

ART TEACHER PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION: A SURVEY OF THE
ATTITUDES OF QUEENSLAND SECONDARY, AND TERTIARY ART
EDUCATORS

by

Victoria Garnons-Williams

B.Ed., The University of British Columbia

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF EDUCATION

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Department of Visual and Performing Arts in
Education

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

October 1987

© Victoria Garnons-Williams, 1987

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS IN EDUCATION

The University of British Columbia
1956 Main Mall
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1Y3

Date OCTOBER 10, 1987

ABSTRACT

This study compares the views of three groups of art educators - secondary, tertiary pre-service lecturers, and scholars - about the content and structure considered important in art teacher pre-service education.

Items of program content and structure, as well as issues in art-teacher preparation were gleaned from the writings of selected scholars and incorporated into a survey questionnaire. The survey was distributed to secondary art educators throughout Queensland and to art pre-service lecturers throughout Australia. An analysis of the results identifies areas and degrees of agreement and difference on items both within and between groups. The study can assist the development of art teacher pre-service programmes that reflect the values of both theoreticians and practitioners of art education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P.

Abstract	ii
List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
 CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION TO STUDY	 1
Research Questions	3
Background to Study	4
Purpose of this Study	4
Design of the Study	5
Conclusion and Summary	7
 CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	 8
1. Determining the nature of the study	8
2. Developing the Survey Items from a Review of Literature	17
`Content of Course' Items	18
`Structure of Course' Items	26
`Part C' Items	31

CHAPTER 3 CONDUCT OF THE STUDY	37
Survey Items	38
Limitations of the Survey	41
Data Analysis Procedures	44
Descriptions of the Populations	45
Summary	48
 CHAPTER 4 RESULTS OF THE STUDY	 50
CONCLUSIONS	50
What selected art education scholars perceive as valuable in art teacher pre- service education	50
What Queensland teachers of art perceive as valuable in art teacher pre-service education	50
Comparisons with the Greer Study	57
What tertiary art educators perceive as valuable for art teacher pre-service education	58
Measure of agreement existing within groups for art teacher pre-service education	64
Secondary Art Educator Respondents	64
Tertiary Art Educator Respondents	67

Agreement Between Groups of Secondary and Tertiary Respondents	70
Measure of difference existing within groups and between groups for art teacher pre-service education	74
Secondary art educator respondents	74
Tertiary art educator respondents	76
Differences between groups of Secondary and Tertiary respondents	77
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS	81
A. Relationships between the two respondent groups and the art education scholarship used as the basis of the survey	81
B. Points for discussion	87
C. Implications for the development of art teacher pre-service education	91
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	92
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	93
REFERENCES	95
APPENDICES	102
I Art teacher preparation survey	103
II Numerical results for items	108
III Personal comments	119

IV	Rank order of results - secondary respondents	122
V	Rank order of results - tertiary respondents	125

LIST OF TABLES

- I Queensland Secondary Art Educators:
 - Content of Course
 - Rank Order According to Mean Response -
1-2 on Likert Scale
- II Queensland Secondary Art Educators:
 - Structure of Course
 - Rank Order According to Mean Response
3-5 on Likert Scale
- IV Tertiary Art Educators:
 - Content of Course
 - Rank Order According to Mean Response
1-2 on Likert Scale
- VI Secondary Art Educator Group: Items
indicating strongest agreement within
Group according to High Modal Responses
- VII Tertiary Art Educator Group: Items
indicating strongest agreement within
group according to high modal responses
- VIII Differences between the group means of
secondary and tertiary respondents of
more than .9 on the Likert Scale.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks goes to my advisor, Dr Graeme Chalmers, for his assistance in the completion of this study, especially considering the distance at which communications had to take place. Thanks also to Dr Ron Macgregor for his advice during summer sessions and to Dr James Gray for his presence and support at the presentation of this study in Brisbane, Australia. Appreciation is also extended to Dr David Hawke, for his time and input to this study on the Brisbane side, and to Donna White for the processing of the many manuscripts. Finally, the writer wishes to express gratitude to Robert Peard for the data analysis program and his patience, and encouragement during the many months it took to complete this thesis.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

In order to develop and evaluate art teacher pre-service education programs, we need to consider what content and structures are basic or desirable for art education pre-service students. At present in Australia, as in other countries, 'educators are now being inundated with proposals for the more adequate preparation of teachers' (Beyer, 1986, p. 16,17).

One way to put the numerous proposals for art teacher pre-service into perspective would be to subject the views of scholars and researchers to a response from two levels of practitioners: art educators in secondary schools and art educators in tertiary institutions of teacher education. In this way, program designers will be more aware of what is valued by each group and the areas and degree of agreement or difference between them.

This information is seen as crucial for course development and evaluation for several reasons. Firstly, if the views of practitioners are solicited and taken into account during program revision, the value differences that have been claimed to exist

between tertiary programs and inservice programs of art education might be lessened (Eisner, 1972). Secondly, there is evidence to suggest that practitioners are more likely to be supportive of reforms if they are part of the change agency that puts them in place (Goodlad, 1976). Thirdly, there have been claims in the Australian literature to suggest that practitioners, both secondary and tertiary art educators, may be resistant to, unaware of or unconvinced of the value of current theoretical viewpoints (Hiller (1984), Hickey (1984), Hammond (1981), Boughton (1986). Lastly, in the specific context of Queensland, there are historic reasons why the current needs of pre-service secondary art educators may have altered and the views of inservice art educators remain relatively unknown. The latter two reasons behind the development of the study will be more fully outlined in Chapter Two, 'Review of the Literature'.

This study began, therefore, with the notion that program designers should establish comparative viewpoints for areas of content and types of structures valued by groups of art educators - scholars, tertiary art teacher pre-service

educators, and secondary art educators. Program designers should also account for these viewpoints more directly when evaluating existing, and developing new art teacher pre-service programs.

Research Questions

These concerns led to the formulation of five research questions:

1. What content and experiences do selected art education scholars perceive as valuable for art teacher pre-service education?
2. What content and experiences do Queensland secondary art educators perceive as valuable for art teacher pre-service education
3. What content and experiences do tertiary art educators perceive as valuable for art teacher pre-service education?
4. What measure of agreement exists within groups and between groups in terms of a) content and b) experiences for art teacher pre-service education?
5. What measure of disagreement exists within groups and between groups in terms of a) content and b) experiences for art teacher pre-service education?

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

In 1985, the Queensland Board of Teacher Education conducted an informal survey entitled 'Education and the Arts: Identifying Research Needs' (Duck 1985) in which some very broad areas of concern amongst arts educators were presented. Since the focus of that study was intentionally broad, issues identified by respondents tended to be fairly general, but some dissatisfaction with pre-service education was indicated. A more specific examination was needed, one that would identify more precisely those areas of content and experiences for art teacher pre-service education that were valued by art educators. The results from such a survey could then be used to evaluate the existing art teacher pre-service program and determine directions for future development.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

This study was designed to discover whether there are value differences between secondary and tertiary practitioners and art education scholars and to what extent there are differences concerning the content and experiences needed in art teacher pre-service education. Results would give

practitioner input into program evaluation and suggest areas of in-service or liaison necessary in order to implement new program models or content.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The views of selected art education scholars and researchers were used to formulate a survey questionnaire that was submitted, after piloting, to groups of Queensland secondary art educators and Australian Tertiary Art Educators. Responses to every item within each group were collated and then every item response was compared between groups. In this way, it was possible to describe areas of agreement and disagreement within and between groups on specific issues in art teacher preparation. It was also possible to describe which aspects of art teacher pre-service education espoused by theoreticians were also valued by practitioners. The study is descriptive, and intended for deliberation, as no survey of this type has been done in Queensland previously.

Definitions of terms

Art education 'scholars' refers to those whose primary field of study or occupation the critical enquiry into or the analysis of the teaching of art,

those who are most aligned to the upper levels of Gray's (1985) multi-dimensional model.

`Researchers` will refer to those who conduct and publish studies or reports that make recommendations on art teacher education, including Australian State and Commonwealth teacher education commissions.

`Lecturer' is the common term for those teaching in tertiary institutions in Australia, and is used both in the survey-questionnaire on items and within this study.

Limitations and delimitations

Some selection of items and topics was necessarily made in order for the questionnaire not to be a daunting length to respondents. Every attempt was made to incorporate recurring topics in the general literature, as well as some unique topics. The shortcomings of the survey instrument specifically and the questionnaire method of data gathering generally will be outlined in Chapters 2 and 3.

There were limitations in the population of art educators surveyed. Results collated from the `secondary' group included only those beyond their first year of teaching (only one respondent was

omitted on these grounds). Responses from `tertiary art educators were collected from Queensland and from other States as well in order to secure a larger number of respondents.

Conclusion and Summary

The need for establishing comparative viewpoints for what content and experience is valued in pre-service art teacher education is prerequisite to any future changes in art teacher preparation in Queensland. An effective pre-service programme is seen as a `mediation' between those things that are valued by practitioners, and those things that are proposed by scholars and researchers: the `theoreticians' of art education. In this study, the accumulated views of scholars have been used as a basis for a questionnaire. Response to the questionnaire were analysed to determine the comparative viewpoints of selected Queensland secondary art educators and a number of tertiary art educators. Results are descriptive, identifying areas of consensus and difference.

CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A survey of literature was used in two ways in the designing of this study. Initially, it was undertaken to determine that a study of this nature was the appropriate starting point for the evaluation and development of the major art teacher preparation program in Queensland. Secondly, a review of literature was undertaken to formulate the specific items for the survey-questionnaire. This Chapter will address both of these 'reviews' in turn.

1. DETERMINING THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

While programs might conceivably be changed using the advice of theorists alone, without an awareness of other participants' viewpoints, this approach is problematic. Beyer alludes to this in his article 'Art in Education reform: Toward what end?' and urges caution - 'In particular, the danger that educators will once again rush to judgement, action, and reaction, at the expense of thoughtful, reflective and sustained analysis, is an ominous one' (1986, p. 17). MacGregor supports this

cautionary view (1985). Hiller links this directly to pre-service -

[Teachers] must be able to resist the temptation to 'jump on the band wagons' when some new panacea is being promoted. Whether this can be done at pre-service level depends on the ability of those designing the courses" (1984, p. 36).

Secondly, using scholars' and researchers' work as the primary basis for changes to pre-service programs is problematic because of their isolation from the classroom situation (Gray, 1984, Eisner, 1983, C.D.C., 1985). Duck's 1985 report supports this, and also indicates that teacher educators may be isolated from both theorists and classrooms - "Teacher educators are at risk of becoming isolated from others involved in the arts and art education" (p. 19). The Australian Schools Commission report of 1979 hoped to counteract this possibility by recommending "that those responsible for primary and secondary education be closely involved in making decisions about the content and structure of courses for teacher trainees" (p. 23). Other reports recommend this, but do not outline exactly how this

is to be accomplished. By subjecting some of the ideas of theorists concerning content and structure of pre-service to those in the field, we can: a) give teachers some input into teacher education, and b) find out whether practitioners in the classroom support the ideas of theorists. Practitioners within pre-service faculties also may not be aware of, or may not agree with, what theorists propose or what teachers value. Out of this came the attempt at a comparative study.

In reviewing the literature, there were few studies that canvassed teacher viewpoints about teacher preparation in art. Chapman points to the dearth of studies involving art teachers in Instant Art, Instant Culture (1982p. 107). Her own study of teachers, reported in the same volume, while not dealing with teacher preparation, presented valuable guidance in terms of specificity of items. Most other studies pertinent to the intended focus and population (Schools Commission, 1983, Duck, 1985, Botsman, 1985) were very general, indicating broad areas of investigation, but not specific in terms of pre-service content or structure. Greer's study of "The Professional Preparation Needs of Art Teachers

in the State of Arkansas", (1979), while extremely specific in terms of items was only meant to evaluate existing teacher preparation programs in Arkansas. Results from the Greer study were descriptive of what art teachers thought was 'desirable' or 'undesirable' for preparation in terms of what was already offered in the State's pre-service programs, not what was proposed by theorists. Nevertheless, it provided a useful model for the present study and some comparisons are made between the results of the two studies in Chapter 4, where it is shown that several trends were supported between the populations surveyed. The most important contribution to the present study was Greer's rationale, which concurred with the rationale for the survey in Queensland: namely, that pre-service program designers must be aware of what teachers value in their preparation in order to 'design better programs' and effect a more collaborative effort. However, the use of the content of existing programs to formulate items on the survey was seen as rather limiting for the present study. There is some evidence that teachers teach as they themselves were taught in pre-service,

which Hammond (1981) calls "a self-perpetuating development" (p. 89). Hickey (1984) supports this as well when she claims "training in tertiary institutions has set the pattern both in content and methodology" (p. 59). In this case, it was crucial that some of the items refer to current theory beyond that which may provide the foundations for most existing programs.

With a more precise profile of art educator viewpoints, program designers will be able to ascertain how informed, receptive, or supportive practitioners may be to current theoretical views.

A brief overview of the literature concerning the Australian and Queensland situation led me to believe that the populations in my study may not value some of the current theoretical proposals. Many art education scholars work in a context outside Australia, and many scholars who work in Australia have obtained their degrees in art education overseas. Australia, and Queensland in particular, has a long history of importing key and influential personnel, curricula, and ideologies from elsewhere (Braben, 1982). It has been suggested that perhaps such wholesale importation is

counter-productive and inappropriate. Mason, in her article "Art teacher preparation in England, Australia, and the USA: some observations" cautions

I suspect, however, that English and Australian art educators are misguided if they assume that innovations in professional studies courses of the kind I have outlined in the USA, in themselves, necessarily guarantee improved art-teacher preparation. Indeed, I would argue that their tendency to borrow quasi-scientific and management metaphors and terminology from art-teacher education programmes in the USA is potentially destructive rather than constructive in the context of English or Australian systems of education (1983, p. 60).

It has even been suggested that the very fact that ideologies or innovations have been imported is the reason they are resisted. Mackrell documents this in his thesis "Changing and conflicting views of Art Education in the Context of Social and Political Forces", and states

Because for the most part Australians did not create it, they are not committed to it. Ideas

and values can be used but are mocked. The sceptism of the Bush tradition and the cynicism of the Digger tradition combine to create distrust ...(1981, p. 207).

If this is so, then Australian or Queensland art educators would not likely value external current theoretical thinking. This would seem to be supported by Hammond in his article 'Art Education Ideologies: current emphasis in Australia', in which he claims that theorists are "largely ignored by art educators in Australia" (1981, p. 88). It was thought that a survey of some art educators may substantiate these views, and help to locate specific areas of contention.

