This descriptive study investigates the bases used to support judgments of artworks by preservice art teachers at two large universities. Bases art teachers might use to judge artwork range from personal preferences, to cultural expectations, to criteria drawn from values of various artworlds. The 26 preservice teachers in this study used a narrower range of bases than we expected. Most participants based their judgments on ideas associated with beauty, realism, and skill or ideas associated with the expression of feelings and ideas. Few participants used modernist ideas to support their judgments. Only one participant in the study used postmodern ideas. The authors discuss the possible explanations for participants’ reliance on a narrow range of ideas, raise questions, and draw implications for art teacher education.

Elementary and secondary art teachers make judgments about artworks in a variety of ways throughout their professional practice. Paramount among their judgments are those they make about their students’ artworks as well as those they make as they select artworks to introduce in their classrooms. Teachers’ judgments of student art often constitute the dominant evidence of student learning. Teachers plan studio lessons to help students achieve particular standards in artmaking and, presumably, draw these standards, at least in part, from their own notions of quality in art. Similarly, art teachers make judgments as they select artworks and other visual objects to present for their students’ critical analysis, which, in turn, draw to some extent upon the teachers’ own casual or carefully considered ideas about quality in art. Art teachers can support their judgments of art on a variety of bases, for example, personal preferences, criteria passed on within their culture, or criteria informed by the concerns of one or more artworlds. In a study supported by a National Art Education Foundation research grant, we asked preservice art education students to select works of art they thought were good and indicate why. Our analysis of the bases they used to support their judgments reveals their range of responses. It also suggests assumptions they may rely upon for future art education curriculum decisions.

Roland (1995) studied assumptions of preservice art teachers and concluded that, “What is taught in art is determined by the art teacher’s preferences rather than by consideration for the field of study, the particular needs and interests of children, or the sequential development of art knowledge and skills” (p. 129). Unrath and Norlund (2006) concluded...
their review of research on teaching art as a reflective practice by asserting that, “Reflective educators who are mindful of their inbuilt beliefs, [and] personal biases…will not remain unchanged and ensnared by their shortcomings” (n.p.). Preservice art teachers’ judgments of artworks reveal their inbuilt beliefs and personal biases about art. It follows, then, that teachers who are reflective about the bases they use to judge art and who can use a variety of criteria are better prepared to make professional and teaching decisions than teachers who can draw upon only a narrow range of bases for those judgments.

We advocate that preservice art teachers need to be able to distinguish their personal preferences from their professional judgments in order to make reasoned and effective teaching decisions. Their need to make reflective art judgments is compounded by the wide array of choices they will face as they select visual objects to present to their students. In recent decades, art education theorists have called for the inclusion of multicultural and global arts (Chalmers, 1996; McFee, 1998; Sabol, 2000), objects from the designed environment (Guilford & Sandler, 1999; Hicks & King, 2007), and objects and events of visual culture (Duncum, 2002; Freedman, 2003, Garoian & Gaudelius, 2004). Preservice art education programs face the challenge of providing their students with diverse content and the experiences necessary to develop a repertoire of ideas for making reflective judgments of art that they can use in their teaching. Efland (2005) observed that “with all the change in culture brought on by the postmodern moment, the teaching of art still continues to be guided by a modernist orientation” (p. 36). Do preservice teachers evince modernist criteria in their judgments about art? And if modernist criteria diminish as a focus in art teacher education programs, how effectively do (will) postmodernist criteria function in their place? This study is a snapshot of the range of ideas preservice art teachers at two large universities use to judge art. For a profession in transition, such a snapshot may offer insights and raise issues that art teacher educators can use as they face the challenge of preparing art teachers for the future.

