Statement of Problem

The problems considered in this study are those concerned with the evaluation of children's art work. Principal consideration will be given to term ambiguity, the value and construction of tests, the exploration of methods previously used and research on more effective means of evaluating art work.

Sources of Data

In order to secure information for use in this paper, the author read articles in art education magazines, other educational journals, books, and copies of art tests.

Methods and Procedures

Information gathered from books and magazines was concerned with methods of evaluation in art programs. Furthermore, the material was gathered with an eye toward evaluative techniques that could be proposed for future use.
Major Findings

Due to the limited amount of time for this study, there were no polls or questionnaires taken. The findings are restricted to the observations made from reviewing the information gathered from books, magazines, and art tests. These findings are included in Chapter V in the form of recommendations.

Recommendation I

There is a need for further research on evaluation in art.

Basis:
New techniques need to be developed to give the art educator the most effective and usable methods of evaluation possible.

Recommendation II

Due to the great amount of ambiguity, there is a need for further work in the refinement of definitions used in the field of art education.

Basis:
Several expressions used in the field of art have very general meanings which can lead to misunderstanding between pupil and instructor.

Recommendation III

A. There is a need for a more effective means of evaluation for both student and instructor in the school art program.

Basis:
Evaluation can play an important part in improving the art program and the student's progress.

B. There is a need to develop an evaluative technique that can be used by the student during the art experience.

Basis:
The student would have the advantage of being able to evaluate his work during creation which would result in greater aesthetic change and thus improve the student's work.
Recommendation IV

The instructor needs to structure his art program so that evaluative techniques can play an important part in aiding the child's artistic growth.

Basis:
Students need to understand how and why their work is being evaluated.

Recommendation V

There is a need for a different method of communicating the child's artistic standing other than that of the letter grade.

Basis:
Letter grades motivate the child to achieve a higher letter grade not learning.

Conclusions

Evaluation is a very important problem in art education that needs to be dealt with immediately. The various problems of evaluation need to be further researched in order to clarify and evolve more effective means of evaluation.

Until the problems of evaluation are solved, there will be a good chance that art programs are not meeting their objectives in terms of effective student learning sequences.

Instructors need to be trained in evaluative techniques in order to function most efficiently. This training would make it much easier to teach students good evaluative techniques.

Instructors must also consider the total child in order to formulate a true judgment. Instructors must further be willing to review their estimate of the child as different factors emerge, and make judgments based on all known components of the child.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"The evaluation of children's art has been and continues to be one of the most vexing problems in the teaching of art."¹

In the past, evaluation has been one of the most difficult problems facing the art teacher. How can one accurately measure the artistic growth in a child has been a widely asked, but little answered, question. Assigning letter grades has been the solution to evaluation for many. Unfortunately, "1) their (letter grades) meaning to parents and students are not very clear, and 2) grades motivate children to achieve a higher letter grade not learning."² Many instructors feel that evaluation is a problem. Others feel that it is a tool, with problems, that can be used to improve instruction and curriculums in the school.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problems considered in this study are those concerned with the evaluation of children's art work. Principal consideration will


be given to term ambiguity, the value and construction of tests, and the exploration of methods previously used and research on more effective means of evaluating art work.

NEED FOR STUDY

The practical need for an effective evaluative means is apparent. Without an evaluative process of a consistent nature, the art educator takes a chance on a mediocre art program. Without such a program, the student loses his right to learn, to express himself, and to evaluate that expression, and to grow artistically. The student's progress or lack of progress aids in determining whether or not courses and instructors are fulfilling their stated objectives. Thus, a practical means of evaluation appears to be most important to the art educator.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study is to review some of the evaluative methods now in use, their weak and strong points, and to establish the need for evaluation in the art program. The author would also suggest further possibilities for workable methods of evaluation for future use.

ASSUMPTIONS

The author makes the assumption that evaluation is necessary

---

for the artistic growth of the child. The author also believes that there is a method or methods of evaluation which are more effective in dealing with children's art work than some of the methods in present practice. The author further feels that art educators should be deeply concerned with the best evaluative techniques available.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms have been defined as to their meaning in this study.

