



1987

## The Muses in Academe: A Survey of Faculty Attitudes Regarding the Role of Fine Arts in General Education Programs

David F. Unumb  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Unumb, David F., "The Muses in Academe: A Survey of Faculty Attitudes Regarding the Role of Fine Arts in General Education Programs" (1987). *Dissertations*. 2505.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/2505](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2505)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1987 David F. Unumb

THE MUSES IN ACADEME: A SURVEY OF FACULTY ATTITUDES REGARDING THE  
ROLE OF FINE ARTS IN GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

David F. Unumb

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

May

1987

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A primary acknowledgement of appreciation is owed to my colleagues at Northeastern Illinois University for their patience and understanding as I worked on this project. I am particularly grateful to Dr. James Barushok and Dr. John Braxton who often gave of their time and expertise as the project developed and instrument formats were devised.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Ernest I. Proulx, my committee chairman, who offered encouragement throughout the length of the study and was most meticulous and helpful in his comments. Dr. Todd Hoover was of great assistance in the design of the study and gave unstintingly of his time and expert guidance as well as indicating every confidence in the successful outcome of the project. The other committee member, Dr. Diane Schiller, allowed me the opportunity to develop the initial plan for the study in one of her seminars and gave invaluable assistance in both the formative and developing stages of the design. Each of these individuals were essential in the completion of the project and their warmth and understanding are gratefully acknowledged.

Thanks are also due to the academic officers at the participating institutions not only for their cooperation, but also for their assistance, in many cases, in having the survey instrument distributed to faculty members. It is for this assistance that I am grateful to: Dr. Alfred F. MacKay (Oberlin College), Dr. Robert T. Voelkel (Pomona College), Dr. Catherine S. Frazer (Grinnell College), Dr. Harry C.

Payne (Haverford College). Dr. Borden W. Painter (Trinity College), Dr. Thomas Warger (Union College), Dr. R. Francis Johnson (Connecticut College), Dr. Carl Benton Staub (Bates College), and Dr. David J. Danelski (Occidental College).

Special gratitude is due to Therese who, although working on her own doctoral study during much of the time involved in this project, was a source of warmth, support, and confidence. She alone truly knows what was required to complete the study.

Finally, thanks are due to two individuals who, years ago, gave me encouragement which has resulted in the accomplishment of this objective, Dwight and Emily Reed. Their early granting of confidence and support is only matched by Therese and my parents, Frederick M. and Neva Unumb.

## PREFACE

Poetry, music, and painting, like their sister arts, are a direct transfer of complete experiences from one man to another. One may not be able to teach a man how to use his imagination, but it is worth while to stimulate it. I have never yet read a description of a beautiful woman which could be substituted for the experience of seeing one and similarly I would maintain that it is much more important to read for oneself a few of Shakespeare's sonnets than to read a complete biography of either the Dark Lady or Mr. W.H.

Let me then come down from the heights and say flatly that even if what we do is to give our students a special kind of pleasure, what is wrong with that? One would think, to hear some of our colleagues, that there is something trivial about enjoying one's studies. I am convinced, however, that the fine arts, including music, are the best products of the human imagination, better, I should be willing to say, than all of the work of Isaac Newton or Albert Einstein.

Intellectual understanding, or pure science, is of course important, not because it will help us kill more Russians than the Russians can kill Americans, but because human beings are in part intellects and must understand their universe in intellectual terms. But this is not only a fraction of human experience, it is a minor fraction of it. We are also people who love and hate, hope and despair, are bewildered and assured, doubtful and certain. It is only in the arts that the major portion of human life finds expression, and if we can stimulate to some extent a sympathy with the nonintellectual side of living, we need not feel utterly inadequate...

Man's feelings of alienation from his fellows is very prominent these days and an intensive study of the fine arts will do much to reduce this feeling. I may be wrong in this but if so, we have time after this talk to convince me of my error.

A Sermon for Humanists by  
George Boas in: "When George  
Boas spoke..." The Johns  
Hopkins Magazine October,  
1984, p. 21

## VITA

The author, David Frederick Unumb, was born on July 2, 1933 to Frederick M. Unumb and Neva (McFarlane) Unumb in Alexandria, Minnesota.

He received all of his early education in the public schools of Alexandria, graduating from Alexandria High School in 1951.

In September 1951 he entered Carleton College and was graduated in June 1955 with a Bachelor of Arts in English. Mr. Unumb was accepted in the Writing Seminars Program at The Johns Hopkins University and served as a Junior Instructor in Speech while completing his degree program. He graduated from Johns Hopkins University in June of 1957 with a Master of Arts, the terminal degree in the Writing Seminars Program.

Following a term of service as a faculty member of the Department of English at Kent State University, Mr. Unumb enrolled in a program of doctoral study at Cornell University in Drama and Theatre with a minor in Rhetoric and Public Address. All requirements for the Ph.D. degree, except for the completion of a dissertation were fulfilled by June of 1960.

Mr. Unumb has served on the faculties of Brown University in English and Drama, and Boston University in Speech and Theatre. Since September of 1969 he has served on the faculty of Northeastern Illinois University where he is currently Professor of Speech and Performing Arts and Chair of that department.

While at Northeastern Illinois University, Mr. Unumb has also

served as Coordinator of the Kaskaskia Plan for Individual Interdisciplinary Curricula and as the first University Coordinator for General Education. He is currently Chair of the University Faculty Senate.

His professional memberships include Phi Delta Kappa, The Speech Communication Association, The Illinois Arts Alliance, and the Illinois Library Association. Mr. Unumb is also a Fellow of the Society for Values in High Education.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. . . . .	ii
PREFACE . . . . .	iv
VITA. . . . .	v
LIST OF TABLES. . . . .	x
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES. . . . .	xii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	21
Definition of Terms. . . . .	23
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	24
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	26
Status of the Fine Arts and the General Education Reforms Report of the 1980's. . . . .	70
The General Education Reform Reports . . . . .	83
Assessment of Faculty Attitudes Towards The Fine Arts in General Education . . . . .	94
Summary. . . . .	115
III. METHOD OF RESEARCH . . . . .	118
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	118
The Questionnaire Instrument . . . . .	123
Limitations of Instrument. . . . .	131
Site Selection and Determination of Sample . . . . .	133
Sample Selection . . . . .	137
IV. FINDINGS . . . . .	151
Introduction . . . . .	151
Composition of Survey Sample . . . . .	152
General Attitudes Towards the Fine Arts. . . . .	160
Item Cluster Analysis. . . . .	170
Analysis of Scores for Correlation . . . . .	184



Questionnaire Analysis Comparing Faculty in the Fine Arts with Faculty in Arts and Literature and All Other Disciplines . . . . .	195
Summary of Findings. . . . .	227
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	234
Respondent Attitude Profile. . . . .	234
Evaluation of the Survey Instrument. . . . .	246
Conclusions. . . . .	247
Recommendations. . . . .	249
REFERENCES. . . . .	251
APPENDIX A. . . . .	265
APPENDIX B. . . . .	274
APPENDIX C. . . . .	305
APPENDIX D. . . . .	317
APPENDIX E. . . . .	332
APPENDIX F. . . . .	340
APPENDIX G. . . . .	344
APPENDIX H. . . . .	346
APPENDIX I. . . . .	348
APPENDIX J. . . . .	350
APPENDIX K. . . . .	355
APPENDIX L. . . . .	367
APPENDIX M. . . . .	370
APPENDIX N. . . . .	373
APPENDIX O. . . . .	378
APPENDIX P. . . . .	382
APPENDIX Q. . . . .	386

APPENDIX R. . . . .	388
APPENDIX S. . . . .	391
APPENDIX T. . . . .	394
APPENDIX U. . . . .	397
APPENDIX V. . . . .	409
APPENDIX W. . . . .	426

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Item Clusters in Survey Instrument. . . . .	129
2. Potential Survey Pool of Sites. . . . .	136
3. Discipline Code . . . . .	140
4. Cell Stratification . . . . .	141
5. Combined Response for Wave A. . . . .	149
6. Combined Response Rates . . . . .	150
7. Individual Site Response to Survey. . . . .	153
8. Site Share in Design/Sample . . . . .	154
9. Discipline Area Proportions of Design and Final Sample. .	155
10. Respondent Distribution by Faculty Rank . . . . .	157
11. Reported Teaching Experience of Respondents . . . . .	159
12. Narrative Score Interpretation. . . . .	161
13. Score Results for Total Sample. . . . .	162
14. Item Means at 4.000 Level . . . . .	163
15. Mean Responses to Fine Arts Requirement in Specific Fields. . . . .	166
16. Item Means at 3.500 to 3.999 Level. . . . .	167
17. Item Means Analysis: Cluster #1 . . . . .	171
18. Frequency Response to Item 7. . . . .	172
19. Frequency Response to Item 23 . . . . .	173
20. Item Means Analysis: Cluster #2 . . . . .	174
21. Frequency Response to Item 34 . . . . .	176
22. Frequency Response to Item 16 . . . . .	179

23.	Cross-Breakdown of Mean Scores by Discipline. . . . .	187
24.	Cross-Breakdown of Mean Scores by Discipline and Undergraduate Fine Arts Course. . . . .	189
25.	Analysis of Variance by Score/Rank. . . . .	190
26.	Analysis of Variance by Score/Discipline. . . . .	190
27.	Analysis of Variance by Score/Rank/Discipline . . . . .	191
28.	Differentiated Demographic Profile of Three-Way Analysis Comparing Fine Arts Faculty, Remaining Faculty in Arts and Literature, and All Other Disciplines . . . . .	197
29.	Sample Composition, Sub-Population of Fine Arts Faculty, Remaining Faculty in Arts and Literature, and All Other Disciplines . . . . .	200
30.	Comparison of Mean Response Level Amongst Fine Arts Faculty, Arts and Literature Faculty, and Faculty from All Other Disciplines . . . . .	202
31.	Difference in Means on Questionnaire Items Between Arts and Literature Faculty and Those in All Other Disciplines Combined. . . . .	212
32.	Means Analysis of Item Cluster #1. Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts, Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines . .	214
33.	Means Analysis of Item Cluster #2. Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts, Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines . .	219
34.	Means Analysis of Item Cluster #3. Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts, Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines . .	222
35.	Means Analysis of Item Cluster #4. Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts, Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines . .	224
36.	Means Analysis of Item Cluster #5. Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts, Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines . .	226
37.	Respondent Profile: Items Recorded at Sample Proportions of 75% and Above for Agreement or Disagreement. . . . .	229
38.	Respondent Profile: Items Recorded at Sample Proportions of 55% to 74% for Agreement or Disagreement . . . . .	231
39.	Respondent Profile: Items Recorded at Sample Proportions of 54% and Under for Agreement or Disagreement. . . . .	233

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

		Page
Appendix A	Catalog Analysis and Survey of Chicago-Area Institutions on the Role of the Fine Arts in General Education Programs (1980-1981) . . . . .	265
Appendix B	"The Role of Fine Arts Courses and the Development of Cognitive Skills in General Education," A Paper Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Association for General and Liberal Studies, San Francisco, California, October, 1984 . . . . .	274
Appendix C	Version A of Questionnaire Instrument, and Pilot Administration Results . . . . .	305
Appendix D	Version B of Questionnaire Instrument, and Pilot Administration Results . . . . .	317
Appendix E	Questionnaire Instrument for the ARTSROLE 1986 Survey . . . . .	332
Appendix F	Letter Soliciting Participation in the Study . . .	340
Appendix G	Letter to Faculty Sample Soliciting Response to the Questionnaire. . . . .	344
Appendix H	Letter to Faculty Sample in Follow-Up Wave B Soliciting Response to the Questionnaire . . . . .	346
Appendix I	List of Participating Institutions . . . . .	348
Appendix J	Summary of <u>Academic Preparation in the Arts</u> (1985), College Entrance Examination Board . . . . .	350
Appendix K	Frequency Response for ARTSROLE 1986 Questionnaire as Presented by Total Faculty Sample . . . . .	355
Appendix L	Sample Profile: Proportions Captured of Original Design Cells by Rank/Discipline. . . . .	367
Appendix M	Item Means Analysis by Mean Range for All Questionnaire Items. . . . .	370
Appendix N	Item Cluster Means Analysis for Total Survey Sample . . . . .	373

Appendix O	Cross-Breakdown Using Score by Undergraduate Institution of Faculty and Enrollment Pattern of that Institution. . . . .	378
Appendix P	Cross-Breakdown Using Score by Faculty Discipline and Years of Teaching Experience . . . . .	382
Appendix Q	Cross-Breakdown Using Score by Faculty Discipline and Academic Rank. . . . .	386
Appendix R	Cross-Breakdown Using Score on Arts and Cognition Item Cluster by Survey Site and Faculty Rank . . . . .	388
Appendix S	Cross-Breakdown Using Score on Traditional Role for the Arts Item Cluster by Survey Site and Faculty Rank . . . . .	391
Appendix T	Comparative Demographics: Fine Arts Faculty, Arts and Literature Faculty, and Faculty in all Other Disciplines. . . . .	394
Appendix U	Frequency Response for ARTSROLE 1986 Questionnaire as Presented by Separate Display for Fine Arts Faculty, Arts and Literature Faculty and Faculty in All Other Disciplines . . . . .	397
Appendix V	Sample Demographics	
	1. Data Display of Mentor Relationships Established by Respondents. . . . .	409
	2. Data Display of Undergraduate Colleges Attended by Respondents . . . . .	419
Appendix W	Cross-Breakdown and Analysis of Variance of Scores for Comparison: Faculty with Mentor Relationship and Faculty Without Mentor Relationship . . . . .	426

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In his book, The Liberal College, (1920), Alexander Micklejohn suggested a philosophy and rationale for the continued development of Amherst College, of which he was then President, and of all similar colleges in the nation. In this time of change and challenge for higher education following World War I and the introduction of the American people to foreign affairs, he proposed a course of study in the liberal college in which there was clear attention to English, foreign language, science, philosophy, mathematics and formal logic, European and American history, and the study of "social and economic institutions, History of Thought, and Intellectual and Moral Thought."

After some discussion of this proposed curricular content and its careful sequencing through the four undergraduate years, he makes the following statements:

Before proceeding to speak of the relationship of courses, may I stop to note the omission of two subjects for which some provision must be made. I refer to the teaching of the fine arts, including music, and to practice in public speech. These subjects are left out because the plan is as yet a mere sketch. In any definite scheme they must be firmly established in some way or other (p. 143).

Thus, Micklejohn was aware of the fine arts, at least in some fashion, and acknowledged they had a role to play in the curriculum of a liberal arts college. Yet this role was not defined, nor discussed at any length in this first presentation of a proposed philosophy and

curriculum for liberal education.

Mieklejohn, who had become a Dean at Brown University in 1901, rising from the faculty ranks, was named President of Amherst in 1912 and in that role was to "mark out some of the fundamental directions for liberal education during succeeding decades" (Vesey, 1970, p. 211). His service in later years at the Experimental College in the University of Wisconsin was to leave a permanent legacy as an innovator in American higher education.

His remarks in The Liberal College are, therefore, to be considered as being representative of a significant figure in higher education and the tradition of liberal education.

The tradition out of which Mieklejohn and his contemporaries emerged had been characterized by the "mental discipline" approach to curriculum design and construction, which had allowed very little provision for the fine arts but was essentially based on the classical education of an earlier era. The relationship between this tradition and the fine arts will be discussed later in this paper.

In charting a new course for the liberal college, and thus in effect the continuation of liberal education in this country, Mieklejohn also rejected what had become current slogans of "efficiency" and "social service" which had arisen out of the experience of recent events and had been reinforced by the experience of World War I in a fashion much like the "post-Sputnik crisis" which occasioned the return to the "basics" movement of the late 1950s. His philosophical course had been articulated, however, as early as 1908, when he wrote an essay on "College Education and the Moral Ideal," in



which the following statement was made about the American college and its role:

...is not primarily to teach the forms of living, not primarily to give practice in the art of living...but rather to broaden and deepen the insight into life itself, to open up the riches of human experience, of literature, of nature, of art, of religion, of philosophy, of human relations, social, economic, political, to arouse an understanding and appreciation of these, so that life may be fuller and richer in content; in a word, the primary function of the American college is the arousing of interests (Vesey, 1970, pp. 210-211).

In these words of one of the primary figures in liberal education on the twentieth century American higher education scene we see several implications if we are interested in the role for fine arts in general and liberal education. One, there is a philosophy which places high respect for the intellect and its development at the heart of the matter. Two, there is an equally strong implication that education should be so constructed and experienced as to develop the "whole person". Three, there is an indication that the arts are to be a part of this, but in some fashion which will encompass "understanding and appreciation".

If one were to examine college catalogs from all institutions which pay any homage to liberal education today, the concepts of "breadth and depth" as well as phrases reminiscent of "understanding and appreciation", especially of the fine arts, are bound to appear. There is also likely to be language which is equally familiar about training of the intellect and studies of culture placed in this context.

If Mieklejohn's position represents a shift from the earlier approaches in curriculum which had been dominated by a classical, even

rigid format of mental discipline and moral education, with little, if any, provision for the fine arts, then we would expect that the recognition of the fine arts, once freed from this curricular rigidity, to begin assuming a more significant role in higher education and most particularly in that part of the undergraduate curriculum which represents the core common to all students.

Such has not been the case, at least not in any broad or universal sense. Indeed, as characterized by Conrad and Wyer (1980):

...the ideal of liberal education as the creation of mentally and morally disciplined gentlemen via the lockstep classical curriculum was in force among the small, denominational liberal arts colleges well into the twentieth century (p. 15).

It should also be noted that the study of science and applied studies, which has its own history of travail and initial exclusion in American higher education, was moving into the curricular arena in the late nineteenth century. As the application of research in many fields took root, fueled without doubt by the social, economic and industrial needs of a growing nation, it became part of the movement toward specialization of knowledge and practicality.

As characterized by Vesey (1970), "facts and rigorous inductions" began to take precedence over classical reasoning, "ideals and presuppositions". A portrait of this curricular landscape was painted by Vesey in The Emergence of the American University (1970) when he states:

By the late nineteenth century American society had become wealthy and secure enough to afford (in both senses) the luxury of certain visible deviations from its accepted codes. Aestheticism was to flourish somewhat fitfully on this marginal basis, both inside and outside the new universities. Research, which could be seen as a more respectable kind of deviance, was for the time almost wholly

captured by academic institutions" (p. 135).

It was in this frame that the "dualism" between science and the humanities (thus also usually including the fine arts) began to take place.

Long before the British writer C.P. Snow captured public attention by attempting to solve the riddle of divisions between the sciences and the humanities, Daniel Coit Gilman, President of The Johns Hopkins University argued for a dualism between these studies in 1903:

While the old line between the sciences and the humanities may be invisible as the equator, it has an existence as real. On the one side are cognitions which may be submitted to demonstrative proof, which do not depend upon opinion, preference or authority, which are true everywhere and all the time; while on the other side are cognitions which depend upon our spiritual natures, our aesthetic preferences, our intellectual traditions, our religious faith. Earth and man, nature and the supernatural, letters and science, the humanities and the realities, are the current terms of contrast between the two groups and there are no signs that these distinctions will ever vanish (Vesey, p. 181).

While Gilman's position is balanced and reasonable, it nevertheless represents a simple dualism which was to characterize the relationship for some time to come.

Recent researchers on the arts and cognition (Gardner, Perkins, Van Sommers) have worked effectively and extensively to present cases which extend and amplify the concept of cognition to include processes in the arts, but their work, which will be discussed later in this paper, is of significance for future developments of the arts in general education and does not reflect much of past developments or experience in curriculum.

What Gilman's position does represent in the history of

curriculum development in the fine arts and general education is a position which, while he may not have intended his remarks to reinforce, has been one of tolerance for the arts at best, and a suspicious regard at the worst.

Among other effects, questions about the basis of examination and inquiry for the fine arts gave rise to questions about their academic respectability and standing as authentic disciplines within the collegiate structure.

As recently as 1974 Kaysen in his paper title, "What Should Undergraduate Education Do?" suggests that:

...tradition persists in the academy, and even after a century the natural and social sciences are "new" fields, still deferential to the established classical and humanistic learning which dominated American higher education--such as it was--for the first two and a half centuries after the founding of Harvard College. Music, drama, dance, film, and the visual arts are barely beginning to reach academic respectability, as disciplines to be practiced, as well as cultural activities to be studied historically (Kaysen, p. 181).

During the ferment of the late 60s and early 70s, when much attention was being given to re-shaping the agenda and curricula of higher education, suggestions were made by two notable figures, Lewis B. Mayhew and Harold Taylor, for enhancing the role of the fine and creative arts in the reformed and re-shaped colleges of the future. That these positions had to be placed as a future agenda item suggests that the present status of the fine arts was limited indeed.

In "The Future Undergraduate Curriculum", which appeared as part of Campus 1980, (Eurich), Mayhew created a "report from the future" which looked at developments in the undergraduate curriculum fostered by the events of the late 1960s. He foresaw a time when the course of

study would have recognized the validity of emotions, the affect, and the research of Nevitt Sanford of the need for management of the emotive and impulse elements of student development. As part of this development he "saw" a time when:

...under such influences as a no-grade system, student demand for a more personnel education, and an acceptance that a longer time in college was appropriate, students were allowed and even encouraged to take courses in poetry, music, philosophy and the applied arts during the freshman year. In a number of colleges every student was expected to take at least for one semester a studio course in one of the fine arts, preferably one in which he was not particularly competent. Art finally reached the state where it was no longer regarded as an ornament but an essential way of knowing reality (Mayhew, p. 213).

While much of the ferment of this era has become only a part of our academic history, with the demise of many experimental programs, a subduing of the issues of "relevance" as defined by confrontive students, and a rise of career-oriented concerns amongst students and the public alike, one wonders if the concerns for a central role for the fine arts in the core college program, an equal concern for the affective impact of study in the fine arts, the provoking of creative impulses, and the recognition of art as an "essential way of knowing reality", have really disappeared from the thinking of faculty who still shape the curricular structure of colleges and universities.

Many of the current faculty members in colleges and universities were not only a part of the time when Mayhew was writing and they were undergraduate themselves, or in graduate school, but were also first encountering the concerns with general education programs which later culminated in the late 70s and early 80s in a series of "reform reports" decrying, as did Boyer and Levine in 1981 in their Quest for

Common Learning, that "general education, the spare room in the curriculum, is the easiest place to dump those concerns for which no one seems willing to take responsibility" (p. 3).

Does the "Reform Movement in General Education" now represent another chance for the significant inclusion of the fine arts in the educating of the whole person, a concept which we have seen articulated by Micklejohn in 1920? Is the arousal of interests, which he spoke of in 1908 to include ones which might have their genesis in the fine arts?

Harold Taylor (1971) writing long before the wide concerns on general education became a national issue, proposed in his book, How to Change Colleges, which was in itself a college administrator's response to the student concerns of the 1960s, that "education through art" was a distinct goal to be sought. He suggested that the college should "...give every student a full opportunity to work in one or more of the creative arts as a normal part of the undergraduate curriculum" (p. 120).

While Morrison (1973, 1985) and others have documented the growing inclusion of the fine arts in the departmental and degree programs in college and university campuses, and a number of studies including the Rockefeller report, Coming to Our Senses (1977) have examined the growing significance of education and the arts for the American public, there is still more than adequate rationale for the charge leveled most recently by Chapman (1982) in her work, Instant Art, Instant Culture. She states that what is being provided as instruction in the arts is too little, too unsequenced, and in grave

danger of being shunted aside from the main curricular stream of education into diverse programs without significant coherence.

Thus, Taylor's charge of 1971 may still be in order:

Those with special interests in music, theater, design, architecture, painting, sculpture, or dance enroll in the professional programs, or the college of fine arts, the rest go along to their classes, read the assignments, write their examinations, and graduate with entire areas of experience essential to their intellectual and personal growth left untouched (p. 120).

The appreciation and understanding suggested by Micklejohn has been expanded by Taylor to become concomitant with intellectual development.

In stating his position about a central role for the fine arts, or at least a role which represents a parity with other studies, Taylor does suggest the removal of all specific requirements for graduation as based upon prior standards:

It is one of the ironies of the present system of requirements that it makes certain that each student has studied the subject matter of the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities on the assumption that without knowledge in these major fields one cannot be considered well educated, while ignoring completely the need of the human being for experience in creating something of his own. In making these requirements universities have said something about what they think a human life should be (p. 120).

He further suggests that by suggesting a curriculum of assigned books, mandatory lectures, examinations based on memory of those experiences, the college in effect "teaches" the student that life is a "series of dutiful gestures toward unexamined obligations" (p. 121).

While much of his rhetoric, and his suggestion of abandoning core requirements are resonant of the 1960s, his central thesis can still be tenable today if curricular decisions about general education

programs are characterized by a concern for the fine arts.

In rejecting the notion that the "arts are frills and real education is in the sciences and humanities" (p. 121), Taylor goes on to suggest that:

It is time to say, and act upon the saying, that the creative arts are basic to all education, and that they should be in the curriculum provided for all students from elementary school through the undergraduate years. The creative arts are basic because they provide a way in which each person can become himself and can extend himself in imagination to something other than he is. Even a glance at what is now done in the colleges will show that this is not the intention of the program, not simply because the arts are left out, but because the total effect of doing what you are asked to do by the curriculum is to dampen the creative urge no matter where it tries to assert itself, in the social and natural sciences or anywhere else (p. 121).

Thus, the position taken by Taylor in 1971 was what might be called a human development point of view and his call for the freeing of the student from artificial and exterior boundaries, as he saw them, a move towards developing in an unfettered fashion human potential through the aegis of the fine and creative arts.

Since the time of Taylor's writing, the human development movement has taken new directions, but the field of Affective Education, and the fostering of creativity in education remain strong and vital forces in curricular concerns.

As research in creativity has been amplified by the study of the issues involved with "left-and-right brain activity", there has been much discussion and evidence offered for an increased role for the fine arts in general education.

In particular, recent studies by Blakeslee (1980), Springer and Deutsch (1981), as well as earlier works by Lytton (1972), Kagan



(1967), Grady and Luecke (1978) and a more popular examination by Ferguson (1975) have all posited a central locus for the arts in education as focal points for the development and enhancement of the use of both "sides" of the brain in expanding flexible, creative, and alternative insights for intellectual development.

The work of Getzels and Jackson (1972) as followed by the applied investigations of Edwards (1979, 1986) and Rico (1983) has tended to reinforce the linkages between the actual processes in creation and the creative act, whether it be in visual art, as with Edwards, or in writing, as with Rico, in such a way as to suggest a case for artistic experience being appropriate for all students, not merely the choice of a small number of students interested in professional careers in the arts.

Within the last decade or two there has also been another significant development in the field of the arts and general education: the relationship of the arts to cognitive development in an essential and basic scheme. Malcom Ross, a representative of the large number of British researchers and teachers writing and working in this area encapsulated the essence of this approach in his choice of title for a collection of essays on the subject: The Arts: A Way of Knowing (1983). The central premise of those investigating this area of curriculum is that aesthetic appraisal or apprehension is a distinctive and universal way of knowing, a recognizable mode of recognizing, organizing, documenting and communicating experience. This modality is thus open to all students and can have a pronounced and positive impact on the entire process of cognitive development.

Other members of the "British School" include not only Dorothy Heathcote, a long-time significant figure in creative dramatics, but also Ken Robinson (1980), Brian Way (1973) and Derek Bowskill (1974). While the major emphasis of these writers has been in the field of drama in education and the arts, the visual arts have also been represented (Barrett, 1979) as well as broad interpretations of the use of imagination as an educational avenue (Sutherland, 1971).

Although McGregor, Tate and Robinson are speaking essentially of drama in their work, Learning Through Drama (1977), their core statement about the role of the arts in curriculum is broad enough to summarize the position of many of these investigations:

We have argued that drama is an active process which functions as a way of exploring and expressing meaning in certain kinds of experience. We have looked at this in terms of the concept of symbolization. The arts as a whole are rooted in symbolic forms of expression of particular kinds, and it is in this context that their role in education can most clearly be seen. The potential value of active experience in the arts lies in the child's controlled attempts to explore, develop, and express ideas and concepts which will help him to make sense of his subjective responses to the public world. Drawing from this, we would argue strongly that the arts should be given at least the same status as other areas in the curriculum (p. 147).

While their discussion gives primary emphasis to what in American school structure would be the elementary and secondary school years, the position advanced by these writers has obvious implications for the collegiate curriculum as well. Furthermore, they seem to be advancing a proposition which reinforces the position taken by Taylor some years ago.

To the traditional view of the arts as part of our cultural heritage, which thus deserves some recognition in the college

curriculum for the well educated person to understand and appreciate, has been added more recent views of the arts as pathways for human development, including the fostering of self-exploration, expansion of creative capabilities, and an enhancement of cognitive modalities.

One of the chief American researchers in the field of curricular recognition of the arts and cognition has been Eisner. His position can be best summarized by the article he wrote for the September, 1981 issue of Phi Delta Kappan. As he indicates in the opening paragraph of this article:

My thesis is straightforward but not widely accepted. It is that the arts are cognitive activities, guided by human intelligence, that make unique forms of meaning possible...the meanings secured through the arts require what might best be described as forms of artistic literacy, without which artistic meaning is impeded and the ability to use more conventional forms of expression is hampered (p. 48).

In other words, Eisner not only takes a position in which artistic meaning is achieved and communicated through cognitive constructs, but the apprehension and manipulation of those constructs has a most significant impact on the entire process of cognition and subsequent communication of cognitive acts.

In the course of his presentation, he draws upon an analysis of verbal and mathematical reasoning processes and suggests that the acceptable definitions of the cognitive process make provision for the arts at the very core:

If you were to consult the Dictionary of Psychology regarding the meaning of cognition, you would find that cognition is "the process through which the organism becomes aware of the environment" (The Dictionary of Psychology, Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1934). Thus cognition is a process that makes awareness possible. It is, in this sense, a matter of becoming conscious, of noticing, of recognizing, of perceiving. It is a matter of

distinguishing one thing from another: a figure from its ground, the various subtleties and nuances that, when perceived, become a part of one's consciousness (p. 49).

From this base Eisner then develops an examination of the implications fostered by symbolic representation in the arts and the forms given to those representations which produces a rule-governed system yet one grounded in sensory forms of life. His conclusions include a position that, as he states, "makes it impossible to regard as cognitive any mental activity that is not itself rooted in sensory forms of life" (p. 52). This, in turn, expands concepts of intelligence and literacy and makes us aware that current definitions of intellectual endeavor are far too limited, but must be expanded to include the cognitive processes involved in artistic experiences as well.

As Eisner suggests:

The view that I have advanced recognizes that the realm of meaning has many mansions. Science, for example, despite its enormous usefulness, can never have a monopoly on meaning because the forms of representation it employs is only one among the several that are available.

This also suggests that the cultivation of what has been called by many proponents of the fine arts in general education "aesthetic literacy" (Barkan, 1955; Curtis, 1981 and Phenix, 1964) in both visual and auditory forms of representation not only has a value in the understanding and retrieval of aesthetic experience, but can also, as Eisner would have it, "significantly improve a student's ability to use propositional forms of representation," (p. 52) in many fields. Whenever a student must confront a challenge in perceiving nuances in experience, whenever that student must conceptualize patterns,

whenever that student must communicate those discoveries in a form which is compelling, Eisner would say that experiences in the fine arts have provided that student with new modalities of cognition and expression.

For a more detailed discussion of this connection between study in the fine arts and cognitive development of students, see Chapter II of this paper as well as Appendix B.

Thus, with positions taken by Taylor, Mayhew, Ross, Eisner and others over the years since the late 60s, the traditional view of the fine arts in collegiate general education has been expanded, amplified, and brought into a much more central arena of controversy.

Yet, the history of fine arts as a curricular entity in American higher education has been one of peripheral concern. As suggested by Rudolph (1977):

The most unobtrusive curricular development of the twentieth century...was the recognition of esthetic values and creativity as legitimate components of the course of study. A combination of Puritan and frontier morality had placed restraints on the fine arts as appropriate sources of pleasure or expressions of talent (p. 265).

In addition, the fine arts had at times been linked with the luxury and licentiousness related to the fall of classical civilization (p. 264), a lack of agreed-upon values (p. 266), regarded as the particular province of women and superficial culture (p. 266) and in general moved into the curriculum by oblique methods (p. 267).

Rudolph further notes that as the arts began to appear as departments and degree programs they also became visible evidence of some re-shaping of the liberal education paradigm which might well

pretend a recognition of dimensions of human experience that had in the past been neglected. This process could well be a redefinition of the liberal arts curriculum away from the gentility of the classical nineteenth century approach and toward a more fullsome identification with intellect and creativity in a new paradigm.

Thus, we are talking of a redefinition of considerable departure from that articulated by Herbert Spencer in his 1859 essay on "What Knowledge is of Most Worth." He posited aims for education which became central to the nineteenth century curriculum, assuming that since the purpose of education was to prepare for all aspects of living, it was necessary to classify all leading activities and needs of life in order to properly establish and then judge an educational program. In his classification of needs and activities, the arts, by implication, appeared last in the hierarchy and were assumed to be pertinent, if at all, to those needs and life activities which "...fill up the leisure part of life, and gratify taste and feelings" (Cubberly, 1934, p. 470). Further, the only artistic endeavors likely to be recognized in the curricula of most nineteenth century institutions were likely to be those of genteel literature.

However, if the arts have been moving since the nineteenth century into a more prominent place in the collegiate curriculum, other events have not been hand-maidens to this journey. In recent years, cycles of general education reform movements, public demands for education in the "basics", coupled with reports supporting such concerns and calls for increased emphasis on mathematics and science education have attracted the major share of attention.

In addition, financial pressures on institutions of higher education, whether private or tax-supported, have added an element of restraint on all except the most urgent and popular programmatic changes. While the dire financial picture which seemed to be the forecast of the future in the early 1980s may have brightened somewhat, the lingering elements of cost-conscious management in higher education can still be traced to events such as the one reported by The Chronicle of Higher Education on April 13, 1981 (pp. 1 and 4) detailing the cutting of \$13.5 million from the budget of Michigan State University with the consequent possible loss of some 108 faculty positions and portions of existing programs.

The same issue of The Chronicle also carried a front-page story which illustrates another aspect of higher education planning in the current era. The previous week at the University of Chicago, Ernest L. Boyer and Arthur Levine had publicly presented their findings on the state of general education in the nation's colleges and universities as published in what has become the well-known first report on the subject in this area: A Quest for Common Learning: The Aims of General Education (1981). In this report, they expressed the hope that there might be a contemporary revival of structured general education programs in the face of what they regarded as an abdication of responsibility by college faculty and administrations for a complete lack of coherence in current programs.

These two events can be considered a mirror of the times in higher education: in a time of economic crisis, movements were underway calling for renewal in general education. During this period

while the desks of faculty and administrators were being stacked with mounting evidences of financial constraints and retrenchments, report followed report on issues of curricular failures and calls for renewal or change (The Paideia Proposal 1983; High School 1983; A Place Called School 1984; Involvement in Learning 1984; A Nation at Risk 1983; Horace's Compromise 1984).

Some of these reports and studies, notably The Paideia Proposal, made provision in fairly specific terms for the fine arts whether on the secondary school or college level, but many did not. Thus, the development of curricular provisions for the fine arts were often left in the same questionable state it had been in previous eras.

Furthermore, in announcing the beginning of a comprehensive study of undergraduate education in 1984, Ernest L. Boyer, a leading figure in much of the discussion about general education reform, and President of the Carnegie Foundation, sponsor of the proposed study, indicated that there was "...an urgent need to bring colleges and universities more directly into the debate about the purposes and goals of education" (Chronicle of Higher Education, August 8, 1984, p. 4).

He went on to suggest that there was little agreement about what should be taught and about what it means to be an educated person (p. 4).

At this same time, college faculty were increasingly seen to be crucial in any improvement of liberal education. As reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education on June 15, 1981, by Beverly T. Watkins, faculty members themselves must become more "liberally educated" if



colleges and universities are to offer effective liberal arts programs to their students (p. 5). Reporting on the views of Sheila Tobias, a program associate with the Washington School of Psychiatry's Institute for the Study of Anxiety in Learning, Watkins quoted Tobias as suggesting that all faculty members are quite capable, if properly motivated, retrained and rewarded, of joining the ranks of liberal educators which had heretofore largely been representative of historians, philosophers, and teachers of literature, foreign languages, and fine arts. Should faculty members from other disciplines be thus added to the ranks of those conveying the tradition of liberal education, they might contribute, "...in every course they teach, to the integrity, coherence, and comprehensiveness of the curriculum" (p. 5).

Yet Tobias noted that faculty members must be given every opportunity and incentive for faculty members not usually engaged in liberal education to become more liberally educated themselves, so that in every course they teach they can draw the connections between their own work and that of others.

Inherent in the position taken by Tobias seems to be a premise advanced by Rudolph in Change Magazine (1984) that if the American college graduate is weak in analysis and the spirit of inquiry, unable to communicate effectively, and ignorant of his own history and culture, the responsibility lies not with the schools or with the college and university presidents, nor with politicians and governing boards, or with the people, but with the professors. He states that "...they have the power to will great change in the curriculum," (p.

41) but he further warns, in a most pessimistic fashion, that professionalism, narrow specialization, the complete neglect in the training of faculty with any concerns other than scholarship as evidenced by little if any preparation in teaching, "...are conditions that inhibit optimism about whether even liberal arts colleges can in fact teach liberally" (p. 41).

Dressel (1968) had earlier posited that faculty members are also inhibited and confined in their views on general and liberal education by virtue of their own experience as an undergraduate. Calling this factor one of the unresolved problems in attempts to design comprehensive undergraduate programs, Dressel highlighted the issue by noting that many curriculum reforms which begin with existing faculty usually end in complexity and compromise even though every faculty member considers that he or she is well and liberally educated. Yet, according to Dressel:

Major curricular reforms in higher education rarely achieve complete success because it is so difficult to generate enthusiasm among faculty members for any program which differs from their own undergraduate training (p. 111).

This difficulty is, of course, even exacerbated by the tendency to specialization on the part of most faculty as was noted later by Tobias.

As has been suggested by a recent Carnegie Foundation survey (1985) we are also today dealing with a faculty which is heavily tenured (69.5% overall) of middle age with a median age level of 45.7 years and concerned with career options which seem to be slighter and less promising than they have been in recent memory.

Since any consideration of the role of the fine arts in general education must take place in this context of manifold difficulties ranging from multiple reform reports, controversies about goals and aims of education, financial pressures and an increasingly aging and tenure-dominated faculty bearing their own experiences of undergraduate education with them, it would seem useful and productive to assess the current state of mind of one segment of the professoriate about the leading propositions which have been advanced by proponents of greater visibility and purpose for the fine arts in general education programs. If we are to believe Dressel, Rudolph and Tobias, it is essentially this faculty as it now exists which will hold the key to any future enhancement of the fine arts in the undergraduate curriculum.

While conditions may have changed somewhat since the 1977 publication by the Carnegie Foundation of Missions of the College Curriculum, one of the comments made in that source is still worth noting:

..There is evidence that faculty members are more identified with their current positions than they were seven or eight years ago. They appear to be less mobile and may, therefore, be more interested in the contributions they can make to their own institution and in the development of a special identity that will attract students. If it continues, this trend, too, could lead faculty to take more interest in general education (p. 167).

#### Purpose of the Study

As indicated in the foregoing discussion, the role of the fine arts in a liberal education, most particularly in the general education program available to all students has been and continues to be a matter of interest to those who are concerned with the fine arts

and equally concerned with offering a general education program to students for their complete development.

While studies have been produced about the attitude of many segments of the general population towards the arts in a social setting (Americans and the Arts, 1984) about attitudes of school boards, legislators, and fine arts educators towards the fine arts (Jensen, 1982), about attitudes of fine arts educators toward educators toward current practices and curricula (Chapman, 1982) and about liberal education and faculty in professional schools (Dressel, Mayhew and McGrath, 1958; Lyons, 1978; Vandemeer and Lyons, 1979) none have been produced which have had as a specific reference the measurement of response of faculty in liberal arts colleges toward specific propositions about the role of fine arts and general education as advanced in the literature of the last two decades.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to conduct such an examination using a questionnaire instrument devised for this specific purpose and to select as respondents faculty members from all disciplines in highly regarded liberal arts colleges across the nation.

This study also was devised to determine what relationships, if any, might exist between a quantifiably favorable or unfavorable response toward an active role for the fine arts in a general education program and characteristics of respondents: (1) number of years of full-time teaching experience, (2) size and type of the respondent's own undergraduate institution, (3) type of general education program experienced by the respondent, and (4) certain other

demographic factors.

By means of a response profile the study aimed to answer questions of interest to those who plan and advance fine arts curricula for the purposes of general education and who must, therefore, deal with faculty bodies which today are likely to be relatively permanent in their composition. Such questions would include: (1) Is there a reasonably consistent attitude held by liberal arts faculty members toward the fine arts as part of general educational curricula? (2) To what extent does the traditional attitude of fine arts representing cultural heritages and thus suitable only for "enhancement" rather than primary study hold sway? (3) Is there evidence that liberal arts faculty are ready for any significant changes in provisions for the fine arts in general education? and (4) Do the traditions of liberal education tend to continue most strongly in the fields of humanities and perhaps the closely related fields of philosophy and history, or is there evidence that faculty in the sciences and social sciences are hospitable to the fine arts as generalized fields of instruction?

#### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the fine arts have been defined as: Arts, Music, Dance, Theatre, and Film. Literature has not been included since its history in American collegiate curricula is somewhat different (Vesey, 1970; Ben-David, 1981; Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Rudolph, 1977) and Departments of English and other literatures tend to be closely linked with customary Humanities requirements in general education programs.

General education, although the terms has from time to time been used interchangeably with liberal education, has been defined as that body of study which all undergraduates share in common and which represents the response of each college or university to a need for breadth in the undergraduate curricular experience. It also may be thought of as the institution's collective response to the question of what constitutes an educated person.

#### Limitations of the Study

Research in curricular issues in higher education, particularly that conducted with an intentionally restricted sample base, does not often yield definitive results. Thus this study makes no claim to resolve the question of what role might be best for the fine arts in any and all contexts. As had been stated by Conrad and Pratt (1981), "...most liberal artists contend that the instruments or programs of liberal education must find their balance within a given historical period or context" (p. 47).

While the response rate for the sites included in this faculty survey are reasonably high, as reported in the data analysis portion of this paper, the range of responses from cell to cell and from site to site will not allow irrefutable conclusions about either distinctive site profiles or significant comparisons amongst all respondent cells. The data are best considered as a pooled response and thus representative of liberal arts faculty as a group.

Since no questionnaire instrument was in existence, an instrument had to be devised. While the questionnaire was given pilot testing in various iterations, it still is a tool which needs further use and

verification before definite results can be claimed.

Some six institutions out of a primary group of eleven and some three institutions out of a secondary group of nine agreed to participate via a letter of intent received from the Dean of the Faculty or similar academic officer. These nine institutions all represented liberal arts colleges of high standing as determined by an intersect of the Astin typology as used in his studies of national freshman norms, plus a "high competitive" ranking in Barron's Profiles of American Colleges, 14th Edition. They all represent, as did the initial selection pool, Liberal Arts Colleges I in the Carnegie typology.

Thus, the results of the study can be examined at best only for being indicative of colleges within this set of delimiters, and cannot necessarily be extended to other liberal arts college faculty and most certainly not to faculty at institutions of significantly different style and structure.

In particular, the homogeneity of the sample, while lending itself to suggestions about a group of this type, must also limit any extrapolations. Some 60% of the respondent group attended a private liberal arts college or private university for their undergraduate degree. Enrollment at the time of their attendance at their undergraduate institution was 2,500 or less for some 54% of the respondent group.

It is obvious that further research and application of the questionnaire instrument is in order before wider conclusions can be drawn about the research questions and the attendant hypotheses.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In reviewing the literature appropriate to the subject of this study, two cardinal principles have been used. One, what has been the degree of receptivity on the part of college faculty to a significant role for the fine arts in higher education curricula and, specifically, to a role for the fine arts in general or liberal education? In addition, how has this receptivity been measured by any specific methodology, and to what extent has the faculty attitude been reflected in general curricular patterns? Two, what discrepancies in existing general education curricula have been noted by proponents of a greater role for the fine arts in general or liberal education made available to all undergraduates and what proposals have been offered by these critics, usually practitioners themselves in the fine arts, to ameliorate or remedy what they see to be deficiencies in existing programs? It was from these proposals that the substance for questionnaire items was isolated and presented to the selected group of liberal arts college faculty who were the focus of the investigation.

In conducting this review, certain sources were of great help. For the history of higher education, principal citations have been taken from: The Emergence of the American University (Vesey, 1970), Curriculum (Rudolph, 1977), Higher Education in Transition (Brubacher



& Rudy, 1968; 1976), and Liberal Education in Transition (Conrad & Wyer, 1980). Additional citations on curriculum trends in the history of higher education up to the present era were supplied by a variety of sources, including Trends in American Higher Education (Ben-David, 1981), General Education (Dressel & Mayhew, 1954), College and University Curriculum (1968), The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education (Dressel, 1963), Undergraduate Curriculum Trends (Dressel & DeLisle, 1969) as well as articles by these same authors.

Initial help in the specific area of fine arts in higher education was provided by an annotated bibliography produced by Lillian K. Drag and printed in Arts and the Schools (Hausman, 1980).

Since the first of the general education reform reports of the modern era appeared in 1945 (General Education in a Free Society, Harvard University) there have been hundreds of publications dealing with the issue of general education, many of which have either included some limited discussion on the role of the fine arts, or have been produced by proponents of a greater role for the fine arts in general education.

For the purposes of this study, the focus has been restricted to those items and citations which speak most directly to the key issue of the role which the fine arts was allowed to play in general education curricula, and to those sources which have found that role to be far short of what proponents deemed appropriate.

Seen from the perspective of the classical origins of the American college curriculum, as adapted to fit the needs of a young nation intent on first providing educated preachers for its pulpits,

then leaders for the country, then engineers and scientists for its development, the fine arts have been on the periphery of the college curriculum since the beginnings of higher education in the United States. This has meant that the fine arts have always had to encounter either hostility or indifference in any attempt to become a significant part of the experience of every undergraduate--presumably a goal of all elements of a general education program.

Unlike the sciences, which also began outside the pale of full academic respectability, the fine arts have had no allies in social, political, or industrial needs to assist their entry into the main-stream of college study.

In 1828, the "Yale Report" was drawn up by faculty of that institution in response to a request from some members of the governing body that Yale be more responsive in preparing its young men for service in business and industry. As characterized by Hawkins (1983) this report was so effective in its justification of liberal education that it was quoted by other educators and college faculty across the country for 50 years (p. 35).

In its defense of liberal education this document lent great weight to what was and what was to continue to be the central premise of curriculum development for the American college during most of the nineteenth century: the task of "mental discipline." This notion was the leading concept behind contemporary defense of the classical curriculum with emphasis on traditional courses and content whose major purpose was to "exercise" the intellectual faculties. The essential response of the Yale faculty document, while conservative in

spirit, expressed this point of view in mild terms:

The two great points to be gained in intellectual culture, are the discipline and the furniture of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge. The former of these is, perhaps, the most important of the two.... No one feature in a system of intellectual education, is of greater moment than such an arrangement of duties and motives, as will most effectually throw the student upon the resources of his own mind.... The scholar must form himself, by his own exertions...we doubt whether the powers of the mind can be developed, in their fairest proportions, by studying languages alone, or natural or political science alone (Hawkins, p. 35).

While thus rejecting any narrowing of focus in the college curriculum, and resisting what they might have regarded as excessively specialized or utilitarian education, did the faculty of Yale, and their contemporaries, judge the fine arts to be a legitimate part of the "furniture of the mind?"

As attested to in a number of sources (Vesey, 1970; Rudolph, 1977; Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; and Sack, 1962), the arts were either not mentioned at all during this period or were regarded with suspicion and the practitioners of the arts were looked upon only with a minimal degree of tolerance.

As some colleges were adding courses in science to their curriculum as early as 1813 (Sack, p. 216), and others were establishing degree or certificate programs in science and engineering such as Union College (Rudolph, p. 63) it was as late as 1875 that trustees at the University of Pennsylvania, in hiring a faculty member for a position as professor of the "science of music," particularly stipulated that the incumbent "...shall hold his office for the term of three years if he shall so long behave himself well" (Sack, p. 221).

In characterizing the nineteenth century practice in higher education, Sack (1962) suggested that:

Music and the fine arts, those enabling pursuits extolled by the ancient Greeks, suffered an uncertain and precarious existence in the hands of our predecessors. Their practitioners were frequently looked upon askance as lacking the moral fiber of decent citizens (p. 221).

This, of course, was the era as well when classical studies, including the required time spent on Latin and Greek, were still the ruling case in higher education curricula.

Although President Eliot of Harvard warned his audience at his inauguration in 1869 that "we cannot afford to neglect the fine arts" (Rudolph, p. 140), he was speaking at a time when that neglect was far more the rule than the exception. By 1915, when he had been gone from the presidency for some six years, Eliot is quoted as still lamenting that although

The training of the senses should always have been a prime object in human education...that prime object it has never been, and is not today.... As a rule, the young men admitted to American colleges can neither draw nor sing; and they possess no other skill of eye, ear, or hand (Rudolph, pp. 140-141).

The nineteenth century was a period in which many curricular wars were waged in higher education, and in the course of this warfare the fate of the fine arts rose and fell, according to the extent and type of outcome.

As characterized by Vesey (1970), one of the first battles was joined between adherents of the classically-based "mental discipline" approach, which had been reinvigorated by the Yale Report of 1828 in defense of liberal education, and utilitarians proposing more attention to "real life" concerns, social service, and applied

studies. In this battle, the fine arts were not a matter of concern. As a controller of curricular goals and aims, the mental discipline camp lost ground. The utilitarians were also joined by those promoting research interests whose ranks had been swelled by the founding of The Johns Hopkins University in 1876 and the growth of graduate programs across the country. The creation of land-grant institutions after the Civil War tended to link the utilitarians and the research oriented faculty in an alliance which, if not always without dissension, was at least one of strength.

The fine arts, which clearly did not belong in any of these curricular camps, were none too successful in finding a haven anywhere else. Their one potential refuge might have been in clinging fast to a tradition of cultural heritage and aesthetic sensibility. Yet here they found a strong moral tradition, bound with a Puritan Christian ethic still strong amongst liberal arts colleges.

In a tradition going back to the Colonial period, while undergoing some stretching from the original seven liberal arts, as suggested by Conrad and Wyer (1980):

The Protestant denominations had pervasive influence and, to a degree based upon denominational type and geographic area, their doctrines and rules blended with the Greek-rooted classical studies (p. 10).

It was in this context that the moral aspect of a liberal arts education took on a decidedly religious aspect.

Furthermore, based on the Yale Report of 1828 and its defense of the liberal education ideal based on mental discipline, many colleges took their own stand on its version of the classical tradition. As

also suggested by Conrad and Wyer (1980);

The numerous sectarian private colleges--with their odd juxtaposition of classical learning and fervent Protestantism in a rugged frontier setting--prospered and, in the meantime, Yale became known as the "Mother of Colleges" (p. 13).

Thus the arts, which were neither utilitarian by and large in their outlook at this time, nor part of the growing camp of research oriented science-minded faculty, had to look for a room at the inn of the cultural-liberal education faculty.

Their reception was often less than fullsome. As recorded by Vesey (1970) to most believers in the mental discipline approach, the argument for culture, including the arts, as a means to academic salvation remained suspect. Noah Porter, of Yale, severely attacked the "Bohemians in letters" who so often seemed to reject orthodox Christianity. In his eyes culture, as least as defined by some, was "frivolous but decorous" in temper and had become a

religion that is false and idolatrous...a religion which tests and measures the aims of life, the movements of society and all individual and social achievements by fastidious and limited standards that satisfy neither the nobler capacities of man nor the severer judgment of God (pp. 30-31).

Under these conditions literary cultivation which promised to reconcile moral and intellectual training without recourse to extracurricular influences would be admitted to the curriculum only with care and under some considerable restraint. If the field of literature, in its polite form, had to run this kind of gauntlet under such circumstances, then how much more arduous and difficult was the task of the other fine arts.

It would also appear that Porter, when confronted with any kind

of public opinion contrary to accepted tradition would respond as he did in his inaugural address at Yale in 1871:

(Higher learning)...is in no sense the servant of public opinion when public opinion is superficial or erroneous,--but it is called to be its corrector and controller. Especially in matters of education should it neither pander to popular prejudices nor take advantage of popular humors. If there is any sanctuary where well-grounded convictions should find refuge, and where those should be honored, it is in a place devoted to the higher education (Vesey, p. 31).

Unfortunate for the arts that they had neither a ground-swell of public opinion with which to ride into battle nor, in the minds of Porter and his adherents, "well-grounded" rationales for their inclusion in the common college curriculum.

What advances and incursions were made by the fine arts during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth, can be characterized by some selected events and evaluations. While many colleges possessed collections of paintings and other art objects, instruction in art history was some time in coming. Although Williams college students formed an art association in 1858 and began assembling a modest collection of engravings, a request for instruction in "the fine arts" first asked in 1870 was not responded to until 1903 when Richard Austin Rice was appointed to a post in art and civilization (Rudolph, 1977, p. 142).

Much earlier Yale had appointed John Weir to a professorship in the Yale School of Fine Arts in 1869, offering the first university program in fine arts. Yet the university had great difficulty in incorporating the school into any kind of organic relationship with the rest of the institution (Rudolph, 1977, p. 142).

Syracuse University has introduced courses in drawing and the history of art in 1872 under the sponsorship of George F. Comfort, professor of modern languages and esthetics. He later became dean of a new school of fine arts at Syracuse which authorized the granting of bachelor's degrees in architecture and painting. Before the turn of the century the University of Illinois, Michigan and Cornell were offering courses in art history and programs in architecture had been developed at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cornell, Illinois, Syracuse, Columbia, Pennsylvania, George Washington University, Harvard and at what was to become the Illinois Institute of Technology (Rudolph, 1977, p. 143).

By 1886 Harvard had moved from offering a single elective course in music to an offering of five courses. The development of courses and even degree programs represented an improvement for the fine arts in terms of recognition on the college campus over the mid-century period. At that time rhetoric and oratory were often given places in the prescribed curriculum but only Harvard had a chair of belleslettres and the study of modern literature and the arts was practically unknown (Vesey, 1970, p. 38). However, these slight changes still did not speak to the central question of what kind of presence, if any, they might have in the core curriculum for general education.

Although by the 1880s, along with philosophy and modern literature, the fine arts began to be thus promoted as worthy of academic study, they profited far less than their fellows in the other developing areas. All this momentum, despite, as Vesey characterizes



it, the "flair of Charles Eliot Norton at Harvard, was still to produce any generalized incursion of the fine arts into the central curriculum.

To some notable extent, the condition of the fine arts might be typified by the attitudes of Andrew D. White, President of Cornell who once stated at the time of the opening of that university: "...there must be a union of the scientific and the aesthetic with the practical in order to produce results worthy of an enterprise" (Vesey, p. 83). In addition Whit reputedly believed in the intangible inspiration of well-displayed library books, and the securing of everything that would mitigate the kind of "dry, hard, factory tone" which might otherwise be true of a research-oriented institution. As he is quoted: "Chimes, statuary, pictures, landscape gardening, bits of good architecture, picturesque groups of buildings, all help in this matter" (Vesey, p. 83). He also reputedly suggested to his friend and colleague at The Johns Hopkins University, Daniel Coit Gilman, that Johns Hopkins construct a special building for organ recitals in order to balance "so much scientific and dryasdust (sic) business as is done in our colleges and universities" (Vesey, p. 83).

The arts, thus, might continue to have a role in the provoking and satisfying of cultural taste and providing a refined environment, but not necessarily in the providing of key elements of the core curriculum.

As the nineteenth century was drawing to a close, a growing link was beginning to develop between intellect and intellectual development and the notions of what constituted liberal culture

(Vesey, p. 208). Where before the cultivated academic had tended to link intellect with science and to oppose both as aspects of an unwholesomely critical approach to life, there now arose a redefining of what constituted liberal education culture.

This re-shaping, which took most of its form during the 1890s, was to a notable extent the result of continuing verbal combat between the scientists on the one hand and those who upheld literary values on the other, and who attempted to return humanism to the curriculum.

The Yale Report of 1828 contained a notion about the development of the whole person through liberal education which was long unconsidered. As reported in Conrad and Wyer (1980) the Report had stated:

The great object of a collegiate education...is to give that expansion and balance of the mental powers, those liberal and comprehensive views, and those fine proportions of character, which are not found in him whose ideas are always confined to one particular channel (p. 13).

The idea of "education of the whole person", through a variety of channels, while originally promulgated by the Yale Committee in defense of the classical mental discipline curriculum and against a particularistic or utilitarian model, was to become a primary vehicle for continuing discussion of general education in the twentieth century, and was also reflected in some of the views held by the creators of a renewed definition of liberal culture in the 1890s. Vesey considers that this redefined view of liberal culture, as it was shaped in the 1890s, had several distinct connotations: aesthetic, moral and emotional, and social (pp. 184-194). First of all, culture was closely linked with the existing literary and artistic standards,

but taste also went beyond literary appreciation. It became linked with the whole of life. As stated by Hiram Corson, professor of English at Cornell:

the true aim of culture (was)...to induce soul states or conditions, soul attitudes, to attune the inward forces to the idealized form of nature and of human life produced by art, and not to make the head a cockloft for storing away the trumpery of barren knowledge. (Culture)...was to be identified with the quickening of sensibility, susceptibility, impressibility, with a cultivation of an instinctive sense of beauty and deformity, with that aesthetic synthesis which every true literary art product demands (Vesey, p. 185).

Thus art was not something separable from the totality of experience, but part of a unity. Yet that experience was not without a moral or ethical component and this represents the second characteristic of the new definition of liberal culture. The educated person who might emerge from this orientation would be characterized by deliberate choices, possessing a sense of what was called "noble and right", and aware that aesthetic influences must always reflect themselves in human action. As suggested in the words of Charles Eliot Norton:

The highest end of the highest education is not anything which can be directly taught, but it is the consummation of all studies. It is the final result of intellectual culture in the development of breadth, serenity, and solidity of mind, and in the attainment of that complete self-possession which finds expression in character (Vesey, pp. 186-87).

Thus, literature, because of its relatively firm presence in the curriculum, and because of its fairly overt ethical content, if properly selected, could become one of the prime conduits for the newly-humanized liberal culture.