Recent, dramatic changes to the Queensland educational structure make secondary art educators' viewpoints concerning their preparation an unknown factor. Prior to 1976, preparatory college programs, syllabi, and classroom teachers' work programs were closely aligned because they were centrally legislated. Mackrell (1981, p. 171) suggests that "change, when it did occur, tended to come as a consequence of direction of central administrators and it was applied uniformly

throughout a state." Braben's 'Survey of Art Teacher Education in Queensland 1890-1976' (1982) also documents this, but explains how this process, and with it the close contacts and uniformity of view between art educators, was dissolved with the granting of autonomy for teacher education institutions in 1976. He concludes that

"with autonomy for institutions in the field of art education, and the relinquishing of bureaucratic control, art teacher education will almost certainly alter its concept" (1982, p. 62).

This autonomy does not necessarily indicate a divergence of art educators' viewpoints concerning teacher preparation, but, along with other factors, does not guarantee awareness of viewpoints between groups like the system of the past.

One other contributing factor which dissolved close contact between groups was the granting of more autonomy to secondary art educators. The state education system adopted first the Radford, then ROSBA structures (Review of School-Based Assessment (1976)). A major change under ROSBA for art educators was the shifting of responsibility for

writing art curriculum to the schools and the classroom teacher. These curriculum work programs were to be based on extremely broad government syllabi that could be interpreted with much flexibility by those who taught the courses. The newly altered role of the teacher as curriculum designer undoubtedly changed the needs of the secondary art educator and it is likely that what they thought would be valuable for pre-service would have altered as well. This much has already been generally ascertained in the recent, informal study by the Queensland Board of Teacher Education, "Education and the Arts: Identifying Research Needs" (Duck, 1985). How much agreement existed between the views of secondary art educators and tertiary art educators, and on what specific issues, was not established in that study. Furthermore, these two groups had not been canvassed concerning some of the current ideas proposed by art education scholars and researchers. Some indication of this information seemed prerequisite to offering recommendations for the future development of the major Queensland art pre-service program.

2. DEVELOPING THE SURVEY ITEMS FROM A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this section, the literature that determined the survey items will be briefly outlined. Laura Chapman's Instant Art, Instant Culture (1982) provided invaluable guidance for topics and was the major source for specific items, mainly because art teacher pre-service education is mentioned in considerable detail. Other sources often supported the ideas and recommendations made by Chapman. Australian art education research was gleaned for items as well, in particular the unpublished compilation of notes made by Geoff Hammond on 'Art Teacher Preparation' at a seminar held by the Australian Institute of Art Education in Perth in 1985. These notes represented recommendations and issues considered important by delegates from each State.

Three major aspects of art teacher pre-service programs appeared in the literature. First, there were the elements that were suggested for inclusion in a program - these were sometimes courses (i.e. 'sociology') or sometimes concepts (i.e. 'strategies for promoting the status of art in schools').

Second, there were items that related to the structure of the program, or the way in which the content or topics should be presented (i.e. 'that students have a breadth of knowledge in studio areas'). Third, there were some things identified as general or local controversies that related to either the course as a whole (i.e. 'that courses should be a minimum of 4 years' duration') or art teaching generally (i.e. funding of in-school art programs). For the sake of organisation, although some of the aspects overlap, these three divisions were made on the survey and will be addressed separately here.

'CONTENT OF COURSE' ITEMS

Content items were by far the most prolific in the literature. However, it was generally 'content' in terms of what should be taught in school curricula, but not necessarily in pre-service programs. Keeping in mind the underlying assumption that there is a connection between what is practised in schools and what is experienced in pre-service, recurring topics in the literature regarding both secondary and pre-service content were developed into survey items. The overview of content

presented in the diagram, "what should an art teacher know about art" outlined by Boughton in "How to Build an Art Teacher" (1986, p. 33), was developed concurrently with this survey, but correlates with most of the items in the survey. What follows is a brief outline of some of the sources for each item, along with rationales for inclusion where warranted:

A. Studio - The historical fine arts subjects of art education were included, that is drawing, painting, and sculpture, along with elective offerings found in the Queensland Senior Syllabus, such as jewellery, pottery, fibre arts, printmaking and leatherwork which could be loosely termed applied arts or crafts. These applied arts are proposed also by Richardson (1984), Chapman (1978) and others. Proponents of the study of newer media, notably Lanier (1984), Feldman (1976) and Jones (1980) prompted the inclusion of film, video, T.V and photography. Computer Art was added as "a medium for doing art projects ... to be considered in curriculum planning for the end of the twentieth century" (1982, p. 31). Commercial art was listed

in the Greer study and highlighted by Chapman in Approaches to Art in Education (1978).

B. Education Studies - As Greer's study showed, these are generally the 'constant' or required studies in teacher education institutions, often times housed within separate faculties. The Australian Schools Commission Reports, (1977, 1979, 1983) and the Queensland Review of Teacher Education, Bassett Report, 1978, concern themselves mostly with general aspects of pre-service. The same reports were also used with reference to some of the 'structure of course' items. The four areas of content included in the 'Education Studies' section of the survey were deemed 'essentials' in these reports.

C. Employment prospects and expectations of employers - Eisner (1972) considers knowledge about the structure and functioning of the school crucial to the neophyte teacher. The 1980 Australian Arts Council 'Parr Report' received many comments from art graduates who were now teachers that indicated 'employment prospects' was a necessary topic for pre-service.

D. Current changes in the educational system as a whole - The AIAE seminar notes (1985) included this as a valuable concept for pre-service, and it is given considerable attention by art educators such as Eisner.

Chapman states "Art teachers should also be aware of the forces - social, political and economic - which are shaping education at the federal, state and local level" (1982, p. 99).

E. Art Advocacy Role of the Art Educator -

i. relevance of art to society - This emphasis has been considered very important by scholars such as Hammond (1981), Mason (1983), McFee and Degge (1977).

ii. relevance of art to students in schools - Lanier (1972) and Feldman (1976) in particular suggest this as the starting point for effective school art activities. This was also on the AIAE seminar list of important issues.

iii. public relations - Chapman lists 'increasing' or 'enhancing public awareness of the arts' as one of her recommendations for improving art education (1982, p. 159-60) . Degge states:

Helping our art education students understand the importance and responsibility of establishing on-going and substantive talk with their students, parents, and administrators about what is being learned and its value seems a necessary step in altering the perceptions of others (1979, p. 178).

iv. Strategies for promoting the status of art in schools - Chapman spends a good deal of time outlining these specifically in Instant Art, Instant Culture (1982, p. 159).

F. Art teaching aids and resources - Chapman considers it "imperative...to employ teachers of art (who are) thoroughly familiar with resources for teaching art" (p. 42).

G. Evaluation of student art work - The 1978 Review of Teacher Education in Queensland recommends that "methods of evaluation should be taught functionally as well as formally." (p. iv) The Queensland Board of Secondary Schools Studies also saw this as a problem area, devoting time to produce an "Assessment in Art" booklet for distribution amongst secondary art educators.

H. Elements and Principles of Design - Studio practice, criticism and aesthetic theory often make reference to the 'formal properties' of art works. Study done by Clark (1975) showed that for at least ten years the majority of art education textbooks included the elements and principles of design as a major component.

I. Cultural differences in forms and functions of art: Many art educators, including Chalmers (1978), McFee and Degge (1977) and Hammond (1981) have suggested shifting the emphasis in art curriculum to one that is more anthropologically based. The particular wording for the survey item was chosen in case art educators were not familiar with terms such as 'cultural anthropology'.

J. Aesthetic theory - Lanier identifies 'Aesthetic literacy' as the "proper single purpose of art education" (1980, p.11). 'Aesthetics' is also mentioned in Duck's Report as a desired focus for art education in Queensland (1985, p. 7).

K. Art History - This item was included as one of the major disciplines of art education. The breakdown into chronological periods was loosely based on the chronological structure of many pre-

service art history courses, as commented on by Hickey in 'Some recent approaches to teaching art history and criticism in schools' (1984, p. 58-65). 'Architecture' was listed as a separate item within art history as it has received renewed emphasis in curriculums that are based on 'environment'. Proponents of this would be Chalmers (1978), Adams, and Ward (1982).

L. Philosophy of Art - This item was included as some scholars (Efland (1978), for instance) take a philosophical approach to studying art education.

M. Knowledge and study of Art Education Theory - Chapman makes the claim that "As a professional group, art educators are probably less receptive to theory and research than most educators" (1982, p. 102). The item was included to seek some affirmation of this.

N. Art Curriculum/Program Planning - These areas are considered important in many art education texts, (i.e. Eisner (1971); Hardiman and Zernich (1974) and others). Chapman sums up the importance by saying "Curriculum development - planning an art program - is an area of study that can help teachers to integrate their knowledge about art, about

students and other information derived from their coursework in education" (1982, p. 97).

O. Integration of Art with Other Subjects -

There is some controversy between scholars on this point. While scholars such as Lewis (1976) support integration between the arts, Lanier would discourage it. Eisner has suggested that some art educators consider art objectives in the wider context of general education - he refers to this as a 'contextualist' viewpoint (1971). Hammond goes so far as to link rigid 'stratification of subjects' with art education's weakened status in schools (1981, p. 90).

P. Current Research - This item was included as a 'null' item, as many scholars and researchers question the valuing of research by those at the classroom level; Eisner, in 'Can educational research inform education practice?' (1983) suggests that it is 'good ideas' and not current research that is valued by practitioners. This seems to be generally supported (Day and DiBlasio, 1983, Chapman, 1982). Although the latter generally defend research, they acknowledge that teachers may remain skeptical of its value.

Q. Liberal Education - Hiller (1984) claims that many pre-service art educators "have insufficient academic rigor" in to cope with important concepts in their program, and suggests that a wide-ranging liberal education is needed to accomplish this.

`STRUCTURE OF COURSE' ITEMS

In an attempt to keep the number of items for the entire survey manageable, the `structure of course' questions were confined to those considered `key' for profiling viewpoints. Questions were set in pairs in order to show if any polarization of the population occurred. For example, Items A and B ask respondents how important they consider `breadth' of studio experience or `depth' of studio experience in pre-service. Similarly, items K and L identify what things are considered important involvements for `Lecturers' and `Teachers'. Some of the sources for the Items and rationales for inclusion follow:

A and B. `Breadth' and `Depth' of studio experience - There has been some controversy about the type of studio experience necessary for pre-service. Chapman (1982) criticizes the `narrowness of scope' of `depth programs', as does Hiller, who

advocates 'giving students an adequate breadth of studio experience to cope with the variety of demands expected of art teachers in the secondary school' (1985., p. 59).

C. Integration of different aspects of art within studio courses - Lovano-Kerr, in particular, highlights this concept in her article 'Implications of DBAE for Teacher Education' (1985, p. 220). This concept is also supported, interestingly enough, by some of those who emphasize the 'studio model' in pre-service, notably Michael (1980) and Schultz (1980).

D. Art curriculum as a part of studio courses - Chapman (1982, p. 91) implies that methods courses (referred to as curriculum courses in Queensland) are often 'at odds' with studio courses in terms of the value and type of activities. This may be a result of a lack of integration of curricular concerns within the studio area as well as a focus on activities of a different nature within the method courses. While Chapman does not directly advocate integration, it was felt that the inclusion of such an item would be valuable.

E. Separate, thorough grounding in different aspects of art - Chapman claims that "in programs that prepare teachers, studio courses may not be balanced with in-depth studies in the history of art or art theory" (p. 90). She therefore appears to advocate separate thorough grounding in these aspects of art.

F. Involvement in content and media relevant to school circumstances - This item was gleaned from the AIAE seminar notes on art pre-service issues. Also, the Duck study (1985) states that "the applicability of their [some college staff] courses to the classroom teaching situation was reported to be doubtful in some instances" (p. 17).

G. Involvement in content and media for their own personal development - The 'artist' model of training, which is under considerable debate currently, is still the predominant emphasis in art pre-service programs in Australia (Hickey, 1984). Chapman views this image of 'teacher - as artist' as 'troublesome' (1982, p. 89). However, the latest Review of Arts Education and Training or Botsman Report, (1985), strongly states "until teachers are trained to a similar degree of competence in the art

form taught to that expected of the professional artist, little progress will be made" (p. 105). Such a dichotomy in points-of-view was considered significant, and as well as forming the basis for this survey item, this dichotomy was formulated into a statement of controversy in Part C of the survey.

H. Practice teaching - These items were mainly gleaned from the models recommended in the Schools Commission Report, 1979. The first item regarding practica at all levels of schooling incorporated views from Chapman (1982) who proposed that such experience would help establish a long-term perspective on art curriculum. The Duck report (1985) also cites some teachers who were dissatisfied with having graduated from pre-service without experiencing art classes at all grade levels.

I. That lecturers have school teaching experience - This item was included as an item in the AIAE seminar notes (1985), as well as the Duck Report, (1985) which stated "there was considerable comment that some college positions were occupied by people with inappropriate training or employment backgrounds" (p. 17).

J. That lecturers be involved in teaching children on a regular basis - The Schools Commission report recommends that "the staff of training institutions should teach for, say, at least a term every three years on a full-time basis" (1979, p. 13). The Duck study reports that "it was argued that college lecturers should ...secure temporary secondments to teaching positions in order to maintain a realistic appreciation of the school teaching process" (p. 19).

K. That lecturers maintain involvements - in art practice, art education issues, arts organizations, schools, obtaining further qualifications. Although not directly related to course structure, the various items listed under this heading were formulated as a result of one of the topics included in the Duck Report which introduced this section by stating "The nature of lecturing staff employed by teacher education institutions was also a matter frequently raised in discussions" (p. 17). "Art practice" was added as a result of the Chapman "Teacher Viewpoint" study (1982) which showed that a majority of teachers felt it was valuable for teachers of art to be practising

artists, although it must be noted that Chapman would seem to be at variance with this (p. 89-91), as are some Australian scholars (Boughton (1986), Hiller, (1984)). It should also be noted that, due to an omission at the printery, "in-service" was not included in this section of the survey.

L. That Art teachers maintain involvements - in art, art education issues, art pre-service programs, arts organizations, obtaining further qualifications, liaison with other school art programs, in-service programs. These items are similar to those set for lecturers in an attempt to determine variance. "Liaison with other schools" was added as a result of the Duck survey, but is also a recommendation in Chapman (1982, p. 152).

PART C

Part C of the survey incorporated issues or statements concerning issues that had been identified as general or local controversies. These issues related to the pre-service course as a whole or art teaching generally. They are outlined as follows:

A. "In Art teacher pre-service training programs, art subject courses should be given more

emphasis than education courses."

The topic of the proportional emphasis of courses within pre-service has been controversial in Queensland. At present the balance of art courses is near 33%, education courses near 30%, practicum 18%. In their 1982 policy statement, the Queensland Art Teachers' Association suggested that the balance for art courses should be 50%.

