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The importance of discussion among researchers, policymakers, and practitioners is increasingly being recognized as there is acknowledgment of the multiple perspectives of these varied constituencies and their distinct underlying goals, commitments, and discursive styles. Those involved in research, policy, and teaching practice can help one another, and their efforts should be aligned for the betterment of arts education. Specifically, coordinated efforts for improved policies and instruction ought to take advantage of up-to-date research results. And research should focus on issues related to teaching and policymaking, grounded in the complex reality of educational settings. The health of the field requires a deep understanding of the concerns, perspectives, and wisdom of each constituency by the others.

The recent publications Schools, Communities, and the Arts: A Research Compendium, Eloquent Evidence: Arts at the Core of Learning, and Priorities for Arts Education Research are important contributions that inform policymakers of research results and give researchers needed direction from the perspective of policymakers. The following section gives an overview of research in the subjects of visual arts, music, dance, and drama education as presented in scholarly journals, which are a forum for researchers. The juxtaposition of the two representations highlights the distinct values and goals of policymakers and researchers and how they fit with the concerns of school practitioners.

Research in Arts Education and Its Dissemination to Practitioners

Today's menu of scholarly journals is strikingly expanded as compared with that of a decade ago, reflecting a proliferation of topics for study, epistemologies, and research methods. A central motivation for change has been the expansion of research methodologies, propelled by the postpositivist paradigm. The use of ethnographic, naturalistic inquiry methods facilitated the study of the operational curriculum and its hidden dimensions, revealed insiders' perspectives of arts instruction, and directed attention to local values and contexts for arts education. The contexts included institutional goals, expectations, and structures; teacher knowledge and beliefs; students' backgrounds and interests; and community resources and values, to list a few of the most prominent.

Of the four arts subjects, visual arts education research seems the broadest and most reflective. It draws on past and contemporary philosophical thinking and incorporates knowledge and conceptual frameworks from related disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, psychology, and curriculum theory. The field's leading journals, Studies in Art Education, Visual Arts Research, Journal of Multicultural and Cross-Cultural Studies in Art Education, and the U.K.-based Journal of Art and Design Education, have published issues on a wide, intellectually compelling array of themes, using various research methods, including philosophical, quantitative, and qualitative, emphasizing an articulated conceptual framework and solid interpretive discussion. Visual art education research addresses issues of diversity and multiculturalism and, more than other arts subjects, touches on controversial topics (for example, considerations of sexual orientations within arts education in the context of culture).
Issues related to art criticism and aesthetics are as important as those related to production.

This research focus is correlated with classroom practice, as evidenced in the operational curriculum and in textbooks and formal materials in arts education. The connectedness of the visual arts with general curriculum is solid: Of the four arts, visual arts offers the most sustained interdisciplinary linking, mostly with literature, as part of the discipline of English, combining with history, as part of the discipline of social studies.2

The commitment of arts education to the understanding of larger contexts is reflected in Mary Ann Stankiewicz’s metaphor of research as a house:

Researchers in art education not only describe the contents of the rooms and their relationships, but also look out the windows to help those of us inside the house of art education to understand how our work might relate to the bigger neighborhood outside.3

In contrast to visual arts education research, which started to extend its scope in the 1980s, music education research has long been positivist in its traditions and practice (as reflected by its leading journal, Journal of Research in Music Education) and draws extensively on psychological methods, mostly behaviorism, and cognitive psychology. The majority of studies are the “process-product” type, emphasizing procedures, sometimes neglecting to develop a philosophical, critical orientation in which to ground the experiment and procedures. In the past few years or so music education research has begun to extend its scope, mostly through the commitment of the Bulletin of the Council of Research in Music Education to include international perspectives and diverse methodologies, and through the establishment of new scholarly journals in and outside the United States. The U.S.-based Quarterly Journal for Music Teaching and Learning (soon to be terminated), the British Journal of Music Education, the Australian-based Research Studies in Music Education, and International Journal of Music Education incorporate a variety of formats and paradigms for inquiry and emphasize a global perspective. Their thought-provoking editorials and invited articles reflect a commitment to theory and practice in the widest sense.

