



**The Reading Matrix**  
**Vol. 7, No. 1, April 2007**

## **RECONSTRUCTING PRACTICE IN TEACHER EDUCATION THROUGH ARTMAKING**

**Peggy J. Anderson**

Peggy.anderson@wichita.edu

**Charles A. Peck**

capeck@u.washington.edu

### **Abstract**

---

Teacher educators are often challenged to demonstrate the same kinds of constructivist educational practices in their own teaching they so often recommend for public school educators. We report here on our efforts to reconstruct our university teaching practice through experiments with artmaking as a pedagogical strategy. Two case illustrations are provided which describe the contexts, process and outcomes of these efforts. We discuss our experiences with these “experiments” in practice as they suggest ways in which artmaking may function to enrich university coursework in teacher education, and as it has functioned to renew and deepen our work as teacher educators.

---

*“Standing before his own students, he reportedly behaved not at all as his theories might lead one to expect.”*

### **Introduction**

The foregoing lines, which many teacher educators might attribute to the tortured recriminations of their own conscience, were written by Phillip Jackson (1998, p.166) with reference to the teaching practice of John Dewey. The statement was not offered as an accusation, but as an acknowledgement of the pervasive tension between thinking and doing that characterizes the work of teaching. Jackson goes on to speculate, “Might the arts have come to Dewey’s rescue as a teacher?” In this paper we report on our own efforts to confront discrepancies between our theorizing and our teaching practice in the context of the work we do as teacher educators. Following the suggestions of Jackson (1998) and others (Eisner, 1996; Greene, 1997; Grumet, 1988; Sarason, 1999), we have used artmaking as a metaphor, and as a method, for exploring and reshaping our practice as teachers in higher education.

It is widely recognized that most public school teachers are currently under considerable pressure to “reconstruct” their teaching practice in response to changing theoretical perspectives on student learning (Cohen & Ball, 1990; Fosnot, 1996), changing professional standards for “best practice” (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics 1993), and changing policies regarding educational accountability. While academic scholars of education are often knowledgeable about these changes (many have emanated from university contexts), and well

able to articulate the theoretical and empirical issues underlying them, university educators are never-the-less often criticized by their students for failing to use the practices they passionately advocate for public school teachers (Rigden, 1996). In reflecting on our own practice as teacher educators--on the many ways in which we do not “walk our talk”, we have been challenged to think more deeply about what we do, what we believe, and what we value. Optimistically, we have considered our reflections not as recriminations, but as self talk which might scaffold a process of development (Vygotsky, 1978).

In this paper we describe two university teaching contexts in which we attempted to find ways to “walk our talk”. Some specific issues were of concern. First, we were concerned that many of the principles of “constructivist” teaching practice (Fosnot, 1996), which we routinely advocated in our teacher education programs, were not conspicuous in our own university teaching practice. These included development of a more active role for students in making decisions about curriculum, instruction and evaluation of learning, increased use of dialogical learning processes in the context of groupwork, and an overall emphasis on creating opportunities for students to make meaningful connections between the curriculum and concerns, experiences, and understandings they held about their own lives. A second, but related, issue of concern about our practice had to do with the incongruence between the ways in which we theorized cognition and competence in public school students (Eisner, 1999; Gardner, 1985) and the relatively narrow ways in which our own students were encouraged to construct and express meaning within the university classroom. In short, we wished to improve the ways in which our practice as teacher educators functioned as a context in which students actually *experienced* more of what we imagined education might become in their own classrooms as they became teachers. While such a goal might be approached through a wide variety of means, we chose to use *artmaking* as both a metaphor, and a method, by which our preservice teacher education students might examine their own construction of meaning in the classroom.