A final attribute, as suggested by Vesey, of this newly refined

and minted liberal culture was a certain set of social attributes of style and manner. Education might be open to all, but they must be properly prepared and ready to meet the purveyors of culture on their own terms. Notions of a certain polish and elegance of style, linked to some extent with the notion of educating an "elite" served at times to distance the liberal culture from the dominant industrial patterns of American life. It is conceivable that the degree to which the arts, in particular literature, partook of this aspect, represents the distance which arts in the academies and college moved from the mainstream of American social, political, and economic mainstreams.

Humanism, whether new to the American academic world in the post-Civil War era, or merely a return to certain of the ideals of the ancient Greeks, nevertheless seemed to offer to the fine arts an opportunity for more direct participation in the central curriculum of the liberal arts college and university. Yet the battle was far from over, with competing philosophies still existing side-by-side and the tradition of "mental discipline" often emerging in new forms masked as "intellectual respectability".

The demise of the elective system at Harvard by the end of the first decade of the twentieth century and the growth of interest in comprehensive goals for education as reflected in the tenor of the end of the nineteenth century and the opening of the twentieth, suggested new opportunities for the fine arts. In what has now become a national habit, but what was then a novel approach to education on a deliberately national scale, committees were being formed in the period from 1891 to 1924 to address matters of coordinated education

on all levels from a national perspective. In most of these committee reports, some attention was paid to the fine arts or aesthetic matters. While most of these reports were concerned with and destined for education below the college level, their substance would clearly have some impact on collegiate curricula over a period of time.

Having begun to move into colleges and universities, if at times only on the periphery in specialized schools or programs, the fine arts now began to appear more in the educational mainstream as elements in suggested core programs for secondary and primary education.

The Committee of Ten on Secondary School studies, constituted in 1891 and reporting in 1893, the Committee of Fifteen, constituted in 1893 and reporting in 1895 on Elementary Education, and the Committee on College Entrance Requirements, constituted in 1895 and reporting in 1899, were all dominated by subject-matter specialists who were "possessed of a profound faith in the value of mental discipline" (Cubberly, 1934). Their work had little significant positive impact on the issue of fine arts as central to the core or required curriculum. However, as the first of a series of national committees in this period, they established a precedent for national awareness of the goals and aims of education and provided the arena for continued discussion.

In 1911 a committee report was made to the National Education Association on the articulation of high school and college. This report led to the creation of a Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education. This commission reported annually on a

subject-by-subject basis from 1913 to 1918. Their work was capped in 1918 with the issuing of Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education.

For one of the first times on a national scale, the fine arts began to emerge as a recognizable, albeit small component of school curricula within a core curriculum.

The suggested redirection of the secondary school curricula was based on seven objectives, termed the "cardinal principles of secondary education":

1. Sound health-knowledge and habits
2. Command of the fundamental processes (reading, writing, arithmetical computation, and oral and written expression)
3. Worthy home membership
4. Education for a vocation
5. Education for good citizenship
6. Worthy use of leisure
7. Ethical character

There was something in this list of principles for most curricular orientations: the social-minded, the "basic educationists" of that era, the utilitarians, and also those who saw the arts as being able to make a contribution for the development of individuals perhaps in the development of "worthy" use of the increasing amount of leisure time available to most Americans.

Yet it was not completely clear at the time of the report how existing school activities and instruction which included opportunities in music and art, were to focus upon the objectives of education as presented.

In 1916 President Eliot had published a paper on the "Changes Needed in American Secondary Education" in which he called for an increase in instructional time for both scientific and technical courses as well as music and art, recognizing that: "...the best part of all human knowledge has come by exact and studied observation made by the senses...the most important part of education has always been the training of the senses through which the best part of knowledge comes" (Cubberly, p. 635).

Eliot's paper had been followed in 1917 by a paper on "The Modern School" presented by Abraham Flexner of the General Education Board, in which he had asserted that the tradition-dictated dominance of Latin, literature and mathematics was not producing results and that the "modern" school should devote more of its attention to getting young people to a state where they would know, care about, and understand the physical and social world in which they live. As one of four fields in which the school should emphasize activities, Flexner named aesthetics which was to include literature, languages, music and art.

Franklin Bobbitt in his work How to Make a Curriculum (1924), suggested another fundamental revision of secondary school structure and in the basic studies designed for all secondary school students he included:

Literature: English and general for appreciation  
Musical training, for appreciation and judgment  
Art training, for appreciation and judgment (Cubberly, p. 637).

It is safe to say that with these reports the concept of the fine arts for "appreciation" entered the curricular canon on a national scale,

and became eventually part of the almost reflexive response whenever the role of fine arts in a core program has been introduced. The language remains alive today in college catalogs and course titles across the land.

Although the first engagement of the fine arts and general education took place on the secondary school level, the basic elements were already present. The high school system was the first to face what, much later, would become the phenomenon of mass education on the college level, and it was the secondary school which was the principal focus of what was to become a national trend of reports, assessments, commission investigations on education, especially general education, and its goals. The fine arts, or at least some of them, had been placed within the scope of a core curriculum, albeit with a somewhat limited scope of endeavor.

In addition, the Bobbitt reorganization proposals also allowed for extras or electives which would include music and art for technical proficiency, in effect the secondary school version of pre-professional training, as well as literary writing, dramatics, and public speaking. Foreign languages, advanced mathematics, the history of English literature, and vocational subjects and training completed the curricular picture (Cubberly, p. 637).

Although not as yet addressed on the level of college curriculum, the major lineaments of fine arts and general education were thus present by the mid 1920s: provision made for the arts within the core, acknowledgement of their presence in elective subjects, and the beginnings of a consistent philosophy about their purpose within the



core of general education.

The two decades between the time of Bobbitt report and the appearance of the report from a Harvard Committee on General Education in a Free Society (1945) were marked in higher education circles by a continuing debate amongst those who were advocating different goals and objectives as well as different means to bring the ideals of liberal education into greater harmony with the realities, as they saw them, of contemporary society.

As characterized by Conrad and Wyer (1980) this debate was conducted amongst adherents of three points of view: (1) those following Irving Babbit and Norman Foster, leading humanists of the early 1900s who rebelled against what they saw as the "banality of pragmatism and the methodological stranglehold of the sciences", (2) those who followed John Dewey and the progressive philosophy of education based on principles of direct experience and problem-solving with an eye towards flexibility and an acceptance of change, and (3) the classical "essentialists", such as Robert Hutchins, who also believed in the perennial appeal of the classics with an emphasis on the Great Books and tradition, as well as the continuing uniformity and power of "human reason" (pp. 16-17).

As one or another of these camps gained ascendancy in a particular locale or group of faculty members, a form of general education would emerge at that school representing the philosophical grounding involved. It is beyond the scope of this study to investigate all of these diverse programs except to say that the role of the fine arts varied considerably from institution to institution.

There seemed to be, obviously, no uniformity to general education curricula across the land. In providing for a central or core experience for the undergraduate the approaches ranged from the Great Books program at St. Johns College to Micklejohn's Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin, to experiential education at Antioch College, to an honors and independent study program at Swarthmore College (Conrad & Wyer, p. 16).

The years following World War II and the publication of the Harvard Report in 1945 saw the opening of a debate on general education on the college level which has continued to the present day, although diminishing during the mid-1950s and then rising again in the late 60s to reach a peak of national attention in the opening of the present decade.

One of the contributions of the Harvard Report was to give currency and some definition to the term, "general education", perhaps in some respects to avoid any lingering tones of elitism to the term "liberal education", as well as a recognition that there was already a decided thrust towards specialized and technical education. In considering the role of general education in a modern democracy, the report suggests that the aim should be to "preserve the ancient ideal of liberal education and to extend it as far as possible to all members of the community" (Harvard Committee, 1945, p. 53).

The framers of the report also concluded that what was necessary in accomplishing this was a general education "capable at once of taking on many different forms and yet of representing in all its forms the common knowledge and the common values on which a free

society depends" (Harvard Committee, 1945, p. 53). While the report did have immediate impact, at least in raising the issue of general education, it did not succeed in its goal of reinvigorating the curriculum.

As suggested by Conrad and Wyer (1980): "By the 1960's any revitalization of liberal or general studies inspired by the twentieth-century Harvard descendant of the Yale Report seemed entirely dissipated within the virtual free-for-all of the distribution approach" (p. 17). Yet there remained a kind of abiding faith in higher education about the need for general or liberal education and for a consequent clarification of its goals. The theme and the tone of this search during the years between World War II and the early years of the 1980's is probably best and somewhat ironically captured in the title which Boyer and Levine gave to their Report for the Carnegie Foundation in 1981: A Quest for Common Learning. The difficulty in attaining consensus and agreement about what this represents and thus what role each discipline within a college structure has in attaining these goals remains a trying and difficult problem.

Once higher education became a significant part of mass education as it now has, the issues of curriculum development also have a way of entering a far more public area than was the case in earlier decades, and with this entrance comes the need to address issues in terms other than the mere assumption of authority. As suggested by Rudolph (1977, p. 262): "The Harvard Report of 1945 knew what was best for everyone, quite as much as a similar self-assurance (or wisdom) had found its

way into the Yale Report of 1828." Both of these failed to significantly transform college curricula across the land, and were subject, according to Rudolph, to the same weaknesses: "they invited superficiality, conformity, and sterility; they thwarted intellectual independence and differences of ability and interest" (p. 262). In addition, these reports probably also did not sufficiently take into account the dynamics of educational change which include undergraduate reaction to prescribed learning, faculty with a high degree of cooperative spirit and agreed-upon goals, and a continuing suspicion in many quarters of a required core curriculum divided like so many shares of stock amongst academic departments.

As Rudolph (1977) suggests in another part of his discussion of this issue:

Even when college and university faculties found themselves accepting English, mathematics, a foreign language, history, some economics and government, natural science, and art and music appreciation as the appropriate intellectual baggage of a generally educated person, they were in no positive to establish the level of attainment expected of all students.... These subjects smacked of tradition and reliability, and to call them general education was to draw attention to the course of study as a school of certification for a predestined white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant elite.... A question that escaped the attention of the Harvard Committee in 1945 would forever plague those who embraced its arguments and curricular designs: What evidence supported the notion that the world would be better off if everyone had been graduated from Harvard College before the election of President Eliot? (pp. 261-262).

The issue thus joined is not only what are to be the goals of general education programs, but also how can the realization of these goals be accomplished with appropriate attention to those involved in the entire process. Since faculty are an important partner in this process, and since, if they are to act with any degree of uniformity,

while representing their own disciplinary training and interests, in reaching curricular decisions about general education it is now necessary to determine what positions have been taken about the role of the fine arts in general education in the years since 1945. These, after all, are the years in which current faculty members were receiving their own undergraduate education and entering the ranks of the colleges and universities. Thus, their experience with the general education programs of this era, the calls for reform, as well as their own educational development represent an experiential component in their decision-making.

The principal reports calling for general education reform will form one part of this body of knowledge. The other part consists of positions taken by proponents of greater attention to the fine arts in general education. Taken together, these two components formed the substance for the design of the questionnaire instrument for this study. The "traditional" view of the fine arts as "appreciation-oriented" parts of the intellectual profile of an educated person has already been established in the history of general education assumptions.

Following the so-called "Sputnik" crisis of the mid-1950's when the needs for the American space effort saw increased attention to science and math education, the place of the fine arts in higher education core programs tended to remain quite traditional as the purveyors of "taste, discrimination and the broadening of culture and experience" (Stone, 1971).

While there was a good deal of attention to the role of fine arts

in elementary and secondary education (Madeja, 1970; 1973; 1977a; 1977b; 1978; Unruh & Madeja, 1969; Hastie, 1965) moves were also underway to bring the arts into a more central position in education at all levels.

By 1977 Acuff could identify seven claims, as she termed them, made by those in the arts who were at work in various funded programs or projects, including two research laboratories--CEMREL (associated with Madeja) and SWRL--which had been funded by the National Institute of Education to develop and disseminate materials in aesthetic education for classroom teachers primarily on the elementary and secondary level.

As recorded by Acuff, the rationales and assumptions upon which these projects and investigations were based, produced the following claims:

#### Rationales and Assumptions

Current funded programs are given various titles: among them Arts in Education, Inter-related Arts, Aesthetic Education, Interdisciplinary, Comprehensive, Arts Infusion, and Arts Centered. Some programs use more than one of these terms in their rationales. Emphases vary, but a program rationale may embody assumptions or present explicit goal statements expressing any of the following claims:

Claim 1: that through active participation in the arts and/or learning to attend to various qualities of the arts, the student will enter the realm of aesthetic experience and subsequently engage with the arts more fully (all programs; especially aesthetic education programs).

Claim 2: that the artist enables students to experience and understand the arts more profoundly than does the classroom or arts teacher (Artists in Schools, some arts in education and aesthetic education programs).

Claim 3: that the arts share common concepts, principles of organization, and process characteristics. By participating in

experiences organized around these commonalities, the student makes conceptual connection between the arts. By relating the arts to one another in this manner, s/he will emerge with more extensive knowledge and experience than if s/he had participated in one art form alone (inter-related arts, some aesthetic education programs).

Claim 4: that the introduction of the aesthetic component into the teaching of a non-arts subject will enrich the student's knowledge of that subject, as, for example, in seeing the aesthetic aspects of biological structures (interdisciplinary, arts in education, and arts infusion programs).

Claim 5: that there are concepts common to the arts and other subjects, and that organizing teaching around these concepts will result in "interdisciplinary learnings": holistic, coordinated experiencing, in contrast to the fragmented learning resulting from teaching each subject separately (interdisciplinary, arts infusion, arts in education programs).

Claim 6: that the arts can be used instrumentally to motivate youngsters to learn skills or cognitive processes that will transfer when applied in situations requiring similar skills or processes in other subjects: for example, perceptual discriminations or problem-solving skills mastered in the visual arts can facilitate reading or mathematics learning (interdisciplinary, such as arts and reading or arts and mathematics).

Claim 7: that the arts can contribute substantially to special education, as the processes involved in artistic activity offer alternative approaches to learning for youngsters who may encounter difficulties in more traditional classroom activities (arts in special education programs) (Acuff, 1977, pp. 127-128).

While approving of efforts on federal, state and local efforts to change the status of arts in the schools, Acuff found that there were troublesome questions, both in the practice of these claims, and in their rationale. At the time of her writing, many of the investigations still lacked what she felt to be sufficient data and evidence to be wholly accepted. Nevertheless, they do represent most of the major facets of the move towards a more central positioning of the arts in school curricula and, by a kind of academic osmosis, have

implications for curricula in higher education, most particularly in general education or core programs.

Foshay (1973) in speaking specifically of the arts in general education on the elementary and secondary level, but with implications for higher education, built his case for a centrality on the educational philosophy of John Dewey and aesthetic education as promulgated by Broudy. His essential appeal was for the arts, via the aesthetic response, to come together with general education in one fabric. He assumes that general education "includes those domains of knowledge and experience which deal with what it is to be a human being" (p. 4), and that by relating this process to six categories of human development taken from developmental psychology, there are central possibilities for the arts. For intellectual development, as suggested by the Bloom Taxonomy, to grow up intellectually is to grasp symbol systems and to "interpret them into principles, to carry on analysis, synthesis, and finally evaluation" (p. 4). In linking the arts as a symbol system, with this process, he is joined by many writers on the arts and general education up to the present (Eisner, 1972; 1976; 1979; 1979; Ross, 1980; McGregor, Tate & Robinson, 1977; 1980; Courtney, 1974; 1980; 1982). There is now a vast body of literature gathered around the linkage between cognitive development and a consequent role for the fine arts in general education for that purpose.

While appeals for the fine arts in general education continue to build a case based upon the older roots of conveying a cultural heritage and "understanding and appreciating" that heritage as well as



the formation of sound aesthetic judgment, and enhancement of creative impulses, the linking of arts and cognition represents the single most significant development for the fine arts and general education of the last several decades.

In 1976 Bloom and Remer presented a "Rationale for Arts in Education", in The National Elementary Principal and while the audience was obvious, the essential rationales which they supplied can be considered as central to the issue on all levels. They spoke of the arts as being universal human phenomenon, an understanding of which could yield a concomitant deeper understanding of cultural differences and traditions. The arts also were carriers of the development of man and expressions of human creativity which could provoke, in both children and adults, an awareness of their own creative and human potential, and could also function as a source of pleasure and mental stimulation--a more recent version of the proper and effective use of leisure time--as well as a means of providing a broader range of choices about the environment and the way in which we choose to live. In addition, they paid some attention to career choices offered by the arts and the use of the arts in special education. One of the more provocative rationales, however, and the one in which Foshay, and many who agree with his position have exploited was presented by Bloom and Remer in this fashion:

The arts involve the elements of sound, space, line, shape, and language. These elements, singly or in combination, are common to the concepts underlying many subjects in the curriculum. For example, exploring solutions to problems in mathematics and science through the arts can increase the understanding or the process and the value of both (p. 45).

While the prospect of the fine arts as "handmaidens" in the curriculum, serving to advance other learning is not pleasing to those who place their emphasis on aesthetic education per se, the arts as a way of knowing (Ross, 1983; Eisner, 1981) has developed much support as an approach true to the arts and at the same time productive of establishing another set of modalities for cognitive development.

Foshay and others went several steps beyond the rather modest proposal by Bloom and Remer into a searching investigation of the entire issue. In essence, the observers of arts in relation to cognition suggest that pattern formation capacity, which is the root of aesthetic appreciation and informed judgment, is also the foundation of cognition (Unumb, 1984).

An argument for enhancing and expanding the role of the fine arts in college general education programs linked with the issue of the relationship between the arts and cognitive development would be similar to the section which appears at the end of this chapter, on fine arts and cognitive development in general education. Its inclusion represents the opinion of this researcher that the cognitive development avenue for the fine arts and core curricula represents one of the most promising developments of the past two decades.

To return to the Foshay examination, however, is still necessary since his discourse does not deal with intellectual development alone, but adds several other facets to his case for the arts and general education.

He suggests (pp. 4-5) the emotional or affective domain is understood less well than the cognitive, but that what is understood

about emotional development, including ego development, suggests a role for the arts, particularly in performance, for this domain. A similar role may be appropriate, as well, in the third domain of social development including conflict resolution. In his examination of a role for the arts in the area of emotional-affective and social development he is joined by another array of commentators (Maslow, 1968; Feldman, 1970; Beatty, 1969; Coan, 1977; Berman, 1968; Hamel, 1979; Jones, 1968; Weinstein & Fantini, 1970; Ryan, 1980; Cangemi, 1984; Combs, 1982; Bean, 1982; Billingsley, 1978; and many others).

Indeed, the entire field of humanistic psychology as characterized by the work of Rogers and Maslow and theories of self-actualization as promulgated by these two psychologists and their followers in education as well as psychology lend a body of writing for this role in education and, often as well, to the fine arts in particular.

In 1968, some two years before his death, Maslow had prepared a paper, first read before a Tanglewood Symposium on Music in American Society which was later modified for presentation to another gathering sponsored by the New York State Council on the Arts, in which he suggested an "education through art for the development of the human potential." In the process of discovering one's identity, the impact of music, for example, does things to the autonomic nervous system, endocrine glands, to feelings and to emotions in such a way as to facilitate the process. While he suggested that there was much to be worked out about the origins and effects of such a process, and that such was a task for everyone involved in arts education, he concluded

by presenting a strong defense for arts education as central to the whole process of education:

...effective education in music, education in art, education in dancing and rhythm, is intrinsically far closer than the core curriculum to intrinsic education of the kind I am talking about, of learning one's identity as an essential part of education. If education doesn't do that, it is useless. Education is learning to grow, learning what to grow toward, learning what is good and bad, learning what is desirable and undesirable, learning what to choose and what not to choose. In this realm of intrinsic learning, intrinsic teaching, and intrinsic education I think that the arts, and especially the ones I have mentioned, are so close to this identity, this biological identity, that rather than think of these courses as a sort of whipped or luxury cream, they must become basic experiences in education.... Such experiences could very well serve as the model, the means by which perhaps we could rescue the rest of the school curriculum from the value-free, value-neutral, goal-less meaninglessness into which it has fallen (p. 29).

In these remarks it is almost as though Maslow re-entered the curricular wars of the late nineteenth century and joined forces with the humanists of the 1890's in doing battle with those who would render the liberal tradition impotent. He suggested not only an experiential and emotional plus social value for the arts, but went further by suggesting an ethical, even moral, element as well. Characteristic of the modern humanistic view, however, the ethical and moral content must be arrived at by the activity of the individual undergoing a process of self-discovery and self-actualization rather than by being the passive recipient of pre-ordained codes delivered by those in authority.

Since the arts deal with and convey symbol systems which are not fixed abstractions, but convey affect, they may also be in a position, as Foshay suggested, to examine the "quality of human interactions, and try to make human interactions into aesthetic statement" (p. 6).

In so doing, they can not only deal with the goals envisaged by Maslow for human development, but also, through their affective core, respond to the position taken by advocates of affective education such as Combs (1982) who suggest that any educational system which ignores or rejects affective aspects of behavior runs the risk of making itself ineffective (p. 495). Combs established his position on premises that assume we possess "meaning-oriented brains" and that we are therefore seekers and creators of meaning and the meanings we create determine the ways we behave. In this process learning becomes the personal discovery of meaning, which has a large measure of subjectivity and experiential response wherein feeling and emotion become indicators of meaning. Thus, four highly affective factors can become strong influences in the learning process: self-concept, the presence of challenge and the absence of threat, an inward sense of values, and a feeling of group identification (pp. 496-497).

In this view the "ambience" created by artistic objects and artistic opportunities to relieve a dryness of the academic atmosphere, as suggested by Andrew D. White in the nineteenth century (Vesey, p. 83) may now have become a far more pervasive atmosphere of effective learning which, as proposed by Foshay and others, can enhance the total educational experience.

Following his discussion of intellectual, emotional, and social domains of human development, Foshay suggests as the fourth domain the aesthetic. He notes early in his discussion that the writers of the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Affective Domain, have misled us by collapsing what should be properly identified as an entire

domain of development into a treatment of affective response alone.

As Foshay goes on to say:

. . . they have no concept of the aesthetic independent of the affective response to aesthetic objects. The decision to view objects aesthetically is real, not necessarily mainly affective, and a significant part of the human experience in its own right. Education must therefore deal with it (p. 5).

In this regard, Foshay speaks for an entire generation of writers who have labored to develop and promulgate a disciplined and coherent view of aesthetic education, and his own philosophical view owes a debt to one of the chief spokespersons for this approach, Harry S. Broudy.

Writing on general education and its search for a rationale in 1974 and addressing directly the phenomena of mass education and increasing demands for specialized training and career-oriented programs, Broudy referred to John Dewey's notion that education is really general when such schooling enables the person to develop habits of thinking scientifically, with reliance on problem-solving. The aesthetic education approach, as reflected in the literature (Madeja, 1978; Smith, 1970; Smith, 1971; Eisner, 1976; Madeja, 1973; Eisner, 1985; Broudy, 1982; Broudy, 1964; Holden, 1978; Madeja, 1977; Reid, 1983; Sykes, 1982) has always contained a strong component of cognitive activity as part of the process, and many of the principal figures in this movement, notably Eisner and Madeja, have been, along with Ross and Gardner, noticeable in the more overt movement to link cognition in the arts with a total movement towards developing an array of cognitive modalities throughout general education.

It is this emphasis on the cognitive processes, whether tied primarily to aesthetic concerns, or broadened to include synergistic

effects of the entire educational process that forms the basis for most of what has been called aesthetic education. In the Broudy formulation for aesthetic education as used by Foshay (p. 5) there are four facets of the aesthetic response: the formal, the technical, the sensuous and the expressive. If this formulation can be applied to what is ordinarily thought of as academic subject matter then, "...the arts will have entered into general education" (p. 5).

Foshay proceeds to test this mobility by using as an example the topic of Conflict Resolution supplied by a director of social studies for a state department of education. In the course of his discussion, he finds methods whereby the formal stage of awareness and definition is realized successfully, the technical stage deals with the content, the sensuous stage deals with the affective and emotional aspects, and the expressive stage discovers the variety of possible resolutions and gives rise to the discovery that conflicts may be resolved intellectually, socially and emotionally via an appeal to mores, rules, or to conscience. According to Foshay:

The effect of the aesthetic analysis of this topic was, we thought, to flesh it out--to tell the whole truth about conflict, not just to portray it as an affair that reasonable man can solve reasonably--a version that is less than the whole truth (p. 6).

Other examples are cited by Foshay, but his conclusion represents a premise about the role of fine arts in the core general education curriculum which has become a whole and entire artifact:

..art in general education can work both ways. To bring the arts to general education, it may be fruitful for us to use the aesthetic analysis of the topics and experiences that characterize general education, thus filling them out and telling the whole truth. To use the learnings developed in other fields in the arts, we need to become aware of what those learnings are, and to

make it obvious to the children (sic) that it is legitimate to transfer them. In the degree to which we can produce these two kinds of interaction, the arts will have entered general education, and general education will have entered the arts, and we will have the seamless web we all desire...the isolation of the arts serves neither the arts nor general education nor the students very well. The initiative for the remedy can be taken by arts people who will begin to help children (sic) give aesthetic expression to general education themes. The other side of it--that side in which general education enters the arts--will appear as a necessity (p. 6).

Foshay's aim, therefore, is to have the integration begin in the curriculum, on whatever level, and then proceed already woven into the "seamless web" to the student.

Although he was writing about a role for aesthetic education on a level other than higher education Foshay's approach and its suggestion of an integrative function for the fine arts has potential implications for general education on the college level and at the very least became part of the intellectual climate in which discussion continued on the role of the arts and general education.

Feldman (1970) also writing primarily for a level other than the college curriculum, chose to pay more attention to a different integrative function, that of a wholistic learning style. Although his expressed concern is for the elementary school curriculum, the call for integration in learning at all levels, and the search for such coalescence, even at the post-secondary level in recent years also make Feldman's position provocative, in particular if we assume that the "dynamic intellectual drives that begin to make their appearance during the upper elementary years" do not, hopefully atrophy and wither away by the time a student reaches college, no matter how the level of sophistication may change:



If it is true that a style of learning is an important product of schooling, then we should be as concerned about ways of learning as we are about what is learned. The aesthetic mode of learning becomes relevant: It is characterized mainly by its style, which is to say, by its affective manner of connecting the elements of perceiving, doing, knowing, and sharing. Instead of separating knowledge from the living, organic situations in which it is acquired, the aesthetic unites all the features of experience by endowing them with a single, pervasive quality. Art synthesizes whereas science analyzes. You can see how important this style of learning is for elementary education: Children are not ready to encounter the world in the form of an endless succession of isolated entities; as their fantasizing and myth-making activities suggest, they seek a comprehensive vision of reality. Educators implicitly recognize this need by postponing the departmentalization of learning until the secondary school years. In grade school, our principal emphasis is on the wholeness of experience, the unity of knowledge, the integrity of learning.

In view of this emphasis on wholeness and unity in elementary education, how do we introduce the vital elements of growth, change, and innovation? Western culture is not disposed to linger very long over the mythic unities of childhood. We encourage curiosity, we institutionalize the spirit of investigation. What is the relevance of the aesthetic mode of learning to the dynamic intellectual drives that begin to make their appearance during the upper elementary years? How do we satisfy the child's desire to know what makes things tick? By teaching him how to interfere with ideas and things. You may say this is the province of science and experimental method. Perhaps it is. But art claims a very ancient right--older than alchemy--to rearrange things, to transform substances, to call new forms into being. In other words, aesthetic education implies taking things apart and putting things together in the light of an affective idea about what they might become. This curiosity presides at the birth of new knowledge and feeling. The elementary school is a place where children do something to ideas and materials in order to find out who they are and what the world is like (Feldman, 1970, pp. 85-86).

If Foshay saw the fine arts in an aesthetic modality forming a primary pattern for a "seamless web" in general education, and Feldman saw the arts, visual art in particular, as bringing a kind of holistic learning experience for the student then Broudy (1972) saw aesthetic education as a vehicle for the providing of values for all students, an "enlightened cherishing", as he termed it, to make aesthetic

literacy, at least through the high school years, as common as linguistic literacy. Broudy saw failures in what was then, and still is, traditional courses in skill development and appreciation in the arts. His primary goal, as expressed in his essay on aesthetic education, was to have education in the arts produce men and women who had developed a cultivated and disciplined aesthetic judgment. His primary tenets were that:

..aesthetic education is first of all the training of imaginative perception to enable the pupil to apprehend sensory content, formed into an image that expresses some feeling quality. So stated, aesthetic education does not concern itself with propagandizing for any specific ideology or way of life. On the contrary, its first concern is that the pupil become adept in contemplating images of feeling which works of art present to us (p. 57).

The development of this adeptness does involve cognitive functions, as has been noted earlier, and also sorts out oversimplified emotional responses. The ultimate results of the process which Broudy advocates is the creation of a sensitized but sensible value base, one which will assist the learner in avoiding pitfalls in sorting out the pervasive world of message-laden images which characterize our society.

Broudy, therefore sees a role for the arts as not merely creating "educated and tasteful consumers" of artifacts and objects of art, but as the development of alert, skillful, and ethical human beings contending with images of all kinds, including those used for a variety of purposes in our social and political milieu as well.

On the level of direct application to curriculum development, one of the best examples of a member of a fine arts faculty mounting a

defense of aesthetic education in a specific proposal has been provided by Leo Segedin, an artist and art historian. In the mid 1960's a group of faculty members at what is now Northeastern Illinois University joined together in creating a proposal for an experimental small college unit within the larger institution. Segedin, one of some seven faculty members joining in this proposal, provided a rationale for the inclusion of aesthetic education in the proposed curriculum of the new college.

One of the stated purposes or goals of this proposed experimental college was "...to provide students with an educational program which focuses on conceptual thinking in verbal and non-verbal frames of reference" (Berlinger, 1965, p. 1). This program was also meant to "...develop the student's ability to relate information from one discipline to another" as well as to experiment with new curricula and new methods of instruction (Berlinger, p. 1).

While funding for the experimental college did not come about and thus there can be no speculation concerning its success, Segedin, in mounting his rationale for aesthetic education within this approach to liberal education has summarized much of what characterizes aesthetic education as an entity when the approach also includes elements of cognition and direct experience.

Since Segedin's proposal is presented in a succinct but sequential fashion, it is perhaps useful to provide the entire text as a kind of summary statement for aesthetic education principles as advocated by a specific faculty member in a specific context and as part of a total curriculum proposal for a projected experiment in

liberal education.

It is most significant that Segedin establishes his position on the basis of an integrated system consisting of the recognition of symbol systems in the arts, a cognitive function, and the affective dimensions which leads to an examination of the life of feeling as well:

### The Significance of Non-Verbal Education

- A. If knowledge is the meaningful articulation of experience by means of symbol systems, at least part of an individual's education should be the development of his capacity to comprehend and function by means of symbol systems. If there are significant areas of experience which discursive systems are inadequate to articulate, skills in systems which are adequate must be developed. If our subjective life is such a significant area, and the arts are the symbol systems which articulate such experiences, an educated individual must have the capacity to utilize the systems of the arts. We believe such to be the case.
- B. Whereas discourse gives form to ideas, the arts give form to feelings. Feeling is not irrational but has its own rationality. A work of art articulates the forms of our emotional life. It objectifies inner experience and presents it for our perception, understanding, contemplation, etc. The arts do not abstract concepts nor make generalizations about experiences; the arts present concrete forms which embody the patterns of our subjective life. The arts are not about feelings: they are the forms of feeling themselves.
- C. All cultures have formed their emotive life through some forms of the arts. Even these without written language, have articulated these significant experiences in dance, music, sculpture, or even simple body ornament. Someone once said that our emotions are largely Shakespeare's poetry. No one really knew the sense of sunlight until Monet pointed it. Whether we like it or not, the jukebox, comic book, pop magazines and T.V. give form to the subjective life of a significant part of our own culture. Bad art in a sense is a corruption of feeling. Education in the arts is an education of feeling and we can see the result of its neglect in the world around us.
- D. We do not learn about symbol systems; we learn symbol systems. We do not learn about English and mathematics; we learn

English and mathematics. We learn the arts in the same way. We learn to think visually and musically. If the function of a symbol system is the articulation of experience, passive "appreciation" is inadequate for such a purpose. The ability to think in a system is an essential skill if the system is to have a significant value. Ability to think in a system involves an ability to manipulate its elements in meaningful structures. In the same way that the articulation of experience by means of verbal language involves the ordering of words, the articulation of experience by means of the arts involves the ordering of their special elements. The elements of the visual arts, eg. line, color, volume, etc. manifest themselves in paint, graphic media, clay, etc., those of music, e.g. melody, harmony, rhythm, etc. in instrumentation and the combinations thereof. The development of skills in the manipulation of such materials, therefore, should be an essential part of the education of an individual. The development of skills in his context does not imply vocational training of the creation of masterpieces. We are not concerned with the development of professional painters or musicians. We do not learn to write in order to create great novels, but the ability to write enables us to formulate our experiences in meaningful ways as well as making us more aware of the significance of the writing of others. The other arts function in the same way.

- E. A primarily verbal education tends to neglect the development of sensory and perceptual discrimination. Our traditional verbal, discursive, rational approach to education has dissolved the sounds, colors and shapes of our world into generalized concepts. We sometimes seem to have lost real contact with the world which we are trying to understand. The ability to discriminate and manipulate sensory nuances underlies the development of the complex structures of artworks. These are the elements of the arts. Out of them we create the emotional subtleties of the emotional character of the arts. The direct manipulation of materials, tools, instruments leads to a more direct sensory involvement with our environment. Control leads to discrimination and a fresh awareness of our perceptions. Skills involve the education and integration of all our senses. We should develop a direct grasp of reality by working with it. An individual who can operate in this world only in verbal terms is only partly educated and certainly has not developed his full potential (Segedin, 1965, pp. 1-2).

The final element in Segedin's rationale, involving the "manipulation" of elements involved in the creation of the symbol systems of the fine arts leads to the consideration of the last

remaining facet of customary arguments for the inclusion of fine arts in general education: "studio experience" and the direct involvement in the process of creating meaning in the fine arts.

In his discussion of the fine arts in general education as an example of a developmental approach, Foshay (1973) suggests that the last category of the six he has enumerated is physical development. While his discussion is less satisfactory on this point when compared with the others, he does suggest (p. 5) that if we consider the question as one of development in acceptance of change and of aesthetic awareness then the experiences of an aesthetic modality of thinking and sorting out experience can come to bear on the continuing cycle of change in physical appearance and self-awareness which we all experience.

The general campus climate for the fine arts and their role in liberal education was probably well captured by Perkins (1965) when dealing with the issue of artists becoming resident on college campuses. He notes that the arts were generally introduced into the university setting around the turn of the century as a part of liberal education's attention to historical contexts. However, once the arts came into the curriculum by methods and techniques long accepted by the scholarly tradition, Perkins suggests that:

..once the arts had come into the curriculum as a proper subject of study, neither the teachers nor the students were long content with this platonic relationship. As often happens when a glamorous visitor comes to call, another kind of interest emerged--an interest in the subject itself, in art as art (p. 54).

There is still a source of tension and pressure in this new relationship which Perkins characterizes by suggesting a difference in

approach between the artist and the scholar.

..the artist tried to express a universal truth through the particular while the scholar will use the particular as only a means of illustrating the universal. This difference in style complicates communication between artist and scholar, makes it difficult to apply similar means of judgments to their work. Without familiar standards of evaluation, the scholar cannot measure artistic performance and frequently concludes that a performance that cannot be evaluated does not belong in a university. The artist on the other hand is puzzled by the seeming depersonalization of the scholarly enterprise (p. 55).

This gulf is frequently marked by a recognition on the part of colleges and universities of art history and art criticism, for example, as being reasonably legitimate and even necessary parts of the curriculum, but the production of art and the performance of artistic work is not a part of liberal education. Indeed, as Perkins suggests (p. 54), "...art as part of liberal education is still essentially a spectator sport."

Yet, in most of his discussion, Perkins is concerned with the issues of relationships amongst the academic and artistic community when they are faced with questions of pre-professional programs, artists-in-residence, and the presence of performance groups on campus as part of the entire cultural and academic scene.

Other writers have been far more direct about the values to be found in direct manipulation of materials in the fine arts. This component has often been linked with the stimulation of creativity amongst all students and the discovery of a degree of control over one's own sense of self and the world around us.

Christ-Janer and Wickiser (1968) saw the role of fine arts in higher education as being far more than the production of literate and

tasteful "consumers", but as being integral to the adjustment, if not almost the salvation, of students confronting a mass culture:

The arts offer the student an opportunity to discover personally the significance of qualitative experience through creative imagination. They are a last refuge of idealism in modern education. If quality is to continue in society schools must create it, in spite of the tremendous onslaught of mass culture and the overemphasis on quantitative experiences that dominate the curriculum. Quantitative experience can be logically arranged to appeal to materialistic beliefs. A premium is placed on logical processes of learning that emphasize the ability to think as the primary requisite of an educated man, largely eliminating what he thinks about. The arts in higher education can and must avoid this pitfall. They must point the way to an educative process that ensures each person's total maturity by developing his creative imagination (p. 56).

They go on to suggest that the arts contain, in effect, a potent metaphor for the advancement of liberal education. This metaphor, which for its full effect to be felt and developed must be based on a complete experience in the arts, suggests a role for the arts is using creativity as a means for ethical development and self fulfillment:

Education in the arts should then be based on a clear understanding of the nature of art, the creative processes, and creative imagination. To make maximum use of the creative imagination, it is necessary to recognize two fundamental social concepts of the artist. We must have first a concept of "man as artist," and second, a concept of "artist as man," as a creative person whose importance to society is felt and recognized. If we examine the concept of "man as artist" we discover that all people have the art impulse--they yearn to commune and share with others. The arts are not merely communication, as most people think. They are not the transfer of ideas but the sharing of aesthetic experiences. Man needs order to make his life more meaningful, beauty to lift him out of the realms of drabness, and expression to fix permanently his moments of ecstasy. In like manner, the concept of "artist as man" presumes he is a creative force in society. This concept has been constructed and romanticized in our folklore to the point where the artist is characterized as a psychological misfit; even he often believes it. A new concept of the "artist a man" must therefore replace this outdated notion, especially in education (p. 57).

While Christ-Janer and Wickiser are primarily talking about the



rescue of common conceptions of the artist from the stereotype of "outside" and "iconoclast" and the recognition of the artist as an aspect of essential humanity, there is implicit in their remarks an encouragement for the broader recognition, as well, of the common heritage we all share of the desire to create.

Setting aside the history of professional education in the arts, which is not germane to this study, we are left with the issue of a role for the fine arts and creativity for the general student population.

Assuming that creativity is teachable, or at least capable of being facilitated as based on the work of Torrance (1973, 1965, 1970, 1972a, 1972b) and others (Torrance & Myers, 1970; Parnes, 1967; Giannini, 1968) advocates for the fine arts in general education have suggested that options in direct experience in the arts should be open to all students in general education programs.

Hirvela (1974) establishes values in creative encounter in theatre and acting for the general student, divorced from any considerations of professional career application. Hodik and Orlock (1976) suggest an encounter process with the arts which has as a primary aim the elicitation of a self-directed creative response. Heist and Wilson (1968) suggest that curricular experiences can be developed which have as their primary aim the providing of opportunities for creative and innovative responses.

Perkins (1984), long active in the arts and cognition movement, and author of one of the most provocative pieces on the relationships amongst the arts, cognition, and creativity, The Mind's Best Work

(1981) suggests that educational curricula can "promote creative thinking by focusing on aesthetic, purpose, mobility, objectivity and intrinsic motivation and by encouraging students to work at the edge of their competence" (p. 18).

Perkins also notes that there are two things which creativity is not: "...a single distinctive ability and a matter of talent" (p. 18). Rather, he suggests, creative thinking is a form of design and pattern which leads to creative results. Inherent in the process is an attention to aesthetic considerations of shape, form, and a striving toward originality. While Perkins does not build his entire approach on the issue of fine arts instruction per se, the implications of such a linkage have become clear in the writings of others. Van Sommers (1984) has reported on the drawing performances of ordinary people, both adults and children, to produce a careful analysis of the complex process involved in something as simple as sketching a map, and the set of abilities which are placed into motion: perceptual, mechanical, strategic, representational, etc.

In situations cited by Van Sommers, it becomes clear that innovations are not simply the product of some mysterious "creative" force, but are linked with a set of operations which can be studied and, to some extent, analyzed.

There is an operant set of stated qualities present in much of the work of creative individuals and a clear desire to achieve these as demonstrated in the work of Getzels and Csikzentmihalyi (1976).

Thus, when the fine arts are presented as offering an opportunity for the development and facilitation of creativity, there tends to be

a link between this rationale for the inclusion of the arts in the total general education process and the development of cognition as well as a more "free-form" individual exploration of degrees of talent in any one of the arts.

To the extent to which "problem-finding" or confrontation with a set of problematic circumstances is a feature of creativity and inventiveness of solutions (Getzels, 1977; Wertheimer, 1959) the arts may be seen as customarily and constantly dealing with such a situation. There is a constant shuttling process between the affective and cognitive realm in arriving at the appropriate solution to a problem--in the arts an artistic solution to an aesthetic problem.

As suggested by Perkins (1981): "Cognition and affect are not distinct aspects of creative experience. Emotions provide knowledge, point to knowledge, and constitute knowledge crucial to the maker. Emotions are a way of knowing" (p. 121).

An the manner in which the arts can "train" attention, can expand perceptual awareness, can focus visual and auditory cues, they can, it has been suggested (Wolf & Garner, 1980), not only become part of an alternative view of the educational and developmental process, but also participate in the more effective utilization of the creative process for multiple purposes.

As suggested also by Perkins (1981): "In general and in creative activity, people maximize sensitivity and thoroughness in evaluation by "looking harder"--directing attention systematically to the various parts and aspects of something" (p. 111).

Joining forces at times with psychologists and other researchers intent on re-defining intelligence and expanding concepts of the modalities of cognitive processes (Gardner, 1983; Perkins, 1981; Perkins & Leondar, 1977; Sternberg, 1977; 1982; 1986; 1984; 1979; 1985a; 1985b; 1984b; 1981; 1985c), the proponents of a greater role for the fine arts in education have sought (Eisner, 1985) to make an expanded plea for such inclusion of the arts over and above the traditional role as transmitters of a cultural heritage.

Most of the literature calling for a more noticeable presence of the fine arts in general education programs has appeared in the last 20 years, with a large share of attention to the issue on the elementary and secondary school level. What has been the impact on the status of the fine arts in higher education programs, including the recent reform reports?

### Status of the Fine Arts and the General Education Reforms

#### Reports of the 1980's

One of the standard works on general and liberal education in an earlier era was Van Doren's Liberal Education (1943, 1959). He had placed emphasis on a necessary union of "heart and mind", saying that the "contemporary world is badly educated in its feelings" (p. 162). Having been a guest lecturer at St. John's College, Van Doren clearly indicated a penchant for the Great Books approach to liberal education, with an equally classical orientation to the classics of literature as vehicles for the training and refining of the sensibilities. In his rationale for the educated person, Van Doren was careful to balance both the scientific and the literary tradition

within a humanistic paradigm which included a moral and ethical component. Building upon a newer version of the trivium and quadrivium, he acknowledged the arts of the painter, poet, sculptor, architect and musician but in his discussion of a curriculum for fostering the liberal tradition stopped short of assigning the arts any kind of prominent locale. Science, literature, philosophy, religion and the social sciences all received discussion.

Thus, according to "standards" of the 1950's the arts were accepted as part of the tradition now of liberal education, but their exact role in that tradition was unclear.

In 1966 Daniel Bell, publishing his report of the experience of Columbia College with changes in general education, had discussed music and art as being part of the Humanities sequence in general education and having, as their organizational premise that a "...student is best initiated in aesthetic experience by confronting him with masterpieces from our cultural heritage" (p. 291). Thus the traditional role of conveyors of culture had been slightly expanded, by admission of the aesthetic experience into the process.

His proposals, however, did include some more far-seeing new dimensions:

I have suggested that because students in the secondary schools are now so greatly exposed to culture both in school and through the mass media, these Humanities courses should be examined with a view of devoting more attention to the nature of visual forms in the arts and new forms of sound in music. It was proposed further than since some freshmen can be expected to show proficiency in music or art, those who could be exempted from, say, the music course be allowed to devote a year to the visual arts, and a student exempted from fine arts to spend a year in music (pp. 291-292).

perhaps, unlike the students of Eliot's generation who had been arriving on campus without any significant ability to either sing or draw, several decades of instruction in art and music in the elementary and secondary school were having an effect.

While limited in scope to a choice essentially between art or music as part of a humanities sequence in general education, students in Bell's proposed curriculum were at least going to be confronted with an aesthetically-based approach of some substance:

..one purpose of a confrontation with a great work should be to provoke "self-consciousness," but not only of one's own immediate response, emotionally and intellectually, to a work, but equally the way in which the same work has evoked successively different styles of self-consciousness. The problem for the course is not only to make a student aware of a text, but of the scholarly context in which it arose; not only of his own sensibility, but aware, as well, of the motions and responses to emotions the work has aroused in others. In sum, the successive histories of mind and sensibility are as integral to the interpretation of a text as the student's (and the instructor's) own "naive" responses, for these "naive" responses are to some extent a product of such histories. And it is the function of intellectual understanding to make this explicit (p. 231).

To the union of mind and heart, the intellect and the sensibility of Mark Van Doren, Bell, uncompromised by being a practitioner himself of any of the fine arts, had now supplied a curricular pattern and purpose. An early "reform report" had supplied a rationale for the arts in general education, albeit in a somewhat narrow frame of reference and opportunity.

Assuming that the general education movement was almost a dead issue, Anderson (1973) wrote of the fifty-year period from 1917--Columbia College inaugurating its course in Contemporary Civilization--to 1960 when he saw the movement in its final decline.

He saw four conceptualizations that had emerged from this period:

- (1) Programs organized around important humanistic writings over the centuries--the Great Books programs, including the College at the University of Chicago.
- (2) Programs organized around systems for the selection or compression of knowledge, and then primarily within a broad field of knowledge--survey courses as with the Contemporary Civilization course at Columbia College.
- (3) Programs organized around categories of human behavior or performance--problem of "need" oriented whether on the basis of groups or individuals as exemplified by the General College at the University of Minnesota or the Basic College at Michigan State as influenced by Paul Dressel and Lewis Mayhew.
- (4) Programs that drew on all three conceptualizations and were, consequently, eclectic (p. 41).

While the general education movement soon proved that it was far from dead with a plethora of reports emerging from foundations, commissions and consortiums within a very few years of Anderson's publication, his article nevertheless is useful in presenting a profile of program orientations on the eve of the next major cycle of general education controversy.

It is also useful to note that the principal vehicle for the fine arts at this time was to take refuge in the "survey course" which, as Anderson noted, generally had as its objective to: "...give each learner an overview of the world of knowledge--the arts and humanities, the sciences, and the social sciences and history. It often produced a person who knew about rather than knew" (p. 41). It should also be noted that a more likely contemporary version of this approach was likely to be, on those campuses where a required core program was still in force, a "miniature survey course" on department-by-department or discipline-by-discipline basis. The

primary objective, however, remained the same, as described by Anderson: how to deal with the explosion of knowledge and how to replace the Renaissance man.

In further assessing the status of the fine arts in general education programs, it is important to note that the most consistent pattern has been one in which they are recognized as participants, perhaps based to some extent on their status as departments and thus as shares in the student enrollment "spoils" of general education programs, but are usually not granted the full status of an independent discipline. Dressel and Delisle (1969) utilized a catalog examination procedure to demonstrate that most colleges and universities of that time had no separate requirement for the fine arts within their versions of general education but were likely to merge such fine arts opportunities within a humanities requirement. When there was a provision for a recognizable fine arts requirement, it was usually for three to five credits, i.e. one course. Yet, as they report, there was some strength and development in this regard. During the time of their data collection in 1968-1969:

Currently 46 percent of the institutions require some work in fine arts subjects, as compared with 38 percent in this category ten years ago. The 46 percent can be broken into two parts: 34 percent in which the requirement is less than 5 percent of the total graduation requirement, and 12 percent in which the requirement is from 5 to 10 percent of the total.

The few institutions requiring more than 10 percent in the fine arts ten years ago have decreased the requirement. These decreases appear to be primarily in institutions with a strong emphasis on and a long history in teacher preparation (p. 20).

There are, of course, a number of difficulties and deficiencies inherent in the use of catalog descriptions and these were admitted by



Dressel and Delisle, including matters of definition and interpretation.

Nevertheless, within the limitations of such a measurement, their study remains a useful index to the status of the fine arts in general education in the mid-1960's. The 371 institutions which comprised their sample represented a one-third random sample of all types of institutions listed in the 1964 edition of the American Council on Education American Universities and Colleges. Some 322 institutions (approximately 87 percent) provided the complete materials requested for making the complete analysis of curricular practices and trends covered in their total survey on undergraduate curriculum trends.

This researcher conducted a small-scale catalog analysis of some 42 colleges and universities in the Chicago area in 1980-1981 in an attempt to replicate and up-date, on a very limited scale, the findings of Dressel and Delisle about representation of the fine arts in general education programs. While the study was limited to a geographic demarcation, the richness and diversity of institutions of post-secondary education in the greater Chicago area is sufficient to include both public and private colleges and universities as well as junior colleges whose liberal arts transfer programs now carry much of the responsibility for the general education component of undergraduate degree programs in many areas.

Of these 42 institutions (12 community colleges, seven private universities, four public universities, and 19 private colleges) only some five (11.9%) had identifiably separate requirements for the fine arts. These institutions were all private colleges. The fine arts

were included in some recognizable fashion within a Humanities track in 30 (71.4%) of the institutions surveyed. Catalog copy concerning the purposes of the institution's general education program specifically mentioned a role for the fine arts, as such, in some seven (16.7%) cases, five of which were private colleges, and two of which were a public university and a community college. More detailed information on this survey can be found in Appendix A of this study (Unumb, 1981).

The extent to which published announcements of the existing provisions of an institution's general education program can be seen as a statement of status for various departments and programs, and an indication of the degree of receptivity of the institution and its faculty to a department, program, or general discipline, such as the fine arts, may necessarily be open to some interpretation.

Nevertheless, evidence from the Dressel and Delisle study of 1969 and the more limited follow-up study by this researcher in 1981 would seem to suggest that the fine arts have yet to achieve significant and identifiably separate stature in many general education programs.

On the eve of the time before the first of the present day significant reports calling for reform of general education, A Quest for Common Learning (Boyer & Levine, 1981), there were reports of the arts having reached a "rising" and acceptable status on the American college campus (Morrison, 1973) this was followed by a declaration of "maturity" for arts departments some years later (Morrison, 1985) and an acknowledgment by a body of some weight, The Arts, Education and Americans Panel of the Rockefeller Foundation, that as a nation we

were "coming to our senses" (1977) and that education and the arts had come to be considered important partners. Based on various surveys and other documentation, the Panel reported that a majority of students had expressed the opinion that their campus did not have sufficient opportunities for their creative interests, including the arts (Coming to Our Senses, 1977, p. 121) and offered a vast array of evidence that the arts were coming into their own in all aspects of American life.

Yet their acknowledgment of the significance of the recent (1976) Harvard Report on general education seems underwhelming when they quote Henry Rosovsky, dean of Harvard's Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and principal figure in the revision of general education at Harvard as stating among the informed acquaintances of an educated person should be "...Some of the important scholarly, literary and artistic achievements of the past" (p. 123).

On the eve of reform, the feast to which the arts were being invited bore strong resemblance to the leavings of some past banquet furnished with bare bones and gruel. At least such might have been the portrait painted by those who had been pressing for something more than "cultural heritage" designation, however significant this might be in the tradition of liberal education.

Levine (1978) in his comprehensive study of undergraduate education, covering both the history of each part of the undergraduate curriculum and the current practice, reveals that the content of general education programs at the time of his writing would, in many institutions, include the fine arts, if at all, in the area of

"general understanding courses." These were intended to "give students both a broad and basic undergraduate learning experience" (p. 20).

Drawing his data from the Carnegie Council Catalog study of 1976, Levine determined that fine arts was required in 20 percent of the curricula and would fulfill distribution requirements in 59 percent (p. 21).

While it is almost impossible to compare this data with the Dressel and Delisle study of 1969 because of marked differences in methodology and sampling technique, it is safe to say that the 1978 Levine profile, when matched with the 1969 report of Dressel and Delisle, and placed together with this researcher's much more circumscribed study of Chicago-area colleges and universities in 1980-1981, suggests that the fine arts have remained visible in the content patterns of many institutions of higher education, but have not generally been a major component, and are far from being a consistent hallmark of general education in colleges across the land.

Despite the thoughtful and provocative content of Phenix's Realms of Meaning (1964) there has been little evidence that general education curricula have followed his prescription for the study of his six realms of meaning in their sequential order. His proposal for a general education program posits that all knowledge be divided into six types or "realms of meaning." The first is "symbolics," consisting of ordinary language, mathematics, and other nondiscursive symbolic forms. The second is "empirics" which represents the physical sciences, as well as biology, psychology and social sciences.

The third, esthetics, consisting as it does of music, visual arts, the arts of movement and literature, represents the significant, and equal, place for the fine arts in a general education scenario. The fourth realm, "synnoetics," deals with personal knowledge, while the fifth is concerned with "ethics" and moral knowledge. The final realm, "synoptics" includes history, religion, and philosophy.

In addition to the recognition of fine arts in the third realm, as well as some potential connections with the first realm of "symbolics" and symbol systems, the Phenix proposal assumes that all six realms of meaning would be studied sequentially, beginning with symbolics as a prerequisite for the other areas and proceeding through empirics and esthetics to synnoetics and ethics. Synoptics would cap the entire process and serve to synthesize all the rest. In addition, whenever possible, students would also study in the six areas concurrently in order to see and confirm interrelationships. This represented in its entirety an elegant and coherent system, yet one which has not become the ruling image of general education programs.

The fine arts had to continue to seek their place within other systems, far less coherent or logical. Yet, on occasion, as recorded by Levine (1978) individual systems could produce interesting results. The competency or outcome-based program at Sterling College required students to demonstrate attainment in eight areas, one of which was art and aesthetics. The measurement system and student demonstration of learning to a faculty committee via courses, independent study, standardized tests and/or field experience required for the art and aesthetics area that the student must:

comprehend the artistic and aesthetic dimensions of culture. To do that the student is (sic) required to demonstrate (1) an understanding of some aspects of his or her cultural heritage and the contributions to it by the arts and artists, (2) an understanding of the way an artist works in a particular medium, (3) some knowledge of aesthetic experience, and (4) an awareness of aesthetic values and a capacity to make discriminating judgments of his or her own (Levine, p. 13).

Thus faculty at this institution must have reached some considerable agreement about a fairly significant role for the fine arts within their own general education program, one which had apparently already gone several steps beyond the provisions of the Harvard revision presided over by Rosovsky.

The faculty at some institutions, such as Berea College, had also clearly gone at least a step in the direction of including a form of "studio" experience in the arts as part of a general education program. Offered as part of a core program in general education, "Man and the Arts" was a course stressing experiential involvement in music, literature and the arts (Chickering et al., 1977, p. 253).

This avenue for general education experience in the fine arts had been commented upon as early as 1968 by Schuman writing on the issue of academic respectability and the arts. He noted that:

The study of art history, philosophy of art, aesthetics, and the like, are traditionally accepted as the stuff of liberal education. They are concerned with evaluations, with understanding the place of things, the interrelationship of things, and, to the extent required to reach such understanding, they investigate things themselves (p. 16).

However, he felt that there was still a significant gap in this customary approach:

In terms of art, this approach fails to recognize that the work of art itself is the stuff of education. Too much of the academic pursuit of the arts is concerned with talk or writing about art,

talk about form, talk about expression, talk about execution, talk about talk, and writing about writing. It ignores art in direct experience: performing a great play or symphony, making a poem, a dance, or a painting. We best come to know the arts not by prodigious feats of reading and talking but by the not-so-simple acts of trying to create and perform works of art and by cultivating a penetrative observation (pp. 16-17).

Thus, Schuman, then President of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, joined the ranks of those calling for a more direct involvement in the processes of art in addition to the cultural and aesthetic appreciation approach as currently practiced.

The American Theatre Association adopted a policy statement on "Theatre in General Education" (1979) which noted that any construction of drama/theatre in general education must:

- (1) recognize the arts as fundamental to the learning process;
- (2) recognize drama/theatre as a major component of the arts;
- (3) acknowledge the value of studying drama/theatre as an art form in its own right as a significant part of general education; and
- (4) acknowledge the value of drama/theatre processes when skillfully applied as a pedagogical tool to facilitate learning in many other areas of the curriculum (p. 1).

Further, the members of this association had subscribed to a very specific role for theatre in post-secondary education which, much like position statements issued by practitioners in the other fine arts, had recognized a diversity of avenues for the arts in general education:

..theatre allows students to participate directly in human action and interaction; they come to understand other points of view, they explore alternative behavior patterns, and this engagement in theatre has a significant humanizing function which is a prime goal of general education (p. 2).

In addition, the theatre group found an avenue for cognitive development in the study of theatre:

Theatre involves analysis and synthesis, both prerequisites for making discriminating and relevant judgments and the highest of cognitive skills. In addition, theatre teaches concentration, interpersonal skills, organization, problem-solving, effective listening, leadership skills, and physical and vocal expressiveness. Both as direct participants and as audience, students in post-secondary education need theatre as a vital part of their general education (p. 2).

With adjustments appropriate to disciplinary differences, the tenor and content of this statement was much like those coming from the fields of music and art, as well as dance.

For example, the College Music Society, in its reports, Music in General Studies (1981) recommended that music should be looked at as one of the vehicles for strengthening intellectual perceptions (p. 17), that instruction in music for general education should recognize the strongly visual construct of our society, which lends itself to work in art and theatre and seek to expand the perceptual sets of students (p. 15), and that "...although music appreciation courses and amateur performances have long been a part of the traditional college scene, the success of these activities in building a knowledgeable public must be questioned."

Thus, participants in the Wingspread Conference which produced this report, felt that there was a need to change, expand and improve instruction in "general music" in order for this portion of general education to have its fullest impact.

They further noted that in order to accomplish this, general studies must be recognized as a specialty within their own ranks, that hiring and promotion of faculty should reflect this, and that accrediting agencies should acknowledge such a specialty in their



considerations (p. 18).

Such an approach would presuppose some sense of stature and recognition for a significant role for the arts in general, and music in particular, in general education at the college level. As the general education "reform reports" emerged in the early 1980's what provision did they make for the fine arts in their calls for change?

