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The role of art in contemporary society has been defined, analyzed, and criticized by a parade of experts, both self-appointed and widely renowned. Opinions are distributed over a broad spectrum. Some charge that contemporary art has been too demonstrated and should be returned to a role of serving a sophisticated clientele. Others advocate a role for art in society of clear and simple communication by trained professionals toward a mass of appreciators (Edgar, 1968). Another expert element claims that the arts cannot be in tune with society until all persons have the opportunity to become active in creating art objects (Rugg and Shumaker, 1928; Dewey, 1934).

Measures of the role of art in contemporary society are diverse and generally inconclusive. The importance of art can be measured in the economic realm in terms of the volume of sales on the collectors' market or the fluctuations in sales of art materials. Inferences may be drawn in the institutional realm, from the size of museum patronage and attendance or from the growth of civic art organizations. Governmental indicators of social art interest could be seen in sponsorship of the arts, although govern-
ment support usually occurs long after social trends have become visible (Dennis, 1968). Educationally, the importance of the arts in society may be indicated by shifts in emphasis of public school art curriculum, by increases in university liberal arts and professional art program enrollments or by the proliferation of community education course offerings in art ranging from basic drawing to faddish art activities. Whatever the evaluation, the multiple roles of art in society have intrigued artist, anthropologist, sociologist, psychologist and educator. Each professional group has its own motivations for attempting to assess the level and direction of society's needs in the field of art.

The identification of each student's goals, understandings and skills is one of the most basic tasks to be accomplished by educators in art today (Watts, 1970). Whatever the instructor's pedagogical stance, the learning experience presented to the student will be seen by that student in terms of personal experiences and goals (Mattil, 1968). Growth for the student involves modifying and expanding his goals, understandings and skills. Therefore, it is the charge and sometime privilege of the artist-educator to become the catalyst for change, eventually preparing the student for a long-term, enthusiastic involvement with art; to value art in the context used by Ben Shahn:

What then are our values? Our values are presumably those things which we hold most dear. They are those matters which call forth our most enthusiastic participation (baseball, philosophy, skiing, music), or those things toward which we are most compassionate (children,
stray cats, the small businessman), or those beliefs in the light of which we behave this way or that (religion, or being a Democrat), accepting some situations, strongly rejecting others. (Shahn, The Shape of Content, 1957, p. 108).

Shahn allows for levels and styles of valuing: enthusiastic participation, compassion or appreciation, critical beliefs. Ideally, the artist-educator allows for such variations in style and level while striving to promote and encourage the valuation of art in each student's life style.

**Visual Arts Education**

This study has explored the impact upon students of Basic Design, a prerequisite course offered by many Oregon post-secondary institutions of public education as a primary experience in the visual arts. The concern here is with the extent to which the Basic Design course fulfills its promise in acquainting students with the fundamentals of design through exposure and participation so as to initiate or intensify a long-term involvement of students as appreciators and/or manipulators in the visual arts.

Can such abstracts as interest level or valuation of the visual arts be measured? What indications exist that the Basic Design student appreciates the fundamentals for more than the time required to get credit for the course? Furthermore, how can the student be expected to appreciate fully the meaning of "the fundamentals" until time has permitted him to explore, apply and interpret the knowledge? How soon does a high value on the visual arts
begin to affect one's behavior?

One type of response to these questions can be derived from surveying both students and faculty when they are involved in Basic Design. Such responses have been obtained in recent years through course evaluation forms circulated in most Oregon schools of post-secondary education. While such data are a poor measure of cognitive or psycho-motor student progress, they yield a current measure of the affective state of student thinking about the course, the instructor and the subject matter.

Another indication of the impact of Basic Design experience would be available through a survey of instructors of advanced art courses who work with students who have completed Basic Design. Risks associated with this type of investigation include the possibility that the survey might take on the appearance of a witch hunt as the effectiveness of individual instructors came into question.

By surveying former Basic Design students five years after participation in the course, continuing interest in the visual arts could be determined. Levels of post-collegiate art activity are a measure of the affective impact of collegiate art training. This study has been an attempt to measure the frequency of visual arts activity undertaken by former Basic Design students during the year 1973-74. A study of the degree and quality of participation in visual arts activities was not undertaken due to the technical problems associated with quantification of such activities.
The study of Basic Design should foster an active interest in visual art for both art majors and non-majors. The impact of the course should be visible in the frequency with which they pursue some contact with the visual arts.

The Objectives

This investigation was conducted to fulfill three main objectives. Each was dependent upon adequate fulfillment of the others.

The first objective called for the development of a survey instrument that would perform two functions: first, the gathering of background data describing both the sample population and the Basic Design courses being studied; second, the collection of data adequate to the fulfillment of the second and third objectives.

The second objective involved the measurement of interest in the visual arts, based upon frequency of participation in ten selected performance indicators, by former Basic Design students, five years after their Basic Design classes, and by a group of former fellow students who earned no art credits. Frequency distributions were to be compared between former art students and non-art students as well as between subgroups by campus, by major areas of study and by total art credits earned. Interest levels in art as stated by the Basic Design respondents were to be compared with interest levels based upon frequency of participation in the performance indicators.
The third objective was to determine former Basic Design students' evaluations of the course through their ratings of overall course quality and their valuations of specific aspects of the course in terms of the total group and for the subgroups described in the second objective including the art interest level groups. The course evaluation was to be completed by determining whether a correlation existed between ratings of the overall course quality and ratings of each of the aspects of the Basic Design course for total art group and for subgroups by campus, by art credits earned and by art interest level groups.

Definition of Terms

**ART** - This term remained undefined throughout the survey instrument design. Communication with the sample population on the subjects of art interest and art activities was totally dependent upon their preconceived notions of the meaning of art.¹ For clarification of the researcher's understanding of the term art as applied to the visual arts, see McFee, *Preparation for Art*: "That form of human behavior by which man purposefully interprets or enhances the quality or essence of experience through the things he produces." (p. 395) Similar definitions are offered by Ocvirk, *Art Fundamentals*, (p. 6) and by *The American Heritage Dictionary* (1969).

¹Mahoney resolved the same problem in similar fashion as described in the Foreword to *The Arts on Campus*, Mahoney, 1970.
OSSHE - Oregon State System of Higher Education is the state agency governing the universities in this study.

LBCC - Linn-Benton Community College is a comprehensive two-year college located in Albany, Oregon.

OSU - Oregon State University is located in Corvallis, Oregon.

U of O - The University of Oregon is located in Eugene, Oregon.

Science Majors - Those respondents listing collegiate majors in pure or applied sciences, including agriculture and forestry, were grouped under this heading.

Humanities Majors - Respondents reporting collegiate majors in liberal studies and human services, including education, home economics and journalism, were grouped under this heading.

Art Majors - Respondents reporting majors in both fine or applied arts including architecture and art education were grouped under this heading.

Art Group - This term was used to refer to all respondents who took Basic Design as opposed to those who took no collegiate art credits.

Non-art Group - The group of respondents who earned no collegiate art credits were identified by this term.

Target Year - The school year 1968-69 during which the art group was enrolled in Basic Design was identified by this term.

Survey Year - The school year 1973-74 was the period during which respondents described their frequency of art activity and answered the questionnaire.
CHAPTER 2

RATIONALE

Art in American Post-Secondary Education

The position of art in post-secondary or university curricula has shifted from that of a minor appendage (Christ-Janer & Wickiser, 1968) to a more central element in liberal education. University art courses were once directed toward art appreciation with little stress on creation. During the last three decades, training for active involvement in the visual arts has become a major emphasis. Universities are carrying the responsibility for training most of the professional artists in today's society (Dennis, 1968).

As the importance of art in the college curriculum has been recognized, and as the cost of higher education has increased, inquiries and criticisms have been leveled at the quality and effectiveness of art programs. During 1967 and 1968, a major investigation was conducted by the American Association for Higher Education.² The findings, edited by Lawrence E. Dennis and Renate M. Jacob, indicated such problems as poor administrative support for most art programs, isolation of art departments from the rest of the university community, inadequate policy to encourage the creative student to enter art programs, insufficient efforts by

²The report was funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, the Christian Faith and Higher Education Institute of East Lansing, Mich. and the National Education Association. (See Dennis, 1968)
leaders of the educational community to strengthen education in the arts and inability to maintain an atmosphere attractive to the professional artist as campus educator. There were five recommendations:

1. Establishment of a National Commission on the Arts in Education.

2. Establishment of continuing seminars, on a regional basis, involving secondary school guidance counselors, college and university admissions officers, and representatives of both professional associations in the arts and institutional programs in the arts.

3. Establishment of regional creativity test centers.

4. Development of new courses, curricula and instructional materials in the arts at both the secondary school and college levels.

5. Research on public attitudes toward the arts.

The last two were of particular importance to this study. The need for research on public attitudes toward the arts and the need for the development of new courses, curricula and instructional materials in the arts were cited.

Another significant inquiry was published in 1970, entitled The Arts on Campus: the necessity for change. (Mahoney and others, 1970) While this work generally paralleled that of Dennis, it was distinctive for the detail with which the various contributors explored existing arts programs, teaching methods and their roles in community and education. Proposals for change were delineated with attendant rationale by each contributor. While some ideas were contradictory, all were worthy of analysis.
These works have been the major efforts in a stream of current articles indicating the need for concern, evaluation and change in college and university visual arts curricula. Most such writing has referred to the social context of art. Except for the recommendations of the American Association for Higher Education little mention has been made of the need to identify what that context is in contemporary society. Most such writers have cited the need for greater relevance in curriculum design and made direct proposals for change. Few authors have mentioned asking students, current or recent, about their goals. A few writers, like John Roush and Robert Watts (Mahoney, 1970), have called for beginning with the student, his goals and expressed needs and working toward a greater maturity and wider vision as the student grows.

Another area of concern has dealt with the grouping of students in art courses. There has been disagreement over whether to segregate majors and non-majors in the art department. Such writers as Holbrook (1970) have alluded to long-standing opposition at some schools to allowing non-art majors into the 'professional art programs'. Yet, a large number of artist-educators would agree with Christ-Janer and Wickiser who argue:

---

3 A parallel work by Jean Creedy, The Social Context of Art, reveals British problems of a remarkably similar nature. (Creedy, 1970)
If the arts and the other disciplines are to become indispensable partners in fact, an educational program should be developed that allows this partnership to benefit all, not merely the interested few who have predilections for the arts. The very real possibility of discovering the talents of many students in the complex university or the liberal arts college is challenging - so many latent abilities may there be unearthed." (Christ-Janer and Wickiser, The Arts in Higher Education, 1968, p. 57).

Where better could this process begin than in a Basic Design course?

**History of the Basic Design Course in OSSHE**

In 1919, the University of Oregon offered a course called Elementary Design for non-majors as well as majors in Architecture and Normal Art. This course in the "theory and structure of the space arts" offered laboratory experience in "pure design" plus an opportunity to apply the pure design principles "to some form of industrial art or craft, such as linoleum printing of cards and bookplates, enameling of boxes, etc." (University of Oregon Bulletin, 1919-20, p. 228). The following year, under the tutelage of Maude Kerns, the course title was changed to Design I and the lab experience was expanded to include woodcuts, embroidery, lampshades, lettering and posters. In 1947 the title was changed to Basic Design. Through the years emphasis in content swung back and forth between serving the needs of pre-architecture students and the needs of fine arts majors, applied arts majors, art education majors, and non-art majors. The breadth of student population and the general nature of course content provided recurring
frustrations to the art faculty. The teaching load was shared by faculty from many sections of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts.

In 1948, Oregon State College \(^4\) initiated a Basic Design course patterned after the one at the University of Oregon. \(^5\) A young instructor was transferred from the U of O staff to introduce the first Basic Design classes at the Corvallis school (Interview with Gilkey, 1974). Color and Composition, a pre-existing service course for home economics majors, was continued at the request of the School of Home Economics. Since 1964, home economics majors have enrolled in Basic Design and/or Intro. to Visual Arts for their art orientation course. Other schools at OSU also depend on the Basic Design

\(^4\) Later designated Oregon State University.

\(^5\) 1948 Course Descriptions for Basic Design

University of Oregon
AA 195 Basic Design 2 hrs/any term
No-grade course. Through individual projects in a series of studio assignments, the student achieves an understanding of design in the basic visual arts, and a familiarity with all the professional fields of the school. Three terms required of all majors as a pre-requisite to specialization. Correlated with Survey of Visual Arts (AA 114, 115, 116).

Oregon State University 2 hrs/any term
AA 195 Basic Design
Instruction through individual projects leading to creative mastery of basic design in the major visual arts and an understanding of the design factors involved in the various professional art fields. Three terms required for all students who expect to major in art, architecture, interior design or landscape architecture at the University of Oregon. Work is correlated with that of AA 114, 115, 116 - Survey of Visual Arts.
course to prepare their students to use the fundamentals of design effectively.

Through similar transfers of U of O trained faculty, the Basic Design concept spread. Portland State College introduced the course in 1958.

In 1965, legislation was passed\(^6\) that bolstered the community college movement in Oregon and numerous new community colleges were formed. Basic Design was among the first college transfer art courses offered at most of the new schools. State guidelines were adopted by the Oregon State Department of Higher Education providing common course descriptions for college transfer courses offered at community colleges. The entry for Basic Design during the target year follows.

Art 195, 196, 197  Basic Design  2 hrs. each term  
A 3-term introductory sequence, a series of studio participation exercises involving the basic principles of design. Two hour studio-lecture with outside assignments.  
(Transfer Curricula, OSSHE, 1968, p. 13)

Basic Design was listed as a transfer requirement for particular majors at several state supported 4-year colleges. (See Table I)

\(^6\)First known as SJR-6, this legislation has been revised and is now ORS 341.009.
TABLE I. Major programs requiring Basic Designs at state colleges and universities, 1968-69. (Transfer Curricula, OSSHE, #26:27-28 and 54 and 57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR PROGRAM</th>
<th>U of O</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOC*</th>
<th>OCE*</th>
<th>EOC*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SOC - Southern Oregon College at Ashland, Oregon  
OCE - Oregon College of Education at Monmouth, Oregon  
EOC - Eastern Oregon College at La Grande, Oregon

From the common origin at the U of O, Basic Design had become an institution at many state post-secondary schools. By 1968, a divergence had set in that was revealed most immediately in the target year catalog course descriptions from the U of O, OSU and LBCC. (see Appendix I). How much difference in goals, content, methods and grading, developed between schools and between instructors? This investigation has measured part of the impact of those differences on students.

Role of Basic Design

From year to year and school to school, the Basic Design course has been expected to fulfill varying functions for administration, faculty and students (staff interviews, 1974). Certain of these have become fairly common.

For administration, the course has served as equalizer of
student preparedness and as a filter, eliminating a portion of the student load through survival of the fittest.\textsuperscript{7} For faculty, Basic Design has provided an opportunity to identify new student capabilities and to explore methods of teaching fundamentals of the visual arts. The faculty has anticipated that Basic Design would free them from the need to reiterate art fundamentals in the more advanced classes. They have counted on the course to provide an elementary set of awareness and skills fundamental to understanding and practice in all phases of the visual arts. For students, Basic Design has been expected to fulfill many roles. For non-art majors, it has often proved to be the only collegiate training in the visual arts. For art majors, the course has been a first step into professional art training or a review of familiar territory, depending on the student's previous experience. Art majors have expected Basic Design to act as catalyst, converting young freshmen into active, questing sophomores ready to pursue a life of appreciation and expression in the visual arts.

That expectations and actual practice have often differed is hardly surprising. Throughout higher education the basic courses (whether they be English Composition, Basic Mathematics or General

\textsuperscript{7}Mattil is critical of use of basic courses as prohibitive experiences. He cites a general acceptance of that function of the course in "The Visual Arts in Higher Education" (Dennis, 1968) where it is frankly suggested that "the really able student will not be deterred by a wretched introductory course or by a boring survey. If he has the stamina to suffer through them, he is likely to preserve to the end."
Biology) have often been the focus of frustration and dissention. Who should teach them? How rigid shall the content be? What will be the basis of evaluation? How can heavy enrollments be managed?

Summary of Rationale

The problems to be faced in the management of content, teaching methods, enrollment and overall goals of the Basic Design courses in Oregon have been similar to those identified across the nation. The visual arts in higher education have been undergoing scrutiny.

The necessity for change is not new. Since the U of O's first Elementary Design course met in 1919, course descriptions, student populations, course content and teaching strategies have fluctuated. Basic Design has been a "service course" for education, home economics, journalism and liberal arts. It has been an introductory requirement for fine arts, art history, architecture, and landscape architecture. Teaching methods have run the gamut from highly organized exercises through loosely structured group projects to rambling discussions. Responsibility for instruction has rested upon graduate assistants and full professors, on architects, sculptors and painters, on weavers, jewelers and print-makers, on ceramicists, photographers and even a few designers.

Theoretically, the needs of Basic Design students can be well met by conscientious, capable artist-educators no matter what their titles or specialties because the goals of the course are funda-
mental to design in all areas of visual arts. This study has been conducted in the belief that the ideal described above seldom exists, that the role of Basic Design is a valid and important one, that worthwhile changes in the course should be based, in part, on student evaluation. A continuing study of former Basic Design students is a logical method of identifying the impact of existing courses and the extent to which those courses have fulfilled the immediate needs of students.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD OF STUDY

The Research Plan

Selection of the size and limits of this research was governed by several technical factors. Identification and access to a specific population of former Basic Design students was a major problem.

