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The pressure to participate in a global community has spurred the development of multiple theories and ongoing efforts to articulate the essential skills and characteristics required to successfully engage with people from other cultural backgrounds. To this end, terminology and frameworks such as cultural competency, cultural literacy, and cultural proficiency\(^1\) have been developed and implemented across multiple disciplines, from business and health professions, to education and pre-service teacher preparation.

J. A. Banks (2004), a leading multicultural education scholar, describes stages of cultural literacy development as a progressive sequence of reflection beginning with a clear concept of self within a cultural context. Drawing on this perspective has suggested applying an interactive educational approach for some multicultural courses, one of which will be explored in this study, in the arts. Engaging with the arts as a vehicle for human cultural expression allows the exploration of the concept of self and its relationship to other. The line of thought to be explored in this research project concerns the potential link in multicultural education between engagement in the arts and the development of self-awareness.

Engagement with the arts elicits a personal interaction that potentially cultivates an expanded awareness of self and possibly a greater understanding of one’s position within society (Eisner, 1982, 2002). One’s engagement and appreciation of art requires multiple levels of self-reflection and evaluation. Reacting to a piece of music, sculpture, dance, or graffiti elicits a response that is often embedded in one’s own value system.

\(^1\) See Table 1.1, Terminology
A connection between increased self-awareness and increased cultural awareness is a potential outcome of interacting with art. If art is considered as an expression of social and cultural context (Bandy & Congdon, 1987; Dissayanake, 1988; Eisner, 1982, 2002) then the potential to gain a deeper understanding of self within a cultural context through an engagement with art may be plausible.

This study examines the impact of a multicultural undergraduate general education course at a single university on the development of students’ self-awareness using arts engagement. Through a mixed methods approach, the study investigates the link between (i) engaging with the arts and (ii) the development of self-awareness. To undertake this study, it is informative to understand the research literature in both multicultural education and art education over the last three decades. These strands of research, to be described in the following sections of this dissertation, provide valuable insight into historical events that have shaped the theoretical frameworks forming current pedagogical practices.

Both multicultural education and arts education share fundamental approaches to curricular theory. One key element is the development of self-awareness within a cultural context (J.A. Banks, 2004a; Bennett, 1993; Brown, 2004a; Campinha-Bacote & Padgett, 1995; Ukpokodu, 2009). This and other common components of personal engagement offer the potential for an intermixing of approaches that may expand current practice in both multicultural and arts education to reach broader student audiences with effective cultural competency education.

Table 1.1 offers terminology and definitions that will be used in the succeeding discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Drawn from Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>The expressive results of individuals and/or groups manifested in a medium (defined in the broadest sense) and developed and/or inherently emerging from within a cultural context.</td>
<td>McFee &amp; Degge, 1977; Blandy &amp; Congdon, 1987; Dissayanake, 1988; Eisner, 1982, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>The social and symbolic domain of a group of people who share common values and beliefs as expressed in language, ritual, art, and behaviors.</td>
<td>McFee &amp; Degge, 1977; Dissayanake, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>The capacity to recognize different cultural groups and identify distinctive characteristics such as cultural beliefs, behaviors, rituals, and practices, including one’s own.</td>
<td>Mellinger &amp; Wilkinson, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competency</td>
<td>The capacity to (i) recognize one’s own cultural context, (ii) sustain an ongoing self-reflective process to identify multiple cultural perspectives, and (iii) engage with respect and understanding of other cultural and social influences on individual values and beliefs, resulting in (iv) proficiency to effectively respond to multiple, on-going cross-cultural contexts.</td>
<td>Betancorte, et al., 2003; Campinah-Bacote, 1995; J.A. Banks, 2004a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Proficiency</td>
<td>A way or approach to respond to emerging issues in a diverse environment through application of tools that are applied from a culturally competent behavior (see above) by both individuals and organizations.</td>
<td>Lindsey, Roberts &amp; Terrell, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>A system of beliefs and behaviors that recognize and value multiple cultures coexisting within a larger national culture. This may include advocacy for social justice through fundamental institutional change whereby underrepresented groups gain equal access to education, health care, and other resources and develop the capacity to engage in a global society.</td>
<td>Banks, J.A., &amp; Banks, C.A.M., Eds. 1995; J.A. Banks, 2004b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Culture</td>
<td>Combines individualism with cultural context and unifies the expression in art as directed by the symbols and meanings of the cultural context. Includes decoding of the exponentially increasing visual symbols on a global level, such as media.</td>
<td>Blandy &amp; Congdon, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmodernism</td>
<td>Proposes that reality is a social construct respondent to time and place – an intentional departure form modernist attachment to “objective truth” and functionality.</td>
<td>Bersson, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next portion of this dissertation (i) explores the emergence of multicultural education, (ii) traces the foundations of current art education theory, and (iii) establishes links between the two disciplines that support a cross-disciplinary approach to the development of multicultural awareness through the development of self-awareness. The potential connections between self-awareness and increased cultural awareness will be discussed as an essential component of the development of cultural competency.

*Multicultural Strand*

Though the United States was founded on principles of tolerance and diversity, as delineated in the Declaration of Independence\(^2\), immigration from before its inception through the late 1800’s and early 1900’s established a Euro-ethnic majority today (U.S. Census, 2010). The Civil Rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s impacted the status of non-white citizens dramatically and the ethnic fabric of the U.S. began a major shift with the Immigration Reform Act of 1965 (D. Reimers, 1983). Immigration reform added to the rapidly growing Latin American and Asian demographic starting in the 1980’s. Students of color made up over 40 percent of the students in the nation’s public schools at the turn of this century (J.A. Banks, 2004b). The U.S. Census Bureau (2000, 2010) projected that non-white ethnic groups would make up 47 percent of the U.S. population by 2050.

With the influx of multicultural groups into the United States as well as an increase in global connectivity, educational institutions have been challenged to respond effectively in the last two decades. A national opinion poll of registered voters sponsored by the Ford Foundation Campus Diversity Initiative in the fall of 1998 found that 68

percent of those polled supported "requiring students to take at least one cultural and ethnic diversity course in order to graduate." Over a decade later, ninety-four percent agreed that "America's growing diversity makes it more important than ever for all of us to understand people who are different than ourselves" (Humphreys, 2000, p. 1).

As of 2000, 63% of colleges and universities reported that they either had a diversity requirement in place or were in the process of developing one (Humphreys, 2000). In a study of campuses across the country at that time, the American Council on Education (2000, 2003) found that higher education was not meeting the growing demand for international education, and in fact, that the U.S. fell short of many countries in their commitment to educate and train citizens about the rest of the world. The report describes how internationalization has become an expected component in curriculum development aimed at producing globally competent graduates. In support of diversity initiatives, some studies have shown that increased diversity may foster student’s academic and social growth (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002).

However, “very little effort has been made to assess these efforts and their implementation, and data are lacking on how well higher education is doing in preparing undergraduates for the demands of the contemporary world" (American Council on Education, 2003, p. xi). Recent studies have been conducted to assess the status of campus diversity initiatives that actively address the pressures facing higher education in the 21st century. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) launched the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative in 2005 to work in collaborative partnerships with colleges,
universities, and businesses. The mission was to address the “far-reaching global, economic, and technological developments that have converged to make postsecondary learning an imperative for almost everyone” (AACU, 2007, p. vii). Key components of the on-going project include the development of intercultural knowledge and competence, knowledge of human cultural contexts, and the ability to navigate a complex and changing world as a globally engaged citizen.

One promising development in this decade is the publication of The Handbook of Multicultural Measures in 2011 that provides a comprehensive compendium of empirically supported multicultural instrumentation (Gamst, Liang & Der-Karabetian, 2011).

Emergence and Evolution of Multicultural Education

Multicultural education emerged from the civil rights era during the 1960s (J.A. Banks, 1996). The development of ethnic studies is credited with the beginnings of multicultural education. “Initiated by scholars such as George Washington Williams, Carter G. Woodson, W. E. B. DuBois, and Charles H. Wesley, the primary goal of the early ethnic studies movement was to challenge the negative images and stereotypes of African Americans prevalent in mainstream scholarship by creating accurate descriptions of the life, history, and contributions of African Americans” (Board, 2010, para. 5). The advocacy for identities distinct and valued alongside the dominant culture was an important stage in the development of multicultural education (Gause, 2011). Banks (2010) stated that, “although multicultural education is not opposed to the West, its advocates do demand that the truth about the West be told, that its debt to people of color and women be recognized and included in the curriculum, and that the discrepancies
between the ideals of freedom and equality and the realities of racism and sexism be taught to students” (p. 1).

During the 1970s and 1980s, educational institutions began developing ethnic studies programs and courses to address the development of cultural awareness. The resistance to “assimilation” by ethnic minorities bolstered by the Civil Rights Movement produced an array of ethnic studies programs that focused on individual ethnic groups and expanded beyond the original African American focus. In 1979, Denison University was one of the first to formally adopt a diversity requirement as part of the core education with the inclusion of ethnic and cultural studies courses (Banks & Banks, 1995; Board, 2010).

Key legislation was passed in the 1970s to support minority rights and access to education such as Title IX, protecting women in education from discrimination; Public Law 94-142 (Education of All Handicapped Children Act) later resulting in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (United States Department of Labor, 2010). With the growing participation of minorities in the educational arena, issues of inclusion and expanding curriculum to reflect diverse perspectives became a persistent pressure that continues on campuses today. The rapidly changing student demographics in the classroom and in American society have created strong pressure to change. Keller (2001) described the sweeping impact:

America's colleges and universities have altered their academic programs, admission policies, faculty hiring, and campus activities to accommodate the tidal wave of immigrants. A majority of all institutions have launched major initiatives in "multiculturalism" or "diversity" with new programs such as Latino or Chicano studies, new courses in comparative literature and religion and the history of China, Japan, and sub-Saharan Africa, and new extracurricular political and social
organizations. Intensive instruction in English as a second language has proliferated on campuses from the Ivy League to little Concordia University in Portland, Oregon. (p. 255)

The evolution of multicultural pedagogy has included the investigation of knowledge construction in order to decode the embedded bias of values and beliefs of knowledge creators. According to Banks (2004), “multicultural theories assert that the values, personal histories, attitudes, and beliefs of researchers cannot be separated from the knowledge they create” (p. 291). Working from the assumption that individuals are influenced by personal and cultural context, identifying and understanding these aspects in both the knowledge creators and oneself has become essential to the learning process.

The investigation of the knowledge construction process has helped illuminate how the cultural identities and social positions of researchers influence the validity of knowledge claims. The re-examination of previously unquestioned content distributed throughout the American educational landscape has become a form of learning and investigation for multicultural studies.

In education, cross-cultural training and multicultural studies has emerged partially to address the need to train pre-service teachers in an increasingly diverse classroom. Brown (2004b) confirmed the projections of demographic change and predicted a strong need for cross-cultural training in teacher education:

The demographic projections of Haberman (1989) and Hodgkinson (1992; 2002) indicated an increasing divergence between the cultures and life experiences of K-12 students and those of their classroom teachers. By 2020 the homogeneity (white, middle class, female) of classroom teachers will reach 95% while the economic, ethnic, racial, religious, and social class diversity of the student population will increase nationally, to over 50% (Hodgkinson, 2002; Sadker & Sadker, 2000). This cultural incongruity is further exacerbated by the limited authentic cross-cultural knowledge and interaction experiences of both classroom teachers and their students. (para. 1)


Arts Education Perspective

Looking at multicultural efforts through the lens of arts education, Lowenfeld (1957), one of the pioneering scholars of art education, recognized the need for developing the capacity for global citizenship in response to the devastation of World War II. He asserted that a foundation in arts education develops a student’s capacity for creative thinking, self-awareness, and flexibility. Lowenfeld (1957) proposed that an essential component of arts engagement was the continual development of self-concept. His influential research and writing emphasized the role of the art educator as encouraging and motivating students to become sensitive and aware and to cultivate flexibility and the ability to connect with others who may have differing ideas. Lowenfeld (1957) argued that engagement with arts has the potential to develop innate creative abilities through a continual expansion of the student’s frame of reference. He proposed a child-centered framework that used a starting point of familiar experiences from which teachers can guide students to make connections to broader spheres. This framework included both an expanded use of media and a larger sociological-cultural context. Lowenfeld (1957) proposed that engagement with art not only offered the development of a greater sensitivity to one’s own process and emotional framework but offered the opportunity to develop a larger awareness of others as well.

Lowenfeld set the stage for the arts to play a central role in education during the 1960s through the 1980s, noting that:

Because every creative process involves the whole child and not only a single segment of him, art education may well become a catalyst for a child-centered education in which the individual and his creative potentialities are placed above subject matter in which his inner equilibrium may be considered as important as his scientific achievements. (1957, p. 11)
While Lowenfeld does not specifically discuss multiculturalism or ethnicity, the impetus for his research came from his desire to address pressing world issues and the need for cultivating the human creative capacity in order to "help our children and youth to grow freely and creatively, to identify themselves with their own experiences and also with the needs of their neighbors, and thus provide for better relationships in our society" (Lowenfeld, 1957, p. 8). The impact of Lowenfeld’s child-centered educational model was far-reaching and played a role in the multicultural education framework that sought to uncover the student’s individual voice, cultural context, and tolerance of differences among people.

Self-reflection in Multicultural Education Pedagogy

Much like the pedagogy of arts education that teaches art appreciation and arts production, multicultural education takes the approach that addresses both the subject and the process of multiculturalism. Programs such as ethnic studies, cultural studies, and others may focus on the subject of culture and study the inherent values and beliefs of the people belonging to that cultural group without drawing connections to the innate biases of one’s own cultural identity and the requisite skills to fully participate in a pluralistic society (Hoffman, 1996).

Although increasing knowledge of culture as a subject can broaden a student’s knowledge base, this approach does not necessarily facilitate significant self-reflection and may miss the opportunity to develop greater self-awareness within a global context.

---

3 See Table 1.1, Terminology
that might lead to greater cultural competency. These courses could then become a small part of a plethora of other numerous requirements for majors and degree completion.

Multicultural education can be found within teacher education and other service provider professions, such as health and business, where the pedagogy turns toward reflective processes. This approach is more oriented towards skills-development and requires the clarification of one’s personal cultural identity as fundamental to becoming multiculturally skilled. Additionally there is an implied commitment to institutional reform that will provide equal access and social justice to all citizens (Hawkins, 2009; Lindsey, Roberts & Campbell Jones, 2005; Banks, 2004a). The need to identify one’s cultural perspective as well as potential cultural biases is seen as an essential starting point.

Banks (2004a) notes that cultural, national, and global identities "are interrelated in a developmental way, and that students cannot develop thoughtful and clarified national identifications until they have reflective and clarified cultural identifications, and that they cannot develop a global or cosmopolitan identification until they have acquired a reflective national identification” (p. 294). Banks has been an influential scholar for decades in the multicultural arena and it is valuable to review some of his contributions that have influenced many sectors. He has presented one model for clarifying the relationship and levels between one’s personal cultural identification and the larger sphere of global identification. The ability to uncover one’s own assumptions about culture and identity is an essential stage in the development of cultural awareness.

---

4 See Table 1.1, Terminology
Banks (2003, 2004a) developed multiple models to assist with the development of global citizenship, such as shown in Figure 1.1.

![Figure 1.1. J. A. Banks (2004) Cultural, national, and global identification spheres.](image)

His numerous models have illustrated his framework that starts with individual reflection and ultimately seeks to develop a *globally competent citizen*. Figure 1.2 illustrates his six stages of global competence development that build upon a discovery and clarification of one’s personal cultural identity to achieve a level of *Globalism* and *Global Competency*. These stages move from Stage 1, where individuals internalize negative stereotypes about their own cultural groups that are held by the larger society, to Stage 2 which moves into an identification that attempts to confirm and shift to a positive pride in the cultural group. Stage 3 moves into a more authentic understanding and sense of belonging to a cultural group. Stage 4 begins to acknowledge one’s own cultural identity as one of a larger multi-cultural community. Stage 5, is characterized by a clarified perspective on one’s own cultural and national identifications and a positive
attitude toward other groups. Finally, Banks' theories have described a stage where individuals, through the on-going reflective process, have achieved a level of “knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to function effectively within their own cultural communities . . . and have a commitment to all human beings in the world community” (Banks & Nguyen, 2008, p. 146).

Figure 1.2. Banks (2004b) Stages of cultural identity topology.
Banks (2004b) saw the development of *multicultural literacy* as an important and fundamental capacity ranked with basic writing and reading skills. He stated that, “multicultural literacy consists of the skills and abilities to identify the creators of knowledge and their interests, to uncover the assumptions of knowledge, to view knowledge from diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives, and to use knowledge to guide action that will create a humane and just world” (p. 291).

Even in some of the earliest models of *cultural competency*, there were essential components of self-awareness development and self-reflection. C. A. M. Banks (1981) developed a model for cross-cultural counseling, shown below (Figure 1.3), that includes several elements of reflecting on one’s own values, beliefs, and on-going self-examination. As co-authors and editors of numerous publications, both C.A.M. Banks and J.A. Banks informed each other’s model development and theoretical frameworks for understanding the core concepts of cultural competency. For example, Figure 1.3 below, derived from C.A.M. Banks, illustrates the dynamics between self-awareness and the capacity to be an effective counselor in cross-cultural settings. Each square represents essential skills and behaviors of an effective cross-cultural counselor. Note the multiple references to one’s own self-reflection about values, beliefs, and behaviors and how they impact others. These same themes emerge in J.A. Banks work in effective teaching models for multicultural education.
One of two examples of models taking multicultural education to a systemic change level is found in Banks (2011) model, Dimensions of Multicultural Education. This model has been used by school districts to conceptualize and develop courses, programs, and projects in multicultural education. The five dimensions of the model are: (1) content integration; (2) the knowledge construction process; (3) prejudice reduction; (4) an equity pedagogy; and (5) an empowering school culture and social structure.

Another model is presented in *The Culturally Proficient School: An Implementation Guide for School Leaders* (Lindsey, Roberts & Campbell Jones, 2005). This handbook strives to address “the complexities of accountability, diversity, and no
child left behind expectations” (p. vii). The focus of the approach is on the role of leadership as the key agent of change and that change must occur systemically. The guide is the third in a series that uses *cultural proficiency* as its core framework and sees it as a skill set where the goal is to foster “high levels of cultural and social interaction among diverse groups” (p. xvii). This framework strives to encourage educational leaders to have the ability to honor, respect, and interact knowledgeably with different cultural groups. Throughout the guide are worksheets and reflective activities that steer participants to uncover personal cultural blind spots and biases through a series of case studies and narrative writing. The proposed Triple Loop Learning Model shown below in Figure 1.4 expands upon previous transformational learning models and incorporates familiar components from the multicultural education models such as a stage of “New Ways of Being” and a required shift in self-perception (Lindsey et al., 2005).

Transformative learning is a term used in educational theory to describe a process that facilitates the learner to re-evaluate past beliefs and assumptions about oneself and others in order to inform and guide new future actions (Mezirow, 2000, 2003). The process illustrated below has added the dimension of self-perception and an adjustment of behaviors as well as self-understanding to a more traditional process of action producing results that recalibrate assumptions.
Multicultural Education Models in Other Service Professions

Professional fields such as health and business have also responded to the demographic trends with increased focus on diversity training and have developed theoretical frameworks, educational programs, assessments, and studies to evaluate the effectiveness of these trainings. It is valuable to inspect some of the scholarship in these disciplines as research has been ongoing in issues of cultural competency applications and assessment for more than two decades.

The health care profession has aggressively developed and applied cultural competency training and assessment in healthcare education for over twenty years. In the early 1990s, Campinha-Bacote (1995), an influential scholar in the health education field, created a “Culturally Competent Model of Care” that “views cultural competence as the continuous process of seeking cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, cultural skill and cultural encounters” (p. 19). An essential component of Campinha-Bacote's model is an on-going self-reflection that develops self-awareness including identifying cultural biases as illustrated in Figure 1.5. The continual cycle of self-examination runs through the four
components shown below. As one gains cultural knowledge, this impacts the levels of cultural sensitivity that then increases levels of cultural competency and so on. A culturally competent health professional would be in a continual cycle of self-reflection.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 1.5. Campinah-Bacote (1995). Culturally Competent Model of Care.**

In the health profession, *cultural competency* or lack thereof can mean life or death to a patient because individual cultural frameworks approach and conceptualize death, sickness, and medical care in different ways. A lack of understanding on the part of a healthcare provider can create misinterpretation of needs and responses of the patient (Betancourt, Green, Carillo & Ananeh-Firempong, 2003; Campinha-Bacote 1995).

One example, among many similar articles, studies, and reports that appear in the health profession literature on *cultural competency*, is “Bilingual, Culturally Competent Managers Enhance Access to Prenatal Care for Migrant Women, Leading to Potential for Improved Birth Outcomes” (AHRQ, 2010). The study describes how the capacity for healthcare providers to understand the cultural context and lifestyle issues of their
patients supported more consistent care and more accurate assessment of health care issues as well as greater success in communicating the importance of medical recommendations. The ability to apply cultural competence to the pre-natal care management showed a potential link to the improvement of the health of newborns and the mothers (AHRQ, 2010).

In business, cultural competence, or intercultural competence\(^5\) as it is sometimes called, can make or break an important negotiation when dealing in the global marketplace. Johnson, Lenarrtowicz & Apud (2006) readily pointed to lack of cross-cultural competence as a leading reason for failed international businesses. However, they argue the working definitions lack a connection between the knowledge of the concept and the application through behavior and action (Johnson, et al., 2006). Bennett (1993) developed multiple models including Intercultural Sensitivity. A widely used model by Bennett is for Intercultural Competence\(^6\) that measures levels of awareness from “unaware of differences” to awareness that is demonstrated by acceptance, adaption, and respect for differences both cognitively and behaviorally. This model is used to assist global business professionals to acclimate to varied cultural practices in order to conduct business effectively and sustain personal health and well being while abroad. Essential to Bennett’s model is a component of cultivating self-awareness and personal reflection as illustrated in Figure 1.6.

---

\(^5\) See Table 1.1, Terminology

\(^6\) Ibid.
Figure 1.6. *Bennett (1993)*. *Model of Cultural Competency*.

Dale (2000) cautioned us to consider that so called “globalization” and the associated changes in demographics and international exchanges will affect policy and practices on multiple levels, many of which we cannot anticipate. Some of the effects may not be immediately recognizable, yet education needs to address the emerging and evolving skill sets required by individuals to join the growing diversity within the United States and participate successfully as global citizens. Banks (2004b) stated that “the increasing ethnic, cultural, language, and religious diversity in nation-states throughout the world have raised new questions and possibilities about educating students for effective citizenship” (p. 289). While many multicultural scholars agree that global developments place monumental pressures on education, there continue to be debates
about terminology and the effectiveness of various multicultural trainings and cultural competency initiatives (Minnich, 2010; Sue, 2001; Betancourt et. al, 2003).

