, life-long learning, and other dispositions thought to be important to creativity and artmaking?
10. In what ways does the studio art education of undergraduates contribute over time to their development as adults and professionals?

Scholarly research of these questions should be undertaken as collaborative efforts between studio art programs and art education departments, encouraged and supported by post-secondary institutions, and provide a national forum for discussion at annual conferences of artists and educators. In this way research of undergraduate studio art education might expand the discourse by questioning and confirming many of the assumptions that are threaded through mainstream dialogue about college studio art, about the value of art education, and about what constitutes quality teaching at the college level.

AUTHOR NOTE

The research for this article was conducted as part of the author's doctoral dissertation (McKenna, 2011). Special thanks are extended to Dr. Judith M. Burton, dissertation sponsor.

REFERENCES

- AICAD. (2007, October 25-27). *AICAD 2007 Symposium: Rethinking the core*. Paper presented at the symposium of Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design, New York, NY.
- Alexenberg, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Educating artists for the future: Learning at the intersections of art, science, technology, and culture*. Bristol, England: Intellect Books.
- Amabile, T. A., & Khaire, M. (2008, October). Creativity and the role of the leader. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <http://hbr.org/2008/10/creativity-and-the-role-of-the-leader/ar/1>
- Anderson, T., & Milbrandt, M. (2004). *Art for life: Authentic instruction in art*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ault, J., & Beck, M. (2005). *Drawing out and leading forth*. Paper presented at the Manifesta 5. Retrieved from www.manifesta.org/docs/05.pdf
- Babcock, P., Botstein, L., Decatur, S., Kent, C., Leef, G., Taylor, M. C., et al. (2011 January 24). Room for debate: Does college make you smarter? *New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2011/01/24/does-college-make-you-smarter
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baas, J., & Jacob, M. J. (Eds.). (2010). *Learning mind: Experience into art*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bayles, B., & Orland, T. (1993). *Art and fear: Observations on the perils (and rewards) of artmaking*. Santa Cruz, CA: Image Continuum Press.
- Becker, C. (1996). *Zones of contention: Essays on art, institutions, gender, and anxiety*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Becker, C. (2009). *Thinking in place: Art, action, and cultural production*. London, England: Paradigm.
- Bekkala, E. (1999). *The development of artists at Rhode Island School of Design*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- Belenky, M., Clichy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1997). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind, 10th anniversary edition*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Belzer, C., & Birnbaum, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Kunst lehren/Teaching art: Städtelschule*. Frankfurt/Main, Germany: Buchhandlung Walther König.
- Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boughton, D., Efland, A., Freedman, K., & Zimmerman, E. (2009, April). *Reconsidering creativity: Theory and practice in art education*. Paper presented at the 2009 Convention of the National Art Education Association, Minneapolis, MN.
- Bryant, A. (2010, January 9). On a scale of 1-10, how weird are you? *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: www.nytimes.com/2010/01/10/business/10corner.html?pagewanted=all
- Buckley, B., & Conomos, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Rethinking the contemporary art school: The artist, the PhD, and the academy*. Halifax, NS: The Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). *Jobs in the arts*. Retrieved from www.bls.gov/oco/ocos092.htm
- Burton, J. M. (1980/1981). Developing minds. *SchoolArts*. [Special series]
- Burton, J. M. (2000). The configuration of meaning: Learner-centered art education revisited. *Studies in Art Education*, 41(4), 330-345.
- Burton, J. M. (2005). The integrity of personal experience, or, the presence of life in art. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 3(2), 9-36.
- Burton, J. M. (2009). Creative intelligence, creative practice: Lowenfeld redux. *Studies in Art Education*, 50(4), 323-337.
- Burton, J. M., & Hafeli, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Conversations in art: The dialectics of teaching and learning*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Campbell, L. (2003). *Portraits of visual artist/teachers: Spirituality in art education*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.