Selection of a follow-up interval of five years was decided upon for several reasons. Five years after taking Basic Design, most persons are out of artificial student schedules and able to exercise greater control over the use of their time for the pursuit of art interests. Measurement of art interest could be considered a more valid reflection of collegiate experience at five years than at some later time when more intervening variables could be expected to have influenced the former student's values. Efforts at address retrieval were more apt to be successful with the short interval. Thus, the Basic Design students enrolled during the 1968-69 school year were adopted as the survey population.

A second problem involved the size and number of schools of higher education from which to draw a sample population. Ideally, campuses selected should represent all types of post-secondary schools where the curriculum included a lower division, fundamental design course. Realistic management of search efforts led to the selection of one community college, one four year university that
offered a full undergraduate visual arts program and one four year university that offered undergraduate and graduate degree programs in fine and applied arts.

Having selected a five year follow-up interval among former students from Linn-Benton Community College, Oregon State University, and the University of Oregon, it was then possible to conduct a feasibility study of a specific nature.

Limitations and Possibilities

Cooperation from the three campuses selected was sought before any further planning could proceed. Generally, the response was one of willingness to assist in any way that was proper. Interest was expressed in any resulting data. The cooperating departments agreed to provide target year Basic Design class lists on which grades were covered, protecting the privacy of the students.

Retrieval of addresses for the former students proved to be a greater problem. Registrars' offices could not permit access to their files nor could their data processing systems retrieve addresses ... the target year was too historic to have been computerized.

---

8 Early plans to include Survey of Visual Arts and Art History in the survey had to be changed when the Art History Department at the University of Oregon refused to consider the possibility of providing controlled access to old class lists.

9 Drop-outs and incompletes were designated as such so as to exclude them from the study.
At the two universities, addresses were found through the respective alumni offices, where the files contained the names and addresses of all alumni whose whereabouts were known to the universities. In the target year, Linn-Benton had no alumni lists from which to retrieve addresses. The information was secured from old records kept in the registration vault. At all three campuses the address search had to be conducted by hand. The time required to retrieve addresses influenced the choice of sample size.

Estimation of potential response was a necessity before proceeding further. Negative factors to be considered were the outdated addresses available and the probable low motivation of questionnaire recipients to respond. A large sample population would have to be secured to assure enough returns to make analysis meaningful. Having just completed a follow-up study of recent Oregon State University liberal arts graduates, the staff of the Office of Counseling Services testified to the built-in difficulties and low rate of response characteristic of such research. However, they affirmed the need for the type of research proposed. A definite interest was expressed in the progress of the project, if undertaken, but caution was recommended against expecting more than a twenty to thirty percent response. It was suggested that

the five year old addresses, the unofficial standing of the researcher, the inability to contact questionnaire recipients more than once (due to limited funds and time) were a very discouraging combination of conditions.

While the chances of a good rate of return appeared poor, assistance and counsel with the technical aspects of the project were assured. Given that recipients of questionnaires could only be contacted once, that addresses available were out-of-date and that a general apathy towards questionnaires prevailed, it was decided to proceed with the survey, anticipating no more than a twenty to thirty percent rate of response.

**Population Characteristics**

An analysis of the population taking Basic Design at LBCC, OSU, and the U of O during the target year revealed a broad spectrum of student backgrounds and campus environments. The individuals enrolled in target year Basic Design courses were part of various undergraduate programs with standings ranging from freshman to senior.

Linn-Benton Community College was a new school in its second year of operation in September of 1968. Over 900 students attended classes in rented buildings in and around Albany, Oregon. One of the first programs offered by the young community college was a college transfer curriculum. Albany was an industrial-agricultural
town with a 1968 population of about 18,000.\textsuperscript{11} The business community and other leaders had worked hard to start a college in their community and interest in the young institution was high.\textsuperscript{12} Enrollment in the community college was made up of two general types of students. The first and larger group included students entering college or vocational training programs. Most were attending LBCC for the simple reason that their budgets or their grades were too low to permit attendance at any other college. The second and smaller group comprised interested townspeople who had little or no intention of earning degrees; their attendance at LBCC was due to a desire to learn for enrichment or to gain some specific skill for vocational growth. Both groups were basically eager to learn, appreciative of the opportunity to go to school and less concerned with national/international events than student populations at large, autonomous campuses. (Staff interviews, 1974) The Linn-Benton art faculty consisted of two full-time instructors and several part-time positions. College transfer course offerings included three terms of Basic Design (see Appendix I), Survey of Visual Arts, Drawing and Painting.

\textsuperscript{11}Data showing city population were based upon figures in the Oregon Blue Book, 1969.

\textsuperscript{12}Later located in large permanent buildings a few miles south of Albany, Linn-Benton Community College has grown and, in 1974, was the fifth largest of Oregon's thirteen community colleges.
The Basic Design classes were taught by the two full-time instructors. By measures of size, age and established reputation, OSU and the U of O towered over the community college.

In 1968, Oregon State University was entering its centennial year. Located fourteen miles to the southwest of Albany in Corvallis, OSU tallied a 1968 enrollment of 15,791 students. Their impact on Corvallis, with a non-student population of 31,000, was such that the major industry of the city was listed as education. A "university town," Corvallis supported only a smattering of light industry, state and federal offices associated with the campus and the business and commercial center serving the town and surrounding agricultural area. The "university influence" was a regular fact of life for the entire community. Programs at Oregon State revolved around its early years as agricultural-technical institution. Sciences, Engineering, Humanities and Social Sciences, Education, Business, Agriculture, Forestry, Pharmacy, and Home Economics were the schools within the university. The student body reflected the program. Drawing widely from the entire state, more students from the rural and non-urban areas enrolled at OSU than at other state universities in Oregon. In the target year, 15% of the undergraduate enrollment declared majors in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (now called the College of Liberal Arts).

13 Originally called Oregon Agricultural College, the name was later changed to Oregon State College, and then to Oregon State University.
During the target year, the art department maintained a staff of nineteen and offered a B.A. degree in Humanities and Social Sciences with a specialization in art. Students in the Basic Design courses were a mixture of a minority of art majors and a majority of non-art majors from other departments of Humanities and Social Sciences and from such schools as Education and Home Economics.

The university granting professional art degrees in this survey is located 40 miles south of Corvallis in Eugene, Oregon. The University of Oregon is only four years younger than OSU and has been "the" state liberal arts university since 1872. Enrollment at the U of O in 1968 was over 14,000 . . . only slightly smaller than at OSU. Size, age and state sponsorship are the major commonalities between the two universities. Eugene was more than twice the size of Corvallis (77,000 in 1968), and, along with neighboring Springfield, formed a metropolitan area second in size only to Portland. Students attending the U of O were part of a multi-faceted city compared with the "university town" at Corvallis or the "home town" agricultural-industrial complex of Albany. U of O programs offered in the liberal arts were complimented by major degree programs in Architecture and Allied Arts, Business Administration, Community Services and Public Affairs, Education, Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Journalism, Law, Librarianship, and Music. Far from the science and engineering emphasis at the Corvallis campus, the Eugene campus centered its energies in the humanities, human services and letters. Campus atmosphere was liberal and extroverted. Pressure groups of many varieties were present seeking a
forum for their views and introducing a radical element into student life. The Cambodian invasion and the Kent State tragedy in the spring of 1969 touched off an already inflamed student activist uproar that fomented violence on the campus. In the official report on campus unrest written by the Office of Academic Affairs of the Oregon State System of Higher Education in 1970 (Self-Study Report, 1970), the Corvallis situation required two pages to describe; the Eugene campus story was recorded on eighteen pages. The impact of this disruption on the U of O Basic Design student of the target year was difficult to assess. However, most of the violence occurred in 1969 and 1970, well after most of the respondents to the survey had completed the Basic Design course. (Since each participant was asked to respond to the questions in terms of the first term in which his or her name appeared on class lists, only a very few respondents were dealing with spring term at all.) Even so, the events must be considered to have had some effect on formation of art interest levels and values developed during the remainder of the survey group's stay in college. One U of O instructor interviewed on the subject related his impression that students from other areas of the liberal arts sought refuge in his Basic Design classes from the intellectual chaos that existed in their major departments. Students seemed, he felt, to sense that their university was crumbling around them. Other instructors felt that the findings of this survey would be quite meaningless due to the degree of chaos in the Art School. (Staff interviews, 1974). Amid unique pressures,
the nineteen faculty members in the Department of Fine and Applied Arts carried on. They taught Basic Design to classes made up of art majors and majors from related fields (landscape architecture, art history and art education) and non-art majors from other areas of the campus.

Summary

The population involved in this study represents a range of backgrounds from non-art student to preprofessional artist; from technologist to humanist and from small school atmosphere to large university environment. The selection of a fair sample population required care. The following procedures for sample selection were used.

Sample Selection Procedures

Determination of adequate sample size was beset with uncertainties. The two-step process of gathering names at art departments and addresses elsewhere contained some inherent variable factors. The most variable of these was the condition of the alumni address files at each campus. If efforts to update alumni files had been more effective, address retrieval would have been far more successful.

Ideally, the minimum respondent subgroup size should be thirty or more students. With a pessimistic estimate of response of 30%, it was decided to seek survey groups from each campus of
100 to 150 addresses. The non-art group, to be treated as an autonomous unit, was to be made up of fifty addresses from each school but was not to exceed one third of the Basic Design survey group from each campus.

At each institution, the following procedure was followed. All names were gathered from all three terms of class lists. Dropouts and incompletes were eliminated. All lists were consolidated and alphabetized. Duplication of names taking consecutive terms of Basic Design was corrected by using each name in regard to the first term in which it appeared. Adjustment of list size was performed on the Oregon State University list at this point due to its large size. (Every other name was eliminated.)

Address retrieval involved taking every address available from the existing files. Table II shows data on the sample selection effort. The non-art group was acquired through alumni office files by selecting students whose last names began with 'A' and who were freshmen or sophomores during the target year. Every third name and address was selected until fifty-five addresses were gathered at each campus. Names already included in the Basic Design enrollment lists were excluded from the non-art lists. Modifications of procedure were necessary at Linn-Benton Community College due to its age and size. Only ninety-four students were enrolled in Basic Design during the target year, making a non-art group of fifty out of proportion, with total Basic Design enrollment. By selecting the non-art group by the procedure established at OSU and U of 0, a total of thirty names and addresses was gathered
TABLE II. Sample Population Selection Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION GROUP</th>
<th>Total unduplicated head count</th>
<th>Percent of reduction before address retrieval</th>
<th>Total addresses sought</th>
<th>Total addresses retrieved</th>
<th>Percent of address retrieval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBCC</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of O</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-art Group</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From old registration forms (approximately one third of the size of the LBCC art group), before coming to the end of the enrolled 'A's for that year. Final non-art group distribution of addresses was: LBCC-30, OSU-54, and U of O-51. For the remainder of the study, the non-art group was consolidated and treated as an autonomous sample of the total non-art student population at all three campuses for the target year.

Final non-art group sizes at both universities fell under 55 due to the fact that four U of O addresses and one OSU address were foreign. Mailing costs and procedures were considered too prohibitive to send questionnaires abroad and the names were dropped from the group.
Design of the Survey Instrument

The science of survey instrument design is sophisticated for some types of investigation. In other categories it is more of an art or a craft. The search for existing survey instruments in the category of art activity level proved fruitless. Creativity and artistic aptitude measurement tools were available. General interest or preference inventory tests also existed. It was out of necessity that the first stated objective of this project called for the design of an art interest survey instrument. The instrument designed is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix II, p. 91-92.

Activities indicating both participation and appreciation in the visual arts were selected and reduced to ten in number (see Appendix II). Five frequency of performance intervals were devised to apply to all ten indicators. The arbitrary selection of activities and the possibility that participation in one activity might be interpreted as representing interest equal to that shown by participation in other listed activities were factors that contributed to the exploratory nature of the investigation. The performance indicator part of the questionnaire was arranged in a format suitable for data processing of frequency distributions.

Two systems of assessing each respondent's total activity level were evolved to be used in rating high, medium and low art interest level. These procedures were described in Appendix III.

Questions in the form of value judgment ratings were written
to formulate each respondent's Basic Design courses evaluation. Ratings on value of subject matter, effectiveness of teaching methods, and effectiveness of teacher were requested (see Appendix II, Part 3). These responses were designed for comparison through the Pearson 'r' correlation coefficients with the responses to question ten rating the overall quality of the course.15

Further descriptive questions were included, seeking the students' own opinions of their art interest level and the effect of the Basic Design course on that interest level. Value judgments were also sought on the subsequent usefulness of the Basic Design course content in other course work.

While more intensive investigation was a temptation, fear that the length of the questionnaire would inhibit response curbed the desire to seek more information. A minimum of sorting information was requested (see Appendix II, Part I). Page one sorting questions prepared the way for groupings of respondents by high school interest and location, by college attended,

15Pearson "r" is a statistical function used to measure the amount and direction of the relationship between individual pairs of responses for an entire group. In this study, it was used to compare respondents' valuation of the Basic Design course with their ratings of specific aspects of the experience. Positive coefficients between .70 and 1.00 were considered to indicate high correlation (Guilford, 1965). Pearson "r" does not prove cause and effect. However, for this study, it identified those aspects of classroom experience upon which respondents placed valuations most closely related to their feelings about the total course.
by major, by number of college art credits earned and by present occupation. Additional descriptive information was sought through questions about Basic Design teaching methods, amount of individual participation required by the course, and applications of the principles of visual organization experienced by respondents (Part 3, question 8 and Part 4). Provision for voluntary comments was made. (see Appendix II, bottom of page one)

Jurying and pre-testing of the survey instrument were conducted with careful attention to clarity of terminology, suitability of format for data processing, simplicity of format, and appropriateness of questions in fulfilling the objectives of the research. Pre-testing of two developmental formats was performed by eleven former college students. Their comments and reactions were duly noted. Words were changed to clarify points of confusion. The advisory committee was kept informed of developments and their opinions and experience were relied upon heavily.

A faculty interview format was developed to be hand carried to as many faculty as could be reached who had taught Basic Design during the target year.

A review of the final proposed format and proposed evaluation procedures was conducted by each advisory committee member. No objectives or alterations were suggested and the survey instrument, the faculty interview format, the survey cover letter and a project

Consultations with an OSU art professor, an educational researcher, and a graduate student consultation service in statistics were extremely helpful in the design effort.
résumé were submitted to the Oregon State University Committee on Human Subjects for approval.

Approval was granted and four hundred fifty-five questionnaires were mailed on May 26, 1974. The three hundred twenty questionnaires mailed to former Basic Design students contained cover letters, prepaid return envelope and pages one and two of the questionnaire. Page two of each questionnaire was coded at the top to inform the student as to which campus, year, term and course the evaluation should be directed. The one hundred thirty-five questionnaires mailed to non-art group addresses contained cover letter, prepaid return envelope and only page one of the questionnaire; only their activity levels were to be surveyed.

Survey Returns and Tabulation of Response

Six weeks after mailing, one hundred ninety-seven responses had been received. Sixty-four questionnaires were returned by the post office marked undeliverable/not at this address. The response was considered complete and tabulations were begun\(^\text{17}\) as indicated in Table III.

\(^{17}\)Three additional responses were received after July 9. These were declared unuseable as the materials were already in data processing.
### TABLE III. Distributions of Response by Campus and by non-art Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>Total sent</th>
<th>Total raw returns</th>
<th>Percent of total returns</th>
<th>Discards</th>
<th>Total useable returns</th>
<th>Percent of returns useable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBCC</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of O</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-art Group</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22***</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS 18</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - sent duplicate by mistake  
** - one, refusal to answer questions; one, deceased (questionnaire was returned by a relative)  
*** - disqualified due to having listed Basic Design or other art credits earned some other time and/or place

---

If the sixty-four undeliverables are subtracted from the original mailing total, (after all, those people never had a chance to respond) and if the disqualified experimental are returned to the tally (after all, they did not know that having taken an art course would nullify their sincere efforts), it is possible to claim a total response rate of 50%. The value of this game is quite obscure but its popularity cannot be denied.
Tabulation of the raw returns required two different procedures. The first involved transfer of all voluntary comments onto note cards, coding each unit with support data from the questionnaire. (The comments appear in Appendix V.) The second was to summarize certain aspects of the sorting information on each response to permit computer card punching as follows:

1. College major listings -
   1 - nondescript entries, GED, or blank
   2 - science majors, either pure or applied including agriculture and forestry
   3 - humanities majors, human services, and liberal studies, including education, home economics and journalism
   4 - art majors, both fine and applied including architecture of all branches and art education where specified

2. Art credits earned -
   1 - non-art group-no art credits
   2 - Basic Design credits only
   3 - total art credits of less than 36 hours
   4 - total art credits of 36 hours or more

3. Art interest levels based on performance indicators (See Appendix III).
   Straight weighted ratings (SW)
   1 - low level (activity score of 0-17)
   2 - medium level (activity score of 18-39)
   3 - high level (activity score of 40-110)
Average Deviation Ratings (AD)

1 - low level (all responses falling more than one average deviation below the mean)

2 - medium level (all responses within one average deviation on either side of the mean)

3 - high level (all responses falling more than one average deviation above the mean)

A notation on the reporting of major groups is that the six undeclared major respondents (four at LBCC, two at OSU) were not included on charts showing majors due to the small size of the group. This explains the fact that percentages for LBCC and OSU on charts showing majors do not total 100% and that total group when totaled by majors is smaller than the total survey size.