#### The General Education Reform Reports

A Quest for Common Learning from the Carnegie Foundation (Boyer & Levine, 1981) suggested in its concept of finding common ground in the "shared use of symbols", an opportunity for the fine arts to participate in general education as part of the development of language skills, including the acquisition of a second language not only for its direct utility but also for its reflection of cultural values and traditions.

Students should explore, as well, how we communicate non-verbally, through music, dance and the visual arts. They should understand how these forms of expression permit us to convey subtle meanings, express intense emotions and how, uniquely, nonverbal symbols can stir a deep response in others (pp. 36-37).

In effect, the Carnegie report was calling for the acquisition not only of skill in English expression, but of some facility in a foreign language as well as some basic vocabulary in a "third" language, the non-verbal symbol system of performing arts.

To the extent this report represented an attitudinal response of its participants, the arts had received some credit in the market-place of general education. As suggested in a later piece by Boyer (1982) the arts were to be a part of organizing the curriculum around shared experiences to help students see that they are members

of the global and historical human community--in effect "seeing the connectedness of things" (Boyer, 1982, p. 582).

The Paideia Proposal (1982) offered by Adler and others suggested a different format for the arts, and thus represents another view by a different group of academics about the role of fine arts in a general education curriculum.

With Adler as the principal proponent, one might expect great reliance of the classical tradition, the Great Books tradition of the University of Chicago, to be present in the Paideia Proposal. Indeed, the various publications outlining and extending the implications of the proposal (Adler, 1982; Adler, 1983; Adler, 1984) do place emphasis on traditional sources of cultural heritage in designing a single course of study which is recommended for all students in a 12 year period from elementary school through high school.

Yet, as outlined by Van Doren in chapter ten of The Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus (1984), the fine arts are very much in evidence in operational and activity area of the proposed program. They operate not only in the area of the "acquisition of knowledge," but also in the area of "improved understanding of ideas and values," and may well be implicit in the more process-oriented area of the development of "intellectual skills--skills of learning."

The opening statement of chapter ten sets the tone for the role of fine arts in the Paideia Proposal:

The Fine Arts: How Related to the Liberal and Useful Arts

A reading of The Paideia Proposal will show that the conception of man as an artist (woman, too), as one who knows how to do things, is fundamental to it. The program envisions the active

participation of children, throughout their basic schooling, in every kind of art appropriate to their stage of development. It may be argued that first in importance among the skills or arts to be acquired are the traditional liberal ones--the verbal and mathematical skills we use to understand the world around us in its qualitative and its quantitative aspects. But these arts are merely part of a series that includes at once the useful arts, in which the aim is not understanding but application, and the fine arts, in which the aim is the rendering of certain aspects of human experience for its own sake, valued for its own perfection.

This characteristic of the fine arts--their lack of any purpose save their own realization and the interest we take in it--has sometimes caused them to be regarded not only as less important than the other arts; but as altogether superfluous, even frivolous activities. That is not our view, not do we think of them merely as embellishments, a graceful addition to the meat and potatoes of basic schooling. On the contrary, we regard such arts as serving real human needs--for self-expression to begin with, and for the account they provide of the world we find about and within us (an account no less true, though in detail very different, from the one that science affords). No creature but man is capable of the fine arts, while man has never, or only in rare instances, been willing to exist without them. Hence the place we have made for them in our Paideia curriculum, both as something to know and as something we ought in measure to be able to do.

We think also that the fine arts cannot be omitted from the course of study, or short-changed in it, without damage to all the other arts. History tells us what happens when one or another part of the series is lost or neglected. What happens is that the remaining arts become either swollen or enfeebled. Without the liberal arts to give purpose to them, the useful arts explode into runaway techniques--that is, technology. Without those same liberal arts, which enable them to illuminate human experience, the fine arts become dilettantish or obscure, occupied with empty gestures. Without application or propriety, such as the useful and fine arts respectively can teach, the liberal arts themselves degenerate, becoming dull exercises for pedants or dangerous propaganda for fanatics. The Paideia Program means to avoid these perversions, assuming that none of them can be fended off unless all are, which is to say unless each of the kinds of art is given its due (pp. 141-142).

The arts which are to be included in the operation of the Paideia program are: music, drama, dance, drawing, painting, sculpture (or modeling), and crafts. While it is not appropriate for the purposes of this study to examine the workings of the Paideia program in any

detail, it should be noted that Van Doren presumes that experiences in the arts will not have as their aim the production of "painters, poets, dancers, or actors," but will develop an ability as a totality, but to develop sufficient competence "...in all the arts--useful and fine, as well as liberal--for continued learning and practice to go on" (p. 145). This is to be accomplished through a combination of coaching, discussion, and the delivery of information with the degree of teacher "intrusiveness" depending on the activity.

While the Paideia Proposal was meant primarily as a curricular pattern for education prior to college, its integration of the fine arts within the total fabric of the curriculum is not without significance for post-secondary education. The recognition and central status which it granted to the arts within a coherently organized general education schema may well provoke some thoughtful reassessment of fine arts in college general education programs on the part of college and university faculty.

Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American High Education (1984), a report issued by a panel established by the National Institute of Education and chaired by Kenneth Mortimer, found, among other things, that the college curricula had become excessively vocational and that there was a great need for college and university faculty and governing bodies to produce demonstrable improvements in student knowledge, capacities, skills and attitudes between entrance and graduation (Chronicle of Higher Education, October 24, 1984, p. 2).

Taking as its charge the whole fabric of higher education, the

panel did not single out general education programs for examination. Its primary focus was on methods and goals to improve the effectiveness of higher education programs and increase student involvement in the process. Nevertheless, two of their recommendations for "realizing high expectations" were that all bachelor's degree recipients should have at least two full years of liberal education, even if this meant that some professional fields would have to extend undergraduate programs beyond four years (Involvement in Learning, 1984, p. 41) and that liberal education requirements should be expanded and reinvigorated. In this latter regard the panel members suggested two directions to give focus to the change: (1) insure that curricular content is not only directly addressed to subject matter, but also to the development of capacities of analysis, problem solving, communication and synthesis and (2) that students and faculty integrate knowledge from various disciplines (p. 43).

Thus, while not directly acknowledging the fine arts, the proposals allowed room for change and expansion of the typical general education program in such a manner that the fine arts could once again be re-considered.

While this document, which became generally known as the Mortimer Report, after the chair of the panel, was not without its critics (Newell, 1984) who often found it long on advice and prescription but short on ideas. Nevertheless, as Newell acknowledged, this report, along with others which had appeared or were in progress, did its share in calling for a reassessment of the value placed on undergraduate education in general.

A Nation at Risk (1983) had already alerted the academic community and the general public to loss of primacy by this nation in commerce, industry, science and technology. Additionally, the report had documented a decline in scores on achievement tests, as well as increasing costs in remedial education. Oriented as it was to issues in technological education, it had no direct impact on the issue of fine arts and general education. Like Involvement in Learning, however, it had stroked the fires of reassessment in education, and, in its case, raised the ideal of the learning society:

..at the heart of the Learning Society are educational opportunities extending far beyond the traditional institutions of learning, our schools and colleges. They extend into homes and workplaces; into libraries, art galleries, museums and science centers; indeed into every place where the individual can develop and mature in work and life (Chronicle of Higher Education, May 4, 1983, p. 12).

This ideal of a "Learning Society", while including the arts as institutionalized in libraries and museums, also could conceivably suggest that the fine arts, especially when considered in company with the needs of technological education, continue to find outlets outside the academic world.

The core curriculum which the report recommended for state and local high school graduation requirements, was built around "Five New Basics": English, math, science, social studies and computer science, with an additional suggestion that college-bound students take two years of a foreign language.

The fine and performing arts were dealt with in the following fashion:

The high school curriculum should also provide students with

programs requiring rigorous effort in subjects that advance students' personal, educational, and occupational goals, such as the fine and performing arts and vocational education. These areas complement the New Basics and they should demand the same level of performance as the basics (Chronicle, 1983, p. 14).

Once again, the fine arts were not integral and central to the educational mission but peripherally "complementary" much like pre-vocational training. Their share in the new program called for in a Nation At Risk was to be allowed into the system as junior partners, but only if they also performed with the rigor and proficiency called for in the report. In effect, the prescription of the report was for more school time, more rigor, more of The New Basics, more attention to technology, both as subject-matter and as the source of instructional tools, and more attention to achievement as demonstrated in standardized testing programs. These were all worthy objectives, but provision for the fine arts, and thus a reflection of their status amongst this group, was minimal.

The appearance of High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America by Boyer (1983) and A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future by Goodlad (1984) added still other elements to the discussion.

Assuming that a core of common learning was essential, Boyer, in a fashion similar to his earlier work with Levine on the college general education curriculum, proposed that this core for the high school be a study of the "consequential ideas, experiences, and traditions common to all of us by virtue of our membership in the human family at a particular moment in history" (p. 302).

Among the highlights of the proposed core curriculum were literature, United States history, Western civilization, non-Western

civilization, science and the natural world, technology, mathematics, and foreign language as well as civics, health and work. The arts were accorded a place in this core in much the same fashion as they had been in the Boyer-Levine report:

The arts are an essential part of the human experience. They are not a frill. We recommend that all students study the arts to discover how human beings use nonverbal symbols and communicate not only with words but through music, dance and the visual arts (p. 304).

Thus, the Boyer recommendation once again places the arts in a central locale of the common core or general education curriculum for all students.

Goodlad's position in A Place Called School, assumes as its base that: "Schools must do the educating not consciously done elsewhere in society. This includes providing systematic encounters with all the major domains of knowledge, encounters designed to inform, enlighten, and stimulate thought" (p. 32). Noting that the Harvard Report of 1945 had specified how the twin goals of assisting young people to fulfill their potential and of reminding them of common culture were also to be reflected in the high school curricula, Goodlad reminds us that the arts were essentially placed in an elective sphere along with agriculture, vocational and business courses and other practical fields. Although the authors of the Harvard Report had acknowledged many times these courses were not wholly vocational and thus the break between them and general education was not complete (p. 139).

In his own recommendations for curricular structure and reflecting what knowledge should be made available to "reflect the



major domains," Goodlad mentions that one way to resolve the dilemmas faced today in schools contending with career-training for the marketplace, pre-vocational study, and the preservation of some sense of liberal learning throughout would be:

specification by accrediting agencies that not just the curriculum of each school but that of each student represent a balance of studies over the three years of the senior high school. If the minimum were 15% English, 10% in each of mathematics, social studies, vocational education, the arts, and physical education, and 5% in foreign languages, a student still would have 20% of his or her time for following up special interests in any of these (p. 163).

While conceding that "tracking" and other practices of school management might not make this solution an easy or practical one, Goodlad still clearly suggests something about a desired composition of curricular content in this proposal.

Much of the substance in this book comes from a survey of schools conducted by Goodlad and his associates. The patterns which they saw in the arts amongst these schools, ranging from elementary to high school, supply some sense of the current status and attention to the arts on this level.

The visual arts and music dominated the arts curriculum of the elementary schools, with junior highs following this emphasis by courses such as Art 7, 8, 9 and Music or Vocal Music 7, 8, and 9. To this array of relatively common courses in music, visual art and general art appreciation, senior high schools often added a wide array of arts and crafts and, most particularly, specialized music courses. At the elementary school level, the visual arts, drama, dance and physical education were the only subjects not oriented to textbooks,

and at both the elementary and secondary levels paper-and-pencil tests were used less in the arts than in other subjects. Consistently at all levels students rated the arts as more "interesting and enjoyable than the academic subject fields and also as relatively unimportant and easy" (p. 219).

Goodlad's assessment of arts instruction in the arts at these levels was one of concern. He found (pp. 219-220) that art classes tended to be too dominated by the "ambience of other academic subjects," and prone to be characterized by rule-finding, finding the right answer and lower cognitive processes. In essence, he did not find that the classroom conduct and atmosphere conveyed the picture of individual expression and artistic creativity so often promulgated in the literature.

He also found a "noticeable absence" of emphasis on the arts as cultural expression and artifact. While noting that the need for expression lies just back of the human need for food, water and socialization, he formed the impression that:

..the arts programs in the schools...go little beyond coloring, polishing and playing--and much of this goes on in classes such as social studies as a kind of auxiliary activity rather than as art in its own right. What does not come through in our data is much if any indication that the arts was being perceived as central to personal satisfaction in a world rich in art forms, processes and products. To grow up without the opportunity to develop such sophistication in arts appreciation is to grow up deprived (p. 220).

It should be noted that Goodlad is clearly not hostile to a role for the arts in education, and most particularly a central role in a core general education curriculum. His support for such a role is clear in a piece on "The Arts and Education" written with Morrison in 1980.

The solutions offered by Goodlad and his associates for the instructional and content problems they found in the schools they surveyed as being representative of national issues, are not germane to the topic of this study, but it is interesting to note that among the recommendations were a number which pre-supposed closer connections between colleges and universities and the schools.

Thus, a larger academic community is once again involved in the issue of general education and, for the purposes of this study, fine arts in particular.

Taken together with the catalog analyses of Dressel and Delisle as well as that Levine as referred to earlier, the reform reports of the early 1980's tend to show the fine arts and general education concerns as being fluctuating elements. While without exception, all major reports will acknowledge the arts in one fashion or another, the degree of centrality and importance accorded the fine arts can range from the integral and integrating function given the arts in The Paideia Proposal to an almost peripheral assignment in A Nation at Risk.

Furthermore, national reports and assessments seldom undertake to specify course content below a certain goal-oriented level, nor to sort out competing pedagogical points of view about proper aims within disciplines. The all-encompassing language of national reports, the specification of "required" units towards graduation as reported in college catalogs share a common flaw: they can be seen, at best, only as second or even third-hand versions of the thinking of faculty who, after all, must do the actual instigating and implementing of

curricular change.

To a marked degree, college and university general education programs, even within state-supported systems, are not mandated on a district or state-wide level as with elementary and secondary schools in many cases. To that degree, the attitudes of faculty members towards the role for the fine arts and towards the many propositions which have been offered in the literature for expanding that role are important.

Assessment of Faculty Attitudes Towards the Fine Arts  
in General Education

A review of the literature on the fine arts and general education has revealed there have been no studies conducted with specific focus on the assessment of the attitudes by liberal arts college faculty members towards the role of fine arts in general education.

Jensen (1982) conducted an analysis of attitudes toward fine arts amongst Nevada state legislators, lobbyists, school board trustees, superintendents, curriculum coordinators, principals and fine arts educators. Her findings did reveal a high degree of support amongst this group for the fine arts even in the light of negative financial trends in the schools, and the loss of music, visual arts, drama and dance classes from school programs across the country.

Her findings additionally suggested that the respondents agreed fine arts education could be successfully intermingled with academic instruction to provide a basis for producing a well-rounded student, and that fine arts education should be considered basic to the general public school curriculum.

Peterson (1978) investigating the feasibility of initiating a comprehensive arts in general education program in an elementary school curriculum, used a questionnaire to determine the status of one arts discipline--music education--in some 45 school districts in DuPage County, Illinois. The study revealed that large-scale aesthetic education programs were almost non-existent in the sample sites and that even music education programs varied considerably in scope and content. There was also evidence that community involvement for planning in the area of arts education was of lower priority than in other curricular areas.

As reported in her work, Instant Art, Instant Culture, (1982) Chapman used a Teacher Viewpoint Survey as part of her research, but the focus of this survey was amongst the direct practitioners of the arts, in particular the visual arts.

The general discussion in Chapman's work, however, make it one of the most important pieces on the issue of the arts in education to emerge in recent years.

On the basis that less than one percent of a student's time in school up to graduation is customarily spent with a qualified teacher studying the arts, Chapman notes that this insignificant amount of time, which does not include in its calculation the somewhat greater time spent on literature, is often spent with teachers who are under-qualifies.

In this and other aspects of pre-college instruction in the arts, she sees a consistent and pervasive neglect of the arts and in her own field of the visual arts in particular.

Chapman sees the situation arising not because of a policy of non-support for the arts, but of a selective and paying-attention-to-the-most-visible support which she sees resulting in:

Typical practice in our schools prevents the majority of youth receiving a basic education in the arts, either by restricting access to instruction so that only the most determined and talented can obtain it, or by so narrowly representing the world of art that youngsters are ill prepared to appreciate it unless, or until, they go to college. Indeed, if we wanted to design a national policy to insure that art would be comprehended and consciously valued only by a privileged social class, we would not need to do much more than translate many current practices into explicit statements of policy (pp. 11-12).

Thus, Chapman sees the current practice being one which, in effect, culturally disenfranchises those who do not go on to post-secondary education.

If instruction in the arts and experience in aesthetic encounters is also not provided consistently at the college level, then the ultimate outcome is only to extend her charge.

Seeing one of the major flaws of current practice to be not only the lack of significant instructional opportunity in the arts, but also the marked deficiency in providing a rationale and careful sequencing of what experiences are available, Chapman also suggests that each of the arts is to have its legitimate place in the curriculum and is not to be diluted by contrived interrelationships amongst the arts or by making the arts serve only the aims of other disciplines.

Chapman found support for her aim of arts education to be the development in students of abilities to perceive, to appreciate, to

critique, and to judge, as well as to create by examining the deficiencies and problems of other current modalities in arts education programs which often seemed to be attempting too much with too little in time, facilities, or adequate teacher training.

Her Teacher Viewpoint Survey, which had an "N" of 600 and covered all teaching levels (four) from elementary through high school, including K-12 supervisors, was essentially an examination of curricular content and goals, time and space management and allocation, and professional activities of teachers. It was reported only in terms of percentage response to questionnaire items and no attempt was made to analyze correlations, such as relationship of years of teaching experience to differing responses. It has value in its own realm, but cannot be considered useful for this study.

Lyons (1978) replicated an earlier research study by Dressel, Mayhew and McGrath (1958) on the liberal arts as viewed by faculty members in professional schools. In his examination, Lyons used the same instrument as the original 1958 study, and followed essentially the same data collection procedures. Some 5,948 faculty members from 456 different administrative units participated in the study. (The 1958 study had some 182 academic administrative units--departments, colleges, schools--and some 3,262 respondents.) Materials were not available to match respondents or institutions for a longitudinal response measure, but other aspects of data collection and organization were similar.

While the target population, faculty in professional schools involved with agriculture, business, education, engineering, home

economics, journalism, music, nursing and pharmacy, is distinctly different, in most regards, than the population selected for this study, it is interesting to note that one of the conclusions reached in the Lyons study was that there has been a diminution in the degree of favorability towards the liberal arts on the part of faculty in professional schools from 1958 to 1978 (p. 60).

Only art and music were included in a listing of subjects common to liberal arts programs required of students in these professional schools. Provision was made in the study for examining respondent's reactions from each of the types of professional school.

The 1978 respondents indicated differing views about art as a subject in the liberal arts general education program for their students. About two-thirds of the faculty in agriculture, business, nursing, pharmacy, and engineering indicated a preference that art be an optional subject. A majority of respondents from these professions as well as journalism, had indicated the same preference in 1958. Half or more of the faculty in education, home economics, journalism and music would either require art or encourage their students to take it. Results in the Lyons survey, however, revealed that even in the fields of agriculture, engineering, and pharmacy significant minorities of the faculty (15 to 30 percent) would require or encourage their students to study art (pp. 126-129).

As might be expected, a majority of faculty respondents on music faculties would require their students to study the subject as part of their liberal education component. According to the results in the Lyons study, about half of the respondents in education, many of whose



students would have certain professional links with the field, would require or encourage the study of music. Outside of the fields of education and music, 60 to 75 percent of the other faculty respondents would prefer that the subject be optional in a student's general education core program (p. 143).

General trends found by Lyons included a developing tendency to not make liberal arts subjects required and for faculty to suggest strongly or require those liberal arts subjects that had specific application to their professions (pp. 155-156).

There were other measures in the Lyons study for assessing the attitude of administrators as perceived by the faculty, but since the items all dealt with "liberal arts" in a fairly global fashion, their applicability to the fine arts in particular is questionable.

A portion of the Lyons study has been reported under joint authorship (Lyons & Vandemeer, 1979) with specific attention to the faculties of schools of business.

In another measure of attitudes towards liberal education, this time some 18 faculty members and administrators connected with an all-university council on liberal education (Boyer & Ahlgren, 1982), an instrument was used in an attempt to uncover what the researchers called "visceral priorities" in liberal education.

One of the investigators, Boyer, is a co-author of Liberal Education in Transition (AAHE, 1980), a work in which the passion of debate on what properly constitutes liberal education has been traced to the fact that faculty often have competing visions, not always clearly expressed, and that this factor fans the flames of

disagreement rather than some antagonism to the ideal of liberal education itself.

Assuming that these strong underlying priorities concerning liberal education, when not uncovered, are part of the confusion which often attends discussion on general education, Boyer and Ahlgren posit a "typology" of educators essential views. They present three heartfelt positions as being the basis for the essence of liberal education: intent, content, consequence (p. 207).

In their formulation, the "intentionalist" priority is to concentrate on the desire and competence of the faculty to offer students a liberal education; the "content" enthusiasts include the various schools of curriculum philosophy such as "particularists," "distributionists," and "methodists," who find the heart of liberal education in a particular set of subjects, an enforced variety of subjects, or in the nature of the teaching process, all according to their particular philosophical "school" of curricular development; the "consequentialists" focus on outcomes, the resultant skills and character of the liberally educated person.

Boyer and Ahlgren used an instrument which contained three sets of probes consisting of a variety of items and aiming to establish a profile of responses relevant to (1) institutions, (2) individuals, (3) a provocation and reassessment of the respondent's own thinking. Although the questionnaire contained these three probes, only responses to the institution-evaluation probe were analyzed further than the first stage.

Despite the fact that the small sample would appear to be

consistent of faculty and administrators who had worked together for some time on the issues of liberal education and thus would assumedly have a degree of cohesiveness, Boyer and Ahlgren found a striking diversity in their responses. The "visceral responses" were scattered all over the structural map of potential clusters.

The researchers commented that even in feedback sessions on the questionnaire instrument statements were made about what was assumed to be agreement, only to be followed by the discovery that agreement was not present at all.

As Boyer and Ahlgren state in their conclusion:

Together, the two propositions of diversity and mutual unawareness of visceral priorities are highly consistent with the notion that confusion prevails in discussions of liberal education. How else might we explain educators talking to each other about liberal education in meeting after meeting, month after month, and yet not realizing the extent to which they disagree on its very essence? (p. 213).

It would seem that in measuring faculty attitudes about any aspect of liberal or general education, a measure of care is necessary in assuming that statements made about specific planning of curricula or programs are necessarily revealing of covert or internalized feelings about the essence of ultimate goals or purposes.

While further research to confirm and extend the work of Boyer and Ahlgren is obviously necessary, and was invited by these researchers, their original work remains provocative as well as heuristic.

Flexner and Berrettini (1981) conducted a survey of faculty and administrators to determine the current status of general education and to develop a profile of response in regard to certain key issues:

(1) the distinction between general and liberal education, (2) the supporting philosophical or conceptual bases of general education, (3) its societal goals and intellectual orientation, (4) the pace within general education for interdisciplinarity, and (5) the role of general education in the graduate as well as the undergraduate curricula.

While there was no special focus on the issue of the role of fine arts within general or liberal education, one of the areas of their investigation, the basic philosophy of general or liberal education does set a context for any investigation of some component within general education.

The sample for this investigation consisted of faculty and administrators in some 235 two- and four-year institutions across the country. Those selected for the initial sample had been identified by the researchers as having some professional connection with general education programs, were heads of professional programs in higher education, or had made their interest in general education known through publication or other activity (p. 6).

Some 500 questionnaires were sent and 330 (66 percent) were returned. This group was almost equally divided between teaching faculty (47 percent) and administrators (45 percent). Major fields of teaching and research were, in descending order, humanities (36 percent), education (28 percent), social and behavioral sciences (21 percent), and physical and biological sciences (8 percent). The remaining seven percent included mathematics, business, engineering, art and music (p. 6).

One of the item areas on the questionnaire had to do with the

conceptual basis of general education since one of the principal aims of the researchers was to examine the differences in the perception of those who distinguish between general and liberal education and those who believe that the two terms are interchangeable.

Respondents were asked to select one position from amongst a list supplied as being representative of, first, their personal view, and, second, of what they perceived to be the perspective of their institution.

Three philosophical positions were explicitly supplied with a provision for the respondent to create his/her own if none of the positions offered seemed suitable. While the statements are fairly broad, they nevertheless did provide a reasonable sorting mechanism:

Knowledge is valued as an end in itself, and the development of the human reason--the means by which knowledge is attained--is consequently a major emphasis. The program of study or curriculum consisted of the humanistic and scientific disciplines through which the cultural heritage is transmitted.

Knowledge is viewed as one means of attaining a more abundant personal life, a stronger and freer society, and other ends considered desirable. The emphasis is on the affective as well as the cognitive growth of the student and hence on a variety of educational experiences designed to facilitate such growth.

General education has and/or needs no distinctive philosophical basis; it comprises the "breadth" component of the curriculum and involves the study of a number of subjects common to all students in a particular college (p. 13).

Of the three positions offered the respondents in this study, the second probably most clearly would offer an hospitable avenue for the fine arts, while the first would be a vehicle for the "cultural transmission" approach and might, at least initially, be somewhat less inclined to a central role for the arts representing, as it does, a

more traditional avenue. The third position begs the question.

Of the 331 respondents to answer this question in the Flexner and Berrettini study, 115 (35 percent) selected the first statement as the best expression of the philosophical basis of general education. However, a substantial majority of the respondents (194 or 59 percent) identified the second statement as the best reflection of that conceptual framework.

As if to lend weight to the charge that general education remains the step-child of the academic world, nearly 35 percent of the respondents (115) selected the third statement when they were asked what position best represented their institution's perspective. Only three percent had selected this statement as representing their personal point of view.

Of those who personally preferred the second statement, Flexner and Berrettini report that almost half (93 or 49 percent) attributed the same position to their institution. Among those who personally identified the first statement as their personal choice, 33 percent (38) selected the second statement for their institution and 27 percent (31) the first statement.

Thus, if we assume that the second statement bodes well for the fine arts no matter what conceptual "school" or frame of reference might be dominant in selecting the particular approach taken in fine arts curricula, this research by Flexner and Berrettini can be seen as confirming some potential role for the fine arts in general education beyond the traditional one of cultural transmission and appreciation.

A study with specific emphasis on establishing a profile of the

attitudes of educators in regard to the theory and practice in art education was conducted by Richardson (1982) amongst secondary school art educators and administrators using a questionnaire instrument. Both groups were asked to rank 12 goals of art education for real and ideal programs and to cite impediments to the implementation of these goals. They were also asked to supply data about course offering, the status of art education in their schools, and to select characteristic artists.

Richardson constructed the goal statements through a review of the literature and a brief history of the trends and theories of art education. Her research also revealed little attention to current criticism and dialogues with artists as part of art education.

Data provided by the survey showed that those goals which ranked highest included creativity and self-expression, production of art, interpretation of the environment, art appreciation and an improved quality of life. The least restrictive goals were the highest ranking.

Information on course offerings indicated an emphasis on media and processes. Impediments to implementation of the goals revealed the greatest need to be for staff development and improved community relations. There was also evidence of an eclecticism in approach with broad support for a variety of goals.

Her general conclusion was that educators support those humanistic goals that promise benefits for the individual and society rather than a narrow focus on content.

Support for the social and individual benefits would seem to be

confirmed evidence which is available regarding public support for the arts.

To cite only a few examples, the 16th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools, as published in summary form in the Phi Delta Kappan of September, 1984, that some 51 percent of respondents in the national totals accepted as an educational goal "To develop the ability to think--creatively, objectively, and analytically" (p. 38). In terms specific to the arts, some 35 percent accepted the goal "To develop an appreciation for and participation in the arts, music, literature, theater, etc" (p. 38). That this response might be so low, although higher by some 15 percent than a goal to promote physical development through sports programs, may be accounted for by the vast array of goals from which respondents had to select--some 25 and some perception that they were, perhaps, ranking all of these on a sequential scale rather than the more direct measure of a 1 to 10 scale to indicate degree of importance.

Evidence from surveys on Americans and the Arts, conducted in 1973, 1975, 1980 and 1984 by the National Research Center of the Arts, would seem to suggest that there is considerable public support for the arts and, specifically, for arts in education.

While the focus of the portion of the study dealing with the arts in education places emphasis on education prior to college, the data are suggestive of a particular climate of support.

Results of the 1984 survey, as highlighted in Americans and the Arts 1984, reveal that a nearly unanimous majority of Americans (91 percent) believe that children in school should "be exposed to



theater, music, dance, exhibitions of painting and sculpture and similar cultural events" (p. 28). This is the same as the response for the 1975 survey.

In addition, the number of people who believe that the arts should be taught as regular, full-credit courses had increased since 1980 in the case of four specific activities: writing stories and poems (from 79 percent to 83 percent), playing a musical instrument (from 78 percent to 80 percent), drawing, painting, or sculpting (from 75 percent to 78 percent), and acting (from 59 percent to 60 percent) (p. 28).

The 1984 study did reveal a slight drop in support for some activities (from 1 to 3 percentage points): music appreciation, voice and singing, art appreciation, photography or film making, modern dance or movement, and various craft activities.

Yet a substantial number of those polled (some 74 percent) still felt that even such courses as listed above, whether for full credit or not, should still be paid for by the school system as a regular part of the school budget.

There was also remarkable stability in the public responses between 1975 and 1984 in feeling that while their schools, based on the respondent's own knowledge, were offering courses in music, art, creative writing, theater, dance and photography, even more such courses should be offered.

One of the conclusions draw from the data collected in the 1984 survey and reported by the research center, an affiliate of Louis Harris and Associates, was:

Despite some marginal declines, the responses make it amply clear that most people do not want the arts relegated to a peripheral role in the classroom, nor do they believe that the arts programs should have to hinge on the uncertainties of funding from outside the school budget. In the education of the country's young people, the arts are viewed as they are in nearly every other phase of American life--as indispensable (p. 28).

While the sponsorship of this survey, and the use made of the results may be part of an "arts lobby," and what Smith (1978) had earlier referred to as "the new policy complex" in arts education (Smith, 1978, p. 88) the results would still seem to substantiate a high degree of support for the arts in education and reflective of public attitudes in general.

Any attitude survey on the issue of fine arts and the educational schema, should also take into account the attitudes of students insofar as they form part of the proximate inter-active community with which faculty members deal as they formulate attitudes about goals and objectives in educational planning.

As published in the Chronicle of Higher Education on January 16, 1985, the American Freshman Norms for Fall 1984 reported by Astin for the American Council on Education, reveal some interesting aspects of the freshman profile. When their attitudes on various goals for college are examined in light of fine arts implications, the following statistics appear for freshman in four-year colleges, the potential site typology for this study:

## OBJECTIVES CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL OR VERY IMPORTANT

	Four-Year Colleges		
	Public	Private	Protestant
Achieving in a performing art	12.0%	14.6%	12.6%
Writing original works	11.7%	15.4%	12.2%
Creating artistic works	11.2%	16.7%	10.3%
Developing a philosophy of life	45.9%	49.9%	49.1%
Being very well-off financially	71.7%	69.2%	62.6%

## ATTITUDES AND ACTIVITIES

Participated in speech or debate	21.3%	25.5%	24.4%
Played a musical instrument	43.0%	45.5%	48.9%
Participated in a music contest	21.3%	19.5%	28.6%
Had a major part in a play	21.3%	23.2%	25.2%
Won an award in an art contest	15.4%	19.3%	15.3%
Attended public recital or concert	75.2%	77.8%	77.3%

Source: "The American Freshman Norms for Fall, 1985" Chronicle of Higher Education, January 16, 1985, p. 16.

With this profile in mind, it would appear that the typical freshman class at a four-year liberal arts college, if they are at all representative of the nation-wide pattern, are going to be oriented to career goals and have some experience with the arts, but largely on a spectator level.

In embarking on an assessment of attitudes towards a role for the fine arts in college general education of a significant part of that general public, faculty members in liberal arts colleges, two final factors must be considered.

It must be recognized that even amongst arts educators there has been and will probably continue to be disagreements about goals, modalities, and practices.

There also has to be an knowledgement of what Conrad and Pratt (1981) have referred to as a "delicate balance" to be achieved in the relationship between fine arts and liberal education--an equilibrium which must seek to preserve the holistic goals of liberal education without allowing distortion to come about from any single factor in the curricular structure.

If the educators in the fine arts cannot come to some consistency of agreement, then this balancing act may be compromised from the outset. Certainly any measurement of faculty attitudes about a role for the fine arts in general education must recognize that the last 20 years have seen the growth of manifold numbers of projects, proposals, claims, and assessments of possible roles for the arts.

Not all of these claims have been fully investigated or demonstrated as suggested by Acuff (1977). By raising the question of the distinction between rhetoric and reality in assessing the claims for a variety of roles for the arts in general education, Acuff reminded her audience of many methodological problems raised by proposals for cognitive education, parallels amongst the arts, affective education components, Artist in Schools programs, etc. The rhetoric of these claims for new territory for the arts in the main-stream of education may have validity, but most investigation, more accumulation of data, more experience in practice was necessary at the time of her writing and may well be today.

Though certainly no enemy of arts education, Smith (1978) also had doubts about the validity of many of the claims being made about a variety of roles for the arts in general education, referred to as the

AGE movement. In examining the arts in general education literature he found that its conception of general education to be:

..uniformed by standard texts and incapable of being pinned down to anything definite. "General education" appears to be almost synonymous with "curriculum" in the sense of everything that happens to be taught, including, one presumes, driver training and band practice (p. 89).

In effect, one of his charges against many of the proposals is that they share the same defect which Kridel later (1980) laid at the doorstep of the literature in general education: that it does not attend adequately to theoretical and historical foundations for curriculum and thereby neglects significant modes of inquiry that are emerging!

As well as finding lapses in coherence in the presumptions about general education, Smith found that there was an almost bewildering array of ways for the arts to be "in" general education, from appearance as a distinct subject or areas of instruction, to being part of an interdisciplinary study, to bring some kind of participant in the "integration of the arts into the total pattern of the curriculum" or the suffusing of the arts throughout the curriculum (pp. 89-90). This latter approach, by the way, was being suggested mostly in elementary school program orientations.

While noting the many contradictions present in the literature, and seeing the almost inconceivable differences lurking beneath the surface, Smith saved his greatest wrath for the approach to arts education which would suffuse the curriculum:

Confused, half-baked theorizing has a way of translating itself into silliness in the classroom, of which the public has had more than enough. The climate for arts education could thus become

even more inclement as a consequence. Despite assurances in the arts in general education literature that arts specialists will prosper and increase, specialists should think twice before relying on this approach to remove them from the endangered species list. When art permeates the curriculum and can be entrusted not only to teachers of other subjects, but also to artists-in-residence, visiting community representatives and the like, will it be long before the thought suggests itself that expensive arts specialists are perhaps not needed after all? (p. 95).

Fortunately for the purposes of this present study, the arts-through-the-curriculum approach is not on which has been advocated for college programs, nor, with the traditional department-discipline organization of most colleges and universities is such an approach ever likely to be offered.

However, the knowledge that arts educators themselves are in disagreement about goals, objectives, and modalities is useful when it comes time to analyze and interpret any results of an attitude survey amongst college faculty from all disciplines.

As college faculty might consider the question of the role to be played by the fine arts within a liberal education tradition, what does the literature suggest as a model for such consideration? Conrad and Pratt, in an examination of this issue supplied this model in their article, "Measure for Measure: Liberal Education and the Fine Arts--A Delicate Balance," in The Review of Higher Education for Winter, 1981.

In developing a philosophical base for defining and outlining what constitutes a liberal education, Conrad and Pratt cite Van Doren (1943) and the idea that a liberal education is "complete as possible" so as to help develop a "template" that aids in the exploration of

uncharted territory. In effect, this type of education is a patterning process whose basic design establishes a method of inquiry which is limited only by individual ability and interest (pp. 48-49).

They also note that a liberal education should so develop as to bridge the gap between work and play, empowering the individual in all of the arts and sciences in such a way that one's work-time and one's play-time are not barricaded, the one from the other.

Finally, a liberal education should, in its process, consider the significant human questions and represent the many-faceted aspects of human experience.

When it comes to the fine arts within a curriculum for liberal education, Conrad and Pratt assume that history has been recorded in human terms in painting, poetry, sculpture, plays, music and other artistic artifacts. As they suggest: "If these fine arts are basic to the human experience, and education that reflects upon human-ness, that gives one a "connected view" of that process, ought to include these arts at the core of its curriculum, alongside the other human arts" (p. 52). In assuming that one aspect of connectedness is liberal education as an integrating process, an ability to think holistically, to see the relationships of parts to the whole, then the arts represent certain skills which can contribute to the development of such a capacity.

In essence, Conrad and Pratt see the arts representing in their very essence and practice analogues of skills in seeing, creating, using patterns of thought and performance. The arts, as with music and visual arts, are also always seeking new patterns, new modalities

of perception, structuring, and communicating. In this process they frequently reflect, as part of the core of this process, the context of the time.

In attempting to achieve a unity of effect, the artist uses sparse materials within given frames of reference matching, as Conrad and Pratt would have it, the same pattern of unity-seeking in the physical sciences who aim to work with as few basic principles as possible.

As suggested by their discussion, the arts can supply, therefore a reference to one of the central features of human sense-making activity:

Students of the arts in the twentieth century are aware that artists in all areas of the fine arts are seeking new vehicles to relate to a new age. Every other field of human activity impacts upon artistic endeavor; and the artist seeks to communicate the essence of this activity. The difficulty that the artistic process encounters when seeking to capture the essence of a yet larger process should not go unnoticed. Simply stated, enduring art is a masterpiece, whether temporal or non-temporal, of contextualization (p. 54).

This sense of context, and unity of purpose, is also found in the humanities as well as the arts and the sciences. In all cases, there is an attempt to "...relate as simply as possible with a rather sparse set of techniques an understanding of the human condition" (p. 55).

Suggesting that as far back as Aristotle the observation has been made of man's desire to know, to seek understanding, and, in so doing, to seek purpose, Conrad and Pratt posit that it is through creativity man strives for purpose, for glimpses of the whole, and that while creativity is confined to no single discipline, the artistic endeavor "...squarely addresses man's creative well-spring", and further that



the arts:

..are the spiritual link between the intellectual and the emotional. The arts are the synapse between the affective and the cognitive. They reflect man's lowest moments, when man is furthest away from humanity, and man's highest moments, when man is closest to the essence of humanity. By juxtaposing the empiricism of the sciences with the questions of the humanities, art symbolically interprets man's models, simultaneously laying bare the value of the perceived combination (p. 56).

If this approach is to be accepted then, as Conrad and Pratt suggest, a balance must be struck and the fine arts can "...no longer be kept waiting in the wings" (p. 57).

That there has been some measure of acceptance of the history of the arts as a part of liberal education, as Conrad and Pratt concede, may be seen as an effort to segregate rather than integrate. Seeing the arts as a process, not merely content, must suggest that neither history of the arts courses nor studio arts courses can be successfully addressed as separate entities.

If the fine arts are to be cast in the role of being, as characterized by Conrad and Pratt, "...a vital force, a unifying spirit," (p. 57) in an integrating process which seems to be more and more present in our society, then curricular decisions must be reached by appropriate groups of faculty in a variety of settings, each of which will have to reflect a set of goals and objectives.

#### Summary

A review of the literature on fine arts and general education has revealed that the fine arts as distinct departments or disciplines have moved from near-obscurity in the nineteenth century to full recognition as curricular entities in most colleges and universities

in the twentieth century, with customary recognition as representing some aspect in general education curricula.

Although Rudolph (1977) has characterized the growth of the fine arts disciplines as one of the most "unobtrusive" curricular developments of the twentieth century, that development has now reached what has been called a degree of "maturity" after a lengthy period of slow and not always well-supported growth (Morrison, 1973; 1985).

In that same period and most particularly since the mid 1960's there has been an explosion of publications, proposals, projects, and creation of research and curriculum-development agencies having as their focus the role of the fine arts in general or core curriculum programs at all levels with much of the emphasis being placed on the elementary and secondary school program.

There is no consistency to the philosophical premises advocated in these myriads of sources, but certain schemes have emerged as being recognizable clusters: (1) arts-across-the-curriculum, (2) relatively traditional aesthetic education programs, (3) attempts to investigate and relate arts education to (a) cognitive development, (b) affective education and human development of that domain, and (c) relationship of arts education to the recognition and facilitation of creativity. The difficulty in assessing these clusters, however, lies in the lack of clear centralities of philosophic bases even within the clusters.

The sheer volume of works, however, when accompanied by more quantitative measures suggest that most arts educators still feel that the fine arts remain "beyond the pale" when it comes to significant

representation in customary general education programs.

With a few notable exceptions, most of the reports and commission studies on the state of general education in the early 1980's made few provisions in their recommendations for any but narrow and traditional roles for the fine arts. Two of the exceptions, The Paideia Proposal (1984) and Boyer's High School (1983) while giving, in varying degrees some attention to the arts in a core curriculum, were devoted to the general education issue on the secondary school level, not college programs.

Surprisingly, in the midst of calls for curricular change and general education concerns of the early 1980's there has been no effort to assess the attitudes of college faculty towards suggested roles for the fine arts in general education curricula. What evidence there is must be extrapolated from other types of surveys, and from evidences of continuing debate, if not dissension in the literature.

Faced with a professoriate likely to be in place for some time as a by-product of the tremendous growth in faculty ranks during the 1960's and the current tenured-in phenomenon, and the continuing pressures for adaptive college curricula in the face of financial exigencies in higher education, such a survey of faculty attitudes would seem to be timely and productive.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD OF RESEARCH

#### Purpose of Study

As has been demonstrated in the review of literature in Chapter II, there presently exists no questionnaire instrument which can be used to assess the attitudes of college faculty towards various propositions which have been advanced about the potential roles of fine arts courses in general education programs at the college level.

An examination of recent literature in the field, including related areas of educational philosophy, foundations, and curriculum development revealed no existing instrument which could be adapted for the purposes of this study.

Even an investigation of related areas of attitude profiles and existing inventory instruments as recorded in the latest (1985) Mental Measurements Yearbook produced no viable alternative to the production of a questionnaire specifically tailored to the purposes of this study.

Conrad and Pratt (1981) produced a most effective case in their article for the inclusion of fine arts as a necessary measure in the liberal education curriculum, but provided no instrumentality to measure faculty attitude on this issue.

Winter, McClelland and Stewart (1981) in a New Case for the Liberal Arts, while documenting at some length the confirmation of

beneficial effects of a liberal arts education in terms of outcomes measures, did not supply or even suggest a measure which would be useful in assessing existing faculty attitudes on the goals and objectives of such an education.

Stark and Morstain (1978) made use of a specific instrument in their research on educational orientations of faculty in liberal arts colleges. The Faculty Orientations Survey, which they used, is an instrument which contains attitudinal items drawn in turn from a companion inventory, the Student Orientations Survey. The items have been transferred with only slight adaptations. The universe for the faculty version, however, is still larger than that envisioned for this study. The Faculty Orientations Survey, for example, deals with attitudes towards the purposes of education, the processes of education, educational decision-making, and both power and peer relationships. Furthermore, while extrapolations from the 57 items can reveal disciplinary profiles, as Stark and Morstain suggest, it does not appear to yield specific responses on the role of fine arts. Any existing instrumentation cannot, of course, reveal attitudes on the part of faculty regarding propositions being specifically advanced in the literature.

There were some instruments, however, which proved to be of some value in planning what would have to be a new questionnaire for the purposes of this study.

The Educational Values Assessment, and the Institutional Goals Inventory as described in the Mental Measurements Yearbook (1985) as well as two scales found in Shaw and Wright (1967), The Education

Scale and Attitudes Towards Education, were helpful in establishing assessment structures as well as essential item design. In essence, the Likert or Thurstone-type scaling system and the derivation of scores via a simple mean of responses seemed to be a likely avenue of development. The use of a Likert variable-response mechanism would allow for control in assessing degrees of favorableness or unfavorableness on the part of faculty members to major issues in the relationship between fine arts and general education programs.

The first task in this study has been, therefore, the development and testing of such an instrument. Once this was accomplished, the questionnaire was then used to achieve the following purposes: (1) to determine the general favorableness or unfavorableness of faculty members at selective liberal arts colleges across the country towards the fine arts in general education programs, (2) to determine, specifically, the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness of faculty in these colleges towards a role for the fine arts in developing cognitive skills amongst students enrolled in general education program requirements, and (3) to determine what correlations, if any, exist between the expressed degree of favorableness or unfavorableness regarding the role of the fine arts in general education and variables of faculty rank, years of teaching experience, disciplinary area, type of institution attended by faculty for their undergraduate degree, the size of that institution, experience with fine arts courses as part of the undergraduate degree, and the existence of any "mentor" relationship which the faculty member may have experienced as a significant part of his undergraduate

experience.

A final purpose of the study was to make possible a thoughtful consideration of the leading issue--what role the arts should take in the curricula of general education programs at the college level--and in some measure evaluate the impact on college faculty of all disciplines of the vast body of literature produced within the last two decades dealing with this issue.

Although the aim of this study was meant to be primarily descriptive in nature, with a resultant "profile" of faculty attitudes towards a specific set of proposition based on that literature of the last 20 years, it was felt that certain empirical data and the testing of certain hypotheses concerning the etiology of attitudes would enhance the descriptive focus and provide information which would be meaningful in the formulation and implementation of general education programs. Thus, the following research hypotheses were formulated regarding possible relationships between degree of favorableness or unfavorableness recorded and sets of independent variables.

Based on the literature, it has been hypothesized that: (1) faculty members who attended a liberal arts college for their undergraduate degree will, as a group, manifest a higher level of approval for a significant role for the fine arts in general education or "core" programs than those faculty who attended a large university for their undergraduate degree; (2) that faculty who are in their earlier years of teaching will manifest a more favorable attitude towards a role for the fine arts in general education because their own development as faculty members will have been occurring during the

time when attitudes regarding this expanded role for the fine arts was being widely discussed; (3) that those faculty members who indicate their undergraduate general education program included the taking of one or more courses in any of the fine arts will have a more favorable opinion of the arts as a significant participant in general education; and (4) that faculty members who indicated a "mentorship" relation to a faculty member during their undergraduate educational experience will have a more favorable attitude towards a significant role for the fine arts in general education, irrespective of the field of their mentor.

All of these hypotheses are based on the assumption that the undergraduate experience is crucial in shaping an attitudinal ground for faculty members as they consider the issue of general education goals and purposes, an assumption clearly suggested by a number of sources as cited and discussed in the literature (Ben-David, 1981; Dressel, 1968; and Rudolph, 1984).

These hypotheses also find a basis in the position assumed by Shoenberg (1982) that, unlike faculty in large research institutions, members of the teaching faculty in liberal arts colleges, while amply qualified as scholars in both their training and often in practice, will be more attentive to the multiple aspects of liberal and general education. It is assumed for the purposes of his study that such a broadness of view will therefore be inclusive of the fine arts, no matter what the specialized discipline of the faculty member, and that this view is reflected in both the present attitudes of those teaching in liberal arts colleges, and in the influences these faculty members



may have received if they also attended a liberal arts college as an undergraduate.

### The Questionnaire Instrument

An examination of the literature in the field, as well as consultation of standard sources of available attitude survey instruments such as the Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook (1985) revealed that there was in existence no survey instrument suitable for the purposes of this study.

Consequently, a survey instrument had to be devised with two specific requirements in mind: (1) to provide a series of summary statements or propositions as advanced in the literature regarding the variety of goals and purposes for the fine arts in general education, in order to assess the attitude of faculty members to these propositions, and (2) to provide a means of collecting demographic data profiling the respondents to the survey in order to establish not only a description of this respondent pool, but also to measure what correlations, if any, existed between the nature of the responses and respondent characteristics.

Using the literature review as an initial source for item constructs, a pilot questionnaire was produced with a series of statements reflecting various attitudes regarding the goals of general education as well as some eight statements in the total number of 20 with a specific focus on the role of the fine arts within any general education program. These 20 statements were then read by a group of eight faculty members in various disciplines in two universities to determine essential clarity and ease of interpretation. This was

particularly crucial since the items as constructed had been taken directly from the literature and thus might suffer from lack of contextual setting.

This critical reading resulted in the modification of a number of the items for the sake of clarity. The re-edited items were then arranged in random sequence and a Likert-scaling of five steps was presented for opinionnaire response: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), No Opinion (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1).

Directionality of the instrument was preserved by preparing the scoring system to reverse the scale on those items which would represent a point of view antithetical to a favorable response for an organized general education core program with a significant role for the fine arts. A "score" on this instrument would be achieved as a simple mean of the responses.

Thus, this instrument had two purposes: (1) to assess the respondent's attitude toward an organized core type of general education program which might have a variety of purposes, and (2) the respondent's attitude toward a significant role for the fine arts in that type of program. The items specifically referring to the fine arts were imbedded in random fashion throughout the item text of the instrument.

This instrument, now titled: "College Community Survey on the Goals of a Liberal/General Education," was designed for survey purposes amongst many segments of the higher education community: faculty, staff and administrators. For that purpose, a simple set of demographic questions was designed and added to the instrument, asking

for information on the respondent's status: faculty, staff, or administration, type of institution in which the respondent was serving, age, highest academic degree held, years of teaching experience, type of institution where the respondent earned the bachelor's degree, the enrollment at that institution at the time of the respondent's attendance, and information about the nature of the general education program at that institution. For a complete copy of that instrument, see Appendix C.

In March of 1983 this pilot instrument was field-tested at this researcher's own institution, a state university in an urban setting with an enrollment of 10,000 students and a faculty of approximately 435. The major purpose in this pilot test was to determine the internal consistency of items and to test for ambiguity of any items. In effect, the item-editing group was being expanded in a more formal fashion, with some provision also for an initial run of data analysis.

A scoring system, with provision for reversing certain items was implemented to create a total score as a simple mean of responses. A separate scaling was also provided to isolate the responses on "arts items" as a discrete area.

This pilot instrument was then submitted to a random sampling of faculty in a variety of departments (N=20) with selection being based within department on a computer-generated random number selection.

The results of this pilot testing, also included in Appendix C, were of some interest as they indicated a relatively high degree of favorable response to a significant role for the fine arts in education in a structured core version of general education programs.

However, the size of the sample, and the limitations of single-site testing do not merit any extensive interpretation.

As a result of this testing, a second iteration of the instrument too place with some revision of the language of certain items, and the addition of two items to further highlight the issue of the role of fine arts in general education. The respondent data being elicited remained essentially the same, with one further provision for the actual identification of the respondent's undergraduate institution by name.

This second version of the questionnaire instrument, which appears in Appendix D, was then given a pilot test at two professional meetings: the Annual Meeting of the Society for Values in Higher Education at Carleton College in August of 1984, and the annual session of the Shakertown Conversations on General Education at Shakertown near Lexington, Kentucky in November of 1984. A total of 26 responses was gathered from these two sites (SVHE: N=13; Shakertown Conversations: N=13).

Expanding the sample size by this process was useful in revealing two weaknesses of the proposed instrument: (1) the focus on the issue of the role of fine arts, while still being given a context of response in terms of attitudinal sets about general education overall, was being obscured by that context; (2) some of the items regarding the overall goals of general education were sufficiently unclear without their accompanying context to be dropped from any future version of the instrument. In particular, the Likert-type scaling was apparently pushing a number of respondents into a "forced-choice"

situation which did not allow them to freely respond.

Since it was the instrument itself which was still being tested, the data from these two testing sites was codified, but not extensively analyzed. Furthermore, the very nature of the two groups involved would deny a true random selection of faculty attitudes, since both organizations tend to be liberal and open to new developments in the field of general education and the arts as well. Thus the data from these two testings, while also available in Appendix D, are mostly useful in conforming organizational characteristics and in testing the instrumental design.

The third iteration of the questionnaire instrument did profit from the previous three experiences, however, in preserving the essential structure of the instrument design, including the Likert-scale approach and the framework of the demographic data section.

Item constructs, on the other hand, underwent significant change. The "arts role" items from the first designs were retained, but a majority of the items dealing with roles for general education programs overall were either dropped or rewritten to eliminate the "forced-choice" phenomenon alluded to earlier. In place of the broad-spectrum general education statements, a new series of propositions regarding the role of the fine arts were taken from the literature, modified so as to stand context-free and yet be representative of the original source and of that range of opinion of practitioners in the arts.

This final iteration of the survey instrument, which appears as

Appendix E of this paper, was then placed in the hands of the same group of faculty at this researcher's own institution who had read the first version of the instrument. They were asked to examine each item for clarity and consistency. Some slight modifications of language were accomplished by this approach, but most items remained as submitted. Members of this researcher's doctoral dissertation committee also examined this final iteration of the survey instrument.

After final editing, the complete survey instrument was typed on an IBM Selectric II and made ready for commercial reproduction using the photo offset process. Seventy pound, white stock paper in an 11 x 17 size was used for printing with black ink. The resultant copy was folded, collated, and stapled to produce an 8 1/2 x 11 survey instrument of eight pages. The cover page identified the survey and made provision for site and respondent codes as well as a requested return date to be entered. The four pages of context items were followed by a two-page section asking for respondent information. The back page of the survey booklet was left blank. Respondents would be asked to return the entire booklet, with responses marked. The booklet form was chosen for ease of handling and mailing.

The survey instrument used in this study was analyzed in two major sections, each with subsections. Items 1 through 23, representing the first section, address attitudes towards core programs in general education, the role of the fine arts in general education, and relative degrees of importance in general education for each of the designated fine arts: music, visual arts, dance, theatre, and television/film. This opinionnaire section of the instrument with

its focus on how faculty respond to stated opinions taken from the literature on the issue was, for purposes, of analysis, subdivided into "clusters" of issues. These clusters are identified in the following Table 1:

Table 1

Items Clusters in Survey Instrument

Issue	Item(s)
Arts and Cognition	1,7,11,12,18,23(4),19
Traditional Role for the Arts	2,3,6,14,15,22,23(1),23(5),23(7)
Primary Role for the Arts-- Unspecified	4,8,9,10,20,21
Elective-Based General Education Program	5,16
Arts and Creativity including Human Development and "Leisure-Time"	10,13,19,23(2),23(3),23(6)
Attitude to the arts as "Disciplines"	17

Thus, related propositions could be examined as part of a sub-profile of response. The degree of favorableness or unfavorableness towards a role for the arts in development of cognitive skills could be contrasted with the degree of response for arts in the development of creativity, and other related issues. It was also possible by this clustering system to isolate the issue of what type of general education program the respondents might favor as well.

The second section of the survey instrument, respondent information, essentially consisted of five sub-sections. Items one through three asked for basic demographic data concerning the respondent's highest degree, his/her disciplinary area, and years of full-time teaching experience. The years of teaching experiences were supplied by the respondent in whole numbers which would then be translated in the data analysis process into the appropriate step in a series of four-year increments.

The second sub-section, items four and five, asked for the type of institution which the respondent attended for his/her undergraduate degree and the enrollment in that institution at the time of attendance.

The third sub-section, items six through nine asked for information about the general education program at that undergraduate institution and the respondent's experience with fine arts courses during his/her undergraduate degree program.

A fourth sub-section, item ten, asked if the respondent developed a mentor-type relationship with a faculty member during his/her undergraduate degree program and what discipline or department that faculty member represented.

The final section of the demographic portion of the survey instrument, item eleven, was marked "optional" and sought the name of the respondent's undergraduate institution and year of graduation.

These distinct sections were not marked or delineated in any way on the survey instrument, but were arranged purposely in the sequence noted above.



### Limitations of Instrument

Although the essential design and structure of the instrument has been piloted in a number of sites, as described earlier, the "N's" involved were small, and the marked change in the item content with the final iteration was not subjected to similar field testing. However, it is hoped that the system of readers checking for item construct consistency and intelligibility have lessened some of the dangers of an otherwise untested instrument. The consistency of essential design throughout the iteration process should also have helped.

Since the major purpose of the instrument is to assess faculty attitudes towards major propositions found in the literature on fine arts and general education, it seemed most important to secure items which were not only representative of the points of view expressed in that literature, but also to present those items in as clear a fashion as possible to potential survey groups representing a diversity of academic disciplines.

Other limitations of the instrument are inherent in the very nature of opinionnaires based on a Likert-type scaling system. While the statements used for item construct do represent a sample of the total range of opinions expressed in the literature, they are only a sample. An effort was made in the creation of the instrument to represent ranges of opinion, but any attempt to create a manageable instrument in hopes of favorable return rates must contend with some diminution of the numbers of opinions represented.

Another traditional limitation of this instrumentality must be

the recognition that the position indicated on a Likert scale of five points are not necessarily equally spaced. The exactitude of range from a "strongly agree" to an "agree" is not necessarily the same as that from "disagree" to "strongly disagree." Furthermore the item statements themselves, taken as they are as intact as possible from the literature, are unlikely to be of equal value in "for-ness" or "against-ness."

The validity of the respondent reaction to a statement on paper and thus in the absence of real-life situations and inherent complexities or ambiguities, should also be dealt with carefully. Even with anonymity promised it is possible, after all, that respondents may be tempted to provide what he/she thinks should be the response rather than what he/she may really feel.

It is also necessary to treat any "scores" achieved with such instrumentality with care, since equal scores achieved by several individuals may or may not indicate totally equal favorableness to the given position being examined. After all, when dealing with the total item sequence on an opinionnaire, different combinations of positions can yield equal score values.

Assuming these difficulties are traditional cautions when dealing with this type of instrument, they were taken into account when constructing the design of this study and the subsequent analysis of data. It is considered more effective and accurate, for example, when dealing with percentage response and frequency count on the content items to report essential agreement and/or disagreement rather than finite distinctions on the five-position scale.

### Site Selection and Determination of Sample

Since one of the major aims of this study was to develop a profile of response to the fine arts in general education programs within the context of traditional liberal education, it was determined that the ultimate faculty sample should come from those institutions most likely to be continuing the historic goals of liberal education: the residential liberal arts college.

Two intersecting systems were used to identify a potential pool of such institutions. The first was the cell stratification sampling designations used by Astin et al. (1983) in research on American freshman national norms for the Fall of 1983, the study prepared by the staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). Cell number 14 in that system represents four-year private nonsectarian colleges with entering freshman SAT combined scores of more than 1,175.

Liberal arts colleges in this category of the Astin survey were then matched as a group against the "College Admissions Sector" system used in the 14th edition of Barron's Profiles of American Colleges (1984). The criteria used in this system to determine the degree of selectivity practiced by institutions during the admissions process include consideration of SAT and ACT scores, high school class rank and grade point averages as part of the student profile. Thus, a measurement of institutional academic rigor is present.

