JOURNAL of MASON GRADUATE RESEARCH

Innovations in Education

Volume 1 Issue1
January 2014

Journal of Mason Graduate Research
Volume 1 Number 1 Year 2014
© George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
ISSN: 2327-0764
Pages: i-ii

Letter of Sponsorship

MARY ZAMON Ph.D.

George Mason University

January 9, 2014

Dear Mason students, faculty and staff,

Today a new publication opens at George Mason University as a result of hard work and dedication from Mason graduate students. Over the past five semesters they have worked steadily, creatively and to high standards to create this first issue of the Journal of Mason Graduate Research. Congratulations are due to all the students whose names you see in this issue. Feel free to send in your good wishes too!

The support of Dr. Jaime Lester is a steadying force to us all as we begin this student conceived, developed and run on- line journal. Thanks also to the George Mason library for the technical systems and advice to make this possible. Although I am now retired, I am proud to remain connected as a co-sponsor and assistant whenever needed.

You may be interested in how this began. I was privileged to teach CTCH 826 in the fall of 2011. Students were from the MAIS Higher Education, DA in Community College Teaching and the Ph.D. in Higher Education programs.

Toward the end of the class, I asked students what they would like in their program that currently was not available. Students replied they desired to publish, but, as part-time students, found it difficult. They were not eligible for assistantships which are the most common entry into publishing as a junior author. As we discussed ways to address their issues, someone said "Let's do it ourselves."

At that moment the JMGR proposal was born.

A series of planning meetings followed and the decision was to open participation to all graduate students, regardless of college or program. A highlight of the planning was the training of peer reviewers. Forty students from across the university answered and participated in the workshop which was entirely planned and conducted by students. I was very impressed with their organization, talents and teaching skills, as well as the ability to mobilize that number of students! At the same time, directions and tutorials were developed so reviewing and submission processes could all take place on line. Another great set of talents exhibited!

The next important step was submission of a proposal to the Associate Provost for a dedicated graduate assistant to provide continuity and support. Again, a completely student developed and presented proposal went forward. Dr. Edwards responded with the grant at the end of their presentation. I think it must be one of the speedier decisions at Mason. We now have a well-qualified and capable graduate assistant supporting JMGR. A third highlight is our partnership with the Graduate and Professional Student Association at Mason, a student created synergy. They have given us a home base in student affairs and proven to be steady partners.

As this first issue is launched, I am quite happy to attend its birth, and deeply proud of the student parents. I am particularly happy as an alumna of Mason and almost 12-year employee and adjunct instructor.

All Mason graduate students are invited to join these efforts, learn about writing and publication and enjoy meeting students across the university. My own very tip top wishes to all, deep thanks to the founding group and expectations of seeing continued growth and achievements.

~ Mary Zamon, Ph.D.

Journal of Mason Graduate Research
Volume 1 Number 1 Year 2014
© George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
ISSN: 2327-0764
Pages: 1-4

JOURNAL of MASON GRADUATE RESEARCH

Inaugural Editorial for the Journal of Mason Graduate Research

MARILYN SHARIF

George Mason University

The Editorial Board of the Journal of Mason Graduate Research (JMGR) welcomes you to our first volume, **Innovations in Education.** As a team of editors, peer reviewers and advisors, we are excited about launching this first issue, and look forward to many more issues of the JMGR in the future.

JMGR is the first peer reviewed research journal by and for all graduate and professional (graduate) students at George Mason University (Mason). The idea for the JMGR was initiated by Dr. Mary Zamon, Associate Director (retired), Office of Institutional Assessment, and shared by her graduate students in the fall of 2011. As a direct result of her enthusiasm and mentorship, several of these students began meeting with her in the spring 2012 semester to brainstorm the development of a journal of graduate student research at Mason.

Today, the JMGR is led by an Editorial Board and team of dedicated graduate students and faculty advisors, and supported by academic and administrative offices across campus. We are especially appreciative of the support we have received from Mason's Library System, the Graduate and Professional Student Association (GAPSA), the Office of Student Media, and University Life (Graduate Life). In addition, we are very appreciative of the funding, support and encouragement that we have received from the Office of the Provost.

Our Editorial Board includes: Stefan Amrine, Assistant Managing Editor and Graduate Assistant, Sydney Merz, Peer Review Editor, Brett Say, Associate Editor, Steve Harris Scott, Marketing Director and Chief Financial Officer, Josh St. Louis, Managing Editor, Marilyn Sharif, Chief Editor, and Josh Yavelberg, Web Director and Publication Editor. In addition, our faculty advisors are Dr. Jamie Lester and Dr. Mary Zamon, professors from Mason's Higher

Education Program, and Anne Driscoll, Mason's Education Liaison Librarian, and consultant to the JMGR for the Open Journal System (OJS), an electronic journal platform supported by Mason and used to launch our online version of JMGR.

JMGR is committed to providing Mason and the broader academic community with a sustainable, quality, peer reviewed, journal of graduate and joint graduate/faculty research readily available online. Also, JMGR provides opportunities for Mason graduate students to engage in positive collaborative leadership through the peer review and publication processes, as well as Mason faculty to contribute service to the university community through academic mentorships. Through such collaborative efforts of graduate students and faculty, it is our mission to:

- publish at least one volume annually of Mason graduate student, peer reviewed research
- provide Mason graduate students with an innovative, multi- and interdisciplinary forum for academic dialogue
- encourage quality graduate student research and writing experiences
- provide graduate students with positive learning experiences through engaging in rigorous editorial, peer review and publication processes
- provide positive leadership and collaborative team experiences for Mason graduate students who participate in the peer review and publication processes
- provide mentorship experiences for Mason faculty, as well as service to the university and academic community at large
- utilize the online Open Journal System (OJS), helping to contribute to Mason's environmental and budgetary goals
- provide academic research content freely, and available online (open access)
- contribute to Mason's greater mission to maintain an international reputation for superior education and public service

In short, our objective is that this volume of the JMGR will be the first of many that will help Mason graduate students publish original research. Focused on **Innovations in Education,** some of the suggested topics included: assessment, STEM, teaching and learning, student services and experience, employability of students, faculty issues, graduate education, international student issues, and more.

Submitted articles were forwarded to a review committee composed of graduate students and mentoring faculty. Each article was reviewed by an editor and then by two trained graduate student peer reviewers who had received training on the peer review process. All reviews were conducted blindly with articles being accepted, or tentatively accepted pending revisions and resubmission, or rejected. Then a team of graduate students copy-edited the accepted articles to prepare them for publication.

The advantage of an electronic publication is that we can accept articles on a rolling basis throughout the academic year. Our goal for this first volume is approximately eight published articles by the end of the 2013-14 academic year. While we are initiating this volume with a letter, an editorial and two graduate student articles, we plan to publish more articles until we reach our targeted number. Therefore, we encourage aspiring graduate student writers to consider submitting articles for publication in this volume. Once it is complete, we will start reviewing articles for the next volume, and so forth.

Our first article in Volume I is by John Lunsford, a graduate student interested in anthropology and cross-disciplinary studies, who participated in Mason's School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, Field School in Bali, Indonesia during the summer of 2011. His article introduces us to a unique international opportunity exemplifying the globalization of Mason's curriculum that not only provided valuable first hand field experience for participating graduate students, but also provided useful feedback to the communities that hosted their research. Overall, Lunsford's article is a wonderful representation of the internationalization process occurring at Mason as we pursue the status of a "world-class" university.

We are especially excited about our second article, written by Josh Yavelberg, JMGR's Web Director and Publication Editor. Highly experienced in teaching the Art History Survey, Yavelberg explores what it takes to transform his discipline's foundational course from a traditional, teacher-centered to a more active, student-centered pedagogy. Utilizing personal conversations with his colleagues, a literature review and conference session feedback, Yavelberg suggests a creative, technological approach to extending this professional dialogue on the methods of art history survey instruction, as well as areas of future research.

Our third and fourth articles are currently under review and will be published as they complete the editorial process. We are still accepting articles for Volume I of the JMGR, and

encourage all Mason graduate students to consider submitting a paper to complete this volume. For instructions on submitting an article, see: http://journals.gmu.edu/jmgr.

In the meantime, the JMGR Editorial Board is considering the selection of a topic for our second volume, and soon will send out an announcement to Mason graduate students soliciting topic suggestions. Also, there is room for more graduate student volunteers as peer reviewers, copy editors, and help in other areas of the publication process, including editing positions as they open up. If you are interested in participating in this process, please contact us by emailing jmgr@gmu.edu.

Again, we welcome you to the inaugural issue of JMGR, and look forward to the academic dialogue we hope to initiate. Please email all feedback to jmgr@gmu.edu.

~ Marilyn Sharif, Editor-in-Chief

Journal of Mason Graduate Research
Volume 1 Number 1 2014
© George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
ISSN: 2327-0764
Pages: 5-22

Innovation in the Tropics: An Autoethnography of a Multidisciplinary Field School George Mason University Field School: Bali, Indonesia.

JOHN LUNSFORD

George Mason University

In today's academic environment, institutions often present students with the opportunity to participate in a field school. This allows students to experience an abridged form of fieldwork and provides a hands-on approach to the application of classroom-oriented theory. While field schools vary in topic and length, many remain firmly bound to a specific discipline. Breaching the exclusivity of a discipline-specific field school to accommodate a variety of academic perspectives is itself innovative in approach, as is encouraging trans-discipline collaboration and facilitating opportunities for cross-discipline discourse. In contrast with that tradition, George Mason University's School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution's field school in Bali, Indonesia, takes an innovative multi-disciplinary approach to the field school experience. Additionally, the field school takes a more action-oriented approach to research. Students produce research materials that are immediately usable to the community under study. This paper presents an auto-ethnographic account of this novel field school approach.

Background

Field schools are valuable academic tools that provide students with an opportunity to participate in an abridged "in the field" experience. As a tool, field schools stem from the activity of *fieldwork*, a prolonged stay in an environment for the purpose of conducting in-depth research into one or more aspects of the object of study. This tradition in anthropology harkens back to its foundations.

Field schools as active pre-fieldwork experience did not emerge in cultural anthropology until the 1960's, though anthropology's sub-discipline of archeology was "not so remiss" (McGoodwin, 1978, p. 175) in providing its aspirants an opportunity for training a decade earlier. By the 1960's, the importance of fieldwork was uncontested, and the academe "saw numerous major publications…concerning how to go about fieldwork" (p. 182). Unfortunately, despite the volumes of professional content produced, little existed to teach burgeoning anthropologists or other aspiring novices on how to successfully conduct fieldwork. For example, Williams (as cited in McGoodwin, 1978) noted that "Student anthropologists rarely study field work itself, but rather only the *results* of field work. The process is analogous to expecting a student pilot to solo without ever having been in an airplane" (p. 175). The creation of the field school, then, reflected a persistent need for students to engage, through practical application, with their respective disciplines in the field. This took place outside the formal confines and support structures of an educational institution.