Upon completion of the tabulation procedures, data processing was undertaken. Findings were read from the computer printouts and the charts in Appendix IV were constructed.

The procedures used in conducting this survey were exploratory in the areas of instrument design and art interest level ratings. Lack of precedent for this sort of investigation demanded the innovations. Further research will be needed before the effectiveness of these procedures can be clearly measured.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Organization

The organization of this chapter was based upon the three objectives of the study presented in Chapter I. Each objective has been repeated and explained in terms of the portions of the survey instrument that gathered the data to fulfill the objective. The major findings pertinent to the objective follow. Detailed charts presenting total findings of each aspect appear in Appendix IV and are referred to throughout this chapter.

Instrument Design

In reporting the findings of the first objective, an effort was made to evaluate the effectiveness of the design and construction of the instrument on the basis of the data which it brought in. Also reported here are the findings regarding description of the respondent population and description of the Basic Design courses offered during the target year.

The first objective called for the development of a survey instrument that would perform two functions: first, gathering a background data describing both the sample population and the Basic Design courses of the target year and, second, the collection of data adequate to the fulfillment of the second and third objectives.
The effectiveness of the questionnaire in gathering adequate data was vital to completion of the research plan. Returning questionnaires gave evidence of respondent confusion in only two areas. One area dealt with sorting information, the other with data describing the Basic Design course.

A request for sorting information regarding the number of collegiate art credits earned was placed in the last section of Part 1 of the questionnaire (see Appendix II). Blanks were provided to record basic art course credits adjacent to listings of three basic courses. Below these was a blank for reporting total additional art credits. The box between these sections labeled "other art courses" appeared to be a source of some confusion. Most respondents who took additional art courses checked the "other art courses" box and proceeded to report all art credits additional to those specifically listed above in the blank below. A few questionnaires, however, had little arrows drawn from the "other art courses" box down to the lower blank. What this indicated was hard to say. In an effort to avoid invalid usage of these data, all art credit hours reported were used only in a very general way to categorize respondents in terms of 1) no collegiate art credits earned, 2) art credit hours earned in Basic Design only, 3) art credit hours totaling no more than 35 and 4) art credit hours totaling 36 or more.

In Part 4, where course description data were gathered, a second survey design problem was identified through respondents' comments.
The need for an additional check point labeled "other" at the end of Part 4, question 2 became apparent. Three respondents took it upon themselves to write in comments, one of them actually drawing a little box and checking it before writing a comment.

Survey construction problems that became evident through review of the data revolved around two art activity questions listed in Part 2. Most of the responses to these questions fell in the highest frequency box showing frequency distributions that did not describe a complete curve. The activities that were so popular were "use of art knowledge on the job" and "creation of art work". (The detailed data on these questions can be found in Appendix IV, Charts D 1 and D 8. Mean scores for all art activity responses were located on charts in the next section of this chapter.) A narrowing of the categories by rewording the activity descriptions or a broadening of the frequency intervals offered to respondents would be necessary to assure a complete curve. Formal validation would be most useful if performed on this section of the questionnaire.

Actual usage of the section of the questionnaire dealing with course impact and evaluation (Part 3, questions 3-12) revealed no obvious problems. Respondents answered the questions with consistency and little apparent need to make additional comment except as already explained in regard to descriptive information about the course. Problems in this section that might not be exposed through usage have to do with semantics regarding such terms as "subject matter", "teaching methods" and "teacher effectiveness in supporting learning". The only feedback derived from respondents that might
have bearing on such terminology involved some rather emotional criticism of the course and could not be considered a meaningful commentary on the terminology employed.\textsuperscript{19}

Strengths of the survey instrument construction were even harder to identify through usage testing than were weaknesses. It can only be reported that the instrument seemed to have "worked well" in terms of its suitability for use in data processing. Furthermore, it yielded data suitable for multiple comparisons permitting conclusions above and beyond those apparent through the simple reporting of all responses to all questions.

Findings Describing the Respondent Population

Data provided by the respondents supported and expanded upon the description of population presented in Chapter III. The size of community in which the respondents attended high school was divided into urban (50,000 population or more) and suburban-rural (less than 50,000 population). Chart A.1.1 in Appendix IV was compiled to show the distribution of "home town", high school back-

\textsuperscript{19}Witness such salty comments as: Question 6, "What subject matter?", question 7, "Does not apply-No teaching was involved", question 9, "What? He was a nice guy. He liked to talk and I liked to listen, thou I never paid much attention to anything he said." The last comment is interesting in that that question was deliberately worded so as to avoid eliciting personality judgments. This respondent has rebelled against such objectivity and rendered a personality judgment anyway.
grounds in terms of size. The U of O group reported the greatest number of urban and out-of-state backgrounds, OSU response demonstrated the middle position and LBCC data showed the greatest suburban-rural distribution.

Descriptive data on the amount of high school art training that respondents received (see Appendix IV, Chart A 2.1) revealed the greatest percentage of high school art study among respondents from the U of O, less among OSU students and the least among respondents from LBCC. The correlation between these percentages and those showing high school or "home town" size was closely paralleled by the percentage trends in figures relating high school art training with subsequently earned college art credits found in Chart A 2.2 of Appendix IV. Whether students from suburban-rural areas took fewer high school art courses due to less community interest or due to smaller, weaker art departments or due to some other (undetermined) factor, could not be determined using the results of this study. That students bring to college varying degrees of commitment to the visual arts is obvious. How the college art experience changes this commitment was of primary concern in this study.

Data describing the respondent population during college by major areas of study, amount of art credits earned and stated art interest

---

20 The high percentage of out-of-state high school backgrounds found at the community college may be due to the older average age of the students attending LBCC. Many of these respondents probably completed high school several years ago, moved to Albany and settled before enrolling in the Basic Design class at LBCC.
levels before taking Basic Design reflected trends quite similar to those found in the high school background data. Graphs of these data were placed in Appendix IV, Charts B 1.1 through B 3.3. Generalizations of the findings about major groupings were that:

1) the community college was more likely to have registered undeclared majors than the other two schools, 2) few science majors were involved with Basic Design at any of the three campuses, and 3) the percentage of art majors taking Basic Design at the U of O was more than twice that at either of the other two campuses. It should be explained that on Chart B 1.2, the presence of art majors in the 'non-art' and 'Basic Design only' groups was due to the inclusion of photo-journalism majors in the group of art majors and related art majors.

Charts B 2.1 and B 2.2 dealt with the amount of art credits earned in terms of campuses and major groupings. OSU maintained the only Basic Design program where the majority of respondents took Basic Design as their only collegiate art class. Even at the U of O, however, where the percentage of art and related art majors was so high (57%, see Appendix IV, Chart B 1.1), only 47% of the

---

21 Questions on the survey instrument reporting this information are: Part 1, below the double line and Part 3, question 3 (see Appendix II).

22 Subjective justification for this placement of journalists in the art majors category is found in Appendix V, Comment 54.
respondents took more than 36 credit hours of art courses. Thus, the potential impact of the Basic Design experience was substantial in proportion to other art credits taken.

Charts B 3.1 through B 3.3 reported the responses to "How interested in art were you when you started your class?" (Part 3, Question 3) in terms of campuses, major groupings and art credits earned. Thirty-eight percent of all respondents taking Basic Design stated a very high interest in art. Over 60% of all respondents placed their pre-Basic Design art interest level above the number 3 rating. Significantly, the campus with the largest percentage of respondents taking Basic Design as their only art course (in many cases as a requirement for a major program outside the field of art) was the only campus reporting any responses in the box indicating a complete disinterest in art.

The general profile of responses for the collegiate years parallels that of the high school years. A commitment to involvement with the visual arts was visible in choice of major and in number of art credits earned. Enthusiasm for art (as stated art interest, B 3.4) ran consistently higher than rates of actual art credits earned (B 2.3). It was difficult to determine whether this should be attributed to cultural pressure to appear interested in the arts or whether selection of majors and the ensuing pressure to acquire the required credits prohibited enrollment in art courses. Only 16% of the total art group indicated their pre-Basic Design art interest as "little" or "not at all". Yet 34% of the total art group fell into the 'captive audience'
category of students who took Basic Design as their only collegiate art course, many as a requirement for major programs outside the art departments.

The non-art group was found to be more science oriented (Appendix IV, Table B 1.2) comprising 54% science majors to 43% humanities and 4% art majors.

Respondent Data Describing the Basic Design Course

In addition to the descriptive data of the survey group, the survey instrument was designed to gather information describing the teaching methods and course content encountered by Basic Design students during the target year. Part 4 of the questionnaire and questions 1, 8, and 12 in Part 3 were constructed to yield a general measure of teaching methods, areas of study in which design fundamentals were applied and respondent ratings of how much Basic Design duplicated high school art training, how much individual participation was required and how useful the course content proved to be in other courses. Additional information descriptive of course content and teaching methods appeared in the form of voluntary comments. While such comments are all very subjective and some quite emotional, they are mentioned here as yet another source of information.

Teaching methods reported are tabulated in Appendix IV, Table C 1.1, both by total study group and by campus. It is interesting to note the common emphasis on "individual projects" at LBCC and OSU. At the U of O, "individual projects" was noted less frequently;
it received about the same attention as "discussion" as a teaching method. Group work was reported more often at the U of O; lecture and slide/lecture were more emphasized at LBCC. Write-in contributions served to emphasize the respondents' loose interpretation of the words "main teaching methods" as used in Part 4, question 1. That such a wide range of teaching methods was checked revealed great diversity in teaching approach from school to school and from instructor to instructor.

In Table C 1.2 of Appendix IV the data regarding application of principles of design were tabulated. The main application of design principles at LBCC and OSU was involvement with student projects. At the U of O, somewhat less frequent choice of "our own projects" was shown. This could have been related to the lower emphasis on individual projects reported in Table C 1.1 but these data could not be used to confirm such a hunch. The other noticeable trend lay in a general comparison of the community college data with those of the two universities. The group from LBCC indicated a broader and more vigorous application of design principles throughout the list. Whether this was actually due to a more specific and applied teaching of design principles, to a greater enthusiasm in remembering details of a five-year-old experience, or to some unidentified factor is impossible to say. Subsequent research could test the motivation behind these responses.

The degree to which the Basic Design course duplicated the content of high school art classes was measured through question 1 of Part 3, "How much of the information taught in the class had you al-
ready learned in high school art classes?" Responses to this question are shown in Appendix IV, C Chart 2. Mean scores indicate that "none" or "little" were the most common answers. By campus, the lowest mean score is in the U of O graph among the group that received the most high school art training of all. No data from this investigation can fully explain this contradiction. Referral to Appendix IV, A, Chart 2 only expands upon the situation. This recording of amounts of high school art training by campus and by art credits earned, when compared with Appendix IV, C-Chart 2, reveals a tendency among subgroups LBCC, OSU, Basic Design only, and total art group to report greater percentage of prior knowledge through high school art training than was possible. This may have been due to knowledge from home economics classes and similar high school curriculum but that cannot be confirmed here.

The amount of individual participation required by the Basic Design class in activities such as research, art projects, and reports, was rated by respondents in Part 3, question 8 of the questionnaire (see Appendix IV, Chart F 6). These data on individual participation were not a quantitative measure of the actual amount of work required of each student. Rather, they were the subjective evaluation by each respondent of the amount of work done for Basic Design class in proportion to the amount done for other courses within his or her experience. Most respondents felt that much individual participation was required. By campuses, OSU's mean score of 4.34 emphasizes the extent to which these respondents felt they were individually involved. LBCC and the U of O fell somewhat below with mean scores of 4.00 and 3.62 respectively. The
subgroupings by majors showed little variation between the humanities majors and art majors. But, the art credits earned subgroups showed a trend toward higher participation ratings by the greater art credits earned subgroup. Were these people spurred on by their greater art interest to work harder? Did they only think that they were working harder? Did their other art courses require so little effort that they thought they were being overworked in Basic Design? The possibilities were numerous. No clear answers could emerge from these data; perhaps it is possible to pose better questions based on these findings. The nature of these data suggested that more investigation would be necessary before reliable evaluation could be done.

The usefulness of the Basic Design course content in subsequent course work was rated by respondents in Part 3, question 12 (Appendix II). Chart F 10 contained these responses in total tabulation and grouped by subgroups. While it was not surprising that the course content should be less useful in subsequent studies for students who took no more art courses (see Chart F 10.3), the expectation was that those students taking "up to 36 art credit hours" in art would report greater use and that those taking "36 art credit hours and more" would report a very high rate of usefulness. The relatively flat profile of responses by "36 hours or more" in Chart F 10.3 might be explained by the data in Chart F 10.0 for the U of O. With 47% of the U of O respondents falling in the 36 or more credit hours group, such a negative rating as was made by the U of O on usefulness of content would have some impact on the profile of responses by the
"36 or more" art credits group. By the same logic, the community college data of Chart F 10.1 showed a moderate positive skew, explainable in part by the grouping of 86% of the LBCC respondents in the "up to 36 art credits" category. Thus, a moderate opportunity was assured to the LBCC group. Whatever the explanation, the total tabulation of the usefulness of the Basic Design course content in other courses presented a negatively skewed profile with a mean score of 2.87. This fact should be kept in mind as the remaining findings of this study are explored.

Measurement of Art Interest Findings

The data fulfilling the second objective reveal art activity levels that were widely varied. They depicted differing emphases in interest and activity level for each art activity listed and for each subgroup involved.

Objective two involved the measurement of interest in the visual arts, based upon frequency of participation in ten selected performance indicators, among former Basic Design students, five years after their Basic Design classes, and among a small group of former fellow students who earned no college art credits. Frequency distributions for each activity were to be compared between former Basic Design students and non-art group as well as between sub-groups by campus, by college major groupings and by total art credits earned groupings. Interest levels in art as stated by the Basic Design respondents were to be compared with interest levels determined by amount of art activity reported.
The data fulfilling the second objective were gathered through Part 2 of the survey instrument. The data yielding the art group's stated art interest ratings were found in Part 3, question 2. As was explained in Chapter 3, Design of Survey Instrument, the data for each art activity were treated separately. Comparisons between frequency of performance in one activity and the same frequency of performance in another were done with caution as they do not necessarily represent equal effort, equal interest or equal commitment of time and treasure to the visual arts.

Frequency of Performance Data

Several general factors are important to understanding of the tables and graphs showing frequency of performance in each of the ten selected art activities. The graphs (found in Appendix IV, D-Frequency of Art Activity, Charts 1-10) were compiled to present the data in groupings by campuses, by collegiate major groupings and by amount of art credits earned. The figures on the graphs by campuses do not include the responses of the non-art group. The graphs showing activities by major groupings do include the non-art group. The graphs dealing with art credits earned contain the non-art group as a separate element labeled "No art hours". Fluctuations in group size might be confusing. These variations were the result of one or more respondents having skipped over the question involved. Percentages were recalculated for each grouping in order to present the most accurate data.
Tables IV and V were assembled to present an overview of the responses for all ten activities through the use of mean scores. These tables were included to permit a quick grasp of the overall behavior of total groups and subgroups.

**TABLE IV.** Mean Scores showing frequency of performance in art activities for total survey, for art group and for non-art group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTED ART ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Total Survey Group</th>
<th>Art Group</th>
<th>Non-art Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the past year, I have:</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used my knowledge of art on my job.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussed art seriously with friends.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquired original art work through purchase or gift.</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended meetings of a community art organization.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visited an art museum or art exhibit.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read an article about art.</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read a book about art.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>created art work of my own.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended art classes.</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displayed my own art work in public exhibition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervals were: 1-never, 2-one or two times, 3-three to five times, 4-six to ten times, 5-eleven times or more.

Since mean scores tend to minimize total range of response, providing an understated picture among ratings where the frequency intervals vary as they do here, discussion of these findings was directed to general analysis of the behavior of the total group.

The popularity of each of these performance indicators among all respondents could be judged by the mean scores. The two most frequently reported activities were "use of art knowledge on the job" and "creation of one's own art work". Nebulous as these two topics are in describing the nature and extent of the art activities, these data indicated that they were important to more respondents than those in art related jobs and those who majored in art. Even the non-art group ranked vocational use of art knowledge
first. Both of these activities imply some manipulation of the elements and principles of design rather than passive appreciation. It was clear that some active involvement with the principles of visual organization was common to the experience of much of the survey group.

The third, fourth and fifth most commonly performed activities were reading articles about art, visiting museums or exhibits, and discussing art seriously with friends. These activities generally

TABLE V. Mean scores showing frequency of performance in art activities for subgroups by campus, by majors and by art credits earned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBGROUPS</th>
<th>SELECTED ART ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Frequency intervals are: 1-never, 2-one or two times, 3-three to five times, 4-six to ten times, 5-eleven times or more.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>used my knowledge of art on my job</td>
<td>discussed art seriously with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY CAMPUS</td>
<td>LBCC</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U of O</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY MAJORS</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY ART CREDITS EARNED</td>
<td>No art hours</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Design only</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 36 hours</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 hours or more</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
require less committment or skill than creating one's own art work and in most cases, less time. They can all be done by "viewers" of art as well as "doers".

