

“Arts-based research methodologies are characteristically emergent, imagined, and derivative from an artist/researcher’s practice or arts praxis inquiry models; they are capable of yielding outcomes taking researchers in directions the sciences cannot go.”

A Paradigm Analysis of Arts-Based Research and Implications for Education

JAMES HAYWOOD ROLLING, JR.

Syracuse University

This article represents a paradigm analysis of the characteristics of arts-based research (ABR) in an effort to reconceptualize the potential of arts-based practices in generating new curriculum approaches for general education practice and the development of the learner. Arts-based theoretical models—or art for scholarship’s sake—are characteristically poststructural, prestructural, performative, pluralistic, proliferative, and postparadigmatic, offering the promise of divergent pedagogical pathways worthy of new exploration.

Correspondence regarding this article may be sent to James Haywood Rolling, Jr., Associate Professor, Chair of Art Education, Department of Art, M-17, Skytop, 441 Lambreth Lane, College of Visual and Performing Arts/ School of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-5750.
E-mail: jrolling@syr.edu

Even in the most current scholarly publications attempting to explore arts-based educational research, the consensus of researchers is that “educational researchers are still trying precisely to define what we call arts-based educational research” (Taylor, Wilder, & Helms, 2007, p. 8). I suggest that a bent for precision does not yield an effective characterization of a growing delta of research methodologies that are “always in the process of creation” and which together demand “an understanding of incompleteness and uncertainty” (Springgay, 2002, p. 20). A more productive starting point is suggested in Melisa Cahnmann-Taylor’s (2008) caution that arts-based researchers have done little to legitimize their methods and approaches to inquiry by defining them “as an either-or proposition to more traditional, scientific research paradigms” (p. 4). Consequently, this article is intended to recognize and identify the opportunities afforded within an arts-based research paradigm to address questions differently than scientific research will allow (Leavy, 2009).

The greater the array of approaches in addressing a given set of problems, the more successful a community of research practitioners will be in surrounding that set of problems and generating a number of viable solutions. A quick tally of competing research paradigms recognizes that there are a number of paradigms for addressing the very same questions, and that certain practices are natively situated within knowledge-building paradigms that lend themselves to better addressing certain kinds of questions. Central to the practice of art education for over 100 years has been the ques-

tion of how works of art and the work of artmaking develops the learner, accompanied by the problem of making curriculum that best facilitates such learning (Wilson, 1997).

In order to understand what an arts-based research paradigm yields in the address of such concerns, this article constitutes a “paradigm analysis” (Carroll, 1997, p. 171). A paradigm is defined as “a body of beliefs and values, laws, and practices which govern a community of practitioners;” an analysis of an arts-based paradigm for research in the field of art education allows it to be weighed effectively against other paradigms for art education problem-solving (Carroll, 1997, p. 171). Scientific historian Thomas S. Kuhn (1962/1996) postulated that paradigms develop because of their success in representing the prevailing understandings, shared beliefs, and research solutions of a community of practitioners. However, when “new information cannot be integrated into the existing paradigm or when problems persist which cannot be resolved,” a new paradigm is likely to arise to replace it (Carroll, 1997, p. 174).

This definition implies that although the question of what art education practices work best in the development of the learner continues to elude any conclusive answer, new paradigms will continue to arise, each worthy of fresh analysis. Hence, arts-based research methodologies are not analyzed here as an alternative to social science or historical methods simply to be contrary; they are reviewed out of the recognition that we negotiate bodies of knowledge in a complex world where human beings learn and acquire life practices enacted along a spectrum between both scientific *and* artistic ways of comprehending the human experience and doing productive cultural work.

This article lays out tenets for understanding the potential for the emerging paradigm of

arts-based research to generate new curriculum ideas for general education practices. Arts-based research becomes arts-based educational research, a tool for developing educational programs, when it addresses the problem of shaping curriculum, a problem which Elliot W. Eisner (1965) long ago identified as both “the very heart of any educational enterprise” and a crucial opportunity for art educators to take a position of effectual educational leadership (p. 7).

In a 2007 graduate art education special topics course, student researchers in art education undertook with me to expand upon the thesis that the “theoretical scope of studio art practice” can have a transformative effect on educational research outcomes (Sullivan, 2006, p. 22). We began by examining the larger premise that an arts-based research paradigm works to disrupt the paradigms governing qualitative and/or quantitative research methods. Teaching an arts-based research methods course served as the point of departure

for my thinking in this article. Arts-based inquiry is grounded in arts practices rather than the sciences and is well documented in its ability to alter the “methodological turf” in scientifically-based practices (Barone, 2006, p. 5). Arts-based methodologies “blur the boundaries between the arts and the sciences” and are proven to be adept at reshaping, eroding, and shifting the scientific foundations on either side of the qualitative-quantitative divide (Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008, p. 3).