*Art Education Strand*

To return to the discussion of art education and how it can help build competence, the study of art includes both art appreciation and production. It encompasses an expansive range of arts including music, literature, theater, dance, fine arts practice, popular culture, visual literacy, art history, aesthetics, art therapy, art criticism, and other approaches (National Arts Education Association, 2010). Art is ubiquitous and can be found in every society from ancient human communities to current civilizations. Within many related disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, and philosophy, the study of art is an approach to interpret cultural belief systems and societal structures (Dissayanake, 1992). The *art-i-facts* are examined in art history, anthropology, and many other disciplines to learn about the individuals and the community they belong to, and to understand the societies and cultures in which they were produced (Geertz, 1976).

Inherent in arts engagement is the need for a process of self-reflection. Whether examining artifacts from ancients civilizations to understand their cultural and sociological import, viewing a painting and deciphering its meaning, or immersing one’s hands in a bucket of clay to form an object, part of the process involves the self and one's own context from which the experience is interpreted and understood (Eisner, 2002).

The field of art education teaches artists, or those who are producing art, to work with materials for art production. It also teaches non-artists to engage with art in an informed way. Art education, as a discipline, encompasses professional arts practice,
Fundamental to art education is the engagement with art. During the last century there was an important shift in Western arts theory and practice from a formalist framework toward a postmodern and visual culture context. One significance of this shift is that arts engagement became accessible to a broader audience, releasing it from the exclusivity of high culture and elite venues, allowing more access to art work and its participation in and expression of popular culture (Blandy & Congdon, 1987; Blandy & Hoffman, 1993).

Art as Anesthetic Inquiry

The study of aesthetics is a major component of arts education. The act of perceiving through the senses is central to making and appreciating art (Eisner, 1982, 2002). For decades, traditional aesthetic inquiry in the arts focused on learning and applying established universal guidelines for evaluating and critiquing artwork. These supposedly “universal guidelines” were developed, however, from a Eurocentric cultural framework (Bersson, 2004). Education and training were required in order to acquire the knowledge to interpret art correctly. Access to this “fine arts” knowledge often was limited to members of the affluent and elite class. This approach to understanding art was to cultivate a trained, detached observer (Parker & Pollock, 1987). This approach often

9 See Table 1.1, Terminology

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid.
inherently disqualified members of cultural groups who framed arts engagement and production as a process embedded in daily life and/or personal expression, ritual, and spiritual practice (McFee & Degge, 1977; Dissayanake, 1988; MacGregor, 1992).

Challenging the notion of detachment, Arnheim (1969) explored the function of artistic activity as a form of reasoning. Focusing on visual perception, he stated that art is “a fundamental means of orientation, born of man’s need to understand himself and the world in which he lives” (Arnheim, 1969, p. 294). Arnheim aligned art inquiry with a scientific approach to cognitive thinking and researched the link between arts engagement and critical inquiry. His work influenced the shift in arts education theories about art participation from passive observer to active personal engagement. Arnheim (1969, 1986, 1997) approached art from the perspective of philosophy, psychology, and aesthetics, and laid a foundation for aesthetic theory debates that influenced arts education and multiple disciplines over decades.

Berleant (1991) pointed out that traditional aesthetic approaches often were bound by limiting doctrines that inhibit one’s ability to engage with new emerging art. He proposed a participatory approach to arts engagement that shifted the aesthetic experience from passive observer to an engaged interpreter. Building on the momentum from Arnheim’s work, he claimed, “the purpose of aesthetics is to clarify and explain our experiences with the arts” (Berleant, 1991 p.18). Berleant helped shape a vision for society that required a transformation in how we identified and experienced art. He saw the emergence of contemporary art that rejected the traditional isolated status and instead explored and celebrated the connections to daily life. He described this significant shift stating, “entering the world of art requires the active engagement of the total person and
not just a subjective cast of mind. Such engagement emphasizes connections and
continuities, and it leads ultimately to the aestheticization of the human world” (Berleant,

The concept that art transcends a formalistic framework of fine arts emerged from
multiple disciplines. From the anthropological field, scholars such as Fischer (1961),
Fratto (1978), Flores (1985), and Geertz (1976) were debating aesthetics and art within
anthropology. The anthropology of art became a widely discussed topic and explored the
function of art in both historic and contemporary society as expressive of individual
cultural meaning and a larger social framework. Dissayanake (1988) took a
“paleoanthropsychobiological” (p.15) view and argued that art, in its broadest sense, was
a universal human need providing a source of heightened personal meaning and
experience. She challenged established arts education practice by arguing that arts
expression was embedded in every aspect of human existence (Dissayanake, 1988, 1992).

Art and Cultural Context

The seeds of change in the United States that helped the field of art better
understand its position within a cultural context, as is true in a number of other fields, can
be traced back indirectly to societal changes. The self-examination in society as well as
the multiple legislative initiatives previously discussed in relation to multicultural
education brought focus to this perspective. Other legislation, such as Brown vs. Board of
Education in 1954 as the first segregation case to advance to the U.S. Supreme Court and
the subsequent civil rights movement of the1960s, had lasting impact on the theoretical
approaches to arts education as well.
Critical Race Theory (CRT) emerged in the 1970s as a broader approach to civil rights that included an activist component dedicated to examining and transforming the relationships of power and race (Tate IV, 1997). Economics, history, personal, and social context—including art, aesthetics, and opportunities for self-expression—were included as essential aspects when trying to understand issues of inequality. CRT was informed by radical feminism and was quickly included in the thinking of many disciplines including education (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

Efland in his *A History of Art Education* (1990) notes influences as early as the turn of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century suggesting that this was the beginning of the questioning of the long-standing academic art traditions. He links the trend of artists moving toward "primitive art" for inspiration with anthropologists of the time exploring customs and beliefs of other cultures and claiming them as valid and credible views of reality. He describes these as early indicators of future questioning and dismantling of the monopoly of Euro-western culture (Efland, 1990, p. L).

During the 1970s and 1980s, scholars in art education began to explore the role of art as fundamental communication that could serve to bridge and interpret the complexity of socio-political diversity (Blandy & Congdon 1987; Eisner, 1974; McFee, 1974; Lanier, 1976, 1980). This continued the growing trend rejecting the traditional formalist frameworks in art education and reconceptualizing the rules of aesthetics represented by the masters of Western European traditions previously accepted as universal.

The emerging post-modern paradigm incorporated personal and social contexts in which art making and art products communicated cultural values and beliefs of individuals and cultural groups. Art was described as "a principal means of
communicating ideas and emotional meanings from one person to another, from one group to another, from one generation to another” (McFee & Degge, 1977, p. 272). Untrained and basic artistic expression such as body ornamentation, fashion, and graffiti were studied as valid artistic forms. This challenged the Eurocentric standards of fine art and invited a larger population to engage with the arts.

Chalmers (1984) stated that artistic perception takes place within a socio-cultural context. This scholar argued that,

Current educational interest in art as a complex language of visual images that people learn to ‘read,’ and in art as the expression of a wide range of human values and concerns, should have the effect of bringing art educators increasingly into contact with anthropological and sociological inquiry. (p. 279)

The emergence of the postmodernist movement challenged the traditions in arts education. Individual experience and cultural context became increasingly important. Training in a universal aesthetic to be applied to all work receded and became one of many approaches to art education rather than the only approach. MacGregor (1992) stated that,

Post-Modernism holds that many value positions may be taken about relationships among persons, art, and education, and many of these positions are likely to be in conflict. Art works are constructed out of social interactions and indeed are designated 'art works' by those elements in society that sponsor them. (p. 1)

He clarified an understanding of post-modernist approaches in arts education as he described the act of deconstruction that allows for multiple viewpoints to coexist around a single work of art. This framework parallels the approaches in multicultural education that strive to support the expression of multiple cultural voices.

Eisner (1974, 1982, 2002) presented theoretical frameworks that examined art as an expression of contemporary trends in society as well as fostering the development of
the individual through aesthetic engagement that transforms consciousness. He explored how art communicates the ideology of cultural groups within societies and also how art is used to create and sustain culture. Parks (1989) further clarified that a postmodernist approach requires the viewer to be culturally literate to understand art. As the scope of art broadened to include more diverse artistic expression, it became more evident that an understanding of the socio-cultural context of the work was essential. Art continued to be researched as a mechanism that impacts the formation, maintenance, and transformation of culture and place. Scholars helped situate the field of arts education into the post modernist paradigm by linking individual artistic expression with social advocacy (Blandy & Hoffman, 1993; Pearse, 1992).

The field of arts education moved from an exclusive hierarchical discipline to a more inclusive, personal, and socio-culturally grounded framework. The concept of art expanded to include a broader scope of cultural voices, including more women and minorities. Reflective practice validated the individual experience of interpretation by artists and viewers. The meaning of art became firmly embedded in a cultural context, and the individual experience was honored not only as unique and valid, but also as an essential path to a deeper understanding of both art and self.

Booth (1999) stated, “art is not apart. It is a continuum within which all participate; we all function in art, use the skills of art, and engage in the actions of artists every day” (p. 3). The emerging theory included what Booth later described as “everyday art” and contributed to a growing scholarly discourse around visual and popular culture (Freedman, 2003; Dikovitskya, 2005). Media, graffiti, zines, and everyday art were included as relevant artistic expression in arts production. Theories of visual culture were
emerging to address the appropriation of cultural images in the creation of art. The study
of image, almost as an interpretive process, came in response to the impact of technology
and media on contemporary aesthetics as well as emerging art production techniques.

Current theories in arts education and reflective practice include a recent book by
culture to provoke mainstream readers to contemplate their role as art makers. Art as a
means to communicate and understand cultural values and beliefs continues to evolve in
both mainstream society and art education practice, where there is a blurring between
artist and audience (D. Blandy, personal communication, July 12, 2010). Dutton (2009)
explored art production as accessible to everyone and advocated for art’s capacity to
facilitate personal and societal transformation.

In a recent editorial, Congdon (2009), editor of *Studies in Arts Education*, the
premier scholarly journal of the National Art Education Association, envisioned the field
of arts education at a turning point. She described change occurring around the world at a
rapid rate where there is new opportunity to reshape and redirect the field. She advocated
for leadership in a global context emanating from the arts education professionals where
arts education fosters transformation. She said, “the experience of art is about
transitioning into another space” (p. 4).

*Development of Self-awareness*

Recent decades of research and debate over the content in art classrooms has
produced a plethora of resources to assist the teacher in the process of facilitating
student’s self-discovery as a component of arts engagement. Recent editions of *Art*
*Education*, the broad spectrum journal of the National Art Education Association, include articles focused on curriculum design facilitating students to make personal connections as a meaning-making process (Marshall & Vashe, 2008; Lopez, Daneau, Rosoff, & Congdon, 2008).

Whether reviewing images in an art history course, engaging with artwork in a museum, or training as an artist with specific materials, the focus has shifted away from a formalist fine arts approach toward an individual reflective process. Reflective practice is “central to the development of new awareness, knowledge, and value shift” (Burnhard, 2006, p. 3).

In reflective practice, arts educators are trained to solicit multiple points of view to deconstruct an arts experience and foster a meaning-making process that cultivates a diversified classroom environment. The process of sharing one’s personal insight and realizations from encountering artwork has become fundamental to engaging with arts as the field continues to debate and explore the role of art in a changing society. The increased interest in visual and popular culture has quickened the refocus of subject matter and pedagogical approaches. The study of art is becoming a vehicle for self-discovery and cultural expression rather than simply a subject to study as a detached scholar.

However, La Porte, Spears, and Young (2008) suggested that, “there has not been a dominant curriculum theory of approach, but instead a plurality of approaches that address a more inclusive body of artists and issues (e.g. social, political, and cultural)” (p. 359). Their study of current content implemented by art teachers in the United States during the first years of teaching was designed to evaluate the integration of
contemporary art education theories into the curriculum. Findings indicated that the paradigm shift from a formalist traditional education is slowed by the fact that teachers are influenced by their own previous education as well as their personal preferences and familiarity with art content (La Porte, et al., 2008). Doug Blandy, noted art education scholar and National Art Education Association 2010 Art Educator of the Year, confirmed the lack of a unified approach within the field of art education: “art education has always been a disparate field with tensions between fine arts and self-expression, expert and vernacular, and the emergence of popular and material culture studies as well as design education” (personal communication, July 13, 2010).

Engagement with art incorporates a level of self-reflection in order to attach meaning to either the art being made or experienced. One researcher, On (2006), did a phenomenological study of eight museum visitors who were not trained in the arts. The study was conducted to provide insight for museum curators and education specialists in order to support the process of engagement that naturally occurs with the non-trained viewing public. On examined the personal connections made by the visitors as they viewed paintings in the museum. The study showed that when participants encountered the paintings they tried to make sense of them through a meaning-making process by relating image and idea to their own thoughts, memories, and experiences (On, 2006). The study suggests that engagement with art triggers a process of active interpretation that is directly linked to previous knowledge and experiences generating meaningful personal narratives that may clarify and reinforce notions of self as well as a connection to the art.
The dialogue about art and the deconstruction process invites the viewer and maker to examine beliefs and assumptions in order to connect with the communication of the artwork. This process, fostered in an arts education curriculum, can produce collaborative conversations that reveal multiple perspectives and offer opportunity to gain new insight into one’s previously held perceptions and beliefs. The comparison of different viewpoints can lead to a larger context for understanding the artwork, the self, and others.

Numerous arts educators have advocated for using arts education as a means to integrate diverse learners into an educational path. Maclean (2008) stated, "the arts are ideally suited to meet the varied needs and abilities of students.... Diversity and variability are celebrated in the arts" (p. 77). She goes on to clarify, "once engaged, the individual can shift between levels of understanding. These levels of understanding can eventually form a basis of knowledge and experience that can be expanded upon. The arts can also provide tools for changing perceptions" (MacLean 2008, p. 78).

Engagement with art includes the aesthetic encounter with art and/or the manipulation with media to produce art. Both encounters start with an individual experience of choice often utilizing the creative process to temporarily suspend beliefs to open to new possibilities, awareness, and options. This open space or state of “flow” allows for shifts in perception and potentially new insight (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Cameron, 1995). The decision-making inherent in arts engagement can clarify a sense of self because the art work, whether music, literature, film, or other expressive mediums, reflects back results of decisions. For example, an encounter with an image calls for
discernment and reaction. This process can further solidify a sense of self by the progression of evaluative choices of response.

In summary, the changes in arts education theory and practice over the last decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and into the beginning of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century were essential to the development of contemporary arts education theory. The shift from a formalist western culture framework to a multicultural, socio-political approach, that is inclusive and participatory, invites humanity to engage with arts more fully. The theoretical shift, supported by numerous other disciplines, made way for the conscious and personal engagement with arts (as defined in the broadest sense) that fosters a deeper self-awareness and personal cultural context.

*Connecting Arts Engagement to Banks' Model of Cultural Competency*

As previously discussed, Banks model for developing *cultural competency* connects the development of self-awareness to an ability to recognize the value of others who may be different than oneself. A model of the arts engagement process linked to the Banks model would include stages of self-reflection as one engages with, reacts to, and evaluates the artwork encountered, with self-acceptance as "a prerequisite to the acceptance and valuing of others" (Banks, 2004, p. 295).

When individuals respond to art, multiple levels of engagement are activated, including emotional and cognitive (Eisner, 2002). For example, a person who may regularly listen to classical music may have a strong reaction to hearing a contemporary rap song. The encounter may elicit responses requiring evaluation, justification, and perhaps, even further investigation to clarify the response.
Similarly, one individual passing graffiti on a building may find it inspiring as representative of political activism while another may find it disturbing as a symbol of anarchy. The reactions may be embedded in personal and cultural belief systems.

Encounters with art elicit reactions.

The formalized integration of arts engagement into a curriculum can foster and expand on this reaction to facilitate articulation of the experience and further exploration about the origins of the reactions that lead us to examine individual values and beliefs developed as a part of one’s unique cultural group. Figure 1.7 illustrates a conceptualization of the levels of reaction that might be elicited when engaging with art. As an individual encounters art, there is a response process that may involve multiple sensory, cognitive, emotional, and contextual components. They serve as a filter of sorts through which the individual might interpret and react to the art.

![Diagram of individual arts engagement as reflective process.](image)

**Figure 1.7. Individual arts engagement as reflective process.**
When an interactive classroom environment is added to the process, learning potentially can build upon itself more quickly as students share their differing responses to the art they encounter and are asked to clarify and justify their views and assumptions with peers who may come from a multitude of diverse backgrounds. Figure 1.8 illustrates the potential dynamic with the addition of multiple learners to the arts engagement process, with the inclusion of individual socio-cultural filters. As students encounter and engage with art, they are also asked to share their responses and examine the origins of their beliefs in the context of their responses. This shared dialogue may reveal differences in responses, interpretations, and the origins of individual beliefs.

Figure 1.8. Arts engagement in temporary interactive learning community: reflection through dialogue with peers.
Within pre-service teacher preparation, courses addressing multicultural awareness have sometimes been received with resistance and defensiveness (Ukpokodu, 2009). There is some evidence suggesting that pedagogy using a reflective process, which supports each individual’s self-expression, ameliorates the resistance and, in fact, cultivates greater self-awareness leading to an understanding and acceptance of others who are different. Typically this reflective process is in the form of dialogue and/or personal narratives documenting one’s experience.

Ukpokodu (2009) employed a qualitative approach to evaluate the effectiveness of a pre-service teacher multicultural course that applied a type of reflective process using transformative learning pedagogy. Through a process of pre- and post-autobiographical narratives, students documented assumptions and beliefs that were then re-investigated through the engagement with the curriculum. Though the study had limited generalizability due to the small sample-size, it models the self-reflective component that is a building block to multicultural awareness found across disciplines. Additionally, this study reveals the necessary aspect of learning as a transformative process that shifts one’s perspective to accommodate new knowledge:

The theory on transformative learning suggests that transformation in learning occurs when individuals gain an awareness of their current habits of mind, develop new points of view, critique their underlying assumptions and premises; reconstruct their perspectives and develop new lenses for looking at the world. (Ukpokodu, 2009, p. 4)

Brown (2004b) conducted a study using the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI). The study examined the impact of a stand-alone multicultural course embedded within the core required training program for pre-service teachers. In
particular, the research on curricular design included an examination of self-concept and a “probe into one’s own history and its relationship to one’s current beliefs” (Brown, 2004, p. 334). The incorporation of self-reflection and community dialogue were two of the key components studied and were found to influence the development of self-awareness and foster greater cultural awareness. Through a mixed methods approach, the study found that “a relationship does exist between instructional methods used in a stand-alone cultural diversity course and changes in the cultural diversity awareness of students” (Brown, 2004b, p. 335).

Through an extensive literature review, no other models for cultural competency development or diversity awareness were uncovered that purposefully ignored or eliminated the need for self-awareness as a core characteristic. Though there are multiple conceptual frameworks and evaluation processes, cultivating an expanded self-awareness is a consistent component in most multicultural programs. While many programs use reflective writing and dialogue to achieve an increased self-awareness, few use engagement with the broader arts to foster an understanding of self and others. Implementing curricular design that integrates arts components might add to the much-needed resources for meeting the demands for developing the multiculturally capable global citizen.

*Context of the Study*

This study explores the above stated themes of self-awareness through arts engagement. The University of Oregon serves as a case study for investigating the hypothesis of whether a multicultural course requirement through an arts curriculum can
foster an increase in self-awareness through arts engagement.

Self-awareness in this context includes not only clarity of one’s values and beliefs, but also, one’s location within a larger social context. The hypothesis is that self-awareness of individual characteristics can add depth of meaning and potential transformative knowledge when combined with understanding of the dynamic exchange with one’s culture and social context. Clarifying one’s positional space allows one to understand the filters and judgments used to perceive experiences. The ability to express and explore these concepts through arts engagement and commentary fosters an on-going reflective practice. This continual dialogue can provide deepening insight to self.

To investigate this hypothesis, the University of Oregon Arts & Administration (AAD) departmental course, AAD 250 Art and Human Values, is the context of inquiry. The structure for the course centers on arts engagement that requires a self-reflective process, as well as a dialogue with peers about personal and other insights regarding the art encountered during each week of the course. The course cultivates a level of comfort with art, and then, uses conversations surrounding art to foster student engagement that is intended to move beyond surface interaction and facilitate a discussion of the experience with classmates. The self-reflective process as well as the dialogue with peers incorporates reflective practice pedagogical approaches.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between engagement with art in an arts-based multicultural course at the undergraduate level and: (i) comfort with art and (ii) development of self-awareness?

2. How can an arts and culture course foster self-awareness?

3. Does the undergraduate Art and Human Values course in this study satisfy university multicultural general education requirements, and if so, how?
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This study investigates a multicultural course intervention employing arts engagement as described in Chapter 1, with respect to student outcomes in two areas: (i) comfort with art (CA) and (ii) the development of self-awareness (SA).

Sample Group

Two sample groups were selected for the study. Both groups participate in general education courses that satisfy University of Oregon multicultural graduation requirements. One group, $X_1$ in Figure 2.1, will be called here the "comparison group". This group was enrolled in a non-arts based course where instructional practices incorporated the broadly practiced reflective writing and peer dialogue approach. The second group, $X_2$ in Figure 2.1, to be called here the "treatment group", was enrolled in an arts-based curriculum that employed reflective writing and peer dialogue focused on the experiences of engaging with art. This is distinct from the comparison course that focused on teaching and learning about the subject of the media’s role in diversity stereotypes and issues of oppression. Arts-engagement, as explored in Chapter 1, offers a different approach to learning about diversity and developing cultural awareness through the self-reflective dynamic that arts-engagement potentially offers.

Figure 2.1 describes the non-equivalent groups design that was employed in this study. A mixed methods approach, described in subsequent sections, was used to explore the scope and depth of the information gathered for the two groups over time, providing a
breadth of data that could look at the groups from a variety of perspectives for more informed analysis, and to strengthen and clarify the interpretation of results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>pre-treatment</th>
<th>treatment</th>
<th>post-treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1. Non-equivalent groups design (NEGD) model, with both groups, X₁ and X₂ enrolled in a multicultural course. X₁ = Comparison Group: multicultural course with non-arts curriculum; X₂ = Treatment Group: multicultural course employing engagement with arts to facilitate dialogue and narrative.

Multicultural Requirements at the University of Oregon

In order to provide a context for the study, a review of past and current policy on the university requirements for multicultural courses was conducted as part of data collection for this project. This included a discussion of past interviews with the UO Vice Provost of Undergraduate Studies and an analysis of past and current multicultural requirements policy documents.