Dance and theatre education departments are considerably fewer in number and smaller in size as compared with those of art and music education. With fewer scholars and practitioners in university and school settings, there are fewer journals dedicated to dance and drama education research and less research conducted beyond the postgraduate level. Arts Education Policy Review and The Journal of Aesthetic Education provide important stages for dance (and the other arts) education research, the former including issues of evaluation and curricula, the latter emphasizing aesthetics and a theoretical stance toward art.4

Drama education is in a somewhat different situation, in that it is less cohesive as a field, does not have its unique symbol system, and is highly collaborative by definition. Drama teachers in the schools, for example, are often English or general classroom teachers, rather than arts specialists. In many countries, drama does not exist as an autonomous discipline but is integrated with other subjects.5 Research in drama education can be found in diverse publications, such as Empirical Research in Theater and the Journal of Creative Behavior, as well as in Language Arts, Early Childhood, and other general education journals. A pivotal addition to drama education research is the U.K.-based Research Issues in Drama Education, which casts a wide net, intellectually and geographically. Articles provide a reflective view of the field and its various subfields (drama, theatre education, dramatic play, etc.). The focus on theory as related to practice and to classroom issues in a variety of cultures, continues the characteristic British and Australian attention to global thinking. In general, research in drama education tends to draw on clinical psychology, as well as sociological and anthropological frameworks, and employs naturalistic methods.

Obviously research exists—in some areas, in abundance. To what extent does it reflect practice? Until the 1980s, topics in arts research drew on developmental psychology, often removed from the social milieu and classroom reality. That, combined with the extensive use of statistical jargon, did not invite teachers as readers, let alone as participants in research. Recently, there has been an increasing emphasis on issues related to actual teaching and learning and the operational curriculum, often incorporating a more communicative, “narrative” style. To what extent is this research disseminated to schoolteachers and policymakers, given that relevance to practice is a driving force of this research?

In general, U.S. teachers, like their colleagues in most parts of the world, do not usually read research. That can be explained by the unavailability of scholarly journals in school libraries and the lack of forums for discussing the implications of research for practice. Reflection on research is not part of the practitioners’ culture—not embedded in their job definition and reward system. Some journals for teachers, such as Art Education, The Drama Theater Teacher Update, Music Education Journal, and Contact Quarterly, include relevant, thoughtful articles for arts educators, presenting the implications of research findings for practice. Other teachers’ journals tend to be less even in their quality and depth, relying more on advocacy and a prescriptive, “how-to” approach. Research activities are not integral to teaching and are not regarded as an extension of natural teaching curiosity, a commitment to improve one’s practice. Rather, research is often perceived as isolated, ivory-tower activity, alienated from teachers’ realities, to be regarded with suspicion.

There are exceptions to the lack of dialogue between researchers and practitioners, such as the collaboration of the North Dakota Study Group and Dialogue in Methods Education. Both groups hold annual meetings, where formats consist of informal conversations as well as larger presentations, centering on the improvement of teaching and bridging the gap between teachers, scholars, administrators, and chil-
Children. Topics range from concrete classroom issues (e.g., How do we know that children are learning?) to more general topics (e.g., historical and current perspectives on reform and testing). These presentations usually result in papers’ being distributed to members and sometimes published in teacher and research journals. As important and intellectually stimulating as those sustained conversations are, they are the exception rather than the rule.

My visits to other countries and conversations with teachers and researchers lead me to believe that this picture describes their situations, too. In Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Scandinavia, Italy, the United Kingdom, the Middle East, South and Central America, New Zealand, and Australia, teachers do not typically read research. The facts that most research is published in English, not a mother tongue in most of those regions, and that research journals are not easily available in many countries add to the dilemma.6

To summarize, until recently, the efforts to construct a knowledge base for teaching have relied primarily on university-based research and have ignored the contributions that teachers can make to both the academic research community and the community of school-based teachers. Teachers, in turn, do not typically read research. Thus, school practice was rarely informed by research and research was rarely informed by school practice.

Schools, Communities, and the Arts

The lack of exposure to research in arts education is common among administrators, who are inundated with pressing problems of accountability, discipline, and public relations. In such a situation, the effort to introduce and summarize current research for local and state policymakers is commendable. The compilation Schools, Communities, and the Arts (1995), prepared by Nancy Welch and others for the National Endowment for the Arts, focuses on research relating to the “realities faced today by local officials, educators, and the arts community.” My personal encounter with the editors of the publication, as they went out of their way to locate relevant research in arts education, occurred at a meeting of the Arts and Learning Special Interest Group of the American Education Research Association, where they described their mission and invited scholars to share their research.