Since the influential publication of Ralph Tyler’s (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, the design of educational curriculum has traditionally been approached as a scientifically-based endeavor guided by hypotheses and proof-of-theory principles with the student as the object of study. The four questions¹ of the Tylerian rationale have become a metanarrative so consciously or unconsciously embedded, it has been “codified as the goals and objectives, lesson plans, scope and sequence guides, and mastery of learning evaluations” throughout education practice (Slattery, 1995, p. 47). Curriculum theorist Patrick Slattery (1995) suggests that educational theorists have yet to fully explore the reconceptualization of curriculum through arts-based educational research. This article represents an initial effort to characterize an arts-based research paradigm that also serves to reconceptualize curriculum as “ongoing, if complicated conversation” more compatible to life and the constitution of knowledge in a postmodern society with a messy plurality of inaugurations and transactions of meaning (Pinar, 2004, p. 188).

Headwaters

Arts-based research methods and outcomes find their sources in diverse arts practices. As such, I disagree with Elliot Eisner’s (2008) characterization of arts-based research as a “soft-form” of qualitative research (p. 19). The tendency to emphasize form over process or to conflate the two such that “aesthetic considerations...trump epistemological ones” (Eisner, 2008, p. 25), is a mischaracterization that stems from an empirical-analytic paradigm

“There is no one set of criteria for judging the artistic quality of a work of arts-based research just as there is no one paradigm for the beauty of a work of art; for some, the beauty of a work of art is in the aesthetics of its forms and the mastery of its techniques, for others, it is in the authenticity and expressiveness of voice, and for still others, in the incisiveness of its social critique.”

defining and delimiting the conception of art as a system of *production*, a cause-and-effect intervention into a stockpile of empirical and manipulable elements, a commodity-oriented process "that has as its basic intent a cognitive interest in the control of objects in the world" (Pearse, 1983, p. 159).

The consequent malapropism of arts-based research outcomes as art products has yielded well-intentioned dilettantes without deep well-springs in arts practices who attempt to artistically craft the research data, questions, and/or solutions into novel forms merely so that those qualities or quantities can "be seen from another angle" (Eisner, 2008, p. 22). Not surprisingly, in many such cases the clarity of the visual concepts employed, strength of composition, quality of craftsmanship, and ability to critique and recalibrate historical and contemporary artistic trends in the chosen medium falls short of the level of a work of art. A different quality of arts-based research practice stems from full immersion in an arts practice wherever its locus, since practices in the "literary, visual, and performing arts" each in their own way "offer ways to stretch a researcher's capacities for creativity and knowing" (Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008, p. 4).

Arts-based research practice requires a far greater creative commitment than dipping one's toes at the water's edge. While I do not wish to diminish the work of those daring enough to wade into the practice of making art for scholarship's sake for the very first time, research derived from merely dabbling in the arts for a brief period is more aptly understood as *arts-informed* research. Arts-informed research is a way of representing research work that nevertheless remains firmly rooted in qualitative methods; in fact, arts-informed research isn't necessarily focused on the arts at all, reflecting instead a researcher who has been inspired by a work of art, arts methods, or a body of work to attempt to represent their research in a novel form or format (Eisner, 1997). Arts-informed research is not practice-based research, much more concerned with "how form accesses and shapes [research] content" (Newton, 2005, p. 92) than in building

research on a foundation of studio-based practices. The deeper commitment of a practice-based research methodology in or of or through the arts requires a sustained adherence to the discipline of making works of art in a selected medium or form while regularly mining the "the processes, products, proclivities, and contexts that support this activity" for scholarship's sake (Sullivan, 2005, p. 84).

Unlike arts-informed research, arts-based research is practice-based research (Irwin & Springgay, 2008; Macleod & Holdridge, 2006). Theory derived from disciplined arts praxis is constituted in part as it is physically materialized or saliently represented and reiterated through studio arts or performance media. There is no one set of criteria for judging the artistic quality of a work of arts-based research just as there is no one paradigm for the beauty of a work of art—for some, the beauty of a work of art is in the aesthetics of its forms and the mastery of its techniques; for others, it is in the authenticity and expressiveness of voice; and for still others, in the incisiveness of its social critique (Rolling, 2008).