1. **Art activity.** Any activity that the pupil engages in as a part of the instructor's art program.
2. **Art Education.** The intertwining of different activities to teach the pupil how to learn about and develop his artistic abilities, rather than just the learning of techniques.
3. **Bi-serial r analysis.** Determines the relationship between two normally distributed, linearly related, continuous variables, one of which has been reduced to two categories, such as I.Q. scores (continuous) and mathematics test scores reduced to pass-fail categories.4
4. **Evaluation.** A measurement of the creative maturation that the student experiences as a result of his art activity experiences.
5. **Grades.** Grades represent the teacher's judgment of the student's accomplishment as it is communicated to the student and parent.
6. **Tests.** Method used to obtain information for forming judgments.

---

concerning either the student or curriculum.

LIMITATIONS

This study concerns itself with the last ten years of writings and educational research on evaluation in art. This particular span of time was used because it was felt that these writings are more pertinent to today's classroom. This study is further concerned with the evaluation of children's art and is not an attempt to present methods of evaluation for all age groups.

This study was further limited by the absence of abundant materials in the Johnson Camden Library, and the fact that materials, other than art tests, could not be secured from other sources.
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CHAPTER II

PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

WHY EVALUATE?

Evaluation of pupil work has been and continues to be one of the most troublesome problems in art education. One cannot talk very long about ability in art without making some type of evaluative judgment.

Evaluating performance is difficult in any curriculum area. It is especially difficult in art because the nature of the field does not lend itself to the neat categories that are more easily applied to other fields.¹

For example, there is only one correct solution to a math problem, in science, there is only one correct solution to an experiment, but there is no one correct answer to a portrait, a print, ceramic piece, or a watercolor except that of the artist's own personal solution.

If it were possible to turn to the back of the book for the correct answer, evaluation would be exceedingly simple, but we are not dealing with just facts. Art education deals directly with the changes of man, his sensitivities, feelings, emotions, and reactions as well. The one-of-a-kind personal statements that result are to be judged as well as the creative process itself. This adds more compli-

cations to an already ticklish task, because people differ from subject to subject, and from one situation to another. And since creativity itself is so intensely personal we cannot expect to have a standard to which people must conform. Perhaps the best we can expect is a general guide, and that itself is better than no guide at all.

Art education is also plagued by terms with ambiguous meanings and expressions which have different connotations for different people. Several expressions, art, art education, aesthetic judgment, creativity, etc., appear repeatedly in art education classes and literature, and their extremely general meanings seem to create more chaos and disagreement than clarification. The reasons for these discrepancies are, in part, that the field of art is open and subject to changes. These terms also have different meanings for different authors as they use them in articles. So far, even art literature and research findings are too inconclusive concerning the best ways to evaluate art work and to state clear explanations for art terminology.

Evaluation, grading, and testing are often confused and assumed to be the same thing. Many people do not know the differences between the three terms. Eisner defines these terms as follows:

Evaluation is the process through which value judgments are made about educationally relevant phenomena. Testing is one procedure used to obtain data for purposes of forming descriptions or judgments.

---


Grading is the process of assigning a symbol standing for some judgment of quality relative to some criterion. After examination of these statements, two major characteristics assert themselves.

1) Value judgments are inherent in the process of evaluation, i.e., evaluation is not just a description but an appraisal of worth, and 2) evaluation can be made (in principal) on any educationally relevant phenomenon.

According to Eisner’s theory, evaluation should be used as an educational tool to improve the school’s curriculum, individual programs, and educational practices that are not functioning as they were designed to function.

It is also important to note that the mode of evaluation procedure that one employs is implicitly related to the conceptions of education that one holds. If one conceives of the educational process as a product delivery, then one would probably use the class critique or teacher critique of the finished product. If one thinks of education as the development of skills in the young, then one would be inclined to evaluate work in progress.