The suggestion that there are important connections between art and teaching, and that art can serve important functions within teacher education is not new. Articulate and compelling arguments to this effect have been offered by Greene (1997), Grumet (1988), Eisner (1996), Beyer (2000) and others. Many of these arguments can be gathered under assertions that: a) art enables one to discover more about one’s own experience, feeling and identity, b) art can enable one to understand more about the identity and experience of the “other”, and c) art enables one to imagine how the world might be changed. Even more basic claims about the functions of art and artmaking in the construction of meaning in daily life have been advanced by Dewey (1934), and elaborated by Jackson (1998) and Booth (1998).

Many advocates for the importance of the arts in teacher education have focused on the uses of artworks themselves, including major works of visual and literary art, as vehicles for imagining and engaging the experiences of “the other” (Beyer, 2000; Greene, 1995). Others have focused on preparing teachers to use the arts in the K-12 classroom (e.g., Goldberg, 2004; Upitus, Soren, & Smithrim, 1998). However, only a relatively few teacher educators have actually focused on *artmaking* as a pedagogical strategy in teacher education coursework. In one example of such an approach, Green (1998) described how she taught her education students to use performance art as a way of investigating cultural stereotypes, body image, ageism and other contemporary social issues. Students studied performance art examples, developed and performed their own artworks, and carried out detailed conceptual and aesthetic evaluations of their work. Green commented that this process allowed students to appreciate the ways in which art could be used to foster critical thinking, and to “imagine” possible reconstructions of the social world. McDermott (2002) used collage activities with preservice teachers as a means of assisting students to explore the relationships between their pedagogy and their perceptions of

themselves as teachers. Using data from collage projects, post-collage essays and interviews with the preservice teacher-artists, McDermott identified themes of “emergence”, “relationality” and “transformation” in students’ experiences. Emergence was characterized around students’ increased articulation of personal values, beliefs and commitments in their work as teachers. Relationality referred to students’ developing awareness of the ways in which their learning, their artwork and their teaching practice were built out of their experiences and relationships with others. The theme of transformation referred to changes in the ways students understood themselves and their relation to the world, particularly in the context of their work as teachers.

In another example of using artmaking as pedagogy, Hubbard (1996) described her use of a variety of drawing exercises with teacher education students as a tools for reflection about their experiences with teaching. Observing the discomfort experienced by many students when asked to break away from their reliance on verbal discourse as a primary means of exploring and expressing their understanding, Hubbard commented on the value of teacher educators directly participating in these activities with their students. She observed that artmaking experiences often served to broaden the perspectives of teachers, even when they did not choose to expand or continue these activities in their classrooms.

Considered together, these reports suggest the promise of an “arts-based pedagogy” for some aspects of teacher education. In the present paper, we describe our own efforts to experiment with arts-based approaches to our courses. We present two case illustrations of this approach, and draw on narrative data from fieldnotes, student freewrites, and course evaluations to characterize some specific kinds of educational outcomes we have observed among our students. Each of these cases are presented as a narrative in the first person--as “teacher stories” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995), reflecting our wish to underscore for the reader a sense of the personal context of this work, and the ways in which its meanings fit into our lives as teachers. We conclude the paper by examining some of the impacts of these experiences with artmaking on our understanding of ourselves as teachers, and on our practice as teacher educators.

### **Case 1:** **Teaching “The Social Contexts of Education” (Cap)**

A few years ago I found myself struggling with a sense of disconnection between the constructivist perspectives on learning and development I routinely urged upon my prospective teachers and the realities of my own teaching practice. I had certainly attempted to incorporate aspects of constructivism into my practice as a teacher educator: I often invited students to participate in defining their own learning goals, to actively use each other as sources of knowledge, and to actively participate in evaluation of their own learning. However, I still had a deep sense of being caught in an epistemological tradition in which the making of meaning was viewed as the responsibility and power of the teacher and the text. I felt that my students were not experiencing themselves, individually or collectively, as important sources of their own learning. I wanted to break out of what I felt intuitively was an epistemological and experiential box which both my students and I had defined as “school”--in this case the university classroom.