B. "Art teacher pre-service training courses should be a minimum of 4 years duration". The AIAE seminar recommended an increase to at least 4 years for teacher preparation in art. Currently, the diploma of teaching in art is 3 years in Queensland.

C. "Art courses that develop individual and personal expression should be given more emphasis than art curriculum courses." This item was included because a historical trend in art pre-service education courses of the past twenty years, as outlined by Eisner (1972) and Chapman (1978), has been towards teachers developing personal expertise in art. Chapman acknowledges this also in her 1982 publication (p. 101, 102).

Items D. and E. Primary Art Education Items
- Although the survey was intended for secondary and

tertiary art educators, there was evidence in the literature of 'blame-laying' (Botsman 1985, p. 104) or suggestions that these two groups were dissatisfied with the primary situation in art. The Duck study concentrated mostly on primary arts education, (1985). Two general items considered 'key' issues were selected for the survey. They are as follows:

D. "Every region should have a specialist art teacher assigned to its primary schools with expertise in Primary Art Education". The Duck report states, "The provision of Specialist support to teachers in Primary schools was generally considered one of the best ways of achieving [upgrading in the arts areas in schools]" (p. 10).

E. "Primary and early childhood pre-service programs should include at least one:

- (i) personal development art course
- (ii) art curriculum course"

This item was formulated so as to be similar in content to issues for secondary teachers. The Duck report lists as a criticism of primary pre-service that "attention is focused on the development of personal skills, rather than teaching competencies"

(p. 15). Elsewhere in the report, however, practical competence and confidence are listed as problems (p. 6).

Items F. and G. Queensland art pre-service program items. In Queensland, and in other States in Australia, art teacher pre-service education involves some aspects of programming that are different from those in North American models. The following two items have direct application to the Australian situation, and thus were included in the survey.

F. "In 3 year pre-service programs, a double-art option should be available as well as an art Primary Teaching Area and other subject Second Teaching Area." One of the opinions expressed during Duck's investigation was that the second area of specialization be done away with in the arts. Currently, in the major Queensland pre-service program, students must spend 19% of their course time in a second teaching area, such as English or Math. The suggestion was made that the arts were complex enough to warrant the entire time within a pre-service program be spent in the one area (Duck, 1985, p. 16).

G. "Art teachers graduating from an end-on preparation program are better equipped to teach the subject than 3 year trained concurrent graduates." Braben (1982) outlines the nature of the two types of pre-service programs in his "Historical Context of Art Teaching in Queensland". The 'end-on' program is a one-year course of art teacher education added on to a 3 year diploma or degree in professional art studies. The 'concurrent' program is a 3 year program of studies involving art, art education, education, and second teaching area coursework simultaneously. Hickey maintained that "both methods produce a quality product and cater respectively to the specializations of different individuals" (1985, p. 58). Hiller, in particular, refutes this - "End-on one year diploma courses are unsatisfactory because of the time constraint" (1984, p.38).

H. "Adequate resources for regular in-school art programs have greater priority than the maintenance/establishment of community services in art." Part of the discussion during the Australian Institute of Art Education Seminar on Art Teacher Preparation (Perth, 1985) centred around the

priorities of funding for art education. A recommendation was made by several delegates that in-school art programs should have greater priority than community arts services. There was considerable controversy surrounding this issue.

I. "It is essential that a prospective art teacher be able to articulate why it is important to teach art and be able to offer reasons for the amount and kind of attention given to activities in the art program." Chapman in Instant Art, Instant Culture states "The prospective teacher should be able to identify what students should be asked to perceive, judge and create, and be able to offer good reasons for the amount and kind of attention given to various aims and content" (p. 97). This statement was adapted to include rationales (i.e. 'why it is important to teach art') as well as activities, as these have been seen as recurring needs in the literature. As Hiller says

"A review of rationale is certainly necessary but what seems to me to be of greater priority is the development of an ability amongst our teachers to design programmes and teach with a specific rationale in mind" (1984, p. 38).

CHAPTER 3

CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

This study presents descriptive data from a survey-questionnaire on areas of content and types of structures that are considered important in secondary art teacher pre-service programs. Two groups were surveyed: pre-service Australian tertiary art educators and Queensland secondary art educators. The survey instrument was developed as a result of a literature search that identified proposals of basic and desirable components for art pre-service programs made by art education scholars and researchers. The responses to items have been treated comparatively within and between the two respondent groups in order to locate areas of agreement and difference. The purpose is to be deliberative in order to make informed proposals for the development and improvement of art teacher pre-service education with a minimum of criticism of present circumstances. The two major references for the data-gathering technique and procedures were Good's Essentials of Educational Research (1972) and Borg and Gall's Educational Research: An Introduction (5th edition, 1984). As well, the

design of the survey was patterned after two other studies conducted in the United States and Australia, namely, "A study of the professional preparation needs of art teachers in the state of Arkansas" (Greer, 1979) and The Parr Report (Australian Arts Council, 1980).

SURVEY ITEMS

One source for items was a seminar on "Art Teacher Preparation" held at the Australian Institute of Art Education's Annual Conference held in Perth in May, 1985. Other sources included published and unpublished art education scholarship, as outlined fully in Chapter 2.

Items were grouped into 4 separate sections - Part A (Personal Data), Part B (Views on Art Teacher Pre-Service Preparation), Part C (which solicited opinions on controversial statements) and Part D (Professional Association Questions). In Part B items were also subdivided according to 2 general topics - Content of Course, and Structure of Course. Several items seemed best subdivided even further - for example, the various studio areas of art, the

breakdown of periods of art history, and other subject groupings.

The survey deals with course and program content generally (44 items), and includes 12 items dealing with structures and proportions of content in pre-service programs. An additional 15 items concern the professional involvements of art educators.

A 5 point Likert scale was used. In this respect it was patterned after the Parr Report commissioned by the Australian Arts Council in 1980. By using a 5 point scale, respondents prioritized items as 'highly valued' to 'not valued at all'. In Part B the naming was 'great deal of emphasis' to 'little or none' and 'very important' to 'not important at all'. In Part C the scale was named 'strongly agreed' to 'strongly disagree', with the mid-point of the scale for this section of the survey named 'no opinion'.

The letter of transmittal introducing the questionnaire was adapted from the letter of transmittal used in the Australian Arts Council Parr Report, Tertiary Visual Arts (1980).

The survey instrument was piloted and revised with the assistance of eight of the Queensland Art Teachers' Association (QATA) Executive members. Five were secondary art educators, two were Department of Education Art Officers, and one a tertiary lecturer in art education. Confusing items, omissions, and irrelevant material were altered, and the final editing was supervised by another tertiary lecturer in Art Education.

The revised survey was distributed via several agencies. One hundred and fifty were sent to QATA members via the Association newsletter with pre-addressed, stamped envelopes. A further fifty were sent with a Board of Secondary School Studies (B.S.S.S.) in-service art member, on her visits to regional teacher groups throughout the State. This latter avenue for distribution was seen as an advantage as this teacher group represents secondary art teachers generally and not just QATA members. As QATA members include primary, secondary, and tertiary art teachers, the instrument included a section for personal data of a descriptive nature to identify the teaching level and experience of each respondent. In this way it was possible to separate

the population into the groups involved in this study. The total number of returns was 53 by these two means, 4 tertiary art educators, and 49 secondary.

As well, the survey was distributed through the Australian Institute of Art Education Newsletter in December, 1985. Since the membership of this professional association is mostly tertiary art educators, it was hoped that the majority of returns would be in this group. Of the 17 returns, 12 were tertiary art educators. The total number of returns for each population via all these means was:
Queensland secondary art educators - 49, Tertiary art educators - 16.

LIMITATIONS OF THE SURVEY

1. Timing

The QATA newsletter that contained the survey-questionnaire was sent out very near to the end of the academic year. This was considered a disadvantage by the researcher, as teachers would be involved in final reporting. However, the editor of the newsletter had space for the questionnaire in that particular issue. It was decided to publish it, as without the professional association's

assistance with printing and mailing the survey would not have received a wide circulation in the State.

The AIAE newsletter was also circulated very near to the end of the year. Since the tertiary institutions do not have an extended vacation, this was not considered a factor at the time. In retrospect, however, due to the small number of returns, timing might have been a factor after all. The Board of Secondary School Studies art member, had some difficulties in circulating the questionnaire also. The teachers' meetings scheduled were part of a moderation process involving student art work and in the past had allowed teachers the day free, with plenty of time in which the survey could be done. However, this format was changed, and art teachers were required to spend the day at their schools, dropping student work off and collecting it at the end of the day. Nevertheless, 13 teachers took time to complete a questionnaire.

2. Follow-up procedures

A visual 'ad' was placed on the back cover of the February QATA newsletter (see Appendix C) and a

reminder sent out via the AIAE newsletter. Only one more response was forthcoming. After an initial compilation of data and consultation with the computing staff at the Brisbane College of Advanced Education, it was apparent that the number of results was sufficient to give the information needed. No further follow-up was attempted.

3. Limitations of the survey-questionnaire method of data collection

This method of data collection cannot be guaranteed to determine what lecturers or teachers really believe or practice, but assuming that people who voluntarily respond to such surveys are answering truthfully, the data can be assumed to approximate their views on the subjects surveyed. Due to the nature of the distribution, the anonymity of individuals made individual follow-up impossible, and the number of returns was dependant on the willingness of people to respond. However, since the intention of the survey was to use results descriptively, and not to make inferences for the entire population, the proportion of returns was considered adequate. The tertiary population was,

in particular, a statistically small sample and this has been kept in mind when analyzing the results.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

All responses to items were entered onto a computer program as numerical 'blocks' - each survey was numbered and each item response was numbered. Personal data boxes were also numbered, and items such as "how many years as an art teacher do you have?" which required a written response, were given numerical equivalents on a Master survey sheet. The program allowed for one or two variable analyses in order to compare responses within groups, between groups, or between items. Handwritten responses to sections marked "other" were collated by hand. The final section of the survey (Part D) was not analyzed for this study, but was included on the survey for the collection of information by the Queensland Art Teachers' Association.

Responses from the data listed as 'tertiary' were printed out first as raw scores for each item and as positions on the Likert scale, then as a percentage. The mean was also calculated. This procedure was then repeated using the response variable 'secondary'. Each group of printouts was

viewed separately to locate items with a strong measure of agreement or difference, as indicated by the modal response. Next, each item was compared between the printouts of 'tertiary' and 'secondary' to locate those items of agreement and difference between groups by comparing mean responses between groups. No statistical computations of variance are recorded. Although 'z' tests were computed on items showing variance, it was felt that for the descriptive purposes of this study, tests of variance and 'z' were not required. The complete tables with mean and mode computations are found in Appendix I.

DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATIONS

Secondary: Of the 49 secondary respondents, 16 graduated with an end-on graduate diploma in teaching (33%), 31 graduated with a concurrent diploma of teaching (63%), and two (5%) responded 'other' (unspecified). These percentages generally reflect the proportion of intake for the program options; quotas for end-on are 15 per year and quotas for concurrent are 30 per year. All but four of the secondary respondents were educated in Queensland. Almost one-half of the group (47%) have

been teaching art for 6-9 years, with 18% having two to five years experience, 16% having between 10 and 20 years experience, and 10% having over 20 years experience. 29 of the 49 secondary art educators (59%) were 'heads of department' for art in their schools. School art department size varied. One-half (51%) were in departments of two to three members, 8% were in single-member departments, 15% were in departments of between four and six members, and 8% had over six members in their department.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the populations is that 59% of respondents were 'heads of departments'. This may be due to the fact that most teachers in attendance at the moderation meetings, one of the avenues via which the surveys were distributed, would have likely been heads of departments. The general mailing of the professional association newsletters also includes those addressed to 'The Art Department' of schools and it is likely that heads of departments would receive the copy.

Tertiary: Of the 16 tertiary respondents, six held Diplomas of Teaching, three held a Bachelor of Education degree and seven had a graduate degree,

either at the Master's or Doctorate level. Five in the group graduated from an end-on program, seven from a concurrent program, and four responded 'other'. While two of these latter were unspecified, one respondent had handwritten 'Art Teacher's Certificate, it was a long time ago.' and the other responded 'A.T.C.' Two of the 16 respondents received their initial qualification in Queensland, 11 in 'other states' and three responded 'other country'. The majority of tertiary respondents (10) had over 20 years of art teaching experience, with three having between 10 and 20 years experience, two having between six and nine years, and one respondent having four years experience. One-half, or eight of the group were 'heads of department'. The size of art department varied considerably. One respondent was a single-member department, two had two to three member departments, seven had four to six member departments, three had six to fifteen member departments, and three were in Departments of over fifteen. It is likely from this that the profile of institutions within which the respondents work would

be very diverse as well although further details on institutions were not solicited in the survey.

SUMMARY

The format of the survey instrument was modelled after two previous studies (Greer, 1979) and (Parr, 1980). Items were drawn up from art education literature as outlined in detail in Chapter 2.

The instrument was then subjected to a pilot group for suggestions. A session was conducted at the October, 1985 meeting of the Executive of the Queensland Art Teachers' Association at which nine members were in attendance. The pilot group represented two tertiary art educators, two art officers of the Queensland Department of Education and five secondary art educators. The survey-questionnaire was then refined by clarifying confusing items, rewording, and omitting material irrelevant to the study. The revised instrument was then sent out in the form of a questionnaire via two professional association newsletters and to an art moderation meeting. There were a total of 71 responses, of which 65 were the desired population. Of these, 49 were secondary art educators and 16

tertiary. The results were collated on a computer program in these two groups, and items compared numerically within and between groups to measure agreement and differences on items.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS OF THE STUDY

CONCLUSIONS

The following summaries address the questions raised in Chapter One.

1. What do selected art education scholars perceive as valuable content and experiences in art teacher pre-service education?

This question formed the basis of the survey instrument items which were detailed in Chapter Two. After the following summary of the results of the survey-questionnaire, some comments will be made concerning these findings in the light of what scholars and researchers have proposed for art teacher pre-service education. (Refer to the section entitled 'Discussion of the findings' p.71).

2. What do Queensland teachers of art perceive as valuable content and experiences in art pre-service preparation?

It would appear that the secondary art educators who responded to the survey considered most items on the questionnaire to be 'of value', as

only six items out of 69 listed under 'Content' and 'Structure' had average responses on the less valued end of the Likert Scale. Those items with a mean response between 1 and 2 on the scale were considered to be the most valued by respondents. (Refer to Tables 1 and 2). (N.B. All items are rank-ordered in Appendix II.)