Conceptual Framework

This study addressed the question: What bases do preservice art education majors offer for their judgments about works of art? Our work was informed by Parsons’ (1987) levels of aesthetic development and Erickson and Clover’s (2003) adaptation of Parsons’ work, which form our conceptual framework. Based on statements subjects made about reproductions of artworks, Parsons delineated five developmental levels from naïve to sophisticated: (1) Favoritism, (2) Beauty and Realism, (3) Expression, (4) Style and Form, and (5) Autonomy. Stage one, Favoritism, is characterized by viewer delight, a strong attraction to color, and association with subject matter. In stage two, Beauty and Realism, the viewer focuses on subject matter, with the assumption that realistic and beautiful representations are better. In stage three, Expression, the viewer is interested in the quality of expression an artwork can produce. The viewer at stage four, Style and
Form, recognizes that artwork is socially constructed and contextual. At stage five, Autonomy, the viewer “judge[s] the concepts and values with which the tradition constructs the meanings of works of art” (p. 25). Since its publication over 20 years ago, Parsons (Parsons & Blocker, 1993) has recognized the problematic nature of stage four, which reflects modernist expectations.

In an effort to include ideas from diverse artworlds, Erickson and Clover (2003) proposed five viewpoints, or clusters of ideas that people can use to understand art. These viewpoints reflect their own research (Clover, 1995; Clover & Erickson, 1997; Erickson, 1995, 1996, 1997) as well as the findings of other scholars (Anderson, 1990; Davis & Gardner, 2000; Freedman & Wood, 1999; Housen, 2000; Jim, Smith, Whitethorne, Nez, Begay, Singer, Isaacs, Walters, Tso, & Peaches, 1997; Koroscik, 1997; Lackey, 1993; McNaughton, 1993; Parsons & Blocker, 1993; Short, 1998; Wang & Ishizaki, 2002). Erickson and Clover built many of their distinctions on those identified by Parsons (1987). However, in contrast to a strict interpretation of stage theory, they regard viewpoints as understandings about art that are acquired over time, first spontaneously and later through education or experience. As individuals attain additional viewpoints, they retain earlier ones, thereby building a repertoire of possible ways of responding to works of art.

Erickson and Clover’s (2003) viewpoints include Non-Reflective; Beauty, Realism, and Skill; Expression of Feelings and Ideas; Artworld; and Plural Artworlds. Some individuals can use ideas associated with only one viewpoint, others with several—or all five. People using the Non-Reflective Viewpoint have an immediate response that they reach without reflection or benefit of additional information. Those using the Beauty, Realism, and Skill Viewpoint judge artwork by one or more of these three standards that they do not question. People using the Expression of Feelings and Ideas Viewpoint think of artwork as a form of communication and are interested in interpreting its meaning, significance, or function. Individuals using the Artworld Viewpoint are familiar with specialized art knowledge and use the ideas, values, and standards of a particular artworld when judging a work of art. We use the modernist artworld in this study because its central ideas continue to dominate many public school art programs1 and university foundations art classes (Efland, 2005). It is one of many different artworlds into which subjects may have been initiated. Individuals using the Plural Artworlds Viewpoint take what might be considered a postmodern approach to understanding art. They understand that no one set of art ideas can capture the values and ideas of all artworks around the globe throughout history within all spheres of visual culture. They are able to select and use norms and ideas used by art specialists in multiple cultures, as appropriate. More complete descriptions of responses using ideas from each viewpoint appear below in the “Model” section of this article.

We offer the following responses to a Larry Yañez2 2006 drawing to illustrate Erickson and Clover’s five viewpoints.

---

1 Arizona, California, Indiana, Florida, and Pennsylvania are just a few of the states that identify standards that address “elements and principles” (Arizona Department of Education, 2006; California Department of Education, 2007; Florida Department of Education, 2007; Indiana Department of Education, 2007; and New Jersey Department of Education, 2006).

2 Although other work by Larry Yañez is reproduced in the text students used to make image selections, this drawing was not one of their options.
Hooray! We Have a Winner. Collect Your New Disease at the Door.
Larry Yanez, 2006. Reprinted with permission from the artist.
Model