Next in the ratings was the reading of books about art. Requiring more time to complete, participation in this activity shows a greater commitment to activity in the visual arts. Ranked closely behind the reading of books, were the performance indicators about acquisition of art objects and attendance at art classes. All three of these activities require a sizeable commitment of either time or money or both. Low levels of participation could be attributed to several factors. The data simply showed that they were not the most popular art activities. The last two of the ten art activities were indeed rarely performed. An active minority of respondents were the only ones attending meetings.

Examination of detailed responses to each of the ten performance indicators by subgroups revealed some strong trends and some interesting exceptions. Charts D 1.1 - D 1.3 showed major usage of art knowledge on the job. The similarity of responses in D 1.1 revealed no campus biases on this topic; the data were remarkably similar for each school (see Table V). The groupings by major in Chart D 1.2 indicate a strong trend which is amplified in the D 1.3 chart by art credits earned. The use of art knowledge on one's job correlated highly with the amount of emphasis placed upon art in one's college training.

The strong profiles presented on the "art on the job" chart contrasted sharply with Charts D 2.1 - 2.3, "discussed art seriously
with friends. LBCC students reported most discussion of art as indicated by the mean score of 3.38. Considering the make-up of the LBCC group (few art majors and few respondents listing large numbers of art credits earned), this mean score was higher than would be expected. The data in Chart D 2.2, by major groupings, reflected logical distributions showing greater activity among art-oriented majors than among science types. However, the art credits earned figures in Chart D 2.3 showed that a large percentage of "Basic Design only" respondents reported no serious discussions about art during the study year. The "no discussion" figure dropped to 11% in the "Up to 36 hours" panel, representing a major shift in activity. While many factors could be considered in analyzing these data, there was no information available here to explain conclusively why the "Basic Design only" group performed more like the non-art group than like the "Up to 36 hrs." group.

While discussion of art requires only an active interest in the field, the acquisition of art objects involves a more specific commitment. Charts D 3.1 - 3.3 ("acquired original art work through purchase of gift") showed greater variation between campuses, between major groups and between art credits earned groups; LBCC respondents, science majors and persons with little or no college art credits acquired little original art work. Whether these variations could be traced mainly to economic factors was impossible to prove with these data. Chart 3.3 would indicate that amount of training in art was also an influence in the decision to collect art.
Charts D 4.1 - 4.3 (Appendix IV) were compiled to present frequency of attendance at meetings of community art organizations; an unlikely activity among most respondents. The campus percentages showed OSU to have been least involved. LBCC reported the most involvement at one to two meetings while the U of O reported a more sustained type of attendance among those respondents who were active. The patterns reflected in Charts D, 4.2 and 4.3 were somewhat unique in that more majors in the science grouping than the humanities grouping were involved in community art organizations. Likewise, respondents who reported no college art training were attending art meetings more often than were those who took "Basic Design only". It became clear that only those respondents with an extensive art background had participated in this performance indicator with measurable regularity.

By contrast, the profiles of percentages reported in Charts D, 5.1 - 5.3 (Appendix IV) showed visiting an art museum or art exhibit to have been a very popular indicator. The frequency interval most common to all groups fell between one and five visits; every panel showed a marked drop after the "three to five times" column.

Responses to the "read an article about art" activity shown in Charts D, 6.1 - 6.3 indicated most active participation by LBCC, U of O, art majors, and respondents taking more than Basic Design credits; only seventeen percent of the entire survey reported reading no article about art during the survey year. The trends on all three of these charts followed the pattern that was developing; the greater
the art emphasis, the greater the participation in the performance indicator.

The larger commitment of time and interest required to read a book about art was depicted by the data on Charts D, 7.1 - 7.3. Here again, the LBCC group made strong showing in the first chart with the mean score falling, at 2.43. But the highest ratings were in subgroups at U of O, art majors, and among persons with 36 or more art hours. Only those respondents with extensive art backgrounds continued to read books about art with any regularity.

Charts D, 8.1 - 8.3 showed responses to the question reading "created art work of my own." Mean scores indicated that the "doers" were ahead of the "readers" by a sizeable margin. A steady interest was found among all subgroups. The capacity of the frequency intervals presented to respondents among the LBCC, U of O, art majors and 36 hours or more subgroups was strained. By campuses, the LBCC data compiled the highest mean score, followed closely by the U of O data. OSU with its high level of "captive audience" students fell behind. In the remaining graphs, the smooth increase in activity from left to right was represented clearly by mean scores. Total mean score was the highest of all the performance indicators; more respondents were "doers" than might be supposed.23

The remaining two batteries of charts showed few parallels with the "created art work of my own" data. Attendance at art

23 Comments that affirm this conclusion are numbered 2, 4, 10, 13, 15, 17, 22, 29, 30, 36, 41, and 46 in Appendix V.
classes, as reported in Charts D, 9.1 - 9.3, was most common among LBCC respondents, among art majors and among persons who took art collegiate classes in addition to Basic Design. As a performance indicator of art interest, attendance at art classes was a highly selective activity.

The display of one's own art work was even more rare as revealed by Charts D, 10.0 - 10.3. Note that in Chart 10.2 the science major group reported more activity than did the humanities group. Chart D, 10.3 held the distinction of being the only art credits earned graph of the entire series where the "no art credits earned" group reported 100% in the "never" column. It would appear that this indicator was too specialized to be useful as a measure of general art interest.

A review of the findings from Part 2 showed that the second objective was fulfilled most clearly through the data comparing activity levels for each performance indicator by art credits earned. Compared to the differences between subgroups by campuses, and by majors, the findings based on subgroupings by art credits earned showed rather simple and predictable differences in art activity levels. The fewer the art credits earned, the more likely was the former student to join the "viewers". The exception lay in the fact that even among the lowest ranking subgroups, creating one's own art work and use of art knowledge on the job remained the most frequently reported activities.
Ratings of Art Interest

For a summary statement on art interest levels, ratings of low, medium and high interest were established, using the ten selected art activities in Part 2 of the survey instrument as performance indicators of interest. These ratings, (both straight weighted and average deviation methods were used) were experimental. Both rating procedures and the validity of the process were discussed in Chapter III, and in Appendix III. The charts bearing these data, grouped by campuses and by art credits earned were placed in Appendix IV, Charts E1 and E2. Mean scores were again used for rough comparisons. The two methods of rating displayed very comparable total group means. While the average deviation yielded a slightly higher total interest rating, the main difference was only in the proportions of distribution among the three categories of low, medium and high. By campuses, the important finding was that those respondents from LBCC, with backgrounds so different from those in the U of 0 group, registered art interest levels that equalled the U of 0 group. Enthusiasm existed where it was not expected. By art credits earned, these art interest level ratings confirmed findings made previously.

Stated Art Interest Levels

The second question in Part 3 of the survey instrument (Appendix II) was designed as a parallel measurement of art interest levels; reported performance vs. stated interest. That a difference might exist between respondents' art interest levels as
rated by performance indicators and their stated art interest levels was considered probable. Factors contributing to such reporting would be varied and no conclusive data were gathered to explain the difference.

The results, as charted in Appendix IV, E, 3.1, showed that the respondents in this study claimed a higher level of interest than their reported levels of performance indicated. This was especially true among the lower activity level groups. The performance based ratings appeared to be more consistent and less extreme.

Self-rating of art interest levels tended to be overstated. stated art interest levels appeared to be a reflection of self-image whereas performance-based interest levels provided a more responsible evaluation of individual values.

Summary of Interest Level Findings

The responses to Part 2 of the survey instrument yielded findings about participation in each of the ten selected art activities, about the behaviors of each of the sub-groupings used, as well as the total group surveyed and about the effectiveness of the survey instrument itself. The ratings of art interest levels based upon performance provided a potential method for general assessment of graduates of courses and programs dealing in affective goals. The stated art interest levels acted as a counter measure demonstrating the differences between two approaches to rating of art interest.
Detailed data revealed energetic art interest on the part of the LBCC group. The OSU group reflected the high percentage of "Basic Design only" respondents through a lower level of activity and a lower level of stated art interest. The U of O data reflected a high level of art interest to be expected from a group committed to art activity as early as the high school years. A review of the data on high school backgrounds and collegiate major programs (Appendix IV, parts A and B) emphasizes the nature of these sample groupings and what might be expected of them in their collegiate and post-collegiate interests. Considering backgrounds and pre-collegiate opportunities in art education, the LBCC group was remarkable for its high level of participation while the U of O group showed less activity than might be expected.

Data on the major groupings showed the science majors to be far below the art majors in frequency of participation. The humanities majors generally showed a mean score of activity falling closer to the science group's mean score than to that of the art group.

Parallels between amounts of art credits earned and frequencies of art performance have already been cited. From "No art credits earned" through "36 hrs. or more", an increasing level of participation has been charted. Trends showed close relationships between "No art credits" and "Basic Design only" and between "Up to 36 hrs." and "36 hrs. or more".

Art interest ratings based upon frequency of performance offered a system for establishing art interest levels on a more sub-
stantial basis than stated art interest levels. The regularity of the performance based profiles was contrasted with the erratic curves which were the products of stated art interest data.

Further analysis of these findings and recommendations for further action are presented in Chapter V.

Course Evaluations by Respondents

Findings for the third objective involved evaluations of the Basic Design course in terms of overall quality, aspects of the experience and subsequent impact of the course. Comparisons of relationships between these evaluations were made by art interest level groups as well as by campus and art credits earned groups.

Specifically, the third objective called for determination of former Basic Design students' course evaluations through their ratings of overall course quality and their valuations of specific aspects of the course in terms of the total group and for the subgroups described in the second objective including the art interest level groups. Course evaluation was completed by determining whether a correlation existed between ratings of the overall course evaluations and ratings of each aspect of the Basic Design course surveyed for total art group and for subgroups by campus, by art credits earned and by art interest level groups.

Gathering data to fulfill this objective was accomplished through Part 3 of the survey instrument. Questions three through twelve were worded as follows: (See survey instrument, Appendix II.)

3. How interested in art were you when you started your
4. How interested in art were you when you completed your class?
5. How have the passing years changed your opinion of the value of the course?
6. How much do you value the subject matter that was taught in the class?
7. How much did the teaching methods used in the class help you in learning?
8. How much individual participation did your class require?
9. How effective was your teacher in supporting learning?
10. How would you rate your course as a whole?
11. How much did the course stimulate you to become involved in art?
12. How much did you use the course content in other courses.

Charts depicting responses to these questions are in Appendix IV, F-H.

Before reviewing detailed findings, the presence of two small subgroups for the data should be noted. While a minimum group size of 30 is recommended (Downie, 1974), the LBCC group contained only 20 or 21 respondents. The science majors subgroup included eleven responses. For the purposes of this research, the LBCC group size fell within reasonably fair limits and was considered as a useful part of the project. The science major group of 11, however, was considered to be too small to be used in a comparative relationship with other subgroups.

Another technical factor to be kept in mind concerned question eight. In dealing with the group of questions evaluating the elements of classroom experience and the overall course evaluation (questions six through ten), question eight was isolated for separate consideration. The findings on this item were in terms of quantity.
rather than quality and were treated as descriptive. These ratings of how much individual participation the course required were valuable as interpretations of the demands of time and effort respondents invested in the course.

However comparison of the mean scores of these data with mean scores of course productive data based upon ratings of quality was not a meaningful exercise. On tables bearing such data, question eight has been excluded.

Distributions of Response in Course Evaluation Ratings

Distributions of response to question three through 12 (excluding eight) of the third part of the survey instrument covered a broad range when viewed in subgroup categories. The total figures for each question, however, showed a rather narrow variance. The mean scores of all responses to each of the ten questions ranged from 2.87 to 4.03. Table VI presents the mean scores of each of the course evaluation questions. These ratings were based on a scale of one to five with one representing the most negative response and five representing the most positive response. (As previously stated, the eighth question, demanding quantification of individual participation was considered separately.) As the mean score shows, respondents considered the Basic Design course to be quite demanding.24

Several relationships between questions are intriguing.

24A student comment relating to this item is found in Appendix V, Comment 5.
TABLE VI. Mean scores of response to course evaluation questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. How interested in art were you when you started your class?</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How interested in art were you when you completed your class?</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How have the passing years changed your opinion of the value of the course?</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much do you value the subject matter that was taught in class?</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How much did the teaching methods used in the class help you in learning?</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How much individual participation did your class require?</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How effective was your teacher in supporting learning?</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How would you rate your course as a whole?</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How much did the course stimulate you to become involved in art?</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much did you use the course content in other courses?</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings are on a scale of one (most negative) to five (most positive).

Responses to questions three and four implied that the Basic Design course increased the student's level of art interest. However, the mean score for question eleven indicated a neutral or slightly negative reaction to the idea that the course may have stimulated the students to become involved in art. Differences between "stated art interest" and being "involved" in art seemed to be reflected here as they were in the findings reported earlier. Another set of interrelationships between these questions was established through a comparison of the mean scores for evaluation questions on subject matter, teaching methods, teacher effectiveness and overall course rating (questions 6, 7, 9, and 10). These mean scores were very close in range with the exception of the
"teaching methods" figure. In considering the detailed breakdown of these data into subgroups, special attention was focused on this critical area.

The lowest of all the mean scores were those for questions 11 and 12. Since these questions evaluated the early aftermath of the Basic Design experience, they were considered to be measures of the immediate impact of the course. In evaluating subgroup divisions of data, meaningful interpretations of these mean scores were sought.

**Distribution of Response by Subgroups**

A study of the distributions of response to questions 3-12 by subgroups yielded specific details of the general differences found in the total mean scores. The graphs showing these detailed data are in Appendix IV, Charts F-1 through F-10.

As a technique for evaluating the Basic Design course, the "before and after" questions, three and four, were considered together. Charts F 1.1 - 1.3 reflected the previously identified characteristics of the subgroups (reported in Frequency of Performance Data). The impact of the Basic Design courses by campuses showed the greatest change in interest to have occurred at LBCC where there was probably the greatest potential for change. The amount of change reported was extreme in comparison to OSU with its "captive audience" Basic Design population and the U of O with its art-oriented, previously committed population. In terms of mean scores, the community college respondents indicated a post-Basic
Design interest level that surpassed both of the university groups.

Charts F 1.2 and F 2.2 revealed an important nuance of data among art major groups. Post-Basic Design distributions of art interest ratings shifted toward both ends of the scale in most groups. An analysis of variance test would need to be conducted to measure the extent of the shift. Mean scores showed a negative impact upon the art majors subgroup which previous findings described as a sophisticated, art-oriented sample.

Whether time and experience may have changed early opinions of one's Basic Design course was dealt with in the fifth question as shown in Chart F 3. A slight improvement in valuation of the Basic Design course was reported. The only subgroup (excluding the science majors group) that was exceptional was LBCC. The mean score of 4.00, compared with 3.09 at OSU and 3.42 at the U of O, showed that the rise in art interest that began during the LBCC Basic Design classes had continued.

Chart F 4 reported data on how the subject matter taught in the course was valued. By campuses (F 4.1) the contrasts were strong. The highest valuation was expressed by the LBCC group with a mean score of 4.14. A bell curve described the OSU group which had a mean score of 3.27. The U of O however, reported in a bimodal curve with the lowest mean score of the three campuses at 3.09.

Some contrasting conditions must have prevailed to produce such diverse response from a population sample as homogeneous as the U of O group. By majors, a predictable set of data showed
the higher valuation of subject matter that was to be expected of the art major types. (The high valuation reported for the science group was intriguing but would require verification through further investigation among a larger group.) The art credits earned subgroups charted in F 4.3 described a major shift in valuation between those who took only Basic Design in the art area and those respondents who took additional art course.

Responses to question seven rated effectiveness of teaching methods used in Basic Design classes. Chart F-5 shows a broad variation among subgroups. Allowing for some distortion due to the small size of the LBCC group did not diminish the striking contrast between the campus ratings. Charts 5.2 and 5.3 reported the trend that one would expect with the art-oriented groups showing greater valuation of the teaching methods used in their class. (The high science group rating was, again, intriguing but the small group size prevented the data from holding much validity.) As a whole, the ratings on this chart dealing with teaching methods were the lowest of any of the questions dealing with elements of classroom experience.

Question eight, dealing with amount of individual participation required in the Basic Design class has been reported earlier in this chapter as descriptive information on teaching methods used.

Data rating the effectiveness of teacher in supporting learning were reported in Table F-7. The subgrouped information, was valuable in itself but became even more meaningful when compared with the data in F-4 valuation of subject matter and F-5 helpful-
ness of teaching methods. Taken by campuses, the LBCC respondents felt strongly supported (mean score of 4.38) and recorded the only united ratings. All other subgroups data were divided into bimodal curves. The OSU group rated their instructors as less supportive but still well above the mid-point on the scale (mean of 3.40). The U of O evaluations were so negative as to pull the mean score to the negative side of the mid-point on the scale. By majors, the art area majors rated their teachers as having been more effective than did the humanities group. The art credits earned data (F 7.3) showed the higher ratings of teacher effectiveness to have been given by the respondents who took more art classes. The "Basic Design only" mean score of 2.96 is similar to the 2.93 rated by the U of O group. The bimodal configurations running throughout the teacher effectiveness graphs indicated strong feelings on the part of most respondents. Voluntary comments (see Appendix V) tended to support this finding.