The highest ranked 'Content' items according to mean response represent a broad, albeit conventional, coverage of topics for art teacher education. Items in this list can be classified as fine art studio areas, art history, art curriculum, art methods and advocacy for art in schools. Absent from the most valued list are aesthetic theory, philosophy, newer media and craft studio areas, and topics that could generally be classified as liberal education, such as 'architecture', 'psychology', 'sociology', 'integration of subjects', and the item 'liberal education' itself.

Of the 17 highest ranked 'Structure' items (according to mean response), 11 concerned the nature and involvements of the lecturing and teaching staff as opposed to the program itself. This indicates that the secondary respondents take

the respective roles of these groups very seriously and have established some consensus concerning their involvements. It is also noteworthy however, that of these 11 items seven concerned the involvements of lecturing staff, while only four concerned the involvements of their own group, secondary teachers.

In Part C of the survey, secondary respondents valued the final item most highly which refers to the articulation and knowledge of art education rationales, goals and activities. Three items concerning primary art education and primary teacher education were also highly rated. Secondary respondents 'agreed' that there should be a 'double-art option' in the pre-service program, that art subject courses should be given priority over education courses, and resources for art in school should be given priority over community arts funding.

TABLE 1
QUEENSLAND SECONDARY ART EDUCATORS:
RANK ORDER ACCORDING TO MEAN RESPONSE -
1-2 ON LIKERT SCALE
CONTENT OF COURSE

Amount of Emphasis		<u>CONTENT OF COURSE</u>				
1	2	3	4	5		
GREAT DEAL				LITTLE OR NONE		
Mean Response Category		Item #	Descriptor			
1.2		A(i)	Drawing (Studio)			
		B(iv)	Art Curriculum			
		G	Assessment & Evaluation of Student Work			
1.3		E(ii)	Relevance of Art to Students in Schools			
1.4		A(ii)	Painting (Studio)			
		E(i)	Relevance of Art to Society			
1.5		B(iii)	Teaching Process (Ed. Studies)			
		K(iii)	Contemporary Art (current)(art history)			
		K(iv)	Australian Art History			
		N	Knowledge of and Practice in Art Education Curriculum.			
1.7		E(iv)	Strategies for promoting the status of art in schools			
		F	Study and awareness of art teaching aids and resources			
		H	Elements and principles of design			
		K(ii)	Modern Art History (1900-1980)			
		M	Knowledge of and study of art education theory			
2		A(iii)	Sculpture (studio)			
		A(iv)	Pottery (studio)			
		A(vi)	Printmaking (studio)			
		K(v)	Aboriginal Art History			

TABLE 2
SECONDARY ART EDUCATORS
RANK ORDER ACCORDING TO MEAN RESPONSE -
1-2 ON LIKERT SCALE
STRUCTURE OF COURSE

1 VERY IMPORTANT	2	3	4	5 NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL
Mean Response Category		Item #	Descriptor	
1.1		L(iv)	Lecturers maintain involvement in schools	
1.3		I(ii)	Lecturers in other than studio courses have school teaching experience.	
		L(i)	Teachers maintain involvement in art.	
1.5		A	Breadth of knowledge in studio areas.	
		C	Integration of aspects of art with in studio courses	
		L(vi)	Teachers maintain liaison with other school art programs	
		L(vii)	Teachers maintain involvement with in-service programmes	
1.6		H(i)	Practice teaching at jr/sr levels of program	
		I(i)	Lecturers in studio areas have school teaching experience	
		K(ii)	Lecturers maintain involvement in art education issues.	
		L(ii)	Teachers maintain involvement in art education issues.	
1.7		K(i)	Lecturers maintain involvement in art practice.	
		K(iii)	Lecturers maintain involvement in arts organizations.	
1.8		B.	Depth of knowledge in some studio areas.	
		F	Involvement in content and media relevant to school circumstances.	
		H(iv)	Practice teaching more than once a year.	
1.9		J.	Lecturers be involved in teaching children on regular basis.	

The close clustering of majority responses within both 'content' and 'structure' items made it possible to 'profile' views on various topics. For example, within the content topic "studio areas", there appears to be a definite hierarchy of importance, according to the responses. While "drawing" and "painting" rated a 'great deal' of emphasis from the majority (88% and 65% respectively), the mean and mode response category dropped consistently to items such as 'jewellery', 'leatherwork', 'media' and 'computer art'. Respondents considered these areas worthy of 'moderate' or 'limited' emphasis. Similarly, 'art curriculum' ranks highest in 'Educational Studies', and 'contemporary' and 'Australian' art history rank highest in the 'Knowledge of Art History' topic within the content section.

Secondary art educators rated teaching 'at jr/sr levels of a program' and 'more than once a year' much more highly than 'short but regular times' and 'at primary/jr/sr levels of a program' in the 'Practice Teaching' topic within the structure section.

The six items where the mean fell on the 'less valued' end of the Likert scale are listed in Table

3.

TABLE 3
QUEENSLAND SECONDARY ART EDUCATORS.
RANK ORDER ACCORDING TO MEAN RESPONSE
3-5 ON LIKERT SCALE

<u>CONTENT OF COURSE:</u>		<u>AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS</u>		
1	2	3	4	5
GREAT DEAL				LITTLE OR NONE
Mean Response Category		Item #	Descriptor	
3.2		A(vii)	Studio area of art: jewellery	
3.2		A(xii)	Studio area of art: computer art	
3.6		A(viii)	Studio area of art: leatherwork	
<u>STRUCTURE OF COURSE</u>				
1	2	3	4	5
VERY IMPORTANT				NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL
Mean Response Category		Item #	Descriptor	
3.1		K(v)	Lecturers maintain involvement in obtaining further qualifications	
3.2		H(iii)	Practice Teaching for short but regular times	
3.4		H(i)	Practice Teaching: at all levels of a program: primary/jr./sr.	

COMPARISONS WITH THE GREER STUDY

While the structures of the two studies are not identical there are commonalities in the findings of each study with respect to the valuing of studio preferences, curriculum and methods, and practice teaching.

Those items of studio content rating the highest response mean (drawing, painting, sculpture, pottery and printmaking) are remarkably consistent with those rating the highest percentage of 'desirable' responses in the Greer Study (1979).

"The six items receiving the greatest percentage of desirable responses were: (1) pencil, charcoal, ink and drybrush techniques, (2.5) watercolour painting techniques, (2.5) clay sculpture techniques, (4) outdoor drawing, (5.5) still life drawing, and (5.5) linoleum block and wood block printing". (p. 78)

Within the Educational Studies items, art curriculum rated a high mean. This, too, is consistent with the Greer Study, where four of the top eight items in 'art methods' dealt with curriculum. Another of these eight top items in the 'methods' section of Greer's Study was "(3) Methods

of evaluating the students' work" (p. 87) which ranked amongst the three "most valued" items on the Queensland survey.

In terms of practice teaching, the two studies can be compared in that in-service educators seem to value longer practice teaching sessions for pre-service students. Where the two populations did not agree was on the value of practice teaching 'at all levels'. In the Arkansas group 'Student teaching was recommended at all levels by a majority [sic] in-service art teachers, including the elementary, middle school, junior high, and high school' (p. 103). The Queensland group did not favour practice teaching at 'primary/junior/senior', as displayed by the mean category of 3.4, or 'limited importance'.

3. What content and experiences do tertiary art educators perceive as valuable for art teacher pre-service education?

As with the group of secondary respondents, the tertiary respondents valued most items of the survey for art teacher pre-service programs. Only 5 items out of 69 had a mean response category of 3 or lower, that is, on the 'less valued' end of the

Likert scale. Those items with a mean response between 1 and 2 on the scale were considered most valued and follow in rank order in Tables 4 and 5. (N.B. All items are rank-ordered for tertiary respondents in Appendix III).

TABLE 4
TERTIARY ART EDUCATORS:
RANK ORDER ACCORDING TO MEAN RESPONSE
1-2 ON LIKERT SCALE
CONTENT OF COURSE

1 GREAT DEAL	2	3	4	5 LITTLE OR NONE
Mean Response Category	Item #	Descriptor		
1.1	A(i)	Drawing (Studio)		
1.2	A(ii)	Painting (Studio)		
	B(iv)	Art Curriculum		
1.3	N	Knowledge of and practice in art curriculum and program planning		
1.4	E(i)	Relevance of art to society		
	E(ii)	Relevance of art to students in schools		
	K(iii)	Contemporary (current) art history		
	K(iv)	Australian art history		
	M	Knowledge and study of art education theory		
1.6	B(ii)	Teaching process (Ed. studies)		
	E(iv)	Strategies for promoting the status of art in schools		
	K(ii)	Modern art history (1900- 1980)		
1.7	D	Influence of current changes in the Ed. system		
	F	Study and awareness of art teaching aids and resources		
	G	Assessment and evaluation of studio art work		
1.8	I	Understanding of cultural differences in forms and functions of art		
1.9		Public relations with the community		
		Aboriginal art history		
2		Philosophy of art		

TABLE 5
TERTIARY ART EDUCATORS
RANK ORDER ACCORDING TO MEAN RESPONSE
1-2 ON LIKERT SCALE
STRUCTURE OF COURSE

1 VERY IMPORTANT	2	3	4	5 NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL
Mean Response Category		Item #	Descriptor	
1.2		L(ii)	Teachers maintain involvement in art education issues	
1.3		H(i)	Practice teaching at (jr/sr) levels of a program	
		L(vii)	Teachers maintain involvement in in-service programs	
1.5		L(i)	Teachers maintain involvement in art	
		L(iv)	Teachers maintain involvement in arts organizations	
1.6		B	Depth of knowledge in studio areas	
		C	Integration of different aspects of art within studio areas.	
		K(ii)	Lecturers maintain involvement in art education issues	
		L(vi)	Teachers maintain liaisons with other school art programs	
1.7		I(i)	Lecturers in studio have school teaching experience	
		I(ii)	Lecturers in other courses have teaching experience	
		K(iii)	Lecturers maintain involvements in arts organizations	
		L(iii)	Teachers maintain involvement in art pre-service programs	
1.8		F	Involvement in content and media relevant to school circumstances	
1.9		E	Separate, thorough grounding in different aspects of art	
		G	Involvement in content and media for students own personal development	
		A	Breadth of knowledge in studio areas	
2		K(i)	Lecturers maintain involvement in art practice.	

The pattern of most-valued items is similar to the list of secondary responses, in that a broad and fairly conventional representation of aspects of teacher education is evident. In addition, however, within 'Content' items are two relatively unconventional items not found on the secondary most-valued list - 'understanding cultural differences in forms and functions of art', and 'philosophy of art'. Other items can be classified as fine arts studio areas, art history, art curriculum and methods, and advocacy. In the section 'Structure of Course', 11 out of 18 items on the most valued list (Table 5) concerned the involvements of tertiary and secondary staff. Of these 11 items concerning art educators' involvements, six relate to secondary teachers and five to tertiary art educators.

The six items that did not apply to art educators included the following noteworthy items: both that there be an 'integration of different aspects of art within studio areas' and also that there be a 'separate, thorough grounding in different aspects of art'. Both these items included a bracketed explanation of the 'aspects'

referred to - (i.e. Art history, Aesthetics, Materials and processes). Tertiary educators also rated highly involvements in studio areas 'in depth', 'for students own personal development', 'relevant to school circumstances' and 'with breadth'. It would appear that respondents hold a broad view of the purposes of the studio component of art pre-service education as well as place considerable importance on it.

PART C. There was a strong degree of agreement on four items in this section. These concerned the articulation of art education rationales, goals and activities, and primary art education. There was, as well, considerable agreement on 3 other items. 69% of the tertiary art educator respondents 'strongly agreed' that 'art teacher pre-service....should be a minimum of 4 years duration, 56% of respondents 'strongly agreed' that 'a double art option should be available as well as a principle teaching area and other-subject second teaching area' and 'adequate resources for regular in-service art programs have greater priority than community services in art'. In the first of these two items, however, 25% of the respondents had 'no

opinion', although no one 'disagreed'. It is fairly clear from the data that the responding tertiary art educators are in agreement on most of the 'controversial' items listed in the survey, as within most items there were response categories with high percentage modes and an accompanying number of categories where there were no responses.

4. What measure of agreement exists within groups and between groups in terms of a) content and b) experiences for art teacher pre-service education?

SECONDARY ART EDUCATOR RESPONDENTS

The results of the survey showed evidence of substantial agreement on most items between the respondents in this group. The data showed that 51 of the 79 items in Part B and C of the survey had a response category with a mode of 50% or larger. In fact, 76 out of 79 items had over a 50% response rate within one category of the mode, either to its right or left.

Within the group of secondary art educators, there were nine items that had a mode category which rated a response of over 75%. These items were considered

the areas of most agreement within the group and are listed in Table 6.

Items whose mode ranked highly in terms of percentage tended to be those that were 'most valued' or whose response category was towards the highly valued end of the Likert Scale. This is not to say that all items with a category whose response mode was 50% or larger fell under 'strongly agree', 'very important', or 'great deal of emphasis', but that there were few that were not. 50% of secondary respondents rated the studio areas of 'fibre arts' and 'leatherwork' as 'moderately important'.

However, these were the only 2 items with a mode category as low as '3' on the scale. What the high modal percentages indicates is a high degree of consensus with the group, especially on the items most valued for art pre-service education.

TABLE 6
SECONDARY ART EDUCATOR GROUP:
ITEMS INDICATING STRONGEST AGREEMENT WITHIN GROUP ACCORDING TO
HIGH MODAL RESPONSES

Item #	Descriptor	Mode %	Mode Response Category
<u>PART B CONTENT OF COURSE</u>			
A(i)	Studio area of art: drawing	88%	1 great deal of emphasis
B(iv)	Education studies: art curriculum	86%	1 great deal of emphasis
E(ii)	art advocacy: relevance of art to students in schools	76%	1 great deal of emphasis
G.	Assessment and evaluation of pupils' work in art	84%	1 great deal of emphasis
<u>STRUCTURE OF COURSE</u>			
H(i)	Practice Teaching: at all levels of a program (jr./sr.)	76%	1 very important
I(ii)	Lecturers in pre-service courses have had school teaching experience: lecturers in other course areas than studio	82%	1 very important
K(iv)	Lecturers in pre-service programs maintain involvement in schools	88%	1 very important
L(i)	Art teachers in schools maintain awareness of and involvement in art	76%	1 very important
<u>PART C STATEMENTS</u>			
D.	Every region should have a specialist assigned to its primary schools with expertise in Primary Art Education	82%	1 strongly agree
I	It is essential that a prospective art teacher to be able to articulate why it is important to teach art and be able to offer reasons for the amount and kind of attention given to activities in the art program.	88%	1 strongly agree

TERTIARY ART EDUCATOR RESPONDENTS

Tertiary art educators showed considerable agreement within the group on a majority of items. Forty-three of the 79 items in Parts B and C of the survey had a response category with a mode of 50% or larger. Seventy-four out of 79 items had a response rate of over 50% within one category of the mode, either to its right or left. The 10 items with a mode category which rated a response of 75% or larger were considered the areas of most agreement within the group. These are listed in Table 7.