In recent years, field schools have become more commonplace, though the majority continues to remain anchored to a tradition of mono-disciplinarity. That is to say, they only allow students of one specific discipline to participate. This stands to reason as the traditional notion of a field school is structured to emulate aspects of fieldwork with the goal of preparing students for careers in the field. For example, an archeology field school limits participation to students of archeology (Perry, 2004) and an ethnography school limits their attendees to mostly anthropology majors (Gmelch & Gmelch, 1999). This mono-disciplinarity is sensible. Not only does it prepare the next generation of researchers for the rigors of fieldwork in their discipline, also it ensures that the student participants have similar theoretical grounding and academic expectations. However, a program that allows for an interdisciplinary approach (i.e. combining elements of different disciplines to use in a single research project) for individual students, while still accommodating interaction among disparate approaches, facilitates considerable flexibility (Jacobs & Frickel, 2009). While the option of an interdisciplinary approach to research may not be new to field schools, its conjunction with program-wide accommodation exploration of disparate disciplines is innovative.

Methods

Autoethnography integrates the typically discreet positions of researcher and research subject such that these positions interpenetrate. This approach brings to bear analytic and observational rigor in the critical evaluation of firsthand experience. As such, this autoethnography is focused on the field school's operations, processes, and experiences, rather than strictly on the study that occurred while taking part in the field school program.

At its core, an autoethnography is a hybrid term combining the approach of ethnography with the critical analysis of the author's own experiences. *Ethnography* is a qualitative methodology for formally studying the behaviors, mores, and rules of a cultural group whose analysis is augmented by an in-depth descriptive articulation of behavior or "thick description" (Geertz, 1973/2000). The term *auto* is a commonly used term in the academy "referencing publications in which the author presents critical reflections and interpretations of personal experience (Hughes, Pennington, & Makris, 2012, p. 209). The method of analysis of an autoethnography is a "critical self-study in which the researcher takes an active, scientific, and systematic view of personal experience" in relation to the object or groups of study (Hughes et al. 2012, p. 209).

Central to the ethnographic approach of autoethnography is the data collection method of participant observation. Participant observation contextualizes an otherwise out-of-context set of observations with the collection of raw data through active engagement and familiarity with the object of study (Malinowski, 1922/2002; Mead, 1930/2001; Lindeman, 1924), allowing for the ethnographer to analyze any data gathered through the lens of the hosting cultures values. Through self-refection, this enables the ethnographer to understand observations in the context of the culture's own norms and avoid superimposing their personal values onto the analysis of an observed culture.

The continual process of self-reflection or *reflexivity* "in the context of social science research…refers to the ways in which the products of research are affected by the personnel and process of doing research" (Davies, 2007, p. 4). That is to say, *reflexivity* as a tool of research acknowledges the potential for an ethnographer's involvement in the culture of study to change the nature of the situation being studied. Davies observes that "[w]hile relevant for social research in general, issues of reflexivity are particularly salient in ethnographic research in which

the involvement of the researcher in the society and culture of those being studies is particularly close" (p. 4).

The reflexive aspect of ethnography is particularly relevant when situated within cultural anthropology. As a discipline, cultural anthropology utilizes ethnography to study all aspects of culture "…and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning" (Geertz, 1973/2000, p. 5). To be an ethnographically-reflexive anthropologist, the study of culture requires submersion in a culture to understand it. However in doing so, the ethnographer's presence can affect the very culture it strives to understand. Similarly, the analysis of such cultures should not be conceptualized as law or universal truth; instead, culture needs to be understood as a group of peoples' interpretation of the world, including the meaning they assign to everything in it. As such, this meaning can differ from society to society.

George Mason University's (GMU) School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (S-CAR) provided an opportunity to practice ethnographic reflexivity in a field school in a post-conflict environment.

S-CAR Field School

The School of Conflict Analysis and Resolution (S-CAR) within GMU is "comprised of a community of scholars, graduate and undergraduate students, alumni, practitioners, and organizations in the field of peace making and conflict resolution" (S-CAR, 2013). It currently facilitates eight field schools, one in the United States, and seven internationally. Its programs are "committed to the development of theory, research, and practice that interrupt cycles of violence" (S-CAR, 2013).

In the summer of 2011, S-CAR facilitated a field school in Bali, Indonesia. The program's focus was to study the aftermath of political violence that enveloped the island of Bali between 1965 and 1966. This was to be achieved through a six-week immersive program for eight graduate and doctoral candidates from various disciplines across GMU. The contents of the program included daily language lessons, separate homestay arrangements with local Balinese families, lectures, cultural events, and academic classes complete with readings and written assignments. The program culminated in an electively-independent abbreviated three week field study. Students selected a topic of their choosing, were given the option of working

independently or in pairs, and had the option to work within the local community or travel farther afield to achieve their research goals.

The program's goals were threefold. First, it familiarized students, through direct planned experiences, with the context of the environmental and cultural landscape. Second, it exposed students to the difficulties and rigors of fieldwork by conducting primary research. Third, the results of students' studies were required to be shaped into a presentable format that was shared with the community that aided in the research. The intent of this final goal was to provide the community with an opportunity to see the results of the data they helped collect. Dr. Leslie Dwyer, the hosting researcher and program lead, believed that researchers had a reputation of being exploitive by conducting fieldwork in a community and then leaving to write a journal article that the people in the community would never see. This field school endeavored to be innovative by contributing to the local understanding of academic research and directing research results directly to back to the community.

The program required that student research be conducted in such a way as to be preliminary research for a more comprehensive inquiry on the topic. It needed to be refined so that the incumbent researcher or a new researcher could familiarize themselves with the original work by reviewing notes, interview protocols, or other data collection tools and resume or adapt them for a larger study. This was intentional. Three weeks was not enough time to conduct a full ethnographic study. In-depth ethnographic study would have involved months of familiarizing oneself with the local community and language, building relationships, and gaining the trust of key informants, often without existing support structures. The program's ability to achieve results of even an abbreviated study (an activity that could still require months rather than weeks) relied heavily on the relationships of the hosting researcher.

The hosting researcher and leader of the program was American anthropologist Leslie Dwyer, PhD, along with her Balinese husband, Degung Santikarma. Having lived in and studied Balinese culture for years, the two used their connections to staff the program. Also, they provided program participants with their expertise and use of internet at their home, and facilitated access to experienced or knowledgeable persons. As research topics took shape, they used their reputation to establish connections applicable to the topics selected by the graduate researchers. These ranged from survivors of the political violence and former political prisoners

to farmers and politicians. Without use of their pre-established connections, it would have been virtually impossible to build such relationships from the ground up in three or six weeks' time.

The first few weeks of the field school included numerous classes, lectures, and excursions. The classes were not formal constructions held behind desks of an academic institution. Instead, they were most often conducted at Dr. Dwyer's home. Despite the informal location and relaxed demeanor, the content of the classes reflected the rigor of a master's level course. Mirroring a course one might find within an institution, classes were held at relatively the same time on the same days (i.e. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM, and another from 1:00 PM to 3:30 PM) -despite a common Balinese tradition of flexible start and end times for events. These classes often saw discussions related to the following: application of theory in fieldwork, current experiences and future appointments, and discussions of reading and writing assignments from previous sessions. From one week to another, it was not uncommon to have 100 pages or more of materials to review in addition to writing assignments that critically analyzed experiences, research methods, and theory. Continuing the theme of academic rigor, the classes and resulting assignments were held in addition to a daily regimen of lectures, cultural events, and ethnographic data collection.

Events and trips took many forms during the field school experience. One of these occasions featured an artisan cooperative. They consolidated resources from multiple artisans to collectively sell their wares online and ship them overseas, allowing them to avoid heavy government taxation. Another focused on cooperatively purchased farmland for trees and coffee. Others were tourist attractions that featured traditional Balinese cultural events and performances, accompanied by a post-event discussion with local Balinese. They discussed how the projected and performed image of Balinese culture differed from the actual. Other trips included a day trip to Ubud, the cultural center of the island, and a rafting trip past where the movie *Eat, Pray, Love* was filmed. Not only did the field school incorporate trips to national landmarks, innovative social and economic constructions, and famous locations, also it included attendance at the local ceremonies. The largest was *Galungan*, a Hindu ceremony that celebrated the Balinese ancestral spirits. Clad in traditional dress supplied by host families, the graduate researchers along with our hosts, program assistants and leaders, spent a day in the community temple observing the traditions and activities associated with *Galungan*.

The lecture topics and the lecturers themselves were as eclectic as the scheduled experiences. While not all of them could boast an extensive academic background, their expertise and experiences more than compensated for the lack of traditional academic tutelage. Some speakers were academics; one was a PhD candidate (now recently graduated) from Harvard's Anthropology Program; another was the cinematographer for the documentary film *40 Years of Silence: An Indonesian Tragedy* (2009). Other presenters were a former police officer, teacher, grassroots activist, gay rights activist, and a newly released political prisoner.

The project, lectures, discussions, and planned experiences presented opportunities for innovations in cross discipline and cross-topic collaborations among the field school students. Our eight person cohort came from the following academic disciplines: two from cultural anthropology, one from psychology, one from film studies, and four from conflict analysis and resolution. This was especially relevant during the design of the research projects, as each discipline had its own operating procedures for conducting an ethnographic-styled study. This gave us the opportunity to collaborate across our various disciplines. We could shape our studies to be reflective of the needs of the project and not be constrained by limiting them solely to the methods of our respective disciplines. In one instance, this allowed me to share the concept of *reflexivity* in the ethnographic method with a film student. With it, she integrated reflexivity into the analysis of documentary filmmaking, which opened up discussion about the researcher's presence affecting the object of her observations. In turn, she contrasted these perspectives with the benefits of having an object (in this case her camera) between her and her respondents. She felt that the camera was able to remove her as a focus of the story, which afforded greater attention on the experiences of the objects of study. This insight became particularly useful when viewed in the context of my key respondent's role as a gatekeeper, a situation explained below.

Although a variety of academic disciplines were represented, no two members of the cohort had the same academic focus or concentration. In conjunction with the varied disciplines, that meant topics of presentation often resonated differently with each person, enriching numerous post-lecture discussions. However, the graduate researcher concentrations did not emerge during the field school; rather, they were preexisting areas of interest that we had gravitated toward in our previous academic coursework. In this way, each graduate researcher brought his or her own interests and specialization to the field school and applied this lens to

their experiences. Where one graduate researcher focused on women's rights, another sought a top-down evaluation of the current political climate. My research focus was the degree to which technology mediated human experience, and how people, consciously or unconsciously, interacted and re-presented themselves through technological mediums. When one of the invited lecturers spoke about a digitally-based Balinese social interest group, my interest was piqued.