The author is not at all sure it is necessary to approach art or evaluation with the idea that what a student likes or dislikes is important, but why does he feel as he does. Not enjoying or

---


5 Ibid.

6 Ibid., 211.
liking certain types of art products is common. Valuing aesthetically and liking an object are not identical.\(^7\) A child can like an art work that would have no aesthetic value to him or to anyone else, but if he sees something in that object that appeals to him, then it has value to him. Conversely, he may not like Leonardo's *Mona Lisa*, which has a high aesthetic value to most art critics and art lovers around the world, simply because it is only another portrait of a woman to him. It has no value to him because it does not stir his imagination nor does it excite him. This child, who does like some paintings, could perform a simple type of evaluation of ranking in preference. A value judgment of this nature could be challenged by inviting more discussion and explanations of why this particular work has more meaning to him.

The instructor could be trying to get the child to express his feelings about the work, and this expression should cause the child to really dig for his reasons for his feelings. David W. Ecker has suggested the following teacher strategy;

1) Get the students to report freely of their feelings, attitudes, and immediate responses to a given art work. 2) Point out to students that there are differences in how people respond to what is apparently the same stimulus and that this is a consequence of different experiences and learnings. 3) Get them to distinguish psychological reports which are true by virtue of their correspondence with physiological and psychological states, with value judgments that are true or better, justified by virtue of arguments and supporting evidence, and 4) broaden their experiences with contemporary

and historical works of art and develop their ability to justify their independent judgments of the merit of art objects, whether or not they initially happen to like them.

This procedure would help to prevent the child from making any snap judgments and closing himself off to a type of art work that he might learn to like later.

Unfortunately, in practice, evaluation is often tied up with grading and reporting of grades. Some instructors put off evaluating work to the last minute, in the hope that a circumspect approach would make it more vulnerable. Actual evaluation should begin with the inception of the art experience. Both teacher and students size each other up, their likes, dislikes, and what one can expect from the other. The teacher must be continually ready and willing to review his estimate and to change his procedure accordingly.

The evaluation process of this set-up is a constant as factors emerge and are weighed to gain an overall picture of the individual student and his progressively changing relationship to the art experience. This way most of the evaluation will be subjective and informal, as the teacher watches his students work and talks to them about what they are doing, their interests, and their problems. Also, the student's

---


10 Harwood, *op. cit.* , 10.

product is an indispensable evaluative aid as it has the student's personality stamped on it. Of course, this product is not to be judged by itself but in combination with all other known components of the student's behavior, plus an individual's understanding of his own work. The teacher must always be careful not to evaluate a child by adult standards but from an age level capability standpoint.

Evaluation can also be defined as the process of determining the amount of and quality of growth and development that has or is taking place in the student.

1) Evaluation should be based upon a particular set of objectives. 2) Evaluation of all major aspects of child growth and development is necessary... 4) Evaluation must be carefully planned and should provide for a continuous program of appraisal... 6) Evaluation necessitates the use of many devices and techniques for collecting data about pupil progress... 9) Evaluation encourages teacher research, experimentation, and growth.12

To be effective, evaluation must be an essential part of the entire job of teaching. It's objective is to be a continuing task that will enable the teacher to eventually gather enough data to be of positive value to the child, his parents, the teacher, and administrators.

Many purposes may be served by evaluation. Customarily, tests are the criteria for assigning grades to students which are to be sent to parents. Evaluation can also serve the teacher in that he can assess his own instruction and course curricula for strengths and weaknesses. The entire school curriculum is supposed to be evaluated

12de Francesco, op. cit., 215.
usually by an outsider to that particular school, to ensure that it is meeting state and national requirements. The author suggests that the evaluative process might be better served by the art instructor's carefully evaluating his own art program.

**SUMMARY**

Evaluation has been, and in some instances, continues to be one of the most difficult problems facing the art teacher. Many instructors feel that evaluation is a problem, or a tool, with problems, used to improve instruction and curriculums in our schools.