The editors succeeded in portraying a diverse, rich canvas of arts education research, including a variety of subject areas, scales of studies, sponsorships, and research methods. The breadth of scope is manifested in the variety of contexts, including formal and informal schooling and outside-of-school arts activities, and in the balance between studies devoted to music and visual arts and ones on dance and drama.

A focus on justification is the prime characteristic of the studies in Schools, Communities, and the Arts. The report notes that information has been scant on the arts education issues that are most likely to be of interest locally; few resources have been devoted to understanding the content and results of arts study and the relationships between the arts and other areas. Researchers in arts education often address like-minded audiences of the same circle, ignoring the need to justify the arts to the larger society. To demonstrate that the arts are indeed useful to “real life” (and not merely decorative, as some school practitioners and others in the larger community often assume), a number of the studies included were designed to prove a relationship between engagement in arts activities and success in academic disciplines. Some researchers examined the effect of involvement in the arts on reading, writing, performance on standardized tests, and school attendance. Others focused on the affective domain, investigating the impact of the arts on general attitudes toward schooling, self, and others.9 The emphasis on usefulness for at-risk and below-average students fits with the advocacy of the arts for everyone, rather than for gifted or elite populations.

Utilitarian thinking can easily slip to the simplistic and narrow, sometimes without enough information on what is being studied. “Art” is a generic concept on both the philosophical and the practical levels. Each of the “school arts” can be constructed in fundamentally different ways, drawing on various, sometimes incompatible, contents and instructional practices, cultivating different types of skills, attitudes, and values. To understand what is measured, we need information about the nature of the formal and operational curriculum, the pedagogical orientations employed, and the specific types of student evaluations. Even well-defined approaches within the arts, such as discipline-based art education, encompass the whole range of pedagogical orientations, from the inquiry approach, on one end, to rote learning on the other. “Thick description” is essential as a basis for transferability (the extent to which the studied phenomenon corresponds to the reader’s experience), and for the more ambitious generalizability.10

A related problem, exemplified mostly in presented surveys, has to do with whether participants’ reports actually describe a day-to-day reality (as opposed to ideal conditions). Leonhard’s comprehensive study of the status of arts education in American public
Schools, for example, do not elaborate on the types of dance, visual arts, and music activities in its findings; the forms that “parental support” takes; or how the activities are assessed. Other studies cluster categories that are distinct from one another; for example, in a survey of listening experiences, live broadcast is grouped with recorded media. Obviously, the listening context has a profound influence on the aesthetic experience and nature of listening and the cognitive and affective processes involved; to treat them all alike without attempting to examine the implications of their differences is simplistic and misleading.

Criteria of trustworthiness in conducting research pertain not only to those epistemological issues described above, but also to procedural issues. In evaluating trustworthiness, readers need information on how the studies were conducted to assess reliability, internal and external validity, or their qualitative equivalents. Because most of the research summaries do not provide us with sufficient information, their role is often introductory, rather than substantive.

As important as what is stated is what is not, that is, the “null.” It is not surprising that in the recommendation for future research, the area of teacher knowledge (as manifested, for example, in genres such as action research, formative research, and teacher research) is missing entirely. In its endeavor to construct a knowledge base for policymakers, the report has relied primarily on traditional research, ignoring the significant contributions that teacher knowledge can make to policymaking, as well as to the community of school-based teachers.

Another neglected area in Schools, Communities, and the Arts (which reflects the situation in the research literature) is what John Goodlad calls “the experienced curriculum”—students’ experiences of the curriculum. The one exception is Stinson’s groundbreaking project that explores students’ perceptions of their dance curriculum and its meaning in their school experiences as well as in their personal lives. The general neglect of teachers’ and students’ perspectives is part of a larger trend and corresponds to the politics of power, in which students and teachers lack authority and are marginalized in policy discussions.

Eloquent Evidence

Published in October 1995 by the President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, Eloquent Evidence refers to Schools, Communities, and the Arts as a resource for research. Although the authors of Eloquent Evidence acknowledge that “the arts remain undervalued in many school districts,” they claim that “the value of arts education is now firmly grounded in theory and research.” I find it a bit of an overstatement; even researchers are painfully aware that the value of school subjects is based on the reward system in existing structures, rather than on theory and research.