At the same time, I had personally been exploring, for the first time as an adult, both visual art and poetry as expressive processes. I was struck by the power art held for me personally as a means of investigating my own experience, and as a means of more richly apprehending the experiences of others. I had experimented in a limited way with inviting students to use art media to communicate their knowledge and understanding of teaching. I was struck by how strongly some students responded to the opportunity to use art to express what

they knew, and how the artwork they made led other students into rich and gratifying discussions about the complexities of teaching. My experiments and reflections about this motivated me to try a broader “experiment”—this time placing artmaking at the center of the knowledge construction process.

The institutional opportunity for this experiment came when I was assigned to teach a course (new to me) entitled “The Social Context of Education”. The ostensive purpose of this ten week, two credit course was to explicate the myriad societal factors which impact children’s participation and performance in school. Clearly, this was an impossible task. Rather than attempt to “cover” such a curriculum, I chose to create an inquiry-oriented process within the class which might teach students to question their assumptions about identity, society and learning, and to become more critical and reflective about how they saw themselves and their students. These challenges were, of course, particularly crucial to their perceptions of students who are members of groups historically marginalized by issues of race, class, gender, and (dis)ability.

### **The Course**

Instead of using an assortment of topical readings keyed to the many critical issues of concern to the course, or selecting a textbook which “covered” these, I chose four rich and holistic accounts of the lives of children and families marginalized by conditions of poverty, race, gender or (dis)ability (Bogdan & Taylor, 1994; Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Kozol, 1995; Janko, 1994). I then invited students to begin with one of these texts according to their interest, and I organized them into student-directed “literature response circles” (LRCs) of about four to six individuals each (Daniels, 1994). Each LRC was charged with developing an aesthetic representation of some connection they had made with the reading, either in their personal lives or in their teaching. Students were invited to collaborate on presentations if they wished. Three LRC cycles were planned for the ten weeks of the course; students chose a new book and formed new groups after each cycle. As the course progressed, students were invited to initiate LRC’s on additional books of their choosing. We devoted about half of our class time to LRC discussions. In addition to the LRCs, I offered a series of short presentations on topics related to the course, and invited guest speakers who had experience with many of the issues we were studying. I created my role in the class as one of facilitation, and I deliberately chose to avoid any direct participation in the LRCs until they were well underway. I wanted students to discuss what they thought important, not what they perceived I thought important. Similarly, while I wanted to participate in the artmaking process myself, I chose not to do this until the end of the course because I did not want to “model” a specific way of responding to the books, discussions and experiences surrounding them. I occasionally read poems I had written in the context of my own experiences with teaching and school life as a means of showing students that I was not standing “outside” the process of taking some risks and sharing more of who I was as a person in the context of our class.

I regularly jotted field notes as I observed the LRCs, class presentations and other activities. In addition, I asked students weekly to write short reflections (anonymous) on what they were experiencing in the course. I reviewed these data each week as I planned the next class session. Finally, I asked students to write narrative evaluations of the course as a supplement to the standard quantitative evaluation questionnaires employed by the university.

### **What Happened...**

Talk in the LRC's quickly became animated, as students connected aspects of their own experience with the lives of children and their families described in the books they were reading. Conflicts arose as students struggled to listen to the stories which were told by one another, and as they interpreted what they were reading. A recurring theme in the reflective writing they did after these discussions had to do with the great value they placed on dialogue and personal story as a learning process. While they had read about epistemologies of personal narrative (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995), now they were noticing and reflecting on how these processes worked in their own lives. One student commented: *"We wove our life experiences into the story the book was telling. The conversation fit into the pages of the book...but it took on a life of it's own."*

As we moved into the presentation of artworks, students and I were at first rather stunned by what had been created. Students presented collages, paintings, sculpture, dance, poetry and many other artworks. One group of women, reading Brown and Gilligan's account of the loss of voice experienced by many adolescent girls, had made a quilt, each panel of which was a personal message from one of the women to an adolescent girl. Many students wept openly as painful connections were made between the lives they read about, and their own. One wrote, *"Last week following the presentations I was exhausted and drained. It was an experience to see how strongly my classmates felt. I was touched deeply by the expression through art."*

