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Section: SYMPOSIUM

The Integration of the Arts into the Curriculum: Part 1. The United States

The 1990s seem to be witnessing a renewed interest in integration, a concept whose fashion ebbs and flows sporadically. Advocates for integrating the arts with academic disciplines reflect a variety of perspectives, interests, and goals. Arts educators typically seek to establish, through integration, a more solid role for the arts within the academic curriculum.[1] They envision arts specialists who collaborate with classroom teachers and, in the process, strengthen the links between the marginalized specialists and the institutions. Principals' vision of integration typically involves classroom teachers teaching the arts as part of the academic curriculum. They tend to value integration as a way both to use school time efficiently and to save money and resources. Classroom teachers often express ambivalence toward the issue of integration: they see the demand that they include the arts as one more mandated curriculum topic imposed upon them with little or no support. At the same time, many teachers are concerned about providing learning opportunities that will allow the less academically oriented students to draw on their unique strengths and talents.[2]

Obviously, integration, like other concepts, is a construction, and can mean very different things in terms of contents, resources, structures, and pedagogies to different people; yet the multiplicity of meanings is not always explicit in the ways that the term is used. Each of the constituencies presented above brings to the concept its own visions on contents and pedagogies in the arts and a different model of what integration implies in terms of resources, planning, and structures.

The scholarly literature emphasizes the cognitive aspects of integration with some reference to affective aspects. The following terms depict some of the ways that the term integration is used in educational circles:
• infusion--integrating a particular subject across the curriculum;
• topics-within-disciplines--integrating multiple strands of the same discipline within the instructional setting;
• interdisciplinary--maintaining traditional subject boundaries while aligning content and concepts from one discipline with those of another;
• thematic approaches--subordinating subject matter to a theme, allowing the boundaries between disciplines to blur;
• holistic approaches--addressing the needs of the whole child, including cognitive, physical, moral, affective, and spiritual dimensions.[3]
• multidisciplinary--looking at a situation as it was portrayed in different disciplines;
• interdisciplinary--considering a problem in terms of different disciplines and then synthesizing these perspectives in coming up with a more general account;
• metadisciplinary--comparing the practices within a particular discipline;
• transdisciplinary--examining a concept as it appears in political and in physical discourse.[4]

Other distinctions include the differences between content-oriented integration and skill-oriented integration: the first is thematic, aimed at helping students acquire higher-order content; the second is procedural, aimed at enabling students to acquire general skills and strategies that they can apply widely to understand situations and solve problems.[5]

To understand today's discussions regarding the integration of the arts with the academic curriculum, we must look to the history of the topic. The roots of integration can be traced to the ideals of progressive education at the beginning of the twentieth century. The emphasis of progressive educators on the child-centered curriculum and holistic learning promoted the idea of integration between curricular subjects. John Dewey, a prominent figure in the formation of the ideals of progressive education, regarded experience and aesthetic experience as the basis around which education should revolve, rather than the formal and symbolic curriculum.[6]

The notion of integration was revived in the 1960s and 1970s, when concern about students' achievement yielded to concern for students' experiences. Instead of regarding curriculum as a rigidly defined, given entity, educators focused attention on its meanings to students. The basic, academic subjects lost some of their traditional content. At the same time, the arts and artistic ways of thinking assumed a more legitimate, even desirable status. This climate of innovation and experimentation with new educational goals, contents, and pedagogies promoted a fusion between the arts and academic subjects. Two prominent advocates for the positioning of art within the curriculum were Harry Broudy and Elliot Eisner. Broudy regarded the development of imagination as central to the purposes of education.[7] According to Broudy, the schools have given their primary attention to the intellectual operations of the mind, especially those of acquiring facts and of problem solving by hypothetical-deductive thinking. The raw materials for reasoning of all sorts are, however, furnished by the imagination. One of the schools' goals is to develop the individual's intellectual and evaluative powers through the use of the cultural heritage conserved through critical traditions, and part of those traditions is the cultivated imagination. The aesthetic image epitomizes that cultivated imagination. Hence, Broudy regards aesthetic education as training imaginative perception. Broudy's vision of the integration of the arts into the curriculum differs from current practice. Instead of the performance approach and
the traditional course in art appreciation, Broudy advocates a more global function of aesthetic
education, one that ought to concentrate on helping the pupil to perceive not only works of art,
but also the environment, nature, clothing, etc., in the way that artists in the respective media
tend to perceive them.