It is through methodologically engaged materials, emotionally wrought performances, and/or aesthetically evolved symbols that "a way of experiencing...a particular cast of mind [is brought] out into the world of objects, where men [and women] can look at it" (Geertz, 1983, p. 99). While scientific ways of knowing involve the gathering of empirical data, testing hypotheses through specified methods, and validated representations of the human experience in the natural world, arts-based ways of knowing are no less empirical, no less dependent on methodologies, no less valid, no less representative of the human experience in the worlds we live in. The arts and sciences are twin peaks in human cognition and neither should be privileged in research practices.

In a new book edited by Melisa Cahnmann-Taylor and Richard Siegesmund (2008), the assembled authors outline various cases of literary, visual, and performing arts-based inquiry, practices which the editors define as "arts for scholarship's sake"

(p. 1). Thus, Cahnmann-Taylor and Siegesmund join the ranks of the authors in a recent special issue of *Studies in Art Education* on the theme of arts-based research in a shared focus on presenting specific examples of this research paradigm. However, in this article, I am more concerned with pulling back the lens to view the larger generalizable characteristics of the confluence of practices identified as arts-based research and their potential as a paradigm to alter the known landscapes of research and curriculum theory.

The tenets presented in the remainder of this article are not final outcomes; they are preliminary theoretical sketches explicating emerging tenets or tendencies for quality in arts-based research (Sanders, 2006). These tenets are attained through a form of "paradigm analysis" that reexamines the "body of beliefs and values, laws, and practices which govern" in the arts education research community (Carroll, 1997, p. 171). Further analysis in subsequent studies is likely to yield more tenets to guide the process of doing arts-based research. The viability of arts-based research has the potential to ably address enduring and unsolved problems in education, such as what Karen Lee Carroll (1997) describes as the persistent "need to secure a position for the arts in the schools" (p. 174).

Arts Practice as Methodology

In his explanation of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, John W. Creswell (1994) distinguishes between a research *method* as the means for "data collection and analysis," and research *methodology* "as the entire research process from problem identification to data analysis" (p. xvii). Researchers have documented strong linkages between arts-based research methodology and poststructural methodologies. Patrick Slattery (2001) writes of "exploring poststructural notions of the self in educational contexts through arts-based projects that foreground the excavation of the unconscious" so as to "provide an alternative form of representation for fresh new understandings" (pp. 380, 381).

Arts practices may be understood as a confluence of *informing practices* that generates, organizes, and reorganizes data deemed to be individually or socially significant through medium-specific (in either or both materials and techniques), experientially representative, and/or theory-laden methodologies (Rolling, 2008). Arts-based research is conducted as an informing arts practice (Irwin & Springgay, 2008).

The utility of arts practices in reorganizing any data, notwithstanding whether that data is initially brought to our attention in either qualitative or quantitative frameworks, illuminates the poststructurality of arts practices and their contribution to "an 'unjamming' effect in relation to the closed truths of the past" (Bennett, quoted in Lather, 1993, p. 676). To unjam prior ways of knowing is to open up new avenues of thought and praxis. However, I would argue that poststructurality is actually only one of several noteworthy characteristics of arts-based research methodologies. If, as I will argue, arts-based research can wend its way into both qualitative and quantitative research landscapes, it is important to know it when we see it. I will make the following ontological arguments about arts practices at the intersection of arts-based inquiry models:

- Arts-based research is poststructural (Barone, 2008).
- Arts-based research is prestructural and experiential (Behar, 2008; Leggo, 2008).
- Arts-based research is performative and improvisational (Sanders, 2006).
- Arts-based research is pluralistic (Olomo & Jones, 2008).
- Arts-based research is proliferative and iterative (Bickel, 2008).
- Arts-based research is postparadigmatic (Carroll, 1997; Pearce, 1992).

Arts-Based Research as Poststructural Practice

Poststructuralist practices recognize that "the social structures and processes that shape our subjectivities are situated within discursive fields,

where language, power relations and discourses, and social institutions exist, intersect, and produce competing ways of giving meaning to and constructing subjectivity" (Jackson, 2004, p. 674). In other words, every idea we embody and/or signify, and every model through which we interpret aggregated knowledge and significance is subject to *reinterpretation* even at the same time as there are social regularities, norms, and discursive fields which are fortified to resist such reinterpretations. Acts of reinterpretation have always been a threat to the continuity of dominant paradigms of thought and patterns of behavior.