- Capriccioso, R. (2006). A call to arts. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/new/2006/02/03/arts
- Carroll, K. L. (2007). *Better visual arts education*. Annapolis: Maryland State Department of Education.
- Carroll, K.L. (2011). What if they believed us?: How well prepared are art educators to deliver on the promises of art education? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 112(1), 9-25.
- Clausen, S. (2005). Teaching as a fine art critical practice: A pedagogic research project. *Higher Education Association*. Retrieved from www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/.../teaching-as-fine-art.pdf
- Cliff, A. F., & Woodward, R. (2004). How do academics come to know?: The structure and contestation of discipline-specific knowledge in a design school. *Higher Education*, 48(3), 269-290.
- College Art Association (CAA). (2011). National conference program. Retrieved from www.collegeart.org
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1984). *Being adolescent: Conflict and growth in the teenage years*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Cullen, T. (2009). *Art school applications multiply despite dwindling job market*. Retrieved from www.scaddistrict.com/?p=3077&postcomment=true
- Daichendt, G. J. (2010). *Artist teacher: A philosophy for creating and teaching*. Bristol, England: Intellect Books.
- Deasey, D. (2009, October). *Preparing graduate students to teach: Keynote address*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Schools of Art and Design, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Dickey, T. (2010). *Color creates light: Studies with Hans Hofmann*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Trillistar Books.
- DiMarco, P. J. (2002). *Educational theories and strategies in a reflective practice case study on teaching computers in the visual arts*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Eisner, E. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Elkins, J. (2001). *Why art cannot be taught*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Fendrich, L. (2007, June 8). A pedagogical straightjacket. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/A-Pedagogical-Straightjacket/20446>
- Fendrich, L. (2009, February 10). You will be held accountable [Opinion]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/brainstorm/you-will-be-held-accountable/6649>
- Fig, J. (2009). *Inside the painter's studio*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Florida, R. (2001). *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community, and everyday life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Fouquet, M. (1995). *Contemporary art/contemporary pedagogy: Interrupting mastery as paradigm for art school education*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Simon Fraser University at The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Frears, D. (2009). Apps to art school increase. *Yale Daily News*. Retrieved from www.yaledailynews.com/news/art-news/2009/01/23/apps-to-art-school-increase
- Freedman, K. (2007). Artmaking/troubling: Creativity, policy, and leadership in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 48(20), 204-217.
- Freedman, K. (2008). Leading creativity: Responding to policy in art education. In T. Eça & R. Mason (Eds.), *International dialogues about visual culture, education and art* (pp. 39-47). Chicago, IL: Intellect Books.
- Freedman, K. (2010). Rethinking creativity: A definition to support contemporary practice. *Art Education*, 63(2), 8-15.
- Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the 21st century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gardner, H. (1990). *Art education and human development*. Los Angeles, CA: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Getzels, J. W., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1976). *The creative vision: A longitudinal study of problem finding in art*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers: The story of success*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company.