This presenter's demeanor was unassuming, polite, and soft-spoken. A web development and graphic design freelancer in his mid-20's, he shared information about the Bali Bloggers, a local group which sought to improve their community by using a grassroots approach to increasing technological know-how by supplying equipment and using digital tools. He emphasized the term *group* because *organization* implied a formal institution. Formality was degree of institutionalization that the group struggled to avoid for reasons that were not apparent to me at the time. The unique attribute of the Bali Bloggers lay in the way they approached the application of social media tools as a mechanism for addressing social, economic, and political interests. This was particularly relevant because it directly followed what popular media had dubbed the 2011 Arab Spring. During this time, many communities in the Middle East used social technologies as tools of mobilization and protest. The Bali Bloggers, on the other hand, used many of the same tools but instead of expressing anti-policy, election, or government sentiments, they utilized technology to promote community-based initiatives of building knowledge by creating or expanding communication networks and skillsets. Rather than employing flash-mob tactics of protests, they elected to lay the foundations for self-sustaining community-based mutual support structures. With time, these could challenge the status quo on previously censored or inaccessible topics such as the killings of 1965 and 1966. The way this group engaged with and shaped their message through technology, revealed them to be an ideal candidate for study.

Learning how to apply anthropological methods

The methods I employed for my research project combined survey tools and unstructured and semi-structured single and group interviews. I chose these methods because they took advantage of tools that contained structure and flexibility. Surveys captured snippets of data and were easily deployed and collected in short amounts of time. The unstructured component of interviews allowed conversations to follow a more meandering path. This was particularly

useful in the discovery phase of the study as this group had never been documented previously. Unstructured interviews allowed the respondents to lead the conversation into areas they found significant (Denzin & Lincoln 2011). Semi-structured interviews were utilized later in the study once I had established a familiarity with the basic structure, goals, and motivations of the group. By providing more structure to the questions, these interviews helped me explore specific topics more deeply.

The method of finding respondents was performed through the tactic of *snowball sampling* (Bernard, 2006). This describes a process where a researcher is introduced to an initial key respondent who introduces the researcher to someone else, and so on. In *snowball sampling*, the technique requires that the ethnographer establish a rapport with the respondent so that they are willing to provide a reference to another person and so on. However, as time for the study was very limited, I did not have the opportunity to establish the relationships needed to successfully perform the *snowball sampling* method.

Through the presentations, I was introduced to my initial key respondent, Sunjay[1], the Balinese presenter who spoke to the group of graduate researchers about the Bali Bloggers group. After having initial interviews, Sunjay introduced me to a second person, Leeroy. I adapted a cross-disciplinary tactic to the sampling approach so that it was more recursive in a way that continually invoked the influence and access of Sunjay as was a well-respected member of the community I was studying. This innovation occurred to me as the direct result of an earlier theoretical discussion with a film student concerning the role of her camera described above. Instead of departing the scenario after introducing me to Leeroy, Sunjay continued to accompany me with the next respondents, Marvin, Locke, and Claude, among others. In doing so, Sunjay served in the role of *gatekeeper* as he held the key relationships that I used to connect with members of the community. In a way, the surrogate ethnographer was to me as the film student's camera was to her. However, not in a way that relegated the *gatekeeper* to the position of an inanimate object, but rather he was a buffer between me and the objects of my study. While he never conducted an interview in my stead, he took the burden of trust traditionally assigned to the ethnographer, during the referral portion of the snowball technique. He used his

[1]For the purpose of this paper he is referred to as Sunjay. Pseudonyms have been used to protect the identity of all respondents.

own existing reputation in lieu of my recently formed one. Additionally, he served as a translator when necessary.

Not all my encounters were with one other person at a time. It was not uncommon that Sunjay introduced me, unexpectedly, to a group of people after which a group interview ensued. While a little more chaotic than the individual interviews, these provided a different social dynamic that was beneficial to the research. According to Bernard (2006), this is significant because each grouping needs to be evaluated within the context of any existing or preexisting social or cultural association that could influence the responses (i.e. the data) collected by the researchers.

It was not uncommon for an individual interview to morph into a group interview. At one point, Sunjay and I were scheduled to meet a respondent, Rex, for dinner around 11pm. After a 30 minute motorbike ride, we arrived. Instead of a single person greeting us, it was a group of six that had seen each other in passing and decided to stay for the interview. This very fluid social gathering was common to Bali, and I was unprepared for my first interview to be with six excited Balinese locals. However, after that evening, I made sure to always carry extra copies of short surveys, handouts, or questions. The unexpected behavior occurred a few more times, and each time it blurred the lines between single and group interviews; it represented the fluidity of Balinese social life. This simple fact was my most poignant introduction to fieldwork; it forced me to reconcile that my best laid plans of academic study only lasted until the very first interview. Ultimately, that flexibility aided me throughout the rest of the study.

Experiences like the one mentioned in the previous paragraph were common amongst my fellow field school students. The program was designed not only to collaborate on theory but also on experience. In fact, Thursday afternoon was the time dedicated to sharing experiences of fieldwork, insights, and suggestions. That did not mean we could not share at other times; however, it was important enough to make a point that there was specific time etched into our schedules for collaboration of experience. Additionally, while many of these encounters were between cohort members, Dr. Dwyer was always present to offer her insights and input, though sometimes only if asked. She was more likely to allow freeform discussion about experience with relatively limited structure. This practice I found helpful as it allowed us to dedicate more time to questions we found important rather than predetermined ones.

The idea of predetermined questions elucidates one of the underlying attitudes of the Bali field school. Where other field schools have strictly planned assignments, this program found innovation in allowing a more freeform exploration of topics. This was because Dr. Dwyer operated under the opinion that fieldwork is unpredictable, an opinion informed by her own experience as a researcher. She believed that one can approach fieldwork with plans and structure, but ultimately, they become guidelines between which self-reflection and adaptation, if fostered, can flourish. That was in addition to the goal of simulating the lack of institutional support structures in actual fieldwork. That is not to say that she did not offer support when it was needed, but like much of the program, that support was fluid, based on the needs of each individual student.

The only difficulties I encountered with the fluid structure of the program were the transition to open ended assignments and a healthy amount of materials to review. Where some field schools are more regimented (Perry, 2004), this one left writing assignments open, and intentionally assigned more reading than what could be critically read in the short amount of time available. On the one hand, this forced us to prioritize which materials are most pertinent to the study, and on the other hand, it exposed us to a volume of related, cross-discipline, literature that we would not have been exposed to had it been strictly a discipline-specific field school.

Research Field School Research Project

The abbreviated studies were designed to give something tangible back to the communities in which the studies were conducted. While an activist role in research is not a new phenomenon (Hale, 2001), this fieldschool articulated community activism in the form of academic involvement by creating a forum in which researchers presented the results of the research to the community of study. Doing so created an opportunity to see the results of the research and critique it for accuracy. This presentation combined with a more formal research paper was innovative because it facilitated the graduate researcher’s exposure to both applied activist research while still simulating the responsibilities and rigor of producing a more formal piece of academic institution oriented research. The forum the projects were presented in was an open air community meeting of roughly 100 people from local and surrounding villages. This number is hard to name exactly because many people would come and go throughout the

evening. Doing this gave us, the graduate researchers who were responsible for the interpretation of our data, a task that was reviewed during the community presentation at the end of the field school. This turned out to be a very enlightening experience as it allowed for direct dialogue with the community and supplied real world application and direct feedback.

The topic of my research was grassroots activism, to which I applied a symbolic interpretive method of analysis. This method looks at cultural symbols and their relationship and significance to the construction of meaning within a society (Geertz, 2000). The subjects of the research all came from the organization Bali Bloggers. The Bali Bloggers began as a small group of like-minded individuals whose shared interest empowered their community though open communication and knowledge. This goal was achieved through expanded communication and organizational networks, which allowed people the ability to freely and openly discuss issues in their society.

Since the inception around 2003 (they were not even sure), the bloggers were an unorganized, informal group of individuals from across Bali that shared ideas, opinions, and experiences via digitally hosted journals known as blogs. Conversations through blogs fostered discussions on message boards; soon after members began to meet with each other in person. The group expanded as relationships made in the blogging community traversed both physical and digital social networks. Some people would discover the group that had no previous affiliation with it or its members, but more often friends would introduce friends, and those friends would introduce more friends. The effect was a cascade of new membership. Eventually, the group began organizing structured meetings. Whereas the initial meetings saw five people in attendance, some of the more recent would see 50 or more. As more people were inducted into the group, each bringing with them new ideas or opinions, the group found itself with membership not only from across Bali, but other islands and provinces in the Indonesian archipelago (e.g., Central Java, Papua New Guinea).

Bolstered by the influx of new members and ideas, the group became more proactive first by creating a website and data repository and later through community outreach. The term community at this point should be understood not in a way that stresses locality (i.e., the island of Bali or the city of Jakarta). Instead, it spanned the physical communities that the members of the blogger community were a part. The role of the website was to supply the bloggers with a place to interact with each other as a community rather than separately in multiple blogs and to

act as a repository for discussions and information that remain accessible to old and new members alike.

From 2008 to 2011, the bloggers group had experienced a period of expansion and growth. During this time, many members of the blogger community expressed interest in sharing the information with others, but could not due to some people's inability to access the internet or their lack of technological knowledge. Both instances precluded an individual from participation in digitally-hosted discussions. To solve this dilemma, the group pursued opportunities for outreach. Group members traveled to communities and held in-person classes in homes, community centers, classrooms, and restaurants. The topics of instruction in these classes varied depending on the needs of the community; it was not uncommon for one class visit to provoke many more. The topics included subjects like basic website and blog creation; how to setup a Facebook, e-mail or online bank account. Other topics included how to use a keyboard, search engine, website, cellphone, or computer. These classes were so successful that companies like Nokia would send representatives to showcase the newest technologies to the group. Additionally, government, military, and non-governmental organizations requested similar instructional classes. While any class for the community was free, the group would charge official organizations a service fee. The proceeds went toward funding additional classes or purchasing equipment.

There were times when increasing knowledge was not enough. The recipients of that knowledge did not have access to the technology required to make use of it. In these situations, the group would raise funding to purchase equipment and subscriptions for internet access. While they did not have the means to give every household access, as internet was very expensive in Bali, they were often able to set up a central location for community access. More recently, they began a new program to familiarize farmers, particularly those in remote locations, with technology. Some of these farms were on small islands only accessible by boat. Through this outreach, the Bali Bloggers hoped to promote solidarity and cooperative efforts between farms. As a result, some farmers used their newfound skills to share farming tactics and coordinated logistics to get their wares to a market. In one instance, a number of island farmers banded together to coordinate a harvest and crop delivery so that they only needed to collectively hire a single boat to transport their crop. This saved them precious resources.

The bloggers built, discovered, or otherwise supplied the forums, both physical and digital, for discussion. They enabled and empowered the communities to teach each other. The idea behind this action was to make the group self-sustainable. As new members joined, archived data and older members would teach them about the group. Within the digital forums, conversations on everything from celebrities and clothing styles to global politics and Indonesian public policy took place. It was used as a staging platform to organize protests, art shows and local concerts. The only topic not allowed was religion. When asked why, the response was it was too complicated and caused too many problems. In their eyes, the discussion of religion was emotional; emotion implied passion, and passion was not a productive tool of discussion as it turned discourse into argument.