Arts-based research practices manifest themselves as poststructural and erosive pathways, flowing over, through, around, and under scientific and social scientific, quantitative, and qualitative epistemologies in a rhizomatic filigree of "micro-becomings" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 70). These leakages erode manufactured paradigms, rupturing empiricist maps, "changing [the] shape of the thinkable" (Gordon, 1991, p. 8), making available new spaces of inquiry in an incessant and unrelenting "epistemic antifoundationalism" (West, 1991, p. 25). The epistemic antifoundationalism of arts-based methodologies destabilizes the footings of the sacred monuments we make of our scientific and social scientific research methods and outcomes, an impulse so akin to the worship of handmade totems and idols that art educator Ken Beittel (1973) once called our slavish devotion to prescribed research methods a form of "methodolatry" (p. 1).

Arts-Based Research as Prestructural Practice

Arts-based research practices manifest themselves as lived experiences, a variation of self-study that conceptualizes research as *life praxis* wherein "(e)very [wo]man is his [or her] own methodologist" (Mills, 1959, p. 123). By the term prestructurality, I am referring to what "semioticians refer to as the experiential store" (Siegesmund & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008, p. 233). John Dewey (1989/1934) recognized the bank of human experience as the

site of felt, intuitive meaning in consciousness that is the precursor to symbolic thought (cited in Siegesmund & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008, p. 233).

Prestructural meaning is the meaning that precedes "the inscription of forms of representation" utilizing the symbology of numbers, language, images, or music, or perhaps expressions of the physical body itself through drama, dance, and other forms of embodied performance (Siegesmund & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008, p. 233). Representative of the store of pre-symbolic experience, arts-based research methodologies lend themselves to the study of the relationships between what we know and what we believe.

Arts-Based Research as Performative Practice

A work of arts-based research innovates in its assumption that research can be performed. The performative aspect of arts-based research may be demonstrated in a range of mediums and modalities: "story, dance, painting, poetry, dialogue, script ... argument, and more" (Mullen, 2003). To perform anything, even one's own identity, is to carry out an action with the intent to present it to an audience. To perform research is to carry out a critical intent as presented to an audience of peers and/or the public who share an interest in the research problem.

It matters not whether the researcher is posing questions about the perception of a phenomenon, explaining a phenomenon through a rich and analytical description of its qualities, or experimenting with a phenomenon in a hands-on intervention engaging its limits and possibilities. There is something improvisatory about the performance of knowledge possibilities (Nachmanovitch, 1990). The performance of new knowledge readily accepts contentiousness as an ingredient in pedagogy, somewhat akin to the unscriptedness in human experience, which is rife with conflicts, ambiguity, questions, and idiosyncrasies. Performativity in arts-based educational research reveals how "cultural identity work functions politically to achieve agency within schooled culture" (Garoian, 1999, p. 44).

Arts-Based Research as Pluralistic Practice

Arts-based research rapidly negotiates the texts of idiosyncratic and collective meaning which are exchanged, reinterpreted, and blended in William James's oft-quoted "theater of simultaneous possibilities" (1890/1952, p. 187). The interpsychological space wherein plurality of voices and methods are brought into rapprochement is analogously described by accomplished jazz composer, trumpeter, and educator Wynton Marsalis in the opening segments of the final episode of *Jazz* (2000), an acclaimed 10-part documentary series by Ken Burns. Marsalis is videotaped making the statement:

In American life you have...all of these different agendas. You have conflict all the time. And we're attempting to achieve harmony through conflict...It seems strange to say that, but it's like an argument you have with the intent to work something out, not an argument that you have with the intent to argue. And that's what jazz music is. You have musicians—and they're all standing on a bandstand and each one has their own personality and their...agenda. Invariably (one or more of the other musicians will) play something that you would not play—so, you have to learn how...when to say a little something, when to get out of the way. So you have to have a question of the integrity, the intent, the will to play together...that's what jazz music is. So you have yourself...your individual expression...and then you have how you negotiate that expression in the context of that group. (Florentine Films, 2000)

The plurality of perspectives available in arts-based research yields a form of conflict, a striving to surmount through means that emerge from different sources and constitute differing aims and makeups. This kind of contention is not a life or death conflict; the solution to the effective conduct of pluralistic research is not that I am a writer or I am a visual artist or I am a researcher and never the

twain shall meet. The solution is in the freedom to generate contentious admixtures of methodology and audience, inaugurating fresh perspectives, visions, and insights.