- Gregg, G. (2006). I will never look at painting the same way again. *ArtNews*. Retrieved from www.artnews.com/2006/10/01/i-will-never-look-at-painting-the-same-way-again
- Gruber, H. H., & Wallace, D. B. (1989). *Creative people at work*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gude, O. (2010). Playing, creativity, possibility. *Art Education*, 63(2), 31-37.
- Hetland L., Winner, E., Veenema S., & Sheridan, K. M. (2007). *Studio thinking: The real benefits of visual arts education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hurwitz, A., & Day, M. (2007). Children's artistic development: How children grow and learn. *Children and their art: Methods for the elementary school* (pp. 43-67). Independence, KY: Thomson Wadsworth.
- James, P. (1996). The construction of learning and teaching in a sculpture studio class. *Studies in Art Education*, 37(3), 145-159.
- James, P. (1997). Artistic creativity: A case study. *Studies in Art Education*, 39(1), 74-88.
- James, P. (2000). "I Am the Dark Forest": Personal analogy as a way to understand metaphor. *Art Education Journal*, 53(5), 6-11.
- James, P. (2004). Beyond her own boundaries: A portrait of creative work. *Studies in Art Education*, 45(4), 359-373.
- Kane, R., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2002). Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(2), 177-228.
- Kane, R., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2004). An investigation into excellent tertiary teaching: Emphasizing reflective practice. *Higher Education*, 47(3), 282-310.
- Kegan, R. (2000). What "form" transforms? In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 35-69). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kent, L. (2001). *The case of Lucio Pozzi: An artist/teacher's studio critique method*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Teacher's College, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- Kindler, A. (1999). "From endpoints to repertoires": A challenge to art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 40(4), 330-349.
- Kindler, A. (2008). Art, creativity, art education and civil society. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 9(2), 1-14.
- Knefelkamp, L. (1999). Foreword (to reprint of William Perry's book). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. New York, NY: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Kroger. (2004). *Identity in adolescence: The balance between self and other*. London, England: Routledge.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kushins, J. (2007). *Brave new basics: Case portraits of innovation in undergraduate studio art foundations curriculum*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Lehrer, J. (2012). *Imagine: How creativity works*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Levine, D. N. (2006). *Powers of mind: The reinvention of liberal learning in America*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Luftig, R. L., Donovan, M. J., Fambaugh, C. L., Kennedy, E. E., Filicko, T., & Wyszomirski, M. J. (2003). So what are you doing after college? An investigation of individuals studying the arts at the post-secondary level, their job aspirations and levels of realism. *Studies in Art Education*, 45(1), 5-19.
- Lupton, E. (2005, March). The re-skilling of the American art student. *Voice: AIGA Journal of Design*. Retrieved from <http://elupton.com/2009/10/reskilling-the-art-student>
- MacGregor, J. (2009, March 23). Zappos' secret: It's an open book. *Business Week*. Retrieved from www.businessweek.com
- Madoff, S. H. (2007). School is out: Rethinking art education today, a conversation between Michael Craig-Martin and John Baldessari. *Modern Painters*, September, 74-79.
- Madoff, S. H. (2009). *Art school (propositions for the twenty-first century)*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- McKenna, S. (2011). *Art school consequential: Teaching and learning in the first year of art school*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Columbia University Teachers College, New York, NY.

- Mezirow, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Learning as transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. (Ed.). (2004). *New practices/new pedagogies: A reader*. Swets & Zeitlinger/Taylor & Francis Group.
- National Art Education Association. (2011). *Creativity, Imagination, and Innovation in Art Education* [Convention Program]. Retrieved from www.arteducators.org
- National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). (2011). *The Future of Art and Design Education* [Conference Program]. Retrieved from <http://nasad.arts-accredit.org>
- Neumann, A. (2010). *Professing to learn: Creating tenured lives and careers in the American research university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Orr, D. (1994). *Earth in mind: On education, environment, and the human prospect*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Perry, W. (1999). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. New York, NY: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Pink, D. (2006). *A whole new mind: Why right-brainers will rule the future*. New York, NY: The Berkeley Group.
- Pujol, E. (2009). On the ground: Practical observations for regenerating art education. In S. H. Madoff (Ed.), *Art school: Propositions for the twenty-first century* (pp. 1-13). Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Risenhoover, M., & Blackburn, R. T. (1976). *Artists as professors: Conversations with musicians, painters, sculptors*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Roth, M. (1973). Interview with John Baldessari. *X-tra: Contemporary Art Quarterly*, 8(2), 14-35.
- Salazar, S. M. (2013). Laying a Foundation for Artmaking in the 21st Century: A description and some dilemmas. *Studies in Art Education*, 54(3), 246-259.
- Schön, D. (1990). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Seigny, M. J. (1977). *A descriptive study of instruction interaction and performance appraisal in a university studio art setting: A multiple perspective*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 280-299.
- Shulman, L. S. (2004a). *Teaching as community property*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, L. S. (2004b). *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Singerman, H. (1999). *Art subjects: The making of the artists in the American university*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Singerman, H., King-Hammond, L., Rinder, L., Fendrich, L., Ferguson, B., Anker, S., et al. (2007, May). Art Schools: A Group Crit. *Art in America*, 95(5), 99-113.
- Skipper, T. L. (2005). *Student development in the first college year: A primer for college educators*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Storr, R. (2006, September). Haste makes waste. *frieze*, 10. Retrieved from www.frieze.com/issue/article/haste_makes_waste
- Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP). (2011). *Tracking the lives and careers of arts graduates*. Retrieved from <http://snaap.indiana.edu/snaapshot>
- Sullivan, G. (2010). Artistic cognition and creativity. In H. Karlsson & M. Biggs (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to research in the arts*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tavin, K., Kushins, J., & Elniski, J. (2007). Shaking the foundations of postsecondary art(ist) education in visual culture. *Art Education*, 60(5), 13-19.
- Taylor, M. C. (2009, April 17). End the university as we know it. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2009/04/27/opinion/27taylor.html?pagewanted=all
- Tepper, S. J., & Kuh, G. D. (2011, September 4). Let's get serious about cultivating creativity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Lets-Get-Serious-About/128843/>