From September 30, 1965 into the early months of 1966 estimations of over one million people were killed across Indonesia. During this time, Bali bore witness to some of the worst of the violence (Cribb, 1990). Afraid to speak openly, many people joined the Bali Bloggers group because it supplied them with a location for discussion, the means to access it, and the knowledge to use it. In the ensuing 50 years since the killings, through propaganda initiatives, veiled threats, and overt punishments, political and military entities used the silence to perpetuate the structural violence that surrounded the killings. At the time of the field school in 2011, there were whispers of the propaganda statement "beware the latent threat of communism" being nailed on the front doors of particularly vocal advocates for open communication. Others received it as an anonymous SMS message from burner cellphones. Advertised or public discussions and official inquiries to the government were met with both indirect and direct action. Indirect action, like the aforementioned propaganda statement, was more anonymous and meant to subdue someone that could cause trouble. Direct action was intended to deal with someone already causing trouble and took the form of a firebombed building, alleged disappearances, and incarcerations. One of the program speakers was one such political activist, imprisoned for his outspoken views concerning the killings.

The Bali Bloggers offered a digital forum in which individuals could express their thoughts and find information on the 1965-1966 killings with comparative secrecy. Hidden amongst a thousand other topics was a place to discuss, share, and search with relative freedom. Not only that, these places increased people's exposure to the topic of the killings. Some in the Indonesian community refuse to talk about the events of those months, even when asked by their

children or grandchildren. These forums gave others, predominantly younger generations, an avenue to learn and understand that did not require their loved ones to relive those events.

Prior to my arrival, the Bali Bloggers had not documented their own activities, objectives, and goals in a centralized location. The PowerPoint presentation I created was tailored to address three major undertakings: community outreach, records, and digital distribution. The project outlined the types of outreach the bloggers perform, the available resources for community improvement, and the methods of getting in contact with them. Its delivery focused on raising awareness within the community so that other members had the ability to access the resources. The second undertaking revolved around recordkeeping. The Bali Bloggers had not kept records of all of their previous works or capabilities and their services were delivered *ad hoc*. By revisiting interviews coupled with a few supplemental conversations, I was able to form a rough list of services that they had previously rendered, to use a resource for reference and easy distribution. The presentation outlined previous projects such as community internet setup packages, classes, and seminars they had been able to offer thus far. Additionally, it supplied a sample recordkeeping sheet to document future services. Lastly, the PowerPoint functioned as a point of digital distribution. Similar in concept to raising local awareness, the digital file was given to Sunjay at the conclusion of my presentation to the community; he could deploy it on the Internet wherever they deemed it would be helpful. Sunjay was pleased with the presentation, and afterward asked my permission to send it to his friends to post online. Even today, the PowerPoint exists as an online resource of the Bali Bloggers.

Operational Critique

Field schools have come to be a key method for students to learn about conducting fieldwork in a supportive environment. However, historically these schools have been siloed by discipline. An innovative approach to the academic tool of field school lies in S-CAR’s Bali field school’s flexibly in incorporating multi-disciplinary perspectives in the experience and application of theory. Providing for a multi-disciplinary program affords students the opportunity to disembark from regimented ways entrenched in their academic discipline, and in my case, adapt the core methods of ethnography during the research process. However, such an open multidiscipline approach has both benefits and detractions. Accommodating for so many

competing theories can be difficult. It also increased our workload while simultaneously lessening the structure of the program.

Exposure to video documentaries, historical, political, and gender-based modes of analysis, combined with my own symbolic interpretative perspective, allowed me to broaden the angles from which I approached ethnographic research. It encouraged me to view data collected from different angles. However, such a broad array of approaches also increased tensions amongst the researcher students. Many arguments arose out of discussions regarding methodological superiority. Not everyone agreed on which approach offered the best analysis and interpretation of the research.

The increased literature workload exposed us to a variety of perspectives, but often took so much time to cover that it infringed upon time needed for research. Meanwhile, the program's flexibility tried to accommodate the increased workload by allowing us to regulate our time while attempting to simulate an untethered experience of fieldwork. However, this was sometimes counterproductive as the time needed for the freeform simulated fieldwork experience collided with time required for more formal academic lectures, reading responsibilities, and written assignments. I found this particularly difficult the deeper and more involved the research became. As the more formal assignments were what determined most of the letter grade received for the field school, this culminated in contentions that juxtaposed a more in-depth fieldwork experience against a better letter grade. The demands for time allowed for the pursuit of one of those options.

As both a difficult and enlightening experience, there were many productive lesions that came out of the fieldschool experience. Because of the innovative approach, it exposed me to new methods of analysis. As I continued my studies after the field school, I found myself augmenting anthropological work with some of these other approaches. Additionally, by creating a workload that could not have been completely addressed in the given amount of time, the fieldschool articulated very poignantly the reality that there is not enough time to always read all the material. In addition, when exposed to the same material, peer groups disagree. This made me reflect on hard academic decisions; there is not enough time - especially when conducting fieldwork - to I do and read everything to the degree that I wish. Therefore, difficult choices must be made that are not always ideal. This was a simple but profound lesson.

Conclusion

S-CAR's innovative incorporation of multi-disciplinarity tactics in the Indonesian field school was manifested in the program's construction, design, implementation, events, and discussions. It fostered cross-disciplinary exposure in the breadth of planned reading assignments, events, and resulting discussions. By incorporating a variety of cultural, religious and famous events, it set the platform for participating in cross-disciplinary experiences and encouraged collaborative discourse. Additionally, by allowing for flexibility and flow in the design of class content, it provided the opportunity to discuss in-depth, experiences and theoretical comparisons that were implemented throughout experiences of the field study.

The field school was a seminal point in exposing me to cross disciplinary collaboration. Prior to my experience in the field school, I had planned on applying to anthropology PhD programs. I found anthropology to be particularly interesting for its exploration of subjects across disciplines. However, by not employing a multidisciplinary approach to its methods of investigation, the sole use of its methods revealed itself to be inadequate in addressing topics of a multidisciplinary nature. As a result of this experience, the flexibility, strength and support a cross-discipline approach can lend to a study caused me to reconsider. I am moving the program of application from a mono-disciplinarily one of anthropology to a cross-disciplinary one in Science, Technology and Society.

References

Bernard, H. R. (2006). Research methods in anthropology: *Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Altamira Press.

Cribb, R. (Ed.) (1990). *The Indonesian killings 1965-1966: Studies from Java and Bali*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies: Monash University Press.

Davies, C. A. (2007). *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others (The ASA research methods)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Geertz, C. (2000). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. (2000 ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gmelch, G., & Gmelch, S. B. (1999). An ethnographic field school: What students do and learn. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 30*, 220-227. doi: 10.1525/aeq.1999.30.2.220

Hale, C. R. (2001). What is Activist Research? *Items & Issues*, 2(1-2), 13-15. Retrieved from http://www.ssrc.org/publications/items-and-issues/

Hughes, S., Pennington, J. L., & Makris, S. (2012). Translating autoethnography across the AERA standards: Toward understanding autoethnographic scholarship as empirical research. *Educational Researcher, 41*, 209-219. doi: 10.3102/0013189X12442983.

Jacobs, J. A., & Frickel, S. (2009). Interdisciplinarity: A critical assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *35*, 63-65. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115954.

Lemelson, R. (Producer), & Pasquino, A. (Producer), & Lemelson, R. (Director). (2009). *40 years of silence: An Indonesian tragedy*, [DVD]. United States: Elemental Productions.

Lindeman, E. (1924). *Social discovery: An approach to the study of functional group*. New York, NY: Republic Publishing Company.

Malinowski, B. (2002). *Argonauts of the western Pacific; An account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London, UK: Routledge.

McGoodwin, J. (1978). Directing an ethnographic field school: Notes and advice. *Anthropological Quarterly, 51*, 175-183.

Mead, M. (2001). *Coming of age in Samoa: A psychological study of primitive youth for western civilization*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Perry, J. E. (2004). Authentic learning in field schools: Preparing future members of the archaeological community. *World Archaeology, 36*, 236-260. doi:10.1080/0043824042000261004

School of Conflict Analysis and Resolution [S-CAR]. (2013). *Who we are*. George Mason University. Retrieved June 29, 2013 from http://scar.gmu.edu/who-we-are

Journal of Mason Graduate Research
Volume 1 Number 1 Year 2014
© George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
ISSN: 2327-0764
Pages: 23-48

JOURNAL of MASON GRADUATE RESEARCH

Questioning the Survey: A Look into Art History Survey and its Pedagogical Practices

JOSH YAVELBERG

George Mason University

The traditional art history survey course is a staple throughout higher education. This course has been taught in a similar manner for generations. This study questions several art history faculty members regarding their unique practices in an effort to understand the pedagogical implications as we move into the twenty-first century. Through continued dialogue, coupling reflections on personal experience, this heuristic inquiry intends to produce and share through a developing community of practice new pedagogical alternatives to what has become labeled, "Art-in-the-Dark."

Introduction

The art history survey has been taught in a similar manner for generations. As we progress further into the twenty-first century, much of the traditional curricular and pedagogical methods of the past have come into question as institutions move towards learner-centered models and technology to engage a new era of students. I too have questioned the traditional methods of art historical instruction, having come to the field of art history more as an artist than a traditional historian. After teaching art history survey to undergraduate classes for years at several institutions, and in different formats, I continue to question my approaches to what is labeled by many, "Art-in-the-Dark." I have become curious about what other instructors' perspectives were on the topic and what they may be doing in their classrooms so that I may further inform our understanding or this course and its implications.

For the purposes of my study, I have defined "Art-in-the-Dark" as a lecture format, survey of art history course oftentimes taught with large auditorium style seating and large class

sizes. Traditional assessment measures include essays, quizzes, midterm and final exams. The course derives from 19th century German rhetorical tradition where the knowledgeable sage conducts his or her lecture to an attentive audience. Robert Nelson (2000) provides a detailed analysis of the implications of this slide lecture approach. Nelson's historical review describes the slide lecture as once a major pedagogical innovation that engaged students through a choreographed journey utilizing visual technology. This once innovative practice has changed little in generations and Nelson himself questions where the art historian will stand in this new millennium. I posit that the traditional art history lecture, as Nelson describes it, places art historians in a unique position to inform future pedagogical practice by utilizing their skills for transforming lectures through the use of media.

A select few textbooks dominate this survey course. When studying for a doctorate in the field, I was required to pass a comprehensive exam that is common to most programs. It measured the knowledge of the three mainly used texts at the time (of which I reference the latest editions): Stockstad's *Art History* (2005); *Gardner's Art Through the Ages* (Kleiner, 2013); and the ever-famous *Janson's History of Art* (Janson, Davies, Denny, Hofrichter, Simon, Roberts, 2011). The exam was described as a certification of my qualifications to teach art history survey at almost any college; they would most likely require one of those three texts. These texts remain the foundation for such courses and guide much of the pedagogical practice. Even though they have evolved over time, there is still much criticism regarding their approach, cost, and the degree to which they have changed over time (Graham, 1995; Nelson, 1997; Schwarzwer, 1995; Weidman, 2007).