Arts-Based Research as Proliferative Practice

An arts-based research methodology is a praxis of proliferation—an organizing system that informs by eroding predeterminations, un-naming categories, and swamping the pretense of objectivity. An arts-based research methodology interrogates in a way that generates turbulence, ambiguity, the miscegenation of categories, and an *expanding* discourse that proliferates possibility and seepages of alterity rather than reducing them. Hence, arts-based research methodologies can unleash torrents of unabated work flow. This does not mean that all of the work generated from the methodology constitutes research. Nor does it mean that all works of art constitute research conclusions relevant in any way beyond the walls of the artist's studio. In fact, much of the art that arts-based practitioners generate is just plain old trial-and-error and the wastebasket wonders that proliferate reconsidered research directions.

George Gerbner (1995) writes that while every problem can be formulated as a question (or purpose or topic, and so forth), not every question makes for a socially significant research problem. Some questions are thus solipsistic, self-sustaining, and are suited primarily toward maintaining the momentum of the artist/researcher's practice on the way to a socially significant outcome and real-world application. Other questions are significant enough to send up a flare over the continuing border skirmishes between qualitative and quantitative research paradigms (Sullivan, 2006). But whether through visual arts practices or otherwise, arts-based research praxis is a de/re/construction of research methodology. The very act of research, the making of methodology, then becomes the focal point of research, proliferating research outcomes that may from time to time lead to significant works of art.

Arts-Based Research as Postparadigmatic Practice

Richard Kearney (1988) makes the pronouncement that "modernity is where we grew up," but "postmodernity is where we now live" (p. 18). Given the postmodern condition, art educator Harold Pearce (1992) suggests a new system for conceptualizing the thought and action originated through arts practices by arguing that we are now in the midst of a postparadigmatic era, "one in a constant state of flux, a kind of perpetual pluralism" of opposing paradigms (p. 250).

Extrapolating from Pearce's (1983) treatise on arts and art education practices, there are at least three prevailing paradigms of thought and action in human inquiry that can be understood in opposition to one another in shaping an understanding of what research is. An empirical-analytic paradigm defines research as an *applied or natural science*, a positivist intervention into a stockpile of empirical and manipulable elements, a cause-and-effect process "that has as its basic intent a cognitive interest in the control of objects in the world" (Pearce, 1983, p. 159). An interpretive-hermeneutic paradigm defines research as a *social science*, the mediated expression of situated knowledge about human relationships within socio-cultural contexts (Pearce, 1983). A critical-theoretic paradigm defines research as a *relativist and discursive process* focused on the complicated conversations researchers and/or their participants are engaged in at any given time in the narrative constitution of their subjectivities, a liberatory activity rendering invisible assumptions, values, and norms newly visible "in order to transform" unjust social relations, empower marginalized individuals and communities, and improve living conditions within the practitioner's social world (Pearce, 1983, p. 161).

Pearce (1992) describes our postmodern condition as a postparadigmatic paradigm where "earlier paradigms continue to exist as...governing perspectives for some people" (p. 249). Thus, we are said to be in an era of thought and action when no one research paradigm is able to dominate, where

oppositional paradigms exist in a confluence that causes them to pull against one another like great subsurface currents. And yet, even within the swirling undertows of incommensurability caused by the confluence of opposing paradigms, the interaction of those paradigms with varying cultural constructs and social geographies often create localized eddies of common sense.

Transgressive Validity

Analogous with George Steiner's (1989) caution that novelty is the enemy of originality, the applied and social science discourses developed over the recent centuries are also novelties in the address of human problems first pondered through non-scientific, aesthetic, and rhetorical inquiries. Still, tests for scientific veracity are somehow insinuated as an enemy to the legitimacy of arts-based research outcomes.

Arts-based methodological outcomes are validated not primarily through a triangulation of methods but within what I would describe as *ephemeral constructs of validity*. Arts praxis methodology invites an anti-foundational "*validity of transgression*" that runs counter to the standard foundational *validity of correspondence*" (Lather, 1993, p. 675). It has been striking to note how flexible the concept of validity is, and that it is not an unusual practice to determine alternatives to conventional conceptions of validity when altering research paradigms and/or designs (Eisenhart & Howe, 1992). The following are suggestions for new criterion for validity consistent within an arts-based research paradigm.