The category in which these high percentage modes occur is 'great deal of emphasis', 'very important' or 'strongly agree'. This indicates that greatest consensus is to be found on the aspects of art pre-service education most valued by tertiary respondents.

Altogether, 10 items had a mode category of 3 on the scale and 3 items had a mode category on the 'less valued' end of the scale, but of these 13, only 4 items had a mode category whose response rate was 50% or larger. This indicates that the most agreement within the group is on those things most valued for pre-service. However, in 'studio areas

of art', 69% of respondents felt 'pottery', 62% of respondents felt 'printmaking' and 56% of respondents felt 'fibre arts' were worthy of only 'moderate emphasis'. 50% of tertiary respondents felt that 'lecturers obtaining further qualifications was only 'moderately important'.

TABLE 7
TERTIARY ART EDUCATOR GROUP:
ITEMS INDICATING STRONGEST AGREEMENT WITHIN GROUP ACCORDING TO
HIGH MODAL RESPONSES

ITEM#	DESCRIPTOR	MODE %	MODE RESPONSE CATEGORY
<u>PART B CONTENT OF COURSE</u>			
A(i)	studio area of art: drawing	88%	1-great deal of emphasis
B(iv)	education studies: art curriculum	88%	1-great deal of emphasis
N	Knowledge of and practice in art curriculum and program planning	81%	1-great deal of emphasis
<u>STRUCTURE OF COURSE</u>			
H(i)	Practice teaching at all levels(jr/sr)	75%	1-very important
L(ii)	Teachers maintain involvement in art education issues	87%	1-very important
L(vii)	Teachers maintain involvement in in-service	75%	1-very important
<u>PART C STATEMENTS</u>			
D	Every region should have a specialist art teacher assigned	87%	1-strongly agree
E	Primary and early childhood pre-service programs should include at least one: (i) personal develop- ment art course	87%	1-strongly agree
	(ii) art curriculum course It is	75%	1-strongly agree
I	essential that a prospective art teacher be able to articulate why it is important to teach art and be able to offer reasons for the amount and kind of attention given to activities in the art program	94%	1-strongly agree

AGREEMENT BETWEEN GROUPS OF SECONDARY AND TERTIARY
RESPONDENTS

Secondary and tertiary art educator respondents had considerable agreement on most of the items in the survey. The majority of items that were rated as 'most valuable' in terms of content and structure, appear on both secondary and tertiary lists (Tables 1, 2, 4 and 5). While there are slight differences in the exact order of ranking, the majority of items are ranked 'most valuable' commonly by both the groups. As well, of the seven items of 'content' and five items of 'structure' that are not rated commonly on the 'most valued' end of the scale, eight are rated by both groups within .4 of each other. For example, on the highest mean list for 'content of course' items, tertiary respondents rated 'Philosophy of Art' at category 2 on the scale, and secondary respondents rated this item at 2.2, showing a very small difference of .2 on the scale. So while the 'most valued' lists differ somewhat, this difference is minimalized when the entire number of items is compared according to means between groups. In fact, 52 items scored with

.2 of each other on the Likert scale when means between groups were compared.

Not only was the general ranking of items aligned on the value scale by both groups, but also the profile of values placed on items within separate topics. This is particularly noticeable in the 'content of course' items, where the least difference was shown of mean positions on the Likert scale. In fact, 36 out of 42 items were closely aligned.

In the 'content of course' section, both groups rated the 'studio areas of art' similarly with 'drawing', 'painting' and 'sculpture' rating the 'greatest emphasis', 'printmaking', 'photography', and 'fibre arts' rating a 'considerable emphasis', 'media' a 'moderate emphasis', and 'jewellery', 'computer art' and 'leatherwork' rating only a limited emphasis. Similarly, the relative valuing by both groups of items in 'Educational studies' can be seen, with 'art curriculum' and 'teaching process' most valued, and 'sociology' and 'psychology' moderately valued. 'Art advocacy' roles are all highly valued by both groups, as is the 'study and awareness of art teaching resources'.

Art History items are profiled similarly by secondary and tertiary respondents with 'contemporary' and 'Australian' rated most valuable, followed by 'modern', 'Aboriginal', 'Western', 'classical' and 'architecture'. In both groups, 'Eastern' art history was ranked lowest in terms of mean responses. Three items in the 'content of course' section that ranked between 'moderate' to 'considerable' emphasis by both groups were 'aesthetic theory', 'philosophy of art' and 'current research in art education'.

There was less agreement between secondary and tertiary art educator respondents in the 'structure of course' section of the survey than in the 'content of course' section. Still, the majority of items showed consensus, in that 16 out of the 27 items had mean positions on the Likert scale within .4 of each other between the two groups. Most of these 16 items are to be found on the 'most valued' end of the scale, and are found in common on the rank ordering lists for each group. There was, however, two 'considerably' to 'moderately' important items that aligned. Secondary respondents rated 'involvement in content and media for own

personal development' at 2.1 on mean and tertiary respondents rated this item at 1.9 on mean. Both groups rated 'that art curriculum be a part of studio courses' at 2.2 on mean.

In Part C of the survey, secondary and tertiary opinion was mostly aligned, with only two items out of 10 showing more than a difference of .3 on the Likert scale when means were compared. Most agreement was found on the final item, which stated that it was essential that prospective art teachers be articulate about their curriculum and the importance of art education. Both groups 'agreed' that 'primary and early childhood pre-service programs should include at least one art curriculum course' and that 'a double-art option should be available' in secondary pre-service education programs. Both groups 'disagreed' that 'art courses that develop individual and personal expression should be given more emphasis than art curriculum courses'.

While the above descriptions give a general outline of agreement between secondary and tertiary art educator respondents, it should be noted that

exact comparisons on each item can be made by referring to the statistical data in Appendix II.

5. What measure of difference exists within groups and between groups in terms of a) content and b) experiences for art teacher pre-service education?

DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE SECONDARY RESPONDENT GROUP

The responses to two items in the survey indicated disagreement. Both items were in Part C, the section of the survey that solicited opinions on controversial statements. These two items concerned the length and type of pre-service program most valued. They were:

	Strongly Agree		No Opinion		Strongly Disagree
	1	2	3	4	5
<u>PART C</u>					
B. Art teacher pre-service training should be a minimum of 4 years duration	29%	10%	26%	12%	24%
G. Art teachers graduating from an end-on preparation program are better equipped to teach the subject than 3 year trained concurrent graduates.	16%	12%	37%	16%	18%

With reference to the second item (G) it should be noted that a check was done on the personal data to see if the responses could be matched up to the type of program from which the respondent had graduated. No commonality was found, as an almost equal number of 'end-on' and 'concurrent' graduates 'agreed' and 'disagreed'.

Another item in Part C that showed some difference, but not as much as the previous two outlined, was 'art courses that develop individual and personal expression should be given more emphasis than art curriculum courses'.

Within Part B of the survey - 'Content of Course' and 'Structure of Course', there was less variance in responses to items, but some items had a more even distribution with responses at each extreme of the scale and for this reason are worth mentioning. It is important to keep in mind, however, that the majority opinion still falls to within one category of the mode. In 'content of course', responses were more scattered in the following items:

A. Studio areas - computer art

C. Employment Prospects and expectations of employers.

In 'Structure of Course' items, the following showed a scattering of responses:

H(i) Practice teaching at all levels of a school art program (primary/jr/sr)

H(ii) Practice teaching for 5 or more weeks at one time

H(iii) Practice teaching for short but regular times

K(v) Lecturers in pre-service programs maintain involvement in obtaining further qualifications.

DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE TERTIARY RESPONDENT GROUP

Although the group of 16 tertiary art educators is statistically small, which normally presumes greater variance in terms of responses, there was agreement within the group on most items. In fact, there were only two items that showed disagreement in response. They were:

PART B STRUCTURE OF COURSE

		Very Important 1	2	3	4	Not Important At All 5
H(ii)	Practice teaching for 5 or more weeks at one time.	25%	19%	6%	19%	31%
J	Lecturers in pre-service programs be involved in teaching children on a regular basis	25%	19%	25%	12%	19%

Results for item H(ii), 'practice teaching', were quite polarized, indicating considerable disagreement within the group. In the second item, responses were less polarized, but did display a lack of consensus.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE GROUPS OF SECONDARY AND TERTIARY RESPONDENTS

There were a total of 17 items out of 79 on the survey that had a difference in mean response that was .5 or greater on the survey's Likert scale. This distance of .5 on the scale was chosen as the minimum, in terms of mean, which could be considered to show disagreement or variance between groups. As such, it is still representative of only one-half of one position on the value scale, which might be, in

some instances, the mid-difference between 'very important' and 'considerably important'. The analysis which follows will only address those items with a mean difference of .9 or greater on the scale (Refer to Table 8).

Of the 5 items that show more than a .9 difference between groups on the Likert scale, two involve the lecturing staff of pre-service programs and two involve practice teaching issues. The remaining item, which is found in Part C of the survey, exhibits the greatest difference in the valuation given it by secondary and tertiary respondents. (1.6 difference of means on the scale). The tertiary respondents favour a 4 year art pre-service program, as there is a high percentage mode (69%) in the 'strongly agree' category. Secondary respondents rated it less favourably and show a dispersion in their responses, and it must be noted that 26% of respondents registered 'no opinion'. As well, there are scattered responses from the secondary group to the two practice teaching items that show the greatest difference in valuing between the two groups. In spite of this, it appears that the tertiary group

generally favour shorter, more regular practice teaching sessions (Item H(iii) in 'Structure of Course') whereas the majority of the secondary group give a higher rating to the longer practice teaching sessions. (Item H(ii) in 'Structure of Course'). Tertiary respondents also rated 'practice teaching' at all three levels of the art program (primary/jr/sr) as 'considerably important', whereas secondary respondents in the majority rated this as 'moderately unimportant'. However, as mentioned earlier, secondary responses to this item were somewhat scattered across the scale. On the other hand, on the 2 items concerning lecturers that showed the largest difference between group means, secondary respondents showed considerable consensus. In fact, both items, 'that lecturers maintain involvement in schools', and 'be involved in teaching children on a regular basis' had high percentage modes in the 'very important' and 'considerably important' category. Tertiary respondents, however, showed some scattering of responses throughout categories, but rated the items of only moderate importance.

TABLE 8
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE GROUP MEANS OF
SECONDARY AND TERTIARY RESPONDENTS OF MORE THAN
.9 ON THE LIKERT SCALE

PART B		STRUCTURE OF COURSE							
	MEAN	DIFF-		ITEM	1	2	3	4	5
					RESPONSE BREAKDOWN				
Sec. 3.4	1.1	H(i)	Practice Teaching:at		22	8	20	8	41
Tert. 2.3			all levels of a		56	6	6	12	19
			(primary/jr/sr)						
Sec. 3.2	1.0	H(iii)	Practice Teaching for		26	18	5	18	35
Tert. 2.2			short but regular		50	12	12	12	12
			times						
Sec. 1.1	1.0	K(iv)	Lecturers in pre-		88	12	0	0	0
Tert. 2.1			service programs		38	31	19	6	6
			maintain involvement						
			in schools						
Sec. 1.9	.9	J	Lecturers in pre-		53	24	10	6	6
Tert. 2.8			programs be involved		25	19	25	12	19
			in teaching children						
			on a regular basis						
Sec. 2.5	.6	H(ii)	Practice Teaching:		39	16	12	16	16
Tert. 3.1			for 5 or more weeks		25	19	6	19	31
			at a time						
Sec. 2.1	.6	L(iv)	Teachers maintain		37	29	22	10	2
Tert. 1.9			involvements in arts		62	25	12	0	0
			organizations						
Sec. 2.4	.5	E	That students get a		31	29	18	16	6
Tert. 1.9			separate, thorough		37	44	12	6	0
			grounding in different						
			aspects of art (i.e.						
			History, Aesthetics,						
			Materials and						
			processes)						
PART C		STATEMENTS							
Sec. 3	1.6	B	Art teacher pre-		29	10	26	12	24
Tert. 1.4			service training		69	25	0	6	0
			courses should be a						
			minimum of 4 years						
			duration						
Sec. 1.8	.6	E(i)	Primary and early		59	16	16	6	2
Tert. 1.2			childhood pre-service		75	25	0	0	0
			programs should						
			include at least one:						
			(i) personal develop-						
			ment art course.						

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The first issue to be addressed is (A) the relationship between the findings, which reflect secondary and tertiary viewpoints on art teacher pre-service education, and the views of scholars which formed the basis of the survey. This will be followed by (B) general points for discussion, and (C) implications for the development of pre-service programs in light of the results of the study.

A. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE TWO RESPONDENT POPULATIONS AND THE ART EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIP USED AS THE BASIS OF THE SURVEY.

The following points which preface this part of the data analysis should be kept in mind while reading the following section:

(i) That these particular respondents may not be representative of the whole population of secondary and tertiary art educators in Queensland, Australia or elsewhere, but only of those who were motivated to respond to the survey.

(ii) That survey items do not fully represent any one art education scholar's viewpoint. While items were drawn from the literature, many are treated generally.

With these points in mind, there are several relationships between the views of respondents and art education scholarship that are worth noting.

It would appear from the results that the two groups of respondents favour a fairly traditional, 'fine arts' emphasis within the studio component of art teacher education. This can be seen by the high mean category of drawing, painting, and sculpture items as opposed to craft areas such as fibre arts, pottery and particularly, jewellery and leatherwork. Even less emphasis was given to newer media-film, T.V., video, photography and computer art, especially amongst the tertiary art educators. Commercial arts, however, received more support from secondary than tertiary art educators. Nevertheless, this generally seems to indicate an honourific view of art studio that Lanier (1979), Chapman (1978), Degge (1979), and others have strongly criticized.

Aspects of art curriculum, as included in four items of 'content', all reflected a high valuing by the respondents and have been highlighted as important in the literature (Chapman, (1982) in particular). Respondents also seemed to favour the

inclusion of curriculum within studio areas, which has been suggested by Boughton (1986) and Lovano-Kerr (1985).

Most respondents also indicated that 'knowledge and study of art education theory' should be given considerable emphasis. Although 'knowledge of current research in art education' rated less emphasis than the previous item by .7 on the scale, it still rated on the 'more valued' end of the scale. This would seem to contradict scholarship, (Hiller, 1981; Chapman, 1982) who claim that teachers, in particular, do not place much importance on research and issues in art education. In the section concerning art educator involvements in art education issues, both respondent groups rated secondary and tertiary involvements in art education issues as 'considerably important' to 'very important', which would further contradict scholarship.