We began with Erickson and Clover’s (2003) distinctions and articulated levels of possible response within the Beauty, Realism, and Skill; Expression of Ideas and Feelings; and Modernist Artworld Viewpoints, as Parsons (1987) did when describing progression within levels of aesthetic development. Housen (2007) stated, “A viewer’s thinking is characterized by a spectrum of thoughts, with those of one stage intermingled with adjacent stages” (p. 177), and Kuhn (1989) argued that “evidence of precursors, or rudimentary forms, of an ability that will develop more fully indicate that the course of development of the ability is longer or more complex than was previously known” (p. 269). The resulting viewpoint clusters allow us to distinguish one participant’s rudimentary use of a particular viewpoint from a more experienced participant’s more fully developed use of that same viewpoint. Descriptions, along with numeric values and designations for coding and scoring purposes, follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Sample Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Reflective</td>
<td>I like rabbits and hearts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty, Realism &amp; Skill</td>
<td>The helmet on top looks more solid than the pepper, which looks kind of flat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Feelings and Ideas</td>
<td>The imagery is both whimsical and tragic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernist Artworld</td>
<td>The symmetrical structure echoes the traditional altar form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural Artworlds</td>
<td>The artist appropriated icons of Chicano/a popular culture into an image reminiscent of Mexican devotional art.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Sample Statements by Viewpoint.

3 See Appendix A, “Sample Color, Realism, and Technical Statements” for sample statements from the scoring guide that illustrate the range of responses.

4 The scoring guide acknowledged that notions of realism can vary across cultures. In cultures that are uneasy with figural representation, realism may not be accepted as a standard (Soganci, 2005).

1. NR: Non-Reflective Response

An immediate response focusing on obvious qualities, such as color or subject matter, reached without reflection.

2. BRS: Beauty, Realism, and Skill Judgment

A judgment based on the assumption that good artworks show beautiful things, are realistic, or exhibit skill. Individuals using BRS see beauty in subject matter, such as lovely landscapes, pretty flowers or people, and attractive colors. Their notions of realism are based on what they know more than on photographic appearance. Their notions of skill are limited to physical processes, such as manual dexterity, amount of detail, or indications of much time spent in production.
3. **XBRS: Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill Judgment**

A judgment demonstrating subtle and rich notions of beauty, realism, and skill. Experienced viewers using XBRS might appreciate beauty in unexpected subject matter as long as the image is not threatening or painful, such as a graveyard at twilight; or they may admire realistic achievements, such as perspective or accurate proportions; or they might admire more than the physical skills of artists, for instance an artist’s capacity to use tools or media in virtuoso or unconventional ways.

4. **EFI: Expression of Feelings and Ideas Judgment**

A judgment that reflects an understanding of artworks as communication between artists and viewers, focusing on the most obvious and direct meanings, significance, or functions of the artworks.

5. **XEFI: Experienced Expression of Feelings and Ideas Judgment**

A judgment based on more subtle expressions, such as underlying meanings, significance, or function. Individuals using XEFI go beyond obvious messages and feelings.

6. **MAW: Modernist Artworld Judgment**

A judgment applying ideas, values, and standards of specialists from the modernist artworld, such as use of line and color, balance and harmony, or truth to materials.

7. **XMAW: Experienced Modernist Artworld Judgment**

A judgment that goes beyond the application of modernist vocabulary and values. Individuals using XMAW demonstrate an understanding of how the work fits into the larger modernist artworld, for example, relating a quality of brushwork to Abstract Impressionism or a color scheme to Cubism.

8. **PAW: Plural Artworld Judgment**

A judgment that applies ideas and norms used by art specialists in more than one culture or a reluctance to judge without knowledge of ideas and norms of art specialists in the culture in which the artwork was made.

**Methods**

Erickson designed an online version of the reflective art judgment instrument as part of an online university course, using 100 artworks from the course textbook as stimuli (Keller, Erickson, & Villeneuve, 2004). The textbook was the catalog of a recent exhibition of contemporary Chicana/o art; it included 100 high-quality reproductions of artworks in a range of media from painting, printmaking, and sculpture to assemblage and installation. Artworks’ styles included abstract, photorealistic, social activist, folk-inspired, and more. We collaborated on an educators’ section in the catalog. We judged it sufficiently diverse for use in this study and relevant to our students because of its curricular content and its value as a resource to art teachers in Arizona and Florida where school populations have large Hispanic components. We distinguished five categories of judgments built on Erickson and Clover’s viewpoints (2003) and then further delineated three of many of the artworks in the text appear on the Latina/o Online Art Community Website (Hispanic Research Center, 2004).
the categories to distinguish more experienced responses, as described above. We developed a scoring guide with descriptions of the resulting eight categories, generated sample responses for each, and assigned numerical points to the categories.