Educational researchers typically employ several strategies to affirm the validity of their research outcomes. Lincoln and Guba (1985) reframe validity considerations as determining the *trustworthiness* of the research, the ability of an inquirer to persuade an audience "that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of" (p. 209). In the 20th century, the methods used in a qualitative research paradigm required alterations in the ways in which experimental

and quasi-experimental methodologies traditionally verified the trustworthiness of the inferences drawn from data, either adapting conventional approaches, establishing alternatives to conventional approaches, or opting for eclectic strategies (Eisenhart & Howe, 1992, p. 645). Similarly, 21st-century researchers operating within an arts-based research paradigm will have to reconceptualize the criterion for establishing validity, undermining or transgressing a regime of “dominant foundational, formulaic and readily available codes of validity” with “the invention of counter discourse/practices of legitimation” (Lather, 1993, p. 676).

A central tenet for the conduct of sound research practice has been protecting the study from “threats” to its internal validity and external validity. Internal validity in scientific research seeks the correspondence of the causes inferred in today’s research with the apparent results while ruling out all other possible causes; however, the indirect sources of arts-based outcomes may require a kind of *interpretive validity*. In scientific inquiry, a cause can be inferred if it precedes an effect, if it clearly relates to an effect, and if all other possible causes have been ruled out. Conversely, in the arts, as with other forms of naturalistic inquiry, it is not plausible to isolate cause from effect because there are multiple causes for every effect and all variables are understood to shape one another across time and space, either subsequently, simultaneously, or recursively (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Thus, various interpretations are best sought; interpretive strategies are born of the multivariate origins that comprise a work of art, as well as our multivariate responses to a single observation or piece of data (e.g., the Wallace Stevens (1954) poem, *Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Blackbird*). Interpretive validity in arts-based research might invoke each of the multiple readings within a research study to serve as a criterion for trustworthiness.

The research tenet of assuring external validity seeks to assure the generalizability of the outcomes, that is, their universal correspondence to all other similar contexts, populations, and/or data

sets across time and space. Likewise, predictive validity in scientific research seeks the correspondence of today’s research outcomes with the subsequent follow-up research results. However, this deterministic bent in scientific inquiry is at odds with the unpredictability of arts-based outcomes and may require instead an *iterative validity*, born of the serial nature of artmaking. As a criterion for trustworthiness, iterative validity in arts-based research might invoke the self-similarity of variations on a concept over time.

Arts-based Inquiry and Implications for the Reconceptualization of Curriculum Theory Models and Educational Practices

Arts-based inquiry models are post-positivist and epistemically antifoundational in an era still dominated by traditional scientific research. Thus, they provide a framework for reconceptualizing curriculum and related educational research. Arts-based research methodologies are characteristically emergent, imagined, and derivative from an artist/researcher’s practice or arts praxis inquiry models; they are capable of yielding outcomes taking researchers in directions the sciences cannot go.

In the praxis of arts-based methodologies, the “method of discovery” is the discovery (Richardson, 1997, p. 88); they yield innovations in accord with Lather’s representation of research as praxis, “the dialectical tension, the interactive, reciprocal shaping of theory and practice” (Lather, 1986, p. 258). Emerging from such praxis, there is “no such thing as ‘getting it right’; only ‘getting it’ differently contoured and nuanced” (Richardson, 1997, p. 91). The preoccupation with getting curriculum programs just right—offering the correct mix of content, strategies, and observation to maximize the development of students—oversimplifies educational programming as little more than an industry for the production of functional students and citizens. I believe the pointedness of such programming misses the potential to develop unre-

dictable thought, the kinds of metaphorical leaps that charter innovation (Rolling, 2006).

Certain curricular areas like reading and mathematics are oriented toward the acquisition of a particular array of content and problem-solving strategies and may reasonably be tested in the immediate run to see what content and strategies have been understood and retained. I argue, however, that the potential of arts-based learning engagements is wasted conveying facts, dates, and figures about dead artists, historical movements, and aesthetic styles. Arts-based learning engagements are more ideally suited for habit-forming exercises, rituals of perception, acts of reflection, personal expression, and social agency which, if they are to be sensibly evaluated for their effectiveness, must be assessed over the long run to document how the life practices, thinking habits, and communities of the learner have been transformed. Arts-based curriculum-making has the flexibility either to spring up from traditional Tylerian objectives-based curriculum architectures or to trickle down from nontraditional practice-based pedagogies.