Art advocacy issues are deemed important by scholars and respondents alike, as are 'understanding of cultural differences in forms and functions of art', and 'aesthetic theory'. In fact,

only 6% or fewer respondents rated these areas as 'not valued', or between 3 and 5 on the scale.

Art history items, as outlined previously, were ranked hierarchically by the respondents, with 'Eastern' art history rated only 'moderately important'. Chapman (1982, p. 150) in particular, claims value in its inclusion in the curriculum, but it is unknown as to whether the extent of coverage she might propose would be different than the survey response would suggest. Emphasis on 'contemporary art' was considered highly valuable, which supports the views of Degge (1979) and Hammond (1981).

'Teachers obtaining further qualifications' was considered only 'moderately important' by secondary respondents, and was rated somewhat more valuable to tertiary respondents. Hiller (1984) has pointed out that teachers need encouragement to be involved in further study, and Duck (1985) identified that, in Queensland, there are few avenues for gaining further art education qualifications. Nevertheless, it appears that these Queensland secondary teachers in particular place only moderate value in utilizing the avenues for further study that may be available to them.

`Lecturers obtaining further qualifications' was also ranked as `moderately important' by both secondary and tertiary art educators. While this may be due to the same factors, it also has implications for the development of programs as outlined later in this chapter.

Whether `lecturers should be involved in teaching children on a regular basis' is worthy of comment. The secondary respondents in particular agree with the Board of Teacher Education (1978) and the Schools Commission (1979) that this is quite important, but it would appear that tertiary respondents are divided on this issue.

Respondents generally `disagreed' that `art courses that develop individual and personal expression should be given more emphasis than art curriculum courses'. This implied balance of emphasis has been a recurring issue in the literature and it appears that the respondents would agree with the literature that overemphasis of students' development as an artist in pre-service may be a disservice to them (Braben, 1982, p. 68).

The results of the survey to the item `art teachers graduating from an end-on preparation

program are better equipped to teach the subject than 3 year trained concurrent graduates' showed considerable disagreement, with a high proportion of 'no opinion' responses. This would seem to support Braben's view that 'it would seem that the dual system of training art teachers [in Queensland] will be practised for some time to come, with supporters for and against" (1982, p. 68).

There was one item that addressed an underlying issue in art education in which all groups appear to be in agreement. 'It is essential that a prospective art teacher be able to articulate why it is important to teach art and be able to offer reasons for the amount and kind of attention given to activities in the art program'. While the particulars, as evidenced by some of the viewpoints registered in this survey, may need to be more fully clarified, art educators-secondary, tertiary and scholars - are adamant that by the end of art pre-service education, prospective teachers should be articulate in terms of their curriculum and the value of art education.

SUMMARY It would seem, on paper at least, that the groups of art educators that responded to the

survey would not be unsupportive of some of the current suggestions in the literature for shifts in the content and structure of art teacher pre-service education. Obvious agreement between groups of secondary and tertiary respondents on most items, and the moderate to high valuation of most items would tend to support this. There were a few areas of difference. One in particular was the honourific valuing, in terms of emphasis, of the 'fine arts' studio areas over the 'craft' and 'newer media' studio areas in this component of pre-service. Secondary respondents did not place great value on obtaining further qualifications, which some Australian scholars criticize. Tertiary respondents were strongly divided on whether or not lecturers should teach children on a regular basis, which was highly favoured by both secondary art educators and scholars. All groups strongly supported the notion that prospective art teachers must be articulate about their curriculum and the importance of art education.

B. POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

The largest issue to be addressed in light of the results of the survey is the strong agreement

between the groups of tertiary and secondary art educators on the nature of pre-service. Without doing a formal evaluation of existing programs, but having an informal familiarity with some, it would appear that this attitude reflects a 'status quo' valuation of art education and pre-service. As there is no prior itemized study of attitudes concerning Queensland pre-service that can be used as a comparison, it is not easily ascertained whether attitudes or needs have changed in this respect, but certainly the current needs appear fairly traditional. Perhaps it can be viewed, as Hammond (1981) has stated, that pre-service is a 'self-perpetuating development' or that teachers in the field reflect the values of the program undertaken. Certainly it is more disturbing that those in the pre-service programs who responded to the survey have a similar, conventional view of what content and experiences are of value in programs, for the development or change of programs depends on their support. Perhaps the clues as to why this occurs can be found in the survey background profiles. Again, it is to be reiterated that these particular respondents may not represent all

tertiary staff. However, within the group, there is a definite age and experience profile. The majority of tertiary respondents had over 20 years of art teaching experience, and over one-half had not gone beyond the Bachelor's level of study in their qualifications. These factors, compared with the moderate valuation (in terms of response on the survey) of gaining further qualifications, may explain the relative conservatism of viewpoint on items most valued for the pre-service education of art teachers. This would possibly point more to lecturers' lack of awareness of current thinking by art education scholars than lack of support. In fact, the survey responses indicate that there is at least moderate support for most scholarly suggestions for pre-service that were selected for the questionnaire.

Considerable importance was given to studio practice in pre-service, yet the nature of that experience was shown to be hierarchical by both tertiary and secondary responses. Craft areas and newer media were valued far less than traditional 'fine arts' areas. This may also indicate a lack of awareness on the part of the survey populations,

particularly with new media. Unfamiliarity may cause a certain amount of skepticism as to the value of study of newer media such as film, video and computer imagery.

Some of the areas of disagreement between secondary and tertiary art educators may be translated as somewhat self-serving. For example, the preferable length of time for a pre-service program was seen as currently adequate by secondary teachers and preferably extended by one year by tertiary lecturers. Another example would be the length of practicums; the longer practicum time was favoured by teachers and the shorter practicum by lecturers, which would cause less disruption of routine respectively. A further area of difference was whether lecturers should be involved in teaching children and involved with schools on a regular basis. Teachers rated these items very highly and lecturers rated them of less importance. Certainly it would take considerable effort on lecturers' parts to arrange for this to happen.

C. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ART TEACHER
PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION

The first and most obvious question to ask is how closely does the existing program match the views expressed as 'most valued' by the respondents. If there is a great deal of similarity, perhaps a causal relationship such as Hammond (1981) suggests can be found. If not, and there is a strong likelihood of the latter, it could be that the current program is not meeting even the traditional needs of teachers, never mind performing a leadership role in implementing new directions in pre-service. It would seem likely that in-service to increase awareness of new theory and media is needed at both secondary and tertiary levels in order to incorporate innovations effectively into these organizations. Certainly, a starting point would be to try to incorporate those changes into existing programs that teachers would already support as evidenced by their responses to the survey.

Liaison between tertiary and secondary organizations is essential to increase the credibility of the pre-service program. Whether or

not this takes the form of "regular teaching of children" or some other form of 'involvement in schools', it is clear that the responsibility for liaison lies with the tertiary community.

Consideration of the value placed on interaction between lecturers, children and schools by secondary teachers as reflected in the study should indicate to tertiary educators the wisdom of making the effort that this would require.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The scope of this study prevented single issues concerning art pre-service to be canvassed in depth. There are several issues indicated by the findings, however, that could bear fruitful investigation. These are listed as:

1. Awareness and attitudes towards the study of 'craft' areas of art and newer media within the secondary and tertiary populations.

2. The familiarity with and support for particular models of art education for pre-service programs such as Discipline-Based, Aesthetic Education, and Multi-Arts, in order to compare them to the profile program indicated by this survey.

3. The canvassing of parent, school staff and administrative attitudes towards particular content and experiences for pre-service and school art education to indicate where advocacy is needed.

4. A more representative sample and survey (to allow for predictive conclusions) on items identified by this study as possible lobby actions. These would include, for Queensland, making the Teaching Diploma (Sec. Art) incorporative of both Principal and Second teaching areas, and the assigning of specialist art teachers to Primary regions.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study showed that there was considerable agreement within and between the populations of secondary and tertiary art educators on what content and experiences are valued for art teacher pre-service education. The profile of 'most valued' items on the survey was a strongly traditional one for both groups, with a 'fine arts' studio component, art curriculum and methods focus, and items that reflected aspects of art education advocacy. However, there were very few items on the

survey that were 'not valued', which indicates some support of things suggested by scholars for pre-service programs. Whether the values reflected in the findings result from a 'self-perpetuating development' or a lack of awareness due to limited further study amongst the populations, it is clear that innovations in pre-service programs must be accompanied by extensive in-service and liaison. The first priority for existing programs is to incorporate those changes in pre-service that teachers already support - as reflected in their responses to the survey - that are not currently in evidence. In other words, developers must ensure that pre-service programs reflect (as a minimum standard) those things teachers and lecturers agree to be a sound basis for art teacher pre-service education.

REFERENCES

- Adams, E. and Ward, C. (1982). Art and the built environment: a teacher's approach. Burnt Mill, Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Australian Institute of Art Education (1985). [Notes on seminar on art teacher preparation at the Annual Conference in Perth, May 1985.] Unpublished raw data.
- Australian Schools Commission (1977). Rolling triennium 1978-80: report for 1978.
- Australia Schools Commission (1978). Triennium Report 1979-81: report for 1980.
- Australian Schools Commission (1979). Issues in teacher education. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Basett, G.W. (1978). Review of teacher education in Queensland. Brisbane: Board of Advanced Education and the Board of Teacher Education.
- Beyer, L.E. (1986). Art in education reform: Toward what end? Journal of the Institute of Art Education, 10(3), 16-34.
- Borg, W.R. and Gall, M.D. (eds.) (1984). Educational research: An introduction (4th ed.). New York: Longman

- Botsman, P. (1985). Review of arts education and training. Canberra, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission.
- Boughton, D. (1986). How to build an art teacher. Journal of the Institute of Art Education, 10(1)
- Braben, D. (1982). Survey of art teacher education in Queensland 1860-1976. Unpublished master's thesis, City of Birmingham Polytechnic, U.K.
- Chalmers, F.G. (1978). Teaching and studying Art History: Some anthropological and sociological considerations. Studies in Art Education, 20(1), pp. 18-25.
- Chapman, L.H. (1978). Approaches to art in education. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Chapman, L.H. (1982). Instant art, instant culture: The unspoken policy for American schools. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Collings, J. (1985). The State of Australian art education, state by state, 1985: Australian Capital Territory. Journal of the Institute of Art Education, 9(2), pp.43-49.

- Curriculum Development Commission (1985). Notes on the National Education and the Arts Seminar. Canberra. (Available from Dr. Phil Perry, Chisholm Institute of Technology, McMahons Road, Frankston, Victoria, Australia, 3199).
- Day, M. and DiBlasio, M. (1983). Contributions of research to the teaching of art. Studies in Art Education, 24(3) pp. 169-176.
- Degge, R.M. (1979). What do teachers need to make art basic? In S.M. Dobbs (Ed.), Arts education and back to basics, (pp. 153-166) Reston, Virginia: National Art Education Association.
- Duck, G. (1985). Teacher education and the arts: Interim report 1: Identifying research needs. Toowong, Queensland, Australia: Board of Teacher Education.
- Efland, A. (1978). Relating the arts to education: The history of an idea. Studies in Art Education, 25(4), pp. 5-13.
- Eisner, E. (1972). Educating artistic vision. New York: Unwin.
- Eisner, E. (1972, March). The promise of teacher education. Art Education, pp. 10-14.

- Eisner, E. (1983). Can educational research inform educational practice? Presidential address, American Educational Research Association Conference, Montreal, Canada.
- Feldman, E.B. (1976). Varieties of visual experience. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Good, C.V. (ed.) (1972). Essentials of educational research methodology and design (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts.
- Goodlad, J. (1976). A study for improving school arts programs, Journal of Aesthetic Education, 3(3-4), pp.151-156.
- Gray, J.V. (1985). A multidimensional model for studying art education. Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia.
- Greer, M.L.J. (1979). A study of the professional preparation needs of art teachers in the state of Arkansas. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1979) Dissertation Abstracts International, (University microfilms #79-19238).
- Hammond, G. (1981). Art education ideologies: Current emphasis in Australia. Journal of the Institute of Art Education, 5 (3) pp.83-91.

Hardiman, G.W. and Zernich, T. (ed.) (1974).

Curricular considerations for visual arts
education: Rationale, Development and
Evaluation, Illinois: Stipes.

Hiller, P. (1984). Current concerns in art
education: Accountability, rationale,
relevance, teacher education... etc. Journal
of the Institute of Art Education, 8(2), pp.32-
42.

Hiller, P. (1985). The state of Australian art
education, state by state, 1985: Tasmania.
Journal of the Institute of Art Education, 9(2)
pp. 57-60.

Hickey, D. (1984). Some recent approaches to
teaching art history and criticism in schools.
Journal of the Institute of Art Education, 8(1)
pp. 58-65.

Jones, B. (1980). Instructional Potential of the
Computer in Visual Arts Education. Unpublished
manuscript, University of Oregon.

Lanier, V. (1966). Newer media and the teaching of
art. Art Education, 19(4).

- Lanier, V. (1978). Assessing the 'S' in Arts Education, Journal of Aesthetic Education, 12(1), pp. 71-81.
- Lanier, V. (1981). Aesthetic literacy as the product of art education. Paper presented at INSEA, Rotterdam.
- Lanier, V. (1984). Eight guidelines for selecting art curriculum content, Studies in Art Education, 25(4), pp. 232-237.
- Lewis, H.P. (1976). Crystal gazing, forecasting and wishful thinking: the future of the arts in public education. The Arts, Human Development and Education, E. Eisner, ed. pp. 115-133.
- Lovano-Kerr, J. (1985). Implications of DBAE for university education of teacher. Studies in Art Education, 26(4), pp.216-223.
- McFee, J. and Degge, R. (1977). Art, culture, and environment: A catalyst for teaching. California: Wadsworth.
- MacGregor, R. (1985). An outside view of disciplined-based art education. Studies in Art Education, 26(4), pp.241-246.

- Mackrell, R.J. (1981). Changing and conflicting views of art education in the context of social and political forces. Unpublished Masters Thesis, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Mason, R. (1983). Art Teacher Preparation in England, Australia and the U.S.A.: some observations. Journal of Education for Teaching, 19(1) pp.55-62.
- Michael, J.A. (1980). Studio art experience: The heart of art education. Art Education, 33(2), pp.15-20.
- Parr, J. (1980). Tertiary visual arts education in Australia. Sydney: Visual Arts Board.
- Report to the Alberta Department of Education (1981). Overview of issues in art education: A report submitted to the Alberta Department of Education Secondary Art Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee. Unpublished manuscript, Edmonton, Alberta.
- Richardson, D. (1984). Art, craft and design in schools: A curriculum framework R-12. Adelaide: Education Department of South Australia.