- The College Board. (2012, January). *Child development and arts education: A review of recent research and best practices*. New York, NY. (pp. 47-57). Retrieved from www.arteducators.org/news/CB_Child_Development_2.2.12.pdf
- Veon, R. (2010). Creating bridges. [Report from conference workshop]. *FutureForward*, 1(1), 60-65.
- Walker, S. (1996). Designing studio instruction: Why have students make artwork? *Art Education*, 49(5), 11-17.
- Walker, S. (2001). *Teaching meaning in artmaking*. Worcester, MA: Davis.
- Walker, S. (2003). What more can you ask? Artmaking and inquiry. *Art Education*, 56(5), 6-12.
- Walker, S. (2004). Understanding the artmaking process: Reflective process. *Art Education*, 57(2), 6-12.
- Witham, L. (2012). *Art schooled: A year among prodigies, rebels, and visionaries at a world-class art college*. Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England.
- Zimmerman, E. (2009). Reconceptualizing the role of creativity in art education theory and practice. *Studies in Art Education*, 50(4), 382-399.
- Zimmerman, E. (2010). *Lowenfeld Award address*. Paper presented at the 2010 Convention of the National Art Education Association, Baltimore, Maryland.

ENDNOTES

- 1 My survey of the literature suggested that there has been little research of undergraduate studio art education and, perhaps, even less of graduate studio art education. As Singerman (1999) noted, the two levels are quite different educational endeavors. I chose to focus on the undergraduate level for two reasons: a) many more students take studio art as undergraduates than pursue MFAs; and, b) there is more research available from other fields of study (adolescent development and undergraduate higher education) relevant to future study of undergraduate teaching and learning.
- 2 In a 2012 publication, *Art Schooled: A Year among Prodigies, Rebels, and Visionaries at a World-class Art College*, Larry Witham narrated an intimate view of a year-in-the-life of a contemporary art school, the Maryland Institute College of Art. While the life of a studio classroom was part of his story, formal reporting on, and analysis of, teacher pedagogy and student learning was not included.
- 3 In order to address this perceived gap in the literature, my dissertation research, *Art School Consequential: Teaching and Learning in the First Year of Art School* focused on contemporary undergraduate teaching and learning. A report based on my research appeared in the Spring 2013 issue of *Studies in Art Education*. (See Salazar, 2013.)
- 4 In a 2005 publication, *The World is Flat*, author Thomas L. Friedman described globalization as a leveling of the playing field, or a “flattening” of hierarchy and national privilege. This, he argued, is the critical feature characterizing the 21st century. Friedman identified a number of flattening effects such as workflow software, the collapse of the Berlin Wall, and personal digital devices. He recommended that to stay competitive, the United States workforce must be more adaptable and more open to changing careers.
- 5 Art educator, Judith M. Burton (2000, 2005), defined the term *re-presentation* as the infinite ways in which artists (of all ages) translate life experience in a tangible, aesthetic form that might be experienced by others who encounter the work.