A poststructural pedagogical approach might yield projects across the curriculum based on Roger Clark's (1998) understanding of the need to deconstruct modernist curricula so as to open new doors in the art classroom and to put up mirrors in those doorways to reflect the contemporary realities of the postmodern milieu in which we live; a prestructural approach might yield projects based on Peter London's (1992) call for the arts and related educational practices to be converted once again to their primal purpose as a tool for transforming lives; a performative approach might yield projects based on Desai and Chalmers' (2007) manifesto for a pedagogy of social justice in

education creating a haven for dialogic and polyphonic engagements giving voice to the social issues and political ideas on the minds of K-12 learners; a pluralistic approach might yield projects across the curriculum based on Wasson, Stuhr, and Petrovich-Mwaniki's (1990) platform recognizing the sociocultural biases involved in art-making and arts learning, and their advocacy for multicultural curriculum development grounded in socio-anthropological perspectives of human learning; a proliferative pedagogical approach might yield projects across the curriculum based on Olivia Gude's (2007) principles of possibility, her rearticulation of the elements of art and principles of design toward constructing an expanded 21st-century curriculum; a postparadigmatic pedagogical approach might yield projects based on Julia Marshall's (2008) understanding of the arts and related study as conceptual collage and the learner as bricoleur creating new ideas from diverse and seemingly incompatible arrays of things.

An arts-based research paradigm also alters the framework for curriculum-making; we can reimagine public schools as crucibles of innovation with teachers of practice adept at generating learning engagements both from curriculum architectures and arts-based curriculum watersheds. Poststructural, prestructural, performative, pluralistic, proliferative, postparadigmatic curriculum practices offer the promise of divergent pedagogical pathways worthy of new exploration. In summary, the continuing galvanization of an arts-based inquiry paradigm has the potential to finally answer Eisner's (1965) call, placing arts praxis and art education practices together at the heart of contemporary educational enterprise, perhaps for the very first time.

REFERENCES

- Barone, T. (2006). Arts-based educational research then, now, and later. *Studies in Art Education*, 48(1), 4-8.
- Barone, T. (2008). How arts-based research can change minds. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 28-49). New York: Routledge.
- Beittel, K. (1973). *Alternatives for art education research*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Behar, R. (2008). Between poetry and anthropology: Searching for languages of home. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 55-71). New York: Routledge.
- Bickel, B. (2008). Who will read this body? An a/r/tographic statement. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 125-136). New York: Routledge.
- Cahnmann-Taylor, M. (2008). Arts-based research: Histories and new directions. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 3-15). New York: Routledge.
- Cahnmann-Taylor, M., & Siegesmund, R. (Eds.). (2008). *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Carroll, K. L. (1997). Researching paradigms in art education. In S. D. La Pierre & E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Research methods and methodologies for art education* (pp. 171-192). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Clark, R. (1998). Doors and mirrors in art education: Constructing the postmodernist classroom. *Art Education*, 51(6), 6-11.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *On the line*. [Johnston, J., Trans.] New York: Semiotext(e), Inc.
- Desai, D., & Chalmers, G. (2007). Notes for a dialogue on art education in critical times. *Art Education*, 60(5), 6-12.
- Dewey, J. (1989). Art as experience. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *John Dewey: The later works, 1925-1953* (pp. 1-400). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1934).
- Eisenhart, M., & Howe, K. (1992). Validity in educational research. In M. LeCompte, W. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 642-680). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (1965). Curriculum ideas in a time of crisis. *Art Education*, 18(7), 7-12.
- Eisner, E. W. (1997). The promise and perils of alternative forms of data representation. *Educational Researcher*, 26(6), 4-9.
- Eisner, E. W. (2008). Persistent tensions in arts-based research. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 16-27). New York: Routledge.
- Florentine Films (Producer), & Burns, K. (Director). (2000). *Jazz: The story of America's music* [Motion picture]. Washington, D.C.: PBS Home Video.
- Garoian, C. R. (1999). *Performing pedagogy: Toward an art of politics*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gerbner, G. (1995, November 28). *The problem is the problem*. Message originally posted to Comserve@vm.its.rpi.edu. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from <http://kerlins.net/bobbil/research/qualresearch/problem.html>
- Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality: An introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*, (pp. 1-51). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gude, O. (2007). Principles of possibility: Considerations for a 21st-century art & culture curriculum. *Art Education*, 60(1), 6-17.
- Irwin, R. L., & Springgay, S. (2008). A/r/tography as practice-based research. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 103-124). New York: Routledge.