Others commented on how the artmaking process had invited them to express themselves in important ways:

*I really appreciate the chance to express ourselves in a way that is not traditional in the university. It allowed me to explore the books at many levels beyond the academic.*

*The presentations allow me to bring more of who I am to class.*

*It was personal, and it was risky, but I learned to express myself in new ways—it's been liberating.*

I had my own experiences with these presentations. One was that I found myself astounded and confronted by how much I learned about who my students were as people. I noticed, with considerable anguish, how much of themselves they had routinely "checked at the door" of the university classroom. I also noticed that some students who had been relatively quiet in previous classes were now stepping to the front of the class, and assuming positions of authority and leadership. I made this fieldnote during one of the presentations:

*Sarah has shown an entirely new side of herself here. She is usually so quiet, but now she has the rapt attention of everyone in the room. I had no idea what a gift for drama she had. I can see that others, too, are surprised at her power.*

Not every student embraced the opportunity to express what they knew through art. Some expressed anger and even a sense of betrayal as we broke traditional rules about school. I took this opportunity to make connections between what these students were experiencing and what many students in public school experience on a daily basis as they are asked to represent their knowledge through means in which they feel incompetent and insecure. By the end of the third cycle of LRCs virtually all of these teacher education students had found some way to connect with this process, either individually or through participation in collaborative artworks.

### **Outcomes and Evaluations**

It is difficult to trace the impact of university coursework on the subsequent careers of teacher education students. By the measures commonly employed by the university to evaluate courses, the Social Context of Education was evaluated as highly as possible (virtually

unanimous student ratings of “5” on five point scales evaluating the merit of the course). Comments of students in their self-evaluations said more:

*I have never felt so involved and touched by work I have been required to do in and outside of class. I believe I will be entering the teaching profession on a different path as a result of what I learned about myself, and the incredible lives of the people we read about.*

*I’m learning so much about myself...beliefs I’ve held for as long as I can remember. I find that I can no longer ignore these heavy, intense social issues, or write them off with simplistic, even ignorant answers. So this class, more than any other, I think, will have a lasting effect not only on my teaching, but on my personal beliefs and attitudes.*

*The connections were so emotionally powerful that my intellectual understanding has taken a back seat to feelings, images, and gut reactions. I have to say I learned more about being a teacher, a human being, in this class than in any educational experience I have had.*

As a teacher, I did not stand outside this process of change. Indeed, one student wrote: “Everyone was a teacher and a learner in this class: especially me, especially you”. I was confronted by my own assumptions about who students were, and the many ways my own teaching practice had limited students’ ability to express their understanding and insight about the world. I found that my way of seeing my students, seeing my teaching practice, and seeing myself as a teacher were changed profoundly. As Karen Gallas has written: “Once one looks imaginally at the classroom, one ONLY has the ability to look imaginally” (Gallas, 1994, p.148). Clearly, the artmaking process has opened my students, and myself, to a much larger sense of possibility about the connections between our selves, each other, and the work we do as teachers.

### **Case 2:** **Assessing the Knowledge Base in** **Second Language Acquisition (Peggy)**

Students are the first to perceive a gap between what we, as teacher educators, say and what we do. Our commitment to our principles is often transparent to those who sit in our classes, whether it is in the teaching methodology we advocate (but don’t practice), the learning principles we espouse (but don’t employ), or the assessments we endorse (but don’t use). I knew very well that if students perceived a mismatch, they might abandon--or never receive--the message.

As I reflected on my own teaching a few years ago, I began to discover areas where I fell short of my goal of modeling what I believed. I was a strong advocate of constructivist philosophy, multiple intelligences, and arts-based approaches to learning. Outside of academia, I had discovered the satisfaction that comes from creating in art, particularly in weaving, song writing and performing. I experienced a form of self-expression that I had rarely found in my world of work. Yet, that was my personal life and my classes were in the domain of my professional life. I struggled over whether it was possible, and, if so, how it might be possible to bring these two worlds together.