Elliot Eisner calls for the education of the senses and for the de-dichotomization of the cognitive
and the affective.[8] The arts provide an excellent example of the interdependence and
interrelatedness of cognition and affect. Different forms of representation (e.g., visual,
kinesthetic, auditory) develop our ability to interact with and comprehend the world around us
and draw multiple meanings out of it. If we expand these forms beyond the verbal and the
numerical, our perception of the world is enriched immensely.

Integration penetrated from the scholarly world to the more practice-oriented circles of arts
associations. Its earliest voices can be traced to the "progressive era," when the Music Educators
National Conference (MENC) Yearbooks of 1933 and 1935 listed such titles as "Projects in the
Interrelation of Music and Other High School Subjects," and "Fusion of Music with Academic
Subjects."[9] Charles Duncan appealed for a balanced attitude on the relationship between the
arts with other subjects.[10] Interestingly, these arguments have re-emerged in the 1990s, at a
time when the arts are seen as endangered. In the 1993 MENC bulletin, "A Vision for Arts
Education in the 21st Century," integration is advocated as enhancing meaning in other
disciplines:

The Arts can be taught in an interdisciplinary manner as part of the broader curriculum and can
make immense contributions to the teaching of other disciplines. No one can fully understand the
Baroque period, for example, without being familiar with the arts [of that period] . . . . Similarly,
knowledge of the arts is indispensable to understanding the rise of nationalism in Europe in the
nineteenth century or the Harlem renaissance in the 1920s.[11]

The "how" of integration involves close collaboration in both of these visions between arts
specialists and the teachers of academic subjects. A recent conference, held under the auspices of
the National Arts Education Research Center, called for arts educators to become an integral
part of the school.[12]

Advocacies in arts associations evolved into projects and curricular materials. For instance, the
teaching and learning of basic subjects through the arts were promoted by projects such as RITA
(Reading Improvement through the Arts) or ABC (Arts in the Basic Curriculum), as well as by
projects centering around aesthetic education.[13]

How did all of these impact the operational curriculum? In contrast to the abundance of ideas
promulgated about the topic of integration, the hard-nosed, down-to-earth examination and
description of school realities is far more scarce. Although advocates for arts integration abound,
the actual practice of integrative programs receive little attention. Most writings on integration
consist of success stories, mostly by teachers who report about their practice.[14] There are also
reports of research that measure the effect of integration on the learning of academic
subjects.[15]
Integration in its natural environment is best examined by qualitative methodologies that involve extensive observations and immersion in the setting. There are few of these studies, and they focus on the illumination of "best cases," that is, those cases that promise the best conditions for integration. Each reflects a different type of integration and reports a different level of success as compared with the initial goals. Giordana Rabitti, for example, studied the exemplary Reggio Amelia preschools in Italy, in which arts are deeply integrated across the curriculum. The Reggio Amelia preschools use a form of the project approach. Rabitti documented projects conducted over a relatively long period of time and daily work periods that involved lengthy sustained sessions and flexible hours. The child-centered philosophy of the schools and the underlying attitude of respect to children were an important part of the schools' success. Rabitti concluded that art in the school was seen as "intentional, contemplated, rational . . . a problem solving activity."[16]