Without an evaluative process of a consistent nature, the art educator takes a chance on a mediocre art program. The student loses his right to learn, to express himself, and to evaluate that expression, and to grow artistically. The practical need for an effective evaluative means is apparent. The student's progress or lack of progress aids in determining whether or not courses are fulfilling their stated objectives.

Many people assume evaluation, grading, and testing to be the same thing. Eisner defines these three terms as follows: Evaluation is a process of making value judgments, testing is one method used to obtain data to make judgments, and grading is a process of assigning a symbol representing some quality judgment relative to a criterion. After examination of these statements, two major characteristics assert themselves, 1) value judgments are innate to the evaluative process, 13

---

and 2) in principal, any educationally relevant phenomenon can be evaluated.\textsuperscript{14}

According to Eisner's theory, evaluation should be used as a tool to improve the school's curriculum, and the curriculum of individual subjects.\textsuperscript{15}

Evaluation must be a constant in education. Changing as factors emerge and are weighed to gain an overall picture of the student, and of his changing relationship to the art experience.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid.
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CHAPTER III

ART TESTS

Testing devices do offer time-saving means for checking up on different phases of the school program. They also offer a means for the discovery of many defects and sometimes suggest remedial measures for those problem areas.

In 1918 educators felt that the possibility of the incorporation of testing into the school program as a checking device was worthwhile. Many educators felt that the intelligent use of tests would supply invaluable data concerning almost all phases of instruction. The belief that tests could supply a type of information economically, time-wise, and under uniform conditions was considered a godsend to the harried teacher. Educators also felt tests contributed towards improvement of instruction by the selection of major points of emphasis elicited by test questions.

These administrators felt that art teachers and those art supervisors who were willing to incorporate tests into their programs of instruction would be able to overcome many of their special difficulties in terms of demonstrable objective data.¹

Various tests of artistic ability have been advanced and broadly

used that attempt to measure artistic ability or taste on a basis of conformity to a set standard of taste. The psychologists who create these pseudo-scientific 'tests' do not generally presume to designate what particular types of art are best, but they apparently assume that somebody does. Consequently, these psychologists go on to ascertain the preferences of a number of artists, teachers, and critics. When treated statistically, these items will comprise a standard for judging students as 'high' or 'low' in powers of appreciation depending upon whether or not they agree or disagree with the test samples. A slight variation of this procedure is to alter or 'spoil' particular works of art and direct the student to indicate which version, the original or the altered version (although they don't know which is which) they like best.

The false assumption here is obvious; that consensus of opinion, even among a group of supposed authorities on art, is enough to establish an objective, reliable scale of art values. Few people with any knowledge of aesthetics would come out flatly with such a statement. But in the language of the researcher it is covered over with a mass of statistics and plausible verbiage.

Research up to 1939 and 1942 produced the general assumption that aesthetic judgment is one of the most important single factors in artistic competence. Apparently this assumption was rather widespread among art educators, teachers, and psychologists for there were

---


3 Ibid., 191-2.
twelve or so tests that purported to measure aesthetic judgment and creativity developed and widely used in the 1940's.

CREATIVITY TESTS

"There seems to be very little relationship between the tests of creativity and the production of actual art projects."\(^4\)

According to William G. Whitford,

In planning tests for use in art education, we must be sure that they are appropriate and deal with important aspects of our work. There is no justification whatever for tests which involve relatively useless or obsolete subject matter, or subject matter too difficult for the age of the pupils to be tested.\(^5\)

Whitford goes on to suggest dividing the content matter into different groups dealing with the different fields of art.

It is apparent that one test cannot adequately cover the field of art. Many different tests are necessary to meet efficiently the needs of art education...however, certain phases of art can be tested, (art history, knowledge of tools and techniques,)\(^6\)

Upon the advice of the author's advisor, three groups of the twelve tests made in the 1940's were discussed. All of these art tests were created to measure the creative ability, native ability and aesthetic judgment of the child.

---

\(^4\) Whitford, op. cit., 227.