Schools which the Barron system placed in the "Highly Competitive" category in admissions practice were then matched with the listing obtained from the Astin system of institutional

classification.

The resultant match yielded a list of some 20 liberal arts colleges, all of whom could also be considered Liberal Arts Colleges I in the Carnegie Typology.

These 20 potential sites in 12 different states across the country were then approached via the chief academic officer closest to faculty concerns, either the Dean of the Faculty, Dean of the College, or Provost to solicit their participation in the study. A copy of the solicitation letter is included with this paper as Appendix F.

Of the 20 potential sites, 11 were liberal arts colleges without any form of graduate program, however limited. These 11 sites were particularly desired as survey points because of this singleness of mission.

The letter of invitation was typed on Northeastern Illinois University letterhead stationery which also identified this researcher's department as Speech and Performing Arts and was signed by both this researcher and the chairman of his doctoral dissertation committee.

A notification form was included in this letter for the dean or provost to return if he or she wished faculty from his/her institution to be solicited for the survey (See Appendix F).

In return for cooperating in the survey, each site was promised a summary report of the results, both for their site and for the entire pool of cooperating institutions. Complete anonymity was guaranteed for all participants in the survey.

It was also made clear in the solicitation letter that not all

faculty at the site would be asked to participate, but only a stratified random sample, sufficient to create an accurate profile not only for the site, but for the total survey pool.

These letters were mailed on October 21, 1985 and directed in person to the appropriate dean or academic officer. A follow-up letter, containing essentially the same information was mailed to sites who had not yet responded on November 12, 1985.

By November 21 nine sites had responded, six of them favorably. By December 1 three more sites had responded favorably for a total final pool of nine sites.

Of those who had responded by declining participation, a total of four, two indicated internal reasons for declining. One site did not supply its own general education program but was part of a consortium of colleges, and another site declined participation because they were about to enter into discussion concerning potential changes in their general education program and it was felt that to circulate a survey with specific attention to the role of fine arts might create undue complications in their faculty deliberations.

Seven sites sent no response of any kind. Thus, of the original pool of 20 possible sites, nine agreed to participate (45%). However, the original group of 20 sites included one which was not coeducational with no graduate program, two which were not coeducational on the undergraduate level and had some limited graduate programs, and one which did not contain its general education program within its own academic boundaries. For purposes of homogeneity, the original pool might best be looked at as having four subsystems:

Table 2

Potential Survey Pool of Sites


---

Category One	
Undergraduate Liberal Arts College- Coeducational - with NO graduate program	8
Category Two	
Undergraduate Liberal Arts College- NON coeducational with NO graduate program	1
Category Three	
Undergraduate Liberal Arts College- Coeducational - with LIMITED graduate program	9
Category Four	
Undergraduate Liberal Arts College- NON coeducational on undergraduate level with LIMITED graduate program	2
TOTAL	20

---

All of these potential sites, fit the dual matrix of Astin cell 14 and the Barron classification system of Highly Competitive as the Carnegie Typology of Liberal Arts Colleges 1.

Final site selection with the nine sites who agreed to cooperate showed that Category One was represented by four institutions signifying a 57 percent response, since one institution in this category had revealed that it did not control the general education program, and that Category Three was represented by five institutions for a 55 percent response. Those colleges which were not coeducational on the undergraduate level had either declined to participate or had not responded. Thus, the final survey pool was

even more homogeneous than the original selection pool itself. This final selection pool also could be said to represent a majority of the qualifying potential sites in each category.

The cooperating sites supplied faculty lists for their institution as well as copies of their current catalog.

After discounting those faculty members who would be unavailable for survey purposes during the survey period of January through April of 1986 because of leaves or sabbaticals, it was determined that some 1,018 faculty members were available in the participating institutions.

#### Sample Selection

In order to draw a stratified random sample of this faculty pool, a sort system was devised which would place available faculty into cells designated by three academic ranks (professor, associate professor, and assistant professor) as well as disciplinary areas. Three faculty ranks were designated on the assumption that the remaining traditional rank for tenure-line faculty is not greatly utilized at most liberal arts colleges. The instructor rank is not used in most cases for tenure-line appointments and is usually reserved for temporary appointments or probationary appointments while the incumbent is completing requirements for a terminal degree.

The issue of disciplinary assignment was more challenging. While these colleges had a homogeneity of mission and history, they also represented a diversity of curricular organization and departmental/program designation.

As the literature has revealed (Biglan, 1973a, 1973b; Lodahl and

Gordon, 1972), the issue of how departments and programs are arranged in disciplinary categories has become one of growing illogicality. In dealing with the issue of subject matter in different academic areas, and attempting to suggest identifying characteristics, Biglan (1973a) suggested a sorting system for subject matter and disciplinary areas based on certain sets of characteristics. The three parameters which he suggested were: (1) concern with a single paradigm, using the work of Kuhn as a departure point (hard vs. soft), (2) concern with application (pure vs. applied), and (3) concern with life systems (life system vs. non-life system). The use of these parameters then produces a structure of "disciplinary" organization which can take into account a variety of newer forms of programs and fields and still produce a logical array of departmental assignments.

However, while this approach was considered for use in their study to create the final cell configuration, it was determined that the Biglan approach works best when applied to large, research-oriented universities in which all the possible cells would then be occupied. For example, the "hard, life-system, applied" cell would include such fields of study as Agronomy, Dairy Science, and Horticulture. These are not likely to be found in liberal arts colleges. Furthermore the relatively untraditional nature of the Biglan system would call for many individual assessments and determinations of content.

On the other hand, the completely traditional approach of creating stratification cells based on Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences does not comfortably allow for theme or geographical



area studies which are often relegated to some conglomerate interdisciplinary category. The traditional approach also not comfortable allow for more applied fields of study. Both such curricular patterns of field or area studies and applied studies existed at more than one of the potential survey sites.

It was finally determined to use a modified version of the traditional disciplinary categories as proposed by Mayer (1981) in discussing a curricular plan for future college development.

The Mayer system posits a college organizational scheme based on divisions, with each division being the smallest academic unit, and the division having an inherent unity of goals and essential methodology. His divisions are: (1) Arts and Literature--to include Art, English, Drama and Music; (2) Studies in Cultures--to include History, Philosophy and Religion; (3) Behavioral Systems or Sciences--to include Anthropology, Biology, Psychology, Sociology, and Political Science; (4) Physical or Reductive Sciences--to include Chemistry, Physics and Geology; (5) Methodologies--to include Computer Science, Management Science, Mathematics and Systems Science.

With some assessments and evaluations of individual programs, this was the system used in this study to create the final frame of the stratification cells.

The Mayer system required some modifications to be useful for the sites involved in this study. Foreign languages, not mentioned in his assignment and discussion, were assigned to the Arts and Literature Category, and a re-assignment was made of mathematics from his Methodologies category to that of Physical Sciences which reflected

the customary organization practiced in the curricular structure of the sites to be surveyed. All final assignments of programs and departments are reflected below in Table 3.

Table 3

Discipline Code

---

- 01 Arts and Literature  
Art, Biblical History and Literature, Communication Studies, Comparative Literature, Classics, Creative Writing, Dance, English, Foreign Languages (all), Fine Arts, Humanities, Music, Rhetoric, Theatre, Music.
- 02 Studies in Culture  
American Studies, Black Studies, East Asian Studies, Hispanic Studies, History, Intercultural Studies, Judaic Studies, Philosophy, Religion, Russian Studies.
- 03 Behavioral (Systems) Sciences  
Anthropology, Economics, Environmental Studies, Government, Political Science, Psychology, Social Sciences, Sociology.
- 04 Physical (Reductive) Sciences  
Astronomy, Biology and Biological Sciences, Botany, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Natural Philosophy, Physics, Physiology, Zoology.
- 05 Methodologies  
Administration and Management, Business, Child Development, Computer Science, Education, Engineering (all), Finance, General Programs, Military Science, Physical Education.
- 

Using faculty lists supplied by the participating institutions, a determination then was made of available faculty in all sites within both the disciplinary areas as previously determined and assigned, and three significant faculty ranks within those disciplinary areas. Code numbers had been assigned as indicated in Table 3 to each disciplinary area and code numbers were assigned to faculty ranks (full professor =

01; associate professor = 02; and assistant professor = 03).

In this fashion, a three by five cell configuration had been created as shown in the following table:

Table 4

Cell Stratification

	Arts/Lit 01	Cultures 02	Beh.Sci 03	Phy.Sci 04	Meth 05
Professor 01	98	75	85	124	37
Associate Professor 02	114	38	72	52	39
Assistant Professor 03	88	46	53	72	25
TOTAL(s)	300	159	210	248	101

Thus, with a total of 1,018 faculty available and a reasonable coverage for all cells, it was determined to draw a stratified sample on random selection basis. In order to achieve a sufficiently strong base at each site for a site-specific profile which had been promised to each contact person at that site as an inducement for participation, it was decided to sample the population at a 60 percent level. However, since the population available in the category of Assistant Professor in Methodologies disciplines was so small (25), this cell population would be sample at a higher level of 92 percent, and any returns in excess of a 60 percent level (15 respondents) would

be re-drawn under a random selection process.

Once the selection procedure and level of sampling had been determined, all potential faculty respondents were assigned code numbers based on the system described above for discipline and rank. This information was then placed on individual 5 by 8 index cards and faculty names within each rank and discipline area were then placed in an arbitrary order. A computer-generated random number selection program was then used to determine which cards were to be pulled in creating the sample pool for each cell.

This process yielded a final sample of 619 faculty selected on a 60 percent level from each site and then merged to form the final sample. Although there was considerable variation in population numbers within the rank-discipline cells, the sampling was consistently done at the 60 percent level with the sole exception of the Assistant Professor cell under Methodologies.

Once the sample had been determined, mailings were prepared for each site. Two of the sites had specified that mailings of materials should be sent directly to the faculty member, using a campus address as supplied by the site. The other seven sites had agreed to distribute mailings via their campus mail system with a bulk shipment to the academic office which had agreed to participation in the study.

Whether mailed directly, or sent to a central location, each submission was addressed individually to the faculty member whose response was being solicited. The faculty member received a copy of the questionnaire (see Appendix E), a letter soliciting his/her participation (see Appendix G) and a pre-paid addressed return

envelope for the return of the questionnaire. This pre-paid return envelope was a color-coded business reply mail envelope available from this researcher's home institution and additionally stamped with the researcher's department designation for ease of identification.

In addition, the return envelope was coded on the back with a special designation to identify the return as being part of the first of what was anticipated would be a two-wave data collection process. The designation: ARTSROLE L.A. NUM. 001, represented what was now the working title in code of this survey, ARTSROLE 1986, and further indicated that this mailing was for Liberal Arts college sites and represented the first mailing.

All questionnaires were mailed directly or bulk shipped to sites on February 3, 1986 with a stamped request on the cover letter for a return on or before February 25, 1986.

Each questionnaire had been stamped with a code system identifying the site (01 to 09), the rank (01 to 03) of the faculty member receiving the instrument, the discipline area (01 to 05) to which the faculty member had been assigned, and a sequence number within the cell from which the faculty member had been selected (01 and above up to the total number sampled in this cell and site).

Returns in this first wave, which began arriving on February 10, continued, without any "prompt" from the researcher until March 14. Some 348 responses were received within this time frame, representing 56.2 percent of the sample and 34.2 percent of the total available population.

A second wave of mailings, directed to those who had not yet

responded was prepared and mailed out on March 24, 1986 with a requested return date of no later than April 14, 1986. This second wave mailing was a complete replication of the first wave with a new cover letter (see Appendix H), an additional copy of the questionnaire, stamped with the same code numbers, but with a new requested return date, and another pre-paid addressed return envelope. This return envelope was code-stamped to identify the return as part of a second wave response.

In the interval between March 14 and the second wave mailing on March 24 three more responses were received. Since these arrived without a "prompt" of any kind they were incorporated into results for the first wave.

Percentages of sample returns from the nine sites in Wave A showed considerable variation from a high of response in one site at 70 percent to a low level at another site of 45 percent of the design sample.

The total returns and the percentages achieved of the design sample in Wave A response are recorded in the table on the next page.

Thus, the response rate for the total sample at the conclusion of Wave A was 56.2 percent, while response rates for individual cells as determined by faculty rank and by discipline varied from a low of 43.2 percent for Associate Professors in the Behavioral Sciences to a high response rate of 65.6 percent for Assistant Professor in that same discipline.

Of the total available 1,018 faculty population at the nine sites, this sample from Wave A represented 34.2 percent. Records for

Wave A were closed on March 24, 1986 in preparation for the returns of what would then constitute Wave B of the survey.

Returns from Wave Two began arriving on March 31, 1986 and the wave was closed on April 21, 1986. Allowing for one "dual response" in which a faculty member had sent in two questionnaires, each from a different mailing, and two questionnaires which were simply returned with no effective responses, the total response to this wave was some 74 usable questionnaires.

The "dual response" was received late from a faculty member who returned a second questionnaire on May 14, 1986. A coin-toss determined which questionnaire to select for data input. Using this random method, the instrument which happened to be selected turned out to be a second-wave dated questionnaire which had been returned within the requested time-frame for response.

Some 273 questionnaires had been mailed out for this second wave but, as has been indicated earlier, three respondents returned questionnaires before the second wave mailing would have reached them, and thus were counted as part of a first wave response. Thus, the second wave potential body of respondents numbered 270 and the return of 74 usable instruments indicated a rate of 27.4 percent.

A total of 23 cells had been captured at 100 percent of sample in Wave One, and some eight additional cells had been captured at 100 percent of sample in Wave Two. Thus, some 31 cells of the nine sites were represented at 100 percent of sample out of the possible 135 cells in all sites. There was one empty cell since one site had no faculty members at the full professor level in a particular

disciplinary area. Therefore some 23.1 percent of occupied cells in the configuration of all nine sites were represented at 100 percent of the desired sample.

The combined total of usable responses from both waves was 421, representing a response rate of 68.0 percent of the design sample. Additionally, the final sample for analysis represented some 41.4 percent of the total available faculty population (1,018) at the nine sites surveyed.

Since the major thrust of this research design was meant to be the creation of a profile of faculty attitudes towards the propositions offered in the instrument, and not a comparison of differences amongst the sites, a decision was made to combine the results of the two waves of mailings.

For the purposes of this study it has therefore been assumed that there are no statistically significant differences between the respondents in the first and second waves.

A running evaluation was made of small groups of respondents within discipline and/or faculty rank during the course of data accumulation during the second wave of responses by comparing frequency of responses on key items in the questionnaire dealing with relationships between fine arts and cognitive development between respondents in wave one and those being received in wave two. No significant differences were found.

In a discussion of whether high response rates are essential to valid surveys, Leslie (1972) asserted that when group-related matters are presented in a survey, a respondent tends to react more on the



basis of his or her role perception as a member of a group rather than on the basis of his or her defining features. As discussed in Chapter IV, the population and the sample achieved, are strongly homogeneous in background and what differences emerge may well be more tied to a disciplinary orientation than any other factor.

Thus, the knowledge of a strong homogeneity in the test group and the failure to detect any marked differences in gross analysis of the returns from Wave B as they were compared with an initial profile of Wave A, suggest the function of merging both waves for data analysis purpose in this study.

Traditional measures for acceptability of a mail survey suggest that a 70 percent return is achieved (Leslie, p. 324). However, the major thrust of the position taken by Leslie was that:

There is ample evidence that response rate bias may occur in mail surveys. However, much of the available evidence reveals only differences between respondents and nonrespondents or late respondents in terms of such independent variables as sex, geography, age, etc. It is often assumed that these differences lead to differences between respondents and nonrespondents on the dependent variables, i.e. the questions under study.

When populations are homogeneous (having a common group identity) minor differences on independent variables between respondents and nonrespondents or late respondents may occur, but differences as to dependent variables are unlikely (p. 328).

Therefore, a decision was made in this study to merge responses to mailing Wave A and mailing Wave B on both the lack of gross detectable differences between responses in the two waves and the demonstrable homogeneity of the sample group. It was also felt that a 68 percent response rate was within an acceptable parameter for legitimate analysis and report.

Combined usable responses from Wave A and Wave B are illustrated in the table on the next page.

Thus, the response rate for the total sample was 68 percent, while response rates for individual cells as determined by faculty rank and discipline varied from a low of 56.5 percent for Assistant Professor in the discipline category of Methodologies to a high response rate of 88.4 percent for Assistant Professors in the Physical Sciences.

The median response rate for all cells was 69.5 percent, while the median response rate for discipline areas was 67.1 percent. Therefore the range involved was a relatively narrow band of some 2.4 percentage points.

A more detailed discussion of the sample configuration, as well as a description of the respondent demographic profile may be found in Chapter IV.

Data generated by this survey were then subjected to analysis using programs available in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The specific programs used were those for Frequencies, Cross-Tab, and Anova. Results of these analyses are discussed in Chapter IV.

Table 5

Combined Response for Wave A

<u>Discipline/Rank</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Arts and Literature</u>			
Professor	59	28	47.5
Associate Professor	69	39	56.5
Assistant Professor	51	30	58.8
TOTALS	179	97	54.2
<u>Studies in Cultures</u>			
Professor	45	24	53.3
Associate Professor	24	11	45.8
Assistant Professor	26	15	57.7
TOTALS	95	50	52.6
<u>Behavioral Sciences</u>			
Professor	51	33	64.7
Associate Professor	44	19	43.2
Assistant Professor	32	21	65.6
TOTALS	127	73	57.5
<u>Physical Sciences</u>			
Professor	75	44	58.7
Associate Professor	31	20	64.5
Assistant Professor	43	31	72.1
TOTALS	149	95	63.8
<u>Methodologies</u>			
Professor	23	11	47.8
Associate Professor	23	11	47.8
Assistant Professor	23	11	47.8
TOTALS	69	33	47.8
GRAND TOTAL	619	348	56.2

Table 6

Combined Response Rates

Discipline/Rank	Sample	Response	Percentage
<u>Arts and Literature</u>			
Professor	59	36	61.0
Associate Professor	69	51	73.9
Assistant Professor	51	35	68.6
TOTALS	179	122	68.2
<u>Studies in Cultures</u>			
Professor	45	29	64.4
Associate Professor	24	14	58.3
Assistant Professor	26	19	73.1
TOTALS	95	62	65.3
<u>Behavioral Sciences</u>			
Professor	51	34	66.7
Associate Professor	44	25	56.8
Assistant Professor	32	24	75.0
TOTALS	127	83	65.4
<u>Physical Sciences</u>			
Professor	75	51	68.0
Associate Professor	31	22	71.0
Assistant Professor	43	38	88.4
TOTALS	149	111	74.5
<u>Methodologies</u>			
Professor	23	15	65.2
Associate Professor	23	15	65.2
Assistant Professor	23	13	56.5
TOTALS	69	43	62.3
GRAND TOTAL	619	421	68.0

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

#### Introduction

The responses to the survey instrument described in Chapter III were analyzed and are presented in this chapter. A composite profile of responses from all nine sites was made of the degree of favorableness toward the propositions regarding the role of the fine arts in general education programs as represented by the items in the survey instrument.

An analysis was also conducted of the demographic characteristics of the respondents using the variables of site, faculty rank, and disciplinary area, as well as other significant variables.

In order to isolate a possible source of survey bias which might have been created by having faculty members in the fine arts disciplines placed within the larger disciplinary category of Arts and Literature, a separate three-way analysis was also conducted contrasting the responses of faculty who self-designated identification was with the Fine Arts with those faculty remaining in the Art and Literature discipline area and will all other faculty members in other disciplinary areas.

Research hypotheses discussed in Chapter III were tested by analysis of the data to determine if any significant independent variables could be isolated as having potential impact on the degree and kind of response.

Data analysis programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were used in the examination of the data. The specific programs used were: Frequencies, Cross-Tabulation, including Cross-Break and Break-Down tables, as well as Anova.

#### Composition of Survey Sample

As has been noted earlier in this paper, the available faculty population at the nine survey sites (1,018) was sampled at a 60.8 percent level. The design sample thus created by using a stratified random design process numbered 619 faculty, distributed among all ranks and disciplinary areas.

The final research sample was 422, with one return being incomplete and thus not usable. The final sample (421 respondents) represented a 68.0 percent of the original design sample and a 41.35 percent sample of the total population. The mean return rate of 68.0 percent did vary from site to site with the lowest percentage of return (53.33 percent) coming from site 04 and the highest return rate (84.74 percent) coming from site 03. The complete site responses are shown below in Table 7.

Table 7

Individual Site Responses to Survey

Site	Design Sample	Returns	Percentage of Design Sample
01	90	54	60.0%
02	76	53	69.74%
03	59	50	84.74%
04	45	24	53.33%
05	75	52	69.33%
06	67	51	76.12%
07	83	55	66.27%
08	60	42	70.0%
09	64	40	62.50%
TOTALS	619	421	MEAN = 68.0%

The major aim of this study was, as has been indicated, to not only to assess the viability of the survey instrument on a full-scale administration, but also by that process to emerge with a profile of faculty responses using a pool of similar institutions. Thus, while variations amongst institutions in terms of response levels was not a major concern, there should be consideration given to avoiding bias which might occur from strongly unequal response rates from one part of the pool to another, as well as attempting to preserve a proportionate representation of not only sites, but ranks and disciplines as present in the total pool of institutions.

If all sites had been equally represented in the final survey sample (a percentage share of 11.11 percent) this would represent a skewing of the profile since not all sites were equal in faculty size. Table 8 which appears below displays the proportionate comparisons of

the design configuration as compared with the final sample configuration.

Table 8

Site Share in Design/Sample

Site	Design Sample	Proportionate Share	Final Sample	Proportionate Share	Diff.
01	90	14.54%	54	12.83%	-1.71%
02	76	12.28%	53	12.59%	+0.31%
03	59	9.63%	50	11.88%	+2.25%
04	45	7.27%	24	5.70%	-1.57%
05	75	12.12%	52	12.35%	+0.23%
06	67	10.82%	51	12.11%	+1.29%
07	83	13.41%	55	13.06%	-0.35%
08	60	9.69%	42	9.98%	+0.29%
09	64	10.34%	40	9.50%	-0.84%
Totals	619	100.0%	421	100.0%	

Thus one site (03) is over-represented in the final survey sample by some 2.25 percent while two sites are under-represented at a level of 1.71 to 1.57 percent. However, as will be seen later in this chapter, the homogeneity of the faculty sample is very strong and any differences in responses based upon site identification were minimal.

In terms of discipline area, the final sample displayed a proportionate balance among the assigned disciplines similar to the design sample and, in turn, to the original population. Table 9 shows this proportionate relationship.



Table 9

Discipline Area Proportions of Design and Final Sample

Disc. Area	Design Sample	Proportionate Share	Final Sample	Proportionate Share	Diff.
Arts & Lit.	179	28.9%	122	29.5%	+0.6%
Stds. Culture	95	15.3%	62	14.7%	-0.6%
Beh. Sci.	127	20.5%	83	19.7%	-0.8%
Phy. Sci.	149	24.1%	111	26.4%	+2.3%
Meth.	69	11.1%	43	10.1%	-1.0%
Totals	619	100.0%	421	100.0%	

Thus, the proportionate share of the respondent pool was well preserved in the final sample, with significant over-representation occurring only with the discipline of the physical sciences. Considering the theme of this investigation, potential skewing of the total response may thus only be in the direction of under-reporting the degree of favorable response rather than over-reporting and over-estimating such favorableness. We generally assume that faculty members in the physical sciences may be less favorably inclined as a group to grant significant status to the fine arts in general education programs.

In essence, the higher proportion of faculty members in the disciplines of Arts and Literature and the Physical Sciences which occurred in the final sample also mirrors that proportionate pattern in the original design sample. This design, based as it was on a

stratified pattern, also reflects the population proportions.

The margin for over-representing or under-representing the population by means of this survey thus ranges from a potential over-representation of two percent for the Physical Sciences and 0.6 percent for Arts and Literature, to a potential for under-estimating response for Studies in Culture faculty by a 0.6 percent margin and for those in Behavioral Sciences by a 0.8 percent margin, as well as for those in Methodologies by a 1.0 percent margin.

In terms of faculty rank as a demographic feature, the final sample pool showed a slight skewing towards inclusion of Full Professors (39.2 percent) in the total sample as compared with Associate Professors (30.2 percent) and Assistant Professors (30.6 percent).

The total pool of faculty available at the nine sites showed, however, a similar distribution amongst ranks with Full Professors (419) representing a 41.2 percent share of the total faculty while Associate Professors (315) represented a 30.9 percent share and Assistant Professors (284) represented a 27.9 percent share.

Thus, within a range of +2.0 percent the proportionate share of the sample occupied by the various faculty ranks approximates the profile of the combined faculty available at the nine survey sites.

More detailed analysis of the discipline and rank design cells may be found in Appendix L. For the purposes of immediate discussion, however, Table 10 shows comparison between design cells for faculty rank and the final sample cells for faculty rank.

Table 10

Respondent Distribution by Faculty Rank

Rank	Design Cell	Final Sample	Difference Between
Professor	253 (40.9%)	165 (39.2%)	-1.7%
Associate Professor	191 (30.9%)	127 (30.2%)	-0.7%
Assistant Professor	175 (28.3%)	129 (30.6%)	+2.3%
Totals	619	421	

It should be noted that the Assistant Professor rank was sampled at a slightly higher percentage level to insure adequate size for cells in the discipline area of Methodologies.

It is also clear that the overall response rate was slightly higher among faculty at the Assistant Professor rank than for those at the rank of Professor.

Nevertheless, the proportions achieved in the final sample bear close parallels to the proportions structured in both the design sample and in the original population.

It should also be noted that the proportions of rank representation captured in this survey mirror the data reported recently in Change Magazine (1985) dealing with characteristics and attitudes of the American professoriate. It was reported that for Liberal Arts I Colleges, the mean percentage for Full Professors on the faculty was 41.8 percent, with Associate Professors representing

some 23.4 percent of a typical faculty body, and Assistant Professors representing some 24.9 percent.

Thus, the highest proportion being Professors, as with the survey conducted for this study, and the next highest proportion being faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor the characteristics of the sample collected for the survey are commensurate with national figures.

An analysis of the data supplied by the Respondent Information portion of the survey instrument revealed a number of features which created a strong homogeneity in the respondent pool.

For example, 88.4 percent of the respondents possessed the doctorate degree and combined total of 70.1 percent indicated they had attended a private, or church-related college or university for their undergraduate degree. A total of 68.9 percent of the respondents had attended an undergraduate institution which enrolled 4,500 or less students at the time of their attendance.

In reflecting on the requirements for a general education or core program in their undergraduate institution, more than 70 percent reported requirements which they had to meet in composition and writing, foreign languages, physical science, social sciences, and humanities. Slightly over 59 percent reported having to meet requirements in mathematics, but only 31.4 percent reported having to meet any requirement in the fine arts.

Of the 407 faculty who responded to the question about taking a fine arts course as part of their undergraduate program, whether it was required or not, some 247 (58.7 percent) indicated they had done

so.

A lesser number of faculty (376) responded to a question about whether or not they had formed a mentor-relationship with one or more faculty members during their undergraduate education. Of those who did respond, some 58 percent indicated they had done so.

It is more difficult to summarize the profile of years of full-time teaching experience reported. It is clear, however, that majority of the respondents (59 percent) reported full-time teaching of 16 years or less. A more complete reporting of the responses on years of full-time teaching experience is reported in Table 11.

Table 11

Reported Teaching Experience of Respondents

Years	N	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
0-4 Years	54	12.8%	12.8%
5-8 Years	76	18.1%	30.9%
9-12 Years	55	13.1%	44.0%
13-16 Years	63	15.0%	59.0%
Sub-Total	248	58.9%	
17-20 Years	65	15.4%	74.4%
21-24 Years	19	4.5%	78.9%
25-28 Years	28	6.7%	85.6%
29-32 Years	24	5.7%	91.3%
33-36 Years	20	4.8%	96.1%
37 or More Years	13	3.1%	99.2%
Missing Data	4	1.0%	
Totals	421	100.0%	

The complete report of respondent data is included as Appendix K.

This appendix also includes a complete listing of responses to all questionnaire items.

As suggested by responses given by the faculty in this survey, therefore, the majority of the respondents had the following characteristics: they possessed the Ph.D. degree, had attended as an undergraduate a private or church-related college or university with an enrollment of 4,500 or less, and had taught for 16 years or less on the college level. In all likelihood they had taken at least one fine arts course during their undergraduate degree program and during the course of that program had formed a mentor-relationship with at least one faculty member.

While this summary profile is modified by the experiences of the remaining respondents in the survey sample, it did form a very substantial picture of homogeneity in the respondent group and had significant bearing on the analysis of causal correlations, as will be discussed later in this paper.

#### General Attitudes Towards the Fine Arts

Using the technique of means analysis, as noted in Chapter III, to produce a score for suggesting the degree of favorableness expressed by the respondent toward the fine arts in general education, the data suggest there is a tendency on the part of faculty in selective liberal arts colleges as represented in this survey to accept a diversity of roles for the arts.

A narrative interpretation was used to codify the means recorded for each item on the questionnaire as produced by the SPSS Frequencies Program. Since a five-point Likert-style system had been used to

structure the survey instrument, the following narrative categories were employed:

Table 12

Narrative Score Interpretation

Mean Range	Interpretation
4.000 and above	Agree to Strongly Agree
3.500 to 3.999	Uncertain but Tending to Agree
3.000 to 3.499	Uncertain
2.999 to 2.500	Uncertain but Tending to Disagree
2.499 and lower	Disagree to Strongly Disagree

This system was also adjusted for certain items where the scoring had been reversed to preserve the directionality of the instrument. In these items (data report items 2, 3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16 and 34) the higher the mean recorded the higher the disagreement with the item content.

This same interpretation system was used to characterize the scores achieved by individual respondents and by cell groupings. This score, as has been discussed also in Chapter III, represents the Grand Mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) of all test item means.

For the entire pool of respondents, the score range results indicate a marked inclination towards accepting a significant role for the fine arts in a structured general education program. Furthermore, the largest single number of respondents were at a clear level of

acceptance. Data analysis of the score range is reproduced below in

Table 13.

Table 13

Score Results for Total Sample (N = 421)

---

Grand Mean X	3.842
Standard Deviation	0.441
Mode	4.195
Median	3.829
Maximum	4.935
Minimum	2.167
Range	2.769
Variance	.195
Standard Error	.021

---

Based on this analysis, it can be stated that at a 68 percent confidence level, the true mean lies between 3.863 and 3.821. At a 95 percent confidence level, the true mean lies between 3.884 and 3.800.

Using the narrative interpretation language, it can be stated there were strong indications of agreement from this survey group on a significant role for the fine arts in general education programs.

Individual items which were reported as having total pool means of 4.000 and above were as follows:



Table 14

Item Means at 4.000 Level

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reverse Score
1	4.176	0.811	
2	4.156	0.896	yes
5	4.177	1.063	yes
8	4.134	0.828	
9	4.166	0.799	
10	4.347	0.757	
11	4.293	0.845	
12	4.115	0.854	
15	4.192	0.789	yes
17	4.431	0.734	
18	4.276	0.865	
20	4.207	0.873	
22	4.282	0.699	
29	4.411	0.926	
30	4.246	0.918	
38	4.070	0.716	
39	4.296	0.638	

Thus, on some 17 items representing 41.5 percent of the total item catalog, strong agreement was evidenced with the content of the item or, in the case of those where the scoring was reversed for directionality, strong disagreement.

Interpolating the content of these items, it can be suggested that the respondents tended to strongly agree that course based experience in the fine arts can assist students in cognitive development and critical thinking skills (item 1) and that a liberal education should also include components involving creativity, intuition, perception, and other aspects of mental life (item 10).

Furthermore, the mean response level to items 2, 5, and 15

suggest that the faculty surveyed do not believe that the only role for fine arts in general education is that of "cultural enrichment" and, further, that there probably should be a place for the "studio or applied experience in the arts" in the potential program of all students.

They also appear to place faith in the type of general education program which has at least required areas for distribution of general education courses or credits.

It would also appear that the faculty in this sample subscribe to the notion that an experience in the fine arts can improve and enhance the functioning of many career fields even that of engineering (item 8) and that this concept also applies to their own field of endeavor (item 9).

The favorable level of response for item 11 suggests that the faculty in this survey also agree that each of the arts represents a way of looking at, analyzing, recording and communicating experience which is as legitimate for the college student to recognize and study as are the methodologies of the physical and social sciences.

Additionally, there was strong indication of agreement with the notion, expressed in item 12, that the arts are a means of not only cognitive development, but of self-understanding, a way by which a person's own nature can be explored clarified and grasped.

The vehicles through which these goals may be achieved, the disciplines and academic departments in fine arts, were recognized as being substantial academic disciplines with clear bodies of knowledge and clearly defined methodologies by the clear majority of the

respondents as they reacted to items 17, 18, and 20 by manifesting substantial agreement that Music, Visual Arts and Theatre were clear disciplines. Dance and Television/Film Studies were also recognized as disciplines but not at the same level of agreement. These two areas were not recorded at the 4.000 mean level, but were placed at the 3.998 and 3.576 level, respectively.

There was substantial agreement, as expressed in response to item 22, that experiences in the fine arts can give students and enhanced and enriched system for learning, including a heightened awareness of the range and depth of their perceptual horizons.

In assigning priorities for which of the arts should be most prominently featured as sources of experience for the student, the respondents indicated agreement with priority for Music (item 29) and Visual Arts (item 30). This priority assignment was based on the assumption, tested in items 24 through 28, that a course-based experience in one or more of the arts should be provided to all students in a general education program. The mean responses to these items is indicated below in Table 15.

Table 15

Mean Responses to Fine Arts Requirement in Specific Fields

Field	Mean	Standard Deviation
Music	3.603	1.151
Visual Arts	3.579	1.158
Dance	3.033	1.086
Theatre	3.282	1.155
Television/Film Studies	2.847	1.121

Not only was there a diminution in strength of support for the idea of a course-based experience for all students in these fields, but, as can be seen, there was considerable range to the responses with groupings of respondents over a noticeable range. Unlike the responses which have been discussed thus far, these items do not represent the same unanimity of agreement.

Thus, the suggesting of priorities for each of the departments or disciplines in the structure of a general education requirement for an experience in one or more of the fine arts must be judged in this context.

There was once again considerable agreement, however, in regard to certain goals of general education and the inclusion of the fine arts. Respondents agreed that in designing a fine arts course for inclusion in a general education program there should be a goal to provide students with an enhanced system of awareness and perceptual

abilities for cognitive development (item 38). There should also, however, be an attempt to include the more traditional goal of developing an awareness of cultural, aesthetic and social heritage (item 39).

When the analysis was carried to the next lower level of agreement (MN = 3.500 to 3.999) the following items were revealed as being source of agreement, but leavened with a degree of uncertainty, shown below in Table 16.

Table 16

Item Means at 3.500 to 3.999 Level

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reverse Score
3	3.686	1.234	yes
4	3.535	1.271	
14	3.917	0.859	yes
19	3.998	0.973	
21	3.576	1.074	
24	3.603	1.151	
25	3.579	1.158	
35	3.906	0.894	
36	3.933	0.845	
37	3.976	0.830	
41	3.645	0.935	

At this level of agreement, which raises greater issues of strength of interpretation than the 4.000 and above levels, the spread of responses also tended to be greater, as reflected in Table 16 and the report of the standard deviations.

With this somewhat lessened assurance, it can be reported that the faculty in the survey sample disagreed with the notion that fine

arts courses should only be regarded as electives in a general education program and not part of any required distribution system (item 3). This response paralleled that expressed to item 5 in which the faculty pool also rejected the notion that a general education program should not have any required distribution areas.

The faculty pool also agreed, although not on a strong level (MN = 3.535) that an effective general education program should contain a provision for a required fine arts experience (item 4).

They clearly disagreed with the notion that the only goal of a fine arts requirement in general education should be to assist students in becoming intelligent viewers and perceptive critics (item 14). This response was apparently in keeping with the profile of other and stronger agreement levels with instrument items in which there had been manifested a clear sense of multiple goals for the fine arts in general education, including a component dealing with cognitive development.

Dance and Television/Film Studies were recognized as disciplines by the faculty respondents at this level, but clearly without the strength of agreement which had been manifested for Music, Visual Arts, and Theatre. The response level showed a mean of 3.998 for the field of Dance (item 19) and a mean of 3.576 for the field of Television/Film Studies (item 21).

The reduced mean range of 3.500 to 3.999 also brought to bear a recognition that perhaps there should indeed be an opportunity provided for all students in general education programs to experience at least the fields of Music and Visual Arts (items 24 and 25). There

was less support for allowing this same opportunity or for establishing any requirement for experiences in Theatre (item 27) which had a mean agreement response of 3.282, or for Dance (item 26, MN = 3.033) or for Television/Film Studies (item 28, MN = 2.847).

Although with less strength than with other goals statements, there was discernible agreement expressed with the goals inherent in items 35, 36, 37, and 41 of the survey instrument. Thus, the faculty sample would agree that among the goals which should be included in a fine arts course designed for general education are those which seek to (1), develop an awareness of cultural differences (item 35) (2), assist the student in developing an awareness of his or her own creative and human potential (item 36), (3), examine the potential of the arts for enhancing the life and environment of all citizens in all stages of their life (item 37) and (4), assist the student in becoming an astute and skilled "consumer" and critic of the arts (item 41).

With the addition of 11 items which had received an agreement level at the 3.500 to 3.999 mean response, the total number of instrument items which had received an indication of agreement by the faculty pool, using the mean response as a basis, had risen to a total of 28 items, representing 68.3 percent of the total instrument items.

Thus, a clear majority of the responses indicate agreement with many of the leading propositions which have been advanced in the literature over the past several years pleading for a significant role for the fine arts in general education programs.

Using the content of the items which had received indications of agreement, a profile of this faculty survey group would suggest they

favor a role for the fine arts which includes the arts within a general education distribution system as part of a pattern of requirements. They also acknowledge that the arts have multiple roles to play, including not only the customary role of conveyors of cultural tradition, but also as partners in the development of cognitive processes as well as the enhancement of personal enrichment and creativity. Music, Visual Arts and, to a lesser extent, Theatre are seen as the primary vehicles for these goals.

Since interpretation of agreement levels is much less secure at the mean response level of 3.499 and below, the items which fell into this grouping will not be discussed in this chapter. However, a complete report of item means analysis is included as Appendix M.

#### Item Cluster Analysis

In order to focus more clearly on the issue of an Arts and Cognition approach to fine arts in general education versus the more Traditional Role for the arts, an analysis was done of item clusters as discussed in Chapter III. These item clusters represented items which had been deliberately placed throughout the questionnaire instrument in a random fashion as a test of philosophical bases for general education programs and the fine arts.

The specific content of individual items can be found in Appendix K and will not be commented upon here. The item clusters approach was used to group items having similar content around a "theme" or "sub-scale" for data analysis. These "sub-scales" were then useful in giving focus to basic curricular premises inherent in item content.

Cluster Number One was devoted to the "theme" of level of .



agreement with a role for the fine arts in cognitive development including enhanced modes of perception and variant modes of analytical reasoning. Item means analysis for this cluster is reported in Table 17.

Table 17

Item Means Analysis: Cluster #1

Cluster	Item(s)	Mean(s)	Standard Deviation
Arts and Cognition	1	4.176	0.811
	7	3.394	1.269
	11	4.293	0.845
	12	4.115	0.854
	22	4.282	0.699
	23	3.467	1.067
	38	4.070	0.716

Grand Mean (X ) - 3.971

Viewing this cluster of items as a "theme" and treating the administration of the survey instrument as a testing of degree of favorableness of the faculty sample towards a significant role for the fine arts in the acquisition and development of cognitive skills, we can assume that there is a tendency for this survey group to accept such a linkage between the fine arts and cognition.

The agreement level, while missing the clear mean agreement level of 4.000 and above is nevertheless within .029 percentage points of achieving such a level. There were, however, two issues which seemed to provide more latitude of response on the part of the total faculty pool. Item 7, while generating a favorable or strongly favorable

response from some 55.1 percent of the faculty sample, showed a considerable range of response. Data results of this item are shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Frequency Response to Item 7

(7) A goal of general education should be to balance a student's awareness of science as an analytical, "taking-apart of experience," with an equally important awareness of the arts as a synthesizing, or "putting-together" of experience.

	Sample % Response	N
Strongly Agree	19.2	81
Agree	35.9	151
Uncertain	20.0	84
Disagree	10.9	46
Strongly Disagree	12.4	52
No Response	1.7	7
Mean: 3.394	Standard Deviation: 1.269	

It is possible that the language used in this item, while slightly modified from its original source in the literature, may still have been too compacted and too dependent upon context for a clear response to be forthcoming from the faculty members surveyed.

Item 23 also produced a wide variation in range of response. It also posed a bi-polar question which may again have proved troublesome for the respondents. The data results of this item are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Frequency Response to Item 23

(23) A liberal education should be so structured as to achieve a balance between expression using the written word and the expressive symbol system used in at least one of the arts.

	Sample % Response	N
Strongly Agree	17.8	75
Agree	34.0	143
Uncertain	25.7	108
Disagree	18.8	79
Strongly Disagree	2.4	10
No Response	1.4	6
Mean: 3.467	Standard Deviation: 1.067	

While some 51.8 percent of the respondents indicated agreement with the proposition, it may well be that a number of the faculty perceived the issue as having a problematical effect on the issue of basic skills in writing or they may have been unclear about what "balance" was being proposed.

Overall, however, the data clearly indicated a majority agreement with the linkage between fine arts and cognition being proposed in this cluster of items.

The respondents also indicated a noticeable level of support for the arts in their more traditional roles as well. Analysis of responses to the cluster of items dealing with a traditional role for the arts revealed a level of agreement only slightly diminished from that registered for a role of the arts and cognition. Results of this analysis are recorded in Table 20.

Table 20

Item Means Analysis: Cluster #2

Cluster	Item(s)	Mean(s)	Standard Deviation
Traditional Role for the Arts	2*	4.156	0.896
	3*	3.686	1.234
	6*	2.582	1.121
	14*	3.917	0.859
	15*	4.192	0.789
	34*	3.332	1.013
	35	3.906	0.894
	39	4.296	0.638
	41	3.645	0.935

Grand Mean (X ) = 3.746

\*items where scoring was reversed

While the grand mean registered for this cluster can be interpreted as a tendency to agree with the item content or, for those items with reversed scoring, to disagree with a position limiting a role for the arts, there was considerable fluctuation from item to item.

There was very clear indication of rejecting the notion as expressed in item 2 that the only role for the arts in general education was for "cultural enrichment." There was also a clear disagreement with the notion, as expressed in item 15, that there was no need for any studio experience to be made available for students in a general education fine arts component. Yet there was also affirmation expressed for the goal articulated in item 39 for the arts to develop and awareness of cultural, aesthetic, and social heritage

in general education courses.

More neutral positions were recorded for items 3, 35 and 41 but the interpretation can still be one of an inclination towards agreement with means of 3.686, 3.906 and 3.645, respectively. Item 14 was also recorded as expressing essentially positive attitudes with a mean of 3.917.

The content of these items when matched with the mean scores achieved, suggests that the respondents were consistent in accepting most of the traditional roles for the arts, but not wishing to limit the arts to only those roles. For example, the respondents clearly rejected the idea in item 3 that fine arts courses should only be regarded as electives and not be included in some required general education distribution scheme. Yet, in items 35 and 41 they also affirmed support for some of the traditional goals for the arts in general education. These goals would be to assist the student in developing an awareness of cultural differences as well as aiding the student in becoming an astute and skilled "consumer" and critic of the arts.

Perhaps because of an unwillingness to enter into curricular and instructional planning in fields other than their own, the respondents were not as clearly clustered in their responses to item 34. This item offered the proposition that "Instruction in the fine arts within a general education program should consist largely of lecture-oriented courses" in which the historical-cultural context of art would be the primary focus. Further, the item suggested that student activity would be largely passive, with some opportunity to write "reviews" of

art works in the field being studied. This capsule description represents a very traditional concept of an "arts appreciation" course designed for large class structure within a broad general education scheme.

While a significant proportion of the respondents rejected this limited notion for instruction in the fine arts, the range of response was considerable, as can be seen in Table 21.

Table 21

Frequency Response to Item 34

	Sample % Response	N
Strongly Agree	2.9	12
Agree	21.1	89
Uncertain	22.8	96
Disagree	40.9	172
Strongly Disagree	9.0	38
No Response	3.3	14
Mean: 3.332	Standard Deviation: 1.013	

Thus, a significant percentage of the respondents (49.9 percent) rejected this limited form of instruction, but an equally significant percentage (46.8 percent) were either uncertain of this approach or were accepting of it.

The most significant rejection of a notion that the fine arts, in participating within a structured general education program, should endeavor to devise any special adaptation to the population came with the responses to item 6. This item suggested that any course offered by the department involved could be used for general education

purposes rather than courses designed particularly for general education purposes. Since this item was one in which the scoring had been reversed to maintain the directionality of the instrument as measuring the degree of favorableness towards a more active and special role for the fine arts in general education, the mean achieved for this item, 2.582, indicates an acceptance of the item content.

Some 53.2 percent of the respondents agreed with the notion that any course within a fine arts department could be used for general education purposes. Only 24.5 percent of the respondents disagreed with the notion, while nearly as many (20.7 percent) were uncertain.

This response could prove problematical if those engaged in designing fine arts courses which might be used for general education purposes were to try and balance the goals of arts and cognition with the goals of acquiring the direct and basic "making skills" which might characterize pre-professional courses in art, music, theatre, or dance. While a case has often been made that "doing" an art will result in some "understandings" of the given art, there are also emphases which instruction in the arts must give to those students who do have to learn explicitly how to do a print-making process, how to apply make-up, how to run a video camera and so forth.

In sum, however, the response of the total faculty sample to the item cluster design with a traditional role for the arts indicated that they generally accept all of the customary goals which have been assigned to the arts in a liberal education framework, but do not wish to limit the arts to only those goals. The responses would also indicate a recognition of a place for the fine arts within a specific

set of distribution requirements in a general education program.

In order to provide a context for the type of general education program which the respondents might have in mind when they were dealing with certain of the issues, two items (5 and 16) had been placed randomly within the survey instrument. These items were designed to assess the respondent's reaction to a general education program which would have NO required distribution areas or courses to be taken and to a general education program which might offer guidelines requiring students to take courses in all disciplinary areas, but would not require specific courses.

Respondents clearly rejected the notion that an acceptable general education program should make no requirements for distribution areas. The overall mean score on this item (4.177) clearly reflects the response in which some 82.9 percent of the respondents disagreed with any program which did not articulate required distribution areas or specific courses.

The response to item 16 was, however, far less clear. The item itself and the recorded responses are displayed in Table 22.



Table 22

Frequency Response to Item 16

	Sample % Response	N
Strongly Agree	10.5	44
Agree	29.0	122
Uncertain	18.5	78
Disagree	32.5	137
Strongly Disagree	7.4	31
No Response	2.1	9
Mean: 2.2973	Standard Deviation: 1.166	

The mean for this item, which was also a reversed item in the scoring process, suggests that the majority of respondents are ranged from agreement to uncertainty but with a tendency which must be accepted as agreement. However, a significant percentage (39.9 percent) of the respondents did disagree with the notion that no further requirements or statements should be made about specific courses. Thus, if we separate the responses into distinct categories of agreement (39.5 percent) and disagreement (39.9 percent) and allow the responses of those who were uncertain to remain in that category, then the issue is truly in balance.

This range of response may be partially explained by the variations amongst general education programs currently in force at the nine survey sites. These programs range from very open systems in which the faculty have provided general guidelines for desired outcomes but the actual programs are planned by the student and his or her advisor on an individual basis, to programs in which discipline

areas are clearly stated and specific course or hour requirements are stated. Thus faculty members who have a vested or proprietary interest in the program at their own institution may be reflecting that institutional stance in response to this item. Since the aim of this study did not include analysis of site-by-site contrasts, no particular effort was made to examine this source of variance.

Analysis was conducted of three other item clusters which covered issues of (1) a primary role for the arts with a focus other than arts in relation to cognitive development, (2) the arts in relation to the development of creativity and "leisure-time" capabilities for students, and (3) the degree of recognition of the arts as legitimate disciplines.

The last category, which was reported as item cluster #6, and is so reported in Appendix M, has already been discussed. In sum, respondents showed a clear acceptance of Music, Visual Arts and Theatre as academic disciplines, but were slightly more hesitate to grant this status to Dance (mean of 3.998 on item 19) and Television/Film Studies (mean of 3.576 on item 21). There was also considerable range to responses about Television/Film Studies with a standard deviation of 1.074 on item 21.

Regarding the link between the study of fine arts and the development of creativity, personal gratification, and the acquisition of "leisure-time" capabilities, the respondents were favorably inclined with a grand mean of 3.762 for the six items included in this cluster. These allied issues, reported as cluster #5, received clearest acceptance in item 10, discussed earlier as a high agreement

item. With this item, some 88.6 percent of the respondents agreed that a liberal education should make provision for the inclusion of learning in creativity, intuition, perceptual processes and aspects of mental life in addition to the traditional views of the role of intellectual processes and cognition.

Other responses to the remaining items in this cluster were uncertain but tending to agree (items 36 and 37) or within the uncertain category completely (items 13, 23, and 40).

The complete array of responses are available in Appendix M and may be compared with the item statements in Appendix K.

For purposes of discussion, it may be stated that the respondents agreed with the proposition as expressed in item 36 that a proper goal for a fine arts course in a general education program was to "assist the student in developing a sense of his or her own creative and human potential." Some 78.2 percent of the responses were either in the strongly agree or agree category for this item.

They also accepted the notion as expressed in item 37 that a fine arts course in a general education program could help the student examine "...the potential of the arts for enhancing the life and environment of all citizens in all stages of their life." A total of 79.1 percent of the survey respondents found this proposition acceptable at either the agree or strongly agree level.

With items 13, 23, and 40 there was not only greater dispersion of response, but a less significant agreement level.

In item 13 respondents were faced with a direct issue of making the tapping of creative potential of all students a primary goal of

general education, thus providing for some form of "studio work" in the arts. While some 55.2 percent of the respondents agreed with this notion, 43.1 percent were either uncertain or opposed to the notion. The standard deviation recorded for this item (1.099) confirms the range of response. A reasonable interpretation of the response to this item would be that while a significant majority accepted the notion, the wise curriculum developer would be well advised to investigate the concerns which might be present in the total faculty body.

The notion of achieving a balance between expression using the written word and that using the expressive symbol system of one or more of the fine arts has already been discussed earlier in this chapter. This item (number 23) was included in the item cluster dealing with creativity and human development because it represents the vocabulary of the arts. While a majority of the respondents (51.8 percent) did accept the proposition, there was a considerable number who had doubts or disagreement with the notion. The standard deviation for this item (1.067) reflects the range of response.

Finally, item 40, which proposed that a goal for a fine arts course in general education should be to provide an outlet for emotional expression, received a very mixed response. While a bare majority of the respondents (50.6 percent) expressed at least agreement with the proposition, a significant proportion (27.6 percent) were uncertain, and a smaller proportion even disagreed clearly with it. Since only 1.7 percent of the total sample did not respond to the item, the data would suggest that this issue, along

with those raise in terms 13 and 23 should be approached with care by any developer of curriculum for the fine arts in general education programs.

The final item cluster, reported as cluster #3, gave attention to those items which tested agreement levels for a significant role for the fine arts in general education programs without specific reference to the issue of arts and cognition or those of the arts as fostering creativity. There was considerable range to the responses for items in this category with a grand mean of 3.190 indicating essential uncertainty about a theme in this cluster. The range included a strong affirmation for the position taken in a number of items (8, 9, 10, and 30) to a tendency to agree (items 4, 24, 25) to uncertainty inclined toward disagreement or even clear disagreement (items 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33). There was also considerable range to the responses with clear indication of this confirmed by the recorded standard deviations for these items.

As an item cluster with a clearly defined "theme", this grouping did not reveal a significant pattern. By taking into account those items in which a clear majority of the respondents had indicated agreement, of whatever strength, however, a profile did emerge as determined by a majority of the respondents. This group would (1) accept a general education program which would include a "fine arts requirement" requiring that all students take at least one or two fine arts courses to satisfy that requirement. Further they would accept (2) that a fine arts experience can enhance development in all fields and (3) that creativity, intuition and the training of perceptual

capabilities are not only goals for liberal education but could be enhanced by experiences in the fine arts. They would (4) clearly accept Music and Visual Arts as purveyors of experiences in the fine arts but were less certain about potential roles for Dance, Theatre and Television/Film Studies in that role.

A complete record of the item means analysis for all six item clusters is available as Appendix N.

#### Analysis of Scores for Correlation

The original design for this study posited that there would be a score variance as correlated with certain key variables in the respondent group. As discussed in Chapter III, the four major hypotheses were that:

(1) Faculty members who attended a liberal arts college for their undergraduate degree would, as a group, manifest a significantly higher level of favorableness for a significant role for the fine arts in a general education program than their colleagues who had not attended such an institution for their undergraduate degree.

(2) Faculty who were in their earlier years of full-time college teaching would manifest a more favorable attitude toward a significant role for the arts in general education programs.

(3) Those faculty members whose undergraduate degree program included the taking of one or more courses in the fine arts would be more favorably inclined to a significant role for the fine arts in general education programs.

(4) Faculty members who had established a "mentor relationship" with a faculty member in their undergraduate college would be more

likely to think in broad terms about undergraduate curricula and thus accept more readily a role for the fine arts in general education programs.

It was also assumed that there would be some clear correlational link between other independent variables such as rank, discipline area of the respondent, and size of the undergraduate institution for the faculty member and the total score achieved on the survey instrument.

Using the SPSS Anova program, data analysis was made of the scores of all respondents to test these hypotheses. As has been discussed earlier in this paper, the score was, in essence, the grand mean of all item means recorded for questionnaire response.

The marked homogeneity of the survey sample, as illustrated earlier in this chapter in the discussion of the sample demographic composition already suggested some difficulties in identifying significant variances and profile differences.

For example, with slightly over 70 percent of the respondents indicating they had attended a private or church-related college or university, and with nearly the same proportion indicating that the enrollment at their undergraduate institution having been 4,500 or less, the respondent profile was not only strongly homogeneous but clearly skewed in a direction which, however, also mirrored the population involved.

Analysis of the data revealed that no significant correlation was present for the dependent variable of the survey instrument score and the independent variable of the type of institution attended as an undergraduate by the respondents. There was also no correlation

apparent between the score achieved and the enrollment at that undergraduate institution. In fact, the mean scores were remarkably consistent across both boundaries. There was a slightly higher mean score for those respondents who had attended a public college or university, but it was not statistically significant. In a number of cases the cells were also quite small (five cases or less) for accurate statistical analysis once the analysis proceeded beyond the level of institutional type and into varying enrollment characteristics of the institution. The complete Breakdown Table of Mean Score by Institution and Enrollment is available in Appendix O.

A SPSS analysis of data was also run for the variables of discipline and experience to test that portion of the design hypotheses.

No significant correlation was detected for the issue of years of teaching experience with mean scores being quite consistent across boundaries of experience. The slight variations which were detected cannot be regarded as statistically significant.

However, as might be suspected, a correlation did begin to emerge between disciplinary orientation and mean scores. The significant portion of the Cross-Breakdown analysis is replicated below in Table 23.



Table 23

Cross-Breakdown of Mean Scores by Discipline

(Grand Mean = 3.8422)

Discipline	Mean	N	Standard Deviation	Difference
Arts & Literature	4.0080	121	.4645	+.1658
Culture Studies	3.9088	62	.3948	+.0666
Behavioral Sciences	3.7302	81	.4673	-.1120
Physical Sciences	3.7330	110	.3842	-.1092
Methodologies	3.7701	43	.3932	-.0721

Total N = 417

Missing Cases: 4

Range between lowest and highest = 0.2778

In comparing score responses with teaching experience as the variable, the range between lowest and highest mean scores was 0.1778 with the highest mean being achieved by respondents with 37 or more years of experience (N=13) and the lowest by respondents with 17 to 20 years of experience (N=65). The complete Breakdown Table of Mean Score by Experience and Discipline is available in Appendix P.

An analysis was also conducted of mean scores with the variables of discipline and whether the respondent had taken a fine arts course as an undergraduate.

Here the results once again confirmed that discipline orientation was a significant variable in correlation with mean scores. There was some indication that not taking a fine arts course as an undergraduate

might have an impact of the score achieved, i.e. the degree of favorableness manifested by the respondent, but the evidence was by no means conclusive. A replication of the data analysis, using the SPSS program Cross-Breakdown, appears in Table 24.

Results of this data analysis suggested that disciplinary orientation was going to prove to be the chief and perhaps only significant variable to interact with mean scores achieved by the respondents.

A cross-break analysis of mean scores by academic rank and discipline revealed that there were significant departures from the grand mean with discipline as a variable, but that academic rank was not a significant variable. Data analysis of these variables can be seen in cross-breakdown table in Appendix Q.

An analysis of variance was conducted using the SPSS program ANOVA, with a dependent variable as mean score and independent variables of professional rank in the one case, and disciplinary area in the other. Results of this analysis are displayed below in Table 25 and Table 26.

Table 24

Cross-Breakdown of Mean Scores by Discipline and Undergraduate Fine Arts Course

Took Fine Arts Course as an Undergraduate		Arts and Literature	Culture Studies	Behavioral Sciences	Physical Sciences	Methodologies	TOTAL
Yes	MN	4.0783	3.8962	3.8080	3.7648	3.9013	3.9071
	N	81	38	47	61	20	247
	SD	.4623	.3733	.4482	.3696	.3547	.4332
No	MN	3.8627	3.9062	3.6382	3.7160	3.6472	3.7432
	N	36	23	32	47	22	160
	SD	.4086	.4293	.4826	.3800	.4035	.4243
Total		4.0009	3.9000	3.7392	3.7436	3.7682	3.8427
		117	61	79	108	42	407
		0.4597	0.3918	0.4670	0.3732	0.397	0.4366

Missing Cases: 14

Difference  
Between Grand  
Mean and Cell  
Mean

+ .1582    + .0573    - .1035    - .0991    - .0745

Difference between Fine Arts Course Yes and Grand Mean = +.0644

Difference between Fine Arts Course No and Grand Mean = -.1295

Range of Difference between high and low means in Discipline Cells = .2617

Table 25

Analysis of Variance by Score/Rank

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Main Effects	0.749	2	0.374	1.934	0.146
Rank	0.749	2	0.374	1.934	0.146
Explained	0.749	2	0.374	1.934	0.146
Residual	80.943	418	0.194		
Total	81.692	420	0.195		

N=421

Table 26

Analysis of Variance by Score/Discipline

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Main Effects	6.080	4	1.520	8.363	0.000
Discipline	6.080	4	1.520	8.363	0.000
Explained	6.080	4	1.520	8.363	0.000
Residual	75.612	416	0.182		
Total	81.692	420	0.195		

N=421

As a confirmation of the interaction effect detected, a three-way analysis of variance was also conducted using score, academic rank and discipline area as the variables. The results of this analysis, also using the SPSS program, ANOVA, are displayed in Table 27.