- Jackson, A. Y. (2004). Performativity identified. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(5), 673-690.
- James, W. (1890/1952). *The principles of psychology*, 1. New York: Henry Holt.
- Kearney, R. (1988). *The wake of imagination: Toward a postmodern culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962/1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 257-277.
- Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34(4), 673-693.
- Leavy, P. (2009). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Leggo, C. (2008). The ecology of personal and professional experience: A poet's view. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 89-97). New York: Routledge.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry: The paradigm revolution*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- London, P. (1992). Art as transformation. *Art Education*, 45(3), 8-15.
- Macleod, K., & Holdridge, L. (Eds.). (2006). *Thinking through art: Reflections on art as research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, J. (2008). Visible thinking: Using contemporary art to teach conceptual skills. *Art Education*, 61(2), 38-45.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mullen, C. A. (2003). Guest editor's introduction: A self-fashioned gallery of aesthetic practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(2), 165-181.
- Nachmanovitch, S. (1990). *Free play: The power of improvisation in life and the arts*. New York: Tarcher/Putnam Books.
- Newton, R. M. (2005). Learning to teach in the shadows of 9/11: A portrait of two Arab American preservice teachers. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(1), 81-94.
- Olomo, O. O. & Jones, J. L. (2008). *sista docta, REDUX*. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 194-207). New York: Routledge.
- Pearse, H. (1983). Brother, can you spare a paradigm? The theory beneath the practice. *Studies in Art Education*, 24(3), 158-163.
- Pearse, H. (1992). Beyond paradigms: Art education theory and practice in a postparadigmatic world. *Studies in Art Education*, 33(4), 244-252.
- Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Rolling, J. H. (2006). Who is at the city gates? A surreptitious approach to curriculum-making in art education. *Art Education*, 59(6), 40-46.
- Rolling, J. H. (2008). Rethinking relevance in art education: Paradigm shifts and policy problematics in the wake of the Information age. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 9 (Interlude 1). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from <http://www.ijea.org/v9i1/>
- Sanders, J. H., III. (2006). Performing arts-based education research: An epic drama of practice, precursors, problems and possibilities. *Studies in Art Education*, 48(1), 89-107.
- Siegesmund, R., & Cahnmann-Taylor, M. (2008). The tensions of arts-based research in education reconsidered: The promise for practice. In M. Cahnmann-Taylor & R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice* (pp. 231-246). New York: Routledge.
- Slattery, P. (1995). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era*. New York & London: Garland Publishing.
- Slattery, P. (2001). The educational researcher as artist working within. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(3), 370-398.

- Springgay, S. (2002). Arts-based research as an uncertain text. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 48(3), 1-30.
- Steiner, G. (1989). *Real presences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stevens, W. (1954). *The collected poems of Wallace Stevens*. New York: Knopf.
- Sullivan, G. (2005). *Art practice as research: Inquiry in the visual arts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sullivan, G. (2006). Research acts in art practice. *Studies in Art Education*, 48(1), 19-35.
- Taylor, P. G., Wilder, S. O., & Helms, K. R. (2007). Walking with a ghost: Arts-based research, music videos, and the re-performing body. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 8(7). Retrieved March 12, 2008, from <http://ijea.asu.edu/v8n7/>
- Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wasson, R. F., Stuhr, P. L., & Petrovich-Mwaniki, L. (1990). Teaching art in the multicultural classroom: Six position statements. *Studies in Art Education*, 31(4), 234-246.
- West, C. (1991). Theory, pragmatisms, and politics. In J. Arac & B. Johnson (Eds.), *Consequences of theory* (pp. 22-38). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wilson, B. (1997). The second search: Metaphor, dimensions of meaning, and research topics in art education. In S. D. La Pierre & E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Research methods and methodologies for art education* (pp. 1-32). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

ENDNOTE

- 1 These four questions are: 1) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?, 2) How can learning experiences be selected which are likely to be useful in attaining these objectives?, 3) How can learning experiences be organized for effective instruction?, and 4) How can the effectiveness of learning experiences be evaluated? (Tyler, 1949, pp. v-vi).



COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

TITLE: A Paradigm Analysis of Arts-Based Research and
Implications for Education

SOURCE: Stud Art Educ 51 no2 Wint 2010

The magazine publisher is the copyright holder of this article and it is reproduced with permission. Further reproduction of this article in violation of the copyright is prohibited.