Participants were 26 preservice art education majors from two large universities. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. Students completed the survey independently online, taking as much time as they deemed necessary. The participants had taken at least the foundation art studio courses and two survey art history courses. However, we cannot be certain about the approach taken in those art courses and the extent to which modernist or postmodernist ideas may have dominated instruction.

Each participant selected one of the 100 artworks that s/he judged to be good and then identified three good features of that artwork. Additionally, the survey asked the participants to indicate the bases (criterion, rule, principle or standard) they used to determine that each feature was good by completing the sentence “Good art …” Asking participants to identify three good features provided the opportunity for them to display a range of response. A graduate assistant electronically compiled data (78 good features) from the online instrument, which she forwarded anonymously to two doctoral students whom Villeneuve trained to score the results.

Reliability and Recording
The scorers independently scored all three of each participant’s judgments, achieving a moderately high degree of inter-rater reliability (86%) on matching and adjacent scores. We recorded the matching scores and averaged the adjacent scores. For instance, adjacent scores of 2 (Beauty, Realism, and Skill) and 3 (Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill) averaged to 2.5, which we recorded and designated as Somewhat Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill. When adjacent scores fell within two viewpoint clusters, we placed the averaged score within the viewpoint with the higher numeric value to reflect the subject’s emerging understanding. In other words, one score of 3 (Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill) and the other score of 4 (Expression of Feelings and Ideas) averaged to 3.5 but was designated as Imminent Expression of Feelings and Ideas and put within the Expression of Feelings and Ideas cluster for analysis purposes. When the scores of the two scorers differed by more than one point, they discussed the participants’ judgments until they could agree on the more accurate category of judgment. We then recorded the reconciled scores.

Findings
The bases preservice art teachers in this study used to support their art interpretations ranged through all five Erickson and Clover viewpoints. The scoring guide distinguished two levels of the Beauty, Realism, and Skill Viewpoint; Expression of Feelings Viewpoint; and Modernist Artworld Viewpoint. In addition, score reconciliation procedures resulted in further distinctions that we labeled “imminent” and “somewhat” (see “Reliability and Scoring” above). Frequencies for each viewpoint or viewpoint cluster.
appear in the right column. Frequencies for distinctions within each viewpoint or viewpoint cluster appear in the center column.

The mode was Expression of Feelings and Ideas, with 23 participant responses. The next most frequent responses, however, were Beauty, Realism, and Skill and Somewhat Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill, with 13 responses each. Clustering viewpoint responses, as seen in the righthand column in the table, results in six non-reflective responses, 33 Beauty, Realism, and Skill responses, 30 Expression of Feelings and Ideas responses, eight Modernist Artworld responses, and one Plural Artworld response.

Of the responses, 88% (69 out of 78) used the Non-Reflective Viewpoint or fell within the Beauty, Realism, and Skill or Expression of Feelings and Ideas clusters.

Only 8 responses, or 10%, used the Modernist Artworld Viewpoint, and none used the Experienced Modernist Artworld Viewpoint. All 8 Modernist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>f.</th>
<th>f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Reflective</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty, Realism, and Skill Cluster</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imminent Beauty, Realism, and Skill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty, Realism, and Skill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Feelings and Ideas Cluster</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imminent Expression of Feelings and Ideas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Feelings and Ideas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Experienced Expression of Feelings and Ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Expression of Feelings and Ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernist Artworld Cluster</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imminent Modernist Artworld</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernist Artworld</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Experienced Modernist Artworld</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Modernist Artworld</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural Artworld Cluster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imminent Plural Artworld</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural Artworld</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Scores by Viewpoint and Further Distinctions.
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Non-Reflective | Beauty/Realism/Skill Cluster | Expression Cluster | Modernist Artworld Cluster | Plural Artworld |
Artworld responses were made by 4 individuals, or, in other words, only 15% of the participants in this study used the Modernist Artworld Viewpoint. Furthermore, only one respondent used the Plural Artworld Viewpoint. The mean score for bases of judgment was 3.41, falling between Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill and Expression of Feelings and Ideas, but still within the Beauty, Realism, and Skill cluster.