Table 27

Analysis of Variance by Score/Rank/Discipline

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Main Effects	5.796	6	0.966	5.306	0.000
Rank	0.199	2	0.099	0.546	0.580
Discipline	5.398	4	1.350	7.413	0.000
2-Way Interactions	1.398	8	0.175	0.960	0.467
Rank Discipline	1.398	8	0.175	0.960	0.467
Explained	7.780	14	0.556	3.053	0.000
Residual	73.912	406	0.182		
Total	81.692	420	0.195		

N=421

The F-ratio established in Tables 26 and 27 for the discipline variable does have a correlation at a significant level for the recorded mean scores of all respondents in the survey pool.

In order to gain a narrower band of measurement and to further test the discriminating power of the survey instrument, an analysis of score data for the item clusters dealing with arts and cognition (cluster #1) and with a traditional role for the arts (cluster #2) was also conducted. This analysis used the SPSS program for Cross-Break which also produced a table for breakdown of the sub-population.

Recorded grand means for each of the two item clusters were used and the variables were academic rank and site identification. The results of these analyses may be found in Appendix R for the analysis of score by site and rank for Cluster #1 (Arts and Cognition) and in Appendix S for the analysis of score by site and rank for Cluster #2 (Traditional Role for the Arts).

There were no significant variations across academic ranks noted in this analysis. There were differences amongst the sites with a range of 0.4888 between the highest mean level and the lowest mean level amongst the sites for Cluster #1. There was also a range of some significance (.3847) between the highest mean level and the lowest mean level amongst the sites for Cluster #2.

Once again, these departures were probably conditioned by the values and traditions inherent in the nine sites. The highest means, signifying approval for a role in general education linking the arts and cognitive development, came from those sites which had always had an active arts program. The lower scores came from sites where the arts had not enjoyed quite the same degree of visibility.

In no case, however, did any site show marked departure from a level of favorableness towards the issue of a significant role for the fine arts in general education (mean of 3.500 and above).

Thus, site variations were detected, but no further analysis was made of the data in pursuit of these differences since the original design of the study did not make any provision for site-by-site comparisons.

Of the original research hypotheses concerning demographic

variables which might be correlated with scores achieved by the respondents, those dealing with attendance at a particular type of undergraduate school and with a presumption that faculty early in their teaching career would be more favorably inclined to the fine arts are not demonstrated by the data collected.

There was also little evidence that having taken or not taken a fine arts course in their undergraduate degree program might have a bearing on the level of favorableness manifested by the respondents. There was a suggestion, as has been noted, that this correlation may exist, but there was insufficient evidence to confirm such a relationship.

What had emerged in the analysis of the data was a clear indication that disciplinary orientation was a factor in determining the degree of favorableness manifested by the respondents. Those in Arts and Literature, for example, tended to register higher levels of approval than those in the Behavioral Sciences or the Physical Sciences as can be seen in the data analysis contained in Appendix Q.

There remains only the issue of whether or not having established a mentor-relationship with a faculty member during their undergraduate degree program might be correlated to significant variations in degree of favorableness towards the fine arts as part of a certain broadness of thinking.

A total of 376 respondents out of the total sample responded to the question about establishing a mentor relationship with a faculty member during their undergraduate years. Of this number, 244 (64.9 percent) indicated they had established such a bonding and 132 (35.1

percent) noted they had not.

An analysis of scores between the two groups was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences programs for cross-break analysis and analysis of variance. It was determined that there was no significant correlation between scores and the mentorship variable.

This conclusion was stable whether total scores were used or the sub-scale scores on various item clusters. The data analysis and scaled responses are available in Appendix W.

The mentorship issue is interesting to consider, since the high response rate to this item (89.3 percent) yielded a rich supply of additional information about the fields of a faculty mentor. There was evidence that the respondents had formed a mentor relationship with faculty from a variety of disciplines, often not the field in which the respondent chose to major. There was also some evidence that certain mentor-fields were more strongly represented amongst the disciplines which were not those of the respondents (e.g. English, History, Music, and Philosophy).

More complete description of the mentorship item and the data collected is displayed in Appendix V, Part I.

The design limits of this study, however, and the marked homogeneity of the survey sample, as has been discussed, make any conclusions about the implications of the mentorship issue difficult to draw.

Any question of how this variable may affect the attitude profile of faculty members in regard to issues of educational philosophy is



probably best left to some future research study.

For present purposes, it is sufficient to state that the original research hypotheses positing a correlation between survey instrument scores and the presence or absence of a mentorship relationship in the undergraduate experience of faculty respondents has not been demonstrated.

Questionnaire Analysis Comparing Faculty in the Fine Arts with  
Faculty in Arts and Literature and All Other Disciplines

In an effort to determine whether the presence of faculty members in fine arts disciplines in the design disciplinary category of Arts and Literature might be unduly skewing the means for item clusters and for individual items, a separate analysis was conducted in which respondents who had identified themselves as being specifically in the fine arts were compared with both their colleagues in Arts and Literature and those in all other disciplines combined.

This analysis was also conducted to determine the extent of balance between faculty who might be expected to have an affinity for the fine arts whether by direct participation or by collegial affinity and those faculty whose disciplines were further removed from linkage with the fine arts.

Much to the dismay of a few respondents who included written notations with their questionnaires, literature had not been included in the questionnaire items as a fine art. The reason for this apparent omission was that it was felt literature had long since assumed a central and clear position in general education curricula. This historical centrality and the common links between basic skills

in writing and at least the limited study of literary works typical of most general education programs suggested that this aspect of fine arts was in a more prominent position than other fine arts.

Nevertheless, it cannot be assumed that faculty who were placed in the disciplinary category of Arts and Literature would necessarily be mirror images of their colleagues in the fine arts.

Responses to the questionnaire item in which the faculty members were asked to self-designate a discipline category were used to identify those faculty who would constitute the fine arts component of this analysis. All faculty remaining in the original Arts and Literature discipline category would then constitute the sub-population of Arts and Literature. All other faculty were combined into the sub-population called All Other Disciplines.

The demographic characteristics of the three groups thus created are enumerated in Table 28.

A complete listing of the demographic characteristics of these groups may be found in Appendix T. Overall, there were certain characteristics which tended to separate the fine arts faculty from the two other faculty cohorts. As can be seen in Table 28, there was a much higher percentage of degrees other than the Ph.D. in the fine arts cohort. This is quite probably a reflection of the fact that a more typical terminal degree for faculty in the fine arts is an M.F.A. rather than the Ph.D.

There was no distinction amongst the three cohorts in terms of years of teaching experience, with only minor fluctuations from cell to cell. There was, however, a tendency for faculty members of the

Table 28

Differentiated Demographic Profile of Three-Way Analysis  
Comparing Fine Arts Faculty, Remaining Faculty in Arts and  
Literature, and All Other Disciplines

---

Value Label	Fine Arts N=36	Arts and Literature N=87	All Other Disciplines N=299
-------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------

---

Highest Degree - Percentages Reporting

Bachelors	2.8	0.0	.7
Masters	19.4	1.1	5.4
TER/Masters	38.9	2.3	1.3
Doctorate	38.9	96.6	92.6

Teaching Experience

0-4 years	11.1	12.6	13.5
5-8	19.4	13.8	19.3
9-12	8.3	17.2	12.5
13-16	13.9	19.5	13.9
17-20	19.4	16.1	14.9
21-24	0.0	4.6	5.1
25-28	8.3	5.7	6.8
29-32	5.6	6.9	5.4
33-36	8.3	1.1	5.7
37 or more	5.6	2.3	3.0

MEDIAN:                                    13-16 yrs.      13-16 yrs.      13-16 yrs.

Undergraduate Institution

Private Liberal	28.6	43.7	39.2
Church Liberal	11.4	9.2	8.4
Public College	5.7	3.4	7.4
Public University	31.4	12.6	22.0
Private University	22.9	25.3	21.6
Foreign	0.0	5.7	1.4

---

fine arts group to have attended a public university for their undergraduate degree. This is possibly a reflection of the greater likelihood for a large, often public institution, to have specialized curricula in one or more of the fine arts. As can be seen in Appendix T, there was also a slight tendency for faculty in the fine arts to have attended slightly larger institutions, probably for the same reason. This differential was, however, minor: i.e., a median enrollment level at the undergraduate institution for fine arts faculty of 2,500-3,000 as compared to a median enrollment level of 2,000-2,500 for both other groups.

A noticeably higher percentage of the fine arts faculty group reported either taking or having to take undergraduate course work in composition and fine arts than was reported by the other groups. The fine arts faculty group also reported less emphasis on mathematics and physical sciences than was true of the other two groups. Yet, it was the Arts and Literature faculty group which had the highest percentage of their membership reporting undergraduate requirements in the physical sciences, as well as a slightly higher margin from that same group when compared with the other two for undergraduate requirements in the social sciences.

Other undergraduate requirements for general education were reported at relatively equal levels for all three groups. Some areas of response were made problematical because of a low "n", especially in the fine arts faculty cohort, but a sufficient number did respond to the item asking whether or not the faculty member had taken a fine arts course in his or her undergraduate program to make a useful

comparison. Fine arts faculty reported at a high level (86.1 percent) as having taken a fine arts course as a part of the undergraduate degree, a not surprising response. This compared to some 58.6 percent of the remaining Arts and Literature faculty and to 55.5 percent of all other faculty.

At high levels of sample response, all three groups revealed a contrast as well on the issue of establishing a mentor-relationship during their undergraduate years. In the fine arts faculty 66.7 percent indicated having done so, while in the Arts and Literature cohort 58.6 percent said they had done so. Some 56.9 percent of the faculty in other disciplines claimed to have established such a relationship.

In addition to the characteristics discussed above, attention was given to the composition of these three sub-population samples. The chief characteristics of the sample composition for these three groups created out of the larger sample are enumerated in Table 29.

As might be expected, the questionnaire responses for these three sub-populations displayed a marked pattern. Separation of the self-designated fine arts faculty into a distinct group clearly revealed the consistent strength of their degree of favorableness to a significant role for the fine arts within general education programs.

Table 30, showing comparative means for each item across the three groups, reveals the distinctive character of the response pattern. The fine arts faculty are consistently in agreement with the item content, or register consistent disagreement (also by high item means) with those propositions which would either relegate the fine

Table 29

Sample Composition, Sub-Population of Fine Arts Faculty, Remaining  
Faculty in Arts and Literature, and All Other Disciplines

Self-Designated Fine Arts Faculty:  
N=36

Site Representation:	N	Percentage
(01)	6	16.7
(02)	9	25.0
(03)	6	16.7
(04)	1	2.8
(05)	1	2.8
(06)	7	19.4
(07)	1	2.8
(08)	1	2.8
(09)	4	11.1

Total 36

Faculty Rank:

Professor	13	36.1
Associate Professor	10	27.8
Assistant Professor	13	36.1

Arts and Literature (Minus the Self-Designated Fine Arts Faculty)

Site Representation:	N	Percentage
(01)	12	13.8
(02)	10	11.5
(03)	13	14.9
(04)	8	9.2
(05)	11	12.6
(06)	11	12.6
(07)	7	8.0
(08)	8	9.2
(09)	7	8.0

Total 87

Table 29 (continued)

---

Faculty Rank:		
Professor	25	28.7
Associate Professor	40	46.0
Assistant Professor	22	25.3
All Other Disciplines N=299		
	N	Percentage
Site Representation:		
(01)	25	12.3
(02)	34	11.4
(03)	31	10.4
(04)	15	5.0
(05)	40	13.4
(06)	33	11.0
(07)	47	15.7
(08)	33	11.0
(09)	30	10.0
Total	299	
Faculty Rank:		
Professor	129	43.1
Associate Professor	76	25.4
Assistant Professor	94	31.4

---

Table 30

Comparison of Mean Response Level Amongst Fine Arts Faculty,  
Arts and Literature Faculty, and Faculty From All Other Disciplines

Item	Mean for Fine Arts	Mean for Arts and Literature	Mean for All Other Disciplines
1	4.889	4.264	4.065
2*	4.806	4.247	4.057
3*	4.528	3.651	3.597
4	4.528	3.477	3.435
5*	4.639	4.256	4.101
6*	2.686	2.718***	2.515
7	3.800	3.588	3.285
8	4.556	4.360	4.010
9	4.571	4.333	4.317
10	4.778	4.286	4.317**
11	4.861	4.360	4.207
12	4.528	4.176	4.054
13	4.306	3.554	3.383
14	4.306	3.908	3.886
15*	4.611	4.198	4.139
16*	3.143	3.202	2.874
17	4.735	4.452	4.395
18	4.647	4.381	4.208
19	4.500	3.964	3.962
20	4.647	4.274	4.154
21	4.265	3.639	3.486
22	4.861	4.341	4.193
23	4.417	3.535	3.333
24	4.514	3.720	3.463
25	4.514	3.744	3.424
26	3.971	3.063	2.922
27	4.314	3.420	3.131
28	3.735	2.950	2.721
29	4.613	4.367	4.393**
30	4.581	4.217	4.212
31	3.200	2.185	2.468**
32	3.400	3.351	3.205
33	2.300	2.018	1.995
34*	3.914	3.325	3.266
35	3.972	3.964	3.884
36	4.500	3.779	3.905**



Table 30 (continued)

Item	Mean for Fine Arts	Mean for Arts and Literature	Mean for All Other Disciplines
37	4.417	3.977	3.925
38	4.639	4.151	3.976
39	4.667	4.459	4.200
40	3.806	3.176	3.361**
41	4.111	3.783	3.549
Grand Mean	4.2628	3.7759	3.6579
Difference Between Means		0.4869	0.1180

\*Indicates items in which the scoring was reversed to preserve directionality of the instrument. Thus, the higher the mean in these items, the greater the disagreement with the proposition advanced in the item.

\*\*Indicates those items for which the mean response of faculty in the Other Disciplines group was higher than the mean for faculty in the remaining Arts and Literature group.

\*\*\*Indicates item for which the mean response for Arts and Literature faculty was higher than that for separate Fine Arts faculty.

arts to a limited "traditional" role in general education. They also consistently reject notions of a "dispersed" general education program which would recognize courses in the fine arts only as electives (see item #3). The consistency of their response can be interpreted as confirmation of the reports in the literature of the thinking of faculty in the fine arts about increasing and deepening the role of these disciplines in general education programs.

Those faculty remaining in the original design group of Arts and Literature, generally also showed a consistency of response, being more favorable than their colleagues in all other disciplines towards a significant role for the fine arts but being somewhat less strongly inclined in the degree of their response than the faculty in the fine arts.

There were, however, a few anomalies. While the margin of mean difference varied amongst the items when measuring the spread amongst the three groups, there was generally very close proximity between the Arts and Literature faculty group and all the other disciplines. Customarily, the Arts and Literature faculty registered higher approval levels, but only marginally so. In five items, however, the Other Disciplines group registered a higher rate of approval. These were items 10, 29, 31, 36, and 40. In general, however, allowing for an average mean level difference of  $+0.1498$ , the responses of the Arts and Literature faculty closely mirrored the responses of the Other Disciplines faculty. This feature suggests once again the strong homogeneity of the survey sample group.

A complete report of all item responses for this three-way group

analysis may be found in Appendix U.

Those items in which there are marked deviations from the typical group pattern are revealing of some philosophical or pedagogical differences amongst these three groups.

Item 6, for example, in which the proposition is advanced that any course offered by a fine arts department can be used for general education purposes as opposed to a course designed with the general student in mind, was accepted by 45.7 percent of the fine arts faculty but rejected by 34.3 percent of that group with 20 percent being uncertain. The Arts and Literature faculty group, however, accepted the concept by a 49.4 percent margin with 28.3 percent rejecting it, and 22.4 percent being uncertain. The faculty in the Other Disciplines pool showed a much stronger acceptance level of 57.0 percent, with only 22.4 percent rejecting the concept.

While the differential in acceptance level between the Arts and Literature group and their colleagues in the Fine Arts was small it does demonstrate the only occasion in which the Arts and Literature group ran contrary in direction to the attitudes of faculty in the Fine Arts. This would suggest that if curricular planning for fine arts courses in general education were to include provision for a set of special courses for that purpose, it might find some opposition from other faculty groups. The response to this item by the Fine Arts faculty, however, suggest that there is not even unanimity of opinion within their own ranks.

Those items, mentioned earlier, in which the mean approval score was higher for faculty in the Other Disciplines group than for those

in the Arts and Literature group are of some interest as potential signals of faculty division, although the mean differences tend to be slight.

Item 10, for example, posing the notion that a liberal education should make provision for learning which includes creativity, intuition, perception, and other aspects of the mental life in addition to traditional views of intellectual processes and cognition, was clearly accepted by all groups as initially revealed by the data analysis of the total sample pool. However, the faculty in the Other Disciplines group in this three-way comparison registered that approval at slightly higher levels than was true of their colleagues in the Arts and Literature group. A total of 90.8 percent of the Other Disciplines faculty accepted this notion as compared with 86.9 percent of the Arts and Literature faculty. As might be expected, 100 percent of the Fine Arts faculty sample accepted the idea. Although the narrowness of the distinction does not allow for any in-depth interpretation, its clarity suggests that the Arts and Literature cohort in this sample may be somewhat more traditional or even conservative than their colleagues in either the fine arts or all other disciplines.

This interpretation may be borne out by the response of all groups to item 31 which asked what priority level should be assigned to Dance, if an experience in the arts were to be provided to all students in a general education program. Using a cumulative percentage analysis to interpret the responses, it can be seen that

93.4 percent of the Fine Arts faculty group would assign Dance a number 4 priority position, with Music being number 1, Visual Arts number 2, and Theatre number 3. Arts and Literature faculty would also assign Dance a number 4 priority position, but only at an approval level of 68.5 percent. Faculty in the Other Disciplines cohort would also assign Dance the same priority position, but at an approval level of 79.8 percent. While 83.3 percent of the total Fine Arts group responded to this item, 62.1 percent of the Other Disciplines group did so. With such varying levels of response a profile of the comparison groups is difficult to ascertain, but the similar response level between Arts and Literature faculty and those in Other Disciplines does allow some reinforcement for the "traditional" label being attached to the Arts and Literature faculty when viewed separate from their colleagues in the Fine Arts.

With response levels similar to those of item 31, the approval granted for Music as priority number 1 in item 29 displayed the same contrast between Fine Arts faculty and those in both Arts and Literature and Other Disciplines. Fine Arts faculty members granted the field of Music a priority number 1 position at a 74.2 percent level of agreement. While those respondents from Arts and Literature and the Other Disciplines category also ranked Music as a number 1 priority, they did so at lesser approval levels. Other Disciplines faculty assigned that priority at 63.3 percent while the Arts and Literature faculty did so only at a 56.7 percent level.

When addressing goals for fine arts courses in a general education program, there were also two items in which higher means

were recorded for faculty in the Other Disciplines category than for faculty in Arts and Literature, although both groups came close to mirroring the responses of faculty in the Fine Arts.

Item 36 suggested that a reasonable goal for a fine arts course in general education was to "...assist the student in developing his/her own creative and human potential." The Fine Arts faculty accepted this goal at a 91.7 percent level of agreement although only 61.1 percent of that faculty group gave such approval at the level of "strongly agree." Faculty in the Arts and Literature group accepted this goal at the 71.0 percent level of agreement, but only 19.8 percent of the group had indicated they "strongly agreed" with the goal. Members of the Other Disciplines group also accepted the goal at a clear majority level of 79.7 percent, but, like the members of the Arts and Literature cohort, only 19.0 percent had indicated acceptance at the level of strong agreement with the proposition.

Again, to risk an interpretation with such a narrow band of separation is difficult, perhaps even inadvisable, but there is, after all, the distinct possibility that members of the Other Disciplines group may be willing to defer the details of curricular goal planning to their colleagues in the arts once they have accepted the broad notion that the "arts are important." Members of the Arts and Literature faculty cohort representing as they do the fields of language and literature may be less inclined to do so.

A further distinction amongst the three groups was seen in responses to item 40, another goals statement for fine arts courses in general education. In this case the respondents were asked whether

they agreed or disagreed with a goal for such courses being to "...provide an outlet for emotional expression." While a clear majority of the Fine Arts faculty (63.9 percent) accepted this goal, a significant number (25.0 percent) expressed uncertainty. Within the Arts and Literature faculty, 29.4 percent expressed uncertainty about the goal, but only 42.3 percent accepted the goal with 34.1 percent doing so only at the level of "agree." The faculty in Other Disciplines accepted the goal at a majority level (52.3 percent) but 28.2 percent indicated uncertainty. The majority response was achieved, however, with only 7.1 percent indicating strong agreement as compared to 27.8 of the Fine Arts faculty indicating strong agreement.

Once again, faculty from disciplines other than the Arts and Literature cohort had indicated approval of a fine arts goal at a level higher than this group, and had done so by a margin of 10 percent. The proportion of the sample responding in each sample was equivalent (97.7 percent for Arts and Literature, and 98.3 percent for Other Disciplines), and the achieved mean in each case (Arts and Literature  $MN=3.176$ , Other Disciplines  $MN=3.361$ ) was governed by a comparable standard error level (0.112 for Arts and Literature, 0.056 for Other Disciplines).

The most likely interpretation for this slight, but clear, distinction in agreement level could be that the faculty in the Arts and Literature cohort also tended to be more traditional or conservative than either their colleagues in the Fine Arts or even their colleagues in all other disciplines.

The basic and over-riding pattern which did emerge from this aspect of the three-way comparison amongst faculty in the Fine Arts, faculty remaining in the design category of Arts and Literature and the pooling of all other faculty into a single Other Disciplines category was that the Fine Arts faculty were, as expected, most strongly in agreement with those notions favorable to the fine arts in general education and that, in most cases, the Arts and Literature faculty were also in agreement but at a less strong level. In fact their affinity often seemed to be more with the faculty in Other Disciplines rather than with faculty in the Fine Arts cohort.

Those items in which there were significant deviations from this pattern, and in which the Arts and Literature faculty were somewhat less favorably inclined than their colleagues in all other disciplines may be suggestive, as has been indicated, of a degree of traditionalism or conservatism in their philosophical and pedagogical outlook. Only further investigation including, perhaps, a replication of this study could begin to confirm this interpretation.

The separation of the survey sample into these three groups and thus isolating the Fine Arts faculty for purposes of analysis, while revealing the importance of this cohort in creating the total sample means for individual items, resulted in a significant shift in the basic pattern of favorableness for any given item. That is, while the measurement levels changed, the profile proved to be essentially stable.

It was only through this three-way separation, however, that the mirror-effect of the relationship between Arts and Literature faculty



and those in all other disciplines was revealed. The three-way analysis also proved constructive in uncovering what might prove to be an interesting degree of traditionalism or even conservatism amongst faculty remaining in the Arts and Literature cohort.

The range of differences in the means between the Arts and Literature faculty group and that of Other Disciplines is displayed in Table 31.

The final analysis done of data from the three-way comparison of these faculty cohorts was an examination of questionnaire responses arranged in the item clusters which have been discussed earlier in the analysis of the total pooled sample.

Cluster #1, dealing with a profile of degree of favorableness to linkage between the fine arts and cognitive development revealed a totally consistent pattern in which Fine Arts faculty gave consistently favorable responses to the notion and in which faculty from Arts and Literature as well as those grouped in the Other Disciplines pool also gave responses which could be interpreted as favorable or tending towards favorableness but at descending levels of agreement. The results of this analysis of Cluster #1 are given in Table 32.

Table 31

Difference in Means on Questionnaire Items Between Arts and  
Literature Faculty and Those in All Other Disciplines Combined

Item	Difference Between Arts and Literature Faculty and Other Disciplines	
1	+.199	
2	+.190	
3	+.054	
4	+.042	
5	+.155	
6	+.203	
7	+.303	
8	+.350	
9	+.016	
10		-.031
11	+.153	
12	+.122	
13	+.171	
14	+.022	
15	+.059	
16	+.328	
17	+.057	
18	+.173	
19	+.002	
20	+.120	
21	+.153	
22	+.148	
23	+.202	
24	+.257	
25	+.320	
26	+.141	
27	+.289	
28	+.229	
29		-.026
30	+.005	
31		-.283
32	+.146	
33	+.023	
34	+.059	
35	+.080	
36		-.126

Table 31 (continued)

Item	Difference Between Arts and Literature Faculty and Other Disciplines		
37	+.052		
38	+.175		
39	+.259		
40			-.185
41	+.234		
Mean of Difference	+.1569		-.1302
Grand Mean of Difference	+.1498		
Range of Standard Error		0.165	-0.370

NOTE: Responses of separate cohort of Fine Arts faculty are not reflected in the table.

Table 32

Means Analysis of Item Cluster #1 Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts,  
Arts and Literature and Other Disciplines

---

Content: Fine Arts and Cognition

Item	Fine Arts	Arts and Literature	Other Disciplines	Range
1	4.889	4.264	4.065	0.824
7	3.800	3.588	3.285	0.515
11	4.861	4.360	4.207	0.654
12	4.528	4.176	4.054	0.474
22	4.861	4.341	4.193	0.668
23	4.417	3.535	3.333	1.084
38	4.639	4.151	3.976	0.663
Grand Mean	4.571	4.0592	3.8733	0.697

Items where range is greater than 0.750: 2

Note: Complete data on the responses, including notations of Standard Deviations and Standard Error, are available in Appendix U.

---

All three groups registered a favorable response to the concept of a relationship between fine arts instruction and the development of cognitive processes, as evidenced by the Grand Means for each cohort. There were, however, differences not only in the essential level of support, but in a wide latitude of response in certain items. For example, in dealing with item 7, in which a proposition was advanced that the "analytical" experience of the sciences be balanced by the "synthesizing" experience of the arts, any interpretation must take into account the bi-polar structure of the item. Taken directly from the literature dealing with fine arts and general education, this item

obviously assumes that the two disciplinary areas involved, the arts and the sciences, cannot only be characterized in this fashion, but it also assumes that the respondent agrees with such a polarization. The total sample mean for this item, 3.394, can only be read as expressing a clear level of uncertainty. Of the groups in this three-way analysis, both faculty in Arts and Literature and those in the Fine Arts could be placed on the scale of uncertainty versus agreement closer to acceptance, but with only limited success. While 74.3 percent of the Fine Arts faculty accepted the proposition of item 7, 65.9 percent of the Arts and Literature faculty did so and only 50.8 percent of the faculty in Other Disciplines. Furthermore the largest proportion of those accepting the item content did so at the level of "agree" rather than "strongly agree."

Thus, while it can be asserted that there is evidence of a degree of favorableness towards the notion, the strength of that support is not as marked as with other questionnaire items such as number 1. This item not only registered a clear reading of agreement by virtue of the item grand mean, but the proportionate levels of agreement make the interpretation even more clear (approval level of 100 percent for Fine Arts faculty, 89.6 percent for Arts and Literature, and 79.6 percent for faculty in Other Disciplines). This item, which is the basic premise for a relationship between instruction in the fine arts and cognitive development, posited that "...Course-based instruction in one or more of the fine arts can assist students in cognitive development and critical thinking skills."

While items 11, 12, and 22 showed consistency in response amongst

the three groups with the usual pattern of decreasing levels of support, albeit still favorable, items 23 and 38 showed greater variation. It is as if, once agreement had been achieved on the basic premise of the issue of a relationship between the fine arts and cognition in item 1, the three faculty groups had different attitudes about its implementation.

With Fine Arts faculty registering the strongest levels of favorableness and the other two faculty groups also registering approval, but at lesser levels of conviction, three additional propositions following the basic premise of item 1 had been accepted:

- (a) Each of the fine arts, with its own vocabulary, represents a way of looking at, analyzing, recording, and communicating experience which is as legitimate for the college student to recognize as are the methodologies of the physical and social scientist. (Item 11)
- (b) A liberal education should reflect the notion that the arts are a means of self-understanding, a way by which a person's sense of his/her own nature can be explored, clarified, and grasped. (Item 12)
- (c) Experiences in the fine arts can give students an enhanced and enriched system for learning, including a heightened awareness of the range and depth of his/her perceptual horizons. (Item 22)

With item 23, which showed the greatest range of response, faculty were presented with another bi-polar or "balancing" item. In this case they were asked if they agreed with the concept that "...a liberal education be so structured as to achieve a balance between expression using the written word and the expressive symbol system used in at least one of the fine arts." The total survey sample response to this item has been discussed earlier in this chapter, including speculation about the difficulty faculty may have had in

appearing to downgrade the current demands for more effective instruction in the basic skill of writing by agreeing to a balance proposed in the item. Analysis of response to this item in the three-way comparison essentially served to reveal the strength of support by Fine Arts faculty who agreed with the statement by a margin of 86.1 percent. The faculty from Arts and Literature also accepted the statement 55.8 percent indicating agreement. Less than a majority (47.6 percent) of the faculty from all Other Disciplines accepted the item. This issue may well represent another area for curriculum planners in the fine arts to approach with caution when dealing with general education programs and the approval of the faculty at large.

The final item in the Arts and Cognitive Cluster, number 38, was included in the goals statement sequence at the end of the questionnaire. In suggesting potential goals for any fine arts course in a general education program, this item offers the notion that a fine arts course can and should "...provide students with an enhanced system of awareness and perceptual abilities for cognitive development." In effect, this item returns the respondent to the basic premise first announced in item 1 of the questionnaire and acts a check for internal reliability and consistency. It also refines the concept, however, by specifically alluding to the characteristics of "awareness" and "perceptual abilities" over and beyond the central assumption that fine arts courses can, somehow, achieve an impact on cognitive development.

As can be seen in Table 32, all three groups registered approval for the item content, ranging from clear evidence of favorableness for

the Fine Arts faculty and the Arts and Literature cohort, to somewhat more uncertainty but still with a favorable interpretation from the faculty in Other Disciplines. Proportionate response confirmed the descending order of favorableness with 94.4 percent of the Fine Arts faculty agreeing with the content of the item, with 89.6 of the Arts and Literature faculty doing so, although with a larger share indicating "agree" rather than "strongly agree," and 79.7 percent of Other Disciplines faculty accepting the statement.

Thus, with a few cautions to be borne in mind, the analysis of data in this three-way comparison amongst Fine Arts faculty, those in Arts and Literature, and the faculty pooled into the Other Disciplines category confirmed that a pattern of favorableness towards a role for the fine arts in cognitive development as part of a general education program was a true and typical reading.

As a further confirmation of response patterns, and as a means of further discrimination amongst the three subpopulations, an analysis was also conducted of mean responses to Item Cluster #2, which dealt with the question of a Traditional role for the arts.

The results of this analysis are given in Table 33.

Most of the items in this cluster have also been discussed earlier in this chapter, in particular those items for which there were any noticeable anomalies in the mean ranges. The results of data analysis in this three-way comparison reveal that all three cohorts indicated a marked degree of favorableness for the item cluster content, but that the Fine Arts faculty clearly granted significant approval to the notion of retaining all traditional roles for the arts



Table 33

Means Analysis of Item Cluster #2 Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts,  
Arts and Literature and Other Disciplines

---

Content: Traditional Role for the Arts

Item	Fine Arts	Arts and Literature	Other Disciplines	Range
2*	4.806	4.247	4.057	0.749
3*	4.528	3.651	3.597	0.931
6*	2.686	2.718	2.515	0.171
14*	4.306	3.908	3.886	0.420
15*	4.611	4.198	4.139	0.472
34*	3.914	3.325	3.266	0.648
35	3.972	3.964	3.884	0.088
39	4.667	4.459	4.200	0.467
41	4.111	3.783	3.549	0.562
Grand Mean	4.1779	3.8059	3.6770	0.501

---

Items where range is greater than 0.750: 1

\*Indicates items which were reversed in scoring to preserve directionality of the survey instrument.

NOTE: Complete data on the responses, including notations of Standard Deviations and Standard Error are available in Appendix U.

in general education while accepting the "newer" functions of relating the arts to cognitive development. The Arts and Literature faculty and those in the Other Disciplines group registered higher degrees of uncertainty in regard to the issue, but can still be interpreted as granting approval.

The most significant separations of the three groups occurred in items 3, 2, and 34 and the clearest rejection of an item occurred with number 6 in which all three groups registered a high level of uncertainty verging on disagreement.

Item 6 was the proposition which had suggested any course offered by a fine arts department could be used in fulfillment of a fine arts requirement in general education as opposed to a course designed specifically for that purpose. This issue has been discussed earlier in this chapter.

Item 2, proposing that the fine arts have a role to play in general education only as cultural enrichment, was clearly rejected by all three cohorts with no departure amongst them from the total sample mean. The range, however, was noticeable with the strongest level of rejection coming, as might be expected, from the Fine Arts faculty.

In item 3 there was the clearest separation amongst the three groups. This item posited that fine arts courses or experiences should be regarded as electives in a general education program and that fine arts therefore not be part of a required distribution system. The Fine Arts faculty rejected such a notion by a clear margin (MN=4.528) while the Arts and Literature faculty were uncertain but tended to reject the notion (MN=3.651). The faculty in the Other

Disciplines cohort also tended to reject the notion but at a slightly higher level than their colleagues in Arts and Literature (MN=3.597). There is clearer evidence of this division if the proportion indicating disagreement with the item is examined since there was a greater range of response with faculty in other disciplines. A total of 94.5 percent of the Fine Arts faculty respondents indicated disagreement or strong disagreement with the item content, while 63.9 percent of the Arts and Literature faculty did so and 64.8 percent of the Other Disciplines cohort registered disagreement. A total of 15.1 percent of the Arts and Literature faculty were uncertain about the issue while only 11.9 percent of the Other Disciplines faculty were Agreement with the item was registered by 20.8 percent of the Arts and Literature faculty while 23.2 percent of the Other Disciplines faculty were so recorded.

In summary, the faculty cohorts in this three-way analysis showed, however, no significant departures from the patterns of approval or disapproval established in the total sample analysis, except for the consistent pattern of high level of favorableness demonstrated by the Fine Arts faculty and descending levels of agreement shown by the Arts and Literature cohort as well as the Other Disciplines faculty.

Results from an analysis of Item Cluster #3, dealing with response to an elective-based general education program, show the same pattern. The total sample group had rejected the notion of a general education program without any required distribution areas (Item 5) and, as can be seen in Table 34, each of the cohorts in the three-way

analysis also clearly did so as well, though, again, with varying levels of approval.

Table 34

Means Analysis of Item Cluster #3 Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts, Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines

---

Content: Elective-Based General Education Program

Item	Fine Arts	Arts and Literature	Other Disciplines	Range
5*	4.639	4.256	4.101	0.538
16*	3.143	3.202	2.874	0.269
Grand Mean	3.891	3.729	3.488	0.404

---

Items where range is greater than 0.750: none.

\*Indicates items which were reversed in scoring to preserve directionality of the survey instrument.

NOTE: Complete data on the responses, including notations of Standard Deviations and Standard Error are available in Appendix U.

The total sample group had expressed reservations about a general education program which would only offer general guidelines for course work but with no further specific requirements (MN=2.973). Analysis in the three-way comparison revealed that the greatest support for rejecting that notion came from the Arts and Literature faculty (MN=3.202) with the Fine Arts almost as strong in their level of rejection (MN=3.143). As with the total sample group, however, there was considerable range to the responses and that dispersion factor

suggested this item reveals an area worthy of some considerable care and discussion for those proposing any curricular modifications involving the fine arts in a required-course general education program. It is often this distinction between a structured program requiring not only distribution of required hours amongst discipline areas but also specific courses, and a more free-flowing program which thus provokes pedagogical and philosophical discussions amongst faculty at any institution.

Analysis of results in the three-way comparison for Item Cluster #4 revealed no significant departures from the profile achieved in analysis of the total sample, except for confirmation, once again, of the role of the Fine Arts faculty cohort and, with some notable exceptions, that of the Arts and Literature faculty in raising the total sample mean. Those cases in which the Arts and Literature faculty established means lower than those of the Other Disciplines faculty as well as those of the Fine Arts faculty, are noted in Table 35. These discrepancies have been discussed earlier in this chapter.

It is interesting to note, however, that the greatest dispersion of response occurred with item 23 in which the respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the notion that there should be a balance between expression using the written word and that using an expressive symbol other than words in at least one of the fine arts. This item has been discussed also earlier in this chapter, but the three way analysis revealed that the dispersion was greatest amongst the Arts and Literature faculty ( $SD=1.165$ ) rather than the faculty in Other Disciplines ( $SD=1.021$ ). As might be the dispersion was less marked

Table 35

Means Analysis of Item Cluster #4 Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts,  
Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines

---

Content: Arts and Creativity

Item	Fine Arts	Arts and Literature	Other Disciplines	Range
10	4.778	4.286**	4.317	0.492
13	4.306	3.554	3.383	0.923
23	4.417	3.535	3.333	1.084
36	4.500	3.779**	3.905	0.721
37	4.417	3.977	3.925	0.492
40	3.806	3.176**	3.361	0.630
Grand Mean	4.371	3.718	3.704	0.724

---

Items where range is greater than 0.750: 2

\*\*Indicates items where the mean for Arts and Literature faculty is lower than the mean for Other Disciplines as well as lower than the mean for Fine Arts faculty.

NOTE: Complete data on the responses, including notations of Standard Deviations and Standard Error are available in Appendix U.

amongst the Fine Arts faculty cohort (SD=0.806).

Analysis of the results in this three-way comparison for Item Cluster #5, dealing with the issue of the various arts as acceptable academic disciplines also confirmed the pattern of varying levels of acceptance as established in the total sample means with the expected greater levels of approval being shown by the Fine Arts faculty and, at lesser levels, by the Arts and Literature cohort. However, the three-way comparison also revealed that the Arts and Literature faculty were closer to the Other Disciplines faculty in their responses than they were to their colleagues in the Fine Arts. In the case of the field of Dance, for example, the Fine Arts faculty group accepted this area as being a recognizable academic discipline at a far higher level than did their fellow faculty members in the other two categories. Also, the separation between Arts and Literature faculty and Other Disciplines faculty was infinitesimal (MN=3.964 versus MN=3.962).

Outside of their own group, Fine Arts faculty will still find, according to the results of this survey, some doubts about the academic standing of at least the fields of Dance and Television/Film Studies.

As illustrated in Table 36, Music and the Visual Arts, the areas with the longest tradition of inclusion in higher education curricula, find the most consistent and strongest levels of acceptance, with Theatre following closely. This pattern was also followed, as has been discussed earlier, when the respondents were asked to supply priority rankings for each of the fine arts within a general education

Table 36

Means Analysis of Item Cluster #5 Faculty Cohorts: Fine Arts,  
Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines

---

Content: Attitude to Arts as "Disciplines"

Item	Fine Arts	Arts and Literature	Other Disciplines	Range
17 Music	4.735	4.452	4.395	0.340
18 Visual Arts	4.647	4.381	4.208	0.439
19 Dance	4.500	3.964	3.962	0.538
20 Theatre	4.647	4.274	4.154	0.493
21 TV/Film	4.265	3.639	3.486	0.779
Grand Mean	4.559	4.142	4.041	0.518

---

Items where range is greater than 0.750: 1

NOTE: Complete data on the responses, including notations of Standard Deviations and Standard Error are available in Appendix U.



program which would require a course or an experience in at least one of the fine arts.

While the three-way comparison amongst these subpopulations identifiable distortions of the sample-based profile, it did reveal the degree of favorableness expressed by the Fine Arts faculty and thus served to confirm that the item content, as taken from the literature, does reflect what fine arts faculty are really thinking and what they consider important as a group.

It further uncovered some anomalies amongst the Arts and Literature faculty cohort in which they appeared to be detectably more traditional or conservative as a group than their colleagues in either the Fine Arts or all Other Disciplines combined.

#### Summary of Findings

Based on the stratified random sample design and the high response level achieved, plus the strong homogeneity of that sample as well as the equally clear homogeneity of the population sampled, it is clear that this survey reveals that faculty members at highly selective residential liberal arts colleges across the nation are favorably inclined to a significant role for the fine arts in general education programs. Furthermore, they can be seen as hospitable to a curricular and pedagogical connection between experiences in the fine arts and the development of processes of cognition.

The survey further revealed some areas, however, where curriculum developers in the fine arts should proceed with caution in proposing course structure, requirements, and roles for fine arts courses in general education programs.

While establishing clear major patterns of response, the survey instrument, through the Likert-style design, was able to detect ranges and degrees of response which can be used as a more refined guide to curriculum developers.

The most significant finding, however, was the confirmation that propositions which have been advanced in the literature for some 20 years about the role for the fine arts in general education and for a significant participation of the fine arts in areas of cognitive development have not only been confirmed by the Fine Arts faculty in this survey as being representative of their thinking, but have proven to be acceptable stances for other faculty in the survey population.

A narrative summary of the philosophical and pedagogical profile of this faculty population as revealed by the survey follows as part of Chapter V.

In order to expedite that discussion, Tables 37, 38, and 39 present an analysis of the significant levels of agreement or disagreement expressed by respondents in the total sample.

Table 37 displays responses for items which were recorded at 75 percent or higher approval levels from the sample survey group. Table 38 displays approval levels from 55 to 74 percent, and Table 39 lists approval levels from 54.9 percent and under.

Results indicate that of the 24 questionnaire items which were designed to test the degree of favorableness of faculty towards a significant role for the fine arts in a structured general education program and make provisions for integrating the fine arts into the process of cognitive development (items 1 through 16, 22 through 28

Table 37

Respondent Profile: Items Recorded At Sample Proportions of 75%  
and Above for Agreement or Disagreement

Item	No Response	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Uncertain	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	1.4	82.5	12.4	3.8	4.176	0.811
2*	.7	6.9	6.2	83.2	4.156	0.896
5*	0.7	11.1	5.2	82.9	4.177	1.063
8	.5	85.5	9.0	5.0	4.134	0.828
9	8.6	79.1	8.6	3.9	4.166	0.799
10	2.1	88.6	6.2	3.1	4.347	0.757
11	1.2	88.3	5.7	4.8	4.293	0.845
12	1.2	83.2	10.2	5.4	4.115	0.854
14*	0.0	10.2	9.3	80.6	3.917	0.859
15*	1.2	4.7	6.7	87.4	4.192	0.789
17	2.4	91.2	3.6	2.8	4.431	0.734
18	2.6	84.1	8.8	4.5	4.276	0.865
20	2.6	82.7	9.0	5.8	4.207	0.873
22	1.4	89.6	6.9	2.1	4.282	0.699
35	1.9	76.5	12.8	8.8	3.906	0.894
36	1.2	78.2	13.1	7.7	3.933	0.845
37	1.2	79.1	13.8	6.0	3.976	0.830
38	2.1	81.5	14.0	2.3	4.070	0.716
39	1.4	92.4	4.8	1.4	4.296	0.638

\*Indicates item in which scoring was reversed to preserve the directionality of the instrument; thus a higher mean indicates disagreement with item content.

and item 34) the content of 11 of those items was accepted by 75 percent or more of the survey sample, in most cases, as illustrated by Table 37 at levels above 80 percent.

An additional six of the items were accepted as valid by 55 to 74 percent of the faculty sample as noted in Table 38 for items 3, 4, 7, 13, 24, and 25. Thus a total of more than 70 percent of the questionnaire items in this area of basic premises favorable to the fine arts in general education were accepted by the survey sample.

Of those five items (17 through 21) which asked whether or not each of the identified fine arts areas of Music, Visual Arts, Dance, Theatre and Television/Film Studies were regarded as academic disciplines by the respondents, responses indicated that Music (item 17), Visual Arts (item 18) and Theatre (item 20) were accepted as academic disciplines by 80 percent or more of the respondents as listed in Table 37.

The remaining two fine arts fields of Dance and Television/Film Studies were accepted as academic disciplines at a somewhat lesser level for Dance (72.2 percent as listed in Table 38) and at a considerable lower level for Television/Film Studies (54.9 percent as listed in Table 39).

If a fine arts course or experience were to be provided to all college students via a general education program, the faculty in this survey would clearly give first priority to a course or experience in Music with 58.0 percent of the survey pool listing this field as being either first or second in their priority system. As noted for the listing of item 29 on Table 38, however, a significant proportion

Table 38

Respondent Profile: Items Recorded At Sample Proportions of 55%  
to 74% for Agreement or Disagreement

Item	No Response	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Uncertain	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Mean	Standard Deviation
3*	1.7	20.9	11.6	65.8	3.686	1.234
4	1.4	60.6	11.9	26.1	3.535	1.271
7	1.7	55.1	20.0	23.3	3.394	1.269
13	1.9	55.2	21.4	21.7	3.489	1.099
19	2.6	72.2	16.9	4.5	3.998	0.973
24	4.3	61.8	13.5	20.4	3.603	1.151
25	4.0	60.1	15.2	20.6	3.579	1.158
29**	31.8	58.0	6.7	3.6	4.411	0.926
41	2.4	65.8	18.3	13.6	3.645	0.935

\*Indicates item in which the scoring was reversed to preserve the directionality of the instrument; thus a higher mean indicates disagreement with item content.

\*\*Indicates item in which respondents were asked to give priority ranking to each of the identified fine arts for placement in general education program requirements. A high proportion of response in the Strongly Agree/Agree category would indicate a priority of number 1 or number 2.

(31.8 percent) of the survey sample did not respond to this item.

As recorded in Table 39, an equally high number of the survey sample also did not indicate responses to this priority question for Visual Arts (item 30), Dance (item 31), Theatre (item 32) or Television/Film Studies (item 33). Thus, beyond using a cumulative proportion technique, as discussed earlier in this chapter, the interpretation of priority placement can only assume a detectable preference pattern for Music, Visual Arts, Theatre, Dance and Television/Film Studies in that order.

Those questionnaire items which listed goals for fine arts courses in general education (items 35 through 41) included a range of traditional statements as well as one which suggested a greater field of activity for the fine arts. Five of those seven goals (items 35 through 39) were accepted by the survey sample at levels of 75 percent and above. One (item 41) was accepted by 65.8 percent of the survey group, and the remaining goal statement (item 40) was accepted by 50.6 percent of the survey sample as indicated in Table 39.

Item content will be discussed as part of the Respondent Attitude Profile in Chapter V.

Table 39

Respondent Profile: Items Recorded At Sample Proportions of 54%  
and Under for Agreement or Disagreement

Item	No Response	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Uncertain	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Mean	Standard Deviation
6*	1.7	53.2	20.7	24.5	2.582	1.121
16*	2.1	39.5	18.5	39.9	2.973	1.166
21	2.6	54.9	26.4	16.2	3.576	1.074
23	1.4	51.8	25.7	21.2	3.467	1.067
26	6.2	30.4	33.3	30.2	3.033	1.086
27	5.7	44.9	22.6	26.8	3.282	1.155
28	6.7	25.4	32.5	35.4	2.847	1.121
30**	32.5	54.8	8.6	3.6	4.246	0.918
31**	35.4	12.8	8.6	4.1	4.246	0.918
32**	34.2	22.8	28.3	14.7	3.245	1.089
33**	35.9	9.5	10.9	43.7	2.030	1.222
34	3.3	24.0	22.8	49.9	3.332	1.013
40	1.7	50.6	27.6	20.2	3.362	0.991

\*Indicates items in which the scoring was reversed to preserve the directionality of the instrument; thus a higher mean indicates disagreement with item content.

\*\*Indicates item(s) in which respondents were asked to give priority rankings to each of the identified fine arts for placement in general education program requirements. A high proportion of response in the Strongly Agree/Agree category would indicate a priority of number 1 or number 2.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Respondent Attitude Profile

Based on the data presented and analyzed in Chapter IV, and summarized in the agreement level tables at the end of that chapter, the faculty sample in this survey could be characterized as displaying the following attitudes towards the fine arts and any role which those fields might play in a general education program.

They accept three of the five designated fine arts fields as academic disciplines without any significant questioning: Music, Visual Arts and Theatre. There is greater reservation about including Dance as an academic discipline and only a bare majority (54.9 percent) were willing to grant that status to Television/Film Studies. A significant proportion of the faculty sample (26.4 percent) expressed uncertainty about acknowledging this field as an academic discipline, which was defined in the questionnaire item as a "...field of study which has a clear body of knowledge, unique to itself, with clearly defined methodologies of inquiry."

When it comes to considering the major premises, as taken from the literature, about a significant role for the fine arts within general education programs, the faculty sample indicated they would seriously consider providing, within a course-based system, an experience for all college students in at least Music and the Visual Arts. They tended to be less certain about such an offering in



Theatre with only 44.9 percent expressing agreement with such a goal, and 26.8 percent expressing disagreement. The field of Dance found the faculty sample almost evenly divided with 30.4 percent expressing support for providing such an experience to all students, 30.2 percent opposing such a notion and 33.3 percent expressing uncertainty. Any provision for including experiences in Television/Film Studies as part of a general program would find only small affirmation amongst this faculty sample with 25.4 percent supporting such a proposal and 35.4 percent opposing it.

The three-way comparison analysis conducted by separating out the self-designated Fine Arts faculty and constituting two other groups of the remaining Arts and Literature faculty as well as all Other Disciplines faculty, while revealing the strong levels of support for inclusion of Music, Visual Arts and Theatre amongst the Fine Arts cohort, did not significantly change the basic relationships amongst the five arts fields, nor the cross-comparisons amongst the three groups.

Analysis of the items dealing with essential premises about the role of the fine arts reveals that this survey pool would accept at significant levels of approval a number of key concepts.

They would agree that experiences in the fine arts can give students an enhanced and enriched system for learning, including a heightened awareness of the range and depth of his/her perceptual horizons (item 22). Furthermore, they are favorably disposed to the notion that a liberal education should make provision for learning which goes beyond traditional views of the intellectual process and

cognition to include creativity, intuition, perception, and other aspects of the mental life (item 10).

Perhaps in company with their general recognition of most of the arts fields as academic disciplines, they would agree that each of the fine arts, with its own vocabulary, represents a way of looking at, analyzing, recording, and communicating experience which is as legitimate for the college student to recognize as are the methodologies of the physical and social scientists. This notion was granted a very high degree of favorableness (87.8 percent) even when the faculty in disciplines other than the Fine Arts and Arts and Literature were reported separately.

There was also consistent rejection, by both the total faculty sample and by sub-populations, that there was no need for a studio or applied experience in the arts to be made available for the non-major or the general education student. It has long been a truism in the literature that aspects of the essential nature of any one of the arts are best learned by "doing" the art and the faculty sample in this study confirmed that notion.

This sample of faculty also accepted the concept, as expressed in item 8, that liberal education should recognize the dictum as once stated by an educator in engineering that "...every engineer would become a better one by deepening his/her understanding and appreciation of one or more of the fine arts." In addition, by almost the same proportional margin (79.1 percent) as with the original statement (85.5 percent) they believed the statement could apply to their own field of endeavor.

On a more pervasive level, they rejected the idea that the arts have a role to play in a general education program only in the area of "cultural enrichment" (item 2). The respondent further indicated agreement that a liberal education should reflect the notion that the arts are a means of self-understanding, a way by which a person's sense of his/her own nature can be explored, clarified, and grasped.

In keeping with the breadth of goals with which this survey sample was in agreement, they also rejected the concept that the only goal of any fine arts requirement in a general education program should be to assist students in becoming "intelligent viewers" and "perceptive critics" of the arts, or at least one art form (item 14).

They accepted the integrative function of the fine arts within a cohesive general education program, by also accepting the notion that course-based experience in one or more of the arts can assist students in cognitive development and critical thinking skills (item 1). Only 3.8 percent of the total sample expressed disagreement with this statement, while 82.5 percent expressed agreement.

There were four issues which found the faculty in this sample supportive, but more uncertain. While a significant proportion of the sample (65.8 percent) rejected the proposal that fine arts courses should only be electives within a general education system with the student free to select or not select them at his/her own option and that fine arts courses not be included in any required distribution system, 20.9 percent agreed with the proposal and 11.6 percent were uncertain.

Also, only 60.6 percent of the sample agreed that there should be

a separate and specific fine arts requirement in a general education program (item 4). Included with this item was the provision that, as illustrative of such a requirement, students would be required to take at least one or two fine arts courses. Uncertainty about the issue was expressed by 11.9 percent of the sample with 26.1 percent indicating disagreement.

By strikingly similar margins, two other proposals were only narrowly accepted by the respondents. Item 13, which proposed that a primary goal of general education should be to "...tap the creative potential of all students, thus giving them the opportunity to be a 'maker or art' via studio work in visual arts, music, dance, theatre or film" was accepted by only 55.2 percent of the respondents. This outcome suggests that, despite the high agreement level with item 15 which would allow studio courses to be available to the general education student, there was greater hesitancy to accept what appeared to be a requirement that all students take a studio course. Thus, while acknowledging the pleas often expressed in the literature for studio courses to be a part of general education, this faculty group is not broadly willing to mandate such courses as being the principal or only avenue for fine arts representation in a general education program.

Again, analysis of the three-way comparison amongst Fine Arts faculty, those in Arts and Literature and those placed in the Other Disciplines cohort served to reveal the depth of commitment to such a role for studio-type courses amongst the Fine Arts faculty who accepted this notion with 86.1 percent in agreement. Arts and

Literature faculty gave approval by a far narrower proportion of 55.4 percent, a level matched by 53.3 percent of the Other Disciplines faculty.

Similar margins of approval were registered for the notion expressed in item 7 that: "...a goal of general education should be to balance a student's awareness of science as an analytical 'taking-apart of experience,' with an equally important awareness of the arts as a synthesizing, or 'putting together of experience.'" While 55.1 percent of the sample accepted this notion, 23.3 percent disagreed and 20 percent were uncertain.

Faculty in this sample were far more divided in the degree of favorableness towards three remaining items in the questionnaire dealing with basic premises for the role of fine arts.

Item 6 posited that any course offered by a fine arts course could be used for general education purposes rather than a course designed for general education. In effect, this item posed the question of whether a "limited-list of courses" should be devised particularly for a general education program. While 53.2 percent of those responding agreed with the notion that any course would be appropriate, 20.7 percent were uncertain, and 24.5 percent disagreed. Since only 1.7 percent of the sample did not respond to the item, the results indicate a slight margin of approval, but considerable doubt amongst the total group. The three way comparison analysis with the sub-populations of Fine Arts faculty, Arts and Literature faculty and the faculty members of all Other Disciplines revealed the same pattern of divided opinion. Even the Fine Arts faculty in this comparison

indicated the same array of attitudes with 45.7 percent accepting the ideas of any course being appropriate, but 48.6 percent indicated disagreements with such an appropriate and 20.0 percent were uncertain.

The level of uncertainty rose even higher when the respondents were confronted with item 23 which proposed that "...a liberal education should be so structured as to achieve a balance between expression using the written word and the expressive symbol system used in at least one of the arts." As has been discussed in Chapter IV, part of the reason for the uncertainty and range of response in this item may have been due to the polarity implied between writing and artistic expression, with some perception that less attention might be paid to the essential development of writing skills if such an approach were adopted in a general education program. While 51.8 percent of the sample indicated agreement at one level or another with the proposal, a striking 25.7 percent expressed uncertainty, and 21.2 percent disagreed with the concept. Since only 1.4 percent of the sample did not respond to the item, the results must be viewed as being representative of the sample group.

When confronted with the question of what type of instructional format should be used in fine arts courses for general education, 24.0 percent of the sample agreed that such courses should consist largely of lecture-oriented approaches which paid attention to the historical-cultural context of the given art form (item 34). However, 49.9 percent of the sample disagreed with that approach, and 22.8 percent were uncertain. Analysis of the three-way comparison groups

revealed that Fine Arts faculty were clearly tending to reject the lecture-oriented approach as the principal curricular delivery system, with 74.3 percent opposing the idea and only 14.3 percent accepting it. Arts and Literature faculty also opposed the notion, but by a less significant margin of 55.4 percent.

Thus, if curriculum developers in the Fine Arts were to propose a system which posited a balance between written expression and the symbol systems of the arts, and which utilized studio courses as one of the principal delivery systems, they should be prepared to engage in significant dialogue, if not persuasion, amongst their colleagues. Also, while they might well propose courses specifically designed for general education purposes, they might find opposition to that notion within their own ranks as well as within fellow faculty in other disciplines.

Based upon the results of this study, one would expect to find faculty members in liberal arts colleges of the type surveyed receptive to required distribution areas or fields in a general education program. There would also, however, be some considerable difference of opinion about requiring specific courses as part of that distribution system.

A clear majority of the respondents in this survey (82.9 percent) disagreed with the notion, as expressed in item 5, that "...a general education program should not have any required distribution areas or required courses which the student must satisfy in order to receive his/her degree." However when asked in item 16 whether there should be no requirements about specific courses within a general education

program requiring students to take some course work in all disciplinary areas, 39.5 percent of the survey group indicated agreement with this approach, i.e. that the general education program would specify required areas of distribution, but make no provision for specific required courses. Yet another 39.5 percent disagreed with this approach and 18.5 percent indicated uncertainty.

Considering the array of types of general education programs offered at the nine sites surveyed, there is a distinct possibility that responses to this item tended to be site-specific rather than indicative of broader philosophical significance. The response to this item would also be of little direct assistance to curriculum developers except as an indicator of the problematical array of opinion which was expressed.

Results of the analysis of responses to items posing goals and objectives for fine arts courses designed for general education purposes (items 35 to 41) revealed that significant proportions of the survey group would readily accept the following goals:

- (1) Developing an awareness of cultural differences.  
(76.5 percent in agreement)
- (2) Assist the student in developing a sense of his/her own creative and human potential. (78.2 percent in agreement)
- (3) Examine the potential of the arts for enhancing the life and environment of all citizens in all stages of their life. (79.1 percent in agreement)
- (4) Provide students with an enhanced system of awareness and perceptual abilities for cognitive development.  
(81.5 percent in agreement)
- (5) Develop an awareness of cultural, aesthetic, and social heritage. (92.4 percent in agreement)

As a group, the respondents were less convinced of the two remaining goals statements. In dealing with item 41, which posited as



a goal aiming to "...assist the student becoming an astute and skilled 'consumer' and critic of the arts," 65.8 percent of the sample indicated agreement, but 18.3 percent were uncertain and 13.6 percent were in disagreement with this goal. Results of the three-way comparison with the sub-populations of Fine Arts, Arts and Literature, and Other Disciplines faculty revealed that the Fine Arts faculty group accepted the notion by a strong margin (83.3 percent approval) while the Arts and Literature faculty did so by a significant but lesser margin (74.7 percent approval), while the faculty in all Other Disciplines also accepted, but at an even lower approval level (63.2 percent). Thus, this goal can be acceptable to all faculty groups, but without the clear conviction of the five goals mentioned earlier.