Instrument Development

Regarding student-level data for the comparison and treatment group described above, three data collection instruments were used for this project:

1. Primarily, a web-based survey designed by the researcher (and previously piloted in early trials) provided to all students in both treatment and comparison groups at the beginning and end of each term. The survey included both selected response and constructed response answers and is shown in Appendix A. An overlap
design for the survey was used with 14 questions repeated across both time points of the survey. The pre-survey had a total of 26 questions; 3 open-ended, 21 close-ended with optional comment, 1 for identifying information, and 1 open-ended comment at end. The post-survey had a total of 25 questions; 5 open ended, 16 close-ended, 2 demographic data, 1 for identifying information, and 1 open-ended comment at end.

2. A previously published self-awareness instrument external to this project was administered to a sub-sample of students, as a criterion-based validity check.

3. A self-reflective essay that serves as a course-based embedded assessment was administered to a sub-sample of students, and qualitative patterns regarding self-awareness was investigated in-depth in the student work.

The data collection instruments were designed to capture self-reported reflection by students in two areas (i) comfort with art (CA), and (ii) self-awareness (SA). These were used to explore the potential connections between the course intervention and these variables. The constructs are described in detail in Appendix F. To summarize here, they are conceived for this study as a compilation of subsets of a broad range of characteristics describing self-awareness and a selection of distinctive characteristics and behaviors of people who interact with art regularly, demonstrating a level of comfort. For the self-awareness scale, the focus is on one’s perceptions and understanding of personal values, beliefs as they impact one’s perceptions and interactions with others. A low score would be “has never reflected on personal identity nor considered or identified personal values and beliefs,” as compared to a higher score that would indicate ability “to articulate own preferences about lifestyle, values and beliefs, and recognize differences in others as well
as potential impact on others, and possible external influences that helped form individual differences.” A low score on the comfort with art scale for this context would indicate a lack of exposure and a sense that art was “for other people.” The coding rubric describes the low level as “has never considered art as part of their experience, may feel uncomfortable around art, and does not see self as ‘artistic’. Generally many think of art in terms of ‘Fine Art’ only and not readily accessible to understanding or participation in art.” A high level on this scale would recognize the multiple forms of art and freely engage in making and/or appreciating art. The rubric states at the higher range that a respondent is “able to articulate own capacity to create an/or engage with art, and considers art as integral to daily life and recognizes own capacity to create and/or engage with art in multiple venues, mediums etc. Intentionally engages with art in multiple venues both formal and informal.” (APPENDIX F)

Construct and Item Analyses

Data from the pre-post surveys were extracted and inspected through exploratory factor analysis. Further analysis using item response modeling examined item fit and aspects of instrument reliability, and calibrated the items to form a scale from which the researcher estimated on each of the two areas of investigation – CA and SA – can be generated.

Pre-Post Survey Pilot Study

The researcher conducted pilot tests of an earlier survey instrument from 2004-2008, culminating in Spring 2008 with a trial to calibrate a tool for data collection in the area of multicultural education. The questions originally were constructed to capture a
measure of student’s experience with and understanding of art and their understanding of culture. Self-awareness questions were included in the pilot survey.

The instrument was piloted in part to address the need of growing diversity initiatives on campus, for which there was an increased concern about the effectiveness of multicultural courses serving the general education requirements. Prior to the development of the instrument, anecdotal evidence from discussion forums, assignments, and discussions with colleagues seemed to confirm the positive impact of the curriculum on student’s capacity to engage more effectively with others, through applying a broader cultural understanding. In 2004, the original pre-post survey instrument was developed for select AAD 250 courses to attempt to measure the effects of the class experience. This survey originally was developed to measure three constructs: engagement with the arts, understanding of culture, and community involvement.

After reviewing the survey results and qualitative analysis from fall, winter, and spring terms 2004-2005, the community and culture constructs were collapsed into one perspective and engagement with art emerged as the intervention. The sample at that time consisted of 35 respondents drawn from students participating in one of three undergraduate online courses. Three sections of AAD 250 Art & Human Values over three terms were investigated. Subsequent re-design and pilot tests with more extensive quantitative as well as qualitative analysis were deployed during fall 2010 resulting in a survey design that retained arts engagement as the intervention and identified three dimensions: (i) comfort with art, (ii) engagement with/tolerance of others, (iii) self-awareness. For the purposes of this study, the areas of investigation described previously were selected as (i) comfort with art (CA) and (ii) self-awareness (SA), with the intention
of future investigation regarding engagement with others pending a clearer understanding of student patterns in the CA and SA areas.

Qualitative Data

In addition to the survey, elements from the regular course assignments were extracted to provide supplementary opportunities to enrich and clarify the data. Students in a subset of the treatment group completed a self-reflective essay as part of the regular curriculum during the final week of the term, consisting of five open-ended questions (APPENDIX G). These have been analyzed for meaningful patterns of interest to the SA area, data displays have been created, and scoring rubrics created to code patterns that may be identified (APPENDIX H). The qualitative data considers how the work product triangulates or does not triangulate with findings from the quantitative data and provides descriptive content from the student’s voice.

External Validity Check

An external survey instrument, Self-Consciousness Inventory (Fenigstein, Scheir & Buss, 1984) was selected to provide additional information on construct and criterion validity with the pre-post survey. This inventory was administered to a subset of the treatment group. Students were assigned the inventory as a part of the regular curriculum. The subset represented students who agreed to have the results used in this study. The instrument was modified to include identifiers and a consent question for a total of 25 questions. The revised survey poses the 23 original close-ended questions exploring
dimensions of self-consciousness, 1 question as a numeric identifier, and 1 open-ended comment asking for consent to use results in research (APPENDIX B).

While self-awareness frameworks abound, few published instruments exist relevant to multicultural courses. Frameworks often have multiple theoretical dimensions identified for use in different settings such as business, leadership, and psychology (Ashley, 2008). Increasing interest in the arts as a language for communicating and increasing self-knowledge is demonstrated by recent studies using arts engagement in reflective practice. For example, Norman and Walker (2010) used an interactive photographic exhibit in their study to increase connections and communication between patients, healthcare workers, and physicians. Their findings support the function of arts engagement as an activity that fosters increased understanding of self and others. In a recent dissertation, Gardner (2008) conducted a qualitative study following ten pre-service arts education students through an action research model of journaling, art-making, and directed sharing. This study also supported the claims that arts engagement can foster greater communication and personal transformation.

For the purpose of this study, the self-awareness construct has been modeled after Fish (2001), where the focus is exploring one’s own cultural background and context in order to appreciate the importance of the cultural context of others. For the purposes of multicultural teaching and learning, the framework seems to help support the goal of this study to isolate an internal processing as it relates to a greater awareness of one’s inner understanding of self and the social-cultural context within which one is situated.

The Self-Consciousness scale was selected to examine construct validity on the survey instrument developed for this study. While there are numerous instruments
claiming to measure self-awareness, many have little data presented to support reliability or validity or have been designed to capture other aspects of self-awareness that may not be directly relevant to this study. This instrument was selected because of its predominance in the scholarly discourse as a documented, tested instrument at least theoretically related to the Self-awareness (SA) construct to be examined in this study.

Below is a synopsis offered by the authors of the survey’s development:

Construction of the scale involved testing the 38 initial items with 130 female and 82 male undergraduates. A principal components factor analysis of the data yielded 3 factors accounting for 43% of the variance: Private Self-Consciousness, Public Self-Consciousness, and Social Anxiety. The final version of the scale, which contained 23 items, was administered to several groups of undergraduates (N = 668) to obtain norms, test-retest (2 wks), subscale correlation, and reliability data. Test-retest reliabilities were .84 for the Public Self-Consciousness scale, .79 for the Private Self-Consciousness scale, .73 for the Social Anxiety scale, and .80 for the total score. Public Self-Consciousness correlated moderately with both Private Self-Consciousness and Social Anxiety, while the correlation of Private Self-Consciousness with Social Anxiety fluctuated around zero. No sex differences in scores were observed. (Fenigstein, Scheier & Buss, 1975, p. 523)

As mentioned above, there are three identified scales within this assessment: (i) Private Self-consciousness, (ii) Public Self-consciousness, and (iii) Social Anxiety. Based upon a review of the instrument, the Private Self-consciousness scale seemed to align best with the self-awareness dimension in this study and to measure along similar dimensions for internal self-awareness and external context. It should be noted in advance that while the scale was selected as the most appropriate external instrument identified, some of the questions were not a clear match with the intention of measurement for this study; this is discussed in more depth in the following chapters.
Data Collection

All students in the treatment and comparison groups in the study were sent an invitation to participate in the pre-class survey during the first week of an eleven-week term. The survey link was included in the email invitation as well as posted on the web-based course sites. All courses used the web-based course site as a learning hub to post information and resources for the course whether they met face-to-face or on-line. Information regarding the purpose of the research, the related follow-up post survey, and the anonymity of participation was included both in the email and on the course site. All students were informed that their choice whether or not to participate would have no impact on their grade and that participation was strictly voluntary. Each faculty member had the option to offer extra credit for the survey participation, and students were granted the extra credit for completing the survey as a course enrichment exercise whether or not they chose to have their survey data included in the analysis here. Other extra credit options were also offered so that students' choice to participate or not would not impact their grade based upon additional credit options. The faculty who opted for this received a list of the students who completed the pre- and post-survey to insure anonymity regarding actual survey responses.

The post-survey was sent out midweek of week eleven/finals week to all students in the study. The link was be included in the email and posted on the course sites. Students were be thanked for their participation in the pre-survey and reminded of the research purpose and anonymity of their participation. Reminder emails were also sent.

The password protected web-based survey tool, Survey Monkey, was used for both the pre-post survey and adapted for the external Self-Consciousness assessment. Each section of AAD 250 included in the study and the comparison group selected for the
non-arts course had a separate survey link. The web-based survey tool automatically generated basic analysis of responses in terms of number of responses such as Likert scale value, dichotomous, catalogued ordinal responses, and collected qualitative comments. Individual responses were preserved as separate records, and open-ended comments retrieved were coded and linked to individual respondents for further analysis.

Figure 2.2 provides an overview of research implementation sequence that includes a (i) pre-post survey, (ii) external *Self-consciousness* assessment and, (iii) self-reflective essay. The pre-class survey was administered at the beginning of the term and the remaining data collected at the end of the term.

*Comparison Instrument*

The *Self-consciousness* assessment was administered to a subset of the treatment group as a part of the regular week ten assignments. Students were asked for consent to have these results included in the research data collection. They were also informed that their choice to participate or not would have no impact on the course grade.

*Self-reflective Essay*

The self-reflective essay was administered from within the subset of the treatment group. It was administered as part of the regular course assignments and collected on the last day of the term, in week eleven. Students were asked for consent to have their responses included in the data collection, again informing them of the research intention and that the choice to participate had no impact on the course grade. The researcher analyzed and prepared rubrics for the self-reflective essay. For inter-rater reliability,
faculties who teach in the AAD 200 series were invited to code qualitative data using the established rubric to assess reliability of the coding of qualitative results.
Data Analysis

Data from both groups were collected and analyzed. The treatment group was composed of four sections of AAD 250. The course sections shared a common core curriculum and similar syllabus goals and outcomes. Each faculty member typically customizes materials and pedagogical approach to the content. All four faculty members use arts engagement as the core component, though the type of arts used might range from literature, music and film to fine and popular art. Three of the four courses were delivered as on-line classes. Drawing from all four sections of the treatment group offered evidence across settings addressing an average trend over instructors and implementations at the case study site. Students enrolled in the comparison group did not have the option to select an on-line format and were enrolled in a single course.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were collected including age, race, major, and class standing. Frequences and mean comparisons between groups for each variable were generated and examined descriptively.

Correlational Analysis and ANCOVA

Comparisons of means as well as correlational studies were used to compare results across different aspects of the findings. Data was analyzed at three levels; total sample from the comparison group and treatment group, select subgroups, and individual respondent. Independent and paired sample t-tests analyzed the relationships between the treatment and comparison groups for the CA and SA variables identified. ANCOVA was applied for covariates of the CA and SA variables. Significant differences were found
between the two groups pre-treatment, and assumptions of ANCOVA were met in order to proceed with this line of analysis.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

Qualitative data from both the survey and the self-reflective essays were analyzed using a coding scale measuring respondent’s levels on each of the two dimensions. Appendix H shows essay examples along with a coding sample and Appendix F shows then overall coding rubric for both dimensions. Qualitative narrative and data displays were used to help interpret survey findings, and share student perspectives on their work.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter will begin with data collected during the policy exploration of multicultural requirements at the University of Oregon. It will continue with the quantitative and qualitative results from the non-equivalent groups pre-post survey data collection and analysis. Finally, results from use of the quantitative comparison instrument and the qualitative reflective essay sub-samples will be presented. Descriptive data and data displays will also be provided as the sections are presented.

Multicultural Requirements at the University of Oregon

Research about the development of current University of Oregon (UO) policies regarding general education requirements provided historical context for current practice and evaluation standards. The University of Oregon (UO) is a public, coeducational research university in Eugene, Oregon, United States. The second oldest public university in the state, UO was founded in 1876, and is one of 60 members of the Association of American Universities. In 1999 the University of Oregon formalized multicultural general education requirements to facilitate the development of cultural awareness. This designation provided courses across disciplines including those focused on the arts such as AAD 250: Art & Human Values.

In line with national trends, the University of Oregon has guidelines for a course to qualify as meeting the Multicultural Group general education requirement for an undergraduate degree. According to the University of Oregon catalogue (2009) “The purpose of the multicultural requirement is to introduce students to the richness of human
diversity and to the opportunities and challenges of life in a multicultural society.” To earn an undergraduate degree all students are required to complete a minimum of 6 credits, or a total of sixty class contact hours, in 2 of 3 multicultural categories; A. American Cultures; B. Identity, Pluralism and Tolerance; and C. International Cultures.

Prompted by a campus-wide diversity plan, as well as student feedback regarding the multicultural requirement, the University Undergraduate Council undertook an evaluation of the qualifying courses. Courses were reviewed during the 2006–2007 and 2007–2008 academic years. In Fall 2008 Karen Sprague, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, generated a draft report of the findings. The council evaluated the effectiveness of all UO multicultural group courses in part, through a review of the course syllabi. The process examined course goals and topics as stated in the syllabus and evaluated their alignment with the criteria established for the multicultural requirement. AAD 250 and the majority of courses up for review retained their status as a multicultural course based upon the syllabus review (K. Sprague, personal communication, November 5, 2009).

However, as acknowledged by the review committee, analysis of syllabi may not reveal the impact of the curriculum on the student. The syllabus states the intention, or goals and objectives of the course, as well as the processes and policies to be applied within the course, but does not necessarily ensure the impact of the curriculum on the student. Typically, assessments and student work products are required by the syllabus to show student progress, which of course is one helpful outcome measure that can be reviewed through the syllabus.

For this research project, additional evidence regarding performance in Category B will be investigated. The University of Oregon (2010a) requires courses that fall in the
Category B of the multicultural requirements to provide a learning environment that assists students to “gain scholarly insight into the construction of collective identities, the emergence of representative voices from varying social and cultural standpoints, and the effects of prejudice, intolerance, and discrimination.” Additionally, such courses are supposed to “analyze the general principles underlying tolerance, or the lack of it” (University of Oregon, 2010a). Currently there is no established method for evaluating the general education course outcomes beyond a review of syllabi, so this research project will look at some possible approaches.

*Sample Groups: Treatment and Comparison*

The next portion of the Results section examines the non-equivalent groups pre-post survey results. To recap from Chapter 2, participants for a treatment group that focused specifically on engagement with art that involved self-reflection and art-based analysis and for a comparison group were drawn from undergraduate students enrolled in multiple sections of University of Oregon multicultural general education satisfying courses.

The students in the treatment group \( n = 178 \) were enrolled in one of four sections of the Winter 2011 AAD 250: Art & Human Values class at the University of Oregon. The face-to-face format had 80 students enrolled and 98 were students enrolled in three on-line delivery formats. Four faculty members affiliated with the Arts Administration program taught the treatment group courses.

Students enrolled in the comparison group \( n = 119 \) were drawn from the same general pool of UO students seeking to fulfill their multicultural requirement, but were enrolled in a lecture style course with discussion sections. The course utilized art
mediums such as film, literature and photography to present and illustrate content focused on the study of media and its impact on diversity perceptions, rather than focusing directly on self-reflection through the arts engagement.

Response Rates

The response for the comparison group (n=119) for both the pre and post survey was 84 for a 70.58% rate. The Treatment group (n=178) overall had 105 responses to the pre-survey for a 58.98% response rate, and a lower response for the post survey, 94 for a 52.80% response rate. Although overall response rates and their adequacy for addressing research questions will vary to some extent by context, Babbie & Mouton (2001) describe a response rate of 50% as adequate, 60% as good and 70% as very good, indicating the response rates as described above range from adequate to very good by this criteria. Figure 3.1 shows a breakdown of response rates by course section.

![Figure 3.1 Pre-post response rate as percentage of total sample size, by course section.](image-url)
The results of multiple data collection tools provided information to analyze the impact of the treatment engagement with art on the two variables (i) comfort with art, and (ii) self-awareness. The comparison group responses \((n = 84)\) served to test the hypothesis of the study. Both groups participated in a pre-post survey that included both numeric choices and open-ended qualitative responses. The pre-survey collected baseline data to assess self-reported initial status of comfort with arts (CA) and self-awareness (SA) in each group. The post survey collected demographic data to establish additional descriptive data comparisons between the groups. Class standing and academic majors were collected from participating faculty for each group after the study was completed, in order to add more information to the demographic profiles.

A subgroup of the treatment group \((n = 32)\) also supplied answers on an external validity check instrument, the Self Consciousness Inventory. This inventory was a part of the regular course curriculum in one of the four classes making up the total treatment sample. The inventory was used to examine some aspects of criterion validity by comparing results of two instruments on student measures in the area of self-awareness. Finally, from the subgroup of the treatment group, 14 cases provided a extensive constructed-response work product, in the form of a reflective essay, to consider more in-depth qualitative aspects of self-awareness, providing an additional perspective on the results, as described in the Methods chapter.

**Descriptive Data**

Descriptive information between the comparison and treatment groups was collected to examine if there were discrepancies between groups. Students enrolled in general education courses tend to be representative of the current UO undergraduate
student profile, due to the general requirement of such courses across the campus.
Specific demographics of the sample groups will be examined, but first a general profile of the university is introduced here. Current student enrollment at the university is over 23,000. General university undergraduate population have an estimated median age of 22 years, with 15% students of color and 6% international students. Approximately 48% are men and 52% women (University of Oregon, 2010c).

In comparison, Figures 3.2 and 3.3 illustrate the distribution of race and age across the treatment group and the comparison group, showing the courses are fairly representative of the general university student population on the aspects displayed. Data on gender was not collected, and this will be included as a limitation of the study. The distributions of major areas of the study were fairly widely distributed across both groups (APPENDIX D).

![Figure 3.2. Distribution of race across treatment and comparison groups.](image-url)
Figure 3.3. Distribution of age across treatment and comparison groups.

Presentation of Descriptive Characteristics of Respondents

Ages of the participants in both treatment and comparison groups were primarily distributed between ages 18-22. The distribution of race and ethnic identification showed somewhat more diversity represented in the treatment group, including (i) Asian/Pacific Islander where the treatment group included 16% and the comparison group consisted of 3%, (ii) 0% of the comparison group identified as Native American Indian heritage as compared to less than 5% in the treatment group; and (iii) the comparison group had a larger percentage (82%) of White/Caucasian heritage students than the treatment group (61%). Several students described multiple ethnic identities in the survey. The treatment group included respondents who skipped the ethnic identification question (< .07%).

Seven respondents opted to make additional comments to further clarify their self-perception of race and ethnicity characteristics. Comments included “Mexican
American,” “I can’t choose one race because I identify with more than one”.
“white/Asian, mixed”, “Caucasian/Asian”, and “Lebanese, and Arab” were comments from the comparison group. Comments from the treatment group included “i would say i identify as a human being” and “White/Caucasian Spanish History.” Table 3.1 shows a detailed distribution of age across both treatment and comparison groups. Table 3.2 shows the distribution of race across the same groups.

Table 3.1. Age Distribution Across Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18-22</th>
<th>23-27</th>
<th>27-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76 (90%)</td>
<td>7 (.08%)</td>
<td>1 (.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89 (94%)</td>
<td>4 (.04%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(skipped n=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Distribution of Race and Ethnicity Across Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Native American Indian</th>
<th>White/Caucasian</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: treatment group skipped question, n=3

The figure below, (Figure 3.4) quickly highlights two disparities between groups. Notable is that the treatment group has a higher ratio of Asian/Pacific Islander (16% compared to 3%), and the comparison group had a higher percentage of White/Caucasian (81% compared to 61%).
Survey Results

The comparison group faculty opted to offer participation in the survey as one of several extra credit opportunities, for 5 points out of 250 points for the term. In the treatment section group D (n=38) students had the option of participating in the survey for extra credit as well. The faculty in the other treatment section groups did not offer extra credit to participate. Students opting for extra credit were matched with their 3-digit codes to a class roster and the faculty instructor was sent a list of students who completed both pre- and post-survey to earn the extra credit.
The pre-post survey instrument included constructed response questions as well as selected response. Qualitative responses were coded using a rubric developed to identify tendencies and characteristics that would reflect one of the two dimensions (i) comfort with art and (ii) self-awareness. These questions were scored and added to the quantitative data, for the subsequent analytic studies. Aspects were also used in the qualitative interpretation section later in this chapter.

**Comfort with Arts (CA) and Self-Awareness (SA) Results**

Following the procedures for the pilot of the survey, as described in the Methods chapter, factor analysis for the data set in this study identified 8 questions that loaded on the CA dimension and 12 that loaded on the SA dimension. These questions were calibrated to generate a single variable per dimension to strengthen the measure. Figure 3.5. show the emergent location within the survey for the dimensions. Note the limited number of items loading in both the pre and post time points. While fewer questions loaded on the factor for calibration than hoped, the Cronbach’s alpha values supported the internal reliability of the selected questions to form the single variable for further analysis. Several questions that loaded on a third factor, possibly related to the *engagement with others* construct, were not included in the subsequent analytic analyses here. See Appendix E for those items not loading on the constructs, and Appendix K for early survey and construct exploration.
Comfort with Art (CA) Results

The dimensionality of the 8 items from the CA measure was analyzed using maximum likelihood factor analysis. In order to unify the questions into a single variable they would need to align with a single dimension. Three criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: the a priori hypothesis that the measure was unidimensional, the scree test, and the interpretability of the factor solution. The scree plot indicated that the initial hypothesis of unidimensionality was correct. In other words, the eight items loaded on a single dimension with 93% variance explained, see Figure 3.6.

Figure 3.5. Calibrated variables located at time points with number of items and Cronbach’s Alpha values.