I had made attempts to use collaborative group activities and a variety of media for presentations within my classes; but, upon reflection, I saw that these attempts were motivated mostly at enhancing my own teaching style. What I was missing was a greater focus on the learner and assessments of learning that modeled my epistemology. I can’t say I wasn’t a little intimidated by the idea of transferring more control over learning and assessment to students, but there was no turning back—my toe was in the water. I knew I had to be true to myself if I wanted to expect teachers to carry that same commitment into their classrooms. Since new district guidelines for assessment, and an emphasis on rubrics, were taking root in the large urban district from which many of my students came, I thought I would begin my reform efforts

with assessment as well. My first attempt was in a Second Language Acquisition Course which had enrolled around 50 students, 95% of whom were teachers already. The course was in the College of Education as part of a block of courses required for English-as-a-second-language endorsement.

I wanted to find a way to assess students through a multidimensional, multiple intelligence-based, arts-based approach. I decided that Gardner's (1985) theory could provide a framework that most students/teachers had already been exposed to and with which they were relatively familiar. I also wanted the process of creating the assessment activity and instrument to reflect a constructivist philosophy. I will describe below the process I went through in designing it, as well as some of the results.

#### The Process

On the day I introduced this plan in which the students were going to be asked to help design their own assessment activity and rubric, I asked students to form groups based on what they believed their strongest intelligence was. We had eight groups, one for each of what Gardner claims as intelligences. Each group was composed of at least five students. I then gave each group a copy of an initial draft of a series of projects (see Appendix A.) and asked them to: (1) Examine all of the projects that were listed under the intelligence represented by their group. Together, modify, improve, change, or add to the projects so that each might best allow students who select it to best tap into that designated intelligence; (2) Examine the overall scoring rubric (see Appendix B), make changes to reflect what they felt was a fair expectation, and (3) set a due date. After approximately thirty minutes, the class reported their changes. The changes were, by in large, more interesting and creative than I would have imagined. I agreed with most, but not all of the changes they suggested. In a friendly spirit of negotiation and compromise, we came to a consensus on all issues.

#### Student Reactions

At various times, I asked students to reflect on the experience of creating the assessment, the process of doing the projects, as well as what they might have learned within as well as beyond the targeted knowledge units. Some students came by or called to ask for clarification on the content entailed in the knowledge base. One student laughed and said, *"This is going to be hard. I can't just memorize the information or quickly put together a paper the night before the due date."* They knew they had to understand the concepts in order to do the projects. The tasks were demanding and yet, doing them, appeared to be unanimously well received. The overall course rating also showed an average of 4.4 on a 5-point scale. From a class of 50 students, most of whom were in the class at their district's request, and at their district's expense, this was more than I had expected. Student evaluation comments were even more informative. Many centered around their personal involvement in the class,

*"I was able to express my ideas and 'experience' knowledge."*

*"I really had to think and rethink about my own life and teaching."*

*"I feel that there was much more of 'me' in the work."*

*"It forced me out of my comfort zones."*

Other student comments focused on what they learned beyond the content,

*"This approach gave me a more holistic view of learning."*

*"I learned to value the differences in people's learning styles."*

*"It forced me to 'walk in someone else's shoes', so to speak."*

*"There aren't enough words or enough space to describe what I have learned from this approach."*

A third category of comments referred to the depth of what they learned

*“I gained a deeper knowledge of the course content than I would ever have from a more typical class.”*

*“I have no doubt I learned and retained more from this experience.”*

I have seldom heard these kinds of comments about any other final exam I have given. I also discovered that rather than dreading a stack of 50 term papers, I couldn't wait to explore the intricacies of the creative and artful projects made by this class.