Shultz, L. (1980). A studio curriculum for art education. Art Education, 33(6), pp. 10-15.

APPENDIX I
ART TEACHER PREPARATION SURVEY

PART B VIEWS ON ART TEACHER PRE-SERVICE PREPARATION:

B. Content of Course: With regard to art teacher preparation programs a number of issues are listed below. For each issue, you are asked to indicate:

How much emphasis, in your opinion, should it be given in an art teacher pre-service preparation program.

Indicate your answers by circling the most appropriate numbers opposite each issue. In addition, space is provided for you to express any other issues you feel are important that are not listed here.

EMPHASIS ON:	Great Deal	1	2	3	4	5	Little or None
A. Knowledge of and participation in the following studio areas of art:							
(i) drawing		1	2	3	4	5	
(ii) painting		1	2	3	4	5	
(iii) sculpture		1	2	3	4	5	
(iv) pottery		1	2	3	4	5	
(v) fibre arts		1	2	3	4	5	
(vi) printmaking		1	2	3	4	5	
(vii) jewellery		1	2	3	4	5	
(viii) leatherwork		1	2	3	4	5	
(ix) media (film, video, TV)		1	2	3	4	5	
(x) photography		1	2	3	4	5	
(xi) commercial arts		1	2	3	4	5	
(xii) computer art		1	2	3	4	5	
(xiii) Other: (please specify)							
.....		1	2	3	4	5	
.....		1	2	3	4	5	
B. Educational Studies							
(i) psychology		1	2	3	4	5	
(ii) sociology		1	2	3	4	5	
(iii) teaching process (general)		1	2	3	4	5	
(iv) art curriculum		1	2	3	4	5	
(v) Other (please specify)							
.....		1	2	3	4	5	
.....		1	2	3	4	5	
C. Employment prospects and expectations of employers (school and government administrators)		1	2	3	4	5	

14 QATA NEWSLETTER NOVEMBER 1985

	Great Deal	1	2	3	4	5	Little or None
D. Influence of current changes in the education system as a whole:		1	2	3	4	5	
E. Art advocacy role of the art teacher:							
(i) relevance of art to society:		1	2	3	4	5	
(ii) relevance of art to students in schools:		1	2	3	4	5	
(iii) public relations with the community		1	2	3	4	5	
(iv) strategies for promoting the status of art in schools:		1	2	3	4	5	
(vi) Other:							
.....		1	2	3	4	5	
.....		1	2	3	4	5	
F. Study and awareness of art teaching aids and resources, such as films, books, videos, slide sets, etc.:		1	2	3	4	5	
G. The assessment and evaluation of pupils' work in art:		1	2	3	4	5	
H. The principles of form and structure in art (theory of the elements and principles of design).		1	2	3	4	5	
I. The understanding of cultural differences in forms and functions of art.		1	2	3	4	5	
J. Education in aesthetic responses towards different forms of art (Aesthetic theory)		1	2	3	4	5	
K. Knowledge of art history:							
(i) classical (pre-20thC)		1	2	3	4	5	
(ii) modern (1900-1980)		1	2	3	4	5	
(iii) contemporary (current)		1	2	3	4	5	
(iv) Australian		1	2	3	4	5	
(v) Aboriginal		1	2	3	4	5	
(vi) Western		1	2	3	4	5	
(vii) Eastern		1	2	3	4	5	
(viii) architecture		1	2	3	4	5	
(ix) Other (please specify)							
.....		1	2	3	4	5	
.....		1	2	3	4	5	
.....		1	2	3	4	5	

	Great Deal	Little or None
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
L. Philosophy of Art (theory of what Art is)	1 2 3 4 5	
M. Knowledge and study of Art Education theory. (Analysing the practice of teaching Art)	1 2 3 4 5	
N. Knowledge of and practice in Art curriculum and program planning	1 2 3 4 5	
O. Integration of art with other subjects:		
(i) expressive arts	1 2 3 4 5	
(ii) other subjects in the school curriculum	1 2 3 4 5	
P. Knowledge of current research in Art Education	1 2 3 4 5	
Q. Liberal Education (literature, philosophy, history and nature of contemporary society, political science)	1 2 3 4 5	
R. Any other 'content' issues that are not listed above:		
.....	1 2 3 4 5	
.....	1 2 3 4 5	
.....	1 2 3 4 5	
.....	1 2 3 4 5	
.....	1 2 3 4 5	
.....	1 2 3 4 5	
.....	1 2 3 4 5	
9. Structure of Course: A series of issues are listed below. For each issue, you are asked to rate how important it is, in your opinion, for art teacher pre-service training programs.		
Indicate your answers by circling the most appropriate numbers opposite each issue.		

	Very Important	Not Important At All
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
ISSUE:	1 2 3 4 5	
A. That students have a breadth of knowledge in studio areas	1 2 3 4 5	

	Very Important	Not Important At All
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
B. That students have depth of knowledge in some studio areas	1 2 3 4 5	
C. That there is an integration of different aspects of art within studio areas (i.e. PAINTING includes history, theory, criticism, materials and processes)	1 2 3 4 5	
D. That art curriculum be a part of studio courses	1 2 3 4 5	
E. That students get a separate, thorough grounding in different aspects of art (i.e. Art History, Aesthetics, Materials and processes)	1 2 3 4 5	
F. To involve students in content and media relevant to school circumstances	1 2 3 4 5	
G. To involve students in content and media for their own personal development	1 2 3 4 5	
H. To involve students in practice teaching:		
(i) at all levels of a school art program: (jr/sr.)	1 2 3 4 5	
(primary/jr/sr.)	1 2 3 4 5	
(ii) for 5 or more weeks at one time	1 2 3 4 5	
(iii) for short but regular times	1 2 3 4 5	
(iv) more than once each year of training	1 2 3 4 5	
(v) Other:	1 2 3 4 5	
I. That Lecturers in pre-service programs have had school teaching experience:		
(i) lecturers in studio areas	1 2 3 4 5	
(ii) lecturers in other course areas	1 2 3 4 5	
J. That Lecturers in pre-service programs be involved in teaching children on a regular basis.	1 2 3 4 5	
K. That Lecturers in pre-service programs maintain involvement in:		
(i) Art (Practice)	1 2 3 4 5	
(ii) Art Education Issues	1 2 3 4 5	
(iii) Arts Organisation	1 2 3 4 5	
(iv) Schools	1 2 3 4 5	
(v) Obtaining further qualifications	1 2 3 4 5	

APPENDIX II NUMERICAL RESULTS FOR ITEMS

The following tables represent the response rates for each item in PART B and PART C of the questionnaire.

The responses are expressed in terms of percentage of responses for the two populations, secondary and tertiary art educators. Total numbers in each group were: a) secondary = 49, b) tertiary = 16. As well, the average response rate for each group is shown. Note: percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole percentage, with .5's taken to the lower whole percentage (i.e. 12.5% taken to 12%). Refer to Chapter 4 for the descriptive analysis of the results. Refer to APPENDIX B for the actual format of the questionnaire.

PART B: VIEWS ON ART TEACHER PRE-SERVICE PREPARATION

8. CONTENT OF COURSE:

EMPHASIS ON:

A. Knowledge of and participation in the following studio areas of art:

		Great Deal 1	2	3	4	Little or None 5		
i.	drawing	88	5	8	0	0	% sec.	avg. 1.2
		88	12	0	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.1
ii.	painting	65	22	12	0	0	% sec.	avg. 1.4
		38	31	31	0	0	% sec.	avg. 1.2
iii.	sculpture	29	47	24	0	0	% sec.	avg. 2
		38	12	38	12	0	% tert.	avg. 2.2
iv	pottery	24	45	31	0	0	% sec.	avg. 2
		19	6	69	6	0	% tert.	avg. 2.6
v	fibre arts	8	39	51	2	0	% sec.	avg. 2.5
		19	6	56	19	0	% tert.	avg. 2.7
vi	printmaking	29	47	24	0	0	% sec.	avg. 2
		25	12	62	0	0	% tert.	avg. 2.4
vii	jewellery	0	18	47	9	6	% sec.	avg. 3.2
		12	6	38	38	6	% tert.	avg. 3.1
viii	leatherwork	0	2	51	31	16	% sec.	avg. 3.6
		6	6	25	44	19	% tert.	avg. 3.6
ix	media (film, video, t.v.)	15	22	41	19	3	% sec.	avg. 2.7
		12	25	38	25	0	% tert.	avg.
x	photography	18	31	51	0	0	% sec.	avg. 2.3
		6	38	44	12	0	% tert.	avg. 2.6

xi	commercial arts	18	26	45	12	0	% sec.	avg.	2.5
		6	19	37	19	19	% tert.	avg.	3.2
xii	computer art	6	22	31	24	16	% sec.	avg.	3.2
		6	6	44	19	25	% tert.	avg.	3.5

B. Educational Studies

i	psychology	2	51	31	19	23	% sec.	avg.	2.6
		12	44	19	12	12	% tert.	avg.	2.7
ii	sociology	6	29	43	20	2	% sec.	avg.	2.8
		31	31	12	12	12	% tert.	avg.	2.4
iii	teaching process (general)	61	31	8	0	0	% sec.	avg.	1.5
		63	19	12	6	0	% tert.	avg.	1.6
iv	art curri- culum	86	8	6	0	0	% sec.	avg.	1.2
		88	12	0	0	0	% tert.	avg.	1.2

C.	Employment prospects and expectations of employers	29	29	22	18	2	% sec.	avg.	2.4
		19	31	31	6	12	% tert.	avg.	2.6

D.	Influence of current change	39	26	31	2	2	% sec.	avg.	2.1
		56	19	25	0	0	% tert.	avg.	1.7

E. Art advocacy role of the art teacher:

i.	relevance of art to society	73	16	8	5	0	% sec.	avg.	1.4
		62	31	6	0	0	% tert.	avg.	1.4
ii	relevance of art to stud- ends in schools	76	18	6	0	0	% sec.	avg.	1.3
		69	25	6	0	0	% tert.	avg.	1.4
iii	public relations with the community	29	35	33	2	2	% sec.	avg.	2.2
		50	25	19	0	6	% tert.	avg.	1.9
iv	strategies for promoting the status of art in schools	53	31	10	5	5	% sec.	avg.	1.7
		62	25	6	0	6	% tert.	avg.	1.6

F.	Study of awareness of art teaching aids and resources	47	41	9	10	2	% sec.	avg. 1.7
		31	62	6	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.7
G.	Assessment and evaluation of student art work	84	14	0	2	0	% sec.	avg. 1.2
		50	31	19	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.7
H.	Elements and principles of design	53	22	24	0	0	% sec.	avg. 1.7
		12	44	37	6	0	% tert.	avg. 2.4
I.	Understanding cultural differences in forms and functions of art	29	41	26	5	0	% sec.	avg. 2.1
		44	31	25	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.8
J.	Aesthetic Theory	22	35	39	2	2	% sec.	avg. 2.3
		31	38	25	6	0	% tert.	avg. 2.1
K.	Knowledge of Art History							
i.	classical (pre-zothc)	18	31	45	6	0	% sec.	avg. 2.4
		25	31	31	12	0	% tert.	avg. 2.3
ii	modern (1900-1980)	51	35	12	2	0	% sec.	avg. 1.7
		56	31	12	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.6
iii	contemporary (current)	67	22	12	0	0	% sec.	avg. 1.5
		56	44	0	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.4
iv	Australian	61	31	8	0	0	% sec.	avg. 1.5
		69	25	6	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.4
v	Aboriginal	29	51	18	2	0	% sec.	avg. 2
		37	37	25	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.9
vi	Western	14	53	31	2	0	% sec.	avg. 2.2
		31	44	12	6	6	% tert.	avg. 2.1

vii Eastern	6	41	37	16	0	% sec.	avg. 2.6
	25	25	25	19	6	% tert.	avg. 2.7
viii Archi- tecture	8	45	35	12	0	% sec.	avg. 2.5
	31	12	37	19	0	% tert.	avg. 2.4
L. Philosophy of Art	29	35	29	2	6	% sec.	avg. 2.2
	50	6	38	6	0	% tert.	avg. 2
M. Knowledge and study of Art education theory	51	31	16	0	2	% sec.	avg. 1.7
	69	19	12	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.4
N. Knowledge of and practice in art Ed. curriculum and program planning	61	31	8	0	0	% sec.	avg. 1.5
	81	6	12	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.3
O. INTEGRATION OF ART WITH OTHER SUBJECTS							
i. Expressive Arts	29	37	26	6	2	% sec.	avg. 2.2
	19	19	44	12	6	% tert.	avg. 2.7
ii Other sub- jects in the curriculum	8	26	47	14	6	% sec.	avg. 2.8
	19	31	25	12	12	% tert.	avg. 2.7
P. Knowledge of current research in art education	22	35	29	12	2	% sec.	avg. 2.4
	31	37	25	0	6	% tert.	avg. 2.1
Q. Liberal Educa- tion	6	24	41	22	6	% sec.	avg. 2.9
	19	37	31	12	0	% tert.	avg. 2.4

9. STRUCTURE OF COURSE:

		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Very Important</div> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Not Important At All</div> </div>						
		1	2	3	4	5		
A.	Breadth of knowledge in studio areas	53	45	2	0	0	% sec. avg.	1.5
		37	37	25	0	0	% tert. avg.	1.9
B.	Depth of knowledge in some studio areas	47	29	22	2	0	% sec. avg.	1.8
		50	37	12	0	0	% tert. avg.	1.6
C.	Integration studio areas	69	22	2	6	0	% sec. avg.	1.5
		62	25	6	0	6	% tert. avg.	1.6
D.	Art curriculum is a part of studio courses	41	18	22	12	6	% sec. avg.	2.2
		37	31	19	0	12	% tert. avg.	2.2
E.	Separate, thorough grounding in different aspects of art	31	29	18	16	6	% sec. avg.	2.4
		37	44	12	6	0	% tert. avg.	1.9
F.	Involvement in media relevant to school circumstances	53	20	24	2	0	% sec. avg.	1.8
		50	25	25	0	0	% tert. avg.	1.8
G.	Involvement in media for own personal development	39	31	22	6	2	% sec. avg.	2.1
		44	25	31	0	0	% tert. avg.	1.9