With the traditionalism of the survey in mind, I began to reflect on my role as an art history instructor. I have been teaching art history survey along with a variety of fine and applied arts courses at colleges throughout the Washington, DC metropolitan area. Each college has had a different curricular approach, but all have had similar described outcomes: to develop aesthetic or visual literacy and to form the ability to identify artistic movements or styles. Some colleges add competencies such as the development of appreciation for arts, creative thinking, or the ability to recognize the complexity and diversity of human experience. However, the main competencies remain as they have for decades. Personally, I have maintained a teaching philosophy that focuses on engaging students by making knowledge relevant to their personal

goals. This is often a challenge in art history as the majority of students enrolled are not art history majors.

As I continually experiment with different methods to reach my goal to engage students, my curiosity lead to the following questions of others in the field:

1. What pedagogical alternatives exist to the traditional “art-in-the-dark” art history survey course?
2. What is the perceived effectiveness by instructors using alternative pedagogical methods of these approaches?
3. What suggestions can be made for future pedagogical practice?

Methodology

The research in this study was conducted following approval from the Human Subjects Review Board of George Mason University. The method that I decided on to answer the research questions was a heuristic approach given my personal connections and experience with this topic. A Heuristic methodology allowed me as researcher to better inform my role as an art history instructor and to develop a dialogue with my colleagues that may inform both my understanding and future practice (Patton, 2004). Heuristics would allow me to work closely with my participants as peers to form an understanding of pedagogical challenges and form a consensus. I chose to approach instructors with whom I was familiar and who represented a range of curricular approaches. Also, I was cautious to approach instructors whom I perceived as struggling with similar questions in their own courses, believing that they would best lend voice to the concerns that I felt were at issue in the art history survey course. Following a call for participants, I was able to meet with three instructors having roughly fifty years of experience between them, currently representing three different institutions in the DC metropolitan area. One instructor teaches fully on-ground, one teaches both online and on-ground, and the other teaches fully online. This provided a rich variety and represented the field today.

These instructors met with me for discussions that lasted roughly one hour. Each was guided by an initial interview guide I developed to keep the conversations on track and to assure that we were addressing all of my questions in each discussion. After initial discussions, I took time to reflect on the experience before thematically coding the transcripts. I then reviewed the themes once again with the participants to assure validity and to engage in further dialogue. As

themes emerged, I reflected on my own experiences and conducted a more comprehensive literature review to gain further critical understanding of each topic. Following this research, I will conclude this study with, as Patton (2004) describes, a creative synthesis.

Results

Discussions with my participants were enriching and each mentioned the joy of being able to speak with a colleague about their work. They described the distance from peers that they often feel in their classrooms, and were anxious to share their experience and hear about my own. From the discussions, several themes emerged that I believe were of great benefit to my initial research questions: course design, technology, assessment, textbooks, and classroom issues such as engagement, demographics, or other management issues.

Course Design

Course design is traditionally driven by a chronological model. The model mimics the formatting of the commonly used art history survey texts. This design allows students to obtain the competency of forming an ability to identify styles and specific artworks. It also forms a method that encourages simple memorization of terms and artifacts that are subject to change for some of the following reasons: political correctness, copyright regulations and space. The participants in this study all described their alternative methods to transform this traditional course design, focusing on broader competencies in an effort to move away from memorization.

By broader competencies, one participant described his change of focus away from specifics toward broader cultural themes. His rationale for such a shift was one of relevance. He described the shift as justifying the legitimacy of visual artifacts by demonstrating how it influences and is influenced by culture. Not only does it validate art history as a relevant subject, but he also believes that the thematic approach provides a more interdisciplinary approach. This mimics the placement of the art history survey within the general education curriculum, and the student demographic that often includes a very small percentage of art history majors. As he exclaimed, “Art is 90% of human history which has been religious, political monuments, structures, [and] huge centers of culture, so it makes perfect sense to teach it that way.” He continued:

> They're not memorizing. They're learning about larger issues and topics. They are seeing the narrative of history take place they are seeing how things take place in Egypt; how they relate to things in Rome; how the Romans appropriate things from the Greeks and Christians appropriate things from the Greeks... You do that by creating a narrative that's broader and not simply memorizing names and dates.

We continued this discussion, elaborating on the benefits of this direction to teaching art history:

> I: I think it would be great to teach one of these surveys, or part of it, and really talk about money.
>
> J: It's interesting that you bring that up. Because this approach, rather than the memorization of names dates and time periods and these thematic subject matter approaches that you think are kind of arbitrary to the relevance, this method, do you think, makes it more applicable to some of the current political initiatives as well? Like, we're currently pushing the areas of science technology engineering and math and how does art history fit into those four? And I guess when you're talking about the engineering and construction of something, the scientific materials and how materials come together, that covers science. And some of the mathematical principles come in when talking about things like the Parthenon. And I guess this is kind of a method to tie those…
>
> I: Or even if you want talk about the business of art, or the political nature of art, I mean people are interested in religion.
>
> J: But what about patronage? And how the patron is important to the artist art history?
>
> I: And the function of the art as kind of a media, and propaganda, and whatever you want to call it. How it functions. A person today is not necessarily interested in how beautiful Jesus looked to a 12th century pilgrimage guy but he would be interested in how this is part of the political iconography of French monarchs or whatever.

Here the discussion continued to describe the directions that one may take thematic approaches, which are broad, but specifically the connection to political initiatives that threaten the future of humanities and other liberal arts courses. It seems to be necessary for all courses and curricula to justify their benefits, and the thematic approach has the possibility of adapting to external pressures.

This same participant also claimed that he still mainly utilizes a lecture format, and in fact stresses his lecture format over the reading or the text, given his cultural/thematic approach. The lectures carry greater weight, and he does not hand out course notes, study guides, or PowerPoint printouts. Instead, he believes that students become more active learners when they are forced to take notes and participate in discussions. He also mentioned that this solves many of his issues with attendance; students are tested on what is covered in class and not from what they can read at home. "They show up because they know that if they miss the lecture they can't pass the quiz."

In designing courses, (though we are discussing alternative methods to course design), there are some successful elements to traditional approaches that cannot be denied. The challenge that this instructor believes he has overcome is one of engagement, though the fact that the students show up does not necessarily mean that they are engaged; rather, they may be falling into the same trap of memorizing for the sake of passing a quiz. Combined with a thematic approach, and more open-ended response questions on a quiz, (to be described below), the instructor navigates the memorization issue and enhances literacy and critical awareness on the part of his students.

A second participant in my study also discussed the thematic approach to art history. She described a particular instance:

> Going back to when we start with Mesopotamian art, I want them to look at images of power, both the places and the personages of people in power. I would like them to look at some of the stylistic things, such as symmetry and axial, and compare this to something in their environment now, with things like presidential campaigns and whatever else they find around. That is the same with Greek and Roman, to look in their environment for buildings which follow Greek and Roman orders. And that sometimes works. Of all the topics, the thing that gets the best discussion is the early Christian debate between iconoclasts and iconophiles.

This approach engages students in discussion and forms relevant connections to the contemporary world. These connections are often not readily made by students who believe that history is no longer relevant. Also, this instructor began to describe the enthusiasm that students have when engaged in discussion, rather than passively listening to a lecture. She mentioned the

importance of leaving discussions open-ended without a right or wrong answer, as the first person to answer correctly leaves others with nothing to contribute.

The third participant further expanded on this issue of lecture and discussion in the classroom, explaining that developing a dialogue with your class is important:

> Basically, it involves talking to them and engaging them in a lecture, which means not sitting back behind a podium pushing a PowerPoint machine but actually talking to them, walking around the room asking them questions that are not simply about the quiz or something they memorized. A question like, "Why do you think Christians use images? Why do you think…? How did Constantine's conversion to Christianity affect Christianity? Do you think it really changed it?" So, I mean, you talk about that and it leads into the topic rather than saying, "What's this image?" That just takes a little bit of getting to know your students and changes with every class. It depends on how big the class is, but that's what I do.

This instructor utilizes open-ended discussions to engage students in his narrative, but also acknowledges that the issue of class size is a challenge, especially at institutions where art history surveys are conducted in large auditoriums. He also emphasized the importance of engaging with the students, moving around the room, rather than standing behind a podium and speaking at the audience. This same participant mentioned the flexibility that he brings to lectures or discussions, keeping them flexible to emphasize different sections or themes based on the interest of the class. These are simple teaching techniques that are often overlooked by many historians, since most are not trained educators, despite their knowledge and/or academic credentials.

Another suggestion from the participants was to fully immerse students into the discussion topics. For example, one could add music, poetry, and other art forms to create a fully sensory experience. Also, the instructor should remain vigilant towards current museum exhibitions that may lend further insight into the topic. One participant mentioned the benefits of guest speakers to break from the voice of the instructor while lending validity to the instructor's claims. Along the lines of guest speakers, this same participant discussed a class that she was able to "team-teach." She mentioned finding both the students and herself more engaged and challenged by the experience. It inspired her to become more critical of her teaching methods by

having them on display and worked-through with a peer. Finally, the students were never able to become too comfortable with a single teaching style.

This same instructor elaborated on the benefits of utilizing student teams within her courses. She utilizes teams in a variety of ways, primarily within the structure of classroom discussions and the development of study groups. For example, in discussions, she would ask students to come together to develop additional questions which would help guide and engage the direction of the class period. She would also have them come together in a similar manner to conduct peer reviews while discussing the importance of critical feedback, emphasizing the "critique sandwich." This required at least a paragraph response to peers, beginning with a positive comment, followed by a suggestion, and then concluded with a positive or encouraging response. In addition, students would come together to work in teams on presentations. Lastly, she used teams as study groups, providing the questions for the midterm or final exam ahead of time in class, and allowing them to discuss the responses. All of these techniques increased student engagement, peer mentoring, and allowed the instructor to pinpoint areas of student confusion.

In designing learning opportunities, all of the instructors described their use of museums. As the participants teach within the Metropolitan DC area, they all attempt to make use of the many free museums in the area. This provides students with first-hand art experiences. Museums are a great resource for engaging students out of the classroom. Students have the opportunity to apply concepts discussed in class to artworks that typically are not covered within the limited survey texts.

Although museums are a great tool for instruction, all the participants mentioned issues that they had with utilizing museums. Each mentioned difficulties in getting students to attend museum visits. The on-ground instructor was challenged by the operational hours of museums relative to the course time requiring visits outside of the typical class time. For example, this instructor would set up two visits where he would be there to guide them. The online instructor had similar issues:

> It was the most dreaded assignment and I got all kinds of excuses and students asking, "Couldn't we do this instead?" And unless they lived in Montana or Oklahoma, I worked really hard to find a place for them to go. I didn't allow them to go somewhere else instead… Oh! Unless they can prove they were housebound and they tried really hard to

> do that too… And then afterwards… The assignment I gave at the Museum, and as museum sites got better, it became hard to come up with something that they wouldn't just copy what was online. I had them talk about the lighting, what objects [were around the piece, etc.]"

The instructor brought up many issues encountered by such requirements - especially when the instructor is not present with the students. Issues of attendance are always a problem, but they become compounded when students believe that all the information they need is on the Internet. Both instructors still pursued the museum visits as students often reflected on how rewarding the experience was to them. I recalled too how students would ask me if these were the "real" artworks, and they were impressed when they then understood that they were in the presence of what they were actually studying.