Eloquent Evidence assumes a broad view of art, pointing at the relationships among the arts, learning, and knowing. The publication balances the language of “delight,” “creativity,” “joy and wonder,” with intellectual rigor and “higher-order thinking skills like analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.” It refers to originality, imagination, students’ engagement and persistence, student-initiated topics and discussions. The discourse weaves in philosophical background, essential to any discussion of values and meanings in the arts, quoting Cassirer, Langer, and Goodman.

Pragmatic values, too, have their place, but there is more substantiation and interpretation. The argument that the arts prepare students for jobs, for example, is substantiated by discussing specific skills—the ability to communicate, adapt, diagnose problems, and find creative solutions—all of which are nurtured and honed through studying arts. The discourse centers on meanings, rather than on mere buzzwords (such as “success”). Interpretations are substantiated by descriptions of programs. The document reflects a questioning of the system, when it invites readers to imagine what might happen to Leonardo Da Vinci today if he were placed in the average U.S. public school, suggesting that he would be labeled an at-risk, special education candidate.

Goals 2000 Arts Education Partnership

The third publication, Priorities for Arts Education Research (1997), from the Goals 2000 Arts Education Partnership, is presented as a response to the “renewed interest in arts education,” part of a general concern about the performance of U.S. students. That the concern typically signals a back-to-basics movement accounts for the utilitarian tone of the publication, in which the arts are presented as an effective means to help students with academic subjects. In that endeavor, accountability and measurement are central.

The arts are described as the embodiment of human imagination, the record of human achievement, and what distinguishes us as human beings. With respect to the cultivating of arts-related skills and the understanding of meanings, the statement carries conviction. But when the discussion moves from this abstract level to the practical, to “needed research,” a language of “first order solutions” is invoked, which avoids references to imagination, deep understanding, and culture. (e.g., “Studies are needed that examine the effects of arts education in preparing students for successful work and careers.”) Recommended areas of research reflect a strong utilitarian stance, encouraging research that examines “effects of arts education on college admission requirements, and the hiring criteria set by employers” and on maintaining a competitive edge with other countries. There is little acknowledgment of the complexity of “success” in life and work, of the role that cultural values and existing resources play in promoting desired goals.

The focus is on “process-product” studies of academic achievement, “establishing links between actively learning an art form and ability to learn other skills, like reading, mathematics and writing,” and on studies addressing affective and social levels, which examine arts education and “student motivation,
positive engagement in the school community, and appreciation of cultural differences." Likewise, "priority areas" highlight psychological studies on child development and the relationships between arts education and learning to read, write, and compute. The goal of employment is central to the discourse, advocating lines of research on the effects of arts education in helping students prepare for the world of work. The report calls for identification of the categories and numbers of job opportunities for persons trained in the arts; the skill sets of those jobs; the effects of art education on the academic performance of at-risk and multicultural student populations; the "best instructional practices in the arts, and the most effective methods of professional development," as if, indeed, there is one such simple answer and we know it.

The same focus on accountability is reflected in the demand to know "how much time American children spend studying the arts, whether they are taught by teachers trained in the arts," advocating comparison across states, with little exploration of what is taught and how. Researchers are directed to provide a "clearer vision." I would suggest that instead, we all need to acknowledge the complexity of issues, to probe the "types and the skills of employment" and their relations to artistic values, and to explore what makes people nurtured, curious, and sophisticated. An overemphasis on effectiveness (e.g., the "most effective uses of technology in arts instruction," the "most effective models of arts instruction," and "the most effective classroom practices in teaching the arts") is evidence of a limited vision of arts and of education, denying heterogeneity and contextuality, ignoring multiplicity in teachers' beliefs and commitments.

Discussion

Scholarly research attempts to look at what is critically and reflectively, asking, What knowledge is of most worth? Two even more basic—and more controversial—questions are, What kind of value system do we want to promote? and What kinds of human beings do we want to shape? That humanistic concern is reflected in Eloquent Evidence and avoided in the two other publications. Although the primary thrusts of the two orientations, humanistic and instrumental, differ, they are not mutually exclusive (depending, of course, on how broadly instrumentality is conceptualized).