H. Practice Teaching:

i. at all levels of a program (jr/sr.)	76	2	14	2	6	% sec. avg. 1.6
	75	19	6	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.3
primary/junior/senior	22	8	20	8	41	% sec. avg. 3.4
	56	6	6	12	19	% tert. avg. 2.3
ii. for 5 or more weeks at one time	39	16	12	16	16	% sec. avg. 2.5
	25	19	6	19	31	% tert. avg. 3.1
iii. short but req. times	26	18	5	18	35	% sec. avg. 3.2
	50	12	12	12	12	% tert. avg. 2.2
iv. more than once a year	63	16	6	6	8	% sec. avg. 1.8
	62	12	0	6	19	% tert. avg. 2.1

I. Lecturers have school teaching experience

i. lecturers in studio areas	69	12	16	0	2	% sec. avg. 1.6
	56	19	25	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.7
ii. lecturers in other areas	82	6	12	0	0	% sec. avg. 1.3
	62	12	19	6	0	% tert. avg. 1.7

J. Lecturers be involved in teaching children on a regular basis	53	24	10	6	6	% sec. avg. 1.9
	25	19	25	12	19	% tert. avg. 2.8

K. Lecturers in pre-service programs maintain involvement in:

i. Art (practice)	57	24	12	0	6	% sec. avg. 1.7
	37	37	19	0	6	% tert. avg. 2
ii. Art education issues	69	14	12	2	2	% sec. avg. 1.6
	69	19	6	0	6	% tert. avg. 1.6
iii. Arts organizations	57	18	22	2	0	% sec. avg. 1.7
	50	25	25	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.7

iv. Schools	88	12	0	0	0	% sec. avg. 1.1
	38	31	19	6	6	% tert. avg. 2.1

v. Obtaining further quali- fications	16	14	31	22	16	% sec. avg. 3.1
	12	31	50	6	0	% tert. avg. 2.5

L. That art teachers in schools maintain involvement in:

i. Art	76	22	2	0	0	% sec. avg. 1.3
	69	12	19	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.5

ii. Art Education issues	53	35	12	0	0	% sec. avg. 1.6
	87	6	6	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.2

iii. Art pre-service programs	31	29	24	12	5	% sec. avg. 2.3
	38	56	6	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.7

iv. Arts orgs.	37	29	22	10	2	% sec. avg. 2.1
	62	25	12	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.5

v. obtaining further quali- fications	12	24	45	16	2	% sec. avg. 2.7
	12	50	31	6	0	% tert. avg. 2.3

vi. liaison with other school art programs	63	29	8	0	0	% sec. avg. 1.5
	62	25	6	6	0	% tert. avg. 1.6

vii. in-service programs	63	29	8	0	0	% sec. avg. 1.5
	75	19	6	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.3

PART C

		Strongly Agree		No Opinion		Strongly Disagree			
		1	2	3	4	5			
A.	In Art Teacher Pre-service training programs, art subject courses should be given more emphasis than education courses.	47	31	5	16	5	% sec.	avg. 2	
		31	31	6	31	0	% tert.	avg. 2.3	
B.	Art teacher pre-service training courses should be a minimum of 4 years duration	29	10	26	12	24	% sec.	avg. 3	
		69	25	0	6	0	% tert.	avg. 1.4	
C.	Art courses that develop individual and personal expression should be given more emphasis than art curriculum courses	12	18	16	31	22	% sec.	avg. 3.3	
		12	12	6	50	19	% tert.	avg. 3.5	

D.	Every region should have a specialist art teacher assigned to its primary schools with expertise in Primary Art Education	82	16	2	0	0	% sec.	avg. 1.2
		87	6	6	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.2
E.	Primary and early childhood pre-service programs should include at least one:							
		i. personal development	59	16	16	6	2	% sec. avg. 1.8
			75	25	0	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.2
		ii. art curriculum course	59	24	16	0	0	% sec. avg. 1.6
			81	6	12	0	0	% tert. avg. 1.3
F.	In 3 year pre-service programs, a double-art option should be available as well as an art Primary Teaching Area and other subject Second Teaching Area	51	12	31	5	5	% sec.	avg. 2
		56	19	25	0	0	% tert.	avg. 1.7

- G. Art teachers 16 12 37 16 18 % sec. avg. 3.1
 graduating 19 6 25 25 25 % tert. avg. 3.3
 from an end-on
 preparation
 program are
 better
 equipped to
 teach the
 subject than 3
 year trained
 concurrent
 graduates.
- H. Adequate 47 22 22 6 2 % sec. avg. 2
 resources for 56 19 12 6 6 % tert. avg. 1.9
 regular in-
 school art
 programs have
 greater
 priority than
 the
 maintenance/
 establishment
 of community
 services in
 art.
- I. It is 88 6 5 0 2 % sec. avg. 1.2
 essential that
 a prospective
 art teacher be
 able to articu-
 late why it is
 important to
 teach art and
 be able to
 offer reasons
 for the amount
 and kind of
 attention
 given to
 activities in
 the art program.

APPENDIX III

PERSONAL COMMENTS

As space was provided in each section of the survey questionnaire, the following handwritten comments included by respondents have been collated within the format established by the survey: [N.B. All respondents are represented here].

CONTENT	LIKERT VALUE (IF ASSIGNED)
A. STUDIO	
. graphic design	
. theatre	2
. craft-type course	1
. graphic art	2
. design	1
. design	2
. design	1
. design	1
. calligraphy	3
. clothing/body	
decoration	2
. visual communication	2
. design (general)	2
B. EDUCATIONAL STUDIES	
. anthropology	
. motivation	
. art criticism	
. design resources for classroom	3
. child art development	1
E. ART ADVOCACY	
. articulate the value of art	1
. art educator as professional	1

K. ART HISTORY

- . Papua New Guinea
- . Feminist Artists
- . Ancient/Americas
- . theatre, music, literature 3
- . history of film
- 2
- . areas relevant to ethnic mix of the school 2

R. OTHER 'CONTENT ISSUES'

- . art education systems in Australia (comparative) 3
- . programs in this state (Eld) 2
- . Identification of student needs 1
- . Artist-teacher in the community 3
- . Systems of appreciation and their application 1
- . public use of art galleries 1
- . stages of creative and mental growth of child to adult
- . research in visual literacy
- . perceptual awareness 1
- . influences on art curriculum or programming 3
- . semiotics 2
- . cultural anthropology 1

H. Practice Teaching

- . 1 day per week for entire year
- . country/city 1

I. Lecturers in pre-service programs have had school teaching experience:

- . yes!!
- . (recent) a must
- . disgraceful not to have lecturers with prac. experience

J. That lecturers in pre-service programs be involved in teaching children on a regular basis

- . they seem to have lost touch.

M Additional 'structure of program' issues:

- . separate training for art educators/ visual artists as aims differ
- . major experience in art (1-2 yrs) before making a teaching decision
- . visiting exhibitions on a regular basis.

APPENDIX IV
RANK ORDER OF RESULTS - SECONDARY RESPONDENTS

Amount of Emphasis		<u>CONTENT OF COURSE</u>				
		1	2	3	4	5
		GREAT DEAL				LITTLE OR NONE
Mean Response Category	Item #	Descriptor				
1.2	A(i)	Drawing (Studio)				
	B(iv)	Art Curriculum				
	G	Assessment & Evaluation of Student Work				
1.3	E(ii)	Relevance of Art to Students in Schools				
1.4	A(ii)	Painting (Studio)				
	E(i)	Relevance of Art to Society				
1.5	B(iii)	Teaching Process (Ed. Studies)				
	K(iii)	Contemporary Art (current)(art history)				
	K(iv)	Australian Art History				
	N	Knowledge of and Practice in Art Education Curriculum.				
1.7	E(iv)	Strategies for promoting the status of art in schools				
	F	Study and awareness of art teaching aids and resources				
	H	Elements and principles of design				
	K(ii)	Modern Art History (1900-1980)				
	M	Knowledge of and study of art education theory				
2	A(iii)	Sculpture (studio)				
	A(iv)	Pottery (studio)				
	A(vi)	Printmaking (studio)				
	K(v)	Aboriginal Art History				
2.1	D	Influence of current change				
	I	Understanding cultural differences in forms and functions of art				
2.2	E(iii)	public relations with the community				
	K(vi)	Western				

	L	Philosophy of Art
	O(i)	Expressive Arts
2.3	A(x)	photography
	J	Aesthetic theory
2.4	C	Employment prospects and expectations of employers
	K(i)	classical (pre- zothc)
	P	Knowledge of current research in art education
2.5	A(v)	fibre arts
	A(xi)	commercial arts
	K(viii)	Architecture
2.6	B(i)	psychology
	K(vii)	Eastern
2.7	A(ix)	media, (film, video, t.v.)
2.8	B(ii)	sociology
	O(ii)	Expressive Arts
2.9	Q	Liberal Education
3.2	A(vii)	Studio area of art: jewellery
3.2	A(xii)	Studio area of art: computer art
3.6	A(viii)	Studio area of art: leatherwork

<u>STRUCTURE OF COURSE</u>		
1	2	3
VERY		4
IMPORTANT		5
		NOT IMPORTANT
		AT ALL
Mean Response	Item #	Descriptor
Category		
1.1	L(iv)	Lecturers maintain involvement in schools
1.3	I(ii)	Lecturers in other than studio courses have school teaching experience.
	L(i)	Teachers maintain involvement in art.
1.5	A	Breadth of knowledge in studio areas.
	C	Integration of aspects of art with in studio courses
	L(vi)	Teachers maintain liaison with other school art programs

- L(vii) Teachers maintain involvement with in-service programmes
- 1.6 H(i) Practice teaching at jr/sr levels of program
- I(i) Lecturers in studio areas have school teaching experience
- K(ii) Lecturers maintain involvement in art education issues.
- L(ii) Teachers maintain involvement in art education issues.
- 1.7 K(i) Lecturers maintain involvement in art practice.
- K(iii) Lecturers maintain involvement in arts organizations.
- 1.8 B. Depth of knowledge in some studio areas.
- F Involvement in content and media relevant to school circumstances.
- H(iv) Practice teaching more than once a year.
- 1.9 J. Lecturers be involved in teaching children on regular basis.
- 2.1 G Involvement in media for own personal development
- L(iv) Arts orgs.
- 2.2 D Art curriculum is a part of studio courses
- 2.3 L(iii) Art pre-service programs
- 2.4 E Separate, thorough grounding in different aspects of art
- 2.5 H(ii) for 5 or more weeks at one time
- 2.7 L(v) obtaining further qualifications
- 3.1 K(v) Lecturers maintain involvement in obtaining further qualifications
- 3.2 H(iii) Practice Teaching for short but regular times
- 3.4 H(i) Practice Teaching: at all levels of a program:(pr/jr/sr)

APPENDIX V
RANK ORDER OF RESULTS - TERTIARY RESPONDENTS

			<u>CONTENT OF COURSE</u>				
			1	2	3	4	5
			GREAT DEAL				LITTLE OR NONE
Mean Response	Category	Item #	Descriptor				
1.1		A(i)	Drawing (Studio)				
1.2		A(ii)	Painting (Studio)				
		B(iv)	Art Curriculum				
1.3		N	Knowledge of and practice in art curriculum and program planning				
1.4		E(i)	Relevance of art to society				
		E(ii)	Relevance of art to students in schools				
		K(iii)	Contemporary (current) art history				
		K(iv)	Australian art history				
		M	Knowledge and study of art education theory				
1.6		B(ii)	Teaching process (Ed. studies)				
		E(iv)	Strategies for promoting the status of art in schools				
		K(ii)	Modern art history (1900-1980)				
1.7		D	Influence of current changes in the Ed. system				
		F	Study and awareness of art teaching aids and resources				
		G	Assessment and evaluation of studio art work				
1.8		I	Understanding of cultural differences in forms and functions of art				
1.9			Public relations with the community				
			Aboriginal art history				
2			Philosophy of art				
2.1		J	Aesthetic Theory				
		K(vi)	Western (Art History)				
		P	Knowledge of Current				

		Research in art education
2.2	A(iii)	Studio area: sculpture
2.3	K(i)	Classical art history (pre 20th C)
2.4	A(vi)	Studio area: printmaking
	B(ii)	Ed. Studies: sociology
	H	Elements and principles of design
	K(viii)	Architecture (Art History)
	Q	Liberal Education
2.6	A(iv)	Studio area: pottery
	A(x)	Studio area: photography
	C	Employment prospects and expectations of employers
2.7	A(v)	Studio area: fibre arts
	A(ix)	Studio area: media (film, video, t.v.)
	B(i)	Ed. Studies: psychology
	K(vii)	Eastern (Art History)
	O(i)	Integration of art with other subjects: Expressive Arts
	O(ii)	Integration of art: with other subjects in the curriculum
3.1	A(vii)	Studio area of art: jewellery
	H(ii)	Practice Teaching: for 5 or more weeks at a time
3.2	A(xi)	Studio area of art: commercial arts
3.5	A(xii)	Studio area of art: computer art
3.6	A(viii)	Studio area of art: leatherwork

1	2	<u>STRUCTURE OF COURSE</u>			5
		3	4		
VERY IMPORTANT				NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	
Mean Response Category	Item #	Descriptor			
1.2	L(ii)	Teachers maintain involvement in art education issues			
1.3	H(i)	Practice teaching at (jr/sr) levels of a program			
	L(vii)	Teachers maintain involvement in in-service programs			
1.5	L(i)	Teachers maintain involvement in art			
	L(iv)	Teachers maintain involvement in arts organizations			
1.6	B	Depth of knowledge in studio areas			
	C	Integration of different aspects of art within studio areas.			
	K(ii)	Lecturers maintain involvement in art education issues			
	L(vi)	Teachers maintain liaisons with other school art programs			
1.7	I(i)	Lecturers in studio have school teaching experience			
	I(ii)	Lecturers in other courses have teaching experience			
	K(iii)	Lecturers maintain involvements in arts organizations			
	L(iii)	Teachers maintain involvement in art pre-service programs			
1.8	F	Involvement in content and media relevant to school circumstances			
1.9	E	Separate, thorough grounding in different aspects of art			
	G	Involvement in content and media for students own personal development			
	A	Breadth of knowledge in studio areas			
2	K(i)	Lecturers maintain involvement in art practice.			

- | | | |
|-----|--------|--|
| 2.1 | H(iv) | Practice Teaching:
More than once a
year |
| | K(iv) | Lecturers maintain
involvement in:
schools |
| 2.2 | D | Art curriculum is a
part of studio
courses |
| | H(iii) | Practice Teaching:
short but regular
times |
| 2.3 | H(i) | Practice Teaching:
at primary/junior
senior levels |
| | L(v) | Art teachers
maintain involvement
in: obtaining
further
qualifications |
| 2.5 | K(v) | Lecturers maintain
involvement in:
obtaining further
qualifications |
| 2.8 | J | Lecturers be
involved in teaching
children on a
regular basis. |
| 3.1 | H(ii) | Practice teaching for five or
more weeks at a time |