Ruth Whitelaw investigated the integration of the arts and the contributions that the arts make to English instruction in an exemplary high school English classroom (chosen as the most outstanding classroom in two Illinois counties).[17] Whitelaw found that the teacher used the arts because of her own personal background and interests. Her goals were to evoke students' interest, stimulate their thinking, help them make connections between the bits and pieces of information they receive in school, and encourage them to discover meaning and think about what they learn. Although the teacher was adamant about the positive effects of the arts on students, Whitelaw was unable to provide specific examples to support her opinion. After in-depth observation, Whitelaw concluded that the specific contributions the arts make to the English classroom apparently cannot be directly linked to students' learning of the content areas in the English discipline, but they can be linked to the development of a knowledge base and mental skills (such as perception, critical analysis, aesthetic awareness) essential to instruction in the English language.

Nancy Hertzog studied the intended and operational curriculum in a new, secular, private elementary school.[18] Even though one of the primary goals in the intended curriculum was integration across different subject matters, intensive observations revealed that the various disciplinary areas were taught as separate subjects, with a rather rigid time allocation. This separation was the result of both the parents' pressure for advanced and accelerated academic content and the lack of structures to facilitate collaboration among the specialized teachers in the school.

Unlike these studies that focus on potentially successful instances, there is little literature on the operational curriculum for arts integration in ordinary schools. This scarcity is all the more intriguing in view of how little can be known about it without actively exploring it. The lack of formal requirements (e.g., guidelines, testing) and materials (e.g., resource books and textbooks) imply that integration is the teacher's (or the team's) responsibility and is left to their initiative, imagination, and resourcefulness. Furthermore, as the Shoemaker, Gardner and Boix-Mansilla, and Ackerman and Perkins categorizations of integration manifest, integration can be interpreted in numerous ways.

This article examines the different manifestations of arts integration in the operational, day-to-day curriculum in ordinary schools, focusing on the how, the what, and the toward what. I
identify four integration styles, each with its own set of goals, contents, pedagogies, and roles within the school: subservient integration, co-equal integration, affective integration, and social integration.

In the first, the subservient style, the arts serve the basic academic curriculum in its contents, pedagogies, and structures. The second, the co-equal style, brings in the arts as an equal partner, integrating the curriculum with arts-specific contents, skills, expressions, and modes of thinking. The third, the affective integration style, emphasizes feelings evoked by and attitudes towards art, as well as student-centered learning and initiative, and it incorporates ideals of creativity and self-expression that teachers and principals acknowledge are not served by the academic curriculum. The fourth style emphasizes the social function of the school and its role as a community.

This article is based on data drawn from a three-year ethnographic study of arts education in three elementary schools, focusing on classroom teachers teaching the arts in addition to music specialists and artists in residence.[19] The settings were selected as "ordinary" (rather than "best" or "worst" cases), with high percentages of non-white youth (40 to 74 percent). Data sources included intensive observations of arts instruction in grades K-8; semistructured interviews with teachers, principals, and artists-in-residence; and review of curricular materials.

The Subservient Approach

The styles of most prevalent instances of integration were what I termed "subservient." Here, the arts served to "spice" other subjects. Such activities included singing songs on themes presented in other disciplines: "The Planets" song sung in a fifth grade social science unit about our solar system or "Fifty Nifty United States," a song sung in a lesson on the United States; the use of visuals to illustrate academic concepts, like making a drawing of many shapes and forms in a geometry class or gluing pictures cut from magazines to create a collage featuring a variety of themes, from learning about different cultures to health and nutrition (according to the academic subject into which art activity was integrated).

Within this integration style, contents were popular and craft-like. Pedagogies varied from teacher-centered in the music classes to student-centered in the visual arts, reflecting teacher traditions of teaching the different arts.[20] The tasks, typically on the lower level of cognition, were not devised to develop aesthetic awareness, critical reviewing, or specific artistic skills.[21] Rather, they focused on the technical and simple activities of coloring, cutting, and pasting; memorizing lyrics to an approximation of a melody and a rhythmic pattern. Ideas were drawn from suggested activities in books or magazines designed for teachers. The subservient nature of the arts to the curricular contents is not surprising, since these activities were typically conducted by classroom teachers with little expertise in the arts. One would assume that the teachers would try to get advice from specialists, but there was little consultation and input from arts specialists.