Problems of practice are deeply rooted. In spite of new policies and advocacy efforts, the position of the arts is still precarious, needing to be established and defended by the terms of the corporate world. Policies on high school graduation and college requirements, including the arts, are important, but they are only a beginning. Most administrators still see the arts as a frill or, at best, something that needs to be justifiably as contributing to success in academic subjects. This struggle is not confined to the United States but is part of a global reality.

The attempt to ground the arts in a pragmatic, instrumentalist framework has characterized arts education since its introduction to formal schooling in the nineteenth century, when advocates emphasized the arts' contributions to the world of work (for example, in drawing skills) and to good citizenship. "School arts" is a hybrid genre, existing between the educational and the artistic. Artistic forms and values are transformed or created as they enter the embrace of the school institution, assuming the look, practices, and goals of academic subject matters. Wolf (1992) noted that historically the arts were admitted to the common curriculum so long as they served virtue, religion, citizenship, and industry. "Without that transformation," writes Wolf, "they would not have survived in the curriculum, but [would have stayed] where they were centuries before: in the private preserve of those who had enough leisure and enough money." As the publications previously discussed illustrate, in these times of pressure for basic skills and accountability, school art seems to be legitimized only inasmuch as it imitates the goals of academic subjects.

Interestingly, notions of the nature of art and its underlying goals underwent major transformation in the past century. From a socializing paradigm, the pendulum swung toward arts as self-expression, supported by "child-centered," non-interventionist pedagogies. Another pendulum swing in the last thirty-some years placed school arts as part of the back-to-basics and discipline-oriented movement. The back-to-basics idea is reflected in the practice of the arts as subservient to academic disciplines and the persistent attempts to correlate art and music education with improved performance in academic disciplines, as is clearly reflected in all three publications, as well as in some research in the past thirty years. Earlier instances of this approach are research studies correlating the teaching and learning of basic subjects through the arts, promoted by projects such as Reading Improvement through the Arts, or Arts in the Basic Curriculum, and others.

A utilitarian approach to education is promoted by the voices of businesses and community members that associate education primarily with jobs, the economy, and the production of good citizens. Given that education is initiation of the young into the knowledge, skills, values, and commitments common to the adult members of the society, and that the central task of socialization is to inculcate a set of norms and beliefs of the adult society that the children will grow into, it is essential to reflect on whose values we advocate. The authors of the three publications are faced with the dilemma of whether to adopt a utilitarian framework, corresponding to that of their audience, or to adopt an Archimedean stance, drawing upon an external frame of reference (exemplified, for example, in various aesthetic theories, or the national standards for arts education) to provide alternatives to the current educational goals.

The effort to justify the arts on pragmatic rationales is rarely successful. Common sense suggests that basic skills can be tackled directly, rather than through the devious, indirect route of the arts, and that the three Rs are more predictive of success in writing job applications or balancing a checkbook than are music and dance activities. The question remains whether reports such
as these preach to the already converted, or if they can actually change people’s attitudes. It may be useful to learn who is the actual audience of these reports and how they respond to them. Possibly a Web site could be established that encourages readers’ interaction and discussion of the research reports.

Clearly, it is important to address the concerns of policymakers. Ignoring intrinsic merit of the arts, however, constitutes a missed opportunity to communicate a deeper understanding of them. Instead of demanding more accountability and effectiveness in their narrow sense, we should assess how the arts fit with the deep educational notions of Dewey and Langer, Beardsley and Eisner. At the same time, it is essential to examine the factors that contribute to current practice: the crowding of classes, the poor funding of education in general and arts education in particular, the value system that is oriented more toward entertainment than toward reflection and interpretation. I believe that teachers, rather than needing more prescriptions, need better conditions for teaching and development, more support for the use of out-of-school resources, and more flexible structures. Publications that do not urge us to examine and change constraining conditions, that do not point toward fostering a climate conducive to exploration and thinking in a variety of media, miss a crucial point.