The summary evaluation of the Basic Design course (Chart F 8) produced data reflective of trends established in the evaluations of specific elements of classroom experience. The highest positive ratings came from the LBCC group followed by the science group and then the "36 or more" art credits group. (The science group, as noted, presented figures that were less than reliable but the high rating here was noted and further research was recommended.) Lowest ratings were from the U of O and "Basic Design only" groups. These ratings were distributed in slightly bimodal curves on five of the eight groups. The stronger positive distribution prevailed for the
total art group yielded a mean score of 3.39 on the scale of one to five. These data in F 8 were quite homogenous and narrow in range with no mean score falling below 3.00 or above 4.14. This general question elicited a more positive response than the questions dealing with specific aspects of the course when judged by mean scores.

In comparing the elements of classroom experience questions, some characteristics of note emerged. All mean scores are presented in Table VII. In comparing teacher effectiveness with valuation of subject matter by subgroups, only the U of 0 group, the humanities majors and the "up to 36" credit hours earned subgroups rated their teacher's effectiveness lower than their valuation of the subject matter taught in their class. A comparison of mean scores on the teaching methods question with all other items

TABLE VII. Mean scores of response to questions 6, 7, 9, and 10 by subgroups and for total survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPINGS</th>
<th>EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY CAMPUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBCC</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of O</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY MAJORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY ART CREDITS EARNED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Design only</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 36 hours</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 hours or more</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ART GROUP</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings are on a scale of one (most negative) to five (most positive).
showed the teaching methods to be the most negatively ranked element of classroom experience by all subgroups but LBCC. The observation made earlier should be repeated that all of the subgroups rated the overall course (question ten) more positively than the average of their mean ratings on questions seven and nine.

Over dependence upon mean scores, however, limits understanding of data. One example of this could be found by examining the graphs in Chart F 7 dealing with teacher effectiveness. The mean scores for this battery of data showed "teacher effectiveness" to be rated more positively than either "value of subject matter" or "teaching methods". Study of the distributions of response for each subgroup revealed all but one of these groups to be split into bimodal configurations. Opinions about teachers were seldom neutral. Only at the community college was any unified curve evident in the data rating teaching effectiveness.

For a more specific comparison of the interrelationship between individuals' responses to overall evaluation (question ten) as they related to individuals' ratings of the other elements of classroom experience (questions 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12) read the findings by correlation coefficient described later in the chapter.

The data derived through question 11 were presented in Chart F 9, "How much did the course stimulate you to become involved in art?" These responses carried the second lowest total mean score of any of the course evaluation questions in Part 3 of the survey.
instrument. The patterns established among subgroups by the previous questions prevailed. The entire response level shifted downward, reflecting clearly that stimulation toward involvement in art was not one of the major impacts of the Basic Design course.

Chart F 10 reported the responses to the twelfth question in Part 3 of the survey instrument dealing with how much the course content of Basic Design was used in other courses. (A review of the data in Appendix IV, B-Collegiate Population Data, Charts 1 and 2 aid in understanding these findings.) The total mean score of these responses was the lowest of any in Part 3 at 2.87. Low ratings by the subgroups who took little or no additional art classes were probable. More than 50% of the OSU respondents ($X=2.94$) took no additional art classes and presumably had less formal opportunity to apply Basic Design course content in their subsequent coursework. However, low ratings by the U of O group ($X=2.57$) indicated little usefulness of course content in subsequent coursework by a subgroup of which 46.7% took 36 art credits or more and 35.6% took up to 36 art credits. Among the art majors with a mean score of 2.75, 62.5% earned 36 or more art credits. These low responses from groups who had ample opportunity to apply basic elements and principles of design in additional art coursework raised questions which could be conclusively answered only by further investigation.
Distributions of Response to Course Evaluations by Art Activity Levels

Arrangement of responses by art interest level subgroups afforded another view of the findings. Appendix IV, Charts G 1 and G 2, Course Evaluation by Art Activity Levels, presented these distributions for questions 6, 7, 9 and 10 of Part 3 of the questionnaire. Using both methods of rating art activity level, the charts matched up those persons pursuing each of three levels of art activity with their course evaluation data.

The data, grouped by the straight weighted method (Table G 1.1 through 1.4), with its somewhat arbitrary approach to weighting of each selected art activity, presented distributions of response remarkably parallel to the "art credits earned" sub-groupings found in Charts F 4 through F 8. This comparison was especially suitable due to the similar sizes of the subgroupings. A very significant factor that appeared through this comparison was that most differences between the parallel data were the result of greater or more consistent skewness in the curves plotted through the straight weighted activity level data (see Appendix III). With all of its short comings, the straight weighted activity level ratings appeared to correlate more highly with course evaluations than did the "art credits earned" groupings. More definite confirmation of this was produced through the correlation coefficient data reported later in this chapter.
Examination of the data by average deviation subgroupings was made possible on Chart G 2.1 through G 2.4. The average deviation method of rating low, medium and high frequencies of art activity took into consideration inadequacies of the frequency intervals on the survey instrument in measuring the selected art activities. This correction, along with the different distribution of subgroup size resulting from the average deviation function, provided data similar to those in the straight weighted graphs but more strongly polarized. Comparison of mean scores shows these differences.

Correlation Coefficients Between Ratings of Elements of Classroom Experience and Overall Evaluation of Basic Design Course

The correlation coefficients for overall course evaluations (question ten), as related to questions 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12 are reported in Appendix IV, H 1-2. These coefficients were shown for subgroups by campuses, majors and art credits earned, as well as for the total group. The same relationships as subgrouped by art activity levels (both straight weighted and average deviation methods) were shown in Table H 2.

Detailed discussion of any of these relationship figures should not be undertaken without the reminder that correlation coefficients identify relationships but do not show causality.
A wide variety of reasons may be inferred for confirmed correlations but proof of such inferences is not possible with the data in Table H.

The data on Table H 1 showed numerous coefficients of more than .70 indicating high degrees of relationship (Guilford, 1965).25 Total responses on general course evaluation (question ten) correlated most highly at .79 with responses on teacher effectiveness (question nine) and on stimulation towards further art activity by the Basic Design course (question 11). The total group ratings on helpfulness of teaching methods correlated with those of general course value at .77. The lowest total group coefficient represented in Table H 1 was between valuation of subject matter and overall course ratings at .65.

Some insight into the direction of correlations between overall evaluation (question ten) and the specific course evaluation questions was gained through examination of the corresponding frequency distribution graphs in Tables F and G. In-depth analysis of the correlation coefficients for subgroups did not hold much mean-

25Correlation coefficients were run among all questions in Part 3 and no high correlations occurred among the total group figures except those among questions 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11. Coefficients for the remaining questions are located in Appendix H, Tables 3 and 4. Among subgroups, only three high coefficients occur among 90 coefficients.
ing without comparisons of the range and mean scores of the responses to questions being compared. This informal analysis of variance was a step toward interpretation of the causes behind high or low correlation coefficients. Essentially, the coefficients shown in Table H tended to confirm relationships identified in Tables F and G.

The data in Table H 2 showed Pearson "r" coefficients for the art interest level subgroups. The consistently high coefficients for low, medium and high subgroups confirmed indications (see Tables G 1 and 2) that the art interest level method of grouping based on performance indicators, appeared to provide a more reliable device for measuring response to art training than art credits earned groupings. Comparison of the frequency of high coefficients in H 2.1 or H 2.3 with those in H 1.3 for art credits earned, revealed an even higher number of subgroup correlation coefficients of .70 or more to be found among the subgroupings based upon art interest levels.

The reporting of correlation coefficients for these course evaluations questions represents one aspect of the statistical investigation that could have been conducted to identify or prove interrelationships and differences among these data. The experimental nature of this research, however, did not justify such intensive treatment. That some high correlations of varying degrees existed between general course evaluations and elements of class-
room experience was demonstrated. This finding could be helpful in future planning for teaching the fundamental elements and principles of design.

Voluntary Comments as Findings

The opportunity for respondents to volunteer additional comments on their questionnaires yielded a large number of responses. While quite subjective in content, these comments provided insights into the nature of that portion of the survey group feeling strongly enough about the investigation to take the time to write.

In Appendix V, the comments were documented in subgroups by art credits earned. Some management of these statements in terms of frequency of comment was attempted to determine the extent to which the more negative or positive elements of the survey group were prone to comment. Table VIII shows frequency of comments in terms of the overall course ratings.

**TABLE VIII. Frequency of comment in terms of overall course rating groups.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING OF COURSE</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
<th>Percent of total comments</th>
<th>Size of rating group</th>
<th>Percent of rating group commenting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste of time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.8*</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non-art group did not rate course; their comments do not appear here.*
More comments were made by respondents who had rated the course positively than by those who rated it negatively. On the other hand, persons who rated the course negatively were more likely to comment than those who gave good or excellent ratings. A comparison of percentage of comment between non-art students and art students showed remarkable similarity as seen in Table IV. Thirty-one percent of all respondents taking art courses commented while 33% of the non-art group took time and effort to write. The significant trend showed in Table IX was in the progression of percentages showing proportion of each subgroup to comment. Those respondents taking 36 or more credit hours were most prone to write while the Basic Design only group made the fewest comments.

TABLE IX. Frequency of comment by art credits earned subgroupings including non-art group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ART CREDITS EARNED SUBGROUPS</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
<th>Percent of total comments</th>
<th>Size of total subgroup</th>
<th>Percent of subgroup commenting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No art hours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Design only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 36 hours</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 hours or more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The real value of these comments, subjective as they were, could be found in the specific details which they related about the Basic Design course taken by these respondents and the insights that could be gained into the range of backgrounds and vocations represented by the survey group. The personal and apparently sincere statements in Appendix V represented anonymous course evaluations and autobiographical contributions that delivered a remarkably different type of impact from all the tables in Appendix IV. Planners of future basic art courses could benefit from these subjective contributions as well as from the statistical findings presented in this chapter.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Project

Efforts at measurement of the ways that people in our culture value the visual arts in their everyday activities have been rare. One reason for this lack of measurement is the great difficulty of quantifying such abstract characteristics as values or interests.

It is the task of the art educator to prepare the student for interaction with the visual arts in our society. The educator needs to identify the roles played by the arts in order to establish priorities and teaching objectives leading toward the best possible preparation for the student. Heightened awareness of society's expression through the arts, an understanding of the basic elements and principles of design and the cultivation of enthusiasm for involvement with the visual arts are important goals for instruction in Basic Design.

Evaluation of the Basic Design course can provide measures of the effectiveness of the course. While evaluation of current students has been conducted to measure cognitive and psycho-motor learning, follow-up evaluation has not been systematically pursued.

It was hypothesized that the former Basic Design student, once out of the artificially determined pattern of college life, should reflect significant impact of the course in his behavior. Did
former Basic Design students choose to become involved in art-oriented activities more than former students who took no art credits? Did a good experience in the Basic Design course relate to subsequent high levels of activity in art? Did evaluations of certain aspects of the course correlate highly with subsequent art activity levels? This investigation has provided partial answers to these questions and, in so doing, has raised new questions.

Of the three main objectives in the study, the first involved the design of a survey instrument to gather information describing respondent population and Basic Design courses and data adequate to fulfillment of the other two objectives. The second objective called for measurement of survey year art interest levels based upon frequency of performance in ten selected art activities. The third objective was to secure respondent evaluations of their Basic Design courses in terms of ratings of overall course quality and of specific aspects of the course. Correlation coefficients established degree of relationship between overall evaluations and ratings of specific aspects of the Basic Design experience. All measurements of art interest and course evaluation were examined for total group and by subgroups for better understanding of details.

Questionnaires were sent to a population sample selected from students enrolled in Basic Design at Linn-Benton Community College, Oregon State University and the University of Oregon during the target year of 1968-69.

Processing of responses involved transcribing of all voluntary comments, coding of sorting information for data processing, and
Major findings were reported in Chapter IV. The survey instrument brought in data fulfilling all three objectives. Respondent sample and Basic Design courses were described. Measurement of art interest levels based upon performance indicators yielded similar but more consistent data than those based upon respondents' stated levels of interest. Assessment of the overall quality of the Basic Design course and evaluations of specific aspects of the course produced findings showing a broad range of feelings among respondents. Correlation coefficients demonstrated the degree of relationship between overall evaluations of the course and specific aspects of the experience. It was found that ratings of teaching methods, teacher effectiveness and amount of stimulation toward involvement in art were most closely related to the overall appraisal of the course. The last area of findings was the subjective accumulation of voluntary comments by respondents.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn after consideration of the total findings.

Students who took collegiate art courses, participated more frequently on performance indicators of art interest than did non-art respondents.

Active involvement in creation of art work and in job-related design efforts as well as appreciation through reading,
discussion, and visiting exhibits were identified as the most common post-collegiate activities in the visual arts among respondents who took Basic Design.

A high appreciation of the teaching methods and teacher effectiveness encountered in the Basic Design classes was reported more often by the active high art interest group than by the medium or low art interest groups.

Most respondents rated their Basic Design course from average to good.

The Basic Design teaching methods were the most heavily criticized element of classroom experience evaluated by the respondents.

Overall ratings of the quality of the Basic Design course were closely related to respondents' feelings about the helpfulness of the teaching methods, the effectiveness of the instructors, and the degree to which the course stimulated interest in art activities.

The amount of collegiate art credits earned by respondents was closely related to the level of post-collegiate art activity reported.

Respondents taking only Basic Design reported little stimulation to become involved in art and subsequently reported low to medium post-collegiate art interest levels.
Art majors, in retrospection, indicated that their Basic Design courses tended to reduce their interest in art rather than increase it.

The Basic Design courses at LBCC appeared to have been the most successful of all three institutions in increasing student interest and activity in the visual arts.

The U of O group reported less satisfaction than the OSU and LBCC groups with every aspect of the Basic Design class and less subsequent application of course content in other courses.

These conclusions are limited to the findings of the survey as they have been explored in this investigation. Other statistical manipulations of the data could produce further detail and direction. The size and scope of this project, however, did not justify such additional study.

Implications

Review of the data and voluntary comments led this investigator to believe that two areas of the study implied findings of importance to planners of basic collegiate art courses.

In the art activity data, and in the comments, were found implications that respondents felt constrained by some imposed definition of the visual arts. Comments chided the questionnaire for alluding to only the traditional art forms when, in fact, drawing, painting, and sculpture did not appear by name. Activity reporting showed most common use of design knowledge on the job in what can be assumed to have been specific and practical applications
in non-fine arts situations. Other comments described types of everyday art activities outside of the traditional modes of expression in the visual arts. Data describing classroom applications of design principles, however, showed architecture, industrial design, consumer products and advertising design to have received little classroom emphasis except at LBCC. Many respondents did not feel welcome to include the non-traditional applications of design in the survey. This implies that there is a need to aid students in recognizing and manipulating the basics of design in tasks on the job and in everyday decision making. In so doing, both process and product are involved, but student inability to separate the two elements was apparently not developed. (See comments 13, 17, 22, 29, and 39.) Preparing students to understand and control the process of designing without limiting the product is an important step in teaching enjoyment of the visual arts.  

Better understanding of the functions of art in contemporary society could provide vehicles for classroom activity wherein students would not assume that design principles apply only to traditional forms of the visual arts.

The second area of implied confusion lay with the apparent misunderstandings between Basic Design student and course. That student expectations and course objectives and activities differed widely in many classes was revealed by course evaluation and by comments.  

26The writer feels that the Basic Design course description for the target year at the U of O (see Appendix I) is an effort at recognizing the need to deal with process of designing without heavy limitations confining the products to the traditional forms of the visual arts.
Many respondents felt that the subject matter was wrong, the teaching methods did not help them to learn and their instructors were not supportive. The implication is that student goals, expressed or unidentified, were often unrealized. Comment #38 speaks for many less articulate respondents and should be read by planners of basic courses in the visual arts.

Conclusions have shown that there was dissatisfaction among respondents in this study who were highly art-oriented and among those who were non-art oriented. Questions must be asked about the identification of student needs and expectations before the desired affective learning in the visual arts can be accomplished.

How much of a sense of satisfaction or accomplishment should a basic course be expected to yield? Can it be quantified?

How great are the differences between the needs of art-oriented, previously trained students and non-art oriented students in the areas of content and skill development?

What teaching methods effect affective learning most positively?

Does the amount of effort put into projects or the number of projects required relate to understanding and valuation of the principles of visual organization?

Can the supportive skills of effective teachers be identified and generalized?

Should the Basic Design course attempt to be a source of stimulation toward involvement in the visual arts?

Should students expect the course content to be fundamental to other course work?...to other experiences?
These questions have been asked before. They have usually been answered by conjecture, in terms of experience and in a subjective manner. While such answers have often been correct, systematic inquiry into some of these areas is recommended.

Recommendations for Further Study

The limited nature of this project has produced a sense of frustration over the need for answers to the questions that have been raised. Basically, two areas of additional research are indicated. Further exploration of the uses to which former students put their fundamental learning in the visual arts is a primary need. Then, further investigation is needed into the best teaching methods and formats for basic learning in the visual arts. Success in affective learning is brought about by assuring success in cognitive and psychomotor learning. Objective evaluation of learning among college art students would aid in this effort.