The primary motivation for integration in this approach centered around economy of time. The following quotation is representative of others in discussions of the subservient style:
Music and art are part of the curriculum all teachers expected to teach. You don't always have time to do it. So if you want to teach music or art, you have to teach it included in another subject.

Another motivation was the building of student self-esteem. Providing different modes of representations so that different students can succeed was a common theme in interviews with teachers. Teachers often brought up the difference in students' success in academic subjects versus the arts:

I don't think there is correlation between success in academic subjects and the arts. If they are very good students, they tend to take a little more time, be a little neater, but not necessarily to be more creative. I would say the ones who are the most creative [in the arts] are the ones who have problems expressing themselves verbally. [For example,] I said to them this morning in science: Now, I want you to draw me a picture. I thought Brian did pretty well. I could tell what he meant, even though he didn't say it with words. He has trouble expressing himself: he has problems in reading. And I have noticed that the bilingual kids are very expressive in colors--the bright and brilliant colors.

The subservient style allowed teachers to teach the academic contents with the inclusion of modes other than the verbal and numerical.

The Co-equal, Cognitive Integration Style

The second integrative style is the one advocated by the scholarly literature. It is also the least common in my study. Because it required discipline-specific knowledge or skills, it was rarely practiced, and when it was, it was either conducted by a teacher with an extensive artistic background, or in consultation and cooperation with arts specialists.

Enid Rice,[22] an eighth-grade teacher in the Chicago school I studied, had are markably knowledgeable musical background. A dedicated teacher, she was highly motivated to challenge and deepen students' thinking and understandings. Rice incorporated into her social studies unit information about composers and the different stylistic eras in which they worked, involving her students in discussions about what people were doing during that particular period of time. In order to place social events within a historical context, she invited students to engage with musical compositions actively and meaningfully as they represented the trends and values of their time.

In Danville, a group of teachers for the gifted collaborated with the music specialists in order to create a unit on lines across the subject matters of literature, music, visual arts, and dance. Observations of this unit revealed that it spanned a relatively long time period, taking up several lessons. In one sixty-minute session I observed, Jim Gholssen and his fifth graders investigated the different kinds of lines in the room (straight, jagged, circles), then they created lines by exploring a variety of materials. Teachers adopting the cognitive integration style often encouraged active perception and critical reflection on the technical and formal qualities of a project. In contrast to the subservient approach, the exploration included higher-order cognitive skills as well as aesthetic qualities. The teacher drew on art-specific skills and sensitivities;
provided guidance that required students to observe, perceive, and come up with their own interpretations; and posed higher-order questions of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. This integrative style did not necessarily require sophisticated materials: in our example above, Gholssen used pencils, crayons, craypas, and markers. Rice used a record player provided by the school and brought her own records.

The Affective Style

The affective style was composed of two subcategories in terms of the roles it fulfilled: change of mood and creativity. The mood-altering function was often manifested in activities where students listened to music in order to relax or concentrate on seat work. Occasionally, music was played as a background during lunch time and recess to "calm students down." Mary Rose shared her passion for impressionism by bringing to class books and calendars from the Chicago Arts Institute. She took time off task to sit with her students in a circle, examine impressionist pictures in quick succession, and then elicit their preferences, reactions, and reminiscences. Here, the emphasis was not on making a product nor on acquiring specific knowledge or skills. It was on exposing students to art so that they could immerse themselves in their feelings and their responses to it. These activities provided a change of pace, a change of mode, a change of mood. Instead of performing according to a predetermined set of rules, students were invited to be responsive to their own feelings and rhythms as triggered by the arts.

The introduction of music as a background to other, structured activities combines "mood altering" with subservient functions. A teacher told me that students were less likely to talk during mathematics if music was being played.