Figure 3.6. Scree plot of Art Dimension using 8 questions from the pre-survey.
In order to prepare the data for analysis, the pre-class arts engagement question that asked students to mark all that apply from 7 possibilities was collapsed into a progressive count with a minimum of zero to maximum of 7 arts activities, as shown in Table 3.3. This table shows the distribution by percentage of students who had previously engaged with different types of art and how many.

Table 3.3. *Students Who Previously Engaged With Art by Percentage in Each Type Including Sub-sections of the Treatment Group.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Perform</th>
<th>Vis Art</th>
<th>Liter</th>
<th>Com Art</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Non-trad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section-B</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section-D</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section-G</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section-H</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For an additional question, students were asked how they engaged with art and had three options; creator, appreciator or both. Table 3.4 shows the distribution of students across the comparison group and the treatment subgroups on this question.
Table 3.4. Distribution of Arts Engagement Type for Students in the Comparison Group and the Sub-sections of the Treatment Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Creator</th>
<th>Appreciator</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section-B</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section-D</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section-G</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section-H</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should also be noted that students did not respond in all available categories on all survey items. For example, question 1 (Acomfort), “How do you rank your comfort with the arts” has 4 possible answers but only three were selected by students across the treatment and comparison sample. In such cases, the unused categories were eliminated and responses renumbered, or categories collapsed as necessary. These changes were noted in the code book for the survey, and shown in Appendix C. Rescoring was also undertaken where questions loaded inversely on the construct (low to high instead of high to low), so that all numerical ordering would be aligned in the same direction. Appendix J shows the Item Key for all questions distributed across pre- and post surveys.

Following rescoring as necessary, the 8 items selected from the survey for CA were then calibrated with item response modeling, using a partial credit model, to generate a calibrated scale and student estimates on the scale. Overall test reliability results for the 8-question CA scale yielded a .71 Cronbach's alpha, and showed reasonable infit mean square characteristics, see Figure 3.7, with all item estimates falling within the displayed .75-1.33 range, indicated by the vertical hashed lines on the display.
For Cronbach's alpha with limited missing data, a .7 value or higher is sometimes considered minimally acceptable, with a preferred value of .8 or higher. This indicates that it would likely be a good idea to add a few more items to the CA scale to measure comfort with art, if student test-taking time allows, to reduce the standard error overall and especially at extremes of the scale; however, the 8-item scale may be considered acceptable depending on purposes of use, and how precise the measure must be. A standard error plot for the CA estimates shows in Figure 3.8.

Figure 3.7. Item fit display for pre-test arts variable (CA).

The standard error of measurement (SEM) for CA ranged primarily between a low of .50 and a high of .60 on the logit scale shown here, which will be described further in the subsequent section showing calibrated displays of the scale (Wright Map).

However, this figure illustrates the placement of all 8 items well within an acceptable range. Standard errors are lowest in the 0 to -2.0 range of the scale and highest at the
extremes, where less assessment data is available. Figure 3.8 shows the distribution of student proficiencies and related error values over the range.

![Figure 3.8. Standard error of measurement (SEM) distribution.](image)

Generating a Wright Map offered a graphic representation of how students loaded on the questions (Figures 3.9 and 3.10). Again, this figure illustrates an acceptable distribution of student responses in order to proceed with further analysis. The distribution of student estimates based on the 8-item CA scale are shown graphically in the vertical histogram on the left side of the Wright Map in Figure 3.9. These estimates will be used in the upcoming analytic techniques to look at the relationship of the CA and SA scales. Figure 3.10 is a more graphical representation of the Wright Map, with the distribution of student scores in red, and the estimates of generalized item thresholds for the 8-item CA scale shown in colored boxes on the right of the display.
Figure 3.9. *Empirically estimated Wright Map for the CA scale (comfort with arts).*
Self-awareness (SA) Results

In parallel with the CA results, the dimensionality of the 12 items from the self-awareness scale was analyzed using maximum likelihood factor analysis. Three criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: the a priori hypothesis that the measure was unidimensional, the scree test, and the interpretability of the factor solution. The scree plot indicated that the initial hypothesis of unidimensionality was reasonable for this data set, as indicated by the original pilot study. Twelve items loaded on a single dimension with 84% variance explained, see Figure 3.11 below.
In order to prepare the data, the two post-class questions that asked students to rank the activities that impacted learning about themselves and, learning about their peers were extracted by category, creating 14 items from the two questions. Six of the 14 items loaded on the SA dimension. Tables 3.5 and 3.6 show the 6-item ranking of activities by percentage as they impacted self-perceptions and perceptions about peers by comparison and treatment groups.
Table 3.5. Comparison Group Activity Rankings for Impact on Self-perception and Perceptions of Peers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity impacting self-perception</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with peers</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td><strong>22.2%</strong></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with art</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td><strong>17.3%</strong></td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with outside professionals/guests/artists</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td><strong>27.5%</strong></td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity impacting perceptions of peers</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with peers</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td><strong>18.3%</strong></td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with art</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td><strong>22.0%</strong></td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with outside professionals/guests/artists</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td><strong>25.6%</strong></td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6. Treatment Group Activity Rankings for Impact on Self-perception and Perceptions of Peers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Activity impacting self-perception</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with peers</td>
<td><strong>22.3%</strong></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td><strong>22.3%</strong></td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with art</td>
<td><strong>22.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.3%</strong></td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with outside professionals/guests/artists</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td><strong>21.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.2%</strong></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Activity impacting perceptions of peers</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with peers</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td><strong>30.8%</strong></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with art</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td><strong>27.6%</strong></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with outside professionals/guests/artists</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td><strong>26.5%</strong></td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The 12 items selected from the survey for SA were then calibrated with item response modeling, using a partial credit model, to generate a calibrated scale and student estimates on the scale. Overall test reliability results for the 12-question SA scale yielded a .80 Cronback’s alpha, and showed reasonable infit mean square characteristics, see Figure 3.12, with most item estimates falling within displayed .75-1.25 range, indicated by the vertical dashed lines on the display and those outside the range overfitting (less randomness) rather than falling above the zone, which is more of a concern. For Cronbach’s alpha a .8 or higher value is preferred so this 12-item scale may be considered acceptable for the purposes of this study.

![Item fit display for SA variable](image)

The standard error of measurement (SEM) for SA ranged primarily between a low of .20 and a high of .33 on the logit scale shown below, which will be described further in the subsequent section showing calibrated displays of the scale (Wright Map). Standard errors are lowest in the .25 to -.25 range and the highest where less assessment data is available. Figure 3.13 shows the distribution of student proficiencies and related error values over the range.
Generating a Wright Map offered a graphic representation of how students loaded on the questions (Figures 3.14 and 3.15). The distribution of student estimates, based on the 12-item SA scale, are shown graphically in the vertical histogram and the left side of the Wright Map in Figure 3.14. These estimates will be used in the next analytic techniques to be described looking at the relationship of the CA and SA scales. Figure 3.15 is a more graphical representation of the Wright Map, with the distribution of student scores in red, and the estimates of generalized item thresholds for the 12-item scale shown in the colored boxes on the right of the display.
Figure 3.14. Empirically estimated Wright Map for the self-awareness (SA) variable.
Comparison of Groups

Student estimates on CA and SA were generated in the item response modeling as described above. Subsequent analysis of relationship began with a baseline comparison of the two groups, treatment and comparison, on both dimensions.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis that both study groups had equal initial measures on average for CA and SA before the interventions shown in the non-equivalent groups design in the Methods chapter. Results showed a significant difference between the groups for both measures. The preCA difference between the treatment and comparison group was significant $t(190) = 3.47, p < .01$ and the preSA was also significant $t(190) = -2.7, p < .01$. This rejects the null hypothesis that both groups were the same at baseline ($\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$).
Figures 3.16 and 3.17 show the preCA and preSA measures for both the comparison and treatment groups. Figure 3.15 shows the treatment group having overall greater self-awareness (SA) than the comparison group before treatment, and Figure 3.16 shows the comparison group having a greater level of comfort with art (CA) than the treatment group before the treatment, as measured in this data set. NOTE: Negative Scores Equal Higher Levels in the Dimension.

Figure 3.16. Pre-survey baseline comparison for SA showing the Treatment Group with greater level of self-awareness, SA (p < .01).

Figure 3.17. Pre-survey baseline comparison for CA showing the Comparison Group with greater level of comfort with art, CA (p < .01).
With CA higher in the comparison group, the baseline covariate of most importance to further investigate was considered to be SA, since it was important to understand how the slightly lower score of the comparison group on entry in the self-awareness area might impact results in the self-awareness outcomes, which are of key interest in the study regarding the core multicultural attributes as described in Chapter 1.

When it is not possible to allocate persons by random assignment to groups in advance, and yet a significant difference in a key baseline variable is found in the results of initial condition, two quasi-experimental techniques are often employed to evaluate post-outcome findings: ANCOVA partialling out the initial covariate or t tests involving the gain score, such as paired sample t-tests. Both techniques have limitations and may lead to contradictory results. One way to strengthen the validity of findings is to employ both and see if the two techniques give the same results. This technique was used here, with ANCOVA first evaluated for suitability and used because base assumptions were met, and then the results from the paired samples t-test are reported.

*Descriptives for Pre-Analysis Prior to ANCOVA*

The next two tables, 3.7 and 3.8, show some descriptive data of case summaries for the variables to be examined in the ANCOVA analysis. Note the logit scales were used in Table 3.9 drawn from the Wright Map estimates. The negative numbers represent increased characteristics of the variable. The first step in the continued analysis checked if the assumptions were satisfied first of ANOVA and then of ANCOVA, since ANCOVA is an extension of ANOVA. PreSA and PostSA are the SA variable at the two time points.
Table 3.7. Case Summary for PreSA and PostSA Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>PreSA GROUP</th>
<th>PostSA GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreSA GROUP</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostSA GROUP</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8. Case Summary for PreSA and PostSA by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PreSA</th>
<th>PostSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.2592364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.48754432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.4616884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.51156117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.3741701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.51003382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Normality for Satisfying Assumptions of ANOVA

Before beginning ANCOVA, statistical indices of normality were tested using Shapiro-Wiik for smaller sample sizes. Two techniques for calculating normality are, (i) graphically and (ii) numerically. The numeric presentation is presented in Table 3.10. Tests of normality can be seen graphically in Figures 3.18 and 3.19 Normal Q-Q Plots.
Normal data is an underlying assumption for parametric testing. The table below presents results from two proven tests for normality, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and the Shapiro-Wilk Test.

We can see from the results in Table 3.9 that the dependent variable PostSA was reasonably normally distributed because the significance value was greater than 0.05. If it is below .05 then data significantly deviate from a normal distribution.

Table 3.9. Test for Normality using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostSA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

*b. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Figures 3.18 and 3.19 below provide the graphical display for normality distributions for both the comparison and treatment groups.
Figure 3.18. Normal Q-Q Plots of display indices for the Comparison Group.

Figure 3.19. Normal Q-Q Plots of the display indices for the Treatment Group.
Conducting the One-Way ANCOVA

Checking the homogeneity-of-regression (slope) assumption before conducting ANCOVA evaluates the interaction between the PreSA estimate (covariate) and the factor TREATMENT/COMPARISON GROUP (independent variable) in the prediction of the dependent variable of PostSA.\textsuperscript{12} Here, the interaction source of GROUP*PreSA shows results suggesting the interaction is not significant, $F(1,119) = 1.936, p = .17$. Based on this finding, the ANCOVA analysis was undertaken. For sample size, 123 cases were included in the ANCOVA analysis, descriptive statistics, shown in Table 3.10, below, for those with no missing data in the model.

Table 3.10. Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variable PostSA for Comparison and Treatment Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-.3614512</td>
<td>.48543138</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.8205631</td>
<td>.56355736</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.5816756</td>
<td>.57071321</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene's test of equality of error variances in Table 3.11 shows that the underlying assumption of homogeneity of variance for the one-way ANCOVA has been met, $F(1,121)=3.11, p=.08$, since $p(.08)>a(.05)$. However this is near the range of significance so this will be listed as a cautionary note in the limitations in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{12} From ANCOVA Using SPSS, p. 3: "A significant interaction between the covariate and the factor suggests that the differences on the dependent variable among groups vary as a function of the covariate. If the interaction is significant – the results from an ANCOVA are not meaningful – and ANCOVA should not be conducted."
Table 3.11. *Lavene’s Test for Equality of Error Variances*\(^{a}\) for Dependent Variable *PostSA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + PreSA + GROUP

The covariate of PreSA is included in the analysis shown in Table 3.12 below to control for the potential differences on PostSA, the independent variable. This is used to evaluate the relationship between the covariate (PreSA) and the dependent variable (PostSA), controlling for the factor TREATMENT/COMPARISON GROUP (that is, for membership in any particular group). Here, this relationship is not significant, \(F(1, 120) = .138, p = .71\). This indicates no significant relationship (effect) between the covariate and the dependent variable, in this dataset, given the cases with non-missing data on all variables of the model.

Continuing with the interpretation, the GROUP source evaluates the null hypothesis that the population-adjusted means are equal. Results show the hypothesis should be rejected, \(F(1, 120) = 21.10, p < .01\). The test assesses the differences among the adjusted means (reported in the Estimated Marginal Means, Table 3.13) for the two groups of Comparison of -.37 and Treatment of -.82. Since lower numbers on the SA scale indicate more self-awareness (SA), the ANCOVA results indicate that taking into account the higher self-awareness of the Treatment group at baseline, the difference in self-awareness at post-survey compared to the Comparison group remains highly significant.
Table 3.1. *Tests of Between Subjects Effects on Dependent Variable PostSA.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>6.509&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.255</td>
<td>11.753</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>23.195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.195</td>
<td>83.766</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreSA</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>5.842</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.842</td>
<td>21.099</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>33.228</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81.354</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39.737</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> R Squared = .164 (Adjusted R Squared = .150)

Table 3.13. *Estimated Marginal Means for the Comparison and Treatment Groups.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-.366&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.498</td>
<td>-.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.816&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.954</td>
<td>-.678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: PreSA = -.3989739.

*Paired-samples t-test*

Next, to employ the triangulation technique, a paired-samples t-test was conducted, to see if the findings supported, or were in contrast with the ANCOVA findings. The paired-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether there was a significant difference in the gain scores for Pre-Post Art (CA) and Pre-Post Self-
awareness (SA) between the comparison and treatment groups. Table 3.14 provides descriptive statistics and Table 3.16 shows the difference in gains. The results indicated that the comparison group had significant gains on the CA dimension (M=.55, SD=.93), t(63)=4.47, p<.01. However, the comparison group did not have significant gains on the Self-awareness (SA) dimension (M=.99, SD=.89), t(63)=.94, p=.34. In contrast, the treatment group had significant gains across both dimensions with CA (M=.99, SD=.89), t(58)=8.5, p<.01 and SA (M=.29, SD=.74), t(58)=3.0, p<.01. These results indicate gains for the treatment group on the self-awareness (SA) dimension and supports the ANCOVA finding, for which the treatment group adjusted mean indicated significantly larger gains on Self-awareness (SA) for the treatment group as contrasted with the comparison group.

Table 3.14. Paired Sample Descriptive Statistics for Comparison and Treatment Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-CA</td>
<td>-1.1668288</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.07847831</td>
<td>.13480979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-CA</td>
<td>-1.7227298</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.80295780</td>
<td>.10036972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-SA</td>
<td>-.2855142</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.49745651</td>
<td>.06218206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-SA</td>
<td>-.3614512</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.48543138</td>
<td>.06067892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-CA</td>
<td>-.6071159</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.89679485</td>
<td>.11675274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-CA</td>
<td>-1.6039427</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.83211503</td>
<td>.10833215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-SA</td>
<td>-.5220488</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.43433954</td>
<td>.05654619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-SA</td>
<td>-.8205631</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.56355736</td>
<td>.07336892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15. *Paired Sample t-test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Mean Pre-Post-CA</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Pre-Post-CA</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Lower 95% CI</th>
<th>Upper 95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C P 1</td>
<td>.55590109</td>
<td>.93693268</td>
<td>.11711659</td>
<td>.32186227</td>
<td>.78993991</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 2</td>
<td>.07593703</td>
<td>.63688701</td>
<td>.07961088</td>
<td>-.08315261</td>
<td>.23502667</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T P 1</td>
<td>.99682678</td>
<td>.89776002</td>
<td>.11687840</td>
<td>.76286924</td>
<td>1.23078432</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 2</td>
<td>.29851424</td>
<td>.74545816</td>
<td>.09705039</td>
<td>.10424678</td>
<td>.49278169</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational Studies**

Following the results of the paired-samples t-test and ANCOVA, some correlational studies of the Post-CA and Post-SA were conducted. The next stage of analysis was to investigate the relationship between CA and SA for both the Treatment and Comparison Groups. Table 3.16 provides basic descriptive statistics. Correlation coefficients were computed for the total sample overall and showed a modest ($r=.19$) but significant correlation ($p=.01$) between the Post-CA and Post-SA results, as shown in Table 3.17.

Next, the data set was split into treatment and comparison groups, and a similar correlational study was conducted, within each group. Table 3.18, provides descriptive statistics for the treatment and comparison group, and Table 3.19, provides the results of the analysis. Here, a significant and stronger correlation of $r=.28$ ($p<.01$), is found between SA and CA for the treatment group ($p<.05$) and no statistically significant
correlation between these two variables is found in the comparison group (p=.22).

Table 3.16. Descriptive Statistics for Correlations for PostCA and PostSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-CA</td>
<td>-1.6494899</td>
<td>.81866980</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-SA</td>
<td>-.5730277</td>
<td>.56210179</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17. Correlation Results for PostCA and PostSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post-SA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PostCA</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.193*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostSA</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3.18. Descriptive Statistics for Treatment and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison PostCA</td>
<td>-1.6747507</td>
<td>.80908649</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostSA</td>
<td>-.3702664</td>
<td>.50219995</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment PostCA</td>
<td>-1.6272493</td>
<td>.83080136</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostSA</td>
<td>-.7515458</td>
<td>.55377289</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.19. Correlations of CA and SA, for Both Treatment and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>POSTAWARE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison PostCA</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment PostCA</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.277**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below, Figure 3.20. is a graphical representation of the Post CA and SA results for the treatment and comparison groups showing significant overall gains in both SA (self-awareness) and CA (comfort with arts) for the treatment group and significant gains only in the CA (comfort with arts) dimension for the comparison group.

Figure 3.20. Illustrates the post treatment measures for the Art (CA) and Self-awareness (SA) dimensions for the Treatment and Comparison Group. NOTE: The scale used registers higher with negative numbers.

The Cohen’s effect size value ($d = .72$), at just under three-fourths of a standard deviation unit, suggests a moderate to high practical significance in post-test self-awareness estimates between the two groups. The value of Cohen's $d$ was calculated using the means and standard deviations of the two groups (post-SA, treatment and control), according to the following: Cohen's $d = (M_1 - M_2) / spooled$. 

---

**Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>.007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*
External Validity Instrument: Self-consciousness Inventory

For this study, an external instrument was used to evaluate the validity of the researcher’s survey instrument. The Self-consciousness Inventory was applied as a post measure of self-awareness for a sub-sample, as discussed in the Methods chapter. The instrument selected was the Self-consciousness Inventory. According to the associated technical report, the inventory is intended to identify three dimensions related to self-awareness — Private Self-consciousness (to be called here S1), Public Self-consciousness (to be called S2) and Social Anxiety (to be called S3). However, when the inventory was applied here, exploratory factor analysis with the current dataset indicated 8 factors with an eigenvalue exceeding 1, explaining 78% of variance.

It was hoped that a combination of the first and second dimensions, S1 and S2, since theoretically described as private and public self-consciousness, would align with this study's self-awareness construct, as made operational in the pre-post survey discussed here. However, based on this data set, only a small correlation was identified, $r=.14$, and it was not significant although close to significance ($p=.06$), see Tables 3.20 and 3.21 for results.

Table 3.20. Presents Descriptive Statistics of the S2 Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSTAWARE</td>
<td>-.5730277</td>
<td>.56210179</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBQUESTIONS</td>
<td>91.8223</td>
<td>19.94800</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.21. Presents Correlation Coefficients for the Variables of S1 and S2 with the SA Dimension PostSA
However, given the extensive and complex factor structure underlying the data as revealed in the exploratory factor investigation, additional analysis was undertaken to identify if one or more of the identified factors in the external instrument could be better associated with the theoretical construct of interest for this study – in other words, the analysis question asked here was, if the theoretical S1 or S2 factors were not well-aligned, were there select item embedded within each dimension of the external instrument that would associate with the post-awareness survey outcomes?

After several iterations of factor reduction an item set of 10 items on the overall external instrument was identified as loading on a single factor that appeared to have theoretical associations with the content of the pre-post survey here. Figure 3.21 shows the items loaded on a single factor, accounting for 97% of the variance.
Figure 3.21. 10 Items from the Self-Consciousness Inventory loading on a single factor.

Correlational studies, reported in Table 3.22, using this factor (the hybrid of items from the Self-consciousness Inventory, which will be called SBQuestions) and treatment subgroup of students who participated in the Self-consciousness Inventory (n=25) showed a moderate to strong correlation, r=.50 (p=.01) with the pre-post survey self-awareness (SA) dimension previously described.

Table 3.22. Correlations for Hybrid Self-consciousness Inventory – SB Questions and Treatment Subset for both Comfort with Art (CA) and Self-awareness (SA) Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBQUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PostSA</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
The intent of this portion of the analysis was not to fully describe measurement characteristics of the various factors of the Self-Consciousness Inventory but simply to explore how this external instrument relates or does not relate to the conception of self-awareness measured in the pre-post survey. So, next the question content of the Inventory's SBQuestions factor that had a moderate-to-strong correlation with the self-awareness estimate and formed a single factor will be considered.

*Self-consciousness Inventory Content Alignment with SA*

The self-awareness scale (SA) as conceptualized for this study attempts to capture individual self-perceptions regarding one’s belief systems and how these impact an individual’s perception of others, and their individual context within a group, described in the inventory as related to culture. To that end, the pre-post survey questions that seem acceptable as part of the framework of questions to capture a sense of student’s self-awareness around these characteristics include asking students about their learning from the class activities, learning about their peers, becoming more aware of the influences that have formed their beliefs, defining cultural identity, and responding to the UO multicultural group satisfying statement. The sub-treatment group who participated in the reflective essay will be examined later in this chapter to further explore the facets of the SA scale as it played out in the qualitative aspect of the data collection.

Reviewing the questions that theoretically loaded on SA based upon the focus of the questions showed that some of the actual questions seem to probe a different facet of self-awareness than intended for this study. Questions not well aligned included “I find it hard to talk with strangers” and “I'm concerned about what other people think of me” and seemed to include the “anxiety” component described in the external Inventory.
While these loaded on a single factor with the rest of the SBQuestions item set for the small data set here, future work could explore in more depth whether these may be measuring something other than the self-awareness characteristics that this study seeks to evaluate, which may account for strong but less than perfect correlation with the post-survey SA results for the SBQuestions factor.