Responses reveal that many preservice art teachers in the study used more experienced understandings of Beauty, Realism, and Skill as the bases for their art judgments. Responses also reveal that although many preservice art teachers in the study used Expression of Feelings and Ideas as the basis for their art judgments, very few used more than a basic understanding of this viewpoint. Finally, although some preservice art teachers in the study used modernist ideas as the basis for their art judgments, responses reveal that none used more than a basic understanding of this viewpoint.

**Range of Subjects’ Responses**

Erickson and Clover (2003) contended that as viewers develop in their art understanding, they can acquire and use multiple viewpoints. Our survey instrument collected three good features about the work of art each participant selected, enabling us to look for a possible range of responses to one artwork. Sixteen participants (62%) illustrated no to little range, citing three bases for judgment that all fell within one point of each other during scoring. The remaining 10 participants (38%) responded from two or more viewpoints, with a scoring range of 1.5 points or greater.

Among the 16 participants whose responses all fell within one point of each other, responses ranged from Non-Reflective to Modern Artworld, with a mean of 3.49. The mean for the 10 participants who demonstrated more than one point difference among their responses was 3.28, despite a broader range and one response using the Plural Artworld Viewpoint.

**Conclusions, Discussion, and Implications for Preservice Art Teacher Education**

The majority of preservice students in this study demonstrated judgments based on beauty, realism, and skill or on basic ideas about expression. Although asked to make three judgments of an artwork, most students in this study demonstrated only a narrow range in their judgments.

If preservice art teachers are to make thoughtful judgments as they plan studio activities for students and evaluate the resulting artwork, they need to be aware of the bases they use for those judgments. Soep (2004) argued that:

Art making is a mindful and mediated experience. Habits of mind, and experiments with the materials, tools, and techniques that mediate arts production are shaped by participation in complex artworlds. Those artworlds are never value free, and as a result assessment of self and peers emerges as an especially important force.
that influences how minds and social contexts develop through visual arts activities. (p. 672)

Preservice art teachers who are fluent in a broad range of viewpoints are better prepared to guide their students in making insightful judgments about their own and their peers’ artwork.

Equally important, art teachers need to be aware of the bases of their art judgments in order to make thoughtful selections of artwork and other visual objects to introduce to their students and to plan activities that help students engage with the most significant issues of and surrounding those works. Barrett (2000) proposed that, “Critical judgments are much more than mere opinions. Judgments are informed critical arguments about the value of a work of art. Judgments should never be given without reasons. Judgments without reasons are both uninformative and nonresponsive” (p.154). Preservice art teachers who are fluent in a broad range of viewpoints are better prepared to make judgments in selecting and using artworks in their classroom. The results of this small study suggest that a substantial number of these preservice art teachers may need additional support to broaden the range of reasons they can call upon to judge art.

For over a decade, art education scholars (Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996; Gaudelius & Speirs, 2002; Hutchens & Suggs, 1997) have criticized traditional modernist approaches to art teaching and advocated for a broader contextual approach. Prater (2002) characterized the much-used Feldman four-step model of art criticism as “essentially formalist, meaning it relies upon a set body of rules or criteria that all artworks are compared to” (p. 12). The results of this study show a surprisingly small number of modernist ideas used by preservice art teachers to justify their judgments. Most of the responses (88%) failed to use modernist or plural artworld ideas. Efland (2005) argued that “many cultures in their collective judgment do take certain works to be more important than others” (p. 37). People who use the Plural Artworld Viewpoint are aware of the existence of multiple collective judgments. Responses of students in this study suggest that preservice art teachers lack sophistication in applying such collective judgments. Art teacher educators face the challenge of building a sound base of knowledge and skills that prospective art teachers can use to make thoughtful postmodern art judgments. If modernist criteria are diminishing in art teacher education programs, are postmodernist or plural artworld criteria functioning effectively in their place?