Most activities in the mood-changing subcategory required a receptive, rather than an active approach to the arts. In contrast, the creativity subcategory focused on active creation: students were expected to produce in different artistic media--visual images and dances, for example. Teachers provided materials--recorded music as a stimulus for dance; assortments of papers, drawing and coloring materials, beads, cartons, and anything that could be used for a visual project--and invited students to let their imagination and inspirations guide them. Pedagogies were typically open-ended: teachers offered little direct, explicit instruction. In interviews, some teachers complained about the overly structured nature of the curriculum, which does not allow students to express themselves and have ownership over their projects. Allowing students to be creative provided a balance, as did the noncritical, nonauthoritative role teachers assumed in order to facilitate students' expressivity and spontaneity. They regarded the arts as tools for self-expression and the manifestation of individuality and uniqueness. Teachers said that through the arts they could teach their students that "they are unique human beings, and what they have to offer, no one else has to offer"; that "it helps them feel better about themselves, especially at this level [second grade]"; and that "creativity builds their self-esteem and makes them feel positive, that they were able to do something on their own." In teachers' eyes, the affective style provided students with the opportunity to have their own space where they would not be criticized for not conforming, but appreciated for their unique visions and capabilities, a place where they could experience and express themselves in a variety of modes, and form their own decisions on what to do and how to do it.
Unlike the other integration styles that existed throughout the elementary grades, the affective style was more prevalent by far in the primary, K-2 grades. Teachers who adopted this orientation were mostly classroom or special education teachers who, although they had little or no formal artistic background, had an active interest in the arts (as reflected in their stated beliefs and activities in their private lives). As it did not require any specific knowledge, the orientation fit nicely within classroom teachers' lack of art expertise.

The teacher's personal background and pedagogical style was one important factor in integrating the affective component. A relative freedom from the pressure for academics was another factor. In my observations, the affective integration style was not dominant in the schools, but, when it happened, it was most prevalent in the primary grades or in special populations (like ESL, bilingual, and trainable mentally handicapped). Typically, those classrooms had less formal structure. The pressure for academic accountability was not as pervasive and there were fewer testing requirements, factors that helped to promote activities not directly related to the general curriculum. If the subservient style was imitative of the general curriculum and the cognitive style attempted to expand the curriculum, the affective style was complementary, catering to those aspects that were seen to be absent from it.

The Social Integration Style

The social integration style, like the affective style, complemented the academic curriculum, but from a different angle. Here, the arts provided for the social functions of schooling. Principals placed high value on the establishment and maintenance of the school as a community and its relations with the larger, outside community--students' families. Social functions, like PTA meetings, holidays, honor programs, and ethnic evenings, were viewed as prime opportunities for creating such a community, and the arts had a key role in making these social events a success. Principals expected students to perform and communicated their expectations to the teachers. It was precisely because the administration valued the social function of art more than other functions that music specialists in one of our settings used it to send a message. When the Danville school budget was cut and music lessons reduced by one-third, music specialists decided to cancel the performances. This did not happen without a fight: one principal, for example, put pressure on classroom teachers to prepare a chorus for a PTA meeting in order to increase the number of people attending ("more parents would come because their kids were going to be in it"). Those teachers who cared deeply about students' performances and PTA meetings and were willing to work on their own programs were put in a doublebind under double pressure. The story had a happy ending: the music budget was restored and so were the holiday and PTA music programs.

School programs were festive and varied and included all grade levels performing in dance, song, and play. Contents were popular--well-known tunes, crafted holiday symbols for decorations, simplistic dances, and skits. Rehearsal and production time were minimal. In the absence of specialists' assistance, little attention was paid to aesthetics or to a sophisticated content and style. Similarly, emphasis was less on the education of audience or performers, and more on the instant and on the eye catching. Still, the arts were there, public, celebrated, and appreciated.
Discussion

The discussion of any categorization warrants caution. In this article, I present integration styles as theoretical constructs. Practice, however, rarely presents itself purely. Indeed, much of the practice of arts integration is eclectic and can combine two, three, or even four of these styles at various stages. Nevertheless, these styles are relatively independent of each other. Teachers do not deliberately develop all of them. Indeed, they may become habituated to one of them and not pay much attention to the others?