Research into art interest levels could be conducted so as to contribute understanding of far greater depth than that based upon mere frequency of performance. Interview formats applied to various groups within our society could produce a greater understanding of quality and degree of the popular types of involvement with the principles of design. Vocational, social, recreational, economic and therapeutic functions all are fulfilled through processes of manipulating the elements and principles of visual organization.
Opportunities for the artist-educator to contribute to continuing student enthusiasm for participation in the roles of art in society are available. Basic Design can be a basis for the expansion and deepening of such enthusiasm. Vigorous evaluation, experimentation with new teaching methods, and identification of effective traditional approaches are needed.27

Specific areas for action include identification of student needs and expectations and improvement of teaching methods. Pre-requisite to all of these, is procurement of administrative support and funding as an incentive to accountable innovation and as assurance that educational programs in post-secondary basic design will survive and prosper. The message of Robert Diamond, assistant vice chancellor for instructional development at Syracuse University is urgent:

> Academic redesign is a matter of survival. Change must occur and it must take place on most campuses without additional total resources. (Diamond, Audiovisual Instruction, December 1974, p. 8)

Some research efforts have been made in the above area (Chappell, 197). A concerted assault on each of these areas of action is needed. Identification of student needs implies not only researching of needs expressed by the student but prediction

---

27It is important to note that all three institutions involved in this survey have made major changes in their Basic Design course offerings since the 1968-69 school year. Study of the affective impact of these new formats would be of value.
of future needs. Better teaching methods could include improved communication with students regarding goals, objectives, and evaluative aims, increased accessibility to content and instructors, a more effective system of accountability to students and administrators, the use of multiple learning strategies that are designed to meet the unique needs of a wide variety of student backgrounds. The procurement of administrative and financial support will require cooperative efforts from instructional personnel (Diamond, 1974). Probably nothing less than an institutional level of commitment will provide the reorganization of fiscal priorities than is needed.

Future research will be needed to affirm and expand the exploratory findings of this study. It is hoped that this contribution to the literature will provide directions for future investigations and guidance around some of the pitfalls ahead.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

BASIC DESIGN COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

(as they appeared in the 1968-1969 catalogs for the three campuses in the study)

Linn-Benton Community College

Art 195  Basic Design  1 class  2 lab hrs/wk  2 credits
       A general introduction to the design field through study of the basic art principles with emphasis on developing sound judgment, basic skills and individual creative growth.

Art 196  Basic Design  1 class  2 lab hrs/wk  2 credits
       Continuation of study of the design field with emphasis on relationships between 2 and 3 dimensional space; further development of basic skills, individual growth and ability to analyze design problems  Prerequisite: Art 195

Art 197  Basic Design  1 class  2 lab hrs/wk  2 credits
       Continuation of the study of design field with emphasis toward the development of the individual designer.  Prerequisite: Art 196

Oregon State University

Art 195, 196, 197  Basic Design  2 lab hrs/term  3 terms
       Language of visual arts; color, texture, form, and space explored in studio and through study of works of art. Must be taken in sequence.  (Required for art majors, home ec. and art ed.)

University of Oregon

Art 295  Basic Design  (no grade)  2 hrs each term
       Programming of information and processes invested in the act of designing; exercises in understanding the syntax of problem posing. Open to non-majors. Special section for Honors College students.
ART INTEREST SURVEY

Please return to: Priscilla Hardin, 2970 N.W. Hayes Ave., Corvallis, Oregon 97330

PART 1

High school attended
City and State where high school is located

High school art courses taken:
☐ none
☐ less than one year
☐ one year
☐ more than one year

College or University attended
Second College or University attended
College major
Present occupation

Basic college art courses taken:
☐ Survey of Visual Arts .... credit hrs.
☐ Introduction to Art History. credit hrs.
☐ Basic Design. credit hrs.
☐ other art courses
☐ none of the above

As nearly as you can remember, how many credit hours of college art courses did you take in addition to those checked above? Credit Hours

PART 2

Please mark only one square for each activity listed below.

WITHIN THE PAST YEAR, I HAVE:

☐ used my knowledge of art on my job.
☐ discussed art seriously with friends.
☐ acquired original art work through purchase or gift.
☐ attended meetings of a community art organization.
☐ visited an art museum or art exhibit.
☐ read an article about art.
☐ read a book about art.
☐ created art work of my own.
☐ attended art classes.
☐ displayed my own art work in public exhibition.

never ☐ 1-2 times ☐ 3-5 times ☐ 6-10 times ☐ 11 times or more

COMMENTS — If, after filling out the entire questionnaire, there is any additional information or comment that you wish to add, PLEASE USE THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS PAGE. Any such information will be most welcome and will be considered a valuable addition to the research project.
Your name was selected from the enrollment lists of the school, course and school year checked below.
PLEASE ANSWER THE REST OF THE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR CLASS.

Linn-Benton Com. College  Survey of Visual Arts  1968  Fall Term
Oregon State University  Intro. to Art History  1969  Winter Term
University of Oregon  Basic Design  1968  Spring Term

PART 3
By each question, mark the square that best describes your basic collegiate art class.

1. How much of the information taught in the class had you already learned in high school art classes?
   - very much
   - much
   - some
   - little
   - none

2. When someone mentions the term 'art' to you, how interested are you?
   - very much
   - much
   - some
   - little
   - not at all

3. How interested in art were you when you started your class?
   - very much
   - much
   - some
   - little
   - not at all

4. How interested in art were you when you completed your class?
   - very much
   - much
   - some
   - little
   - not at all

5. How have the passing years changed your opinion of the value of the course?
   - much improved
   - improved
   - none
   - diminished
   - very diminished

6. How much do you value the subject matter that was taught in the class?
   - very much
   - much
   - some
   - little
   - not at all

7. How much did the teaching methods used in the class help you in learning?
   - very much
   - much
   - some
   - little
   - not at all

8. How much individual participation did your class require?
   (such as research, art projects, reports, etc.)
   - very much
   - much
   - some
   - little
   - not at all

9. How effective was your teacher in supporting learning?
   - very effective
   - usually effective
   - often effective
   - effective
   - ineffective

10. How would you rate your course as a whole?
    - excellent
    - good
    - average
    - poor
    - a waste of time

11. How much did the course stimulate you to become involved in art?
    - very much
    - much
    - some
    - little
    - none

12. How much did you use the course content in other courses?
    - very much
    - much
    - some
    - little
    - none

PART 4

1. Check the main teaching methods used in your class on the following list.
   - lecture
   - slide/lecture
   - discussion
   - individual projects
   - group projects
   - written reports
   - other (specify) ____________________________

2. In class, we applied principles of visual organization to:
   - our own projects
   - works of fine art
   - objects from nature
   - architecture
   - industrial design
   - consumer products
   - advertising design
APPENDIX II - CONTINUED

Guide to presentation in Appendix IV of data collected by the Survey Instrument

Part I
High School location
High School art courses taken
College Major
Amount of art credits earned

- Table A, 1.1
- Chart A, 2
- Chart B, 1
- Chart B, 2

Part 2
Frequency of Performance in Selected Art Activities

- Charts F, 1-10

Part 3
Question 1
Question 2
Question 3
Questions 3-12

- Chart C, 2
- Charts E, 3
- Chart B, 3
- Charts F, 1-10
- Charts G
- Tables H 1-2

Part 4
Questions 1 and 2

- Table C, 1
To: Priscilla Hardin, Graduate Student at OSU  
2970 NW Hayes Ave., Corvallis, Oregon 97330  
May 23, 1974

GREETINGS:

YOUR NAME HAS BEEN SELECTED......

These words are usually associated with advertising gimmicks offering you something wonderful for next-to-nothing. In this case, the offer is small indeed. I am preparing a follow-up study of students from LACC, OSU and U of O. Many of these students took basic art courses four or five years ago. The idea is to learn how these people are presently involved with the subject of art. The art departments at Linn-Benton, OSU and U of O are cooperating by providing names from old class lists. In turn, they will receive the results of the study.

BUT, the effort is meaningless without your response. What will you receive for your efforts?

YOU ARE OFFERED:

1) THE OPPORTUNITY to invest 5 minutes of your time in answering a questionnaire about yourself and art.

2) THE SATISFACTION of knowing you have provided vital assistance of a sort that no one else could give.

3) A CHANCE to increase the meaning and impact of college art instruction.

4) THE PROMISE that you and your former art instructor (if you had one) will remain anonymous while the statistical knowledge gained will be made available to your former school to be used in planning instruction.

5) THE ASSURANCE that any inquiries you may make concerning these procedures will be answered.

PLEASE......Your questionnaire is urgently needed to make this survey statistically valuable. This research is not publicly funded. Due to postage and printing costs, a small number of names has been selected. Due to out-dated address information, many respondents will not even receive their questionnaires. So, no matter how hum-drum you may consider your responses to be, PLEASE return the fully answered questionnaire in its prepaid envelope as quickly as possible.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. If you have read this far, you need only to invest this much time again to fill out the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Hardin
APPENDIX III

PROCEDURES USED IN RATING ART ACTIVITY LEVELS

Straight Weighted Procedures

The straight weighted process involved attaching point values (one through four) to responses in columns two through five of Part 2 of the questionnaire. Each respondent's score was totaled. All scores were plotted on a distribution curve. The distribution was divided into simple thirds. As noted, scores under 18 fell in the lower third, 18-39 made up the central group and 40-110 included the upper or most active group. This method assumed all ten listed art activities to have equal weight and treated frequency responses from left to right as equidistant intervals.

Average Deviation Procedures

The average deviation method allowed for consideration of distribution of total responses to each activity and correction of such variations as did occur between activities. The average deviation formula as described in *Basic Statistical Methods*, (Downie and Heath, 1974) was applied to the distribution of responses for each activity. Average deviation was found and low, medium and high activity ranges were established for each activity. The result was the elimination of the first (used art on the job), fourth (attended meetings), ninth (attended classes) and tenth (displayed own art work) activities from the rating process. They
had to be declared invalid as responses were grouped too far to one end of the scale of frequency as can be seen in Appendix VI, D. (It appears that "everybody" uses their knowledge of art on the job more than eleven times a year, and that "nobody" goes to meetings of community art organizations, takes art classes or displays their own art work.) Using the low, middle and high activity ranges established for each of the remaining activities, each questionnaire was then rated according to the average of its responses to questions 2, 3, 5, and 9. In the few cases where the average response fell on the border between two ranges, the respondent was rated in the category of higher activity. This average deviation method allowed for different valuation of each item determined by frequency of response. It still carries the weakness of treating the frequency ratings as equidistant intervals.
APPENDIX IV, A - HIGH SCHOOL BACKGROUND DATA

TABLE A, 1.1 - Urban and suburban-rural high school backgrounds of respondent population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF HIGH SCHOOL COMMUNITY</th>
<th>TOTAL Survey (174)</th>
<th>Non-art group (29)</th>
<th>LBCC (21)</th>
<th>OSU (79)</th>
<th>U of O (45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban-rural</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban-rural</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Urban</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Suburban-rural</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communities with a target year population of 50,000 or more were designated as urban.
Communities with a target year population of less than 50,000 were designated as suburban-rural.
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, A - High School Background Data

Chart 2 - Amount of high school art training received by respondents for total art group, total survey, and for subgroups by campus and by art credits earned.

Intervals are: 1 - No high school, 2 - Less than one year, 3 - One year, 4 - More than one year. Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

APPENDIX IV, B - Collegiate Population Description

Chart 1 - Distribution of areas of major study among respondents for total survey and subgrouped by campus and by art credits earned.

Intervals are: 1 - Sciences, 2 - Humanities, 3 - Art. Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, B - Collegiate Population Description

Chart 2 - Amount of art credit hours earned for total art group and subgrouped by campus and by major.

Intervals are: 1 - Basic Design only, 2 - Up to 36 hours, 3 - 36 hours or more. Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 3 - Pre-Basic Design levels of art interest reported for total art group and subgrouped by campus, by major and by art credits earned.

Intervals are: 1 - Not at all, 2 - Little, 3 - Some, 4 - Much, 5 - Very much. Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, C - DATA DESCRIBING THE BASIC DESIGN COURSE

TABLE C, 1.1 - Main teaching methods used in Basic Design classes as reported by campus subgroups and by total Basic Design respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING METHOD</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LBCC (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U of O (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture (77)</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slide/lecture (21)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion (92)</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual projects (130)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group projects (36)</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written reports (10)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (6)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

TABLE C, 1.2 - Classroom applications of design principles reported by campus subgroups and by total Basic Design respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATIONS OF DESIGN PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LBCC (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U of O (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student projects (136)</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works of fine art (29)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects from nature (56)</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architecture (27)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial design (11)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumer products (19)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertising design (18)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, C - Continued -

Chart 2 - Responses to Question 1, "How much of the information taught in your class had you already learned in high school art classes?", by subgroups and for total art group.

Intervals are: 1 - None, 2 - Little, 3 - Some, 4 - Much, 5 - Very Much
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, D - Frequency of Performance in Ten Selected Art Activities.

Chart 1 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have used my knowledge of art on the job."

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 2 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have discussed art seriously with friends."

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, D - Frequency of Performance in Ten Selected Art Activities (Continued)

Chart 3 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have acquired original art work through purpose or gift."

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 4 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have attended meetings of a community art organization.

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, D - Frequency of Performance in Ten Selected Art Activities (Continued)

Chart 5 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have visited an art museum or art exhibit."

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 6 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have read an article about art."

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, D - Frequency of Performance in Ten Selected Art Activities (Continued)

Chart 7 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have read a book about art."

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 8 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have created art work of my own."

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, D - Frequency of Performance in Ten Selected Art Activities (Continued)

Chart 9 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have attended art classes."

Chart 10 - Responses to "Within the past year, I have displayed my own art work in public exhibition."

Intervals are: 1 - Never, 2 - 1 to 2 times, 3 - 3 to 5 times, 4 - 6 to 10 times, 5 - 11 times or more
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, E - Art Interest Levels Based on Performance Indicators.

Chart 1 - Art interest levels derived by the straight weighted method of rating* for subgroups by campus and by art credits earned and for total survey.

Intervals are: 1 - Low interest, 2 - Medium interest, 3 - High interest
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 2 - Art interest levels derived by the average deviation method of rating* for subgroups by campus and by art credits earned and for total survey.

Intervals are: 1 - Low interest, 2 - Medium interest, 3 - High interest
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
Chart 3.1 - Responses to question 2 (Part 3), "When someone mentions the term 'art' to you, how interested are you?", reported as stated current art interest levels of art group by art credits earned.

Intervals indicating stated art interest are:  1 - Not at all,  2 - Little,  3 - Some,  4 - Much,  5 - Very much
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Charts 3.2 and 3.3 -

Responses to question 2, "When someone mentions the term 'art' to you, how interested are you?", reported as stated current art interest levels of art group by art interest levels based upon performance indicators.

Intervals indicating stated art interest are:  1 - Not at all,  2 - Little,  3 - Some,  4 - Much,  5 - Very much
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, F - Course Evaluation Data

Chart 1 - Responses to question 3, "How interested in art were you when you started your class?"

Chart 2 - Responses to question 4, "How interested in art were you when you completed your class?"

Intervals indicating stated art interest are: 1 - Not at all, 2 - Little, 3 - Some, 4 - Much, 5 - Very much
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, F - Course Evaluation Data (Continued)

Chart 3 - Responses to question 5, "How have the passing years changed your opinion of the value of the course?"

Intervals are: 1 - Very diminished, 2 - Diminished, 3 - None, 4 - Improved, 5 - Much improved
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 4 - Responses to question 6, "How much do you value the subject matter that was taught in the class?"

Intervals are: 1 - Not at all, 2 - Little, 3 - Some, 4 - Much, 5 - Very much
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, F - Course Evaluation Data (Continued)

Chart 5 - Responses to question 7, "How much did the teaching methods used in the class help you in learning?"

Intervals are: 1 - Not at all, 2 - Little, 3 - Some, 4 - Much, 5 - Very much
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 6 - Responses to question 8, "How much individual participation did your class require?"

Intervals are: 1 - None at all, 2 - Little, 3 - Some, 4 - Much, 5 - Very much.
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, F - Course Evaluation Data (Continued)

Chart 7 - Responses to question 9, "How effective was your teacher in supporting learning?"

Intervals are: 1 - Not effective, 2 - Seldom effective, 3 - Often effective, 4 - Usually effective, 5 - Very effective
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.

Chart 8 - Responses to question 10, "How would you rate your course as a whole?"

Intervals are: 1 - A waste of time, 2 - Poor, 3 - Average, 4 - Good, 5 - Excellent
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, F - Course Evaluation Data (Continued)

Chart 9 - Responses to question 11, "How much did the course stimulate you to become involved in art?"

Chart 10 - Responses to question 12, "How much did you use the course content in other courses?"

Intervals are: 1 - None, 2 - Little, 3 - Some, 4 - Much, 5 - Very Much
Bracketed numbers indicate group sizes.
APPENDIX IV, G - Course Evaluation by Art Interest Level Groups.

Chart 1 - Responses to questions 6-10 by low, medium and high art interest level subgroups as determined by the straight weighted method.