King and Kitchener (1994) offered a framework for understanding levels of reflective judgment that explains the higher-order understandings required in postmodern art judgments, such as those described in the Plural Artworld Viewpoint. King and Kitchener described the development of reflective judgment as a “progression that occurs between childhood and adulthood in the ways that people understand the process of knowing and in corresponding ways that they justify their beliefs about ill-structured problems” (p. 13). Ill-structured problems are those for which rules and principles are uncertain and that lead to multiple solutions. Making post-
modern art judgments is an ill-structured problem. King and Kitchener delineated seven stages that they grouped into three levels, Pre-Reflective Thinking, Quasi-Reflective Thinking, and Reflective Thinking. Within each level are characteristic assumptions about the nature of knowledge and strategies for addressing ill-structured problems.

At the level of Pre-Reflective Thinking, individuals believe that knowledge is certain and fixed, although sometimes not accessible. When addressing ill-structured problems, they accept what they see or believe to be true or defer to a perceived authority figure. At the next level, Quasi-Reflective Thinking, individuals begin to recognize that knowledge is uncertain. Because they then see knowledge as subjective, they may use idiosyncratic evidence or invoke criteria from other contexts when trying to address ill-structured problems. At the level of Reflective Thinking, individuals understand that knowledge is changing and is constructed based on current information from appropriate sources and contexts. When addressing ill-structured problems, they provide justification by evaluating the evidence and comparing disparate perspectives (King & Kitchener, 1994). The level of reflective ability required to use the Plural Artworld Viewpoint is considerably higher than that required to apply the Modernist Artworld Viewpoint. Preservice art teachers in this study did not demonstrate high-level reflective abilities.

One might wonder why a substantial number of preservice art teachers, after having taken at least basic university-level art history and studio courses, would base their judgments on ideas that require little to no deliberate art instruction. Sixty-nine of 78 responses (88%) fell within the Non-Reflective; Beauty, Realism, and Skill; or Expression of Feelings and Ideas Viewpoints. The Non-Reflective Viewpoint requires no formal instruction. One can argue that Beauty, Realism and Skill, and, to a great extent, Expression of Feelings and Ideas are criteria acquired through popular culture. Why is there so little evidence of influence of university art instruction, whether modernist, postmodernist, or plural artworld, on responses of the preservice art teachers in this study?

Might a diminishing focus on modernist ideas and an increasingly demanding expectation for higher-order reflective judgment explain some participants’ reliance on Beauty, Realism and Skill and Expression of Feelings and Ideas Viewpoints? In university art history courses, information about plural artworlds has increasingly challenged the dominance of modernism and its Western roots. University studio courses often raise contextual significance as an issue in artmaking. Yet this study suggests that these preservice art education students may have difficulty understanding these broader ideas well enough so that they can call upon them in new situations as bases for their own art judgments. Without this facility, they default to deeply engrained, non-reflective or culturally acquired responses. Haskell (2001) described this difficulty as a problem of contextual transfer: “We have known for some time that learning is cued by the place or environment in which it occurred” (p. 139). If students have difficulty using postmodern ideas...
unprompted in their own judgments, how likely is it that they will make pedagogically appropriate judgments using these ideas under the pressures of teaching in today’s elementary and secondary art classrooms?

Henry and Lazzari (2007) made a case for the need for more research on art teacher education in light of contemporary movements. The pressures of contemporary educational reforms complicate the context within which new art teachers will be making important art judgments. If preservice art teachers have difficulty with transfer across disciplines within a university context, how much more difficulty will they face in their first teaching positions? This study exposes a potential contextual transfer problem in preservice art education programs and offers a conceptual framework that may be useful in addressing the problem. Our small sample size permits us to apply our conclusions only to this sample. A larger sample at multiple institutions would reveal whether students in the two art education programs we studied are representative of those in other programs across the United States or around the world. University art teacher educators who are acquainted with their students’ current skills, especially in reflective art judgment, are in a position to plan activities to help future art teachers build broader repertoires of viewpoints they can take with them to make key judgments in their art teaching.