In addition to the discussion of museum visits, my colleagues and I discussed the possibility of travel. The on-ground instructor described organizing field trips to nearby cities where it was possible to conduct similar experiential opportunities to the museum visits. The online instructor expressed the importance that travel had on her understanding of the material. This instructor also discussed the advantages of online education, as many of the students could be anywhere in the world and bring that lived experience into the classroom, adding to the engagement. With this, we also discussed the possibility of virtual travel, utilizing tools such as Google Earth to visit locations and demonstrate alternative views to the structures that are in the course texts.

Technology

Technology and its pedagogical implications are a growing discussion within higher education. It is difficult to ignore the benefits of many current technological tools. However, it seems that many art history survey classes choose to ignore these possibilities. On-ground courses are becoming technologically enhanced by "smart carts." These are faculty stations including a computer wired to the Internet and overhead projectors. Some schools have the added opportunity of technologies such as Smartboards and audience response systems. There are many technological tools available, and the instructors all mentioned the various ways that they were utilizing technologies in their classrooms.

I previously mentioned that instructors were using Internet tools such as Google Earth to take students on virtual field trips. These instructors also utilized the Internet to discuss their museum field trips and to take students virtually to museums that were not geographically feasible. One tool that came up in all the discussions is the newly developed site hosted by the Khan Academy, Smarthistory.org (Harris & Zucker, 2013). The instructors all described the growing quality of the site and the benefits of the short, conversational videos to engage students in the same material found within the standard survey text.

These resources are all beneficial to faculty in technologically enhanced classrooms. This is even more the case when faculty utilize not only their own smart carts, but also the technology that students themselves bring to the classroom. The online instructor described a particular scenario:

> I: So many of the students are computer this and computer that majors and know more than I do, but now I can't imagine being in a face-to-face classroom with students all on their laptops and phones that I would have to be competing with for their attention. In fact I gave a talk, lecture, in somebody else's class at the Corcoran about a year and half ago and I had it prepared as a PowerPoint presentation and I had a DVD to show part of… But there was one student there with her laptop constantly doing this and that and I was getting really pissed. All of a sudden, she raised her hand, and it turned out what she was doing was not gabbing away, but she was going further with what I was doing. And what she contributed to the class was going deeper. You know, that's an ideal situation but I'm not sure how often that…
>
> J: so she was sitting there researching and using the Internet…
>
> I: Yes.

This scenario brings to light not only the possibility of students utilizing technology, but the fact that they are active learners, constantly testing the validity of the instructor's lecture. The instructor also acknowledged the deficiency that they had with technology and the flexibility and openness that they may have in the future to students' use of technology within their classroom.

Utilizing the student's engagement with technology was expanded to considering blended learning methods. The on-ground instructor described how he intended to develop short video lectures much like those found on Smarthistory.org of his lectures. The intent was for these

lectures to be viewed or listened to on any device outside of class. Class time would be utilized to engage students in discussions rather than having them sit and passively listen:

> I: What I eventually want to do is to provide some video lectures that complement classroom with maybe some other more text-based handouts that are available online with terminology. Again, that are not your typical Jansen or Gardner vocabulary, like, whatever, “vault” or “flying buttress,” or something but more like other terminology that’s broader that’s not technical, its more cultural. Eventually I’d like to have these video lectures available so that students can listen to them on their phone take them with them and that reiterates what we’re doing in class and it basically takes the place of the textbook and that would just echo the main form of the class, which is the broad general contextual historical multidisciplinary all that kind of stuff… that’s what I’m trying to do. So I think the textbook, which is basically online, is just a virtual version of the textbook. Instead I would like to have more of a lecture that can be, like a video, and it would be basically images with me talking. It’s like here in class, those will be available to you for your phone or other device and you could study, like students have to do, on the bus or the subway anywhere.
>
> J: Do you think it’s important that it’s a video because you’re showing images?
>
> I: Yeah, I think it’s important that it’s a video because you can listen to it. The images since you’re not really memorizing anything it’s not like here’s image one, blah blah blah…

The lectures, in this case, would take the place of the course reading. The instructor would like to see alternatives to the reading and reliance on a single textbook. As this is a visual course, the instructor also emphasized the importance of video. The instructor described the importance of acting in the lectures for his classes rather than relying on other resources. Students find the lectures more engaging and develop more trust in their instructor when they provide their own videos. This is superior to relying on resources produced elsewhere that could be found without paying for credits at the college.

The other major impact that technology has had on the survey class is the shift to online education. Discussing the art history course with two instructors who teach the course fully online was insightful as to the pedagogical adjustments made to accommodate for the asynchronous distance media. The technology was described as flipping the course from the

instructor focused model to a “learner-centered course design.” This shift becomes clear as the instructor becomes a facilitator and relies on the course modules and reading to supplement the lectures. The faculty member as facilitator then becomes the guide-on-the-side by engaging students in discussions and providing feedback on course assignments. Students have to work harder and the instructor has to be more vigilant.

The online course has course modules developed by a content expert, often a full-time faculty member, combined with an instructional designer. These course modules are thematic making reference to the course text and other materials. The faculty assigned to the course then develops their expectations. Much of the course participation is run through discussion boards. The assessments are typically similar to the on-ground course with a midterm, final and research project of some kind.

The instructors discussed many issues with engagement in these courses. The asynchronous format and lack of physicality makes it difficult to make personal connections with the students. In discussing the online course with one of the participants, I described a growing issue with the course design:

> In online courses the main thing is that everyone uses discussion forums. That’s pretty much the standard method. It’s the kind of post and discuss/respond. That’s become pretty much the standard for online. And there’s also the argument that we should be trying to break from that some way to because it’s sort of restrictive in some ways, but the alternatives are difficult too. The method of assessment for online is still developing, so it’s kind of the best thing we have now and people just stick with that. I would be happy to mention some of the ways I do things. I do pretty much the same thing.

I acknowledged the issue that online courses are already falling into a standard format much like the art history course had and there should be a push to move away or make things better, but I also acknowledged that I fall into much the same routine. I try new things, video posts, calling students, and whatever new method I tend to come across that shows promise. However, I too fall back into the same routines as most faculty in online courses.

The instructors described a variety of ways in which they attempt to overcome these issues. One instructor makes it a point to call each student and formally introduce herself. Also, the responses have to be more personal as students read through cut-and-paste feedback. This same instructor described how she would develop video responses to papers, in combination with

the tracked changes in Microsoft Word. She would utilize a program called Jing that is free and creates short screen cast videos that she could narrate to discuss the rationale behind her comments on the student papers. I discussed this same concept with the other online instructor. I would also provide video responses to some posts and encourage students to do the same rather than write in their responses. This provides more personality to the course. Though I have yet to have students take me up on the video responses, they have linked in short video documentaries that they find online when providing examples. These video posts receive more responses and feedback than the discussion posts that are simply text.

Assessment

The three instructors interviewed had a variety of modes of assessment that differ from the midterm, final, and paper format that is typical in a survey course. They described the most important aspect of any assessment, especially any alternative means of assessment. It is to form clear expectations. One must list the learning objectives for the course as well as the assignments and form rubrics that match those objectives. By doing these simple things, students will remain on track and be more successful.

The on-ground instructor, as previously mentioned, focused his course more thematically and forced students to take notes as he did not lecture straight from the text. This instructor's assessments were also different from the typical midterm and final with mainly slide identification and the occasional short answer or essay. He required bi-weekly quizzes that were essays written in class:

> All the quizzes are the same. They get two questions ahead of time and a study guide that tells them what to study from their notes and then they come back and answer the question in class as an essay that makes them more engaged because they had to pay attention in class, they take notes. Then you take good notes they'd understand things because of not getting credit for memorization artist repeating things. I emphasize always, "explain," "explain," "explain," "why," "why," "why," "why is this significant?" And when they do this they not only write better but they are more engaged in a class and I think they learn more. They might not learn the date of the Pantheon but they understand that the Greeks were extraordinary people in a way that's not your typical

> Wikipedia explanation. And I just test them that way that's it. Then know the questions ahead of time and they have to write.

While speaking with this instructor, he had a pile of these quizzes in front of him. I commented at the length of the responses, and he mentioned that they often ask for more paper to write their responses. The students were not only providing a couple of sentences, they were fully engaged.

Besides the discussion posts, which consisted of a large portion of the course grades, the online courses provided some unique research projects. From the institution where one of the instructors teaches, the designed assessment reflects the course modules. Students are asked to produce a similar course module from artwork pairs provided to them. They are able to choose from a list of pairs. This assessment allows students to demonstrate research, analytical and comparative skills while relating the images to their historical context. The instructor mentioned that the engaged responses of the students were because of their personal connections to many of the images.

When discussing the topic of other assessments with these instructors, they mentioned other possibilities, such as having the students teach, as well as museum papers focusing on images they must see in person. We discussed the television show "C.S.I." as a model for developing research and critical analysis skills. Though there are many alternative ways of teaching, these instructors did not describe many methods that were extremely different from the traditional assessments mentioned. Mainly they continued with tests, often allowing students to see the questions ahead of time, and allowing for the creation of study groups.

Textbooks

The issue of textbooks came up often in the discussions. The online instructor was on the lookout for alternatives to *Gardners' Art Through the Ages* (Kleiner, 2013) mostly due to cost and often referred to Smarthistory.org (Harris & Zucker, 2013) or other sources to circumvent the readings. The issue that this instructor had was the fact that she had eight weeks to cover fourteen chapters, far too much for such a condensed timeframe. Though this online institution had eight-week sessions, other schools function with even shorter timeframes such as five weeks and even four-week courses, making it even more difficult to cover the previously prescribed material in the same detail. The on-ground instructor had even more issues with the textbook

claiming they do not really serve any purpose besides making money for the publishers. He described:

> As you know the art history textbooks have been around since the 1950s and they're all exactly the same except for some yearly little extra pictures and some politically correct additions. They are expensive and the industry doesn't want to change because it's working. Professors buy them, people require them. To me, they're very simple. They don't have any real interesting information other than names and dates and little tidbits about, you know, Charlemagne being the King of France or something. They're helpful if the student wants lookup maps and look up images for background if they wanted.

This instructor discussed issues of politics within the academy and ways in which the publishing companies are exploiting conservative methods of the art history field. He mentioned efforts that faculty have made to adjust to the field, but also acknowledged limitations of those adjustments. He described the fact that students often do not even read these books anyway, and it is the instructor's job to engage them and get them actively involved. The book just does not do that.

Classroom Issues

Discussions with my colleagues often sidetracked from alternative teaching methods to general teaching issues encountered in the classroom. Participants explained the reason for this diversion from the topic was due in large part to the rarity in which they spoke with their peers regarding classroom issues. The online instructor especially enjoyed the conversation as online instructors rarely ever meet their peers face-to-face within the same institution. Online instructors are often geographically disparate, making formal faculty meetings challenging. This same online instructor described the methods that she used to remain engaged with peers and development:

> I am on at least two professional list serves. Something called CAAH, which is over 25 years and running, Consortium of Art and Architectural Historians, which is international, or at least European and Western Hemisphere, and sometimes pedagogy comes up. In fact, Smarthistory folks are on it. I'm also on one on American art where pedagogy comes up a lot more often. So perhaps that's the best way I sort of follow those issues. In fact so many of my personal colleagues are retiring or have retired and I realize things are much more different now. Well, I guess the greatest trend now is the huge

percentage of people in graduate school are doing the modern and contemporary, and very few people are doing anything earlier than that.