Qualitative Analysis of Student Perceptions

Qualitative data for this study were collected in the form of student’s written responses both in the survey by both groups and in the treatment subgroup reflective essay. The qualitative data were collected for several purposes, including to further explore the facets of the study dimensions of comfort with art (CA) and self-awareness (SA). Another important aspect was to consider triangulating with the quantitative results and examining the relationship between the self-selected numerical responses, the written responses, and the researcher’s scoring rubric. Through an examination of these relationships, alignment and miss-alignment may be identified among the responses.

Some qualitative responses are presented in the following section to allow the reader direct connection to students statements. Corrections for spelling errors have been made where the meaning of the sentence would not be altered. No grammatical corrections were made.

Qualitative Responses

Tables 3.23 and 3.24 offer examples of students who scored low (Table 3.23) and high (Table 3.24) on both dimensions SA and CA from both the treatment and comparison groups. The samples are drawn from the 5 post-survey questions that loaded
well on the SA dimension. The responses are drawn from both high and low scores on the SA scale. The high-score examples illustrate the connection of self to the larger context of a cultural group and society. In these examples students tend to frame their understanding of culture, society and others from the perspective of self rather than a detached concept or idea. The low-score examples illustrate a potential lack of personal insight and awareness but may show a high level of academic or subject-based learning. The responses tend to describe conceptual learning about a subject rather than personal insight about self in relation to the content.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>I believe that cultural identity is not only ethnicity, race and sex, but also one's history and future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>It has really shown me the hidden, less noticeable consequences that race has in our society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>I understand stereotypes a lot better now and can recognize them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Not much notable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>I am more aware of the white/hetero normativity of our media and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Creativity can be found in anyone. Most people just have to learn how to apply their creativity in the proper way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Cultural identity is how you identify yourself within a group or culture. It is the feeling of belonging that we have when we feel a part of a group or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>How you perceive your self with relation to how you fit into a culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Cultural identity is my association with the society of people whom I live and interact with on a day-to-day basis. Thus my own identity is shaped based on these interactions and societal rules to shape who I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I have learned to accept who I am and try to understand others better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I think I have become more comfortable recognizing I identify with more than one race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>This course made me aware of the inherent unconscious biases i contain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>I see that I have some thoughts and beliefs that have been questioned through this course. It has allowed me to see all sides of a topic through discussions with my peers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I now try to challenge my beliefs and my values and strive to be open to other values.

Before this class, I was aware that others had their own point of views, but did not value them. After taking this class, I realized I had grown a tremendous amount during these 3 months and now know that others perspectives are just as valuable as my own.

I deepened my perspective on my own value system and roots of issues that arrive in my life through the interpreting of art and reading of others experiences.

The next set of tables present the qualitative pre-post data of individual cases to illustrate a potential progression along both dimensions of comfort with art (CA) and self-awareness (SA). There were a total of 8 open-ended questions with a final question inviting any additional comments. Though other numeric questions also had a comment box, these were not included in this discussion due to the small number of responses.

Table 3.25 provides responses from 2 cases on pre-post definition of art illustrating a developed connection and understanding of art as a way to express personal, cultural values, beliefs and ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE 234</td>
<td>Pre-treatment: <em>Music, performing arts, visual arts, literature, sculpture, dance and so on.</em>&lt;br&gt;Post-treatment: <em>Art is the thing that can express the culture and beauty.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE 497</td>
<td>Pre-treatment: <em>Art is a way to express people's thinking.</em>&lt;br&gt;Post treatment: <em>Art is a way to express the thought of the artist and creativity makes the art better. Every one can create art.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These cases will be considered more in the next chapter, for the discussion section. They are presented here to illustrate some of the qualitative data across the question set. In particular, they were selected to illustrate a progressive process of self-reflection from pre to post answers in the data set. In particular, student definitions of art, cultural identity and their response to the UO Multicultural statement were captured both pre- and post. In some cases, students had significant progression of self-understanding as documented by their comments. In others, students continued with a more distanced, academic discussion, which seemed to at least overtly incorporate fewer aspects of self-awareness in interpretations. Table 3.26 below provides sample cases to illustrate.

Table 3.26. Sample of Progression of Responses to Open-ended Questions Pre-(1-3) and Post – (4-8) with Optional Open-ended Question #9 from Treatment and Comparison Groups (T) (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T31/158</td>
<td>1. Art is an expression of feeling and emotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Culture is the social and structural characteristics of a society or environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The characteristics which differentiate the ways in which one culture interacts relative to another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Art is the expression of an acute emotion or feeling through alternative modes of communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Art as a mode of communication for initiating cultural change is not something that I had really thought about previously, and this course help me to understand the ways in which art can contribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cultural identity consists of the various ideas, beliefs, and forms of socialization that a society in general engages in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I simply never realized how little I knew about art, the culture surrounding art, and its impact on our and other cultures.

8. The overall cultural impact of art.

9. Left blank

Student C34/167

1. Art is creating and designing

2. Culture in my eyes is a way of living and seeing things in perspective.

3. Understanding and knowing what it means to be in a culture.

4. Art is something you can make, design, or create. It can also be something to view.

5. It has helped me get an understanding of the different types of people there are.

6. Cultural identity is belong to a cultural and being a part of it, belonging.

7. I am now able to understand other people and not simply judge them by stereotypes.

8. Mostly not to judge too quickly.

9. Good class, certainly changed how I view people.

Also interesting to note were the differences between groups responding to the open-ended question “Please describe in a short sentence or two, how your perceptions about yourself changed from your experiences in this class - if there was no change just state "no change” The comparison group had a greater number (n=38) of respondents claiming their was little of no new learning about themselves than the treatment group (n=21). There were also participants who opted not to answer.
Treatment Subgroup – Reflective Essay

Fourteen students from the treatment section-D agreed to have the final assignment, a self-reflective essay, included in the data analysis for this study. (APPENDIX H) The essays were coded by the researcher and also by 3 other faculty members who have taught one of the AAD 250 course sections. The responses to the assignment questions offered specific comments from the students about their learning and insight gained from the course. For purposes of inter-rater reliability there was mixed agreement with the coding scale as it was applied, see Appendix I. Since the sample size was intended to be small for qualitative interpretation purposes, quantitative analysis was not undertaken, however inspection of scores and discussions with the instructors indicated mixed interpretations of the written rubric definitions. Further conversation with faculty clarified the rubric intentions. This points to an area of the study that needs further development and alignment, and to future work, which will also be discussed in the next section. However, portions of the reflective essay will be used in the next chapter to illustrate the discussion ideas and course themes.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

One of the cornerstones of cultural competency is the capacity to understand one’s own cultural context. As described in Chapter 1, some multicultural education programs implement self-reflective processes to develop increased levels of self-awareness. This study investigated an approach utilizing arts engagement to foster greater self-awareness, as a potential stage in the development of cultural competency. Specifically, a treatment of arts engagement delivered through an arts-based course at the undergraduate level measured students on the dimensions of self-awareness (SA) and comfort with art (CA), before and after the course. Results were contrasted with a comparison group, and qualitative data were collected to enrich the quantitative results and further clarify the student experience.

As we move into a discussion of the findings, it is important to restate that arts engagement, as implemented in the treatment course and discussed in Chapter 1, involves self-reflection and a form of active reasoning (Arnheim, 1969, Eisner 1973, 1982, 2002). This engagement is uniquely different from the purposeful use of an art form to illustrate a topic or idea, such as a film about stereotypes in the media, or a piece of literature written from the voice of an oppressed minority to provide insight into the experience of oppression. The distinction can be made that one is a delivery system or tool to convey information, while the other invites the participant to interact with the actual work of art and form unique personal and individual opinions about that experience. This process also engages the learner to interpret the messages conveyed by the artist. The added
component of sharing thoughts about the experience with peers through discussion, writing, and projects is intended to help students develop purposeful self-awareness, and explore the dynamics of engagement with others through art.

This process is also uniquely different than discussing topics that may be typical in multicultural courses, such as oppression or white privilege, where students may have the option of learning subject matter without connecting the material to their own personal framework. The arts engagement process potentially uncovers a greater awareness of one’s personal values and beliefs through the act of engagement itself, as presented in Chapter 1. An example of such engagement found in the treatment would be selecting an art object from one’s home environment and presenting this to the class with an analysis of the object’s personal meaning as well as why they classified it as art. Another example would be attending a musical event that the student would typically avoid and conduct a prescribed analysis of the experience, again, shared with the class. Additional activities are listed in the sample class syllabus, Appendix M.

The following sections will provide a summary of the study, review the limitations, discuss the findings as they relate to the research questions, suggest what conclusions might be drawn from the findings, and offer implications for future research.

Summary of the Study

Students in both groups, the comparison and the treatment, participated in a multicultural undergraduate course intervention. The treatment group participated in an arts-engagement approach to the subject, while the comparison group focused on content such as diversity in media trends, using art representation to provide examples, for instance films in journalism. The results of pre-post measures indicated that, for the self-
awareness measure used, the treatment group experienced significant self-reported
growth in both comfort with art (CA) (p<.01) and self-awareness (SA) (p<.01), while the
comparison group self-reported gains in CA (p<.01) but did not make significant gains in
SA, based on this data set (p=.34).

These results support the arts literature discussed earlier, including Lowenfeld’s
(1957) seminal work that presented the theory that the arts facilitate a greater sense of
that arts engagement fosters greater cognitive ability as well as self-knowledge. McFee &
Degge (1977) expanded these ideas and connected arts engagement to the expression of
cultural values and beliefs.

As stated in Chapter 1, if art is considered as an expression of social and cultural
context (Blandy & Congdon, 1987; Dissayanake, 1988) then the potential to gain a
deeper understanding of self within a cultural context through an engagement with art
may be a reasonable hypothesis. This study helped draw the connection between an
engagement with art and the increase in one’s capacity to understand one’s self.
Additionally the treatment aimed to expand this awareness into the context of the
learning community made up of students who may have different perspectives from
each other.

The self-awareness scale for this study was created with the intention of capturing
specific facets of one’s awareness of self within the context of others as articulated by
Fish (2001). The self-awareness dimension included self-reported attitudes about
personal insights, reflections on cultural identity, and experiences of interacting with
peers and art.
For the comfort with art dimension (CA), students were evaluated on self-reported levels of comfort with art, previous exposure to and activities with art, as well as attitudes about art. There was a statistically significant (p<.01) positive correlation between an increased comfort with art and an increase in self-awareness (r = .193). However, the comparison group also showed a significant increase in comfort with art (p<.01) yet no significant increase in self-awareness (p>.05). The comparison group used media and other art forms such as literature to help convey the course materials, however there was no purposeful engagement with art as defined previously. This is an important distinction as to where and in what ways engagement with art takes place; as it interacted in the treatment but not the comparison course, students increased both their comfort with art and self-awareness.

*Limitations*

*Sampling Group Disparity and Some Survey Design Issues*

An important limitation of the study to consider is the non-equivalent groups design. Pre-survey indications that the groups had different initial proficiencies (treatment group higher than comparison in SA) directed the analytic methodology toward tools to investigate this disparity, including two techniques from which results could be compared, through a paired-samples t-test and through ANCOVA to partial out the initial status. Both techniques supported the treatment group as having a statistically significant greater shift in self-awareness, even entering the course with overall a higher proficiency on this measure than the comparison group. A cautionary note would be that perhaps the treatment group had a penchant for self-awareness development and their
increase only measured a pre-initiated trajectory. Future random sampling approaches would better help control for this limitation, if they could be implemented.

One might postulate that an increased comfort with art may also foster increased openness to engagement with art that could support an increase in self-awareness as delineated in this study. However, based on this data set and study, an increase in comfort with art did not necessarily impact self-awareness, as the comparison group had an increase in comfort with art but no significant increase on the self-awareness scale. This suggests a focus on the process of engagement with art as perhaps differentially impacting self-awareness.

The comparison group pre-treatment proficiencies also indicated a higher level of CA. Reviewing the major areas of study (APPENDIX D), this group had a majority of students enrolled in the journalism majors studying some form of design or communication media. Future random sampling and additional comparison group studies could help control for any such influence of academic biases.

Additional limitations resulted due to the overlap design of the survey administration at the two time points, which resulted in less than the full item set administered at the pretest for self-awareness and at the post-test for comfort with art. Probably the surveys should have been made more extensive and included the full item set at both time points. This somewhat increased the standard error, and thus the pretest self-awareness and the post-test art scores should be treated with caution.

Additionally, one of the 8 questions in the CA scale was a tabulated count of how many types of art students had engaged with prior to taking the class. This could indicate a level with art comfort but may also be misleading. For example, a student who has
participated in literature may still have a high comfort with art even though they did not participate in the six other options such as fine arts or performing arts. In fact, students scoring high on this question may indicate a completely different characteristic than comfort with art such as being a “dabbler” and uncomfortable going deeper into developing an understanding of any particular art medium. However results of the factor analysis and the item response analysis indicated to retain this item in the set as well-fitting with the other items in the set, despite these potential limitations.

The 12 questions that loaded on the self-awareness dimension were from the post survey of 25 total questions (3 were for demographic data). Six of the twelve were drawn from a ranking of class activities that impacted either the student’s self-awareness or their awareness of their peers. This may have oversampled information in this area, placing perhaps a little too much importance on these questions in the aggregated outcome results, although the items seemed to have a reasonable fit by both the factor analytic and item response model indicators.

*Limits of Self-reporting Data, Response Rates, and Participant-observer Effects*

Self-reporting has inherent problems in that student’s self-perceptions over time may shift thus changing the definitions of perceived self-awareness and/or comfort with art. In other words the respondent may perceive they are more self-aware before the treatment but through the process of the course they decide that level of awareness is less than they thought and even if their awareness increased, their perceptions of their awareness reports at a lower level. While the results indicate a statistically significant relationship between the engagement with art intervention and an increased self-awareness these results should be interpreted cautiously. Additionally, they are only the
respondent’s indication of self-awareness and comfort with art, and not independent evaluations.

The attrition of matched pre-post responses may pose a problem with the results in analysis where two time points were considered together. While the total sample size was 174, the total matching pre-post responses was less than half, which may pose validity threats to the findings. Upon examination of individual cases there did not seem to be any trend connecting age, race or ethnicity to the attrition.

It is possible that through the teaching methods students were influenced to report higher self-awareness and comfort with art than were actual. Students may also have been guided to articulate their experiences in certain ways through the prescribed interaction.

*Inter-rater Reliability*

Of the possible 6 faculty who have taught or currently teach AAD 250, 3 coded the treatment subgroup self-reflective essay, as reported in Chapter 3. The results were mixed indicating multiple issues with both the definitions of the frameworks and the method of communicating the rubric to the raters, for the self-reflective essay. The written documentation for the coding was widely interpreted by the other faculty. There are cases of unanimous agreement, and generally the majority of scores (1-5) clustered in similar directions. Most ratings were within one score level, for instance, all 4s and 5s for a dimension in one essay or all 3s and 4s in another example. It was notable that none of the outside raters awarded a score lower than a 3. Through verbal discussion with the raters after submitting their coding, it became clear that the coding write-up needs to be more precise about the scale and measures. This points to the challenge to describe as well as measure such dimensions as self-awareness (SA) and comfort with art (CA).
These can be confounded through the interpretation by raters when constructed work samples are considered.

*Construct Validity*

The concept of self-awareness is not a straightforward construct and has multiple potential facets and definitions. Comfort with art is also a very broad term that has multiple definitions and conflicting ideas of what it is.

The external Self-Consciousness instrument was used to evaluate an alignment with the self-awareness construct. Through factor analysis, construct mapping and correlation analysis it was determined that one factor of the external inventory had a moderate to strong correlation with the pre-post survey ($r=.50$). However, the congruence of self-awareness measures based upon the questions as framed in the Self-consciousness Inventory did not align as anticipated. This raises the question again about how and what we are measuring on a dimension called self-awareness, and how it may differ across instruments.

Based upon the perceived intention of the questions and a factor analysis, different questions fell into dimensions that obscured the intended framework for comparison. Two of the three dimensions from the inventory were identified, SC1 private self-consciousness and SC2 public self-consciousness. However, the final set of questions that generated modest correlations with the instrument in this study was a hybrid of the total inventory. It would be important to further investigate multiple measures of self-awareness to continue a rigorous application of self-awareness definitions and identify their appropriate measures.
Discussion

The mixed methods approach to this research provided qualitative data to enrich the numerical results and provide insight from the student’s perspective about the experiences in the class, both comparison and treatment groups. The treatment group’s interactive dialogue with peers about the artwork encountered seemed to help prompt students to re-examine assumptions about themselves, their worldviews, and how they perceive others who are different, based on the qualitative tables shown in Chapter 3. For example, students often discovered others who shared common values and beliefs yet expressed these in very different ways and lifestyle choices. This multi-stage process of discovery is described through student self-reported statements. For example QUALCASE T219 from the treatment group stated, “This class helped me a lot because with every project we did there was a discussion with peoples opinions involved. I understood how other people looked at the same topic.”

The written responses from students in both the treatment and comparison groups were collected to illuminate the results of the quantitative analysis. Self-reported comments reveal levels of learning that might be categorized along the self-awareness framework. This can be seen from personal insight about one’s place within a larger diverse community to a general understanding of the course content as a subject matter to be mastered from an academic perspective. For example, response to the question, “If you were to describe the single most important thing you learned from taking this class, what would it be?” included a range of answers from “no significant learning” to "deeper insights into one’s personal values and beliefs." Some statements stayed within an academic analysis of the subject matter, such as Treatment QUALCASE T31 “The overall cultural impact of art” while many students provided personal reflection and self-
analysis that revealed a greater insight and shift in their views about themselves, the
world of art, and/or their view of peers. The comparison group responses also included
some students who self-reported increased self-awareness but in contrast to the treatment
group, there were larger numbers of students who discussed their learning as gains in
subject matter knowledge rather than personal insight.

The following discussion will address findings about the specific research
questions in this study. Responses to multiple open-ended questions have been
purposefully selected to help illustrate the perspectives of students regarding course
content, personal insight and learning.

Results as They Relate to the Research Questions

Research Question #1

1. What is the relationship between engagement with art in an arts-based
   multicultural course at the undergraduate level and: (i) comfort with art, (CA) and
   (ii) self-awareness, (SA)?

The study examined the relationships between comfort with art (CA) and self-
awareness (SA) and the treatment of arts engagement. The results of the study indicate a
statistically significant relationship between the treatment, engagement with art and both
dimensions SA and CA. Students in the treatment condition participated in a variety of
activities throughout the course including assignments specifically designed to broaden
their exposure to a wider variety of art forms and messages from broader art producers.
These encounters were purposefully designed to provoke student self-reflection about
their own perceptions and belief systems. Additionally students had options to interact
with each other in multiple ways. The online courses used online discussion forums,
while the face-to-face used small group meetings, and large group lecture and discussion to share responses and interpretations of the work.

The increased levels of comfort with art may have supported students to expand their exposure to a broader spectrum of arts. However, as stated earlier, comfort with art alone does not necessarily foster a greater self-awareness, based on this data set and study. Through the introduction of new and different art forms students encountered unfamiliar work as well as new and different perspectives as expressed through the artwork. The combination of broadening arts engagement and purposeful dialogue may have influenced student’s own self-awareness.

Qualitative findings of treatment student reflections focused in large part on self-reported increases in creativity, awareness of their own capacity to create and enjoy art, and insight into other people’s perspectives that cause them to rethink their own. To illustrate here are two comments from the post-survey regarding the development of comfort with art, Treatment QUALCASE T199 stated, “Before I didn't think I could create art and now I believe I create art on a daily basis.” and Treatment QUALCASE T199 stated, “I loved this class and it opened my eyes to the world of art. I am definitely interested to expand my knowledge of the arts and take additional classes!”

In terms of self-awareness development, in addition to the quantitative results, students self-reported on that dimension in several qualitative post-survey questions. In response to the question, “Please describe in a short sentence or two, how your perceptions about yourself changed from your experiences in this class - if there was no change just state 'no change,'” students had a range of responses. Treatment QUAL CASE T8 stated, “My perceptions have not changed, but rather have been confirmed,” while
treatment QUALCASE T22 stated, “I become more willing to discuss art-related issues with different types of people.”

Students also reported insight about assumptions they made regarding groups of people they previously generalized about such as treatment QUALCASE T27, who stated, “Since this class touch a part of religion stuff, I think I understand some behavior of people who have a religion, thus when in the future I treat with this kind of people, I know what I should response.”

The development of increased awareness of self, and how art can communicate to others is described by Treatment QUALCASE T50, “I feel that art is the most important form of self-expression. A way to reach out for others with the same experiences or a way to gain empathy.” Treatment QUALCASE T45 stated, “I learned to listen and accept the opinions of my fellow classmates and use their thoughts in order to shape mine.” Treatment QUALCASE T20 stated, “The class completely changed the way I view art on a daily basis.”

These self-reported statements about student learning help illuminate how the process of encountering and engaging with art linked to students' personal insight on how they perceive their own capabilities and how they became aware of assumptions they held about their peers. As they moved through the course, and engaged in discussing responses to the artwork and readings, comments indicate they began to learn about how and why their peers held different opinions. As they challenged their own viewpoints and reflected on the origins of their belief systems they may also have gained greater insight into the influences that their peers have had in terms of developing different sets of values and beliefs. This personal insight about how individual values and beliefs are
shaped can emerge from the assignments constructed around this personal engagement with art and subsequent examination of one’s own response.

Self-reports across multiple open-ended questions included gaining greater insight about their own creativity, an excitement to further expand their exploration of art, to a new awareness of their peers different perspectives and the validity of those perspectives. The qualitative data offers a student voice for what the quantitative data suggests.

While there were also self-reported insights from the comparison group there was no significant change in self-awareness as measured in this study (p=.34). Comments from students about the single most important learning taken from the class tended to remain in an academic realm for example Comparison QUALCASE C170, “The Media shape the thoughts of viewers” or Comparison QUALCASE C182, “Stereotypes are extremely prevalent in the media and though they are not always blatant and obvious, they have effects on us subconsciously.” Some comments such as Comparison QUALCASE C96 stated, “I have learned to be more aware of stereotypical representations in the media, and to be sensitive of humor used,” touch on levels of self-awareness but one might argue these seem to be expressed from a detached academic perspective rather than personal insight. Reviewing the comments across the groups there seems to be a distinction in such aspects of self-perception and awareness expressed between the treatment group and comparison group.
Research Question #2

2. How does an arts-based multicultural course at the undergraduate level foster self-awareness?

As stated previously, the engagement with art treatment had a statistically significant correlation \( r = .28 \) (\( p < .01 \)) with the development of self-awareness, based on this data set and instrumentation. The following is a discussion of how the course structure may have fostered self-awareness.