It is possible, in interpreting the results for this item, to consider that the item may have posed an implied assumption that all students would, in some fashion, have to become "active" in the arts world to make the goal a realistic and purposeful one.

The survey group was even less certain of the goal statement, offered as item 40, which presumed that a fine arts course in a general education program would "...provide an outlet for emotional expression." Only 50.6 percent of the respondents approved of this goal, while 27.6 percent were uncertain and 20.2 percent disagreed. Results of the three-way analysis indicated that 63.9 percent of the Fine Arts faculty would accept as one of the goals of a fine arts courses in general education the providing of an emotional outlet for students. While 52.3 percent of faculty in Other Disciplines would do so, only 42.3 percent of the faculty remaining in the Arts and

Literature cohort would accept this goal. Between 25 and nearly 30 percent of the faculty in all three cohorts were uncertain of the stand they should take. Since only 1.7 percent of the sample did not respond to this item, the results must be taken as being representative of the sample.

Finally, when asked what priority they would assign to each of the designated fine arts areas in providing an experience of the arts to students in a general education program, the faculty in this sample clearly suggested that the first priority would go to Music, the second to Visual Arts, and the third to Theatre. Dance emerged as a very limited fourth priority and Television/Film Studies would have to assume the lowest priority of all. More detailed analysis of this issue has been provided in Chapter IV. For purposes of this summary it is sufficient to note that the priority system suggested by the respondents in this survey, is a mirror-image of the historical appearances of each of these disciplines on the academic scene. Music, with its roots in the medieval trivium and quadrivium, clearly emerges as the first priority for faculty in these survey sites, just as Visual Arts, which has its academic roots in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, as discussed in Chapter III, emerges as the second priority. Theatre and Dance, arriving as they did on the academic scene in the early years of this century, find similar levels of acceptance in the priority system.

In sum, the respondents in this survey accepted a significant role for the Fine Arts within general education, including them in a partnership for assisting in cognitive development and in facilitating

study, displaying a marked range of response in a number of items, suggest that such potential bias is not serious. The high response rate, as discussed in Chapter IV, indicates that a sufficient array of opinion has been tapped. It is, however, still possible that those faculty who did respond may be typical of extreme ends of the total spectrum. Those in favor of a significant role for the fine arts may be responding at higher levels because of that bias, just as those who are not so favorably inclined may also be responding at higher levels. In the final analysis this study must rest on the two-fold assurance of the random stratification of the design coupled with the high return rate.

It is also conceivable that a form of Hawthorne effect might be in action, with some tendency for respondents to express the opinion which they feel they should express rather than one which they actually feel, especially since all potential respondents were informed that a copy of the results, listing total pool response and individual site response would be made available to their institution.

It is felt, however, that assurance of individual anonymity, plus the demonstrable homogeneity of the respondent pool, as well as the recorded range of responses in many items are all indicators that such bias was not significantly in operation.

The results of this study, offered as a descriptive profile of faculty attitudes from nine cohesive and comparable sites, are produced by an instrument which, therefore, has been deemed sufficient for its stated purposes.

While there may be grounds for detecting variations in responses

critical thinking. With the reservations which have been noted, faculty at the nine sites have no great difficulty in accepting the Fine Arts disciplines as partners in the collective enterprise of general education.

#### Evaluation of the Survey Instrument

Considering that the major goal of this study was to test the acceptability of propositions which have been advanced in the literature over the past 20 to 30 years and to do so in a circumscribed setting amongst faculty at highly selective liberal arts colleges across the country, the instrument devised for this purpose has served appropriately.

It has proved capable of identifying distinctions in response amongst various cohorts, and of organizing data in meaningful patterns. The manner of its devising and the inclusion of items throughout designed to test for consistency of response suggests a degree of internal validity and reliability.

Certain cautions must, of course, be kept in mind. The instrument is still in need of further testing and administration to develop a sufficient data base to confirm its validity and reliability. Its original context, which was to measure the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness of faculty attitude to items based on the literature, should be maintained.

Knowledge of the apparent aim of the instrument, i.e., its emphasis on the Fine Arts and presumed interest in establishing the degree of favorable reception for the Fine Arts in general education, may be a source of bias for respondents. However, the results of this

on a site-by-site analysis, no attempt was made to make such an analysis a major part of the study. Not only had an agreement been made with each of the nine participating sites that such comparisons would not be made, but the major purpose of the study, as has been stated earlier, was to emerge with a composite profile of faculty attitudes collectively using a variety of sites across the nation to insure a reasonable data base for a specific type of institution.

### Conclusions

As has been discussed in Chapter IV, of the original research hypotheses concerning variables which might be linked with scores achieved on the instrument, only the independent variable of disciplinary orientation proved to be significant in this survey sample. Perhaps because of the strong demographic homogeneity of this sample and the population from which it was drawn, other variables proved to be of no significant interactional effect.

As might be expected in consideration of the survey instrument content, degrees of favorableness tended to be higher amongst faculty in the Fine Arts than among faculty in either the related areas of Arts and Literature or faculty in Other Disciplines.

Other factors of length of teaching experience, rank, type of undergraduate institution at which the respondent took his or her degree, enrollment at that institution, and other undergraduate experiences proved to be remarkably similar across lines of comparison. A replication of this study at different types of sites and the consequent enlargement of the data base might lead to such distinctions but none were found in the current study.

Results from this survey, however, did validate the position which has been taken in the literature by Eisner, Gardner, Way, Madeja, Phenix, Rosse, Perkins, and others which has been that the arts are a "way of knowing," a mode of cognition and intellectual activity which not only deserving of attention on its own merits, but also for adding to the cognitive repertoire of all students. Not only did the Fine Arts faculty in this survey group affirm this basic position and the major premises underlying it, but significant proportions of the faculty from other disciplines also demonstrated an essentially favorable attitude towards the link between arts and cognitive development as well as the implications of that position in establishing goals and objectives for fine arts courses in a general education program.

Based on the results of this study, and the respondent attitude profile presented earlier in this chapter, however, curriculum planners in the Fine Arts who might be involved in proposing avenues for their disciplines in a general education program would find that faculty in sites similar to those surveyed in this study would be inclined to:

- (1) Accept a general education program provision for the fine arts as a required area of distribution credit, if not specific courses designed only for general education credit.
- (2) Allow Fine Arts general education courses to become a participant in any across-the-curriculum approaches to cognitive development and the acquisition of critical thinking skills.
- (3) Ask that such Fine Arts courses used for general education purposes retain the more traditional goals of fine arts courses for cultural enrichment, but that the courses need not be limited to those customary avenues.

- (4) Admit that there is a place within the curricula of liberal education for exploration of enhanced perceptual capabilities and individual creativity as these pursuits are manifest in the experience provided by courses in the Fine Arts.

#### Recommendations

The following recommendations are submitted as a result of the analysis of the data gathered in the current study.

1. This study should be replicated using other site clusters, notably Liberal Arts Colleges II, in the Carnegie Typology, as well as one or more of Research Universities Typologies. This replication would not only expand the data base for testing research hypotheses relating to correlations between instrument and items scores in independent demographic variables, but would also enhance and enrich the essential profile of faculty attitude.

2. Further examination and analysis of the data gathered in this study might serve to illustrate finer distinctions amongst disciplines and amongst sites, still keeping within the spirit of the agreement reached with the survey sites of not revealing site identifications. These analyses were beyond the boundaries of the present study with its focus on a descriptive profile of a total faculty pool from comparable institutions.

3. The survey instrument should be administered to senior-level students at the nine survey sites to determine their attitudes and to see if they are consistent with the faculty responses both in the total sample pool and, again, on a site-by-site basis.

4. The information gathered by the present study could be presented to institutions, of a type similar to the survey sites, who

might be considering a modification of their present general education program and who might be considering, as part of that modification, an increased or different role for the Fine Arts. The survey instrument could also be offered to those institutions for their use in determining faculty attitudes within the institution.



## REFERENCES

- Ackerman, J.S. (1973). The arts in higher education. In C. Kaysen (Ed.), Content and context: Essays on college education. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Acuff, B. (1977). The arts in general education: Rhetoric or reality? Teachers College Record, 79 (1), 125-133.
- Adler, M.J. (1982). The paideia proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Adler, M.J. (1983). Paideia problems and possibilities: A consideration of questions raised by the paideia proposal. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Adler, M.J. (Ed.) (1984). The paideia program: An educational syllabus. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- American Theatre Association (ATA). (1979). Policy paper series: Theatre in general education (No. 1). Washington, D.C.
- Anderson, G.L. (1973). Half a century of general education. Intellect, 41-42.
- Astin, A.W. (1983). The American freshman national norms for fall 1983. Los Angeles, California: The Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Astin, A.W. (1984). The American freshman national norms for fall 1984. Los Angeles, California: The Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Barkan, M. (1955). A foundation for art education. New York: Ronald Press.
- Barrett, M. (1979). Art education: A strategy for course design. London: Heinemann.
- Bealmer, W.J. (Ed.) (1982). The arts: A basic component of general education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education/Illinois Alliance for Arts Education.
- Beane, J.A. (1982). Self-concept and self-esteem as curriculum issues. Educational Leadership, 504-506.
- Beatty, W.H. (Ed.) (1969). Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective behavior. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Bell, D. (1966). The reforming of general education. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ben-David, J. (1981). Trends in American education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berlinger, H. et al. (1965). Proposal for a small experimental college. Unpublished manuscript, Illinois Teachers College-Chicago North (Northeastern Illinois University).
- Berman, L.M. (1968). New priorities in the curriculum. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Biglan, A. (1973a). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (3), 195-203.
- Biglan, A. (1973b). Relationships between subject matter characteristics and the structure and output of university departments. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (3), 204-213.
- Billingsley, A. (1978). Higher education as a source of personal and social integration. Paper presented at the 1978 National Conference on Higher Education, American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, IL, March 21, 1978.
- Blakeslee, T.R. (1980). The right brain: A new understanding of the unconscious mind and its creative powers. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Bloom, K., & Remer, J. (1976). A rationale for the arts in education. National Elementary Principal, 55 (3), 45.
- Boas, G. (1984). When George Boas spoke.... The Johns Hopkins Magazine, 36 (5), 14-21.
- Bobbitt, F. (1924). How to make a curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bowskill, D. (1974). Drama and the teacher. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Boyer, C.M., & Ahlgren, A. (1982). Visceral priorities in liberal education. Journal of Higher Education, 53 (2), 207-215.
- Boyer, E.L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. New York: Harper and Row.
- Boyer, E.L., & Levine, A. (1981). A quest for common learning: The

- aims of general education. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Broudy, H.S. (1964). The structure of knowledge in the arts. In S. Elam (Ed.), Education and the structure of knowledge (pp. 75-119). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Broudy, H.S. (1972). Enlightened cherishing: An essay on aesthetic education. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Broudy, H.S. (1974). General education: The search for a rationale. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Broudy, H.S. (1982a). What knowledge is of most worth? Educational Leadership, 39 (8), 574-578.
- Broudy, H.S. (1982b). Report on the aesthetic education project. A report to the Spencer Foundation of Chicago, Illinois, December 31. ERIC Document #224 015.
- Brubacher, J.S., & Rudy, W. (1968). Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1968. New York: Harper and Row.
- Brubacher, J.S., & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976 (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- Cangemi, J.P. (1984). The real purpose of higher education: Developing self-actualizing personalities. Education, 105 (2), 151-154.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1977). Missions of the college curriculum: A contemporary review with suggestions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1985). The faculty: Deeply troubled. Change Magazine, 17 (4), 31-34.
- Carnegie Fund to Launch Major Study of goals of undergraduate education. (1984). The Chronicle of Higher Education, August 8, 5.
- Cass, J., & Birnbaum, M. (1985). Comparative guide to American colleges (12th ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- Chapman, L.H. (1982). Instant art, instant culture: The unspoken policy for American schools. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Chickering, A.W., Halliburton, D., Bergquist, W.H., & Lindquist, J.

(1977). Developing the college curriculum: A handbook for faculty and administrators. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Christ-Janer, A., & Wickiser, R.L. (1968). Higher education and the arts. In L.E. Dennis & R.M. Jacob (Eds.), The arts in higher education (pp. 42-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coan, R.W. (1977). Hero, artist, sage or saint? New York: Columbia University Press.

College Entrance Examination Board. (1983). Academic preparation for college: What students need to know and be able to do. New York: CEEB.

College Entrance Examination Board. (1985). Academic preparation in the arts. New York: CEEB.

College Music Society. (1982). Music in general studies. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado for the College Music Society.

Combs, A.W. (1982). Affective education or none at all. Educational Leadership, 495-497.

Conrad, C.F., & Pratt, A.M. (1981). Measure for measure: Liberal education and the fine arts--A delicate balance. The Review of Higher Education, 4 (2), 47-58.

Conrad, C., & Wyer, J.C. (1980). Liberal education in transition. AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington: American Association for Higher Education.

Courtney, R. (1974). Play, drama and thought: The intellectual background to drama education. New York: Drama Book Specialists.

Courtney, R. (1982). Re-play: Studies of human drama in education. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: OISE Press.

Cubberly, E. (1919). Public education in the United States. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Curtis, T.E. (1981). Aesthetic education and the quality of life. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Dennis, L.E., & Jacob, R.M. (1968). The arts in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dressel, P.L. (1963). The undergraduate curriculum in higher education. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education.

- Dressel, P.L. (1968). College and university curriculum. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Dressel, P.L. (1979a). Liberal education: Developing the characteristics of a liberally educated person. Liberal Education, 65 (3), 313-322.
- Dressel, P.L. (1979b). A look at new curriculum models for undergraduate education. Journal of Higher Education, 50 (4), 389-397.
- Dressel, P.L., & DeLisle, F.H. (1969). Undergraduate curriculum trends. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Dressel, P., & Mayhew, L.B. (1954). General education: Explorations in evaluation. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Dressel, P.L., Mayhew, L.B., & McGrath, E.J. (1959). The liberal arts as viewed by faculty members in professional schools. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Edwards, B. (1979). Drawing on the right side of the brain. Los Angeles, CA: J.P. Tarcher, Inc.
- Edwards, B. (1986). Drawing on the artist within. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Eisner, E.W. (1972). Educating artistic vision. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E.W. (Ed.) (1976). The arts, human development and education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Eisner, E. (1976). Making the arts a reality in the schools of tomorrow--An agenda for today. Art Education, 29 (3), 20-24.
- Eisner, E.W. (1979). The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E.W. (1981). The role of the arts in cognition and curriculum. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 48-52.
- Eisner, E. (Ed.) (1985). Learning and teaching the ways of knowing: Eighty-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Eurich, A.C. (Ed.) (1968). Campus 1980: The shape of the future in American higher education. New York: Dell/Delta.
- Feldman, E.B. (1970). Becoming human through art: Aesthetic experience in the school. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Feldman, E.B. (1972). Varieties of visual experience: Basic edition. New York: Abrams.
- Ferguson, M. (1973). The brain revolution. New York: Taplinger.
- Ferguson, M. (1980). The acquarian conspiracy: Personal and social transformation in the 1980s. San Francisco: J.P. Tarcher.
- Flexner, H., & Berrettini, R. (1981). General education: Concept and practice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 3-4. ERIC Document #203 817.
- Foshay, A.W. (1973). The arts in general education. Art Education, 26 (6), 2-6.
- Foster, S.L., & Burke, A. (1978). The fine arts and general education: Are they compatible? Liberal Education, 64 (1), 55-62.
- Gallup, G.H. (1984). The 16th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (1), 23-38.
- Gardner, H. (1973). The arts and human development. New York: Wiley.
- Gardner, H. (1982). Art, mind, and brain: A cognitive approach to creativity. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligence. New York: Basic Books.
- Getzels, J.W. (1977). Problem-finding and the inventiveness of solutions. In S.J. Parnes, R.B. Noller, & A.M. Biondi (Eds.), Guide to creative action (pp. 180-182). New York: Scribner's.
- Getzels, J., & Csikzentmihalyi, M. (1976). The creative vision: A longitudinal study of problem finding in art. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Getzels, J., & Jackson, P. (1962). Creativity and intelligence: Explorations with gifted students. New York: Wiley.
- Giannini, V. (1968). Nurturing talent and creativity in the arts. In P. Heist (Ed.), The creative college student: An unmet challenge (pp. 73-83). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Goodlad, J., & Morrison, J. (1980). The arts and education. In J.

- Hausman (Ed.), Arts and the schools (pp. 3-21). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Grady, M.P., & Luecke, E.A. (1978). Education and the brain. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Hamel, P.M. (1979). Through music to the self: How to appreciate and experience music anew. Boulder, CO: Shambhala.
- Harvard Committee on the objectives of education in a free society. (1945). General education in a free society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hastie, W.R. (Ed.) (1965). Art education: The sixty-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hausman, J.J. (Ed.) (1980). Arts and the schools. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hawkins, H. (1983). Liberal education and American society: A history of creative tension. Change Magazine, 15 (7), 34-37.
- Heist, P., & Wilson, R. (1968). Curricular experiences for the creative. In P. Heist (Ed.), The creative college student: An unmet challenge (pp. 190-207). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hirvela, D.P. (1974). Beginning acting and the non-major. Players, 50 (1-2), 34-37.
- Hodik, B.J., & Orlock, J.M. (1976). Encounters in the arts - Modeling an inservice program to help teachers make friends with their creative selves. Music Educators Journal, 62 (8), 37-39.
- Holden, C.D. (1978). Aesthetic education, aesthetic literacy, and the arts in general education: Curriculum issues. Art Education, 31 (3), 23-27.
- Jensen, J.K. (1983). An analysis of attitudes toward fine arts education among Nevada State legislators, lobbyists, school board trustees, superintendents, curriculum coordinators, principals, fine arts educators, and other educators in Nevada public schools. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nevada, Las Vegas). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 2204A-2205A.
- Jones, R.M. (1968). Fantasy and feeling in education. New York: New York University Press.
- Kagan, J. (Ed.) (1967). Creativity and learning. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

- Kaysen, C. (1974). What should undergraduate education do? Daedalus, 180-185.
- Kridel, C. (1980). General education: Practice without theory. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March. ERIC Document # 196 361.
- Kuffler, P.M. (1980). The role of the arts in general education: Theory and practice. (Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 6077-A.
- Leslie, L.L. (1972). Are high response rates essential to valid surveys? Social Science Research, 1 (3), 323-334.
- Lodahl, J., & Gordon, G. (1972). The structure of scientific fields and the functioning of university graduate departments. American Sociological Review, 37 (1), 57-72.
- Lyons, M.D. (1978). The liberal arts as viewed by faculty members in nine professional schools and three types of universities: 1958-1978. Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Alabama.
- Lytton, H. (1972). Creativity and education. New York: Schocken Books.
- Madeja, S. (Ed.) (1970). Report of the aesthetic education program. St. Louis, MO: CEMREL.
- Madeja, S.S. (1973). All the arts for every child: Final report on the arts in General Education Project in the School District of University City, MO. New York: John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund.
- Madeja, S.S. (Ed.) (1977). Arts and aesthetics: An agenda for the future. St. Louis, MO: CEMREL.
- Madeja, S.S. (1978). The arts, cognition, and basic skills. St. Louis, MO: CEMREL, Inc.
- Madeja, S.S., & Onuska, S. (1977). Through the arts to the aesthetic: The CEMREL aesthetic education curriculum St. Louis, MO: CEMREL, Inc.
- Maslow, A. (1968). Education through art for the development of the human potential. In The Arts and Education, New York State Council on the Arts, 24-29.
- Mayer, J. (1981). The future college: Motivation and design. Interdisciplinary Perspectives: A Journal of General and Liberal Studies, 11 (1), 11-19.
- Mayhew, L.B. (1968). The future undergraduate curriculum. In A.C.



- Eurich (Ed.), Campus 1980: The shape of the future in American higher education (pp. 200-219). New York: Dell/Delta.
- McGregor, L., Tate, M., & Robinson, K. (1977). Learning through drama. London: Heinemann.
- Meiklejohn, A. (1969). The liberal college. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times.
- Mitchell, J.V., Jr. (Ed.) (1985). The ninth mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Morrison, J. (1973). The rise of the arts on the American campus. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Morrison, J. (1985). The maturing of the arts on the American campus: A commentary. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform--Text of the Report. (1983). Chronicle of Higher Education, May 4, 11-16.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.
- National Institute of Education, Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (1984). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education.
- National Research Center of the Arts, Inc. (1975). Americans and the arts: A survey of public opinion. New York: Associated Councils of the Arts.
- National Research Center of the Arts. (1984). Americans and the arts: A survey of public opinion. New York: American Council for the Arts.
- Newell, L.J. (1984). A catalyst and a touchstone. Change, 16 (8), 7-10.
- New York State Council on the Arts. (1968). The arts and education. New York.
- Parnes, S.J. (n.d.). Can creativity be increased? In W.L. Brittain (Ed.), Creativity and art education (pp. 44-51). Washington, D.C.: National Art Education Association (NAES).
- Parnes, S.J., Noller, R.B., & Biondi, A.M. (1977). Guide to creative action. New York: Scribner's.

- Perkins, D.N. (1978). The significance of interpretive disagreements for cognitive theories of the arts. In S.S. Madeja (Ed.), The arts, cognition, and basic skills (pp. 51-57). St. Louis, MO: CEMREL Inc.
- Perkins, D. (1981). The mind's best work. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Perkins, D.N. (1984). Creativity by design. Educational Leadership, 42 (1), 18-25.
- Perkins, D.N. (1986). Thinking frames. Educational Leadership, 43 (8), 4-10.
- Perkins, D., & Leondar, B. (Eds.) (1977). The arts and cognition. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Perkins, J.A. (1965). Should the artist come to the campus?" Saturday Review, July 17, 54-56, 71.
- Peterson, B.D. (1978). The arts as basic in general education with recommendations for local elementary school district curriculum development. (Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Illinois University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 08-A, 4700-A.
- Phenix, P.H. (1964). Realms of meaning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Reed, M.K. (Ed.) (1985). Barron's profile of American colleges, 14th Edition. Woodbury, NY: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.
- Reid, L.A. (1983). Aesthetic knowledge in the arts. In M. Ross (Ed.), The arts: A way of knowing (pp. 19-42). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Richardson, A.S. (1982). Educators' attitudes toward goals and theories of art education. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43.
- Rico, G.L. (1983). Writing the natural way: A course in enhancing creativity and writing confidence. Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher.
- Robinson, K. (1980). Exploring theatre and education. London: Heinemann.
- Rockefeller, D., Jr. (Chairman) (1977). Coming to our senses: The significance of the arts for American education, a Report of the Arts, Education and Americans Panel. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Ross, M. (1980). The creative arts. London: Heinemann.
- Ross, M. (Ed.) (1983). The arts: A way of knowing. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Ross, M. (1984). The aesthetic impulse: Education and the arts. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Rudolph, F. (1977). Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rudolph, F. (1984). The power of professors: The impact of specialization and professionalization on the curriculum. Change, 16 (4), 12-17, 41.
- Ryan, M.B. (1980). Doldrums in the Ivies: A proposal for restoring self knowledge to a liberal education. Change, 33-38, 55.
- Sack, S. (1962). Liberal education: What was it? What is it? History of Education Quarterly, 2 (4), 210-224.
- Schuman, W. (1968). Academic respectability and the arts. In The Arts and Education, New York State Council on the Arts, 16-19.
- Scully, M.G. (1981). General education called a 'disaster area' by Carnegie officials: Need for revival seen. Chronicle of Higher Education, April 13, 1-4.
- Scully, M.G. (1984). U.S. colleges not realizing their full potential, panel says: Urges a national debate on quality. Chronicle of Higher Education, October 24, 1-34.
- Segedin, L.B. (1965). The significance of non-verbal education: Curriculum of small college. Unpublished manuscript, Illinois Teachers College-Chicago North (Northeastern Illinois University).
- Shaw, M.E., & Wright, J.M. (1967). Scales for the measurement of attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Shoenberg, R. (1982). Across the grain: Undergraduate liberal education and the faculty of research universities. Liberal Education, 68 (1), 11-17.
- Sizer, T.R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smith, R.A. (Ed.) (1971). Aesthetics and problems of education. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Smith, R.A. (1978). Critical reflections on the AGE idea. Music Educators Journal, 64 (5), 88-97.
- Springer, S., & Deutsch, G. (1981). Left brain, right brain. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Stark, J.S., & Morstain, B.R. (1978). Educational orientations of faculty in liberal arts colleges: An analysis of disciplinary differences. The Journal of Higher Education, 49 (5), 420-437.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1977). Intelligence, information processing and analogical reasoning: The componential elements of human abilities. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1979). Stalking the IQ quark. Psychology Today, 42-54.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1981). Thinking and learning skills: A view of intelligence. Educational Leadership, 39, 18-20.
- Sternberg, R.J. (Ed.) (1982). Handbook of human intelligence. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1984a). Testing intelligence without I.Q. tests. Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (10), 694-698.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1984b). How can we teach intelligence? Educational Leadership, 42 (1), 38-48.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1985a). Teaching critical thinking, Part I: Are we making critical mistakes? Phi Delta Kappan, 67 (3), 194-198.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1985b). Teaching critical thinking, Part 2: Possible solutions. Phi Delta Kappan, 67 (4), 277-280.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1986). The future of intelligence testing and training. Manuscript distributed at the Phi Delta Kappa and Northwestern University Research Symposium on The World of the Mind: Insights into Human Potential. March 8, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Caruso, D.R. (1985). Practical modes of knowing. In E. Eisner (Ed.), Learning and teaching the ways of knowing (pp. 133-158). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stone, O. (1971). The role of music in general education. Improving College and University Teaching, 19 (4), 283-284.
- Sutherland, M.B. (1971). Everyday imagining and education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Sykes, G. (1982). The case for aesthetic literacy. Educational Leadership, 39 (8), 596-598.
- Taylor, H. (1971). How to change colleges: Notes on radical reform. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Torrance, E.P. (1965). Rewarding creative behavior: Experiments in classroom creativity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Torrance, E. (1970). Encouraging creativity in the classroom. Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.
- Torrance, E.P. (1972). The creative teacher at work. Lexington, MA: Ginn.
- Torrance, E.P. Education and creativity. In A. Rothenberg, & C.R. Hausman (Eds.), The creativity question (pp. 217-227). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Torrance, E.P., & Myers, R.E. (1970). Creative learning and teaching. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Torrance, E., & Torrance, J.P. (1973). Is creativity teachable? Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Unruh, G., & Madeja, S. (1969). The arts in general education: An interrelated approach. Educational Leadership, 26 (7), 646-650.
- Unumb, D.F. (1984). The role of fine arts courses and the development of cognitive skills in general education programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for General and Liberal Studies, San Francisco, October.
- VanderMeer, A.W., & Lyons, M. (1979). The liberal arts as viewed by faculty members in colleges and schools of business: 1058-1976. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Institute of Education, ERIC Document # 187 181.
- Van Doren, M. (1959). Liberal education. Boston: Beacon Press.
- van Sommers, P. (1984). Drawing and cognition: Descriptive and experimental studies of graphic production processes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Veysey, L.R. (1970). The emergence of the American university. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Watkins, B.T. (1981). Faculty motivation called key to improving liberal education. Chronicle of Higher Education, June 15, 5.
- Way, B. (1968). Development through drama. London: Longman.

- Weinstein, G., & Fantini, M. (1970). Toward humanistic education: A curriculum of affect. New York: Praeger.
- Wertheimer, M. (1959). Productive thinking. New York: Harper and Row.
- Winter, D.G., McClelland, D.C., & Stewart, A.J. (1981). A new case for the liberal arts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wolf, D., & Gardner, H. (1980). Beyond playing or polishing: A developmental view of artistry. In J. Hausman (Ed.), Arts and the schools (pp. 47-77). New York: McGraw-Hill.

APPENDIX A

Catalog Analysis and Survey of  
Chicago-Area Institutions on the  
Role of the Fine Arts in General  
Education Programs. (1980-1981)

David F. Unumb  
Department of Speech and Performing Arts  
Northeastern Illinois University

January, 1982

Summary

A careful review and analysis of catalog descriptions of the general education programs currently in effect as some 42 colleges, universities, and community colleges in the greater Chicago area, indicated that only five of these institutions of post-secondary education had a separate and distinct requirement for a fine arts experience as part of their current general education program. These five institutions were all private colleges.

Thirty institutions included the fine arts as a component of the disciplinary area of Humanities, but most often in such a way that experience in the fine arts could be "avoided" by a student via elective options in satisfying any distribution requirement in the Humanities area.

Four institutions provided a separate "track" for the fine arts within a broader Humanities requirement. This provision might encourage a student to sample at least one or two courses in the fine arts.

For those institutions which did specify a clearly separate requirement in the fine arts, the credit-hour range extended from three hours to nine hours. The latter provision occurred only once and that within a Bachelor of Science degree program in Education.

Almost without exception, courses designated for general education purposes were lecture-survey in nature and appeared to be oriented to the traditional values of "appreciation" for the art involved.

It should also be noted that some of the sites had no specific "core curriculum" for general education purposes, but depended upon a variety of measures to insure liberal education. These included: faculty-guided but student initiated program design, competency-based outcomes



programs, and systems of total electives within broad areas as determined by student and advisor. These variations made it difficult to assess any impact of the fine arts on a typical undergraduate's "general education" program.

Some seventeen institutions did acknowledge a role for the fine arts within a liberal education. This attitude was most frequently displayed in statements about the overall educational philosophy of the college or university. It is questionable whether catalog statements appearing as goals of the faculty or governing boards have any significant impact on student decisions involving selection of courses in the absence of explicit requirements to reinforce those broad generalizations.

No clear correlation was uncovered between the degree of "selectivity" of the institution ( as suggested by the 14th edition of Barron's Profiles of American Colleges ) and receptivity to a significant role for the arts within the institution's general education curriculum.

While this study was limited in methodology to the analysis of catalog material only, there is some evidence that the role of the arts in any institution's general education program may be more of a phenomenon of the college's historical development and liberal education "ethos" than it is a factor of academic rigor or selectivity in admissions.

This hypothesis would then form the essential and primary question of the critical factor of faculty attitude in shaping the curricular framework of any general education program. That is, while faculty certainly have a primary role to play in determining the academic rigor of any institution, and while they may have some voice in admissions policy, they are clearly the primary force in making the detailed decisions which form the curricular answer to any broad institutional goals. Thus, when it comes time to "flesh out" an institution's commitments to all the dimensions of liberal education, faculty attitudes may well be an important factor in determining the degree of emphasis to be placed on each facet of that program, including the extent and nature of the participation of the fine arts.

More research is necessary to explore this area of examination.

Catalog Analysis

N = 42 Institutions

Sample Configuration: 12 community colleges  
 7 private universities  
 4 public universities  
 19 private colleges

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Community College</u>		<u>Private College</u>		<u>Public College</u>	
Institution has a separate Fine Arts requirement	0		5	19.2%	1	25.0%
Fine Arts courses included within Humanities	11	91.7%	16	61.5%	2	50.0%
Fine Arts have a separate "track" within Humanities	1	8.3%	2	7.7%	0	
Catalog states a role for the Fine Arts	1	8.3%	5	19.2%	1	25.0%
Fine Arts linked with Communications	0		3	11.4%	0	
Fine Arts linked with Literature	0		3	11.5%	0	

Institutions Surveyd

<u>Site</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Barron Ranking</u>	<u>Astin Cell</u>
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES(7)			
DePaul University	DU	C	na
Illinois Institute of Technology	IIT	VC	13
Lewis University	LU	C	na
Loyola University	LUC	C	4
Northwestern University	NU	HC	6
Roosevelt University	RU	C	na
University of Chicago	UC	MC	6
PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES (4)			
University of Illinois at Chicago	UICC	C	8
Chicago State University	CSU	LC	34
Governor's State University	GSU	na	na
Northeastern Illinois University	UNI	LC	7

PRIVATE  
 COLLEGES (19)

Aurora College	AC	C	na
Barat College	BC	LC	18
College of St. Francis	CSF	VC	17
Columbia College	CC	SP	21
Concordia Teachers College	CTC	C	20
DeLourdes College*	DLC	LC	na
Elmhurst College	EC	LC	na
George Williams College*	GWC	C	12
Illinois Benedictine College	IBC	C	17
Judson College	JC	C	11
Kendall College	KC	C	na
Lake Forest College	LFC	VC	23
Mundelein College	MC	C	12
National College of Education	NCE	C	11
North Central College	NCC	C	22

North Park College	NPC	C	na
St. Xavier College	SXC	C	16
Trinity Christian College	TCC	LC	12
Wheaton College	WC	VC	13
COMMUNITY COLLEGES (11)			
City Colleges of Chicago	CCC	na	na
College of DuPage	COD	na	na
College of Lake County	CLC	na	na
Elgin Community College	ECC	na	na
Joliet Community College	JCC	na	na
McHenry County College	MCC	na	na
Moraine Valley Community College	MVCC	na	na
Morton College	MCCB	na	na
Thornton Community College	THCC	na	na
Waubonsee Community College	MCC	na	na
William Rainey Harper College	WRHC	na	na

PRIVATE JUNIOR  
COLLEGES (1)

Central YMCA Community College*	CYCC	na	na
---------------------------------------	------	----	----

TOTAL N= 42 institutions

\* Indicates institutions no longer in operation

Barron Rankings of Selectivity

MC	Most Competitive
HC	Highly Competitive
VC	Very Competitive
C	Competitive
LC	Less Competitive
NC	Noncompetitive
SP	Specialized Schools

Profiles of American Colleges  
14th Edition

Astin Study: Stratification  
Cells

(SATV + SATM scores)

Private Universities

<u>Cell</u>	<u>Score Level</u>
4	Less than 1,050
5	1,050 to 1,174
6	1,175 or more

4-Year Public Colleges

7,10	Less than 935 or unknown
8	935 to 1,024

4-Year Private  
Nonsectarian Colleges

11,15	Less than 950 or unknown
12	950 to 1,024
13	1,025 to 1,174

4-Year Catholic  
Colleges

16	less than 950
17	950 to 1,024
18	1,025 or more

4-Year Protestant  
Colleges

20,24	less than 875 or unknown
21	875 to 974
22	975 to 1,049
23	1,050 or more

Predominately  
Black Colleges

34,36	see Public 4-Year and 2-Year
-------	---------------------------------

The American Freshman Norms for Fall 1983  
Astin, Green, Korn and Maier.

APPENDIX B



The Role of Fine Arts Courses and the  
Development of Cognitive Skills in  
General Education Programs

David F. Unumb, Associate Professor and  
Chair,  
Department of Speech and Performing Arts  
Northeastern Illinois University  
Chicago, Illinois

Association for General and Liberal Studies  
San Francisco, California  
Twenty-Fourth Annual Meetings  
October 25-27, 1984

This is an era in higher education where those of us who try to plan coherent and responsive curricula are buffeted by many winds of challenge blowing from both within our institutions and from the society without. Those of us in the fine arts have a particularly exposed position when those winds are blowing.

While there has been an increased recognition of the importance of representing the fine arts in a general education program, this recognition still all too often relegates our role to the fringes of the general education program at our institutions. A recent catalog survey of colleges and universities in the Greater Chicago area, some 42 in number, revealed that only seven of them had an identifiable separate fine arts requirement in their general education program, and of the remaining institutions twenty-seven recognized fine arts as an "option" within a broad humanities requirement. (Unumb, 1982)

As we attempt to respond to the call articulated by Boyer and Levine in A Quest for Common Learning (Carnegie Foundation, 1981), we find that the area of a "Shared Use of Symbols" (Quest, p. 36) provides the fine arts with an arena but in practice the fine arts still gain greatest support and recognition as an "enhancement" of a liberal education rather than some activity which strikes at the core of liberal/general education. We find that the era is also marked by what Levine has termed the "new vocationalism," (Levine, 1982) with attendant demands for career and

vocationally oriented degree programs. There are times when even our own faculty and "majors" will strive to find such pre-professional orientation a primary goal of our undergraduate programs within our own departments. It has also been reported (Levin, 1982, p. 3) that as the college curriculum is becoming more specialized relative to the 1960s, students are now spending one third more time in their major areas.

Levine also reports that the majority of colleges (92%) now offer credit work experience, transfer credit for courses taken at vocational/technical schools (79%), and credit for cooperative education (53%). Levine, 1982, p. 3) While all of these programs and approaches may have their validity, nevertheless one does get an image of the "center will not hold," of an increasingly powerful centripetal force sending any coherent curriculum spinning off into a void.

As suggested by Norman Rice some years ago (Rice, 1969) there is a marked tendency for colleges to move into a more professionally oriented program in the arts through the development of faculty and resources aimed in this direction. Again, these developments have a perfectly defensible rationale, but also threaten a sense of coherence in the core of the undergraduate general education program.

There is also emerging another challenge to the role of fine arts in general education, a challenge which is visible throughout the campus and not merely in our own departments: there is increasing evidence as reported and reviewed by Stonewater and

stonewater (1984) that "anywhere from 42 to almost 90 percent of our college students are not at levels of cognitive development necessary to do...high-level, abstract problem solving and thinking." (p. 7) In effect, they are not yet at Piaget's level of formal operations. We have all heard this expressed in more informal terms from our colleagues who join us in concerns that "students by and large cannot seem to write and think" at a college level.

It is not my purpose here today to either discuss the origin of these trends or to case forth some all-encompassing solution for them, if one is even possible, but to examine the role which the fine arts can and should play in the contemporary scheme of things for general/liberal education and to suggest a direction which those of us in the arts might profitably pursue, with no essential diminutive of our dedication to our art and discipline, but with greater attention to a far more significant role in assisting general education programs to achieve that crucial sense of coherence and broad-base which has been so often alluded to in many evaluations for the past five or more years.

In doing this, I wish to briefly review the arguments and propositions which have been advanced over the years for the inclusion of fine arts in any general education system, suggest a definition of liberal/general education which not only encompasses all of these but which suggests an additional avenue of exploration, and to advance a notion already receiving great currency about a central role for the arts in the cognitive

development of undergraduate students, I will also give some brief attention to the issue of creativity as a legitimate goal and objective for fine arts participation in the general education program.

If we accept, for the sake of illustration, a definition of the ideal outcome of liberal education is for the student to become "...not merely a bearer, but a critic and extender of culture." (Hawkins, 1983) then we can view the customary and traditional rationales for inclusion of the fine arts in a general education program as being represented by the following:

The arts are an essential in higher education to provide a balance to the present emphasis on science and technology. (Gould, 1968)

Involvement with the arts makes man a more sensitive, discriminating, appreciative, creatively aware creature and is therefore not only desirable but essential in higher education. (Gould, 1968)

Colleges and universities can perform valuable services as repositories and disseminating points for library materials, art objects, and performances in the varied art forms. (Gould, 1968)

Universities have a responsibility for encouraging and sharing in the training of potentially professional artists. (Gould, 1968)

Just as it is dangerous to entrust the life of the nation and the world to citizens ignorant of good science and technology, so is it dangerous to entrust it to men and women whose feelings and values are uncultivated and undisciplined. This is the overriding reason for the cultivation of the young in the aesthetic dimension of experience. For a good society there must be enlightened cherishing. (Boudy, 1972)

pointed to the specific demands of curriculum construction:

The arts embody and chronicle the cultural, aesthetic and social development of man. (Bloom and Remer, 1976)

The arts are a tangible expression of human creativity, and as such reflect humanity's perceptions of the world. (Bloom and Remer, 1976)

The arts, as a means of personal and creative involvement, are a source of pleasure and mental stimulation. (Bloom and Remer, 1976)

The arts are useful tools for everyday living. An understanding of the arts provides people with a broader range of choices about the environment in which they live, the lifestyle they develop, and the way they spend their leisure time. (Bloom and Remer, 1976)

In sum total, customary rationales for inclusion of the arts tend to focus on the cultural, aesthetic and ameliorative functions. Important though these may be, and persuasive as are such examinations of many of them including Harry S. Broudy's authoritative work on aesthetic education in his Enlightened Cherishing of 1972, we may be getting closer to the mark for our present purposes when we find such rationales as:

The arts are a universal human phenomenon and means of communication. (Bloom and Remer, 1976)

The arts involve the elements of sound, movement, color, mass, energy, space, line, shape, and language. These elements, singly or in combination, are common to the concepts underlying many subjects in the curriculum. (Bloom and Remer, 1976)

If only Bloom and Remer in 1976 had gone one small further step and suggested that pattern formation capacity, the root of aesthetic appreciation, is also the foundation of all recognition,

then we would be on the doorstep of the major purpose of this 281  
examination.

Thus, a recognition that the entire process of perception linked with pattern formation is part and parcel of the essential skills of cognitions, is crucial to a renewed emphasis on the fine arts as an overlooked avenue to enhancing and reinforcing cognitive development in today's undergraduate students. It is my central contention that those of us in the fine arts should be able to deal effectively with certain aspects of cognitive development, especially those aspects which stem from a combination of "right-brain and left-brain" orientation and include the non-linear modes of thought and access as opposed to the traditional logic-dominated modes.

If we truly seek a holistic and coherent approach to undergraduate general education, then we must be prepared to have a curriculum which mirrors the array of access modes available to us for cognition and we must acknowledge the centrality of the perception process in cognition. If these premises are accepted, then it must follow that the fine arts have a significant role to play in such an undergraduate general education program.

Beginning with Read's assertion of some years ago that "... art is a language for conveying in intuitive knowledge of reality, (Read, 1966) and culminating with Gardner's recent theory of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983) as expressed in his Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences, we have the basis of constructing a coherent undergraduate curriculum which is more

truly reflective of the realities of human cognition than simply 282  
restricting that process to a representation of linear and his-  
torically based logical sequences.

Gardner suggests that intelligence best be define as proce-  
dures for solving problems and that current IQ tests present quite  
a restricted set of problems and measure a very narrow range of  
intellectual competence. Further, he maintains that such a  
single test, no matter how valid, reliable, and even predictive  
in the minds of many, cannot possibly measure human intelligence  
because human intelligence is specific rather than general, and  
multiple rather than singular.

In his MI Theory, Gardner posits six independent intelli-  
gences which he says all normal human beings have the potential  
to develop: linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial,  
bodily-kinesthetic, and personal. Each of these intelligences  
is a set of procedures for solving particular types of problems.  
While we do not have time in this discussion to investigate  
Gardner's theory in any detail, suffice it to say that he does  
offer a rationale which includes creteria or "signs" to estab-  
lish the autonomous nature of each of these intelligences which  
can each be destroyed as a result of brain damage as in the  
case of lesions leading to linguistic disabilities.

If we at least accept his presentation on a heuristic  
basis, and consider that the development of self intelligences  
lies within the normal span for human beings, then we can en-  
hance and expand that normal range by the work of David Perkins



who, in his The Mind's Best Work (1983) suggests that it may not be necessary to attribute specialized mental processes to creative discovery, but to assume that creating occurs when ordinary processes in able persons are marshalled by "creative intentions." Further, he posits that highly creative people are not so much characterized by their quantity of ideas as by the quality of their standards, and that pattern-recognition is an ordinary ability with built-in flexibility.

Many commentators (Lowenfeld, 1968; Broudy, 1972; Read, 1966 and Ehrenzweig, 1967) have also noted that human beings are born with aesthetic or artistic impulses but that these impulses are somehow deformed or submerged as we pass through the educational process and life process.

As Read put it is:

We are all born artists...and become insensitive citizens in a bourgeois society because either (a) we are physically deformed in the process of education so that our bodies can no longer express themselves in natural and harmonious movements and sounds; or (b) we are psychically deformed because we are compelled to accept a social concept of normality which excludes the free expression of aesthetic impulses. (Read, 166, pp. 99-100)

Douglas Sloan has also taken issue with a too-narrow definition of cognition, and with the notice that expanded human potential in creative development is not educationally feasible in his work. (1983) He finds that it is necessary to develop a full notion of the imagination which does not demean it to something on the level of fictive, basically unreal and trivial. Rather, he conceives of the imagination and imaginative activity as an

activity of the whole person, in which knowing involves thinking, willing and feeling. It is his observation that cognition in current parlance all too often turns out to mean almost exclusively verbal and logical mathematical skills (often measured by IQ tests). Further, cognition is thus narrowly conceived as a matter of discursive knowledge and what he calls "calulative intellect," as a consequence of which education is taken to consist entirely in the imparting and retention of information and the development of logical-mathematical facility.

Sloan culminates his discussion with an appeal:

The challenge at hand, it should perhaps be emphasized, is not that of attempting to return to old communal and cultural forms, but of carrying out a search for new possibilities within a situation in which the processes of cultural uprooting and erosion is far advanced. But this requires, at the least, an education in which the full dimensions of rationality are recognized and nurtured, for therein lie the sources of humanly meaningful cultural life and activity. An education devoted entirely to the development of abstract and technical mental facility, which lacks any vital connection with human meaning and substance, becomes itself a main agent of cultural impoverishment and the displacement of human concerns. (Sloan, 1983)

Thus, if we accept the position(s) of the need in education for a more holistic approach, representing all diverse modes of human rationality, and include in that assumption a recognition of the centrality of perception and pattern-formation based on perception in the process of cognitive development, we have the basis for an enhanced and more meaningful participation of the fine arts in the core of any general education program.

Elliott Eisner, in a significant article which appeared 285 in the Phi Delta Kappan of September, 1981, made a cogent case for the role of the arts in cognition and the curriculum. Long-standing experience as an important figure in the field of art education allowed him to marshal a significant argument for his central thesis that "...the arts are cognitive activities, guided by human intelligence, that make unique forms of meaning possible." It was his further contention that the meanings secured through the arts require what might best be described as artistic literacy, without which artistic meaning is impeded and the ability to use more conventional forms of expression is hampered. (Eisner, 1981, p. 48)

In developing his discussion of concept formation, Eisner placed great emphasis on the matter of becoming conscious, of noticing, of perceiving and the essential role played by the senses in that process. Further, as he stated:

- 1) no concepts can be formed without sensory information,
- 2) the degree to which the particular senses are differentiated has a large effect on the kind and subtlety of the concepts that are formed, and 3) without concepts formed as images (whether these images are visual, auditory, or in some other sensory form), image surrogates -- words, for example -- are meaningless.

It was on this kind of basis that Eisner formulated his views of any form of activity which can be called cognitive must be rooted in sensory forms of life, which thus expands our conceptions of intelligence and literacy and that the "realm of meaning

has many mansions." (Eisner, p. 52) Science thus, despite its enormous impact, cannot have a monopoly on meaning because the form of representation it uses is only one among several which are available.

Written before the appearance of Gardner's complete presentation of his theory of multiple intelligences, Eisner's article nevertheless forms an effective companion piece to the Garner work.

Herbert Read once wrote:

...education should have no other aim than to preserve within us some trace of the penetration and the delight of the innocent eye...  
(Read, 1966, p. 111)

In light of the discussion thus far, it might be appropriate to amend Read's last phrase to say "delight of the innocent, knowing and learning eye," and to thus preserve and extend the notion of the crucial role played by the senses in cognition, and to suggest the full array of modalities which we call "knowing."

This "knowing" may well involve a familiarity with the domain of knowledge in a given field as represented by what Bruner called analytic thinking in his work The Process of Education (1960) but in combination with the linear, logical, step-at-a-time process of analytic thinking, he also recognized the corresponding role of intuitive thinking and the need for the complementary nature of intuitive and analytic thinking to be recognized.

Perhaps in the arts, where we can focus on the self-contained constructs of experience captured in visual, auditory and kinesthetic forms as plays in performance, music in performance, visual arts and blueprints for each, we can assist and draw upon student skills and aid in the development of those skills toward concept formation and management of detail in drawing conventional maps.

We can assume that education can have an impact on developmental stages (Weller, 1977; Stonewater and Stonewater, 1984), especially in light of the research of Kohlberg in moral and values education and the extensive work of Perry on the profile of the typical undergraduate. There is, for example, particular concern today with the issue of how to teach problem-solving to the college student who arrives on campus at a lower stage of "readiness" than we would like as discussed earlier in this paper. Stonewater and Stonewater (1984) in their discussion of the teaching of problem-solving in this era suggest two groups of instructional strategies: the first of these being instruction which creates "disequilibrium" and thus creates a necessary condition for a movement to the next stage of development. Stonewater and Stonewater, pp. 7-8]

Methods of creating this disequilibrium include: (1) creating dissonance which will bring into sharp focus contradictions requiring the student to respond and develop a fuller repertoire of responses, (2) use of direct experience in activities which give the student some kind of hands-on experience with the

content, (3) presentation of diversity and so to challenge the unidimensional view which they may have of the world as linear, singular and essentially non-complex or without ambiguities and dissonances, and (4) providing of social transmission and social interaction with others which Piaget specified as one of the conditions necessary for cognitive development.

It would seem that the fine arts are, or can be, in a particularly effective position to provide these kinds of experiences to students by virtue of the vary nature of creative-aesthetic-artistic activity, including the constant shuttling back-and-forth between the artist and his medium, the artist and his society and the intra-psychic forces within the artist himself as extensively discussed by Ehrenzweig (1967), Read (1966), Arnheim (1969), Gregory (1970), Courney (1974 and 1980), Copland (1952) and many others representing the fields of Art, Drama, and Music.

Furthermore, Stonewater and Stonewater suggest that these experiences be provided within a context of "engagement" to enhance the possibility of the student actually entering the developmental process by supplying the instructional strategies with a second group of requisites including: (1) a structure which establishes boundaries and organizes content in such a way that helps make the disequilibrium manageable, (2) providing psychological support in what can be a very ego-threatening and anxiety-producing activity triggered by the "disequilibrium" and (3) making a provision for a presentation

of some "next stage" of development.

Again it would appear that these factors of a supportive environment, organized with a structure, are ones familiar to those of us practicing the arts, not only because of the inherent and deliberate "tensions" within a work of art, but because of the methodologies most of us use in introducing students to the practices of our art.

At the first of what will now be a series of suggestions or implications for those of us in the arts and based on the current research work in the fields of cognitive development and theories of creativity, it might be well to quote from the conclusion to the Stonewater and Stonewater article on the "Teaching of Problem-Solving":

There seems to be some combination of methods which, when used under certain conditions can, in fact, facilitate cognitive growth. It would be appropriate to continue such research with an emphasis on isolating the different strategies. However, it would be equally important to further analyze these strategies, combined with student assessment and classroom environment data, to develop a workable and transferable model of engaging students in disequilibrium-creating activities. (p. 10)

Here, it would seem, is an opportunity for the fine arts to engage in classroom-oriented research, and to also find a way of linking their general education courses to the main objective of such education.

Both the instruction and the evaluation-assessment of the impact of that instruction could also take place comfortably within the scope of another essential aim of the fine arts in general

education - the development of aesthetic sensibility, viewed not merely as an acquisition of some "instructed tests," or historically oriented review of great works and great epochs but also as an active inquiry partaking of the cognitively important essential skills and attributes of creative endeavors. For example, Perkins (1984) has suggested that creative thinking involves aesthetic as much as practical standards and the impulse seems to value stated qualities and to carry forward the person's effort to achieve these qualities. (1984, p. 19) Perkins further that education all too often falls short in not stressing attention to aesthetic dimensions, but also in encouraging assignments and tasks which are so narrow that students have little chance to generate or even select among different purposes, offering little mobility of inquiry and not pushing students to work at the edge of their competence, all attributes, he feels, of truly creative thinking.

In essence, Perkins states a case for a change best expressed in his own words:

...part of the problem is that conventional instruction usually presents knowledge as given, when it should encourage a view of knowledge as the product of creative effort. An approach well suited to this aim can be summed up in three words: knowledge as design...To put it succinctly, virtually any product of human effort, including knowledge, can be understood better with the help of four design questions: What is the purpose? What is the structure? What are some model cases (concrete examples that bring the matter in question closer to perceptual experience)? What are the arguments for or against the design?



While this approach may appear to bear a great deal of resemblance to Bruner's "inquiry learning" of an earlier era, the particularity of Perkins' approach again suggests that the fine arts, with their process-product orientation, their attention to each work being a new challenge, and the combining of extrinsic and intrinsic factors being wonderfully rich sources of instruction and interaction.

Henrickson and Torrance have suggested (n. d., p. 24) that the main difference between the acquiring (i.e. passive mind) and the inquiring mind is the difference between the "what" and the "how," or the difference between "recognition" and "manipulation." This freedom to maneuver would seem to be consistent with Perkins' concept of the approach to creativity by the design mode. Further, the research of Henrickson and Torrance reveals that the components of creativity include such characteristics as fluency, flexibility, sensitivity to problems, the ability to abstract and the ability to rearrange, are attributes not only of Perkins' design modality, but of a studio-based, experientially oriented course in the fine arts.

We also know that in developing the ability to make aesthetic judgments, we use and direct the application of description, analysis, interpretation and evaluation (Valley, 1983, p. 15) in such as fashion the process of using these four-fold tasks we engage in activities directly related to acts of cognition and thus are involved with cognitive development.

Even more importantly, however, for the purposes of this discussion is a typology of creativity in the visual arts which has been discussed by Eisner writing in Creativity and Art Education edited by Brittain. He has identified four characteristics for work in the visual arts on a creative plane: boundary pushing, which is using materials in a new way; for example, inventing, inventing of new subject matter or forms through combining known forms or subjects; boundary breaking, which expands frontiers even further through totally new approaches; and finally, harmonious ordering as in aesthetic organizing. While Eisner discusses these attributes in terms of visual arts, certainly parallels can be found in the other plastic and performing arts.

Taken in sum total, all of these approaches are not only suggestive of the design approach of Perkins but reinforce the idea of a totality of cognitive manipulations which when subjected to individual identification can become a holistic approach reminiscent of the "creative intelligence" articulated by Viktor Lowenfeld. In an essay on "Creative Intelligence" (Brittain, ed., n.d.) Lowenfeld posited that intelligence as well as creativity are essential to human growth, with the acknowledgement that intelligence, at least in its academic interpretation, is based on the assessment and use of facts while creativity greatly depends on the use and application of sensitivities.

Since the exploration and boundary pushing involved

in creative endeavors and filtered through enhanced sensitivities are bound to result in enhanced imagination, and since Sloan (1984) has posited that imagination is an activity of the whole person with the act of knowing involving thinking, feeling, valuing and doing, we can ameliorate the false dichotomy which so often exists between metaphoric, intuitive reasoning and the traditional logical and linear patterns of reasoning.

In his introduction to the 1978 volume The Arts, Cognition and Basic Skills Stanley Madeja raises the issue of the role of transfer of knowledge in the Arts as he reviews the sessions of the conference held in 1977 which gave rise to the articles in this volume. He identifies the key question in the following way:

An individual's underlying strategies for making sense of the world - how he or she selects for attention, aggregates, differentiates, and builds relationships in everyday living - appear to offer a much richer source for knowledge than the information an individual can capture and express in the variety of symbol systems that are available ... Do the arts enhance the underlying knowledge base of the individual and therefore make it possible to detect and resolve features or relationships that previously went unnoticed? The implication here is that the arts provide a noticeably different way of viewing or knowing the world. If so, participation in the arts can serve to make explicit aspects of events that an individual in fact knew already but could not single out for attention or form future manipulation. This suggests that the arts can be a way of developing a sensitivity to the nuances of events, a sensitivity that can be reinforced by studying or actually making a work of art. Madeja, 1978, pp. 13-14)

Thus, while we can posit that study in the fine arts as part of a general education program will enhance a totality of cognitive development and encourage the fostering of creative modalities, we can also posit that there will still remain certain characteristics unique to each of the arts and to its particular and peculiar symbol system.

While the position taken in this paper has been essentially that of the cognitivist view of the arts as representing a part of a larger domain of knowing even with their unique content for that part of the larger or higher order of things, there is still room for that aspect of the arts which could be called "expressive" as well as those aspects which are related to overall cognitive development.

This expressive component can still be found within Eisner's typology of creativity for the visual arts and Perkins' knowledge by design. Placing the general education component of arts disciplines within a larger frame of reference for cognitive development will not lessen the expressive and intuitive relationship between the artist and his or her work, and can only enhance and extend the range of experience for the undergraduate who has yet to experience the full array of modalities available to the inquiring mind. In surveying those modalities which can be assessed in the fine arts, we must keep in mind testimony from both those within the arts and those who speak to us from the field of cognitive psychology. Thus, we can find the commonalities which the artistic activity may share

with the total field of cognitive development as well as those attributes which may well remain uniquely the province of the arts.

If we accept the premise that seven major behaviors have been identified as the means by which aesthetic qualities are encountered and that these seven are: perceiving the conceptualizing, analyzing, evaluating, valuing, producing, and reacting (CEMREL, 1970); and if we further compare these behaviors to any scheme of the cognitive process, we have the foundation-stone for commonalities. Thus, as Eisner has suggested (1981), the arts are a cognitive activity.

Irving Sigel (1969) in writing on Piaget's system and education also has reminded us of two essential principles:

...although cognitive growth appears to be a continuous process, it proceeds in discontinuous ways with spurts and plateaus of achievement. Thus, for the educator, it is important to be aware of the fact that cognitive structures are not fixed or given but develop and, in the process of adaptation become modified and reconstituted as new structures at subsequent points in time. (p. 468)

Thus, the creation of deliberate points of "disequilibrium" which were discussed earlier are a necessary part of the growth and change process in the formation of cognitive structures.

Sigel also noted that in the Piaget system:

...language is the tool by which thoughts are expressed, having been preceded by actions

which are internatlized and eventually defined in verbal and symbolic forms. Language conveys to the individual an already prepared organization of thought, concepts, and relationships. It is not thought, since thought can occur without language. (p. 469)

Anton Ehrenzweig in his work The Hidden Order of Art (1967) also noted the currency Piaget gave to the term "syncretistic" in children's vision and of child art. This is viewed as a holistic totality, a global vision monitored by inner resources. While it also involves the concept of undifferentiation, it is marked by a bold experimentation and a freedom of investigation. As Ehrenzweig suggests, the child grows older and starts matching his/her artistic work with that in "adult pictures" and the response loses its vigor; the work becomes more anxious in draughtmanship, duller in color. In short, the child's vision has ceased to be total and syncretistic and has become analytic instead.

If we now move to recommendations for the fine arts in general education gased on the preceding discussion, they would appear to be several in number:

(1) We clearly identify the goal of cognitive development as an important component in all courses slated for inclusion in a general education program, and in particular bend every effort to insure that the contributions of the fine arts be a recognized part of the totality, not merely a "complementary" contribution.