Remaining engaged in professional list serves is important as it maintains a community of practice that progresses the field. The instructor described the fact that these communities do discuss pedagogy, though rarely. They primarily focus on content developments that trend toward contemporary artistic study. This trend also does further disservice to the survey course as it demonstrates the narrow focus of many instructors who are asked to teach outside of their content area.

During our discussions, professional development came up often, further demonstrating these instructors' desire for pedagogical knowledge by continually requesting my rubrics and project descriptions. The online list-serves and other meetings that they attend rarely discuss teaching. Therefore, they were extremely interested in alternatives to the ways they had learned. Since these instructors were chosen for this study for their openness to alternative methods, they are not completely representative of the entire art history field that remains focused on content rather than on delivery methods.

An interesting topic did arise with regard to professional development and changes in the field. One instructor described the loss of the slide library, "I started out when the slide room was both a social and intellectual center. And now, most universities are doing away with slide rooms, and that's too bad. For the interaction between faculty…" The instructor went on to describe the antiquated skills learned regarding the physical preparation of slides by placing the image in glass. Also, she referred to the interactions that took place between faculty as they prepared their lectures.

The issue went deeper as the instructors discussed other issues, such as finding reliable image resources. They claimed that they often found themselves scouring Google for images for their course which were sub-par reproductions, never once considering the library's collection or the issues of copyright in displaying such reproductions. The instructors wanted images that were richer and more physical; images that they could really zoom into and break apart both aesthetically and formally. They desired to talk about the textures, surface quality, and brushwork. These elements are lost with "found" images. This complaint developed as they discussed their dissatisfaction with art historical documentaries, which often they found outdated and stuffy. They would not show many of them to their classes, and the students would not be

engaged. Familiar with glossy entertainment, today's students often voice their opinions about the low quality of old movies. These documentaries mostly mimic the lecture classroom when coupled with the lack of special-effects, discussions of old, immobile, artifacts which are historically out of context, and historians droning on throughout to low-budget music tracks.

Pedagogical practice is rarely mentioned in art history and is not an isolated issue to the discipline. As one instructor states regarding the instructional methods of art historians:

> …because art historians are trained that way, they've been trained that way for years. It's like any other discipline. In the social sciences you're trained a certain way to get a PhD. And the people who were training you did the same thing the same way. The people that are coming out of grad school right now with an art history degree have been taught to teach the survey the same way it's been taught. And then the people who hire them at X University who have a PhD in art history, let's say, also taught and were taught the same way. So it's really hard to break out of that when that's the case.

This instructor mentioned this cycle, and described the issues that this course has relating to the place it holds within the curriculum:

> The other problem is that the majority of places that teach art history, art history is simply an elective. It's either simply an elective for the humanities, or fine arts, or art and humanities elective, or not elective for certain arts majors. Usually in places that don't even have an art history program, just art majors. So they have ceramics and painting and sculpture in graphic design but because of accreditation they have to have art history surveys. I think they have to have two years of art history, the one-year survey, and then usually two other classes, modern art or something else. Anyway it's just accreditation… These classes are just there to fulfill a requirement for accreditation. And as I've heard from people, and in my own experiences, while the chairs for these programs are not art historians and are artists, sculptors, or whatever, they don't have time to mess with the curriculum. They want "X" amount of F I T's, or whatever they're called, you don't want people to get out. You want to keep our majors. "Don't make this too hard." I've had students come and say, "this is a very boring class. It's not relevant to their major." Even though their major is art, have had students tell me this, "Why do I need to learn this crap? This has nothing to do with what I'm going to do." And so when you have that kind of attitude from the students, the junior faculty members who are afraid of being fired or

> losing tenure, hell, just getting a contract renewed, and it can change anything. In fact, they're going to dumb it down even more. And they make it easier.

Here the instructor described the issues of where this course fits within most curricula and even within the overall conversation, the difficulty of getting and even maintaining a job teaching art history because there are no jobs in the discipline.

Instructors are forced to "dumb down" their courses, or make adjustments to their outcomes to accommodate gaps in student knowledge. All three of my colleagues described the difference between the knowledge they expected their students to bring into their class and the actual knowledge of their students. The main discussion was about writing and research skills, which students lack as a result of writing that has become shorter, especially in an online format, and their shallow research skills, consisting of Wikipedia. All the instructors described methods that they utilize to scaffold research and demonstrate good practices and methods for finding credible sources of information. Issues that students have with content knowledge are often more surprising. For example, students rarely know history, and as one instructor put it, "We were looking at Baroque art and the students didn't even know the Bible." These issues take time away from discussing the artworks and instead force the instructor to focus more on describing contexts in order to frame meaning. Each of these classroom issues, however, are great areas of opportunity to construct teachable moments and challenge art history instructors to become stronger guides.

Another topic of agreement was plagiarism. The instructors spoke at length about this growing issue, and how to combat issues of academic integrity. This should be addressed in teaching subjects beyond art history. When speaking with the on-ground instructor regarding the way in which he conducts quizzes, he spoke at length about this very topic:

> J: …And the advantage of them having to write it in class is no that there may be no real way to cheat.
>
> I: Right, which again I don't want them to do anything online because I don't have time to be checking for cheaters. I know that people have all these methods, but I don't want to have to go around doing that. Regardless of what people say, cheating is rampant. It's almost taken for granted. I don't think the administrators know how rampant it is, and when you tell students to do something at home, you're basically telling them, well you're not telling them, but you're seducing them into cheating because students are just

as busy as everyone else nowadays, and they're not going to do something when they can do it easier. And not to mention, as you know, many students don't even know what plagiarism is.

J: I think that's more of the issue. That they haven't been corrected at some other time so they don't really understand what plagiarism is, proper citations, or things like that.

I: This to me is foolproof. You can't cheat and you need to know your stuff in order to pass these classes and quizzes. I found people cheating, but it's getting rarer and rarer. Students talk and you (the instructor) kind of get a reputation that if you take my class you're going to have to write. That's the way it is. Don't expect anything less than that. It takes a while. And students these days aren't necessarily good writers, and you have to help them use the resources that they have, but it's something that I think works for me.

The instructor here acknowledged that cheating is rampant and discussed how he does as much as possible to have students work under his supervision to avoid the issue. The quizzes are not set up so that students can cheat, and the questions are provided ahead of time. Though the issue is present and this instructor is aware, he has found a method that works for him and applied it consistently, forming a reputation that students have come to respect. It is important that instructors find what works for them, and stick to their methods. They must not fall victim to the latest trend.

The notion of doing things at home or online was what the on-ground instructor referred to as "seducing [students] into cheating." The online environment holds that risk and makes authenticating work even more difficult, as the instructor may never see their students. This lack of physical presence on campus has led to a sense of isolation for the online instructor missing the slide library. But that lack of physicality also takes a toll on the level of engagement from the students within a course. To remain engaged, students need to understand that they need to check in almost daily to complete assignments within the shortened semester system. The online instructor attempts to let students know that they should only take two courses at a time if they wish to complete the assignments, but many students still try to take on too much work. At the other extreme, there are also students who only speak once or twice, and fall out of the course dialogue. In these instances, the faculty is encouraged to reach out, but that becomes difficult due to the lack of physical connection or presence.

Finally, there is the issue of the art history survey demographic. The instructors described the placement of the course within the curriculum as a general, liberal arts elective. This brings to the course not only arts students, but also students from every degree program at the institution. The students are welcome, however, the instructors did not belittle the challenges that have come from trying to engage each new audience. They all described the ease of teaching this course in the traditional manner to students whose major is art history, but such students are rare. Demographic diversity issues have become even more acute. There are students admitted into programs with lower and lower admissions standards. The instructors discussed the trouble that they have with the knowledge that students have coming into the course as they take the course within their first few terms at institutions with open enrollment policies. According to them, these policies allow students to be admitted to the institution with extremely low standards of admission that are often so low that these students would not have been admitted to other institutions of higher education.

Reflection

I entered this heuristic study seeking insight into alternatives to the traditional pedagogical methods for teaching art history survey and selected faculty that I believed to have had some strong opinions on this subject. Though they did have strong opinions, I would not claim that their methods of instruction were paradigm shattering. Each was taking steps toward student-centered pedagogies and each was concerned with issues of engagement and retention. The themes that emerged from our discussions - course design, technology, assessment, textbook, and classroom issues - are issues that all faculty face, and are not restricted solely to art history. The question remains, where does the art history survey fit within the future curriculum and what pedagogical methods exist that are truly challenging the status quo?

Art history survey courses are not only a requirement for those in art history, but also are a requirement for students in a variety of liberal arts majors and a general elective for those in other degree programs. I would not make the case to simplify the survey towards becoming similar to an art appreciation course as I feel the skills that are taught in art history are different from art appreciation. Art appreciation implies a shift towards cultural and aesthetic understanding without a heavy dose of historical context. These courses tend to last a single term. Art history, on the other hand, typically expresses a deeper and more formal understanding

of artworks as they function within the greater context. The art history course teaches essential research and analytical skills that turn students into scholarly detectives, placing artists and artworks within the pantheon of history based on historical knowledge. This distinction describes the importance of this course for future art historians seeking an introduction and foundation into their program, but also a unique skill set for those in other fields of study.

The art history survey finds itself in a unique position as it remains a staple of many curricula; however, arguably it has not kept up with the change in focus of the academy towards a more student-centered model of instruction. The pressures of the Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) movement will soon require that art history justify itself and the skills it produces for a demanding student and public consumer. The student body is also increasing, becoming more diverse, and includes varied needs for both student support and learning styles (Hainline, Gaines, Feather, Padilla, & Terry, 2010). Furthermore, the skills required for a twenty-first century population are vastly different from previous generations to remain both flexible and competitive throughout life (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2002). The art history survey must clearly align its outcomes and state the skills it develops if it is to maintain its place in curricula.

Many of these issues of a changing population and demands for evidence of generalizable skills can be easily overcome using clearly listed objectives and student learning outcomes, as described by one of the instructors interviewed. Art history faculty rarely are instructed in pedagogical methods, assessment strategies, learning styles, curricular design, or any of the theories discussed in education. As described by those interviewed, the art history instructor commonly teaches in the manner in which they learned thus continuing the cycle that has been in existence for generations of art historians. In what ways can faculty break this mold?