Building on the assignments students had throughout the class, students discussed their experiences with each other and began navigating the sometimes-difficult process of encountering differing opinions. The process fostered learning about other perspectives and views, “I really enjoyed the course and the readings that were selected for us to read this term. I enjoyed the discussion boards and being able to discuss my views with fellow classmates.” (QUALCASE T155). While discussion groups in undergraduate courses are a common feature, it may be that a unique dynamic occurs in the way in which students are able to share opinions and perspectives about art, in particular their experience engaging with art that fosters self-awareness.

One might consider that the pedagogical model utilizing a reflective process could be applied across a wide range of disciplines besides art. While this would be a worthy study, the well established dynamic of the arts as an expressive medium seems to lend itself to personal insight and reflection. Scholars for decades, as discussed in chapter one, have described this capacity of art to communicate human experience and generate a self-reflective interaction.

Drawing again from the qualitative responses to illuminate the statistical findings one discovers multiple comments about personal reflection and insight as a result of the
course. For example, treatment QUALCASE T152 states, “This course has helped me understand how I am part of a multicultural society by exploring art forms in different cultures.” Further comments describe the dynamics of the interaction such as treatment QUALCASE T68 “I learned how great of an impact the arts has on society, including me, and how exposure to it shapes my values”, and treatment QUALCASE T164, “This course has helped me, in many ways to understand how I am a part of a multicultural society by showing me many different areas and arguments of art and having me relate myself to it, along with others in my class.”

Additional support for this idea can be seen from treatment QUALCASE T178, who stated, “I think this course helped me understand how different cultures communicate through the arts to convey their beliefs or values.” Finally, treatment QUALCASE T54, states “I see myself as a much more accepting person. I never really understood art so I didn't appreciate it. Now, I understand it more and I am more accepting of different ideas.”

The requirement to write down their experiences and interpretations as well as share it with others asks them to examine the origins of those belief systems. The reflection upon personal values and cultural beliefs becomes a part of the process of engaging with art and sharing those responses. The course structure fosters this dynamic interaction both internally for each student and as a part of the peer interaction. This may indicate some mechanism in place that may account for the stronger relationship with increased self-awareness in the treatment group, although interpretations should remain mindful of the many limitations described in the previous section.
Research Question #3

3. Does this undergraduate art and human values course to be examined satisfy the multicultural general education requirements, and if so how?

The University of Oregon’s (UO) 2010-2011 catalogue states “The purpose of the multicultural requirement is to introduce students to the richness of human diversity and to the opportunities and challenges of life in a multicultural society.” (University of Oregon, 2011). The treatment group The Art and Human Values course in this study is further classified under Category B: Identity, Pluralism, and Tolerance where the goal revolves around increasing insight into construction of collective identities, recognizing representative voices from diverse cultural perspectives, and the development of tolerance for differences (UO, 2011).

Both the syllabus and activities in the class strive to fulfill these requirements. The course syllabus states these objectives as goals for course outcomes. The syllabus was reviewed and deemed as meeting these requirements by the academic affairs committee in 2008, as described in Chapter 3. This study seeks to further link course outcomes with the goals of the multicultural requirement. Through an engagement with art students have been asked to reexamine their own perceptions, values and beliefs as they encounter artwork that may expresses a different perspective and to engage with classmates who may interpret the work in varied ways including opposing views and opinions. The expansion from a private interaction with art as illustrated in Figure 1.6, to an interaction with both art and peers (Figure 1.7) brings diversity of thought, as well as of values, beliefs and experiences that may have influenced the thoughts as they are brought into an open dialogue. This indirect discussion about personal views as they are
related to art, rather than directly about oneself, may also be helping to construct a "safe space" for such dialogue to occur.

When asked about the UO Multicultural statement and how this class helped or did not help student understand how they are a part of a multicultural group students also had a range of responses. Treatment QUALCASE T71 describes how the course impacted their understanding because it, “Exposed me to people with completely different values. Helped me accept people who were different by understanding their different values through art.” Treatment QUALCASE T68 responded, “This course has definitely illustrated the range of cultural diversity not only in the community but throughout the world.” Treatment QUALCASE T78 stated, “This course has helped me realize that I am part of a multicultural society because I contribute my opinion and my way of life among a variety of others around me.” Treatment QUALCASE T234 states, “It helped me understand how I am a part of multicultural society by having us attend an arts event and by writing about art in our journals and discussions.”

The insight into one’s place within a larger multicultural context was a part of the self-awareness dimension of the study. Students seemed to develop an increased awareness that they represented a perspective not necessarily shared by all and that they were part of a larger diverse community. The encounter with artwork that expressed different ideas that the student might have been familiar with as well as sharing their reactions with peers who had different opinions, may support a broadening of perspective, awareness, and acceptance of others who are different.

From the comparison group there was also a wide range of responses including an increased awareness of the larger cultural context. For example from comparison QUAL
CASE C72, “This class absolutely helped me understand how to be a part of a multicultural society. It made everyone seem more human despite their differences and encouraged empathy and understanding.”

Other students focused more on the subject level learning for example, comparison QUALCASE C126 stating, “I was already familiar with many of the patterns discussed in class, but there was some new scholarly interpretations of the multicultural world.” When asked how the class impacted self-awareness this same student stated, “No major changes - the only one that was affected was my perception of Arabic students. For the first time, I took a good look at my assumptions about the Arabic world, and where those assumptions came from.”

This certainly indicates some translation to the level of individual self-awareness. Another example, Comparison QUALCASE C122 state, “I understand the different societies, but by being a white person I don’t understand how I am apart of a multicultural society.” The same student also stated “no change” when asked about impact of the class. Both of these comments indicate a fledgling awareness of the student’s place in a larger context of diversity. However, overall, there were a larger number of “no-change” responses in the comparison group when asked about the learning from the class.

Interestingly, the AAD 250 Art and Human Values does not focus on stereotypes as a subject yet students came away with awareness of how they apply assumptions about others that may limit their understanding of people who may be different. In contrast, the comparison group intentionally sets out to study the issues of stereotypes as the core content of the course. Students from the comparison group seem to have come away with
an understanding of the subject matter but may not have actually gained greater self-awareness that may help them successfully navigate a multicultural society.

When we review the discussion of multicultural development as described by scholars in cultural competency development (J.A. Banks, 1996, 2003; M.J. Bennett, 1993; J.R. Betencourt, et.al.,2003) there is a strong need for greater levels of self-awareness in order to make the types of personal changes gaining insights described in the goals of multicultural courses at UO. Certainly there were students in the comparison group who had compelling self-awareness insights such as comparison QUALCASE C2, who stated “I realized that I too am a part of a general trend and that it is hard to spread awareness and correct others' ideals when they are so internalized.” Another personal insight from comparison QUALCASE C11 stated “I think I evaluate more about the way I am quick to think about people in a certain manner, rather than to fully think things through.” But the larger responses fell more into a general insight about the topic of stereotypes such as comparison QUALCASE C23 who states, “Based on the videos we watched, I feel as though I was a bit naive about class and racial stereotypes. Now I feel as though I have a broader understanding of these issues.” Another example, comparison QUALCASE C55 states “through this course, I feel more about discrimination in society of U.S”. While students did gain understanding of diversity issues in the comparison group there may be an important distinction between shifts in individual, personal awareness and increasing one’s knowledge of an equity-related subject.

If we are willing to accept that increased levels of self-awareness provide a necessary tool for clarifying one’s own identity and potentially recognizing someone else as different then the AAD 250 Art and Human Values course seems to meet some of
these criteria stated in the UO requirements. We may further postulate that the arts can express views from across social and cultural standpoints (McFee & Deggee, 1977; E. Dissayanake, 1992) and that student’s engagement with such work and subsequent dialogue with peers might foster a greater understanding of different perspectives at a more personal awareness level. If the goals of the multicultural requirement are to foster a larger understanding of a diverse population then this course design may be a useful means towards that end.

Conclusions

There are two outcomes from this study, (i) development of a self-awareness assessment instrument, and (ii) identifying a link between engagement with art and the development of greater self-awareness. Both outcomes offer exciting implications.

First, the instrument development, while fledgling, has the potential to contribute to a growing body of work in the area of assessment and measurement for the dimension of self-awareness. Multiple instruments are used in a wide spectrum of settings yet there are few if any outside of an art therapy application that link arts-engagement with the development of self-awareness.

Secondly this study showed a statistically significant relationship between engagement with art and the development of self-awareness. Students who enrolled in a general education class that utilized arts-engagement emerged with a greater sense of their own values and beliefs within a context of a larger, diverse society. The potential exists for courses seeking to increase student self-awareness, in particular around multicultural development, to implement arts engagement as pedagogical tool to achieve these outcomes.
Limitations, of course, should be noted, as described in the previous section. However, the potential to build upon an arts-based course in order to foster greater multicultural awareness and potentially cultural competence and proficiency seems warranted for further exploration. The author is not suggesting the use of art “as a tool” to create a multicultural citizen. Rather, a more conscious engagement with a fundamental human activity, art, which can foster greater self-awareness with thoughtful curricular development could be explored. The link between arts curriculum and the development of self-awareness has great potential and future research can provide reflection and tools to implement effective strategies, that may be helpful for teaching and learning efforts in this area.

*Implications for Future Research*

Measuring self-awareness is arguably a challenging and elusive prospect, yet necessary if we are to take seriously the task of developing culturally competent global citizenry. Future research includes identifying methods for delivering and evaluating multicultural courses that begin building capacity for students to learn about themselves. If we accept that understanding of self is an important foundation in the development of multicultural understanding, then it is essential that work should be done to develop measures that can assess the effectiveness of multicultural courses, including their contributions to helping build self-awareness.

This study was conducted to explore the potential relationship between an engagement with art and the development of self-awareness. The challenge to capture meaningful data on a self-reported self-awareness scale warrants additional research and instrument development. The instrument that has been developed for this study deserves
further examination for refinement and testing in order to continue developing ways to evaluate outcomes of courses seeking to foster multicultural understanding and cultural competencies.

A further examination of the AAD 250 course as a whole and a closer examination and comparison of course modules may highlight pedagogical practice that may transfer to other settings. It would be important to evaluate the course as to whether it was the whole experience or individual units within the course that impacted student’s comfort with art and self-awareness. It may be these modules are independent and could transfer to other classes, or even suggest a framework or set of strategies to build new multicultural courses.

Another area for further study might address these emergent questions from the current study; (i) Could interactive discussions without the arts engagement also facilitate the same level of self-awareness? (ii) What is it about introducing the arts that makes it potentially more effective in increasing self-awareness than standard discussion groups?

A continued mixed methods approach would offer additional triangulated data that could illuminate the nuances of self-awareness as they connect to an understanding of self within the context of a multicultural society and globally connected world.

Immersion in the qualitative data highlighted a potential but subtle difference between the two groups that is worthy of further investigation. The treatment group seems to filter the learning and insight through a more personal perspective or lens while the comparison group seemed to offer new insights and learning from a detached intellectual stance. This would be a most interesting finding to test with future research
by designing an instrument to more carefully collect data that would evaluate and clarify the levels of self-reporting from personal/internal to intellectual/external.

Additionally, considering that the participants in this study represented a broad range of majors across multiple disciplines within the university, there may be a potential application for educational programs across multiple disciplines to incorporate engagement with art as a core component of the class to cultivate greater self-awareness. Further research in this area would be recommended.

Finally, the implications for future research also include linking self-awareness development with the development of cultural competency. As educational institutions grapple with the development and delivery of courses and curriculum that will foster the capacity to engage in a diverse world it is imperative that we find meaningful and reliable ways to evaluate the effectiveness of these classes.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Pre-Survey

1. Arts & Culture Survey

The following 26 question multiple choice/short answer survey has been designed to measure students experience with arts, culture and learning communities. Your participation in this survey will assist me in refining the instrument so that I can use it for my dissertation research. Your participation is voluntary and will have no impact on your grades for this class. Your responses are anonymous and confidential. The information you provide will be coded and analyzed in order to improve the data collection process. Thank you for choosing to participate in my research project. By completing the following survey, you are consenting to participate in this research. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office of Human Protection of Human Subjects at human_subjects@orc.uoregon.edu

Q1  Edit Question  ▼  Add Question Logic  ▼  Move  ▼  Copy  ▼  Delete

* 1. How would you rank your comfort with the arts?
   - I am comfortable with the arts
   - I am somewhat comfortable with the arts
   - I am somewhat uncomfortable with the arts
   - I am very uncomfortable with the arts

Q2  Edit Question  ▼  Add Question Logic  ▼  Move  ▼  Copy  ▼  Delete

* 2. How would you rank your experience with the arts?
   - I engage with the arts on a regular basis
   - I occasionally engage with the arts
   - I rarely engage with the arts
   - I never engage with the arts

Q3  Edit Question  ▼  Add Question Logic  ▼  Move  ▼  Copy  ▼  Delete

* 3. Previous to this class, have you ever studied art?
   - yes
   - no
4. Have you ever created art?
   - yes (please specify below)
   - no
   (please specify)

5. Please select the type of art you have engaged in (select all that apply)
   - music
   - performing arts
   - visual arts
   - literature
   - commercial arts
   - fine arts
   - non-traditional art
   other/comment

6. When you engage in art what is your primary way of connecting/engaging?
   - creator of art
   - appreciator of art
   - both create and appreciate art
   Other (please specify)

7. In a short sentence or two, how would you describe/define art?

8. When engaging with art I prefer to
   - share and discuss with others most of the time
   - share and discuss with others some of the time
   - rarely share and discuss with others
   - never share and discuss with others

9. I think art is mostly
   - an individual experience
   - a community experience
   - both individual and community experience
10. Please select the statement that best represents your views.
   • art can be enjoyed by anyone
   • To enjoy art you must have education or training

11. Please select the answer that best represents your views
   • art can only express an individual experience
   • art can express a group experience

12. How important is engaging with the arts?
   • very important
   • somewhat important
   • somewhat unimportant
   • not important

13. Please select the statement that best describes you.
   • I prefer to work on assignments alone
   • I prefer to work with some peer interaction on assignments
   • I prefer to work with peers on assignments

14. Please select the question that best describes your participation in the class discussions.
   • I do not participate in class discussions
   • I participate minimally in class discussions
   • I participate in class discussions
   • I always participate in class discussions

15. Please select the answer that best describes your role in discussions.
   • I do not pay much attention to other student comments in the discussions
   • I prefer to follow other's lead in discussions
   • I occasionally contribute new ideas to the discussions
   • I often initiate new topics in the discussions
   • I always initiate new topics and contribute resources to the discussions
Q16  Edit Question ▼ Move Copy Delete

*16. The following is from the current description of courses satisfying the U.O. "Multicultural Requirement" please read then in a short sentence or two, how would you define/describe "culture"?

from UO catalog
Multicultural Requirement

"The purpose of the multicultural requirement is to introduce students to the richness of human diversity and to the opportunities and challenges of life in a multicultural society."

in a short sentence or two, how would you define/describe "culture"?


Q17  Edit Question ▼ Add Question Logic Move Copy Delete

*17. Do you identify with a cultural group?

  yes (please describe below)

  no

  (if "yes" please specify)


Q18  Edit Question ▼ Add Question Logic Move Copy Delete

*18. If you answered "no" to the previous question please skip to the next question.
If you answered "yes" can you give an example of how you express your cultural identity?

  yes (please specify below with the example and a short explanation)

  no

  (if "yes" please specify)
19. In one or two sentences, please describe your definition/understanding of "cultural identity".

20. Which statement best represents your views on the relationship between art & cultural identity.
   - there is no link between art and cultural identity
   - there is some connection between art and cultural identity
   - art expresses one's cultural identity

21. How would you describe the range of different types of people you socialize with?
   - mostly similar to me - (similar backgrounds and experiences)
   - somewhat similar to me
   - some people are somewhat different than me
   - mostly different than me - (different backgrounds and experiences)
   Other (please specify)

22. How would you describe the range of different types of people you work with?
   - mostly similar to me - (similar backgrounds and experiences)
   - somewhat similar to me
   - some people are somewhat different than me
   - mostly different than me - (different backgrounds and experiences)
   optional comment
23. How comfortable are you discussing ideas with people who have different values and beliefs?
- I am comfortable
- I am somewhat comfortable
- I am somewhat uncomfortable
- I am very uncomfortable

Optional comment

24. How would you rate your ability to accept another person's opinion if it is different/opposing your own?
- I can easily accept people with different opinions
- I can somewhat accept people with different opinions
- I sometimes reject people with different opinions
- I usually reject people with different opinions

Comment

25. Please provide the LAST three numbers of your student ID.
   This will be used to match the pre- and post surveys to a single respondent. There is no way to connect these three numbers to your identity so you will remain anonymous. You may also opt for a different code that you can remember and use again for the post survey Week 10.

26. Feel free to add any additional comments here.
Post-Survey

1. Arts & Culture Survey

The following 25 question multiple choice/short answer survey has been designed to measure students experience with arts, culture and learning communities. Your participation in this survey will assist me in refining the instrument so that I can use it for my dissertation research. Your participation is voluntary and will have no impact on your grades for this class. Your responses are anonymous and confidential. The information you provide will be coded and analyzed in order to improve the data collection process. Thank you for choosing to participate in my research project. By completing the following survey, you are consenting to participate in this research. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office of Human Protection of Human Subjects at human_subjects@orc.uoregon.edu

Q1.

1. How would you rank your comfort with the arts?
   - I am comfortable with the arts
   - I am somewhat comfortable with the arts
   - I am somewhat uncomfortable with the arts
   - I am very uncomfortable with the arts

Q2.

2. In a short sentence or two, how would you describe/define art?

Q3.

3. When engaging with art I prefer to
   - share and discuss with others most of the time
   - share and discuss with others some of the time
   - rarely share and discuss with others
   - never share and discuss with others
4. How important is engaging with the arts?
- very important
- somewhat important
- somewhat unimportant
- not important

5. Please select the statement that best describes you.
- I prefer to work on assignments alone
- I prefer to work with some peer interaction on assignments
- I prefer to work with peers on assignments

6. Please select the question that best describes your participation in the class discussions.
- I do not participate in class discussions
- I participate minimally in class discussions
- I participate in class discussions
- I always participate in class discussions

7. Please select the answer that best describes your role in discussions.
- I do not pay much attention to other student comments in the discussions
- I prefer to follow others’ lead in discussions
- I occasionally contribute new ideas to the discussions
- I often initiate new topics in the discussions
- I always initiate new topics and contribute resources to the discussions
8. The following is from the current description of courses satisfying the U.O "Multicultural Requirement"
AFTER READING - In a short sentence or two describe how has this course helped or not helped you to understand how you are a part of a multicultural society.

from UO catalog
Multicultural Requirement

"The purpose of the multicultural requirement is to introduce students to the richness of human diversity and to the opportunities and challenges of life in a multicultural society."

In a short sentence or two describe how has this course helped or not helped you to understand how you are a part of a multicultural society.

9. In one or two sentences, please describe your definition/understanding of "cultural identity".

10. Which statement best represents your views on the relationship between art & cultural identity.
   - there is no link between art and cultural identity
   - there is some connection between art and cultural identity
   - art expresses one's cultural identity
11. How would you describe the range of different types of people you SOCIALIZE with?
- mostly similar to me - (similar backgrounds and experiences)
- somewhat similar to me
- some people are somewhat different than me
- mostly different than me - (different backgrounds and experiences)
Other (please specify)

12. How would you describe the range of different types of people you WORK with?
- mostly similar to me - (similar backgrounds and experiences)
- somewhat similar to me
- some people are somewhat different than me
- mostly different than me - (different backgrounds and experiences)
Other (please specify)

13. How comfortable are you discussing ideas with people who have different values and beliefs?
- I am comfortable
- I am somewhat comfortable
- I am somewhat uncomfortable
- I am very uncomfortable
optional comment
14. How would you rate your ability to accept another person's opinion if it is different/opposing your own?

- I can easily accept people with different opinions
- I can somewhat accept people with different opinions
- I sometimes reject people with different opinions
- I usually reject people with different opinions

Comment:

15. Please provide the LAST three numbers of your student ID
This will be used to match the pre- and post-surveys to a single respondent. There is no way to connect these three numbers also opt for a different code that you can remember and use for the post survey Week 10.

16. Please select your age range.

- Under 18
- 18-22
- 23-27
- 27-30
- 30-35
- 35-45
- 45 or older

17. Please select the race/ethnicity you identify with most

- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American Indian
- White/Caucasian
- Other

Optional comment:

18. During this class have you learned anything new about yourself through a discussion of art?

- Yes
- Somewhat
- Not very much
- No
19. During this class, have you ever learned something new about your peers through a discussion of art?
   - yes
   - somewhat
   - not very much
   - no

20. How has this class impacted your perception of other student's ideas and beliefs?
   - my perceptions have changed
   - my perceptions have changed somewhat
   - my perceptions have not changed much
   - my perceptions have not changed
   Other (please specify): 

21. Please describe in a short sentence or two, how your perceptions about yourself changed from your experiences in this class - if there was no change just state "no change"

22. Please rank the class activities from 1-7 with 1 being the most impactful and 7 having little or no impact on YOUR perceptions about yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discussion with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct engagement with art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct engagement with outside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionals/guests/artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video or other media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture/course information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project collaboration with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Please rank the class activities from 1-7 with 1 being the most impactful and 7 having little or no impact on your perceptions about YOUR PEERS or others in your life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discussion with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct engagement with art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct engagement with outside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionals/guests/artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video or other media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture/course information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project collaboration with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. If you were to describe the single most important thing you learned from taking this class, what would it be? (short sentence or two)


25. Feel free to add any additional comments here.
APPENDIX B

SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS INSTRUMENT

Self Consciousness Scale

http://www.psychbytes.com/Quizzes/Self Consciousness - Multi...

Self Consciousness Scale

by Allan Fenigstein,
Michael Scheier, and Arnold Buss

Below are twenty-three statements that may or may not be characteristic of the way you see yourself as a person. Read each one carefully and rate whether the statement is characteristic of uncharacteristic of you using the rating scale below. Select the number of your answer after each question.