1.1 How much do you value the subject matter that was taught in the class?

1.2 How much did the teaching methods used in the class help you in learning?

1.3 How effective was your teacher in supporting learning?

1.4 How would you rate your course as a whole?

Intervals are: 1-Not at all, 2-Little, 3-Some, 4-Much, 5-Very much.

Intervals are: 1-Not effective, 2-Seldom effective, 3-Occasionally effective, 4-Usually effective, 5-Very effective.
APPENDIX IV, G - Course Evaluation by Art Interest Level Groups

(Continued)

Chart 2 - Responses to questions 6-10 by low, medium and high art interest level subgroups as determined by the average deviation method.

1. How much do you value the subject matter that was taught in the class?
2. How much did the teaching methods used in the class help you in learning?
3. How effective was your teacher in supporting learning?
4. How would you rate your course as a whole?

Intervals are: 1-Not at all, 2-Little, 3-Some, 4-Much, 5-Very much
APPENDIX IV, H - Relationships between Responses to Question 10, “How would you rate your course as a whole?” and Questions 1–12

Chart 1 - Correlation coefficients between responses to question 10 and questions 6, 7, 9, 11, and 12, evaluating specific aspects of the classroom experience, subgrouped by campus, by majors, by art credits earned and for total art group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>1.1 TOTAL</th>
<th>1.2 - BY CAMPUS</th>
<th>1.3 - BY MAJORS</th>
<th>1.4 - BY ART CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. How much do you value the subject matter that was taught in the class?</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How much did the teaching methods used in the class help you in learning?</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How effective was your teacher in supporting learning?</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How much did the course stimulate you to become involved in art?</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much did you use the course content in other courses?</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2 - Correlation coefficients between responses to question 10 and questions 6, 7, 9, 11, and 12, evaluation specific aspects of the classroom experience, subgrouped by art interest levels based upon performance indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>2.1 TOTAL</th>
<th>2.2 - Straight Weighted</th>
<th>2.3 - Average Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. How much do you value the subject matter that was taught in the class?</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How much did the teaching methods used in the class help you in learning?</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How effective was your teacher in supporting learning?</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How much did the course stimulate you to become involved in art?</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much did you use the course content in other courses?</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV, H - Relationships between Responses to Question 10, "How would you rate your course as a whole?", and Questions 1-12 (continued).

Chart 3 - Correlation coefficients between responses to question 10 and questions 1-5 and 8, subgrouped by campus, by majors, by art credits earned and for total art group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>3.1 TOTAL</th>
<th>3.2 - BY CAMPUS</th>
<th>3.3 - BY MAJORS</th>
<th>3.4 - BY ART CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much of the information taught in the class had you already learned in high school?</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When someone mentions the term 'art' to you, how interested are you?</td>
<td>+.35</td>
<td>+.75</td>
<td>+.26</td>
<td>+.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How interested in art were you when you started your class?</td>
<td>+.10</td>
<td>+.48</td>
<td>+.23</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How interested in art were you when you completed your class?</td>
<td>+.48</td>
<td>+.72</td>
<td>+.61</td>
<td>+.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How have the passing years changed your opinion of your class?</td>
<td>+.56</td>
<td>+.55</td>
<td>+.54</td>
<td>+.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How much individual participation did your class require?</td>
<td>+.40</td>
<td>+.39</td>
<td>+.31</td>
<td>+.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 4 - Correlation coefficients between responses to question 10 and questions 1-5 and 8, subgrouped by art interest levels based upon performance indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>4.1 TOTAL</th>
<th>4.2 - Straight Weighted</th>
<th>4.3 - Average Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much of the information taught in the class had you already learned in high school?</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When someone mentions the term 'art' to you, how interested are you?</td>
<td>+.35</td>
<td>+.16</td>
<td>+.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How interested in art were you when you started your class?</td>
<td>+.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How interested in art were you when you completed your class?</td>
<td>+.48</td>
<td>+.51</td>
<td>+.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How have the passing years changed your opinion of the value of the course?</td>
<td>+.56</td>
<td>+.57</td>
<td>+.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How much individual participation did your class require?</td>
<td>+.40</td>
<td>+.31</td>
<td>+.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

COMMENTS OF RESPONDENTS

Comments volunteered by respondents have been organized into four groupings on the basis of art credits taken as follows:
1) No art credits earned in college (experimental group), 2) Basic Design art credits only, 3) Up to 36 art credits earned, and 4) 36 or more art credits earned in college. Within each group, comments are organized by rating of the Basic Design course in order from "excellent" through "a waste of time". The first group, being the experimental group, is presented randomly as there was no rating of course quality.

No Collegiate Art Credits Earned

1. Housewife  major grouping - humanities
   Since I didn't take Basic Design, (I didn't want to waste time doing projects I wouldn't enjoy and I feel art should be a source of enjoyment, not a source of tedium) I couldn't take classes such as weaving, lettering, etc. However, since graduating I've found that the community colleges offer a wide variety of art courses which can be taken for no credit through their continuing education program. I took a course last fall and it was great. I plan to take several more in the future and I feel they're ideal for people who aren't serious art students but enjoy working in different mediums.

2. Chemist  major grouping - science
   I am presently working as a colorant chemist. My duties include the formulation of colorant systems used in paints. Although a knowledge of art is not necessary, the concept of color - i.e., shade and strength differences, is important. My work involved color matching - by eye and with the aid of a computer system. In planning courses in color appreciation, I feel that this aspect, especially the practical side, job opportunities for example, should be open to students.
In my own field, for example, the position of color consultant to various coatings groups is becoming important.

3. Transportation engineer - major grouping - science

What is art?

4. U. S. Army Officer (engineer) major grouping - science

Though I've never taken any formal classes in art, (time did not permit that in my curriculum), I feel I have some appreciation of art. My own talents are limited to making numerous sketch maps and diagrams as training aids to enhance teaching in my classes.

I have a friend who took art courses from (**) who would appreciate making mention to improving and expanding availability of art courses at (**).

5. Housewife major grouping humanities

This questionnaire may not be valid as I dropped out of the Basic Design course after about three weeks of class. I could not stand the instructor and a project that I had spent a great deal of time on was given a relatively low grade for the time and effort. The art classes I attended recently were tole painting lessons.

6. Substitute teacher major grouping humanities

My greatest interest in art came from a European visit which included last year. After seeing something I became more interested in it - such as museums in Europe... thus the discussions and museums. (referring to the responses on the questionnaire)

In general, though, art doesn't make up one of the most important parts of my life.

7. Housewife major grouping humanities

In college it was next to impossible to get into an art class unless it was required in your major. I know this is a problem because of numbers of people but I think it is too bad for people not to be able to develop an interest simply for fun.

8. Teacher major grouping humanities

As I consider my artistic abilities very limited, I was somewhat hesitant about even trying any art courses. Besides that, there was usually an extremely long waiting list for such classes, and I felt I should let the really interested persons have first crack at it. The only art course I took was for elementary teachers, because I had to!
9. Nurses aide major grouping humanities
I don't know how you got my name or if this will be of any value to you. The only art class I have ever taken was one required in 7th grade. I do not have any interest or talent in this area, although once in a while I make an effort. One of my best friends was an art history major and still manages to produce some work. All I know about art has come from our discussions.

10. Housewife/mother major grouping humanities
The art course I took in college was especially for elementary education majors. I do not feel that the class was very good in preparing one to teach. Such things as drawing nudes and making movies did not seem like things to learn to teach the basics from. In my senior year, I switched majors to geography. I used my high school learning in calligraphy to further my mapmaking work. Last summer I worked on aerial photos for a state fire patrol. As a housewife I use art a lot, although it is mostly creative, and not what I learned in school. I make patterns for toys, paint seasonal designs on the window, decorate desserts, wrap packages, make cards, etc. I wish you lots of luck on your project.

Collegiate Art Credits in Basic Design Only

Course rating - EXCELLENT

11. Project engineer (civil) major grouping science
I was only allowed to enroll in an art class after I had transferred out of engineering. Both instructors were very encouraging and stimulating, which was such a change from my earlier professors. Thanks for asking.

Course rating - GOOD

12. Lab technician major grouping science
(Part 3, #9) What? He was a nice guy. He liked to talk and I liked to listen, though I never paid much attention to anything he said. He was an old man. I listened to his voice and watched him as he moved. Each day as I entered the classroom my IQ would slip down 30 to 40 points. It was like descending to the bottom of the sea.
13. Oregon State Library  major grouping  science
Artistic discussions are an important part of my private life - I have several close friends with degrees in art, art education, art history, etc., who are quite vocal.
My own "artistic" creations are not the basics such as painting, drawing, but more in the realm of creative needlework - crewel embroidery, crochet, needlepoint. I consider it art - you might not. What the world needs most are more decent museums where people can go to experience art. Oregon has a few, but for one who has spent many beautiful days in museums in Boston, New York, we are missing something here - perhaps an art consciousness. Hopefully someday it will change, even though Salem will probably never have a Bush Barn full of Monets and Rembrandts. Too bad!
Hope this is valuable. I really love questionnaires and nobody ever sends them to me.

14. Unemployed  major grouping  science
I realize this will not be of much help to you. I am not actually art oriented, merely curious.
My instructor in Basic Design stimulated my interest in perception more than application of technique, which has undeniably been a factor in my present interest in meditation. Overall I would say my course in Basic Design did more to stimulate and challenge basic foundations in perception than any courses in psychology (this is a Psy major writing). Sorry this is so late, I just received it today.

Course rating - AVERAGE

15. Graduate research engineer  major grouping  humanities
Basic criticism of beginning class is:
1) Too large of class (usually 30 students)
2) Major portion of criticism followed projects and with only one assignment in a specific area it was difficult to improve, i.e., we tended to show the talent we already had; not develop new talent.
3) Often quantity rather than quality was over emphasized or large quantity demanded that quality be sacrificed (in reference to first term primarily where we were involved with line quality, visual relationships, etc.)
4) Basic Design should not be a prerequisite to upper division courses (if it still is). It appeared to simply be a means of keeping anyone, but art majors out of upper division classes since no one else could afford to take more than the Basic Design sequence without infringing on other major and minor requirements.

I was sorely disappointed with the first term, satisfied with the second and enjoyed the third term. I have used the material taught in the first term of the sequence more than that of any other term but felt that little new talent was developed.

Combining Art History and Basic Design I think would be ideal. One's appreciation would be improved by greater involvement in both classes.

Goethe once said, "If you treat a man as he is, he will remain as he is. If you treat a man as he could be, he will become what he could and should be." In a creative field such as art this is especially true.

My compliments to (Instructor X) whom I felt exemplified this attitude.

An engineer is being demanded more and more to relate complex ideas and conclusions to non-engineers. Visual aides play a tremendous role in this regard. Although an engineer seldom is required to produce the finished product - we rely on artists for that, his basic format often governs the direction the finished product will take. For this reason, I have found a background in art to be of assistance to me in my work.

16. Substitute teacher  major grouping  humanities
I had always felt very unartistic and was very apprehensive as I approached this course (it was required for I was a Home Ec major at the time). The course instructor served to reinforce my feelings with regard to my artistic ability. When I began teaching elementary school I began to see how effective I really could be in art - how truly creative. I now really enjoy art and appreciate my own creativity as well as that of others. I am able to recognize so many things in the art of my elementary students and have even been able to help some of them to overcome the hurdle of no confidence in their own ability with art.

17. Graduate student  major grouping  humanities
My definition of art includes the broader areas of macramé, crafts and sewing.
18. No occupation listed  major grouping  humanities
I was a sophomore when I took Basic Design, and pretty ignorant about the subject of art. I'm sure I would get more out of it now as my understanding and interest has increased much since then. But I don't feel the course was much of an impetus to this. I was not yet interested in the finer things in life.

Course rating - POOR

19. Day care center  director  major grouping  art
My second term of Basic Design really ruined art for me for a while. My teacher tended to belittle those who didn't have talent.
My interest in art, in the most part has soared because my husband is majoring in fine arts with emphasis in jewelry and sculpture. I find that the beginning art courses at (***) tend to discourage rather than encourage students to take more advanced classes. The advanced classes seem very interesting.

20. Special education teacher  major grouping  art
An an undergraduate my intended major was art and journalism - then as I did volunteer work for the retarded, I changed my major to special ed. After 2 years of teaching the emotionally disturbed, I have enrolled in graduate school for psychology and art courses. I am presently taking ceramics and plan to continue with ceramics and pick up weaving.

Course rating - WASTE OF TIME

21. Ass't buyer for Macy's, Ca.  major grouping  science
I felt that Basic Design was a waste of 6 credits. I took it because it was a requirement.
I had very little art background before the class and hoped that it would help with the basic principles of art - I wanted to learn about proportion, presentation, methods of design, colors, etc. Instead, we were given general assignments which applied to little. There was no basic idea behind a project to apply in the actual project itself. I always felt as if the classes gave me any direction or enabled me to collect my ideas enough so that when I did a project that it looked artistic.
NOTE - (Perhaps this confusing sentence is intended to read "should have given me some direction...")
I realize that if the assigned projects are very structured that it restricts creativity and originality - but some restrictions allow an inexperienced student a direction in which to apply themselves. I barely applied what I learned in Basic Design in my weaving and home furnishings. I have not used it at all in my work at Macy's.

22. Photojournalist major grouping art
Of all classes that I took in four-plus years of college (1964-1969), the one term of Basic Design was the least worthwhile to me. As the data on the reverse of this page show, Basic Design was also the only art department class that I took in high school or college.
What did I expect? With a major in mass communications, I was looking for a design class that would add to my studies in newspaper and magazine page layout, photography, television composition, etc. By Basic Design I was looking for an introductory discussion of strengths and weaknesses of square, triangular and circular patterns, of light vs. dark colors, etc.
What did I find? My experience in art classes was too limited to make general observations, but the one class should have been labeled "philosophy" rather than "art". The professor spent the entire term rambling about philosophy of life, stopping to discuss the meaning of any words that he or a student should use, and never got around to the design techniques that I expected from the class.
As a result, I felt that the class was worthless at the time and have not changed my opinion in the five years since. (I might add that I probably would have dropped the class had it not been my last term of my senior year and I needed the two credits to graduate.)
Regarding Part 2 on the reverse side of this page, my frequent use of art is in the area of photography composition and publication layout for typographic reproduction. I would like to feel that photography is a form of art, but for the purposes of this questionnaire, have not included it as such. Thus, when you ask if I have created or displayed art, I assume that you mean the mediums of drawing, painting, pottery, etc. and not photography... not letterpress.
One last comment...as an example of practical use of art technique in my personal life, I design and
prepare my own stamp album pages for exhibition. Many of the tools that I use for this work I learned to use at (**) --- but not in my one art class. This training in pen and ink work came from a geography department cartography class.

Up to Thirty-Six Collegiate Credits in Art

Course rating - EXCELLENT

23. Teacher  major grouping  humanities  
I had never had art courses before I entered (**). (Instructor X), who taught most of the classes I took, was an excellent teacher. I had changed my minor to art as a result of his classes. But when I transferred to (**) I found it very difficult to fit art courses into my schedule, therefore, acquiring only 18 of my 24 required classes for a minor. (Instructor X) had his students do projects in all art classes. His classes were not dull lecture-type. I can't use too much of my "acquired art knowledge" in my 2nd grade classroom but I certainly enjoy (it) for myself. I hope this will be of some help to you.

24. Married and part-time painting teacher  major grouping  art  
High school barely gave me the basics of art and left me rather disappointed. (**) had two of the finest art instructors one could have and really helped open new doors to the world of art. I have benefited greatly from the year of college that I had, more so, I believe, than if I would have taken the same art courses from (**). I wish (**) had a better art department. Also, I have taken two summers of painting and drawing at a private art school near Goldendale, Was. It is there I believe that I really learned what makes a good painting from a bad one. I have sold many paintings over the years and right now am enjoying giving painting lessons in individuals homes at reasonable rates.

25. Homemaker  major grouping  none given  
I began Basic Design fall term 1968 with (Instructor X) as teacher. His encouragement led me to take up oil painting and the next term I included oil painting along with Basic Design. The spring term I dropped oils and I found pleasure in painting. I feel Basic Design helped me have the basics that I needed in
art and I highly recommend it to others who ask me questions about beginning painting. My original purpose in Basic Design was for aid in homemaking, decorating, etc. and I know that it was helpful for that also, and I was 43 years old at the time.

Course rating - GOOD

26. Housewife major grouping humanities
By necessity "art" and art courses have been of secondary importance because of practicality of my work and lack of time. The art courses taken have whetted my appetite to learn more and at the first opportunity plan to take more and would like to do something with it. The fall term of Basic Design was somewhat a repeat of high school, but the winter term and spring term were full of new knowledge and insights.

27. Freelance major grouping art
Although I had no background in art, I believe (**) had a very successful art program for a young college and motivated me to a much greater appreciation of art forms than had I only studied art without additional guidance. (Although I am in NO way an artist myself), I have 'set in' on art classes with friends at both (**) and (**) plus taken a few more at OCE and at none of these establishments do students get the individual help and guidance as is offered at (**). Plus additional "quality" of the courses. Someday I just may go back there and let them teach me how to spell! Pris, with all that art under my belt, just look at some of these design objects I've been able to conceive and build! Never wood (would) these sterling ideas have come to me had I not taken 15 hours of art at (**).
NOTE (Attached was an entire page of designs with notes on the use and marketing of the proposed objects.)