To answer this question, I conducted a more thorough literature review seeking published pedagogical models that have been employed in art history courses, expanding on the models adapted by my colleagues and me in our courses. Many searches directed me to a special edition of the *Art Journal*, "Rethinking the Introductory Art History Survey: A Practical, Somewhat Theoretical, and Inspirational Guide" (Collins, 1995). This issue contained a strong overview of different approaches to the course along with quickly delivered course and project ideas to support a variety of competencies such as developing writing skills, visual and cultural literacies, and developing analytical or research skills. The theoretical approaches included analyses of the

survey text, feminist modes of instruction, collaborative learning models, and even the incorporation of music. This may immerse students in the context, as one of the participants in this study had described with her use of poetry and other cultural artifacts.

The issue also describes various art history approaches that different schools have begun taking to break from the traditional mold. As this issue was produced nearly eighteen years ago, I decided to take a quick survey of the persistence of the curricular approaches mentioned by reading through each school's website. For some sites, I was able to discover the information on the pages dedicated to the Art History department. For other schools, I searched their published curriculum for mention of the courses and their course descriptions. Swathmore College's "Critical Study in the Visual Arts" (Cothren, 1995), The University of Texas at Austin's "Art History 301, an Introduction to the Visual Arts" (The 301 Project, 1995), and Harvard's "Art and Visual Culture" course (Winter & Zerner, 1995) are still in existence, Harvard's with both faculty still listed within the department. The School of the Art Institute of Chicago's description of the combination of art history and studio arts (Elkins, 1995) could not be rebuked by their website's statement (School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 2013). In addition to offering degrees in modern and contemporary art history at both the graduate and undergraduate level, the department is fully integrated into studio and design education across SAIC (School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 2013). While these courses seemed to have survived the years, others such as Northwestern University's "Introduction to Visual Culture" (Clayson & Leja, 1995) has no record past 1998, Oberlin College's "Approaches to Western Art History" (Mathews, 1995) seems to have ended in 1999, and the University of Wyoming's "Survey Studies" companion course (Schaefer, 1995) was mentioned within the article as subject to concluding due to shifting credit requirements within the college.

I particularly enjoyed reading Mark Miller Graham's (1995) piece, "The Future of Art History and the Undoing of the Survey," as he makes specific suggestions for the future of art history survey. First, he suggests that we stop using the survey textbook as its coverage is impossible to achieve. Second, we should avoid completeness as it "undermines and problematizes notions of canonical works and focuses us to rethink basic models of artistic creation and influence" (p.33). Third, we should rethink the content of the course. Fourth, he suggests demonstrating the discipline of art history and the role of the art historian in writing that history. Finally, we should teach conflicts and encourage debate. Although I found these points

rather interesting, I noticed that many of them have gone largely unheeded, as there has not been a substantial issue of this publication since readdressing these concepts.

Though not a substantial issue on the topic, the dialogue has continued with Bersson's (2006) piece regarding the lecture in the art history survey course for the College Art Association's (CAA) publication along with a talk, "Pedagogy for the 21st Century: Transforming the Art-History Survey and Art-Appreciation Courses," at the same association's conference that year (Wheeler, 2006). Not yet disheartened, I attended the same association's conference in February 2013 with an ear to where this dialogue has progressed, if at all. During the conference, I encountered several disparate and developing communities of practice engaged with the questions outlined in this study. The most formal group recognized by CAA is Art Historians Interested in Pedagogy and Technology (Och, 2013) which held a session titled, "Technology and Collaboration in the Art History Classroom" that covered such subjects as interactive classroom techniques, audio casting, wikis, Voice Thread, and virtual collaboration. With similar interests, Professors Lise Kjaer and Marit Dewherst of the City College of New York and City University of New York chaired a session titled, "Imagining Creative Teaching Strategies in Art History" for which roughly sixty people were in attendance. It covered topics such as reenactment, mini-conferences, guided discovery, and a method described as an "archive paradigm" discussed by Robert Peterson from Eastern Illinois University. Yu Bonk Ko of Dominican College discussed using the sketchbook for mind mapping exercises in his panel, "Working with the Sketchbook Page." Acknowledging the growing needs of art history instructors to have better access to resources and information for personal pedagogical development, Michelle Jubin and Karen Shelby, both instructors at the City University of New York, initiated the development of a web resource: Art History Teaching Resources (http://arthistoryteacher.wordpress.org) (College Art Association, 2013).

Creative Synthesis and Future Research

Heuristic inquiry, as Patton (2004) describes, culminates in a creative synthesis. Based on informal discussions with my colleagues, academic discussions at the CAA conference in New York, my literature review, and a quick online survey, I have come to understand that there are entirely too many alternative approaches to the traditional art history survey course. I came to the study having compiled, created, and exercised many different strategies for my own survey

courses, and I wanted to know what others were doing. Some were doing similar projects, and others, at conferences, happened to be taking alternative approaches. My colleagues did not discuss many, as I called it previously, "paradigm shattering" methods. The discussions that I had with peers at the CAA conference demonstrated not only their continued interest in this topic, but also the abundance of interest given the large turnout to panel sessions and feedback returned to the professors beginning a web resource. Academics are discussing the change, but one theme stood out over all others, the need for a community of practice to connect instructors to the growing body of resources and information, as well as to continue the dialogue.

As such, I utilized my renewed understanding of the art history survey to develop new methods for approaching my courses and editing my assignments. I included projects utilizing mapping, group discussion, trans-media approaches, and creative interpretation, clarifying my outcomes. Following in the footsteps of Art History Teaching Resources developed by the two professors from the City University of New York, I set out to develop a web resource to further engage faculty in a community of practice for continued focus on the issues that have been discussed in this study and allowing for a venue for future issues to be discussed. Using an open licensed content management system, Joomla, I produced ArtHistorySurvey.com (Harris & Zucker, 2013). The site contains a main page to provide announcements and community news stories, a resource area for providing web links, syllabi, lesson plans, project ideas, and publications, and a discussion forum for members to continue discussions, ask questions, and seek answers from their peers. The community goes a step further, influenced by a feature that I found on the Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy (JiTP) webpage, "Teaching Fails," an area where faculty can describe their attempts at using new methods and the issues that they encountered in an effort to spark dialogue regarding those methods and elicit solutions (2013). This community is monitored by myself and the established academics in the community. Although members can produce articles, the articles are form-based for information consistency and the publication is monitored for quality.

The design considerations were based on a need for a platform that fostered community involvement and was flexible, adjusting to the needs of a growing membership. I believe this design is simple, yet meets these needs. Currently, it has few flashy components allowing users to focus on the content and delivery of meaningful resources and discussions. To model the use, I began populating the site with my own resources, projects, lesson plans, and other materials that

I had recently revised and found important to informing art historical practice. As each area has commenting features, it is my hope that others become involved and begin a dialogue connected to each resource. To further spark dialogue, I have begun placing open-ended questions into the forum for informal discussion and debate.

There are many areas for future research on this topic. The dialogue with my colleagues demonstrated many themes that I had not originally anticipated. These included issues of faculty development, the use of survey texts, and the institutional politics that create barriers to change in the survey course. These issues can be studied further with more targeted research and questions directed to a broader audience. Pedagogical alternatives became only a small part of the discussion. Although several alternative teaching methods and projects were discussed, there were many other alternative strategies that were not touched upon in discussions with my colleagues. However, I have noticed them in conference proceedings. I believe that there are many rich alternatives that would yield strong results, though I believe further studies should be conducted with specific projects within art history survey courses, and with stricter research methods. Many project descriptions and presentations are shaped by informal studies conducted within a professor's course rather than compared with traditional approaches. Furthermore, these studies do not look at factors such as student engagement, literacies, or other competencies in detail to form stronger educational justifications for their use.

If there is to be change in the methods of art history survey instruction, educational and art historical researchers need to come together to discuss alternatives and test the effectiveness of a variety of approaches. Further research is necessary not only to inform practice, but also to sustain the importance of this course within the curriculum during a time where educational focus is shifting away from the arts and humanities towards science, technology, engineering, and math. These competencies can find a place in the art history survey course which many students in a wide variety of majors still take as either a general elective or required elective at most institutions. It is up to the art history community to continue this dialogue in a more formal context and deliver the results of this growing discussion at conferences and through publications. I can only hope that my website will be viewed as a valuable contribution to this effort, sustaining a community of practice and informing future practice.

References

Bersson, R. (2006). The lecture in the art-history classrooms. *CAA News, 31*(5), 8–10.

Clayson, H., & Leja, M. (1995). "Quaecumque sunt vera"? *Art Journal, 54*(3), 47–51.

College Art Association (2013). *CAA 101st Annual Conference Program, New York.* Lancaster, PA: Cadmus, a Cenveo Company.

Collins, C. (Eds.) (1995). Rethinking the art history survey: A practical, somewhat theoretical, and inspirational guide [Special issue]. *Art Journal, 54*(3), 23.

Cothren, M. (1995). Replacing the survey at Swathmore. *Art Journal, 54*(3), 58–62.

Elkins, J. (1995). Parallel art history/studio program. *Art Journal, 54*(3), 54–57.

Graham, M. (1995). The future of art history and the undoing of the survey. *Art Journal, 54*(3), 30–34.

Hainline, L., Gaines, M., Feather, C. L., Padilla, E., & Terry, E. (2010). Changing students, faculty, and institutions in the twenty-first century. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 7–10.

Harris, B., & Zucker, S. (2013). *Smarthistory*. Khan Academy. Retrieved from http://smarthistory.khanacademy.org

Janson, H. W., Davies, P. J. E., Denny, W. B., Hofrichter, F.F., Jacobs, J., Simon, D., & Roberts, A. M. (2011). *Janson's history of art: The western tradition* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Journal of Interactive Technology Pedagogy. (2013). Teaching fails. *JiTP the Journal of Interactive Technology & Pedagogy*. Retrieved from http://jitp.commons.gc.cuny.edu/category/teaching-fails/

Kleiner, F. (2013). *Gardner's art through the ages: A global history* (14th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Mathews, P. (1995). What matters in art history. *Art Journal, 54*(3), 51–54.

Nelson, R. S. (1997). The map of art history. *Art Bulletin, 79*, 28–40.

Nelson, R. (2000). The slide lecture, or the work of art "history" in the age of mechanical reproduction. *Critical Inquiry, 26*, 414–434.

Och, M. (2013). *Art historians interested in pedagogy and technology*. Retrieved from http://ahpt.us

Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2002). *Learning for the 21st* century. Tucson, AZ: Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=925&Itemid=185

Patton, M. (2004). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schaefer, J. O. (1995). The optional seminar. *Art Journal*, *54(3)*, 83.

School of the Art Institute of Chicago. (2013). SAIC - Art history, theory, and criticism. School of the Art Institute of Chicago. Retrieved from http://www.saic.edu/academics/departments/arthi/

Schwarzwer, M. (1995). Origins of the art history survey text. *Art Journal,* 54(3), 24–29.

Stockstad, M. (2005). *Art history* (Rev. 2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

The 301 Project. (1995). *Art Journal*, 54(3), 75–78.

Weidman, J. (2007). Many are culled but few are chosen: Janson's History of Art, its reception, emulators, legacy, and current demise. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing,* 38(2), 85–107.

Wheeler, D. L. (2006). The arts & academe. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 52(27), A10-A11.

Winter, I., & Zerner, H. (1995). Art and visual culture. *Art Journal,* 54(3), 42–43.