Extremely uncharacteristic = 0
Generally uncharacteristic = 1
Equally characteristic and
uncharacteristic = 2
Generally characteristic = 3
Extremely characteristic = 4

1. I’m always trying to figure myself out.
   a. ☐ 0
   b. ☐ 1
   c. ☐ 2
   d. ☐ 3
   e. ☐ 4

2. I’m concerned about my style of doing things.
   a. ☐ 0
   b. ☐ 1
   c. ☐ 2
   d. ☐ 3
   e. ☐ 4

3. Generally, I’m very aware of myself.
   a. ☐ 0
   b. ☐ 1
   c. ☐ 2
   d. ☐ 3
   e. ☐ 4

4. It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations.
   a. ☐ 0
   b. ☐ 1
   c. ☐ 2
   d. ☐ 3
   e. ☐ 4

5. I reflect about myself a lot.
6. I'm concerned about the way I present myself.
   a. ☐ 0
   b. ☐ 1
   c. ☐ 2
   d. ☐ 3
   e. ☐ 4

7. I'm often the subject of my own fantasies.
   a. ☐ 0
   b. ☐ 1
   c. ☐ 2
   d. ☐ 3
   e. ☐ 4

8. I have trouble working when someone is watching me.
   a. ☐ 0
   b. ☐ 1
   c. ☐ 2
   d. ☐ 3
   e. ☐ 4

9. I constantly scrutinize myself.
   a. ☐ 0
   b. ☐ 1
   c. ☐ 2
   d. ☐ 3
   e. ☐ 4

10. I get embarrassed very easily.
    a. ☐ 0
    b. ☐ 1
    c. ☐ 2
    d. ☐ 3
    e. ☐ 4

11. I'm self-conscious about the way I look.
    a. ☐ 0
    b. ☐ 1
    c. ☐ 2
    d. ☐ 3
12. I find it hard to talk to strangers.
   a. ○ 0
   b. ○ 1
   c. ○ 2
   d. ○ 3
   e. ○ 4

13. I’m generally attentive to my inner feelings.
   a. ○ 0
   b. ○ 1
   c. ○ 2
   d. ○ 3
   e. ○ 4

14. I usually worry about making a good impression.
   a. ○ 0
   b. ○ 1
   c. ○ 2
   d. ○ 3
   e. ○ 4

15. I’m constantly examining my motives.
   a. ○ 0
   b. ○ 1
   c. ○ 2
   d. ○ 3
   e. ○ 4

16. I feel anxious when I speak in front of a large group.
   a. ○ 0
   b. ○ 1
   c. ○ 2
   d. ○ 3
   e. ○ 4

17. One of the last things I do before I leave the house is look in the mirror.
   a. ○ 0
   b. ○ 1
   c. ○ 2
   d. ○ 3
   e. ○ 4

18. I sometimes have the feeling that I’m off somewhere watching myself.
   a. ○ 0
   b. ○ 1
c. ○ 2
d. ○ 3
e. ○ 4

19. I’m concerned about what other people think of me.
a. ○ 0
b. ○ 1
c. ○ 2
d. ○ 3
e. ○ 4

20. I’m alert to changes in my mood.
a. ○ 0
b. ○ 1
c. ○ 2
d. ○ 3
e. ○ 4

21. I’m usually aware of my appearance.
a. ○ 0
b. ○ 1
c. ○ 2
d. ○ 3
e. ○ 4

22. I’m aware of the way my mind works when I work through a problem.
a. ○ 0
b. ○ 1
c. ○ 2
d. ○ 3
e. ○ 4

23. Large groups make me nervous.
a. ○ 0
b. ○ 1
c. ○ 2
d. ○ 3
e. ○ 4
Question 1: The “I am uncomfortable with the arts” response was not selected by any student and collapsed into the three.

Question 2 (AexperienceART) where no one selected “I never engage with the arts”.

Question 3 “Previously to this class have you ever studied art only shows the “yes” response.

Question 4 “Have you ever created art” also only shows a “yes” response.

Question 5 “When engaging with art I prefer to” has no responses for two options “rarely share and discuss with others” and “never share and discuss with others”.

Question 6, “Please select the statement that best represents your views” had all respondents load on one of the two options between a group and individual experience and selected “art can only express an individual experience” has only one answer of the four loading “very important”.

Question 7, “How important is engaging with the arts” did not have any student select the fourth option, “not important”
APPENDIX D

CLASS STANDING AND DISTRIBUTION OF MAJORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Fresh</th>
<th>Soph</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment B</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment G</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Intervention B</th>
<th>Intervention D</th>
<th>Intervention G</th>
<th>Intervention H</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPHY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAD</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCOM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMAG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPR</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPPM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xPBA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

SURVEY QUESTIONS NOT LOADED ON ANY FACTOR

POST
1. CASE: assigned number
2. ID: corrected ID number eliminating duplicates with reassigned numbers (1 up or down from dup number)
3. GROUP: T = treatment/C = comparison
4. RACE
5. AGE

PRE/POST
1. Bdefart: (Qual to Quant) In a short sentence or two, how would you describe/define art?
2. Bworkstyle: Please select the statement that best describes you.
3. BApartment : Please select the question that best describes your participation in the class discussions.
4. Bdiscrole: Please select the answer that best describes your role in discussions.
5. BMultistate: (Qual to quant) The following is from the current description of courses satisfying the U.O "Multicultural Requirement" AFTER READING - In a short sentence or two describe how has this course helped or not helped you to understand how you are a part of a multicultural
6. BcultID: (Qual to quant) In one or two sentences, please describe your definition/understanding of "cultural identity".
7. BArtidentity: Which statement best represents your views on the relationship between art & cultural identity.
8. BRANGEsocial: How would you describe the range of different types of people you SOCALIZE with?
9. BRANGEWORK: How would you describe the range of different types of people you WORK with?

PRE ONLY
1. Aengagetype: When you engage in art what is your primary way of connecting/engaging? (create/appreciate)
2. ATRAIN: Please select the statement that best represents your views (training/no training – dichotomous)
3. Aexpress: Please select the statement that best represents your views: art expresses individual/art expresses group
4. CULTyes/no: Do you identify with a cultural group?
5. CULTcomment : If you answered "no" to the previous question please skip to the next question. If you answered "yes" can you give an example of how you express your cultural identity?

POST ONLY
1. Beclassimpact – post comment (Qual to quant) If you were to describe the single most important thing you learned from taking this class, what would it be? (short sentence or two)
APPENDIX F

CODING RUBRIC

Coding Rubrics – Scales for Qualitative Coding – UPDATED
Based on self-reported perspectives from qualitative answers and reflective essays.

**Comfort with Art  CA**
1 – has never considered art as part of their experience, may feel uncomfortable around art, not see self as “artistic”. Generally may think of art in terms of “Fine Art” only and not readily accessible to understanding or participation
2 – is aware of art but has never articulated own thoughts about art. May feel slightly uncomfortable talking about or engaging with art. Does not see self as “creative” enough to make art. Is aware of art in formal settings such as galleries/museums.
3 – is aware of art in various forms and capable of identifying basic art forms such as music, traditional fine arts and may include other creative expressive output. Might engage with art forms on a consistent basis. May have encountered art in both formal and informal settings.
4 – able to articulate own preferences about specific art forms and artists. Feels comfortable engaging with art. Does not view artistic capacity as sheer talent, recognizes some training and/or practice improves capacity. May recognize some artistic capacity in self. Has intentionally engaged with art forms in either formal and/or informal settings.
5 – able to articulate own capacity to create art and/or engage with art. Considers art as integral to daily life and recognizes own capacity to create and/or engage with art in multiple venues, media. Intentionally engages with art in multiple venues both formal and informal.

**Self Awareness  SA**
1 – has never reflected on personal identity nor considered or identified personal values and beliefs
2 – is aware of some preferences regarding lifestyle choices, values and beliefs
3 – is aware of self in the context of others including lifestyle choices, values & beliefs
4 – able to articulate own preferences about lifestyle, values and beliefs and recognize differences in others
5 – able to articulate own preferences about lifestyle, values and beliefs and recognize differences in others as well as potential impact on others, and possible external influences that helped form individual differences.
APPENDIX G

SELF-REFLECTIVE ESSAY ASSIGNMENT

FINAL ASSIGNMENT - CLASS REFLECTION

Writing: One Page: Reflect on all the class readings, activities, discussions, and assignments. Answer the following questions:

1. How has this class impacted your awareness of art, if at all?
2. How has this class impacted your awareness of your personal values and beliefs, if at all?
3. How has this class impacted your awareness of your classmate’s values and beliefs, if at all?
4. Describe the assignment, reading, activity, discussion, video, etc that impacted you the most. Why and how?
5. Highlight one new idea or perspective on art, culture or values that you have formulated since the beginning of class. This is a one-page reflection - not a formal paper.
APPENDIX H

SELF-REFLECTIVE ESSAY SAMPLES

CODING SCALE
Comfort with art
Engagement with/tolerance of others (NOTE: this dimension was collapsed into self-awareness in some instances)
Self-awareness

EXAMPLE:
CASE#O504
This class has impacted my awareness of my own personal beliefs and values because it has caused me actually think about what I value and believe in. Although I have distinct values, this class has made me think about them and helped me realize how I express my values and beliefs. Before entering this class I did not consider myself creative or artistic, but I now know this is not true. I am creative in my own ways and although I do not paint or take photographs, I do participate in art forms every day.
AAD 250 has made me gain a new level of respect an appreciation for my classmates and the values and culture they are a part of. Although we all come from different backgrounds, we can still appreciate each other’s values through art.
The article that has greatest impact on me was the article on creativity by M. Csikszentmihalyi. I am a science major and am more of a math and science based person who likes to think objectively. Art, in my opinion, is mostly very subjective, but Csikszentmihalyi brought up a great point that discoveries are creative and should be considered an art form. This proves that everyone, no matter what type of person you are and what your values are, can participate in art and has the potential to be creative and come up with new, original ideas. I found this article to be very inspiring.
One new perspective I have gained throughout this class is that there are no limits to art. That is what is so great about it. Everyone has the ability to participate in art and the ability to express their beliefs through art. Art is not confined to sculptures and paintings but is all around us; all you have to do is open your eyes and be observant and open-minded. This class has helped me to become more aware of my own surroundings and to gain a true appreciation for art.

I learned more about different cultures and the sports they participate in. From doing some background research on our topic “Sports as Art” I learned about several writers explanations about why they thought sports should be considered art. Also, I learned about the cultural impact of sports.

This case coded:
Comfort with art = 5
Engagement with/tolerance of others = 5
Self-awareness = 4
CASE#1526

After taking this class art seems to be everywhere. Discussing and discovering what art is truly, has opened my eyes to see all of the art around me. I have noticed that everywhere you are you can find a piece of art that symbolizes something in that community. Art can be about a feeling, your cultures, your values, or a picture of how you see something. Art doesn’t have to have a deep meaning; it can be just a picture. Art can also make a difference in how someone thinks about themselves or the world, as I did when I went and saw the Chris Jordan exhibit.

I have had to really think about what I consider is art. I also have analyzed why I have the art in my house. I realized that a lot of the art I own has a significant symbol for my life. I own a lot of European pictures due to my romanticized vision of Paris, Rome, London, and Athens. I have not had the chance to see these cities yet, but I get to see them all this summer on my 18 day excursion through Europe with my little brother. I have a framed poster of, “Be Calm and Carry On” because I want to be full of happiness and stress free. I also have more than 50 pictures of my family and friends expressing my love and joy for them. My family and friends are what keep me from falling apart when I get too stressed out or have a bad day. I am now aware of what I value and believe based on the art I have and value.

My classmates have shown what they value and believe through class assignments. We have had the unique opportunity to relate and comment on how they interpret different aspects of art. I enjoyed getting to know what they considered art and how they interpreted the different aspects of art. It was also rewarding to see how we all progressed in our understanding of art and how it reflects the values of the artists and/or the community.

The community art assignment in week four was my favorite assignment and reflection of the entire course. I went to a classical music concert that was played by a pianist and flutist who were remarkably good. I was extremely put into a dream like state when they played. It was as if I was in a fairy tale and I was the princess who was waiting for her prince. I don’t consider myself a classical music fan, but the concert was so soothing and romantic I have a new appreciation for it.

I also went to the Chris Jordan exhibit at the University of Oregon’s Jordan Schnitzer Museum of art. It was a remarkable exhibit that opened my eyes to what we as humans are doing to our communities and the globe as a whole. To see how much materials we consume in a creative ways made me not only pay attention but also remember what I was seeing. I normally don’t like to recycle because my apartment complex doesn’t have recycling but now I take my recycling to places on campus and recycle it there. I also use reusable water bottles instead of buying plastic ones. I bought a “Britta” filter system for my sink so I could have filtered water. The exhibit opened my eyes to what I could do to make a difference.

Over the past 10 weeks I have really noticed that art is everywhere you go. It is on the bus, on campus, on the street, and in office buildings. I have learned to really pay attention to what art is doing or what statement it is portraying in the community it is in. I have a new respect and perspective on what art is and what it means to my community and the world. Art can make someone really think about how they are acting or how they are impacting the world. Artists such as Chris Jordan or Bansky are bringing awareness to issues that have been looked over or forgotten. This class has opened my eyes to the world and how art can impact our communities and the entire world.

CASE #1761

Once in a while I encounter an instance in which I am urged to question my own’s perception. I think it is important to check in with yourself and take a moment to reflect on your
strengths and weakness as a person. Survey's such as this one ask simple questions with complex meaning. I noticed in the survey that there were two types of questions, one type was asking about your internalized feelings towards yourself while the other was asking how you thought others perceived you. I noticed that my weakness is generally around image but I am tune with who I am as a person emotionally. I feel confident about my morals and often don't feel the need to change myself as a person to please anyone, however the times that I feel the least confident in myself as a person is when I don't have any make-up on or feel that I look ugly. Though I often try to remind myself that looks are only skin deep and do not define me as a person, I have noticed the importance society has placed on looks in which I have been heavily influenced by its motives. As shallow as it may seem I have noticed the difference in how people treat me when I am done up versus when I do not have any materialistic layers on, which does not give me much confidence to change. We have been taught to care about our appearance and in return have learned to judge and banter those who do not fit the mold of what is considered beautiful. Knowing that I can work on changing my mindset does not mean that others around me will and so I continue to cowardly play along with society to feel acceptance. I can relate to your comment about caring more about how you look versus how other perceive your looks. I notice how much time I spend getting ready and how little I stop to analyze someone else’s looks. The steps I stress over in my daily routine and aspects of someone’s appearance I would never notice. I also realized how art is an outlet to feelings of insecurities, and can be used as a form of therapy when the human language doesn't work. Many people use forms of art to build confidence whether it be performing in sports or doing an abstract painting of your internalized thoughts.

1. How has this class impacted your awareness of art, if at all? This class has impacted my awareness of art in several ways. Though I have always appreciated art, I appreciate it in different ways now due to the newfound perspectives I have gained from taking this course. First, I finally understand the deep emotional connection art can give its creator and viewers. What may not evoke an emotion to me could change someone else’s life so it is the assigned meaning we individually give art. I learned from the Chris Jordan exhibit, the research I did on graffiti and the photography’s group presentation how powerful art can be on society and the incredible amount of influence one artist’s work can make on the world.

2. How has this class impacted your awareness of your personal values and beliefs, if at all? I wouldn’t know how to exactly answer this if I had not just previously done the self-awareness survey and extra credit. Because I am now aware of the impact art can have, I see how it can be a tool of empowerment and self expression to a suffering person, population, country, or nation. When I was reflecting on my weaknesses as a person I saw how artists used art as therapy to deal with their emotions. Art has made me aware that there is another language available to express feelings that have no words.

3. How has this class impacted your awareness of you classmates values and beliefs, if at all? Growing up in a diverse environment and being taught strong morals regarding the acceptance of others, I pride myself on always keeping an open mind and being accepting and respectful of other people’s beliefs and culture. Because I have had wonderful role models growing up I feel that my awareness of my classmates values and beliefs has not changed from the content of this course.
4. Describe the assignment, reading, activity, discussion, video, etc. that impacted you the most. Why and how? The assignment that impacted me the most was our midterm project in which I interviewed a local artist named Wesley Hurd. His willingness to meet in person for an interview and thought provoking answers really made for a wonderful experience that changed my perception on art. Before I had never really understood abstract art but after talking with Wesley I saw how much of an impact it made in his life and that the experience behind each painting meant more to him then the finished product. What always perplexed me about abstract art was how people would sit an analyze a piece of art and come up with a meaning so far fetched from what the artists intent was. Wesley taught me that it doesn’t matter if people get the right idea or not, but that the beauty of his work was knowing that it had the ability to evoke any kind of emotion in someone’s life.

5. Highlight one new perspective or insight about art, culture or values that you have formulated since the beginning of the class. One insight I have formulated over the course of this class is that arts meaning is individualistic. What I mean when I say this is that arts meaning creates different experiences and emotions for everyone that views it and there is not right or wrong in this. While I may pass by a old building everyday and never notice, someone else could walk by the same building and be inspired by its architecture and historical background. We as a society assign meaning to things, so although I may have my opinions of what I think art is, it is not my right nor place to tell others what inspires or evokes meaning to them, not only in reference to art but life in general.

CASE # 1982

From this survey, I learned a lot about myself. Before this class I have never really self-analyzed myself. I think it was an overall good experience, and gave me the opportunity to notice things about me that I have never really paid attention to before. I am wondered what the answers of my classmates are. I hope the teacher could post it on the blackboard in order to let us analysis most students’ personality.

The discussion form is essential for this class. There are five reasons. First, our class is a web course, the professor and the students don’t have a chance to communicate and share ideas face to face. So, the only way is discussion online. Second, it helps people find out things from other points of view. Third, through the discussion forum people can get other people’s opinions of what is important to them. Fourth, the students can find friends who have same idea or opinion with him. Fifth, the professor can read comments fairly quickly and validate them to know students whether are invested in their ideas. Sixth, it gives the professor a better way to evaluate students’ understanding about this course. The discussion is not only benefit for the students, but also good for the professor. Therefore, it is essential for this web course.

1. How has this class impacted your awareness of art, if at all?
   Before learning this class, I think the definition of art is writing, painting, sculpture, architecture, music, dance, drama, movies and other any can express the beauty behavior or things all belong to art. However, after studying, I changed my mind because art is not only include these famous paintings, sculptures and so on, but also includes some things from our daily life belong to art. For example, food art, dressing, sports, teaching etc. Many ordinary things also can count as art. Just as food for example, as we all know, a delicious food should through several processes; finally we will get a finished product. Also, food can make us without hungry, it is the most important. Just like Ellen Dissayanake said art can help us survive. Therefore, Art is not only confined writing, painting, sculpture, architecture,
music, dance and so on; many daily affairs, behavior or action all belong to art. Everyone can create art.

2. How has this class impacted your awareness of your personal values and beliefs, if at all?
At the beginning of the class, I said that the family, loyalty and responsibility are my top three values. I put the family in the first rank because family is consist of F-father, A-and, M-mother, I-I, L-love, Y-you, it is “father and mother I love you”. In my opinion, parents are the most important people in our whole life, they give us love and care, they teach us knowledge and give us support to get a good education etc. So we should keep in mind our parents in order to repay them in the future. I think that is why I study hard. However, after this class, I think friendship also is also very important because it helps people survive as a species. Without friends, there is no social interaction. Without interaction, there is isolation. Especially, when I explored the final topic, I am afraid I cannot connect well with other America students. Luckily, I found a Chinese students group which one group member is my friend. I think everyone needs some to lean on when they have problems. Therefore, a good friendship is so important.

3. How has this class impacted your awareness of your classmates values and beliefs, if at all?
Before this class, I like doing any projects or work by myself. I don’t like work with other people because I don’t know how to assign task to other people and I am afraid other people will not listen to me. So before this class, I don’t think teamwork is my classmate values and beliefs. However, anything is not like I imaged. For example, our final project. Originally I just want to finish it by myself because I know at the end of the term, everyone has to prepare their final exams, so I think they will be very busy and will not pay attention to this project. However, every group members are very enthusiastic. They send email to me and tell me their ideas. After reviewing the email, I found their idea is very novel and useful. Besides that, they help me find a lot information which has already been arranged. Therefore, when I did the PowerPoint, I felt it is very easy and effective. After this experience, I found I cannot think everybody is lazy or unwilling to do the team project. To be honest, they are all study very hard. I should not look down upon others. Therefore, team work is very important.

4. Describe the assignment, reading, activity, discussion, video, etc. that impacted you the most. Why and how?
I think the activity that impacted me the most. For example, the art event, music event and the interview. Chris Jordan, his witty images show a great way of visualizing dull raw data that would otherwise be understood as mere meaningless statistics. Chris Jordan really caused strong feelings to emerge by producing meaning out of simple, seemingly harmless everyday actions of people. I thought that feeling is a way of understanding--in the deepest sense. The music event made a chance to contact with classical music which I never listened before. It is good experience with classical music because I think they are very beautiful, peaceful, and melodious; it is a good way to release myself. The activity of interview made me learn how to interview a person. Although I am business major, I think interview a person is very interesting. Because every art work has a good
story, I like to listen to the artist to tell me the creation process. Interviewing is a good way to improve your communication skills.

5. Highlight one new perspective or insight about art, culture or values that you have formulated since the beginning of the class.
After reviewing the final project, I think sport also is a kind of art. Because it influences American cultures a lot, even the world culture. For example, NBA. Michael Jordan, Kobe Bryant, Lebron James and other famous basketball players make countless people love this game. In addition, not long ago Blake Griffin leaps car and wins slam dunk contest, it is definitely a kind of art. Because just like the group of “Sports as Art” said “sports are considered art because the artists are the players, who create a game or competition in order to express themselves and their values”. Blake Griffin used his skill to make people amazing and highly praise. I think that is the best expression of sports as art. Art from anywhere, everyone can create art.

CASE #2354
After taking a few AAD classes I have noticed that you learn a lot about yourself and your opinions of art and how it relates to our culture. I think that the first assignment - what is art?, is an essential part of this class. I have learned so much about art and how it relates to us as humans and I think it is interesting to look back on what I said the first day of class and compare it to how I view it now. It definitely shows me how I have grown and how my views have expanded. I think it would be cool if you did an assignment at the end of how you would compare your definition of art now to what it was at the beginning of this class.
1. This class has definitely impacted my awareness of art. While I always was aware of all the different types of art that are in our culture, I never really took the time to actually notice them when I go out everyday. Since taking this class I can now go to the grocery store and notice something as simple as food as a piece of art. It pretty amazing and almost distracting to know how much art really surrounds us!

2. While I do not think that this class has actually affected my beliefs and values, it has definitely made me think about them more. Almost every assignment incorporated our beliefs and values and I really liked this. I believe that after taking this class my values and beliefs have been strengthened, especially because I’ve had to defend them and why they are important to me in multiple projects.

3. I thought it was interesting to hear all the different values of the people in this class. I enjoyed reading the values from the international students – it was interesting to see how in some ways they were similar and in some ways completely different – and we’ve grown up in completely different cultures. I think that reading about others values and beliefs also makes you question what you do or do not belief. Some people can make very convincing arguments as to why they have a certain value or belief and I enjoy reading what other people had to say.