Our analysis of the bases these preservice art education students used to support their art judgments revealed that they drew upon a narrow range of ideas and that they relied less on postmodernist (or even modernist) ideas than we expected. Several questions emerged from these findings. How can art teacher programs most effectively help students transfer any postmodern ideas or other content they may learn from art history and studio classes to professional art education practice? What minimum level of reflective ability do postmodern art theories require of preservice teachers, secondary art students, and elementary children? How might a theory of the development of an understanding of postmodern art ideas be constructed and tested?

The findings of this study also suggest potentially valuable implications for art teacher educators. We propose that art teacher educators: (1) deliberately assess the reflective abilities of preservice art teachers and teach them to do the same with their students, (2) explicitly guide preservice students in comparing viewpoints that do not require deliberate formal art education with viewpoints that do require deliberate formal art education, and (3) explicitly challenge preservice art educators to select artworks and criteria based on clusters of ideas (viewpoints) that, with instruction, particular groups of students are likely to be able to learn to use. If some viewpoints can be acquired spontaneously or through popular culture, but if others require deliberate, formal instruction, helping preservice art teachers more fully understand and reflect on a wide range of viewpoints can prepare them to plan more effective art instruction for others when they take their positions in elementary and secondary schools.
Appendix A
Sample Color, Realism, and Technical Statements

1. NR: Non-Reflective Response
   COLOR EXAMPLE: It's my favorite color.
   REALISM EXAMPLE: I like dogs.
   TECHNICAL EXAMPLE: Watercolor is fun!

2. BRS: Beauty, Realism, and Skill Judgment
   COLOR EXAMPLE: The colors are pretty.
   REALISM EXAMPLE: You can see it's a house because it has a door, windows, a roof, and a chimney.
   TECHNICAL EXAMPLE: Look at all those little stitches. That took a lot of time to make.

3. XBRS: Experienced Beauty, Realism, and Skill Judgment
   COLOR EXAMPLE: Good color choice for subject matter.
   REALISM EXAMPLE: It looks as if you could walk into the space and pick up the apple.
   TECHNICAL EXAMPLE: It's hard work getting so many colors in a print.

4. EFI: Expression of Feelings and Ideas Judgment
   COLOR EXAMPLE: Red is a good color for rage.
   REALISM EXAMPLE: The skinny dog suggests poverty.
   TECHNICAL EXAMPLE: The splashes of paint look exciting.

5. XEFI: Experienced Expression of Feelings and Ideas Judgment
   COLOR EXAMPLE: The muted colors enhance the somber mood.
   REALISM EXAMPLE: The distorted figure and garish colors get at real, fundamental, human feelings.
   TECHNICAL EXAMPLE: The long brushstrokes emphasize the forlorn howling of the wind.

6. MAW: Modernist Artworld Judgment
   COLOR EXAMPLE: The painting uses a split complementary color scheme.
   REALISM EXAMPLE: The diagonal composition focuses attention on the woman and her importance.
   TECHNICAL EXAMPLE: The unique handling of the wood lets the piece sing.

7. XMAW: Experienced Modernist Artworld Judgment
   COLOR EXAMPLE: The power of color to show space owes much to the earlier work of Joseph Albers.
   REALISM EXAMPLE: Cubist depiction of multiple simultaneous views provide the viewer with more information than one view could.
   TECHNICAL EXAMPLE: By painting her constructions with one color, Louise Nevelson shifted attention from materials to form.

8. PAW: Plural Artworld Judgment
   COLOR EXAMPLE: In comparison to U.S. production pottery, Mexican talavera uses a limited, but brighter, palette.
   REALISM EXAMPLE: Printmakers of the Mexican Revolutionary Workshop exposed the reality of impoverished Mexican peasants while in the United States Regionalists romanticized the industrial and agrarian lifestyles.
   TECHNICAL EXAMPLE: Traditional U.S. art museums have a difficult time figuring out how to collect and exhibit work of the Guerrilla Girls (Postmodern feminist performances and other work).
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