28. Purchasing agent major grouping humanities
I have found that I can better relate to colors and form. I have found a broader interpretation of that which I observe. I have used my experience in painting rather than Basic Design to be of more benefit. I find that the structured form of Basic Design that I was taught does not show for the freedom of expression and design that is present in painting (oils in my case).
Also, I find the rigid structure of Basic Design much less rewarding and relaxing than painting. I have also felt that instruction should be limited to the basic structures of the program, then free form should be allowed to develop.

29. Graduate student religion major grouping art
I was only an art major for two years. I graduated a religious studies major and am now at Yale getting a masters in the divinity school. My art classes were the first classes to turn me on at college. I love sculpture...but, alas, haven't really done any since I was at (**). I like oriental art more than western art, if I can generalize about such a thing.
Art, for me, is how we live. Living is an art. How I decorate my room, the clothes I wear, how I garden, clean my car...alas, I try to live a life of conscious design. How does it look, how does it feel, how does it fit, what is the whole, what is the part? questions which constantly run through my head no matter what I am doing.
I guess I'm trying to say that art is not "objects" for me. I create art countless times every day. In this way, while I haven't carved a sculpture with hammer and chisel, I sculpt the ground when I garden... I have said enough...I liked most of my art classes... but I'm not sure I want to give them too much credit for the ideas or values I have now.
Sorry to delay on answering this, it had to be forwarded...and I keep forgetting to answer my mail.

30. Instrumental music teacher major grouping art
In working with my music students I use knowledge of balance, form, texture, shape, continuity, series, etc., that I gained and developed in visual art courses. Abstract ideas in music can be made clear in terms of visual art. Notated music (music written on paper with symbols) is visual.
Methods and tools used in jewelry have helped me in instrument repair problems, too.

31. Teacher (Unemployed) major grouping art
Art was not my college major. I graduated in social studies and education. When I could not find a social studies job in the state of Oregon, I taught one year (1966-7) in Alberta, Canada. I went back to (**) to get another teaching area. Arts and crafts was the easiest to complete as I already had several credits from my undergraduate work. After obtaining my teaching certificate for arts and crafts, I obtained
a job as crafts teacher for Cheldelin Jr. High in Corvallis. I was there for one year and after that left the teaching profession. It was just too much hassle. As you can see from the answers on the other side of the page, I have no involvement in art lately. Concerning the first question, from July 1972 to Sept. 1973, I was involved in designing and building a house in Halsey. Whether or not you would consider that as a use of art training I had at (**), I do not know. Its design is quite unlike any other house I have seen in that it is a one story gambrel roof style with the roof being covered by split shakes and the ends covered with bevel redwood siding.

NOTE At this point, this respondent took the time and effort to list all art and architecture credit hours taken, both undergraduate and graduate.

I graduated from (**) in 1961. I then spent three and a half years in Munich, Germany, with the U.S. Army Intelligence Corps. Then, back to (**) from Sept. 1965 to Aug. 1966. From Sept. 1967 to June 1968, I substituted at Central Linn High School. Then in Sept. 1968, I went back to (**) for work in arts and crafts.

Course rating - AVERAGE

32. Computer programmer major grouping humanities
I feel that the subject of art is very subjective and is not easily taught. Each person has his or her own idea of what is the "correct" method and should be able to pursue that method. Art classes, in my opinion, tend to discriminate against people who don't follow the instructor's method. Consequently a student can do excellent work by one instructor and average or below by another.

Course rating - POOR

33. Housewife major grouping art
This term, Spring '69 Basic Design was very disappointing. The instructor was visiting from another school and I felt he didn't have any form of lesson plans or methods for teaching. I learned very little about art that term. My previous two terms of Basic Design had given me so much more information. Also, I had learned a great deal about color and design through the school of home economics.
34. Any work I can find major grouping art
   My participation in this class is very foggy. I'm afraid in answering these questions I am recalling a montage of many classes. I don't remember this class as any boosting inspiration. I took many classes from one teacher, (Instructor X) and I believe this was one of them. It was a requirement and something I just wanted to get through.

35. Coordinator-instructor, Respiratory therapy program major grouping art
   Basic Design was the worst art course I took. I loved my three terms of jewelry and was even more totally immersed in the one term of ceramics. As a result, I often express myself and work out ideas or problems that bother me in an unlined "day book". Much of the markings in my books are ink drawings or diagrams of ideas and social interactions. This was recommended in my ceramics class. I have never quit this form of expression or doodling or whatever since I finished the ceramics course. Probably one of the more valuable events to happen to me in terms of my continued growth as a being! I hope your study goes well.

Course rating - WASTE OF TIME

36. Savings and loan teller major grouping art
   I believe your definition of art to be limited to what is offered in the art department at (**), I sew and consider that an art. I'm also studying Italian and consider that an art, too. Also, day to day discussions on displays are many times based on intuitive knowledge of what looks good and isn't always thought of as "arty" knowledge so sometimes it's difficult to decide what part "art" plays in your life. I realize this has been completely negative but I hope you'll take it seriously. I enjoyed college very much and learned, very, very much, in most of my classes. Basic Design, however, was a complete waste of time and should never have been stressed as it was. I took two terms of it, the second in the summer and the second term was even worse. Neither teacher gave any thought or previous preparation to the class and showed continually their disinterest and dissatisfaction in having to teach it. It was a case of someone higher up deciding
most of the students needed Basic Design for their majors so there were hundreds who had to take it which meant many teachers were forced to teach it who neither wanted to or were trained for it. Good luck on your project - I hope it reaches someone who's in a position to reorganize the program. (Part 3, #5) I considered it a complete waste of my time then and I haven't changed my mind. (Part 3, #6) However, the subject matter was all repetition of high school home economics courses so I don't give the art class credit for having introduced the subject matter. (Part 3, #12) This class introduced NO new information that hadn't been taught in high school courses so in reality it influenced no other classes.

37. Employment counselor major grouping art
The Basic Design courses I completed at (**) were a complete waste of time and effort. The instruction was the poorest I encountered while in college. If anything, they served to deter me from pursuing any further education in art. The classes were nothing but pure busy work and a source of headaches and ulcers but of little other value. The only decent art course I did have was a basic drawing class during the summer term 1970. The teacher was great; I emerged with a feeling of accomplishment and a sense of confidence in my own creative ability. In all, the Basic Design (required course) has proven to have been a complete loss.

38. Site planner/free lance landscape designer major grouping art
I gather you are interested in the effectiveness of the basic college art courses. If I am missing the point perhaps this will be useless. Most of my art background comes through self-teaching, close association with a couple very good artists, and exposure to the finer examples of art and architecture throughout Europe, the Middle East, Japan and South America. My purpose in taking Basic Design at (**) was to learn why I liked or disliked something rather than merely knowing that I liked it or not. In these terms, my high school art course was very good. Basic Design was also the route to more advanced art courses in which I was interested. Any art background would help me in my field of landscape architecture since the principles of visual organization are applicable to any field of design.
It seems to me that the Basic Design course is at the level of teaching which has the most potential for helping people to enrich their own lives and homes because even if the student does not pursue art any further, the basic art course is of value to anyone in decorating their homes, making flower arrangements, buying furniture, etc. Obviously it is difficult for someone to appreciate fine art unless he understands what it was the artist accomplished. A fair percentage of the people in my Basic Design class had little feeling for visual organization and my own knowledge was limited to a gut level feeling. This fact, and the implications of the course title indicate to me that that was the ideal opportunity to begin learning about the principles of visual organization. The principles I refer to are the elements of design: line, form, space, rhythm, values, texture, color, and the ways these elements are used to achieve or maintain composition, unity, recession, and dominance, contrast and harmony and so on. If these interactions can be understood, the student will be capable of analyzing his own work and that of others and seeing how messages and emotional effects can be communicated to the viewer. Better yet, if he is having trouble getting his own design to "work" he will be able to analyze the problem.

Teaching these basic principles is no easy task. Articulation, clear verbal expression, instead of gut level feelings and cliches like "it works" or "that seems to fit" is the essence of teaching these principles. The trouble of course is that the definition and character of these elements is nearly as elusive as the definition of love...but not quite. Here and there I have read a good description of one element or another, but I have yet to find a single source which clarifies all the elements and principles. The point here is that it takes a long time to gain this understanding and exposure to many sources. I think that if a Basic Design course could present good explanations over the period of a year or two, it would be tremendously effective and stimulating. My high school art course presented some of the elements of design one at a time. Our individual projects were designed to help us explore one element at a time. One assignment was: With a black felt tip pen and a straight edge held at different random angles, draw only lines on an 11" x 14" paper until the paper is completely blacked out. Another assignment was: With a felt tip pen, drawing only lines create rhythm. These very basic exercises, unencumbered by recognizable images are among the most memorable of my
learning experiences. I got the distinct impression in college that teaching the dummies basic design was beneath the dignity of my teachers. Yet none was able to critique the work of their students with any clear expression. Result: the student, if he had done well, didn't know what he had done right, much less what he had done wrong. I might add that there seems to be a connection in history between men who understood these principles well and those who are considered to be great artists. None of my teachers were great artists so it should hardly have been beneath their dignity to study the basic principles until they understood well enough to communicate with others. Rather than accuse my teachers of being too lazy to prepare lessons, I will say that they were so hung up with giving the student complete freedom of expression that they failed to give any direction. The idea that a student learns best when he learns for himself sounds good and if he has some direction of his own that is good. Some of the students in my Basic Design course were uninspired and had no such self drive. One needs to know a little about a subject to get interested in it and sufficient direction to produce work that is not overly frustrating. My teacher offered neither. I have a vague feeling that my teacher made a small effort to get us to learn about some of the elements of design through self discovery, but I saw that only through hind sight. Some of those students didn't even realize there was such a thing as visual rhythm and not knowing that how are they to learn how to create it? Freedom without a little knowledge is useless and wasteful and even with knowledge there are few students who can get along without some direction or at least a clarification of goals. Another drawback to the course was my teacher's idea that we should create something that carried a message. This has its place in art, but not at the basic level. How can a student put across a message when he does not understand how to manipulate harmony and discord, contrast, color, or texture? The result is a frustrated student, whereas if he had been shown how these elements had been used in the past in different ways to express different things he would have some ideas from which to choose his own original combination. For the student's part, he should hardly be concerned with originality until he gains some insight into the tools he has to work with. No one has become an artist without studying other art anyway.
I left that Basic Design course still interested in art, but rather frustrated. Since then, I have stumbled on things which have suddenly brought clarity to some of these principles and looking back I can't help but think about how that frustration might have been avoided. Visual organization is not an easy subject to teach and any teacher who thinks it is has to be lacking in insight himself. My feeling is that the most important quality needed is the teacher's constant effort to get the student to discover and then verbalize insights into the elements and principles of visual organization. To do this the teacher must be able to verbalize them himself. Until the student can do likewise he will never be able to critique his own work and develop his concept to where the bugs are out and the expression is complete.

39. Secretary major grouping humanities
My erasures are because I misunderstood the questionnaire. My Basic Design class was horrible. We just stood around and talked in philosophical ambiguities... Art being life, etc. A real bore and waste of time. My other applied art classes, painting and drawing, i.e. learning from actual experiences did much more to stimulate my interest in art. Of course, I was only an art major for two years, then changed to psychology.

40. Teaching art privately and selling my work major grouping humanities
At the University of California I took a Basic Design class that was terrific. I learned more in that one class than in any class I have taken. It was in 1957 (3 hrs/one semester). Both of the classes at (**) were a total waste of time. Both instructors were trying to be modern. Neither of them was able to accomplish that goal.

Thirty-Six Collegiate Art Credits or More

Course rating - EXCELLENT

41. Landscape designer and contractor major grouping art
My whole life is involved with art. I am also a collector of original oils and watercolors. I draw up to two drawings every week and my job is totally a design related field.
42. Staff artist/designer major grouping art
Because this was a "basic art" course: this particular term dealing with color theory, it was an aid in all of my continued art work.

43. Jewelry designer major grouping art
After looking over most art departments on the West Coast, I really have to give a lot of credit to the (**) art department. I have nothing but the highest regard for their faculty.
NOTE (The remainder of this comment is praise for individual faculty members and expression of gratitude for the type of instruction they offered to this respondent.)

44. Craftsman and landscape painter major grouping art
"Xtra, Xtra, Read all about it! Basic Design Attendance leads Youth to Art Career in mid-Oregon town!"
"Part 2, #1) As an art teacher at Cal Young Jr. High for 6 months, Yes; As a "roughneck" on an oil rig in Wyoming, "No", not exactly; But now, as a starving artist, "Yes"...
Part 3, #6) Story trading, future prognostication, pastoral praise, viewing works and zen.
Part 3, #7) Relaxed informal, encounter circle, natural low key.

45. Seminary student major grouping art
(Part 4, #2) The class was quite unstructured and whatever came up we talked about. Mostly we learned to "apply" visual knowledge to more than just "art works".

46. Cartographic draftsman and investment manager major grouping art
Due to the nature of opportunities/or lack thereof/ I'd like to see the addition of courses aimed at more practical aspects of the art works, i.e., making a living!

47. Artist major grouping art
The institution is useless without human interest.
You can mark time or you can top out the sap to further your progress as an aware human being. They can teach you manual dexterity but if you can't see you can't do.
Artistic involvement of any sort does not limit itself to 1 or 2 times or 11-12 times. Either you are or you are not. In all you do you relate as a humanly compassionate, visually aware actor. Art
can be a business; you can leave it at the office but then you are not an artist; you are a manually competent employee. An artist moves through his life taking the ups and downs and learning the lessons of life as he moves, leaving in his wake whatever changes his effect will bring on the willing and unwilling associates.

(Part 3) I wish I would have exerted more energy in that class. You learn when you are ready to learn no matter what the teaching method. The responsibility for learning lies in the progressive energy of the students. How effective is any human being in the growth of others...as much as they will absorb. All things relate to one who wants to see and be.

Course rating - GOOD

48. Student, sometimes major grouping art It's too bad that I couldn't get a gob teaching in high school as I wanted. I was a good teacher. I did do some teaching of art in a private school and a kindergarten, where I was hired as a "teaching aide" and wound up teaching art to the entire grade school for $200 a month. I am bitter and frustrated every once in a while. After starving and working at shit jobs for 3 years, I went back to school this past year for another degree in political science. I wanted to know how everything got so messed up - history, economics, politics, international relations. Now that I know, it's back to the drawing board. I will be a crafts-person and sell at our "Saturday Market". One thing that continues to bring me some joy and relief is letting all that is in me out = art. Good luck to you, too.

49. Production artist and lecturer major grouping art I'm sorry this is so late - I hope you can still use it. I only received it today - home on vacation. Your project sounds fascinating, being a firm believer of art in theory and practice and coffee table discussion and would like to hear some of your conclusions, whenever they arrive. PS - If my answers seem a little heavy handed, they should be - I've spent the year since graduation sampling art careers to decide which direction to go with it and it looks like teaching and art history win and so it's back to grad school!
Course rating - AVERAGE

50. Housewife and mother major grouping art (Part 3, #10) 'Too basic; projects lacked imagination.

51. Gallery manager/shop keeper major grouping art
At the time the art department was an anemic sort of hot potato; nobody wanted to be department head for long; everybody wanted to have their say. Typical perhaps, chaotic art department; directionless to a point of digression and stagnation. So was the environment.
The specific class was an unfulfilling feeling. It was difficult in the environment at the time (campus unrest) to relate to everyone's energy specifically as to "Basic" design. My thoughts are that the approach to the design thing was too abstracted: i.e., instead of popsicle stick bridges, why not build ("design") something less model-like and more useful? Also, an indoors design class is what? conceited? (by default)? The instructor had a lot of useful observations but his attitude was one of benevolent paternity and some of us don't need grandpa art. It's funny how much greater my interest in design is after spending one evening reading Papanek's "Design for the Real World" than spending time, dollars, etc. in Basic Design...on second thought, it's not funny at all.

Course rating - POOR

52. Secretary major grouping art
There were some major problems with the course;
1. Much of the course was extremely basic to the point of being tedious, i.e., mixing colors, etc.
2. To some the information was new (Home Ec. majors): to others, extremely old. Therefore, the course may have been much more valuable to some than to others.
3. The assignments and projects used to teach these basic principles were unimaginative and, again, tedious. A lot of the time, the assignments took many hours to complete and enabled the student to learn very little. Some assignments took me nearly 20 hours to complete. The second and third terms of this class were much more interesting and valuable so a judgment cannot be made strictly from an evaluation of the first term. In the later terms much more imaginative assignments were used to incorporate less basic principles and therefore were more challenging.
53. Homemaker major grouping art
I suggest two improvements:
1. A class offering current art history, 3 term sequence.
2. More classes in modern printmaking and advertising design techniques
Could you mail

Course rating - WASTE OF TIME

54. Artist major grouping art
(Part 4)
1. other - enigmatic babbeling
2. metaphysical realm of metaphor, clear-blur and journalism

55. Asst. Supervisor major grouping art
Basic Design was such a poor excuse for an art class I cannot even remember enough about it to answer your questions and I took 9 hours of it!
(Part 3, #4) Fortunately I remained interested in spite of it.
(Part 3, #6) What subject matter?
(Part 3, #7) Does not apply - no teaching involved.
(Part 4, #2) Who knows what the instructor had in mind?