(2) Such courses as we do offer in the fine arts represent a significant opportunity for the students to engage in "hand-on" and direct experience whenever possible so as to not only convey

the actual "feel" of the particular art, but to also assist them in what Davidman, drawing from earlier work by Eisner, has called the "expressive encounter" (1980). This expressive encounter is the antithesis of the behavioral objective with its pre-ordained goal, but rather represents an opportunity for the student to grapple with a problem which has been presented to him/her within a controlled structure, much like the deliberate "disequilibrium" principle of Stonewater and Stonewater.

(3) We take conscious steps in designing our general education courses to recognize and build upon alternative cognitive modalities, not just differences of content between the arts and the other disciplines, and that in building those alternative modalities we extend and demonstrate either the heuristic theory of Gardner and multiple intelligences, marking what is suitable for our art, or that we at the very least extend and particularize the potential of the "right-brain, left-brain" investigations. In this regard, we should consider not only the by now well-known work of Betty Edwards with her Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain (1979) but also that of Gabriele Rico in her recent work, Writing the Natural Way, in which her concept of "creative tension" and the shuttling process between what she calls the "sign mind," or left-brain, and the "design mind," or the right-brain, holds many interesting implications for instruction in all the arts. These implications may be particularly fruitful in enhancing or extending the Perkins concept of knowledge by

design which was discussed earlier. What are we in the arts if not specialists in design and working with the signs of various symbol systems?

Finally, as research in the essentials of the creative process continues to accumulate, based on earlier work by Torrance, Lowenfeld, and others, we in the arts should be ready to feed the results of those research efforts into our courses for general education, with particular emphasis on the process involved. Perkins (1983) again has laid the groundwork for this effort by his emphasis on structural means which can enhance the development of creativity.

Lest these proposals be taken, however, as an attempt to vitiate the uniqueness of the arts disciplines and to reduce the artistic process to a series of totally conscious activities, there are two final cautionary notes.

We should always bear in mind that of the four areas of awareness suggested by Jung (Bassett, 1969, p. 14): the senses, the emotions, the intellect, and the intuition parts will always remain beyond our complete understanding by rational methodology or quantitative analysis. Even in Jerome Bruner's early writings on the learning process and his notion of three ways in which a person could represent his knowledge of a subject, two thirds of that concept of knowledge remains essentially intuitive. That is, if knowledge can be represented by an expert act, by a capacity to picture or describe its logical structure, the first two are, to a large extent, founded on intuition.



As Bassett describes this in his The Open Eye in Learning (1969),

A group of children in following this sequence might know about seesaws - first by being able to use them, then, in a few cases by being able to draw a picture of a seesaw or mention some visual equivalent - but all of them would have to wait for a high school science course to describe the mechanics of the contraption.  
(p. 48)

Thus, there will remain areas in which our instruction in the arts, for example, will not be totally measurable and we will have to tolerate, as well, as "delay" principle in its impact. Suffice it to say that there is evidence that instruction in the fine arts on the elementary level has had positive impact on "basic education" in other areas. As indicated by Hirsch (1983),

In 1977 a study was conducted on the scholastic aptitude of the children residing within each of the twenty-three elementary schools in the Berkeley, California school district. Research results showed that children enrolled in schools that emphasized the arts had better "basic" scores than children in schools that deemphasized the arts in their curricula. (p. 27)

It might be difficult, if not impossible, to replicate such a study on the post-secondary level and to achieve the necessary controls of variables, as well as other design elements, but our case can still be made by some extension of the basic principle of cognitive development. Certainly more research needs to be done in this area.

If we in the fine arts do indeed follow the implications of viewing our instruction in general education courses through the prism of cognitive development, we will ultimately:

1. give greater emphasis to the correspondence between our instructional activities and the essentials of cognition on a broad basis,
2. accept the notion of cognitive development as being stage-based and sequential, and
3. so arrange our resources in teaching as to assist students to move through those last stages and refinements which will include a growing awareness of all modalities of thought, including those which exist on a more intuitive level.

In so doing, we should also be honoring the notion articulated by Viktor Lowenfeld (1968) in a volume of his collected talks published following his death. In one of his talks, "On Integration in Art and Society," he said the following (if we mentally substitute the word "Student or person" for his word "child," then the substance can remain essentially the same):

May I say here that it is not the main purpose of art to integrate various subjects in the thinking of the child, for art itself is an integrative experience. As the child produces he brings his feeling, his thinking, and his perceiving into integrative relationships in such a manner that he cannot separate the one from the other. Integration occurs in the child ... So whenever we engage the child in a creative process - a meaningful creative process - the child meaningfully integrates, and this I believe is the most important contribution which art can make to integrative experiences, because what is integrated is man, not subjects. (p. 34)

The final cautionary note is thus supplied by Lowenfeld. That whatever efforts we make to meaningfully participate as fine arts disciplines in a coherent undergraduate program for general

education, based on cognitive developmental principles, we shall still have as an ultimate integrative experience the essential act of each of our arts.

Bibliography

Books

- Boyer, Ernest L. and Arthur Levine, A Quest for Common Learning: The Aims of General Education. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981.
- Brittain, W. Lambert (ed.), Viktor Lowenfield Speaks on Art and Creativity. Washington, DC: National Art Education Association, 1968.
- Broudy, Harry S., Enlightened Cherishing: An Essay on Aesthetic Education. Urbana, Illinois: U of Illinois Press, 1972.  
for Kappa Delta Pi
- Bruner, J., The Process of Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1960 (also) NY: Vintage (Knopf), 1963.
- Edwards, Betty, Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain. Los Angeles, CA: J.P. Tarcher, Inc., 1979 distributed by: St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Ehrenzweig, Anton, The Hidden Order of Art: A study in the Psychology of Artistic Imagination. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967.
- Gardner, Howard, Art, Mind and Brain: A Cognitive Approach to Creativity. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1982.
- Gardner, Howard, The Arts and Human Development. NY: Wiley, 1973.
- Gardner, Howard, Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligence. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Hirsch, Robert O., Listening: A Way to Process Information Aurally, 2nd Edition. A Unit in: Components in Speech Communication, W.E. Arnold, General Editor Dubuque, IA: Scarisbrick Publishers, 1979.
- Madeja, Stanley, S., The Arts, Cognition, and Basic Skills. St. Louis, MO: CEMREL, Inc., 1978.
- Perkins, David, The Mind's Best Work. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U Press, 1981.
- Read, Herbert, Art and Society. New York: Schocken Books, 1968 (1936).

- Rico, Gabriele Lusser, Writing the Natural Way: A Course in Enhancing Creativity and Writing Confidence. Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher, 1983.
- Sloan, Douglas, Living Thinking, Living World: Toward an Education of the Imagination. New York: Greenwood Press, Kettering Foundation, 1983.
- Weller, Richard (ed.), Humanistic Education: Visions and Realities. Bloomington, IND: Phi Delta Kappa, 1977.

#### Articles and Papers

- Bloom, Kathryn and Jane Remer, "A Rationale for the Arts in Education," National Elementary Principal, 55, 3 (January/February, 1976): 45.
- Report of the Aesthetic Education Program, CEMREL. Stanley Madeja, Director, St. Louis, MO: 1970.
- Davidman, Leonard, "On Educating the Imagination: A Modest Proposal," Phi Delta Kappan (62) p. 24-6, September 1980.
- Eisner, Elliot W., "The Role of the Arts in Cognition and Curriculum," Phi Delta Kappan (63) p. 48-52, September 1981.
- Eisner, Elliot W., "A Typology of Creativity in the Visual Arts," in Creativity and Art Education, edited by W. Lambert Brittain, Washington, DC: National Art Education Association (NAES), n.d. pp. 127-138.
- Gould, Samuel B., "The Arts in Higher Education: Valid or Valueless?" In The Arts and Education, New York State Council on the Arts, 1968, pp. 9-15.
- Hawkins, Hugh, "Liberal Education and American Society: A History Creative Tension" in Change Magazine (15), 7, October, 1983 pp. 34-37.
- Levine, Arthur, "A Report Card on the Undergraduate Curriculum". AAHE Bulletin (34) 7, March, 1982, pp. 1-4.
- Perkins, D.N., "Creativity by Design." Educational Leadership (42), 1, September 1984, pp. 18-25.

- Rice, Norman L., "Maturity on Trial: Art in College" in The Open Eye in Learning: The Role of Art in General Education, edited by Richard Bassett. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1969, pp. 98-117.
- Sigel, Irving E., "The Piagetian System and the World of Education." in Studies in Cognitive Development edited by David Elkind and John H. Flavell. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969, pp. 465-489.
- Stonewater, J.K. and Stonewater, B.B., "Teaching Problem-Solving: Implications from Cognitive Development Research". AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Currents AAHE Bulletin, February, 1984, pp. 7-10.
- Unumb, David F., "A Catalog Survey of Fine Arts Components in General Education Programs in Colleges and Universities of the Greater Chicago Area in 1982." (unpublished paper) Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University.
- Valley, Philip J. OSB, "Aesthetic Education: Its Status in General Education and a Justification for its Existence as a Required Program", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for General and Liberal Studies in Lexington, Kentucky, November 10, 1983.

APPENDIX C

SCORE DATACollege Community Survey:  
The Goals of a General/Liberal Education

N = 20

March, 1983  
Northeastern  
Illinois  
University

For purposes of pilot testing this instrument, which was created to assess the attitudinal response of faculty to propositions which have been advanced in the literature regarding the goals of a General/Liberal Education, a small sample was selected.

Using a Likert-style scoring system with a value of "1" assigned to responses indicating substantial disagreement with item content, and "5" assigned for substantial agreement with item content, a total score of all responses is possible. These summed responses have been used in this profile.

In order to preserve directionality of the instrument, scoring was reversed for items 11 and 13. The major thematic content of the instrument, and of the research interest which lead to the creation of the instrument, lies in calls in the literature for an expanded humanistic base for general education programs and for increased visibility for the fine arts within such an expansion.

The scores as recorded in this report can therefore be regarded as some measure of attitudinal disposition toward such an enhanced role for humanistic and artistic concerns within general education programs.

Certain items (4,6,8,10,12, and 14) which deal with an expanded role for the fine arts within general education programs have been "imbedded" in the instrument in order to create in the scoring process an "item cluster". This cluster has been reported as "Arts Item Score".

A substantial agreement on the part of faculty with the notion of an expanded role for the fine arts would be reflected by an Arts Item Score of 28 to 30.

SUMMARY

Although the survey numbers are quite small, an attempt was made to sample a variety of disciplines. Since the "N" was so small, and no attempt had been made to achieve effective stratified random sample design, no major statistical tests were conducted. Nevertheless, the basic data does suggest that those respondents who attended a liberal arts college for their undergraduate degree were



more favorable disposed to an expanded role for the fine arts within a humanistically-oriented general education program.

However, the numbers are so small, and the lack of a stratification system in this pilot administration make any conclusions difficult and questionable.

No attempt was made to measure the impact of other key variables such as disciplinary orientation, years of teaching experience, etc.

Since the primary purpose of this administration was to assess the clarity and validity of item content and to assess the degree of difficulty which the style of the instrument might create, specific conclusions on the issues will have to await future administrations of the instrument as used in more complete research designs.

David F. Unumb  
Coordinator of General Education

Respondent Profile

N = 20

<u>AGE RANGE</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
25-30	1	.05%
31-35	2	.10%
36-40	5	.25%
41-45	4	.20%
46-50	4	.20%
51-55	3	.15%
56-60	1	.05%

DEPARTMENTS  
REPRESENTED

Art	2	.10%
English	3	.15%
Chemistry	3	.15%
Physics	2	.10%
History	3	.15%
Economics	2	.10%
Speech	2	.10%
Mathematics	1	.05%
Philosophy	2	.10%

UNDERGRADUATE  
INSTITUTION TYPE

Private, Liberal Arts College	7	.35%
Church-Related Liberal Arts	1	.05%
Public College or University	7	.35%
Foreign College or University	1	.05%
Private University	4	.20%

DEGREES HELD

MA	1	.05%
MFA	2	.10%
Ph.D.	17	.85%

Score DataALL RESPONDENTS POOLED

N =20

## Total Score

<u>Score</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cum f</u>	<u>percentage</u>
100-98	0		
97-95	0		
94-92	1	20	.05%
91-89	2	19	.10%
88-86	1	17	.05%
85-83	7	16	.35%
82-80	4	9	.20%
79-77	1	5	.05%
76-74	3	4	.15%
73-71	1	1	.05%

mode= 83.5

median=83.0

mean= 82.6

## Arts Item Score

<u>Score</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cum f</u>	<u>percentage</u>
30-28	7	20	.35%
27-25	7	13	.35%
24-22	6	6	.30%

mode= 27

median=27

mean= 26.2

SCORE FOR UGRAD=LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

N= 7

## Total Score

<u>Score</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cum f</u>	<u>percentage</u>
88-86	1	7	.1428%
85-83	3	6	.4285%
82-80	2	3	.2857%
79-77	0		
76-74	1	1	.1428%

mode= 83  
 median=83  
 mean= 82.28

## Arts Item Score

<u>Score</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cum f</u>	<u>percentage</u>
30-38	4	7	.5714%
27-25	2	3	.2857%
24-22	1	1	.1428%

mode= 29  
 median=28  
 mean= 27.2

SCORE FOR UGRAD=PUBLIC UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE

N=7

## Total Score

<u>Score</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cum f</u>	<u>percentage</u>
91-89	1	7	.1428%
88-86	0		
85-83	3	6	.2857%
82-80	0		
79-77	1	3	.1428%
76-74	1	2	.1428%
73-71	1	1	.1428%

mode= 84  
 median=84  
 mean= 81.3

## SCORE FOR UGRAD=PUBLIC UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE (Cont.)

Arts Item Score

<u>Score</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>cum f</u>	<u>percentage</u>
30-28	2	7	.2857%
27-25	2	5	.2857%
24-22	3	3	.4285%

mode= 25  
median=25  
mean= 25.1

March, 1983

on

## THE GOALS OF A LIBERAL/GENERAL EDUCATION

- |   | STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NO OPINION | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
|---|-------------------|----------|------------|-------|----------------|
|   | 1                 | 2        | 3          | 4     | 5              |
| (1) As a result of general education, students should recognize that while many explanations may be advanced to account for certain phenomena, some may be better than others.                            |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (2) A liberal education should include a conscious emphasis on a comprehensive value system.  |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (3) A liberal education should reflect an appropriate balance of self-initiated and directed learning.  |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (4) A goal of general/liberal education should be to balance the students' awareness of the analyzing function of science with the synthesizing function of the arts.                                     |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (5) A liberal education should include study of the process of social interaction by examining one or more aspects of an ongoing social system.   |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (6) A primary goal of general education should be to tap the creative potential of all students in making them intelligent viewers, perceptive critics, and sensitive interpreters of the arts.           |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (7) As a result of general/liberal education, students should be sensitive to the distinction between findings and the explanations for findings.   |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (8) General/liberal education should recognize the dictum as once stated, "...every engineer would become a better one by deepening his understanding and appreciations of one or more of the fine arts." |                   |          |            |       |                |

- (9) A liberal education should reflect the concept that each generation must learn the great traditions of the past in order to pass this tradition on to the next generation, and to profit from the lessons of history.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (10) A liberal education should make provision for teaching and learning which go beyond pure cognition to include creativity, intuition, perception, and other aspects of mental life.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (11) General education programs should represent the return of colleges to a more concise curriculum emphasizing religious knowledge, moral philosophy, humane letters, rhetoric, languages, history, logic and the theoretical sciences.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (12) A liberal education should be so structured as to achieve a balance between expression using the written and spoken word and all other forms of communication—art, dance, theatre, film, video, and work with materials.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (13) General education programs should say less about "socialization," and "personality building," and more about the improvement of human reason for the reason's own sake.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (14) A liberal education should reflect the notion that the arts may be conceived as a means to self-understanding, a way by which a person's sense of his/her own nature can be explored, clarified, and grasped.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (15) General education should focus on the understanding of the processes of conceptualization and generalization.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (16) General education should emphasize learning how to learn, how to attack new problems and how to acquire new knowledge.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (17) A general education should provide students with a beginning or a further commitment to a lifetime of learning.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (18) An essential component of liberal education should be helping the student formulate and clarify values and goals for his/her life.
- 1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- (19) A general education should enable individuals to integrate their knowledge so they may draw upon the many sources of learning in making decisions and taking actions in daily practical situations.
- 1                      2                      3                      4                      5
- (20) Liberal education for today's student should not so much reflect the notion of the inheritance and custodianship of tradition as education's highest goals, but rather the revisions of tradition that needs invigorating again.
- 1                      2                      3                      4                      5

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. If you wish a report of the results to be mailed to you, please complete the following information.

---

Name

---

Address

---

City

---

State

---

Zip Code



PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOX

Resp Code: 315

Survey Site:

THE GOALS OF A LIBERAL EDUCATION  
College Community Survey

Respondent Data

It will help validate this survey and justify the data gathered, if you will take an additional minute or so and respond to the following questions.

Answers will consist of circling the appropriate response, except in the case of questions numbered 8 and 9 which are fill-ins. THANK YOU!

- (1) At your institution, which of the following best describes your status:  
faculty  
staff  
administration
- (2) Please circle the response which best describes your institution:  
(a) private liberal arts college  
(b) church-related liberal arts college  
(c) public college or university  
(d) private university  
(e) an institution located outside the United States  
(f) other
- (3) What is your age:  
25-30            46-50  
31-35            51-55  
36-40            61-65  
41-45            66 and older
- (4) What is your highest academic degree:  
BA                MFA  
MA                PhD  
MBA                Doctorate other than PhD
- (5) How many years of teaching experience do you have (at college level):  
01-05            21-25  
06-10            26-30  
11-15            31-35  
16-20            36 years or more
- (6) Which of the following phrases BEST describes the institution where you earned your UNDERGRADUATE degree:  
(a) private liberal arts college  
(b) church-related liberal arts college  
(c) public university or college  
(d) private university  
(e) foreign college or university  
(f) other

Page Two

College Community Survey

Respondent Data

Code:

- (7) Which of the following sets of figures BEST describes the enrollment at the institution where you earned your undergraduate degree AT THE TIME OF YOUR ATTENDANCE:

0500-1000  
1000-1500  
1500-2000  
2000-2500  
2500-3000  
3000-3500  
3500-4000  
over 4000

- (8) In the space provided, please indicate your UNDERGRADUATE major field:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (9) What is your current field of interest or professional activity:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (10) To the best of your recall, did your undergraduate degree program require you to take course work in the following areas: (CIRCLE ALL RESPONSES WHICH ARE APPROPRIATE)

composition and writing  
fine arts  
mathematics  
foreign languages  
physical sciences  
social sciences  
humanities  
interdisciplinary studies and/or freshman seminars

APPENDIX D

AUG. 1984

COLLEGE COMMUNITY SURVEY  
on  
THE GOALS OF A LIBERAL/GENERAL EDUCATION

- |  | STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NO OPINION | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
|--|-------------------|----------|------------|-------|----------------|
|  | 1                 | 2        | 3          | 4     | 5              |
| (1) As a result of general education, students should recognize that while <u>many</u> explanations may be advanced to account for certain phenomena, some may be <u>better</u> than others. |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (2) A liberal education should include a conscious emphasis on a comprehensive value system.   |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (3) A liberal education should reflect an appropriate balance of self-initiated and directed learning.   |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (4) A goal of general education should be to balance the students' awareness of the analyzing function of science with the synthesizing function of the arts.                                |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (5) A liberal education should include study of the process of social interaction by examining one or more aspects of an ongoing social system.  |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (6) A significant goal of liberal education should be to tap the creative potential of all students: thus making them sensitive viewers and perceptive critics of the arts.                  |                   |          |            |       |                |
| (7) As a result of liberal education, students should be sensitive to the distinction between findings and the explanations for findings.  |                   |          |            |       |                |



- (17) A primary goal of general education should be to tap the creative potential of all students: thus making them intelligent viewers and perceptive critics of the arts.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (18) A general education should encourage students to commitment of a lifetime to learning.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (19) An essential component of liberal education should be helping the student formulate and clarify values and goals for his/her life.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (20) A general education should enable individuals to integrate their knowledge so they may draw upon the many sources of learning in making decisions and taking actions in daily practical situations.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (21) The arts should be made available to the beginning college student in exactly the same terms as any other form of knowledge, from physics to literature.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

- (22) The arts, being made generally available to all students, should form a central part of the curriculum for the entire four years.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE  
IN THIS BOX

Resp. Code: 321

THE GOALS OF A LIBERAL EDUCATION  
College Community Survey

---

Survey Site:

Respondent Data

---

It will help validate this survey and justify the data gathered, if you will take an additional minute or so and respond to the following questions.

Answers will consist of circling the appropriate response, except in the case of questions numbered 8, 9, and 11 which are fill-ins. THANK YOU!

- (1) At your institution, which of the following best describes your status:
- (a) faculty
  - (b) staff
  - (c) administration
- (2) Please circle the response which best describes your institution:
- (a) private liberal arts college
  - (b) church-related liberal arts college
  - (c) public college or university
  - (d) private university
  - (e) community college
  - (f) other
- (3) What is your age:
- (a) 25-30
  - (b) 31-35
  - (c) 36-40
  - (d) 41-45
  - (e) 46-50
  - (f) 51-55
  - (g) 56-60
  - (h) 61-65
  - (i) 66 and older
- (4) What is your highest academic degree:
- (a) BA
  - (b) MA
  - (c) MBA
  - (d) MFA
  - (e) PhD
  - (f) Doctorate other than PhD
  - (g) Bachelors other than BA
  - (h) M.S.
  - (i) other Masters
- (5) How many years of teaching experience do you have (at colleg level):
- (a) 01-05
  - (b) 06-10
  - (c) 11-15
  - (d) 16-20
  - (e) 21-25
  - (f) 26-30
  - (g) 31-35
  - (h) 36 years or more

College Community Survey

Respondent Data

Code:

- (6) Which of the following phrases BEST describes the institution where you earned your UNDERGRADUATE degree:
- (a) private liberal arts college
  - (b) church-related liberal arts college
  - (c) public university or college
  - (d) private university
  - (e) foreign college or university
  - (f) other
- (7) Please circle the set of figures which BEST describes the enrollment at the institution where you earned your undergraduate degree AT THE TIME OF YOUR ATTENDANCE:
- (a) 0500-1000
  - (b) 1000-1500
  - (c) 1500-2000
  - (d) 2000-2500
  - (e) 2500-3000
  - (f) 3000-3500
  - (g) 3500-4000
  - (h) over 4000
- (8) In the space provided, please indicate your UNDERGRADUATE major field:
- 
- 
- (9) What is your current discipline, field of interest, or professional activity:
- 
- 
- (10) To the best of your recall, did your undergraduate degree program require you to take course work in the following areas: (CIRCLE ALL RESPONSES WHICH ARE APPROPRIATE)
- (a) composition and writing
  - (b) fine arts
  - (c) mathematics
  - (d) foreign languages
  - (e) physical sciences
  - (f) social sciences
  - (g) humanities
  - (h) interdisciplinary studies and/or freshman seminars
- (OPTIONAL)
- (11) Name of your undergraduate institution: \_\_\_\_\_
- (12) Do you wish a report of the results of this survey to be sent to you?  
 Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ If so, please return the following.



If you wish a report of the results to be mailed to you, please complete the following information.

---

NAME

---

ADDRESS

---

CITY

---

STATE

---

ZIP CODE

---

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE  
IN THIS BOX

Resp. Code:

Survey Site:

Item Analysis: Test Administration  
at Carleton College ,August, 1984  
Meeting of The Society for Values  
in Higher Education.

N = 13

ITEM MEANS

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Mean of All Responses</u>
1	4.923
2	4.385
3	4.692
4	4.000
5	4.385
6	4.538
7	4.385
8	4.385
9	4.615
10	4.846
11	2.923
12	3.846
13	3.000
14	4.615
15	4.153
16	4.846
17	4.615
18	4.923
19	4.769
20	4.692
21	4.462
22	3.769

MEAN SCORE: 4.3530

MEAN OF ARTS ITEM CLUSTER: 4.3418

Items:4,6,8,10,  
12,14,17,  
21,and 22

MEANS FOR INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS:

<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1	4.864	11	3.682
2	4.409	12	3.910
3	4.409	13	4.318
4	5.000		
5	4.455		
6	3.955		
7	4.364		
8	4.136		
9	3.955		
10	4.591		

SUMMARY REPORT

Questionnaire-Survey:

"The Goals of a General/Liberal  
Education."

1984

D. Unumb

c. 1984







Item Analysis: Test Administration  
at Shakertown Conversations on  
General Education. November, 1984

N =13

ITEM MEANS

<u>Item</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>
1	11	4.73	0.47
2	13	4.38	0.77
3	12	4.58	0.67
4	11	3.64	1.21
5	13	4.38	0.51
6	13	4.54	0.52
7	13	4.38	0.51
8	12	4.25	0.62
9	13	4.62	0.51
10	13	4.85	1.19
11	13	2.92	1.19
12	13	3.85	1.21
13	11	2.64	1.21
14	12	4.50	0.52
15	11	4.27	1.19
16	13	4.77	0.44
17	10	4.30	0.67
18	13	4.85	0.38
19	13	4.77	0.44
20	13	4.69	0.48
21	12	4.33	0.89
22	13	3.77	1.17
TOTAL	13	4.28	0.94

MEAN OF ARTS ITEM CLUSTER: 4.2256      Items: 4,6,8,10,  
12,14,17,  
21, and 22

MEANS FOR INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS:

<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1	3.00	10	4.91
2	3.55	11	4.95
3	3.82	12	4.94
4	3.95	13	5.00
5	4.14		
6	4.18		
7	4.45		
8	4.50		
9	4.77		

## THE GOALS OF A LIBERAL EDUCATION

Pilot Administration  
 N: 13  
 SITE: Shakertown  
 Conversations  
 November, 1984

SUMMARY OF RESPONDENT DATA  
 (percentages rounded off)

1. Status

Some respondents "double-checked" in this category, thus there were NINE responses for faculty status, and SIX responses for administrative status.

2. Institution Type

private liberal arts college	(1)	7%
church-related liberal arts college	(4)	31%
public college or university	(8)	62%

3. Age Range

31-35	(1)	7%
36-40	(3)	23%
41-45	(2)	16%
46-50	(2)	16%
51-55	(2)	16%
56-60	(1)	7%
61-65	(2)	16%

4. Years of Teaching Experience

6 to 10 years	(3)	23%
11 to 15 years	(3)	23%
16 to 20 years	(2)	16%
21 to 25 years	(2)	16%
26 to 30 years	(2)	16%
31 to 35 years	(1)	7%

5. Type of Institution for Undergraduate Degree

private liberal arts college	(2)	16%
church-related liberal arts college	(3)	23%
public university or college	(2)	16%
private university	(4)	31%
foreign college or university	(1)	7%
other	(1)	7%



6. Enrollment

less than 500	(2)	16%
500-1000	(2)	16%
1500-2000	(1)	7%
2000-2500	(1)	7%
2500-3000	(1)	7%
3500-4000	(1)	7%
over 4000	(5)	39%

7. Required Course-Work in Specific Areas for the Undergraduate Degree

composition	(10)	77%
fine arts	( 4)	31%
mathematics	( 3)	23%
foreign languages	(12)	93%
physical sciences	(11)	85%
social sciences	(10)	77%
humanities	(10)	77%
interdisciplinary seminars and/or freshman seminars	( 2)	16%

APPENDIX E

The Role of the Fine Arts in a  
College General Education Program:  
A Survey of Faculty in Selective  
Liberal Arts Colleges. 1985-1986

Site Code:

Respondent Code:

Please Return No Later Than: \_\_\_\_\_

c. 1985

## COLLEGE COMMUNITY SURVEY

The Role of the Fine Arts in a College General Education Program

Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Circle:           AA    for STRONGLY AGREE  
                   A     for AGREE  
                   ?     for UNCERTAIN  
                   D     for DISAGREE  
                   DD    for STRONGLY DISAGREE

- (1) Course-based experience in one or more of the Fine Arts can assist students in cognitive development and critical thinking skills.
- AA A ? D DD
- (2) The Fine Arts have a role to play in a general education program ONLY in the area of "cultural enrichment."
- AA A ? D DD
- (3) Fine Arts courses or "experiences" should be regarded in a general education program as ELECTIVES which a student may or may not select at his/her own option and NOT BE INCLUDED in any "required distribution system."
- AA A ? D DD
- (4) In an effective general education program there should be provision for a specific separate "fine arts requirement" which mandates that all students shall take at least one or two fine arts courses as a part of that general education program.
- AA A ? D DD
- (5) A general education program SHOULD NOT HAVE ANY required distribution areas or required courses which the student must satisfy in order to receive his/her degree.
- AA A ? D DD
- (6) Fine arts courses which a student can take as part of a general education program can be ANY courses offered by the fine arts departments rather than courses DESIGNED by those departments for the purposes of general education.
- AA A ? D DD

-2-

- (7) A goal of general education should be to balance a student's awareness of science as an analytical, "taking-apart of experience," with an equally important awareness of the arts as a synthesizing, or "putting-together" of experience.

AA A ? D DD

- (8) Liberal education should recognize the dictum as once stated by an educator in engineering that "... every engineer would become a better one by deepening his/her understanding and appreciation of one or more of the fine arts."

AA A ? D DD

- (9) Do you believe the statement made above could apply to your own field?

AA A ? D DD

Does not apply since I am in the fine arts \_\_\_\_\_

- (10) A liberal education should make provision for learning which goes beyond traditional views of the intellectual process and cognition to include creativity, intuition, perception, and other aspects of the mental life.

AA A ? D DD

- (11) Each of the fine arts, with its own vocabulary, represents a way of looking at, analyzing, recording, and communicating experience which is as legitimate for the college student to recognize as are the methodologies of the physical and social scientists.

AA A ? D DD

- (12) A liberal education should reflect the notion that the arts are a means of self-understanding, a way by which a person's sense of his/her own nature can be explored, clarified, and grasped.

AA A ? D DD

- (13) A primary goal of general education should be to tap the creative potential of all students, thus giving them the opportunity to be a "maker of art" via studio work in visual arts, music, dance, theatre or film.

AA A ? D DD

- (14) The ONLY goal of any fine arts requirement in a general education program should be to assist students in becoming "intelligent viewers" and "perceptive critics" of the arts, or at least one art form.

AA A ? D DD

- (15) In the light of the proposition advanced in item 14, there is NO NEED for any kind of "studio or applied experience" in the arts to be made available for the non-major or general education student.

AA A ? D DD

- (16) While there should be some guidelines in a general education program requiring students to take some course work in ALL disciplinary areas, there should be no further requirements about specific courses.

AA A ? D DD

- (17) Defining an "academic discipline" as a field of study which has a clear body of knowledge, unique to itself, with clearly defined methodologies of inquiry, do you regard the following fields as being "disciplines"?

MUSIC AA A ? D DD

VISUAL ARTS AA A ? D DD

DANCE AA A ? D DD

THEATRE AA A ? D DD

TELEVISION/FILM AA A ? D DD

- (18) Experiences in the fine arts can give students an enhanced and enriched system for learning, including a heightened awareness of the range and depth of his/her perceptual horizons.

AA A ? D DD

- (19) A liberal education should be so structured as to achieve a balance between expression using the written word and the expressive symbol system used in at least one of the fine arts.

AA A ? D DD

- (20) An experience, via some course-based system, should be provided to all college students in:

MUSIC AA A ? D DD

VISUAL ARTS AA A ? D DD

DANCE AA A ? D DD

THEATRE AA A ? D DD

TELEVISION/FILM AA A ? D DD

- (21) If you agree in item 20 that an experience should be provided to all college students in one or more of the fine arts, please indicate the priority of importance you would assign to having that experience in the following fine arts areas:

MUSIC	Priority	1	2	3	4	5
VISUAL ARTS	Priority	1	2	3	4	5
DANCE	Priority	1	2	3	4	5
THEATRE	Priority	1	2	3	4	5
TELEVISION/FILM	Priority	1	2	3	4	5

- (22) Instruction in the fine arts within a college general education program should consist largely of lecture-oriented courses with attention to the historical-cultural context of the given art form and with some opportunities for the students to write "reviews" of some performances or works in the artistic field being addressed.

AA A ? D DD

- (23) ESSENTIAL objectives in a fine arts course designed for general education purposes should be:

- 1) Developing an awareness of cultural differences.

AA A ? D DD

- 2) Assist the student in developing a sense of his/her own creative and human potential.

AA A ? D DD

- 3) Examine the potential of the arts for enhancing the life and environment of all citizens in all stages of their life.

AA A ? D DD

- 4) Provide students with an enhanced system of awareness and perceptual abilities for cognitive development.

AA A ? D DD

- 5) Develop an awareness of cultural, aesthetic, and social heritage.

AA A ? D DD

- 6) Provide an outlet for emotional expression.

AA A ? D DD

- 7) Assist the student in becoming an astute and skilled "consumer" and critic of the arts.

AA A ? D DD

## RESPONDENT INFORMATION

It will help validate this survey and render the data meaningful, if you will take a few additional minutes and answer the following questions.

Answers consist of checking the appropriate response or supplying the information requested.

(1) What is your HIGHEST academic degree:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (a) B.A.            | <input type="checkbox"/> (c) terminal Master's        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (b) Master's degree | <input type="checkbox"/> (d) Ph.D. or other Doctorate |

(2) Which BEST describes your discipline area:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (a) Humanities                        | <input type="checkbox"/> (e) Behavioral and Social Sciences |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (b) Fine Arts                         | <input type="checkbox"/> (f) Interdisciplinary Studies      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (c) Physical Sciences and Mathematics | <input type="checkbox"/> (g) other                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (d) Professional Studies              |   |

(3) How many years of FULL-TIME teaching experience have you had at the college/university level?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

(4) Which of the following BEST describes the institution where you received your undergraduate degree?

- |   |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (a) private liberal arts college         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (b) church-related liberal arts college  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (c) public or state-supported college    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (d) public or state supported university |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (e) private university                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (f) foreign college or university        |

(5) Please indicate the figure which BEST describes the enrollment at your undergraduate institution AT THE TIME OF YOUR ATTENDANCE:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (a) 0500 or less | <input type="checkbox"/> (f) 2500-3000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (b) 0500-1000    | <input type="checkbox"/> (g) 3000-3500 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (c) 1000-1500    | <input type="checkbox"/> (h) 3500-4000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (d) 1500-2000    | <input type="checkbox"/> (i) 4000-4500 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (e) 2000-2500    | <input type="checkbox"/> (j) over 4500 |

(6) To the best of your recall, did your undergraduate degree program REQUIRE you to take course-work in the following areas:  
(PLEASE CHECK ALL WHICH ARE APPROPRIATE)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (a) composition and writing | <input type="checkbox"/> (f) social sciences                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (b) fine arts               | <input type="checkbox"/> (g) humanities                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (c) mathematics             | <input type="checkbox"/> (h) interdisciplinary studies       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (d) foreign languages       | <input type="checkbox"/> (i) freshman and/or senior seminars |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (e) physical sciences       |  |



-6-

(7) If your undergraduate degree program REQUIRED you to take any course-work in the Fine Arts, how was this requirement fulfilled:

(a) by taking ANY course in the Fine Arts area for a total of:

ONE course (THREE credit hours)  
 TWO courses (SIX credit hours)  
 THREE courses (NINE credit hours)

(b) by taking A SPECIFIC course (or courses) in the Fine Arts for a total of:

ONE course (THREE credit hours)  
 TWO courses (SIX credit hours)  
 THREE courses (NINE credit hours)

(8) If your undergraduate degree program DID NOT HAVE ANY SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT for course-work in the Fine Arts, were courses in the Fine Arts departments acceptable for a general Humanities requirement?

yes  no

(9) Did you take any fine arts courses as a part of your undergraduate degree program?

yes  no

If so, in what department (s):

(10) During the period of your undergraduate degree program, did you form an important relationship with at least one faculty member who came to represent a "significant other" to you?

yes  no

If yes, what department or discipline was this faculty member a part of?

(11) OPTIONAL

What is the name of your undergraduate degree institution:

\_\_\_\_\_

Year of your graduation: \_\_\_\_\_

--- Thank You ---

APPENDIX F



NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
5500 N. ST. LOUIS AVENUE • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60625 • (312) 583-4050

SPEECH & PERFORMING ARTS DEPARTMENT

November 11, 1985

Dear Dr.

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in a study to determine what, in the judgment of faculty members in highly selective liberal arts colleges, is the role which the fine arts should play in a general or core curriculum for all undergraduate students.

To our knowledge no such study has been undertaken in recent years, although a good deal of discussion and study have been provoked by the recent upsurge of reports and assessments of general education across the nation.

Our intent is to assess the range of thinking displayed by faculty members in all disciplines regarding the fine arts and general/liberal education and to use the results of this survey to form a "base line" of comparison for future research involving other types of institutions.

Your college has been selected as a potential survey site based on a number of national profiles all of which have indicated that College is a highly selective institution emphasizing the liberal education tradition.

Your involvement in the research, if you will help us, is to supply us with a complete list of faculty at your institution from which we will select a stratified random sample who will then be asked to complete a questionnaire. A copy of that instrument is enclosed with this letter. We would additionally appreciate your assistance in distributing this questionnaire to faculty so selected. Individual envelopes contain the questionnaire, a respondent data sheet, and a cover letter will be prepared for circulation through your campus mail system. Faculty will also be supplied with a postage-paid return envelope so they may reply directly to me.

-2-

We believe that there will be sufficient understanding of the liberal and general education context in which this survey will function based on the recent experiences of the principal researcher, David F. Unumb.

Professor Unumb has his own undergraduate degree from Carleton College and was University Coordinator for General Education when Northeastern Illinois University was a participating institution in the recent General Education Models Project sponsored by the Society for Value in Higher Education, of which he is a Fellow, and funded jointly by the Exxon Educational Foundation and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Please mark the appropriate box on the form which is enclosed with this letter. If you are willing to cooperate, please include with this form the faculty listing requested. We do not wish home addresses or telephone number of faculty, ONLY the campus mailing address, department designation, and faculty rank of each individual.

The form also allows you to indicate if you wish a copy of the survey results from either your institution, or from the data pool which will be formed from all institutions surveyed.

The pooled data, which is the form in which the results will be discussed and reported WILL NOT IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS, since our aim is to create this pooled "base-line" profile to which I alluded earlier in this letter.

We hope that you will be able to assist us in this research and look for reply at your earliest convenience, preferably no later than November 25.

Sincerely,

David F. Unumb  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Speech and  
Performing Arts  
Northeastern Illinois University

Ernest I Proulx  
Professor  
Department of Curriculum  
and Instruction  
Loyola University of  
Chicago

Enc.

LETTER OF INTENT  
Role of the Fine Arts in General Education -- A Faculty Survey

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

- ( ) I am interested in the research, and am enclosing a list of current faculty members at our institution
- ( ) I am NOT interested in this research

We would like a copy of the results of the research covering:

- ( ) Our institution ONLY
- ( ) Pooled research data ONLY
- ( ) BOTH our institution AND pooled research

PLEASE RESPOND BY:

Return to:

David F. Unumb, Chair  
Department of Speech and Performing Arts  
Northeastern Illinois University  
5500 N. St. Louis Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60625

APPENDIX G



NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
5500 N. ST. LOUIS AVENUE • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60625-4699 • (312) 583-4050

SPEECH & PERFORMING ARTS DEPARTMENT

Dear Colleague:

As we are sure you know, there have been many reports and assessments in recent years on the status of general and liberal education in colleges and universities across the nation. The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study which selects one aspect of that concern, the role which might be played by the fine arts in general education, and seeks to establish a profile of faculty attitudes in a number of selective liberal arts colleges.

Your name has been selected from the roster of faculty members at your institution and we ask that you take a few minutes of your time to fill out the questionnaire and the respondent form. This study will result in a pooled attitude profile of faculty in these selective liberal arts colleges and will NOT identify either individual respondents OR the particular individual college.

The chief academic officer of your institution has agreed to this survey, and the results, which will be mailed to him or her on completion of the study, may include a profile of your college but the study as reported to the academic community will pool all responses.

We have attempted to keep the questionnaire as brief as possible so as to not take too much of your time. Please do not sign your name on either the questionnaire or the respondent data form. The information we receive will be absolutely confidential and individual responses will not be reported.

Since you have been particularly selected to form part of a statistical sample, your cooperation is important for the validity of the survey.

We have provided a postage-paid return envelope for the questionnaire and the respondent data form. Please return these forms NO LATER THAN FEB 20.

Thank you for your response and assistance in this research.

Sincerely,

David F. Unumb  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Speech and  
Performing Arts  
Northeastern Illinois University

Ernest I. Proulx  
Professor  
Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
Department of Counseling Psychology and  
Higher Education  
Loyola University of Chicago

APPENDIX H





NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

5500 N. ST. LOUIS AVENUE • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60625-4699 • (312) 583-4050

March 26, 1986

SPEECH & PERFORMING ARTS DEPARTMENT

Dear Colleague:

Early in February a questionnaire was sent to you dealing with The Role of the Fine Arts in a College General Education Program.

Your name had been selected from the faculty roster at your institution using a stratified random selection system. According to present records, you have not yet returned the questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope which was provided.

Every attempt was made to keep the questionnaire as brief as possible so as not to take too much of your time. Would you assist in the development of this study on faculty responses to current ideas about the role of the fine arts in general education by returning the completed questionnaire at your earliest opportunity?

The Dean, Provost, or similar academic officer at your institution is aware of this study and has indicated interest in receiving a copy of the results. The first part of this report will consist of a profile of faculty response at your institution. The second part of the report will be based on a statistical sample from all the institutions being surveyed. These institutions are all highly selective liberal arts colleges.

The complete study, as well as the specific profile for each college, will not identify individual respondents. All information received will be absolutely confidential.

Since you have been particularly selected to form part of a statistical sample, your cooperation is important for the validity of the study.

Please return the questionnaire no later than April 14. If you have misplaced the original postage-paid return envelope, an additional one is enclosed for your convenience, as well as a copy of the questionnaire.

Thank you for your assistance in this research.

Sincerely,

David F. Unumb  
Principal Researcher - ARTSROLE Survey  
Professor and Chair,  
Department of Speech and Performing Arts

APPENDIX I

List of Participating Institutions

Bates College	Lewiston, Maine
Connecticut College	New London, Connecticut
Grinnell College	Grinnell, Iowa
Haverford College	Haverford, Pennsylvania
Oberlin College	Oberlin, Ohio
Occidental College	Los Angeles, California
Pomona College	Claremont, California
Trinity College	Hartford, Connecticut
Union College	Schenectady, New York

APPENDIX J

One response to the issue of translating overall goals statements into course-oriented recommendations has been supplied at least for the high school level by a recent publication of the College Entrance Examination Board and released in 1985 under the title, Academic Preparation in the Arts: Teaching for Transition from High School to College.

Part of a series of publications which aim to follow the overall goals statements as realized in Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do (1983), this examination of the arts takes up where the earlier publication, often referred to as the "Green Book," left off.

It restates the goals and objectives of Arts Education in high school, suggests why the arts are among the basic academic subjects, and then provides a discussion of some of the ways teacher can help students move towards these goals in the face of shrinking enrollments, tight budgets, and the current demands for academic excellence as translated into action agendas for secondary school systems.

Covering the fields of visual arts, theatre, music, and dance, the writers of this survey suggest a series of essential goals and production/performance abilities to be sought in arts education on the secondary level. It must be assumed that while some of these programs may be applicable to those students who will go on to pre-professional post-secondary training in the arts, the essential approach of the consultants has been to address the arts as part of the mainstream of the educational process.

To achieve the skills and knowledge described in the earlier

publication (1983), it is suggested that students need intensive work in at least one arts discipline, such as visual arts, theatre, music, or dance. They will also need time and an in-depth instruction in order to fully develop the unique concepts and ways of thinking which are specific to each art form (p.20). It is also suggested that significant progress must be achieved toward three kinds of essential abilities: (1) knowledge of how to produce or perform works of art, (2) knowledge of how to analyze, interpret, and evaluate art-works, and (3) knowledge of art-works of other periods and cultures within those contexts.

It is interesting to note that customary arts education in either the high school or college curricula is directed , at best, to the second and/or third goals. As is evidenced in the literature this emphasis on the "information" seeking process is not sufficient for the authors of this report. They join with others in seeking more of the direct and experiential instructional process in arts education.

A number of what the authors term "production and performance abilities" are suggested in the body of this report. They include:

- (1) The ability to use the techniques, media, tools and processes characteristic of an art form.
  - (2) The ability to create one's own work or carry out a fresh performance of an existing score or text.
  - (3) The ability to draw upon basic aesthetic concepts when creating or performing works.
  - (4) The ability to develop a concept or feeling by being attentive to oneself and one's world.
  - (5) The ability to carry a work or a performance through several stages of development.
- (pp. 21-22)

The authors of this report also suggest several abilities which should be manifest in the interpretation and evaluation of

artistic "facts":

- (1) The ability to examine a performance or a work at a number of levels or from a range of vantage points.
  - (2) The ability to evaluate a work of art or performance.
  - (3) The ability to understand and appreciate different artistic styles and works from representative historical periods and cultures.
  - (4) The ability to appreciate how people of various cultures have used the arts to express themselves.
  - (5) The ability to understand the social and intellectual influences affecting artistic forms.
- (pp. 23-25)

While these configurations of abilities and skills may appear to be totally appropriate for those seeking to go on for further study and instruction in the arts themselves, the authors of this handbook make clear that the arts per se belong in the center of general education for all students:

The arts are distinct fields of study: they deal with different materials and problems and have different methods and purposes from mathematics, languages, science, or social studies. Consequently, the study of the arts can make a distinctive contribution to high school students' development. When this study includes all three components just described--making or performing artworks, learning to analyze and evaluate art, and knowing artworks of various periods and cultures--then it can teach students to understand and pursue quality, to be expressive and responsive, to exercise their imaginations, and to be interested in the visions and inventions of others.

(p.25)

In building a case for the arts as part of the basic pattern of academic subjects, the authors also extend the case for the arts in general education curricula by suggesting two kinds of "hard work" with which the arts are engaged: (1) that of learning a set of skills to fit the special kind of "knowing" typical of the arts, in effect the acquisition of a new vocabulary of learning, and (2) the further development of skills and competencies which are common to the full range of academic subjects and objectives.

It is maintained by these authors that the arts can:

(1) Train students to apprehend and value the qualitative dimension of life and become sensitive to the unique qualities which make every object and each part of life peculiar unto itself as an integral part of the artistic mode of "knowing,"

(2) Lead students to become more sensitive to the unique qualities of each work of arts and to clarify these through performance or the making of arts,

(3) Help students better understand themselves and others and gain a sense of the fundamental human issues through artistic expression, and

(4) Assist students in stimulating their imagination and in discovering what working with imagination can mean within a specific construct whether in music, visual art, theatre, or dance.

(pp.14-16)

The "hard work" in expanding skills common to the general academic curriculum can, according to the authors of this report, include the ability to read and interpret scores or texts, conveying and communicating these interpretations and discoveries to others, as well as using generic academic skills of critical thinking, analysis, working with abstractions and other aspects of the total reasoning process.

While they do not, for the most part, directly address the issue of relationships between arts education and cognitive development, the positions taken in this report clearly are compatible with those expressed elsewhere in the literature on the subject.

This publication does, however, clearly reinforce the argument for the centrality of arts education in general education curricula and places great emphasis on the need for an experiential or "studio" component in such core arts education programs.



APPENDIX K

## ARTSROLE SURVEY 1986

Questionnaire ReportPool N = 421

NOTE: Percentage (S) = proportion of Sample  
 Percentage (R) = proportion of those responding

	<u>% ( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% ( R )</u>
(1) Course-based experience in one or more of the Fine Arts can assist students in cognitive development and critical thinking skills.			
STRONGLY AGREE	37.8	159	38.3
AGREE	44.7	188	45.3
UNCERTAIN	12.4	52	12.5
DISAGREE	3.3	14	3.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	.5	2	.5
NO RESPONSE	1.4	6	Missing
MEAN: 4.176		SD: 0.811	
(2) * The Fine Arts have a role to play in a general education program ONLY in the area of "cultural enrichment."			
STRONGLY AGREE	2.1	9	2.2
AGREE	4.8	20	4.8
UNCERTAIN	6.2	26	6.2
DISAGREE	48.7	205	49.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	37.5	158	37.8
NO RESPONSE	.7	3	Missing
MEAN: 4.156		SD: 0.896	
(3) * Fine Arts courses or "experiences" should be regarded in a general education program as ELECTIVES which a student may or may not select at his/her own option and NOT BE INCLUDED in any "required distribution system."			
STRONGLY AGREE	6.9	29	7.0
AGREE	14.0	59	14.3
UNCERTAIN	11.6	49	11.8
DISAGREE	36.3	153	37.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	29.5	124	37.0
NO RESPONSE	1.7	7	Missing
MEAN: 3.686		SD: 1.234	

- (4) In an effective general education program there should be provision for a specific separate "fine arts requirement" which mandates that all students shall take at least one or two fine arts courses as a part of that general education program.

	<u>% ( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% ( R )</u>
STRONGLY AGREE	25.9	109	26.3
AGREE	34.7	146	35.2
UNCERTAIN	11.9	50	12.0
DISAGREE	18.5	78	18.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	7.6	32	7.7
NO RESPONSE	1.4	6	Missing

MEAN: 3.535

SD: 1.271

- (5) \* A general education program SHOULD NOT HAVE ANY required distribution areas or required courses which the student must satisfy in order to receive his/her degree.

STRONGLY AGREE	3.3	14	3.3
AGREE	7.8	33	7.9
UNCERTAIN	5.2	22	5.3
DISAGREE	34.4	145	34.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	48.5	204	48.8
NO RESPONSE	.7	3	Missing

MEAN: 4.177

SD: 1.063

- (6) \* Fine arts courses which a student can take as part of a general education program can be ANY courses offered by the fine arts departments rather than courses DESIGNED by those departments for the purposes of general education.

STRONGLY AGREE	16.6	70	16.9
AGREE	36.6	154	37.2
UNCERTAIN	20.7	87	21.0
DISAGREE	20.2	85	20.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.3	18	4.3
NO RESPONSE	1.7	7	Missing

MEAN: 2.582

SD: 1.121

- (7) A goal of general education should be to balance a student's awareness of science as an analytical, "taking-apart of experience," with an equally important awareness of the arts as a synthesizing, or "putting together" of experience.

STRONGLY AGREE	19.2	81	19.6
AGREE	35.9	151	36.5
UNCERTAIN	20.0	84	20.3
DISAGREE	10.9	46	11.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	12.4	52	12.6
NO RESPONSE	1.7	7	Missing

MEAN: 3.394

SD: 1.269

- (8) Liberal education should recognize the dictum as once stated by an educator in engineering that "...every engineer would become a better one by deepening his/her understanding and appreciation of one or more of the fine arts."

	<u>%( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>%( R )</u>
STRONGLY AGREE	33.7	142	33.9
AGREE	51.8	213	52.0
UNCERTAIN	9.0	38	9.1
DISAGREE	3.6	15	3.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.4	6	1.4
NO RESPONSE	.5	2	Missing

MEAN: 4.134

SD: 0.828

- (9) Do you believe the statement made above could apply to your own field?

STRONGLY AGREE	32.3	136	35.3
AGREE	46.8	197	51.2
UNCERTAIN	8.6	36	9.4
DISAGREE	2.9	12	3.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.0	4	1.0
NO RESPONSE	8.6	36	Missing

MEAN: 4.166

SD: 0.799

- (10) A liberal education should make provision for learning which goes beyond traditional views of the intellectual process and cognition to include creativity, intuition, perception, and other aspects of the mental life.

STRONGLY AGREE	46.8	197	47.8
AGREE	41.8	176	42.7
UNCERTAIN	6.2	26	6.3
DISAGREE	2.6	11	2.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	.5	2	.5
NO RESPONSE	2.1	9	Missing

MEAN: 4.347

SD: 0.757

- (11) Each of the fine arts, with its own vocabulary, represents a way of looking at, analyzing, recording, and communicating experience which is as legitimate for the college student to recognize as are the methodologies of the physical and social scientists.

STRONGLY AGREE	45.8	193	46.4
AGREE	42.5	179	43.0
UNCERTAIN	5.7	24	5.8
DISAGREE	3.1	13	3.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.7	7	1.7
NO RESPONSE	1.2	5	Missing

MEAN: 4.293

SD: 0.845

- (12) A liberal education should reflect the notion that the arts are a means of self-understanding, a way by which a person's sense of his/her own nature can be explored, clarified, and grasped.

	<u>%( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>%( R )</u>
STRONGLY AGREE	34.0	143	34.4
AGREE	49.2	207	49.8
UNCERTAIN	10.2	43	10.3
DISAGREE	4.0	17	4.1
STRONGLY AGREE	1.4	6	1.4
NO RESPONSE	1.2	5	1.4

MEAN: 4.115

SD: 0.854

- (13) A primary goal of general education should be to tap the creative potential of all students, thus giving them the opportunity to be a "maker of art" via studio work in visual arts, music, dance, theatre or film.

STRONGLY AGREE	18.1	76	18.4
AGREE	37.1	156	37.8
UNCERTAIN	21.4	90	18.4
DISAGREE	18.1	76	18.4
STRONGLY AGREE	3.6	15	3.6
NO RESPONSE	1.9	8	Missing

MEAN: 3.489

SD: 1.099

- (14) \* The ONLY goal of any fine arts requirement in a general education program should be to assist students in becoming "intelligent viewers" and "perceptive critics" of the arts, or at least one art form.

STRONGLY AGREE	.5	2	.5
AGREE	9.7	41	9.7
UNCERTAIN	9.3	39	9.3
DISAGREE	58.7	247	58.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	21.9	92	21.9
NO RESPONSE	0.0	0	21.9

MEAN: 3.917

SD: 0859

- (15) \* In the light of the proposition advanced in item 14, there is NO NEED for any kind of "studio or applied experience" in the arts to be made available for the non-major or general education student.

STRONGLY AGREE	.7	3	.7
AGREE	4.0	17	4.1
UNCERTAIN	6.7	28	6.7
DISAGREE	51.5	217	52.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	35.9	151	36.3
NO RESPONSE	1.2	5	Missing

MEAN: 4.192

SD: 0.789

- (16) \* While there should be some guidelines in a general education program requiring students to take some course work in ALL disciplinary areas, there should be no further requirements about specific courses.

	<u>% ( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% ( R )</u>
STRONGLY AGREE	10.5	44	10.7
AGREE	29.0	122	29.6
UNCERTAIN	18.5	78	18.9
DISAGREE	32.5	137	33.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	7.4	31	7.5
NO RESPONSE	2.1	9	7.5

MEAN: 2.973

SD: 1.166

Defining an "academic discipline" as a field of study which has a clear body of knowledge, unique to itself, with clearly defined methodologies of inquiry, do you regard the following fields as being "disciplines"?

- (17) MUSIC

STRONGLY AGREE	52.0	219	53.3
AGREE	39.2	165	40.1
UNCERTAIN	3.6	15	3.6
DISAGREE	2.1	9	2.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	.7	3	.7
NO RESPONSE	2.4	10	Missing

MEAN: 4.431

SD: 0.734

- (18) VISUAL ARTS

STRONGLY AGREE	46.1	194	47.3
AGREE	38.0	160	39.0
UNCERTAIN	8.8	37	9.0
DISAGREE	3.1	13	3.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.4	6	1.5
NO RESPONSE	2.6	11	Missing

MEAN: 4.276

SD: 0.865

- (19) DANCE

STRONGLY AGREE	34.7	146	35.6
AGREE	37.5	158	38.5
UNCERTAIN	16.9	71	17.3
DISAGREE	6.9	29	7.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.4	5	1.5
NO RESPONSE	2.6	11	Missing

MEAN: 3.998

SD: 0.973

	<u>% ( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% ( R )</u>
(20) <u>THEATRE</u>			
STRONGLY AGREE	41.6	175	42.7
AGREE	41.1	173	42.2
UNCERTAIN	9.0	38	9.3
DISAGREE	4.8	20	4.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.0	4	1.0
NO RESPONSE	2.6	11	Missing
MEAN: 4.207		SD: 0.873	
(21) <u>TELEVISION/FILM</u>			
STRONGLY AGREE	20.9	88	21.5
AGREE	34.0	143	34.9
UNCERTAIN	26.4	111	27.1
DISAGREE	12.6	53	12.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	3.6	15	3.7
NO RESPONSE	2.6	11	Missing
MEAN: 3.576		SD: 1.074	
(22) Experiences in the fine arts can give students an enhanced and enriched system for learning, including a heightened awareness of the range and depth of his/her perceptual horizons.			
STRONGLY AGREE	39.2	165	39.8
AGREE	50.4	212	51.1
UNCERTAIN	6.9	29	7.0
DISAGREE	1.9	8	1.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	.2	1	.2
NO RESPONSE	1.4	6	Missing
MEAN: 4.282		SD: 0.699	
(23) A liberal education should be so structured as to achieve a balance between expression using the written word and the expressive symbol system used in at least one of the fine arts.			
STRONGLY AGREE	17.8	75	18.1
AGREE	34.0	143	34.5
UNCERTAIN	25.7	108	26.0
DISAGREE	18.8	79	19.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	2.4	10	2.4
NO RESPONSE	1.4	6	Missing
MEAN: 3.467		SD: 1.067	

	<u>% ( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% ( R )</u>
--	----------------	--------------	----------------

An experience, via some course-based system, should be provided to ALL college students in:

(24) MUSIC

STRONGLY AGREE	21.4	90	22.3
AGREE	40.4	170	42.2
UNCERTAIN	13.5	57	14.1
DISAGREE	15.4	65	16.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5.0	21	5.2
NO RESPONSE	4.3	18	Missing

MEAN: 3.603

SD: 1.151

(25) VISUAL ARTS

STRONGLY AGREE	21.4	90	22.3
AGREE	38.7	163	40.3
UNCERTAIN	15.2	64	15.8
DISAGREE	15.4	65	16.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5.2	22	5.4
NO RESPONSE	4.0	17	Missing

MEAN: 3.579

SD: 1.158

(26) DANCE

STRONGLY AGREE	9.7	41	10.4
AGREE	20.7	87	22.0
UNCERTAIN	33.3	140	35.4
DISAGREE	23.3	98	24.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6.9	29	7.3
NO RESPONSE	6.2	26	Missing

MEAN: 3.033

SD: 1.086

(27) THEATRE

STRONGLY AGREE	14.5	61	15.4
AGREE	30.4	128	32.2
UNCERTAIN	22.6	95	23.9
DISAGREE	20.9	88	22.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5.9	25	6.3
NO RESPONSE	5.7	24	Missing

MEAN: 3.282

SD: 1.155



	<u>%( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>%( R )</u>
(28) <u>TELEVISION/FILM</u>			
STRONGLY AGREE	7.6	32	8.1
AGREE	17.8	75	19.1
UNCERTAIN	32.5	137	34.9
DISAGREE	23.5	99	25.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	11.9	50	12.7
NO RESPONSE	6.7	28	Missing
MEAN: 2.847		SD: 1.121	

If you agree in items 24-28 that an experience should be provided to all college students in one or more of the fine arts, please indicate the priority of importance you would assign to having that experience in the following fine arts areas: (priority listed after each of the responses; (1) = high priority / (5) = low priority for #'s 29-33)

(29) * <u>MUSIC</u>			
STRONGLY AGREE (1)	43.0	181	63.1
AGREE (2)	15.0	63	22.0
UNCERTAIN (3)	6.7	28	9.8
DISAGREE (4)	2.4	10	3.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE (5)	1.2	5	1.7
NO RESPONSE	31.8	134	Missing
MEAN: 4.411		SD: 0.926	

(30) * <u>VISUAL ARTS</u>			
STRONGLY AGREE (1)	33.7	142	50.0
AGREE (2)	21.1	89	31.3
UNCERTAIN (3)	8.6	36	12.7
DISAGREE (4)	3.6	15	5.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE (5)	.5	2	.7
NO RESPONSE	32.5	137	Missing
MEAN: 4.246		SD: 0.918	

(31) * <u>DANCE</u>			
STRONGLY AGREE (1)	4.5	19	7.0
AGREE (2)	8.3	35	12.0
UNCERTAIN (3)	14.5	61	22.4
DISAGREE (4)	23.5	99	36.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE (5)	13.8	58	21.3
NO RESPONSE	35.4	149	Missing
MEAN: 2.478		SD: 1.165	

		<u>% ( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% ( R )</u>
(32) * <u>THEATRE</u>				
STRONGLY AGREE	(1)	11.4	48	17.3
AGREE	(2)	11.4	48	17.3
UNCERTAIN	(3)	28.3	119	43.0
DISAGREE	(4)	11.4	48	17.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	(5)	3.3	14	5.1
NO RESPONSE		34.2	144	Missing

MEAN: 3.245

SD: 1.089

(33) \* TELEVISION/FILM

STRONGLY AGREE	(1)	3.1	13	4.8
AGREE	(2)	6.4	27	10.0
UNCERTAIN	(3)	10.9	46	17.0
DISAGREE	(4)	12.6	53	19.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	(5)	31.1	131	48.5
NO RESPONSE		35.9	151	Missing

MEAN: 2.030

SD: 1.222

- (34) \* Instruction in the fine arts within a college general education program should consist largely of lecture-oriented courses with attention to the historical-cultural context of the given art form and with some opportunities for the students to write "reviews" of some performances or works in the artistic field being addressed.