Nevertheless, these integration styles reflect some fundamental differences in assumptions about the relationship of art and art instruction to the larger curriculum and educational goals, emphasizing different roles of the arts in the school. Each model implies different values concerning what is worthwhile and important for children to know in art (as well as in academic subjects) and how the arts could fit within the academic curriculum and the school. These values and goals shape the organization of learning resources and pedagogies.

An important difference among these integration styles is the extent to which they necessitate curriculum reform and change of existing practices. Even though the literature extolled the second integration style--the co-equal cognitive integration style--this style was the least prevalent in practice, and that is not surprising, as this style is the most difficult to implement. The subservient approach and the social integration style fit existing practices of arts in the school in that they conform to existing school goals. The affective style attempts to integrate teachers' beliefs evolving from their private domains with the institutional goals.[24] Here, the primary responsibility for success is seen to lie with the child. In contrast, the co-equal, cognitive integration style attempts to integrate the arts into the curriculum in ways that draw and build on the characteristics of art, requiring classroom teachers to provide direction and guidance that often transcend their visions and current abilities. Whereas the subservient, affective, and social integration styles do not require any major changes in teacher thinking and attitudes, the co-equal, cognitive style entails a fundamentally different way of conceptualizing a discipline in terms of content, goals, and sometimes pedagogies. These new conceptualizations often call for a change of existing structures, in that they involve collaboration among groups of people who do not traditionally work together.

The interpretation of the different functions--affective, cognitive, social, or subservient to academics--that the arts fulfill within the school correlates with the prevalence or scarcity in the operational curriculum. It seems intriguing that the subservient and social integration styles accounted for the great majority of arts activities observed, but perhaps it should not be. D. P. Wolf noted that, historically, the arts were admitted to the common curriculum so long as they served the larger cultural values--virtue, religion, citizenship, and industry.[25] Without that, they would not have survived in the curriculum. I suggest a parallel argument. In our times of pressure for basic skills and accountability, art is often integrated into the curriculum only insofar as it fits within the school's primary values: serving the academic subjects and institutional social goals. Had it not served those values and priorities, art may have been even more marginalized. Teachers' beliefs about the affective qualities of art are translated to curricular activities when beliefs and motivations are strong and institutional pressures less urgent.
The scholarly literature focuses on the intellectual motivations for integration: Does integration aim at illuminating new problems or new concepts, ones that are difficult to tackle with current disciplinary boundaries, as our examples of Edna Rice and the "gifted group" in Danville reflect? Practical considerations, however, are as important, if not more so, in determining the initiation and implementation of integration. Understanding the conditions that each integration style calls for may help us discern obstacles to its implementation. Clearly, the co-equal style, which has the potential for intellectual stimulation, in integrating the specialized, discipline-based knowledge of arts specialists with academic and student knowledge of the classroom, necessitates a revision of the integrated discipline as well as a revision of working relationships. The modification of disciplinary boundaries is far from trivial. Just as distinct disciplines have developed over the ages because they allow scholars to elucidate specific kinds of phenomena,\[26\] school subjects are often taught as much for convenience of presentation and evaluation as for their intrinsic logic. This convenience establishes traditions within schools as well as within teacher education programs in colleges of education. Changing these traditions has implications for conceptual knowledge and pedagogical techniques, implying changes in attitude and beliefs about the nature of the discipline and of cooperation. In addition to intellectual feasibility and soundness, integration typically involves issues of human relations, communication among different groups of teachers, and the coordination of resources, schedules, and structures. To use an analogy from the arts, it involves a shift from a solo performance to a chamber work.
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