### **My Reactions**

I made field notes and observations after each part of the process. In my notes following the creating of the assessment, I wrote, *“The act of creating the exam was an aesthetic experience itself in ‘surrendering to the unexpected possibilities’*. I observed on several occasions my surprise at how students revealed sides of themselves that had not been apparent before. For example, I wrote: *“I was amazed that Linda asked to sing her rap for the whole class. She has seldom spoken in class before, and certainly didn't look like a performer!”* On another occasion, I wrote: *“I've never seen so many students who are begging to allow more time to share what they have made—it sure seems like the students are experiencing great satisfaction from their efforts.”*

### **Discussion**

While the idea that it is important to teach *about* the arts is commonplace, the notion of teaching *through* the arts, particularly in teacher education, is not. Eisner (1999) has eloquently articulated the lessons that the arts teach. He suggests that they teach that (a) judgement rather than rule prevails; (b) problems have more than one solution and that questions have more than one answer; (c) small differences can have a large effect; (d) everything affects everything else. In addition, he submits that art (a) has the capacity to move us, (b) creates an experience through which we may begin an inquiry, (c) helps us to think metaphorically, (d) helps us develop empathy, (e) moves us from one-dimensional words on paper to three-dimensional spaces, and (f) changes us from a focus on parts to a focus on the parts' relationship to the whole. We saw evidence of all of these outcomes in the works students presented in our arts-based teacher education courses. In addition, we believe our data support some more specific assertions about the function of artmaking in these courses.

First, our data suggest that artmaking invited these students to construct richer and more personal meanings about their coursework than is common in teacher education--and in the university in general. As the quotes from students in both of these courses show clearly, the value of such an experience for prospective teachers is significant in shaping their ideals and goals for their own practice as teachers. Sadly, it is rather uncommon for teachers to refer to their experiences in teacher education courses as setting standards toward which they might aspire in their own teaching (Rigden, 1996).

A second, and closely related function artmaking served in these courses was the engagement of emotion in the learning process (Eisner, 1999). Many students commented on the importance of this, and on the ways in which emotion was typically distanced in university coursework. While abstraction and emotional distancing may be useful in some kinds of cognitive processes--our experiences with these courses (including both feedback from our students and our own responses) suggest that the artmaking process *moved* us, just as Eisner has claimed. This had a tremendous motivational effect on students, many of whom commented that these courses stimulated greater investment and involvement than any they had previously undertaken.



Third, we believe our data support the claim of Greene (1997) and others that the arts can facilitate teachers' imaginal engagement with the lives led by children and their families who are marginalized by issues of social class, race, gender, (dis)ability and sexual orientation. Many of the our teacher education students who were relatively underprepared for careers serving students from diverse social backgrounds, races and cultures, were particularly impacted by their experiences in these courses. The concrete and visceral experiences which were mediated by the artmaking process were in many cases cited by students as among the most important they had in their teacher preparation work.

Fourth, our experience with these courses suggests that expanding the means by which students are invited to articulate what they are learning beyond the traditional verbal/linguistic and logical/mathematical "voices" had a substantial impact on the visibility, power, and status of many students. Students who had been relatively silent and passive in classroom discussions sometimes emerged as powerful leaders when they were invited to use art as a means of communicating what they felt and understood. In other cases, students who had dominated verbal exchanges in the class became much less visible and influential. We view both of these experiences as of great potential value to the individuals involved, and also to other class members, as a very concrete example of the ways in which the competence of some students may be obscured by the narrowness of the means they are allowed to use to express what they know in school (Gardner, 1985).

Finally, our experiences with these courses have sensitized us to the ways in which artmaking consistently raises questions about "Who am I"? , that we believe are critical for teachers to engage. We observed the process of constructing aesthetic representations of knowledge and experience to lead our students again and again into important reconsiderations of the ways in which their ideas about themselves are intertwined with their perception and understanding of others. In the context of teacher education, these issues become critical for individuals who must come to some deeper understanding of who they are in the context of their work with students and others: (Britzman, 1992; Diamond, 1993; Van Manen, 1994). As teachers ourselves, we were very much a part of this process . Our experiments with artmaking in our courses have forced us to reconsider who we are, and who others might be as well.