STRONGLY AGREE	2.9	12	2.9
AGREE	21.1	89	21.9
UNCERTAIN	22.8	96	23.6
DISAGREE	40.9	172	42.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	9.0	38	9.3
NO RESPONSE	3.3	14	Missing

MEAN: 3.332

SD: 1.013

ESSENTIAL objectives in a fine arts course designed for general education purposes should be:

- (35) Developing an awareness of cultural differences.

STRONGLY AGREE	22.8	96	23.2
AGREE	53.7	226	54.7
UNCERTAIN	12.8	54	13.1
DISAGREE	7.1	30	7.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.7	7	1.7
NO RESPONSE	1.9	8	Missing

MEAN: 3.906

SD: 0.894

	<u>%( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>%( R )</u>
(36) Assist the student in developing a sense of his/her own creative and human potential.			
STRONGLY AGREE	22.6	95	22.8
AGREE	55.6	234	56.3
UNCERTAIN	13.8	58	13.2
DISAGREE	6.7	28	6.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.0	4	1.0
NO RESPONSE	1.2	5	Missing
MEAN: 3.933		SD: 0.845	
(37) Examine the potential of the arts for enhancing the life and environment of all citizens in all stages of their life.			
STRONGLY AGREE	24.5	103	24.8
AGREE	54.6	230	55.3
UNCERTAIN	13.8	58	13.9
DISAGREE	4.8	20	4.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.2	5	1.2
NO RESPONSE	1.2	5	Missing
MEAN: 3.976		SD: 0.830	
(38) Provide students with an enhanced system of awareness and perceptual abilities for cognitive development.			
STRONGLY AGREE	25.9	109	26.5
AGREE	55.6	234	56.8
UNCERTAIN	14.0	59	14.3
DISAGREE	2.1	9	2.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	.2	1	.2
NO RESPONSE	2.1	9	Missing
MEAN: 4.070		SD: 0.716	
(39) Develop an awareness of cultural, aesthetic, and social heritage.			
STRONGLY AGREE	37.1	156	37.6
AGREE	55.3	233	56.1
UNCERTAIN	4.8	20	4.8
DISAGREE	1.2	5	1.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	.2	1	.2
NO RESPONSE	1.4	6	Missing
MEAN: 4.296		SD: 0.638	

	<u>% ( S )</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% ( R )</u>
(40) Provide an outlet for emotional expression.			
STRONGLY AGREE	9.0	38	9.2
AGREE	41.6	175	42.3
UNCERTAIN	27.6	116	28.0
DISAGREE	16.4	69	16.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	3.8	16	3.9
NO RESPONSE	1.7	7	Missing
MEAN: 3.362		SD: 0.991	

(41) Assist the student in becoming an astute and skilled "consumer" and critic of the arts.

STRONGLY AGREE	13.1	55	13.4
AGREE	52.7	222	54.0
UNCERTAIN	18.3	77	18.7
DISAGREE	11.2	47	11.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	2.4	10	2.4
NO RESPONSE	2.4	10	Missing
MEAN: 3.645		SD: 0.935	

---

\* Indicates items in which the scoring was reversed in tabulation to maintain a consistent attitudinal pattern. Thus the final "score" for individual respondents and for a mean score in cells and pooled responses, indicates the degree of affirmation for a significant role for the Fine Arts in a relatively structured general education program.

Except when "reversed" to preserve this directionality, the Likert Scale was as follows:

STRONGLY AGREE	1
AGREE	2
UNCERTAIN	3
DISAGREE	4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5

APPENDIX L

Sample Profile: Proportion  
Captured of Original Design  
Cells by Rank/Discipline.

	<u>Design</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Arts and Literature (01)			
Professor	59	36	61.01%
Assoc. Prof.	69	51	73.91%
Asst. Prof.	51	35	68.62%
SUB-TOTAL	179	122	68.16%
Studies in Culture (02)			
Professor	45	29	64.44%
Assoc. Prof.	24	14	58.33%
Asst. Prof.	26	19	73.08%
SUB-TOTAL	95	62	65.26%
Behavioral Sciences (03)			
Professor	51	34	66.67%
Assoc. Prof.	44	25	56.82%
Asst. Prof.	32	24	75.00%
SUB-TOTAL	127	83	65.35%
Physical Sciences (04)			
Professor	75	51	68.00%
Assoc. Prof.	31	22	70.97%
Asst. Prof.	43	38	88.37%
SUB-TOTAL	149	111	74.50%
Methodologies (05)			
Professor	23	15	65.22%
Assoc. Prof.	23	15	65.22%
Asst. Prof.	23	13	56.52%
SUB-TOTAL	69	43	62.32%
TOTALS	619	421	68.01%

AVERAGE CAPTURE PERCENTAGE: 67.48%

NUMBER OF CELLS MORE THAN 2.00% ABOVE OR BELOW AVERAGE= 9

Cells as Proportionate to  
Design Sample and Final  
Sample

<u>Cell</u>	<u>Design Sample</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Survey Sample</u>	<u>%</u>	
01	0101	59	9.53%	36	8.55% +
	0201	69	11.15%	51	12.11% +
	0301	51	8.23%	35	8.31%
02	0102	45	7.27%	29	6.89%
	0202	24	3.88%	14	3.33%
	0302	26	4.20%	19	4.51%
03	0103	51	8.24%	34	8.08%
	0203	44	7.11%	25	5.94% + *
	0303	32	5.17%	24	5.70% +
04	0104	75	12.12%	51	12.11%
	0204	31	5.01%	22	5.23%
	0304	43	6.95%	38	9.03% + *
05	0105	23	3.72%	15	3.56%
	0205	23	3.72%	15	3.56%
	0305	23	3.72%	13	3.09% +

+ cells out of proportion by 1.00% or more (2)

\* cells out of proportion by 0.50% or more (6)

Greatest Discrepancies:

0203 Associate Professor-Behavioral Sciences  
(under-represented by 1.17%)

0304 Assistant Professor-Physical Sciences  
(under-represented by 2.08%)

Margin of error of interpretation =  $\pm 2.00\%$

APPENDIX M



Item Means Analysis By  
Mean Range for All Questionnaire  
Items

<u>Item</u> <u>Range</u>	<u>Items</u> <u>Included</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard</u> <u>Deviation</u>
MN= 4.000 and Above	1	4.176	0.811
	2(r)	4.156	0.896
	5(r)	4.177	1.063
	8	4.134	0.828
	9	4.166	0.799
	10	4.347	0.757
	11	4.293	0.845
	12	4.115	0.854
	15(r)	4.192	0.789
	17 *	4.431	0.734
	18 *	4.276	0.865
	20 *	4.207	0.873
	22	4.282	0.699
	30 ***	4.246	0.918
	38	4.070	0.716
	39	4.296	0.638
MN= 3.500 to 3.999	3(r)	3.686	1.234
	4	3.535	1.271
	14(r)	3.917	0.859
	19 *	3.998	0.973
	21 *	3.576	1.074
	24 **	3.603	1.151
	25 **	3.579	1.158
	35	3.906	0.894
	36	3.933	0.845
	37	3.976	0.830
	41	3.645	0.935
MN= 3.000 to 3.499	7	3.394	1.269
	13	3.489	1.099
	23	3.467	1.067
	26 **	3.033	1.086
	27 **	3.282	1.155
	29 **	3.411	0.926
	32 ***	3.245	1.089
	34(r)	3.332	1.013

MN= 3.000 to 3.499 (cont.)	40	3.362	0.991
-------------------------------------	----	-------	-------

MN= 2.999 to 2.500	6(r)	2.582	1.121
	16(r)	2.973	1.166
	28 **	2.847	1.121

MN= 2.499 to 2.000	31 ***	2.478	1.165
	33 ***	2.030	1.222

- \* Items asking about the arts as disciplines
- \*\* Items asking about fine arts experiences for ALL students within a general education program
- \*\*\* Items asking about priority to be assigned to each of the various arts if an art experience were required within a general education program
- (r) Items which were reversed in scoring; thus the higher the mean the greater the disagreement with the item

#### NARRATIVE INTERPRETATION (Narrow )

MN=4.000 and above	Agree to Strongly Agree
MN=3.500 to 3.999	Uncertain but Tending to Agree
MN=3.000 to 3.499	Uncertain but Tending to Disagree
MN=2.999 to 2.500	Disagree
MN=2.499 to 2.000	Strongly Disagree

#### NARRATIVE INTERPRETATION (Broad)

MN= 4.000 and above	Agreement
MN= 3.000 to 3.999	Uncertain
MN= 1.000 to 2.999	Disagreement

Note: terminology is reversed for (r) items.

APPENDIX N

Item Cluster Means Analysis  
for Total Survey Sample

N= 421

<u>Cluster</u>	<u>Item(s)</u>	<u>Mean(s)</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>	<u>Grand Mean</u>
#1				
Arts and Cognition	1	4.176	0.811	
	7	3.394	1.269	
	11	4.293	0.845	
	12	4.115	0.854	
	18(22)	4.282	0.699	
	23(38)	4.070	0.716	
	19(23)	3.467	1.067	
				$\bar{X}_G = 3.971$
#2				
Traditional Role for the Arts	2(r)	4.156	0.896	
	3(r)	3.686	1.234	
	6(r)	2.582	1.121	
	14(r)	3.917	0.859	
	15(r)	4.192	0.789	
	22(34)(r)	3.332	1.013	
	23(35)	3.906	0.894	
	23(39)	4.296	0.638	
	23(41)	3.645	0.935	
				$\bar{X}_G = 3.746$
#3				
Primary Role for the Arts (General)	4	3.535	1.271	
	8	4.134	0.828	
	9	4.166	0.799	
	10	4.347	0.757	
	20(24)	3.603	1.151	
	(25)	3.579	1.158	
	(26)	3.033	1.086	
	(27)	3.282	1.155	
	(28)	2.847	1.121	
	21(29)	3.411	0.926	
	(30)	4.246	0.918	

(31)	2.478	1.165
(32)	3.245	1.089
(33)	2.030	1.222

$$\bar{X}_G = 3.190$$

#4

Elective-Based  
General Ed.  
Program

5(r)	4.177	1.063
16(r)	2.973	1.166

$$\bar{X}_G = 3.575$$

#5 Arts and  
Creativity,  
Human Dev.,  
"Leisure"

10	4.347	0.757
13	3.489	1.099
19(23)	3.467	1.067
23(36)	3.933	0.845
23(37)	3.976	0.830
23(40)	3.362	0.911

$$\bar{X}_G = 3.762$$

#6

Attitude  
Toward Arts  
as  
"Disciplines"

17(Music)	4.431	0.734
18(Visual Arts)	4.276	0.865
19(Dance)	3.998	0.973
20(Theatre)	4.207	0.873
21(TV/Film)	3.576	1.074

$$\bar{X}_G = 4.098$$

Numbers listed in parentheses represent the sub-division of certain item numbers from the survey instrument into smaller units for scoring purposes.

(r) indicates an item in which the scoring was reversed to preserve the directionality of the instrument. Thus, a high mean with these items represents disagreement with the item content.

Item Cluster Means Analysis:  
Agreement Levels

LEVEL: 4.000 and above

<u>Cluster</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Percentage at Agreement Level</u>
#1 Arts and Cognition	1,11,12, 18,(22),23 (38)	71.43%
#2 Traditional Role for the Arts	2,15,23,(39)	33.33%
#3 Primary Role for the Arts (General)	8,9,10,21, (30)	28.57%
#4 Elective-Based General Ed. Program	5	50.00%
#5 Arts and Creativity Human Dev., "Leisure"	10	16.67%
#6 Attitude Toward Arts as "Disciplines"	17,(18),(20)	60.00%

The responses in Cluster #5 suggest a clear acceptance of Music, Visual Arts, and Theatre as disciplines. There is less assurance for Dance (MN=3.998) and for Television/Film Study (MN=3.576).

LEVEL: 3.500 and above

<u>Cluster</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Percentage at Agreement Level</u> *
#1	none	71.43%
#2	3,14,23, (35),23, (41)	77.78% **
#3	4,20,(24), 20,(25)	50.00%
#4	none	50.00%
#5	23,(36)23, (37)	50.00%
#6	19,21	100.00%

\* Percentage of items at Agreement Level listed here reflects the inclusion of agreement levels from the 4.000 range in the previous table to demonstrate an incremental effect of agreement levels with an increasing latitude of interpretation.

\*\* With the large number of reverse score items in this cluster, the agreement level should be read as a measure of attitudes opposing a role for the arts as only performing in the traditional modes within general education programs.

APPENDIX 0



Cross-Breakdown Using Score by Undergraduate Institution  
of Faculty and Enrollment Pattern of that Institution

VARIABLE	VALUE LABEL	MEAN	STD DEV	CASES
FOR ENTIRE POPULATION		3.8387	.4413	414
INST	1 PRIV LIBERAL	3.8378	.4378	164
ENROLL	1 0500 OR LESS	3.8112	.3619	7
ENROLL	2 0500-1000	3.8027	.4072	32
ENROLL	3 1000-1500	3.8506	.4054	53
ENROLL	4 1500-2000	3.8360	.4420	30
ENROLL	5 2000-2500	3.9499	.4203	21
ENROLL	6 2500-3000	3.4891	.5899	6
ENROLL	7 3000-3500	3.9872	.6646	2
ENROLL	8 3500-4000	3.3514	.5483	5
ENROLL	9 4000-4500	4.1066	.4303	3
ENROLL	10 OVER 4500	4.1872	.4242	5
INST	2 CHURCH LIBERAL	3.8776	.4467	37
ENROLL	1 0500 OR LESS	3.9959	.3101	5
ENROLL	2 0500-1000	3.8339	.4489	13
ENROLL	3 1000-1500	3.6852	.4737	7
ENROLL	4 1500-2000	4.1552	.5935	6
ENROLL	5 2000-2500	3.7750	.0000	1
ENROLL	6 2500-3000	3.7812	.0345	2
ENROLL	9 4000-4500	3.7561	.0000	1
ENROLL	10 OVER 4500	3.9146	.6381	2

CRITERION VARIABLE SCORE

ENROLL	6	2500-3000	3.8482	.3984	11
ENROLL	7	3000-3500	3.8683	.3768	7
ENROLL	8	3500-4000	3.6668	.5181	8
ENROLL	9	4000-4500	3.6108	.7269	8
ENROLL	10	OVER-4500	3.7454	.4987	30
INST	6	FOREIGN	3.7019	.4593	9
ENROLL	3	1000-1500	3.5854	.0000	1
ENROLL	4	1500-2000	3.6585	.0000	1
ENROLL	7	3000-3500	4.1951	.0000	1
ENROLL	10	OVER 4500	3.6463	.5312	6
TOTAL CASES =	421				
MISSING CASES =	7 OR	1.7 PCT.			

CRITERION VARIABLE SCORE

INST	3	PUBLIC COLLEGE	3.8982	.4359	27
ENROLL	2	0500-1000	3.8588	.3411	2
ENROLL	3	1000-1500	3.6293	.0414	2
ENROLL	4	1500-2000	3.9844	.6482	4
ENROLL	5	2000-2500	3.6272	.5309	3
ENROLL	6	2500-3000	4.1341	.4320	4
ENROLL	7	3000-3500	4.6410	.0000	1
ENROLL	10	OVER 4500	3.8435	.3510	11
INST	4	PUBLIC UNIV	3.0916	.3851	85
ENROLL	2	0500-1000	3.5610	.0000	1
ENROLL	3	1000-1500	4.4878	.0000	1
ENROLL	4	1500-2000	3.8854	.2229	5
ENROLL	5	2000-2500	4.2172	.3426	2
ENROLL	6	2500-3000	4.6585	.0000	1
ENROLL	7	3000-3500	3.9677	.0456	2
ENROLL	8	3500-4000	3.9556	.4871	2
ENROLL	10	OVER 4500	3.8763	.3893	71
INST	5	PRIV UNIV	3.7627	.4885	92
ENROLL	2	0500-1000	3.5819	.7722	4
ENROLL	3	1000-1500	3.7868	.2818	7
ENROLL	4	1500-2000	3.7730	.5405	9
ENROLL	5	2000-2500	3.9227	.3999	8

APPENDIX P

Cross-Breakdown Using Score by Faculty Discipline  
and Years of Teaching Experience

VARIABLE	VALUE	LABEL	MEAN	STD DEV	CASES
FOR ENTIRE POPULATION			3.8422	.4429	417
DIS	1	ARTS AND LIT	4.0080	.4645	121
EXP	1	0-4	3.8798	.5851	14
EXP	2	5-8	3.9946	.3349	19
EXP	3	9-12	4.0911	.3494	18
EXP	4	13-16	4.0874	.4219	22
EXP	5	17-20	4.0137	.4669	21
EXP	6	21-24	3.9461	.3002	4
EXP	7	25-28	3.8610	.7626	8
EXP	8	29-32	3.8473	.5814	8
EXP	9	33-36	4.0961	.6859	3
EXP	10	37 OR MORE	4.2922	.3469	4
DIS	2	CULTURE STUDIES	3.9088	.3948	62
EXP	1	0-4	3.8800	.3721	8
EXP	2	5-8	3.8769	.5030	14
EXP	3	9-12	3.9557	.3897	5
EXP	4	13-16	3.9563	.3745	12
EXP	5	17-20	3.7788	.4226	9
EXP	6	21-24	3.9695	.3405	3
EXP	7	25-28	4.0329	.2931	3
EXP	8	29-32	3.6829	.0000	1
EXP	9	33-36	4.0966	.4264	5
EXP	10	37 OR MORE	3.7972	.1453	2

DIS	3	BEHAVIORAL	3.7302	.4673	81
EXP	1	0-4	3.6915	.4277	9
EXP	2	5-8	3.8461	.5144	10
EXP	3	9-12	3.9100	.4914	16
EXP	4	13-16	3.6757	.2772	11
EXP	5	17-20	3.3767	.5017	13
EXP	6	21-24	3.6456	.4091	8
EXP	7	25-28	4.0259	.4142	3
EXP	8	29-32	3.9726	.4334	4
EXP	9	33-36	3.7312	.5497	5
EXP	10	37 OR MORE	3.8902	.0172	2
DIS	4	PHY SCIENCE	3.7330	.3842	110
EXP	1	0-4	3.7418	.3106	16
EXP	2	5-8	3.6093	.3883	24
EXP	3	9-12	3.6971	.4072	10
EXP	4	13-16	3.7348	.4080	12
EXP	5	17-20	3.8089	.4239	18
EXP	6	21-24	3.9169	.1496	3
EXP	7	25-28	3.6260	.4814	10
EXP	8	29-32	3.9125	.3812	8
EXP	9	33-36	3.7539	.2783	6
EXP	10	37 OR MORE	3.9845	.2311	3

DIS	5	METHODOLOGIES	3.7701	.3932	43
EXP	1	0-4	4.0463	.2935	7
EXP	2	5-8	3.7454	.4588	9
EXP	3	9-12	3.5200	.3212	6
EXP	4	13-16	3.6782	.4686	6
EXP	5	17-20	3.9152	.3682	4
EXP	6	21-24	4.4634	.0000	1
EXP	7	25-28	3.8216	.2589	4
EXP	8	29-32	3.7061	.1744	3
EXP	9	33-36	3.2683	.0000	1
EXP	10	37 OR MORE	3.5488	.3277	2

TOTAL CASES = 421

MISSING CASES = 4 OR 1.0 PCT.

APPENDIX Q



Cross-Breakdown Using Score by Faculty Discipline  
and Academic Rank

DIS	RANK	MEAN COUNT STD DEV	PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ROW TOTAL
			1	2	3	
ARTS AND LIT	1	3.9030	4.0627	4.0319	4.0068	
		36	51	35	122	
		.5196	.4076	.4723	.4628	
CULTURE STUDIES	2	3.9202	4.0332	3.7999	3.9088	
		29	14	19	62	
		.3438	.4049	.4486	.3948	
BEHAVIORAL	3	3.6501	3.7560	3.8250	3.7326	
		34	25	24	83	
		.4347	.4751	.4874	.4629	
PHY SCIENCE	4	3.7549	3.7400	3.7046	3.7347	
		51	22	38	111	
		.3927	.4534	.3307	.3829	
METHODOLOGIES	5	3.7816	3.6901	3.8493	3.7701	
		15	15	13	43	
		.4401	.4393	.2739	.3932	
COLUMN TOTAL		3.7971	3.8992	3.8444	3.8424	
		165	127	129	421	
		0.4354	0.4562	0.4297	0.4410	

APPENDIX R

Cross-Breakdown Using Score on Arts and Cognition Item  
Cluster by Survey Site and Faculty Rank

SITE	RANK	MEAN COUNT	STD DEV	PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ROW TOTAL
				1	2	3	
OBERLIN	1			3.8377	3.9796	3.9048	3.8968
				22	14	18	54
				.7113	.5428	.6999	.6581
POMONA	2			4.1029	4.1190	3.9375	4.0566
				25	12	16	53
				.5869	.7506	.5878	.6198
GRINNELL	3			3.9911	4.3008	3.8571	4.0686
				16	19	15	50
				.5557	.5385	.8250	.6671
HAVERFORD	4			3.9841	3.7959	3.9286	3.9107
				9	7	8	24
				.7051	.2312	.5506	.5342
TRINITY	5			3.8333	3.9524	3.8750	3.8736
				24	12	16	52
				.8056	.5594	.6779	.7054
CONNECTICUT	6			4.1357	4.0226	4.0952	4.0840
				20	19	12	51
				.5609	.5157	.4692	.5160

SITE	MEAN		RANK			
	COUNT	STD DEV	PROFESSOR 1	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR 2	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR 3	ROW TOTAL
UNION	7		3.5771	3.5789	3.6714	3.5952
			25	19	10	54
			.4620	.8404	.4716	.6129
BATES	8		4.0238	4.0000	3.8421	3.9354
			12	11	19	42
			.6384	.6027	.5531	.5828
OCCIDENTAL	9		3.8831	4.0204	3.6095	3.8286
			11	14	15	40
			.7662	.6083	.8764	.7630
COLUMN TOTAL			3.9138	3.9809	3.8571	3.9167
			164	127	129	420
			0.6514	0.6331	0.6585	0.6484

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1

APPENDIX S

Cross-Breakdown Using Score on Traditional Role for the Arts Item  
Cluster by Survey Site and Faculty Rank

SITE	RANK	MEAN COUNT	STD DEV	RANK			ROW TOTAL
				PROFESSOR 1	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR 2	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR 3	
OBERLIN	1	3.4899		3.5952		3.4321	3.4979
		22		14		18	54
		.5094		.4962		.6545	.5519
POMONA	2	3.8044		4.0926		3.8472	3.8826
		25		12		16	53
		.5165		.5251		.4950	.5154
GRINNEL	3	3.6667		3.8889		3.7185	3.7667
		16		19		15	50
		.2981		.3648		.4786	.3890
HAVERFORD	4	3.5802		3.6349		3.5833	3.5972
		9		7		8	24
		.3504		.4957		.3815	.3719
TRINITY	5	3.5926		3.5278		3.7569	3.6282
		24		12		16	52
		.4641		.4371		.4298	.4482

	RANK				
	MEAN		ASSOCIATE	ASSISTANT	ROW
	COUNT	PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR	TOTAL
	STD DEV				
	6	3.8778	3.8889	3.8796	3.8824
CONNECTICUT	20		19	12	51
		.4233	.5354	.3229	.4408
	7	3.5171	3.4971	3.6222	3.5293
UNION	26		19	10	55
		.5630	.5002	.3108	.4983
	8	3.4907	3.7980	3.6433	3.6402
BATES	12		11	19	42
		.6329	.3811	.3806	.4687
	9	3.6263	3.8492	3.7407	3.7472
OCCIDENTAL	11		14	15	40
		.3074	.3007	.3325	.3193
COLUMN TOTAL		3.6350	3.7568	3.6899	3.6886
		165	127	129	421
		0.4868	0.4800	0.4519	0.4758

APPENDIX T



## COMPARATIVE DEMOGRAPHICS

Fine Arts Self-Designated Faculty  
 Remaining Arts and Literature Faculty  
 and All Other Disciplines

SAMPLE COMPOSITIONSelf-Designated Fine Arts Faculty:

N=36

	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Site Representation:		
(01)	6	16.7
(02)	9	25.0
(03)	6	16.7
(04)	1	2.8
(05)	1	2.8
(06)	7	19.4
(07)	1	2.8
(08)	1	2.8
(09)	4	11.1

Total	<u>36</u>	
-------	-----------	--

## Faculty Rank:

Professor	13	36.1
Associate Prof.	10	27.8
Assistant Prof.	13	36.1

Arts and Literature(Minus the Self-Designated  
Fine Arts Faculty)

N=87

	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Site Representation:		
(01)	12	13.8
(02)	10	11.5
(03)	13	14.9
(04)	8	9.2
(05)	11	12.6
(06)	11	12.6
(07)	7	8.0
(08)	8	9.2
(09)	7	8.0

Arts and Literature (cont.)

	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Total	<u>87</u>	
Faculty Rank:		
Professor	25	28.7
Associate Prof.	40	46.0
Assistant Prof.	22	25.3

All Other Disciplines

N=299

Site Representation:		
(01)	25	12.3
(02)	34	11.4
(03)	31	10.4
(04)	15	5.0
(05)	40	13.4
(06)	33	11.0
(07)	47	15.7
(08)	33	11.0
(09)	30	10.0
Total	<u>299</u>	

Faculty Rank:		
Professor	129	43.1
Associate Prof.	76	25.4
Assistant Prof.	94	31.4

APPENDIX U

Frequency Response for ARTSROLE 1986  
Questionnaire as Presented by Separate  
Display for Fine Arts Faculty, Arts  
and Literature Faculty and Faculty in  
all Other Disciplines.

PERCENTAGES OF THOSE RESPONDING  
 TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
1	AA	88.9	37.9	32.8
	A	11.1	51.7	46.8
	?	0.0	9.2	15.4
	D	0.0	1.1	4.4
	DD	0.0	0.0	.7
		MN=4.889	MN=4.264	MN=4.065
		SD=0.319	SD=0.673	SD=0.848
		SE=0.053	SE=0.072	SE=0.050
		"N"=36	"N"=87	"N"=293
2 *	AA	0.0	2.4	2.3
	A	0.0	0.0	6.7
	?	0.0	5.9	6.7
	D	19.4	54.1	51.3
	DD	80.6	37.6	32.9
		MN=4.806	MN=4.247	MN=4.057
		SD=0.401	SD=0.770	SD=0.936
		SE=0.067	SE=0.084	SE=0.054
		"N"=36	"N"=85	"N"=298
3 *	AA	2.8	5.8	7.8
	A	2.8	15.1	15.4
	?	0.0	15.1	11.9
	D	27.8	36.0	38.9
	DD	66.7	27.9	25.9
		MN=4.528	MN=3.651	MN=3.597
		SD=0.878	SD=1.206	SD=1.242
		SE=0.146	SE=0.130	SE=0.073
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=293

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
4	AA	66.7	25.6	21.8
	A	25.0	31.4	37.4
	?	2.8	16.3	11.9
	D	5.6	18.6	20.4
	DD	0.0	8.1	8.5
		MN=4.528	MN=3.477	MN=3.435
		SD=0.810	SD=1.281	MN=1.267
		SE=0.135	SE=0.138	SE=0.074
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=294
5 *	AA	0.0	2.3	4.0
	A	0.0	9.3	8.4
	?	5.6	4.7	5.7
	D	25.0	27.9	37.0
	DD	69.4	55.8	44.8
		MN=4.639	MN=4.256	MN=4.101
		SD=0.593	SD=1.065	SD=1.095
		SE=0.099	SE=0.115	SE=0.064
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=297
6 *	AA	25.7	14.1	17.3
	A	20.0	35.3	39.7
	?	20.0	22.4	20.7
	D	28.6	21.2	19.0
	DD	5.7	7.1	3.4
		MN=2.686	MN=2.718	MN=2.515
		SD=1.301	SD=1.161	SD=1.087
		SE=0.220	SE=0.126	SE=0.063
		"N"=35	"N"=85	"N"=295
7	AA	34.5	23.5	16.6
	A	40.0	42.4	34.2
	?	8.6	12.9	23.7
	D	5.7	11.8	11.9
	DD	11.4	9.4	13.6
		MN=3.800	MN=3.588	MN=3.285
		SD=1.302	SD=1.217	SD=1.262
		SE=0.220	SE=0.134	SE=0.073
		"N"=35	"N"=85	"N"=295

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
8	AA	63.9	47.7	26.2
	A	27.8	44.2	57.0
	?	8.3	5.8	10.1
	D	0.0	1.2	5.0
	DD	0.0	1.2	1.7
		MN=4.556	MN=4.360	MN=4.010
		SD=0.652	SD=0.750	MN=0.847
		SE=0.109	SE=0.081	SE=0.049
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=298
9	AA	64.3	44.9	31.2
	A	28.6	44.9	54.1
	?	7.1	9.0	9.6
	D	0.0	1.3	3.8
	DD	0.0	0.0	1.4
		MN=4.571	MN=4.333	MN=4.317
		SD=0.646	SD=0.696	SD=0.821
		SE=0.173	SE=0.079	SE=0.048
		"N"=14	"N"=78	"N"=292
NOTE: This question was designed to exclude respondents specifically in the fine arts				
10	AA	77.8	44.0	45.4
	A	22.2	42.9	45.4
	?	0.0	10.7	5.5
	D	0.0	2.4	3.1
	DD	0.0	0.0	.7
		MN=4.778	MN=4.286	MN=4.317
		SD=0.422	SD=0.754	SD=0.771
		SE=0.070	SE=0.082	SE=0.045
		"N"=36	"N"=84	"N"=293
11	AA	86.1	53.5	40.0
	A	13.9	36.0	47.8
	?	0.0	5.8	6.8
	D	0.0	2.3	3.7
	DD	0.0	2.3	1.7
		MN=4.861	MN=4.360	MN=4.207
		SD=0.351	SD=0.880	SD=0.854
		SE=0.058	SE=0.095	SE=0.050
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=295

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
12	AA	66.7	37.6	30.2
	A	25.0	49.4	52.2
	?	5.6	7.1	11.9
	D	0.0	4.7	4.4
	DD	2.8	1.2	1.4
		MN=4.528	MN=4.176	MN=4.054
		SD=0.845	SD=0.848	SD=0.847
		SE=0.141	SE=0.092	SE=0.049
		"N"=36	"N"=85	"N"=295
13	AA	50.0	22.9	13.6
	A	36.1	32.5	39.7
	?	8.3	25.3	22.4
	D	5.6	15.7	20.3
	DD	0.0	3.6	4.1
		MN=4.306	MN=3.554	MN=3.383
		SD=0.856	SD=1.118	SD=1.078
		SE=0.143	SE=0.123	SE=0.063
		"N"=36	"N"=83	"N"=295
14 *	AA	0.0	0.0	.7
	A	2.8	10.3	10.0
	?	5.6	9.2	9.7
	D	50.0	59.8	59.2
	DD	41.7	20.7	20.4
		MN=4.306	MN=3.908	MN=3.886
		SD=0.710	SD=0.844	SD=0.867
		SE=0.118	SE=0.090	SE=0.050
		"N"=36	"N"=87	"N"=299
15 *	AA	2.8	0.0	.7
	A	0.0	3.5	4.7
	?	2.8	7.0	7.5
	D	22.2	55.8	54.2
	DD	72.2	33.7	32.9
		MN=4.611	MN=4.198	MN=4.139
		SD=0.803	SD=0.717	SD=0.798
		SE=0.134	SE=0.077	SE=0.046
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=295

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
16 *	AA	5.7	6.0	12.9
	A	20.0	27.4	31.6
	?	40.0	19.0	16.0
	D	22.9	35.7	34.0
	DD	11.4	11.9	5.4
		MN=3.143 SD=1.061 SE=0.179 "N"=35	MN=3.202 SD=1.149 SE=0.125 "N"=84	MN=2.874 SD=1.175 SE=0.069 "N"=294
17	AA	76.5	53.6	51.0
	A	20.6	40.5	41.8
	?	2.9	3.6	3.7
	D	0.0	2.4	2.4
	DD	0.0	0.0	1.0
		MN=4.735 SD=0.511 SE=0.088 "N"=34	MN=4.452 SD=0.684 SE=0.075 "N"=84	MN=4.395 SD=0.762 SE=0.044 "N"=294
18	AA	70.6	51.2	44.0
	A	23.5	40.5	39.9
	?	5.9	4.8	10.6
	D	0.0	2.4	3.8
	DD	0.0	1.2	1.7
		MN=4.647 SD=0.597 SE=0.102 "N"=34	MN=4.381 SD=0.790 SE=0.086 "N"=84	MN=4.208 SD=0.900 SE=0.053 "N"=293
19	AA	64.7	36.9	32.4
	A	20.6	32.1	42.0
	?	14.7	22.6	16.4
	D	0.0	7.1	7.8
	DD	0.0	1.2	1.4
		MN=4.500 SD=0.749 SE=0.128 "N"=34	MN=3.964 SD=0.999 SE=0.109 "N"=84	MN=3.962 SD=0.963 SE=0.056 "N"=293



<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
20	AA	73.5	46.4	38.9
	A	20.6	41.7	44.4
	?	2.9	6.0	10.9
	D	2.9	4.8	4.8
	DD	0.0	1.2	1.0
		MN=4.647	MN=4.274	MN=4.154
		SD=0.691	SD=0.869	SD=0.872
		SE=0.119	SE=0.095	SE=0.051
		"N"=34	"N"=84	"N"=293
21	AA	50.0	22.9	18.0
	A	26.5	37.3	35.0
	?	23.5	26.5	27.9
	D	0.0	7.2	15.6
	DD	0.0	6.0	3.4
		MN=4.265	MN=3.639	MN=3.486
		SD=0.828	SD=1.100	SD=1.064
		SE=0.142	SE=0.121	SE=0.062
		"N"=34	"N"=83	"N"=294
22	AA	86.1	43.5	33.2
	A	13.9	50.6	55.3
	?	0.0	2.4	9.5
	D	0.0	3.5	1.7
	DD	0.0	0.0	.3
		MN=4.861	MN=4.341	MN=4.193
		SD=0.351	SD=0.700	SD=0.700
		SE=0.058	SE=0.076	SE=0.041
		"N"=36	"N"=85	"N"=295
23	AA	58.3	24.4	11.9
	A	27.8	31.4	35.7
	?	11.1	20.9	28.9
	D	2.8	19.8	20.7
	DD	0.0	3.5	2.7
		MN=4.417	MN=3.535	MN=3.333
		SD=0.806	SD=1.165	SD=1.021
		SE=0.134	SE=0.126	SE=0.060
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=294

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
24	AA	60.0	24.4	17.4
	A	31.4	42.7	43.2
	?	8.6	15.9	14.3
	D	0.0	14.6	18.5
	DD	0.0	2.4	6.6
			MN=4.514 SD=0.658 SE=0.111 "N"=35	MN=3.720 SD=1.069 SE=0.118 "N"=82
25	AA	60.0	23.2	17.7
	A	31.4	47.6	39.2
	?	8.6	12.2	17.7
	D	0.0	14.6	18.4
	DD	0.0	2.4	6.9
			MN=4.514 SD=0.658 SE=0.111 "N"=35	MN=3.744 SD=1.052 SE=0.116 "N"=82
26	AA	37.1	11.2	7.1
	A	25.7	21.2	22.1
	?	34.3	36.2	35.2
	D	2.9	25.0	27.0
	DD	0.0	6.3	8.5
			MN=3.971 SD=0.923 SE=0.156 "N"=35	MN=3.063 SD=1.083 SE=0.121 "N"=80
27	AA	48.6	19.8	10.3
	A	34.3	33.3	32.3
	?	17.1	21.0	25.2
	D	0.0	21.0	24.8
	DD	0.0	4.9	7.4
			MN=4.314 SD=0.758 SE=0.128 "N"=35	MN=3.420 SD=1.171 SE=0.130 "N"=81

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
28	AA	32.4	10.0	5.0
	A	17.6	27.5	16.8
	?	41.2	27.5	36.4
	D	8.8	17.5	28.9
	DD	0.0	17.5	12.9
		MN=3.735	MN=2.950	MN=2.721
		SD=1.024	SD=1.252	SD=1.048
		SE=0.176	SE=0.140	SE=0.063
		"N"=34	"N"=80	"N"=280
29	Priority			
	#1	74.2	56.7	63.3
	#2	16.1	31.7	19.9
	#3	6.5	6.7	11.2
	#4	3.2	1.7	4.1
#5	0.0	3.3	1.5	
		MN=4.613	MN=4.367	MN=4.393
		SD=0.761	SD=0.938	SD=0.947
		SE=0.137	SE=0.121	SE=0.068
		"N"=31	"N"=60	"N"=196
		Missing:5	Missing:27	Missing:103
30	Priority			
	#1	64.5	46.7	49.7
	#2	29.0	35.0	29.5
	#3	6.5	13.3	13.5
	#4	0.0	3.3	6.7
#5	0.0	1.7	.5	
		MN=4.581	MN=4.217	MN=4.212
		SD=0.620	SD=0.922	SD=0.953
		SE=0.111	SE=0.119	SE=0.069
		"N"=31	"N"=60	"N"=193
		Missing:5	Missing:27	Missing:106
31	Priority			
	#1	16.7	3.7	6.4
	#2	20.0	7.4	13.8
	#3	36.7	24.1	20.2
	#4	20.0	33.3	39.4
#5	6.7	31.5	20.2	
		MN=3.200	MN=2.185	MN=2.468
		SD=1.157	SD=1.083	SD=1.149
		SE=0.211	SE=0.147	SE=0.084
		"N"=30	"N"=54	"N"=188
		Missing:6	Missing:33	Missing:111

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u> <sup>406</sup>
32	Priority			
	#1	23.3	24.6	14.2
	#2	20.0	12.3	19.5
	#3	33.3	40.4	44.7
	#4	20.0	19.3	15.8
	#5	3.3	3.5	5.8
		MN=3.400	MN=3.351	MN=3.205
		SD=1.163	SD=1.157	SD=1.057
		SE=0.212	SE=0.153	SE=0.077
		"N"=30	"N"=57	"N"=190
		Missing:6	Missing:30	Missing:109
33	Priority			
	#1	10.0	5.5	3.8
	#2	10.0	7.3	10.8
	#3	23.3	20.0	15.1
	#4	13.3	18.2	21.6
	#5	43.3	49.1	48.6
		MN=2.300	MN=2.018	MN=1.995
		SD=1.393	SD=1.225	SD=1.191
		SE=0.254	SE=0.165	SE=0.088
		"N"=30	"N"=55	"N"=185
		Missing:6	Missing:32	Missing:114
34 *	AA	2.9	6.0	2.1
	A	11.4	19.3	23.4
	?	11.4	19.3	26.9
	D	40.0	47.0	41.0
	DD	34.3	8.4	6.6
		MN=3.914	MN=3.325	MN=3.266
		SD=1.095	SD=1.072	SD=0.960
		SE=0.185	SE=0.118	SE=0.056
		"N"=35	"N"=83	"N"=290
35	AA	33.3	29.8	20.1
	A	41.7	50.0	58.2
	?	13.9	8.3	13.9
	D	11.1	10.7	5.8
	DD	0.0	1.2	2.0
		MN=3.972	MN=3.964	MN=3.884
		SD=0.971	SD=0.963	SD=0.863
		SE=0.162	SE=0.105	SE=0.050
		"N"=36	"N"=84	"N"=294

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
36	AA	61.1	19.8	19.0
	A	30.6	51.2	60.7
	?	5.6	18.6	12.9
	D	2.8	8.1	6.8
	DD	0.0	2.3	.7
		MN=4.500	MN=3.779	MN=3.905
		SD=0.737	SD=0.938	SD=0.803
		SE=0.123	SE=0.101	SE=0.047
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=295
37	AA	50.0	26.4	21.4
	A	41.7	52.9	57.5
	?	8.3	13.8	14.6
	D	0.0	5.7	5.1
	DD	0.0	1.1	1.4
		MN=4.417	MN=3.977	MN=3.925
		SD=0.649	SD=0.862	SD=0.827
		SE=0.108	SE=0.092	SE=0.048
		"N"=36	"N"=87	"N"=294
38	AA	69.4	25.6	22.0
	A	25.0	64.0	57.7
	?	5.6	10.5	16.5
	D	0.0	0.0	3.4
	DD	0.0	0.0	.3
		MN=4.639	MN=4.151	MN=3.976
		SD=0.593	SD=0.584	SD=0.745
		SE=0.099	SE=0.063	SE=0.044
		"N"=36	"N"=86	"N"=291
39	AA	66.7	49.4	30.2
	A	33.3	48.2	61.7
	?	0.0	1.2	6.4
	D	0.0	1.2	1.4
	DD	0.0	0.0	.3
		MN=4.667	MN=4.459	MN=4.200
		SD=0.478	SD=0.589	SD=0.642
		SE=0.080	SE=0.064	SE=0.037
		"N"=36	"N"=85	"N"=295

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Label</u>	<u>Fine Arts</u>	<u>Arts and Literature</u>	<u>All Other Disciplines</u>
40	AA	27.8	8.2	7.1
	A	36.1	34.1	45.2
	?	25.0	29.4	28.2
	D	11.1	23.5	15.3
	DD	0.0	4.7	4.1
		MN=3.806	MN=3.176	MN=3.361
		SD=0.980	SD=1.037	SD=0.963
		SE=0.163	SE=0.112	SE=0.056
		"N"=36	"N"=85	"N"=294
41	AA	33.3	18.1	9.6
	A	50.0	56.6	53.6
	?	11.1	13.3	21.8
	D	5.6	9.6	12.3
	DD	0.0	2.4	2.7
		MN=4.111	MN=3.783	MN=3.549
		SD=0.820	SD=0.938	SD=0.923
		SE=0.137	SE=0.103	SE=0.054
		"N"=36	"N"=83	"N"=293

\* Indicates items in which the scoring was reversed to preserve directionality of the instrument. Thus, the higher the mean in these items, the greater the disagreement with the proposition advanced in the item.

APPENDIX V

Mentorship (SIGOTHER) Summary

From SPSS Program Run on FREQUENCIES:

SIGOTHER item

<u>Value Label</u>		<u>FREQ</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>VALID PERCENT</u>	<u>CUM PERCENT</u>
YES	(1)	244	58.0	64.9	64.9
NO	(2)	132	31.4	35.1	100.0
	(0)	45	10.7	MISSING	
STD. ERROR		.025			
STD.DEV.		.478			
VARIANCE		.228			
VALID CASES		376			
MISSING CASES		45			

Percentage of total sample responding to question: 89.31%

Percentage of total sample indicating a Mentor: 57.96%



Academic Fields of Mentors  
As Identified by Survey Respondents

411

<u>Fields Named</u>	<u>Number of Times</u>	<u>Number of Times Outside the Discipline Area of Respondent</u>	
Anthropology	2	1	Arts & Literature
Architecture	1	1	Arts & Literature
Art	5	0	
Art History	3	0	
Art/Math	1	1	Arts & Literature
Biology	9	0	
Biology/Fisheries	1	0	
Biology/Music	1	1	Physical Sciences
Chemistry	10	1	Methodologies
Chemistry/Biology	1	0	
Chemistry/History	1	1	Physical Sciences
Chemistry/Philosophy	1	1	Physical Sciences
Classics	3	0	
Classics/Anthropology/ History	1	1	Behavioral Sciences
Comparative Literature	2	1	Behavioral Sciences
Dance	1	1	Physical Sciences
Drama	1	1	Studies in Culture
Economics	8	2	Studies in Culture Methodologies
Education	3	0	
English	32	9	Behavioral Sciences (3) Studies in Culture (5) Methodologies (1)
English/Biology	1	1	Arts & Literature
English/French	1	0	

English/French/ Philosophy/History	1	1	Studies in Culture
English/Painting/ Film Illustration	1	0	
English/Philosophy	1		
English/Philosophy/ Art History	1	0	
English/Philosophy/ Music/Math/Physics/ Art	1	0	
English/Religion	1	1	Studies in Culture

TOTAL NUMBER OF CITATIONS OF ENGLISH, singly or in combination: 40

TOTAL NUMBER OF CITATIONS OF ENGLISH, singly or in combination for re-  
spondent of field: 10

Foreign Languages	1	0	
French	1	0	
French/Music	1	1	Methodologies
Geography	1	1	Arts and Literature
Geology	3	1	Methodologies
German	4	1	Studies in Culture
German/Physics/ Philosophy	1	1	Arts and Literature
Government	3	1	Methodologies
History	15	7	Behavioral Sciences (6) Arts & Literature (1)
History/Classics	1	0	
History/English/ Philosophy	1	1	Behavioral Sciences
History/Humanities	1	0	

History/Music	1	1	Studies in Culture
Humanities/Music	1	1	Studies in Culture
Insect Toxicology	1	0	
Languages	1	0	
Linguistics	1	0	
Linguistics/Humanities	1	1	Physical Sciences
Literature	1	0	
Mathematics	7	0	
Mathematics/Philosophy/ German	1	1	Arts and Literature
Mathematics/Physics	1	0	
Mechanical Engineering	1	0	
Modern Languages	2	1	Studies in Culture
Movement	1	0	
Music	17	9	Studies in Culture (2) Behavioral Sciences (2) Physical Sciences (3) Methodologies (2)
Music/Chemistry/ History	1	1	Physical Sciences
Music/Classics	1	0	
Music/History	1	1	Arts and Literature
Philosophy	9	3	Arts and Literature Physical Sciences (2)
Philosophy/Religion	1	0	
Philosophy/Religion Biology	1	1	Studies in Culture
Physical Education	2	0	
Physics	7	1	Behavioral Sciences

MENTORSHIP SUMMARY

414

Physics/English/Math	1	1	Physical Sciences
Political Science	10	1	Arts and Literature
Psychology	9	0	
Psychology/History	1	1	Behavioral Sciences
Psychology/Philosophy	1	1	Behavioral Sciences
Psychology/Humanities	1	1	Behavioral Sciences
Religion	3	0	
Religion/Anthropology	1	1	Studies in Culture
Religion/Classics	1	1	Studies in Culture
Russian	2	1	Methodologies
Science	1	0	
Social Studies	2	0	
Sociology	6	2	Arts and Literature
Sociology/History	1	1	Behavioral Sciences
Spanish	1	1	Methodologies
Theatre	1	0	
Theology	2	1	Physical Sciences
Zoology	1	0	
TOTAL	233		

TOTAL of MENTORS  
CITED OUTSIDE FIELD  
OF RESPONDENT

72

PERCENTAGE OF MENTORS  
CITED OUTSIDE FIELD  
OF RESPONDENT

30.9%

TOTAL RESPONDENT INDICATING "YES" TO MENTOR QUESTIONS: 244  
MISSING CASES 11

TOTAL VALID "FILL-IN RESPONSES" 233

TOTAL CITATIONS OF FIELDS (Original plus Multiple)

		<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>
Anthropology	4	.02%
Architecture	1	.004%
Art	11	.05%
Biology	14	.06%
Chemistry	14	.06%
Classics	7	.03%
Comparative Literature	2	.01%
Dance	1	.004%
Drama	2	.01%
Economics	8	.03%
English	43	.18%
Foreign Languages	14	.06%
Geography	1	.004%
Geology	3	.012%
Government	3	.012%
History	25	.11%
Humanities	3	.012%
Linguistics	1	.004%
Mathematics	11	.05%
Engineering	1	.004%
Music	25	.11%
Philosophy	20	.09%
Physical Education	2	.01%
Physics	11	.05%
Political Science	10	.04%
Psychology	11	.05%
Religion	8	.03%
Sociology	7	.03%

English 43  
 History 25  
 Music 25  
 Philosophy 20

TOTAL 113 or 48.5% of all responses

Above plus

Biology 14  
 Chemistry 14  
 Foreign Language 14

MAKE UP A TOTAL OF 155 or 66.5% of all responses

## MENTORSHIP SUMMARY

Responses Outside the Field of Respondent

<u>Mentor Field</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Number Outside Respondent Field</u>	
English	43	12	28.0%
History	25	3	12.0%
Music	25	4	16.0%
Philosophy	20	8	40.0%
Biology	14	2	14.3%
Chemistry	14	0	0.0%
Foreign Languages	14	5	35.7%

THUS, OF THE FIELDS MOST FREQUENTLY NAMED AS THE FIELD OF THE UNDERGRADUATE "Mentor":

<u>Total Citations</u>	<u>Total Outside of Chosen Field of Respondent</u>	
155	34	( 21.9% )

Respondents Identifying One or More  
Faculty Mentors NOT in Respondent's  
Own Major Field

417

<u>Respondent Field</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentage of Discipline Pool</u>
01 Arts and Literature N=74	15	20.27%
02 Studies in Cultures N=38	20	52.63%
03 Behavioral Sciences N=49	13	26.53%
04 Physical Sciences N=53	14	26.42%
05 Methodologies N=20	13	65.00%
Total (s)	75	32.05% of Respondents indicat- ing they HAD establish- ed a "Mentor" relation- ship with a faculty mem- ber during their under- graduate education.

Mentor Fields NOT the Respondent's  
Own As Identified

Arts and Literature	19*	Anthropology, Mathematics, Biology, Philosophy, Physics, Geography, History, Political Science, Sociology, Theology
Studies in Culture	20*	Drama, Economics, English, French, German, Classics, Music, Modern Languages, Biology, Political Science, Anthropology
Behavioral Sciences	15*	Classics, History, Comparative Literature, English, Philos- ophy, Music, Humanities, Phys- ics

Physical Sciences	16*	Music, History, Philosophy, Dance, Linguistics, Human- ities, English, Theology
Methodologies	14*	Chemistry, Economics, English, French, Music, Geology, Government, Move- ment (sic), Russian, Social Science, Spanish

TOTAL "N" = 234

\* A number of respondents gave multiple citations for mentors



Part 2Undergraduate College Attendance Summary

Total Questionnaire Response	N=421
Total Responding to Item Naming Undergraduate College	N=351
Percentage of Response	83.4%

<u>SITE</u>	<u>Item N</u>	<u>Sample N</u>	<u>Percentage of Response</u>
Oberlin	41	54	75.9%
Pomona	46	53	86.8%
Grinnell	44	50	88.0%
Haverford	22	24	91.7%
Trinity	45	52	86.5%
Connecticut	43	51	84.3%
Union	46	55	83.6%
Bates	36	42	85.7%
Occidental	28	40	70.0%
TOTAL	351	421	83.4%

## Part 2

Undergraduate College Attendance Summary (con't.)

## POOL CONFIGURATION

<u>Site</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentage of Sample Supplied</u>	
Oberlin	41	11.68%	
Pomona	46	13.10%	
Grinnell	44	12.54%	
Haverford	22	6.27%	Note: A perfectly balanced equal share for all sites would = 11.11%
Trinity	45	12.82%	
Connecticut	43	12.15%	
Union	46	13.11%	
Bates	36	10.16%	
Occidental	28	7.98%	

## UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE ATTENDANCE

SUMMARYTHUSSITES SIGNIFICANTLY UNDERREPRESENTED

Haverford	6.27%
Occidental	7.98%

SITES SIGNIFICANTLY OVER REPRESENTED:

Pomona	13.10%
Union	13.11%
Trinity	12.82%
Grinnell	12.54%

## SITES CLOSE TO TARGET SHARE:

Oberlin	11.68%
Connecticut	12.25%
Bates	10.26%

However, the response rate of Design Sample compared to captured sample (see above) suggest that the stratified random sampling process should still insure reasonable accuracy in the overall profile.

Some 15 institutions account for 110 (31.3%) of all respondents.  
(SEE LISTING)

By adding some 13 additional institutions (listed by less than 5 but more than 2 respondents) can account for some

157 respondents (44.7%) (SEE LISTING)

The remaining respondents listed a wide variety of institutions.

THUS

15 institutions account for almost one-third (31.3%) of all those responding

28 institutions account for almost one-half (44.7%) of all those responding

OF THE 28 institutions: 21 (75.0%) are private colleges/universities  
OF THE 15 institutions: 13 (86.7%) are private colleges/universities

OF THE SELF-REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 258 (61.3%) indicated attending a private college/university and 37 (8.8%) indicated attending a church-related liberal arts college, FOR A TOTAL FIGURE OF 295 (70.1%) attending a private or church-related liberal arts college/university.

## UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE ATTENDANCE

SUMMARYProfile

95 of the respondents (27.1%) attended ONE of 13 private liberal arts colleges or private universities.  
i.e. MORE THAN ONE-FOURTH

122 of the respondents (34.8%) attended ONE of 21 private liberal arts colleges or private universities.  
i.e. MORE THAN ONE-THIRD

## COLLEGES ATTENDED

Five or more Respondents

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Number indicating attendance (all sites)</u>	
Amherst	5	
Brown University	5	
Columbia University	10	
Harvard University	7	
Haverford College	6	
Oberlin College or Conservatory	12	
Pomona College	8	Note: all from the Pomona College site
Princeton University	6	
Stanford University	7	
Swarthmore College	7	
Union College	6	Note: all from Union College sites
University of Calif. Berkeley	7	
University of Chicago	5	
University of Michigan Ann Arbor	8	
Yale University	11	NOTE: Thus these institutions account for 31.9% of U/Grad background of those responding.
TOTAL	110	

## Total N responding:

Oberlin	41	
Pomona	46	
Grinnell	44	
Haverford	22	
Trinity	45	
Connecticut	43	
Union	46	
Bates	36	
Occidental	28	
TOTAL	351	TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRE N = 420
		Institution response = 83.6%

## COLLEGES ATTENDED

Less than Five but more than Two Responses

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Number indicating attendance (all sites)</u>
Barnard College	4
California Institute of Technology	3
Carleton College	3
Cornell University	3
Hamilton College	3
Occidental College	4 Note: 3 at Occidental College site
Queens College (NY)	4
Smith College	3
SUNY	6 Note: not consistently identified as to which site
Trinity College	4 Note: all at Trinity College site
University of California Los Angeles	3
University of Texas	4 Note: not always identified as to which site
Wesleyan University (Ct)	3
	<hr/>
TOTAL	47

NOTE: These institutions, when added to the first group which had 5 or more responses = 157 responses, constituting 44.7% of those responding.

APPENDIX W



Cross-Breakdown and Analysis of Variance  
for All Scores for Comparison with Faculty  
with Mentor Relationships and Faculty With-  
out Mentor Relationships

427

Variable: SIGOTHER

Means Analysis

Comparison Variable

Total Score

	SIGOTHER YES <u>N=244</u>	SIGOTHER NO <u>N=132</u>	SAMPLE POPULATION <u>N=421</u>
Score	3.8737	3.8195	3.8547
Difference Standard Deviation	+.019  .4574	-.0352  .4213	  .4453

Comparison Variable

Arts and Cognition  
AC-Score

Score	3.9865	3.8496	3.9385
Difference Standard Deviation	+.0482  .6542	-.0887  .6010	  .6385

Comparison Variable

Traditional Role  
TR-Score

Score	3.7177	3.6414	3.6909
Difference Standard Deviation	+.0268  .4925	-.0495  .4693	  .4852

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

		<u>Significance of F</u>	
SCORE by	SIGOTHER	1.272	0.260
AC-SCORE by	SIGOTHER	3.964	0.047
TR-SCORE by	SIGOTHER	2.122	0.146

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by David F. Unumb has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Ernest I. Proulx, Director  
Professor, Curriculum and Human Resource Development and  
Counseling and Educational Psychology, Loyola

Dr. Todd J. Hoover  
Associate Professor, Curriculum and Human Resource Development,  
Loyola

Dr. Diane P. Schiller  
Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Human Resource Development,  
Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 2, 1987  
Date

Ernest I Proulx  
Director's Signature