4. I think the assignment that impacted me the most was the very first assignment – what is art? This assignment did not impact me at the time that I wrote it, but now looking back on it, it shows how much I have learned from this class because my definition of art has changed. I have
definitely become more open minded about art and how it relates to human values. I think it’s really great to see my growth in this class and I’m sure others feel the same way as well.

5. I think the biggest insight that I have taken away from this class is all the different types of art there are that we would never consider art. After reviewing my classmates final projects – I was really amazed at what I learned! I think what impressed me the most was how one group explained how sports are an art. At first I wasn’t convinced, but by the end I was completely convinced through the research they did.

CASE: 3497
From this class, I learned a lot about art and culture. The part I think essential is the group project. It is a way to exam how well we learn this term. Also, we can communicate with other peers with our ideas. It is really important. It likes a performance of us to show our thoughts. So I think group project is really important and essential.
The self-awareness survey is really interesting. It lets me know more about myself. I like to reflect myself a lot, and I pay a lot attention on what I did, especially the work of I did. So in the group of the final project, I am very serious on doing my job. Also sometimes I pay attention on the work of the whole group finished. I am shy, however, I am not very afraid to speak in the front of a large group. Because I think it is a part of the work, I need to finished it excellent. I like to do everything perfect, and I am trying to do everything perfect. In this term’s studying, I learn more about the art and culture. At first, I think art is belongs to some famous artists’ work. With the studying of art, I know that art is very close to us. Creativity is one of the main conditions of art. If one object or work contains the creativity, it is art. Also artists through their work communicate and express their emotion. Art conveys some spriest, emotions and the view to some society issues. Through the reading, activities and discussions in this class, I understand more about art.
Also, this class has some impaction on my values and beliefs. I am not familiar with art. After studying, I feel I interested in art. I also think creativity is a very part in our life. Creativity exists in every filed, not just in art filed. I like to think more about some topics with creativity. It makes me have some unexpected results sometimes.
I think my classmates must have some impaction on their values and beliefs. They should have more information about the art, and learn some culture about some art.
The assignments make me have to know something about the topics. To finish those assignments excellently, I have to read those reading, watch those video, do those activities and discuss with other classmates. Those things give me some information and let me have more knowledge about art and culture. Sometimes, the readings, activities and the discussions make me know some thoughts I never heard before. It always amazed me. That makes me have more interested in art.
The new perspective of art is to reflect some issue about the society. It leads more people to know about the problem of the whole society. Just like Chris Jordan.
APPENDIX I

INTER-RATER SCORING

Frequency Counts for Inter-rater Scoring of Treatment Subgroup Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>CASE#</th>
<th>Rater DB</th>
<th>Rater LH</th>
<th>Rater KD</th>
<th>Rater DT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with Art (CA)</td>
<td>0504</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2354</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2661</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3099</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3497</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3502</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3548</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5694</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6234</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6282</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6480</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness (SA)</td>
<td>0504</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2354</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2661</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3099</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3497</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3502</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3548</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5694</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6234</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6282</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6480</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

ITEM KEY

POST
6. CASE: assigned number
7. ID: corrected ID number eliminating duplicates with reassigned numbers (1 up or
down from dup number)
8. GROUP: T = treatment/C = comparison
9. RACE
10. AGE

PRE/POST
11. Bcomfort: How would you rank your comfort with the arts?
12. Bdefart: (Qual to Quant) In a short sentence or two, how would you
describe/define art?
13. Bengagement: When engaging with art I prefer to (others/alone)
14. rankartengage: How important is engaging with the arts?
15. Bworkstyle: Please select the statement that best describes you.
16. BApartment: Please select the question that best describes your participation in
the class discussions.
17. Bdiscrole: Please select the answer that best describes your role in discussions.
18. BMultistate: (Qual to quant)The following is from the current description of
courses satisfying the U.O "Multicultural Requirement" AFTER READING - In
a short sentence or two describe how has this course helped or not helped you to
understand how you are a part of a multicultural
19. BcultID: (Qual to quant) In one or two sentences, please describe your
definition/understanding of "cultural identity".
20. BAartidentity: Which statement best represents your views on the relationship
between art & cultural identity.
21. BRANGEsocial: How would you describe the range of different types of people
you SOCIALIZE with?
22. BRANGEWORK: How would you describe the range of different types of people
you WORK with?
23. BComftDifferent: How comfortable are you discussing ideas with people who
have different values and beliefs?
24. Bacceptdiff: How would you rate your ability to accept another person's opinion
if it is different/opposing your own?

PRE ONLY
6. AexperienceART: How would you rank your experience with the arts?
7. AStudyART: (yes/no) Previous to this class, have you ever studied art?
8. Acreate: previous to this class have you ever created art?
9. Aengagetype: When you engage in art what is your primary way of connecting/engaging? (create/appreciate)
10. TYPE TOTAL = number of the following checked
11. Atype1: music
12. Atype2: Performing arts
13. Atype3: Visual arts
14. Atype4: literature
15. Atype5: commercial art
16. Atype6: fine arts
17. Atype7: non-traditional art
18. Aindv/comm.: I think art is mostly (indv / community)
19. ATRAIN: Please select the statement that best represents your views (training/no training – dichotomous)
20. Aexpress: Please select the statement that best represents your views: art expresses individual/art expresses group
21. CULTyes/no: Do you identify with a cultural group?
22. CULTcomment: If you answered "no" to the previous question please skip to the next question. If you answered "yes" can you give an example of how you express your cultural identity? CULTcomment

POST ONLY
25. BselfAWA: During this class have you learned anything new about yourself through a discussion of art?
26. BPEER: During this class, have you ever learned something new about your peers through a discussion of art?
27. BAWAROTHER: How has this class impacted your perception of other student's ideas and beliefs?
28. Bclassimpact – post comment (Qual to quant) If you were to describe the single most important thing you learned from taking this class, what would it be? (short sentence or two)
29. SELFCHANGE: (Qual to quant) Please describe in a short sentence or two, how your perceptions about yourself changed from your experiences in this class - if there was no change just state "no change"
### APPENDIX K

**CONSTRUCT TRIALS PROMPT**

Original survey design development seeking 5 dimensions: CA = comfort with art, SA = self-awareness, EA = engagement with others, TO = tolerance of others, CA = Cultural Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 1</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. How would you rank your comfort with the arts? (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 2</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How would you rank your experience with the arts? (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 3</td>
<td>Dichot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3. Previous to this class, have you ever studied art? (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 4</td>
<td>Dichot/Qual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Have you ever created art? (2) Plus please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 5</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5. Please select the type of art you have engaged in (7 + other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 6</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6. When you engage in art what is your primary way of connecting/engaging? (3 plus other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 7</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7. In a short sentence or two, how would you describe/define art?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 8</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. When engaging with art I prefer to (4 ranked options about sharing and discussing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 9</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. I think art is mostly (3 ranked community/individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 10</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Please select statement (enjoyed by all, or needs training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 11</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11. Please select statement (art can express indiv, or also group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 12</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. How important is engaging with the arts? (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 13</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>13. Please select statement (work alone, together partly, together fully)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 14</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>14. Select statement (4 on class participation in discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 15</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>15. Select statement (5 describes your role in discussions from inattentive to leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 16</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. How would you define/describe &quot;culture&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 17</td>
<td>Dichot/Qual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Do you identify with a cultural group? (if yes, specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 18</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18. If yes in 17, give example how you express cultural identity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 19</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>19. Describe your definition/understanding of &quot;cultural identity&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 20</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20. Relationship between art &amp; cultural identity (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 21</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>21. Different types of people you socialize with? (4, similar/different to respondent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 22</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>22. Different types of people you work with? (4, similar/different to respondent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 23</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>23. Comfort discussing ideas with people who have different values and beliefs? (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 24</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>24. Accept people with different opinions (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post 25</td>
<td>ID info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25. ID info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 26</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>26. In class learned anything new about yourself through a discussion of art?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 27</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>27. In class learned anything new about peers through a discussion of art?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 28</td>
<td>Ordinal/Qual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>28. Class impacted your perception of other student's ideas and beliefs? (3 plus other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 29</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>29. Most impactful aspect of this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 30</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>30. Anything they want to add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

TREATMENT GROUP SYLLABUS

AAD 250: Art & Human Values
Course Syllabus - Grading Policy

Course Description:
This course will address fundamental, theoretical, and practical questions that result from a view of art as a powerful social and cultural force. Participants, by addressing these questions, will examine their and other's aesthetic values as a means of understanding art and advance multicultural and cross-cultural understanding. Emphasis will be placed upon individual interpretation and experience in local, national and international settings.

Course Objectives:
It is anticipated that participants in this course will:
1. Consider culturally based versus universally based theories of art.
2. Examine the political, regional, economic, technological, religious, ethnic, gender, and generational influences that shape conceptions of art.
3. Investigate the role of art to both communicate and perpetuate personal/cultural values.
4. Examine contemporary and historical cross-cultural examples of art as an agent of social/cultural change and stability.

Attendance:
Attendance and class participation are crucial to this course. Participation in the discussion forum will be tracked and impact your grade.
The Discussion Forum serves as a primary means to explore and expand course topics with your peers one needs to contribute to the discussion numerous times throughout the week for full participation.
Discussion Forum total possible points = 3 points PER WEEK assigned
3 = postings address relevant topics for the week and expand the discussion by asking questions and responding to peers throughout the week with a minimum of 3 postings that respond to other posts and contribute additional resources or ideas.
(multiple posts on the last day of the week are counted as a single post)

Assignment Overview:
A variety of formal and informal writing assignments have been devised to provide an opportunity to explore a broad range of concepts. Each week you will have short papers or activity reports assigned. There will also be a midterm paper and a final project. An overview of assignments and schedule is posted in the Assignments Folder.

NO LATE ASSIGNMENTS ACCEPTED w/o prior approval or documented illness.
ASSIGNMENTS without proper label/format may not be graded.
All writing will be graded as follows:
10 % = writing clarity, grammar, spelling, presentation
70 % = directly and thoroughly answer the questions/address the topic
20% = integration of readings and other references and original thought

Course Text:
All required reading will be available electronically on the course site.

**CORE Articles;**
Dissanayake, E. "What is art for?"

Besson, R - Responding to Art

Booth, Eric. "Art as a verb." and excerpts from "EveryDay Art"

McFee & Degge. "Exploring the relationships between art and culture."
Part 1
Part 2

Csikszentmihalyi, M. Selections from Creativity: flow and the psychology of discovery and invention.
"Setting the stage."

Cameron, J. "Spiritual electricity: the basic principles."


and other readings as assigned will be posted to the Course Documents folder

**GRADES & ASSIGNMENTS: (subject to change)**
all assignments are due Sunday evenings by midnight and submitted via the assignment upload folder unless otherwise noted. NO LATE ASSIGNMENTS ACCEPTED

**GRADES assigned based upon cumulative points**

95-100 = A
90-94 = A-
88 - 89 = B+
85-87 = B
80 - 84 = B-
78-79 = C+
75-77 = C
70 - 74 = C-
68 - 69 = D+
ASSIGNMENT OVERVIEW
All written assignments will be due Sunday, midnight unless otherwise noted.
See details for each assignment posted in weekly folders.
total possible points 100 - weekly values in ( )

once you read this document, click the "reviewed" button at the bottom

WEEK ONE - (16)
set up initial Journal Post in MEET YOUR PEERS - journal
DUE SUNDAY:
paper 1: art object (5) also post image of your art object and why you think it is art on
WEEK ONE ART OBJECT
Discussion Forum (3)

WEEK TWO (8) DUE SUNDAY: Ethnographic Observations/log (part A & B) and
culture report (5)
Discussion (3)

WEEK THREE (8)DUE SUNDAY: Paper 2: Creativity (5)
Discussion (3)

WEEK FOUR (7)
DUE SUNDAY: Community Activity report: Art & Music events (4)
Discussion (3)

WEEK FIVE (8)DUE SUNDAY: Paper 3: The Role of Artist in culture (5)
Discussion (3)

WEEK SIX (3)DUE SUNDAY: midterm artist name and short reason for selecting this
person
Discussion (3)

WEEK SEVEN (15)
midterm paper: artist interview (10) + Journal post (2)
Discussion: exploration of final project topics (3)

WEEK EIGHT & NINE (3)
Selection of topic and group members
Final project planning
Team/Group Journal update (3) WITH FINAL PROJECT IDEAS/TEAM

WEEK TEN (25)
Final Project presentation (20)
individual report & team evaluations (5)

**FINALS WEEK** (7)
1 page reflection (2)
project reviews (5)
post class evaluation

*schedule subject to change

**Disabilities:**
If you have a documented disability and anticipate needing accommodations in this course, please make an appointment with me during the first week of the term. Please request that the Counselor for Students with Disabilities send a letter verifying your disability. The current counselor is Steve Pickett at 346-3211. Disabilities may include (but are not limited to) neurological impairment; orthopedic impairment; traumatic brain injury; visual impairment; chronic medical conditions; emotional/psychological disabilities; hearing impairment; and learning disabilities.

The University of Oregon is working to create inclusive learning environments. If there are aspects of the instruction or design of this course that result in barriers to your participation, please notify me as soon as possible. You may also wish to contact Disability Services in 164 Oregon Hall at 346-1155 or (TTY: 346-1083), disabsrv@uoregon.edu <mailto:disabsrv@uoregon.edu>

**Course Conduct**
Materials in this course may be controversial and involve contentious discussion. A variety of opinions and ideas are encouraged and appreciated. Participation in this class assumes:
• the dignity and essential worth of all participants is respected
• the privacy, property, and freedom of all participants will be respected
• bigotry, discrimination, violence, and intimidation will not be tolerated
• personal and academic integrity is expected

*Extend respect to all in the classroom*: Biased, abusive, insulting language or actions will not be tolerated. We may very well discuss stereotypes and derogatory images, as these are often embedded in cultural practice, but we will do so critically and with respect for everyone's feelings and perspectives. Should you feel threatened, insulted, or discriminated in any way, please bring your concerns to me. The University Bias Response Team is also a resource at your disposal; find more information at their website [http://bias.uoregon.edu/index.html](http://bias.uoregon.edu/index.html) or by phoning (541-346-1134/1139).
APPENDIX M

COMPARISON GROUP SYLLABUS

**Course Description:** In this media literacy course, we will examine the psychological, historical, sociological, and cultural processes of stereotype construction and representations of marginalized peoples in American mass media content. Four related issues are at the center of this process:

1) Media representations of ethnicity, race, sexuality, and gender
2) Audience interpretations of media portrayals
3) Critical analyses of media culture and media content
4) What to do about these concerns via media literacy, activism, and advocacy

You will be asked to become an “expert” on the way several media forms portray a group of people (your choice) who are marginalized in American society and, as a result, in American media. You are asked to consider the consequences of these inequities.

**Readings**

Assigned readings for this course appear either on the Course Schedule section of this syllabus and are either in the textbook or available online on the course Blackboard site.

**REQUIRED READINGS**

*Books:*


Zinn, H. *A people’s history of the United States.*

Additional readings posted to class Blackboard site (http://blackboard.uoregon.edu), hot-linked, and/or handed out in class.

**COURSE ORGANIZATION**

In the first third of this course, we will examine the historical and psychological underpinnings for the social construction of race, ethnicity, gender, and class. The role of the mass media in the process of framing and maintaining stereotypes are emphasized. Students will study theories of representation and applying methodologies for examining mass media construction, perpetuation, and maintenance of stereotypes, such as rhetorical analysis, semiotics, and phenomenology.

The second third of the course is devoted to studying mass media representations of specific groups of people. For example, popular culture and mass media portrayals of Native Americans in early literature, memorabilia, modern advertising, and films will be analyzed to explain how and why specific stereotypes are formed and how they consistently reappear and persist as significant and dominant images.

The final third of the course will combine the first two areas as each student selects and completes a mini-study of how media represents a particular group, becoming an “expert” in media portrayals of the group for his or her final paper.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

After taking this course, it is expected that you will:
1. Develop an awareness of, and sensitivity toward, the many ways race, class, and gender affect both media content and audience interpretations of that content.
2. Possess a greater understanding of our media culture through examination of various production, construction, and meaning-making processes.
3. Acquire a fundamental knowledge of some of the ways to participate in various “dialogues” over media relationships to race and gender, and of how these dialogues are shaped by power—structural political and economic inequities.
4. Become familiar with some of the approaches used to study media, gender, and race.
5. Enhance oral and written communication skills; develop analytical thinking and critical reading proficiencies.
6. Develop a greater appreciation of the media's cultural influence and ultimately, become more media literate and a more informed consumer and enlightened participant in our media culture.

COMPUTING AND ELECTRONIC MAIL
Students are required to maintain an active computer account for electronic mail and other computing services. Most course material will be available via the Internet on Blackboard. I encourage you to check blackboard and your email regularly to access grades, handouts, lecture notes, find out about updates, etc.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS
This course requires you to:
1. Attend class regularly. Attendance will be taken each class, verified by each student signing the attendance sheet. Only under unusual circumstances is an absence, beyond the three unexcused allowed, approved. This course is designed for respectful, motivated, professional students who do all the readings in advance of the class meeting for which they are assigned and who ask questions about the material and ideas raised by them. It is up to you to ask for clarification for concepts, terms, or ideas you do not understand. If you must miss a class (students are allowed three absences), it is your responsibility to get notes from a classmate.

2. Participate in class discussions: The format of this class includes open class and small group discussions. Thus, you are expected to attend and participate in these activities having completed the assigned reading before coming to class. I expect each of you to take responsibility and be able to distinguish between critical positions and personal opinions. Be prepared to support your opinions with evidence from the readings and lived experience and recognize the limitations of drawing only on personal experience. Late arrivals and early departures from class distract your classmates, the professor, and the teaching assistants. If an emergency requires you to leave early, please let us know at the beginning of class. If you are more than 10 minutes late do not bother coming to class. The simple truth is this: students who do not attend class perform poorly.

3. Complete the assigned readings for the day they are assigned (listed) on the schedule. Do not get behind in the readings as the pace and structure of the course make it difficult to catch up. You are expected to offer your views on readings in class discussions, and in written essays. Furthermore, many of the lecture-discussions will supplement (not repeat) the assigned readings and thus presume that you already have read the material. In short, you must read for this class! The Zinn book is important background information that we
will only refer to, but is critical for assignments and understanding the context of what we are studying.

4. **Complete** in-class writing assignments (announced and unannounced): These short assignments are designed both to encourage you to keep up with the assigned readings and to provide an opportunity to demonstrate an understanding of course material. These in-class assignments cannot be made up.

5. **Take** 2 exams, quizzes, write two short reflection essays, and prepare a final paper.

**Each assignment and point value is listed below***:

**Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay #1: Personal reflection</td>
<td>25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay #2: Project Implicit assignment</td>
<td>25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pop quizzes on readings (10 pts. each)</td>
<td>50 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test 1</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test 2</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final paper/project</td>
<td>200 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/participation</td>
<td><strong>50 points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>550 points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*only five quiz scores are counted – your lowest quiz score will be dropped from the six.

**Attendance/Participation** (includes discussion groups and in-class group and writing activities)

The instructor reserves the right to add to/alter the assignment requirements, due dates, and/or percentage values.

In the calculation of final grades (100-90%=A, 89-90%=B, etc.) will be used. You are encouraged to discuss your course performance with the instructor or GTF at mutually convenient times. You are expected to work hard in this course. We rigorously, but fairly and consistently evaluate student work across all students in the class. The course material is not extremely difficult to grasp, but doing well requires a commitment to understanding the material, willingness to do the reading, and enthusiasm for in class activities. This is important work for we are talking about issues involving social justice. Come to class with an open mind and an open heart. We want each of you to do well and will gladly assist each one of you, so please come to office hours or email us.

**Students with documented disabilities:**

"If you have a documented disability and anticipate needing accommodations in this course, please make arrangements to meet with me soon. Please bring a notification letter from Disability Services outlining your approved accommodations." See [http://ds.uoregon.edu/](http://ds.uoregon.edu/) for more information.

**COURSE POLICIES**

Ground rules: (for building a respectful classroom environment-together!)
- Listen actively -- respect others when they are talking.
- Speak from your own experience instead of generalizing ("I" instead of "they," "we," and "you").
- Practice timely attendance.
- Do not be afraid to respectfully challenge one another by asking questions, but refrain from personal attacks -- focus on ideas.
- Participate to the fullest of your ability -- community growth depends on the inclusion of
every individual voice.
-Instead of invalidating somebody else's story with your own spin on their experience, share your own story and experience.
-The goal is not to agree -- it is about hearing and exploring divergent perspectives.
-Be conscious of body language and nonverbal responses -- they can be as disrespectful as words.

**Assignment Details:**
1. All assignments (essays) (exception for the Personal Reflection essay which is to be hand written) must be typed and conform to a style manual for academic writing (either MLA or APA). Submit all essays with a cover page that includes your name. Use 12 pt. font with 1-inch margins and page numbers in the upper right hand corner. A good source for writing tips is available at: Resources for Writers George Mason University [PDF] http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/resources/index.html
2. When submitting essays, always keep a hard copy for yourself and submit the original. We are not responsible for "lost" papers.
3. Unless you are given permission, all assignments are to be submitted on the announced due date. Late submissions are not accepted. If an unexpected legitimate circumstance arises, discuss it with one of us before the due date.
4. Academic honesty/plagiarism: "Plagiarism is the inclusion of someone else's product, words, ideas, or data as one's own work. When a student submits work for credit that includes the product, words, ideas, or data of others, the source must be acknowledged by the use of complete, accurate, and specific references, such as footnotes. Expectations may vary slightly among disciplines. By placing one's name on work submitted for credit, the student certifies the originality of all work not otherwise identified by appropriate acknowledgements. On written assignments, if verbatim statements are included, the statements must be enclosed by quotation marks or set off from regular text as indented extracts...." (http://libweb.uoregon.edu/guides/plagiarism/students/) Unauthorized collaboration with others on papers or projects can inadvertently lead to a charge of plagiarism. If in doubt, consult the instructor or seek assistance from the staff of Academic Learning Services (68 PLC, 346-3226). In addition, it is plagiarism to submit as your own any academic exercise (for example, written work, printing, computer program, art or design work, musical composition, and choreography) prepared totally or in part by another. Plagiarism also includes submitting work in which portions were substantially produced by someone acting as a tutor or editor." For information about avoiding plagiarism (and academic consequences thereof) see:
http://libweb.uoregon.edu/guides/plagiarism/students/

**Extra Credit:** There may be opportunities for all students to earn extra credit for this course. Most of these opportunities pertain to campus and community programs that deal with some aspect of race, gender, and media. I will announce these opportunities in class (and let me know if you hear of any) and what you need to do to complete the assignment.

Be sure to have cell phones, pagers, and any other electronic devices turned off before coming to class. Lap top computers are not allowed on in class.
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