As we heed the directive for research, we should remind ourselves that the most important criterion for any research is that it be about something important—important to policymakers and researchers, as well as to practitioners, our raison d’être. The gaps between research, policy, and actual practice reflect the problematic nature of a field that is not critical of itself. The issue of what is worthwhile knowledge and understanding is central to all research, policymaking, and teaching. There are no general or extensive standards of rationality to which we can appeal in deciding what constitutes a valid understanding. Misunderstandings, according to Gadamer, are caused by a failure to achieve an authentic conversation or an open, responsive dialogue with the object to be understood.22 The appropriateness of ideas and knowledge drawn from research will depend upon the extent to which teachers and policymakers view them as speaking to their concrete, practical concerns. Communication of the kind that the publications do is a necessary first step. The ultimate test of the usefulness of research as a source of ideas is whether teachers and policymakers can use it to construct a workable theory of the case, where the outcome is both theoretical and a form of action.

The gaps between research, policy, and actual practice reflect the problematic nature of a field that is not critical of itself.

Notes

1. I am indebted to Eunice Boardman and Eve Harwood for their insightful comments. Many thanks to Karen Andrews for her excellent secretarial work.

2. See, for example, Yvonna S. Lincoln and Egon Guba, Naturalistic Inquiry (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1985).


5. Design for Arts in Education 93, no. 5 (1992); Arts Education Policy Review 94, no. 6 (1993). Impulse, the only journal devoted exclusively to dance education research (which also covered dance science and medicine), is no longer published. Other journals, such as Dance Research Journal, the Australian-based Writing on Dance (devoted to postmodern criticism) and Brolga (on dance history) occasionally publish articles on dance education research, but that is not their focus. The scarcity of dance education research is exemplified by a series of monographs edited by Lynette Overby "Dance Selected Research," which has very little on dance education research.

6. The gap between research and practice varies, depending on available structures and the incentives to participate in them. For example, in the past few years, Australian music educators are becoming increasingly interested in research. More teachers are pursuing master’s degrees, exploring theoretical considerations underpinning their teaching. Furthermore, since colleges of advanced education and teaching colleges were amalgamated with universities in the late 1980s, there has been more of a focus on research; university academics are now all expected to do research and it is having an effect on undergraduate teaching. Still, as in other parts of the world, it is a slow process for teachers in remote parts of the continent to continue their own professional development.


8. True, the arts have gained in status on the national and state levels, seeming more legitimate than ever. Goals 2000 includes the arts as part of a core curriculum. The National Assessment of Educational Progress includes testing in the visual and performing arts (to start in 2007). Twenty-eight states now require some study of the arts for high school graduation, a dramatic increase since 1980 when only two states included the arts. By May 1997, forty-six states had announced their intention to adopt standards that include the arts, as part of legislative and educational governing bodies, to raise levels of students achievement.

9. For example, they investigated the effectiveness of creative drama as an instruc-
tional strategy to enhance the reading comprehension skills of fifth-grade remedial readers; the effect of a dance program on the creativity of physically disabled preschool children; the cognitive and behavioral consequences of using music and poetry in a fourth-grade language arts classroom; the relationship of oral reading, dramatic activities, and theatrical production to student communication skills, knowledge, comprehension, and attitudes; and the impact of an improvisational dramatics program on student attitudes and achievement.


13. Indeed, one of the metanalysis studies in the compendium (Kardash and Wright’s) addresses procedural weaknesses by pointing to the fact that only two of the studies in their survey, which they read in its entirety, had sufficient data to calculate effect sizes. They also point to problems: for example, one of the two school districts did not use the same standardized achievement tests as the other and did not test all children in all areas every year. A critical reading of the reports illustrates that often issues of arts education are not conducing to experimental design, and any conclusions based on such comparative research design are highly problematic. Some summaries, such as Carol Fineberg’s study of arts and cognition and the relationship between arts partners programs and the development of higher level thinking processes, contain relevant information, providing a more complete picture.


16. Studies show that students of the arts continue to outperform their non-arts peers on the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT), and that students of art score fifty-nine points higher on the verbal and forty-four points higher on the math portion than students with no coursework or experience in the arts (according to the College Board, Profile of SAT and Achievement Test Takers, 1995). Also research reveals that students advanced more quickly by an average of one to two months in reading for each month they participated in New York City’s program of learning to read through the arts.

17. For example, the contents and goals of the Humanities program are described, as well as the concrete relationship between literature, social studies, and the arts and specific student outcomes—writing higher quality essays, showing more conceptual understanding of history and making more interdisciplinary references than non-Humanists students.


Liora Bresler is an associate professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
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