The changes represented in these two cases grew from an attempt to reconnect the intellect with the senses—the rational mind and the perceptive mind—the head, the heart and the hand. Both cases represent a move toward integration of content, experience, and aesthetic expression within a traditional academic setting. The cases "embody" our constructivist theorizing. By this we mean that the cases represent our attempt to make something (artfully) out of our ideas and beliefs about teaching and learning, using the concrete materials which constitute our *practice* of teaching. Through the infusion of aesthetic elements into university teacher education courses, we believe we are learning how to (a) let learning happen more holistically, (b) engage students' cognitive and emotional faculties in the learning process, (c) create a means for discovering the individual signatures of students, and (d) better hear the many diverse, and often silent, voices in their classrooms. These are the same qualities we hope to see in the teaching practice of our graduates.

## References

- Beyer, L. (2000). *The arts, popular culture, and social change*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. (1994) *The social meaning of mental retardation: Two life stories*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Booth, E. (1999). *The everyday work of art*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.
- Britzman, D. (1992). The terrible problem of knowing thyself: Toward a poststructural account of teacher identity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 9 (3), 23-46.
- Brown, L., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, D., & Ball, D. (1990). Policy and practice: An overview. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12, 347-353.
- Daniels, H. (1994). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in the student-centered classroom*. York, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Capricorn Books.
- Diamond, C.P.(1993). Writing to reclaim the self: The use of narrative in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9, 511-517..
- Eisner, E. (1996). Is the “art of teaching” a metaphor? In M. Kompf, W. Bond, D. Dworet, & R. Boak, (Eds.), *Changing research and practice: Teachers' professionalism, identities, and knowledge*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Eisner, E. (1999). *The kind of schools we need: Personal essays*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fosnot, C. (1996). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gallas, K. (1995). *The languages of learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gardner, H. (1985). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goldberg, M. (2004). *Teaching English language learners through the arts*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Greene, M. (1997). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter Milk: Women and teaching*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Hubbard, R. (1996). Reclaiming the power of visual thinking with adult learners. In R. Hubbard & K. Ernst, (Ed.s) *New entries: Learning by writing and drawing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Jackson, P. (1998). *John Dewey and the lessons of art*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
- Janko, S. (1994). *Vulnerable children, vulnerable families: The social construction of child abuse*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kozol, J. (1995). *Amazing Grace: The lives of children and the conscience of a nation*. New York: Crown Press.
- Little, J. (1993) Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15, 129-151.
- McDermott, M. (2002). Collaging preservice teacher identity. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29 (4), 53-68.
- Rigden, D. (1996, Dec. 11). How teachers would change teacher education. *Education Week*, 4-5.
- Sarason, S. (1999). *Teaching as performance art*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Upitus, R., Sorne, B., & Smithrim, K. (1998, April) Teacher transformation through the arts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Diego.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Peggy J. Anderson, Associate Professor at Wichita State University, specializes in Applied Linguistics and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. She is excited by the potential of artmaking in college classrooms, and believes we have merely scratched the surface in understanding the positive impact that art can have in educational research and teacher education. Dr. Anderson has recently been appointed as Series Editor of a 13-Volume series, TESOL Classroom Practice Series, currently in development. She can be contacted at Wichita State University, 1845 Fairmount, Wichita, KS 67260-0028. Telephone: 316-978-6872. Email: peggy.anderson@wichita.edu

Charles (Cap) Peck began his career in education as an instructional aide working with children with severe multiple disabilities. He earned teacher certification in special education and elementary education from Sonoma State University, and subsequently worked as a preschool teacher of children with autism for several years. He earned the doctorate in education from UC Santa Barbara in 1984. His current research interests focus on the pedagogy of teacher education, and the use of arts-based research strategies within teacher self-study and inquiry processes. He currently serves as Professor and Director of Teacher Education at University of Washington.