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) Ibid.
The Meir Art Tests

The Meir Art Tests, 1 Art Judgment, developed by N. Charles Meir, Ph. D., are constructed with the altered version technique. This is an art test designed to measure special abilities (creative imagination and aesthetic judgment).

Meir stated that he reconstructed the tests by concentrating upon the ten best items as determined by bi-serial r analysis (see definition 3, page 3) and ten years experience in use. The test has one hundred items with a weighted score of the twenty-five items of greatest diagnostic validity determined by frequency distribution.

Meir suggested the characteristics of the type of individual likely to attain eventual success in art. He decided that three of these characteristics, manual skill, volitional perservation, and aesthetic intelligence, are most probably inherited. The other three characteristics that he lists are creative imagination, aesthetic judgment, and perceptual facility (the ease and readiness with which one responds to and retains experiences).

The author feels that Meir was correct in his listing of characteristics, but the author does not feel that his art test measured these characteristics accurately. Although Meir does admit that a measurement of art judgment is a rough approximation at the very best and really should be used as an indicator of relative standing in the

---

7 Charles Meir, Meir Art Tests, (Iowa City: State University of Iowa), 2.
8 Ibid.
general population to which it refers. Retest reliability for the Meir Art Judgment Tests is from .71 to .85 from group to group.\(^9\) .85 is the lowest acceptable retest validity indices, so in some cases retest reliability falls below the score (.85) that indicates validity of the test.

Meir also assumes that the 'spoiled' version is in fact worse for all persons at all times which is a debatable conclusion.

"... in trying to make 'spoiled' variations of it, (drawings, etc.), the draftsman often unwittingly succeeds in transforming an academic banality into something more pleasing, at least to persons of radical taste, for its odd and irregular form.\(^10\)

The Tests of Fundamental Abilities of Visual Art

These tests were designed to measure native ability rather than the product of abilities. This test was divided into three parts. Part I, test 1 was Recognition of Proportion. Its purpose was to evaluate a child's aesthetic judgment concerning related lines. One has to rely on a 'natural feeling' of what is 'right'. It is a four-response, multiple choice section with ten minutes for fifteen questions.

Test 2 is Originality of Line Drawing. This section was designed as a measurement of drawing originality. According to its designers, freshness of imagination and the ability to overcome the commonplace are highly prized qualities in the world of art. This test seeks to discover quickly, with a minimum amount of time and effort on the pupil's

\(^9\)Ibid., 4.

\(^{10}\)Whitford, op. cit., 228.
part, the degree, type, and development of originality of each student. The test page has sets of dots in groups of three to eighteen. The purpose of the dots is to thwart any attempt at reproducing a standard or favorite representation. This section has a twenty minute time limit.

Test 3 is Observation of Light and Shade. This test was designed to measure observation. Observation here was defined as the ability to recognize the compositional details and to understand the relationship of parts to the whole. Pupils were asked to indicate absence of shadows in a series of drawings. The test was scaled from simple to complex with the complex shadows falling on two surfaces. The student has five minutes for ten drawings.

Part II was Knowledge of Subject Matter. The test was made up of six sections of ten pairs of words in each. The first set was an example of the type of matching expected of the students by the testers. The other five sets of words dealt with materials, processes, terms, and art history. The students were allowed twenty minutes for this test. The matching section is perhaps the most valid part of the entire test since terms are not subjected to as much personal preference or individual differences as was other parts of the test.

The Visual Memory of Proportion test attempted to discover how efficiently the student could reproduce a form with a line drawing based upon a mental image. The pupils were allowed to look at a black vase form on a white background for two minutes. At the end of that time, the examples were removed and the students were instructed to draw only two lines which were supposed to correspond exactly to the contours of the
Tests six, seven, and eight were Analysis of Problems with Perspective. The tests were based on perspective problems. The pictures of each test had one or more errors in perspective which the students were to mark with an X. Test six dealt with cylinders, test seven with parallel or one point perspective, and test eight involved two point or angular perspective. They were allowed five minutes per test.

Test nine was Recognition of Color. The test was a multiple-choice section with six response questions with forty-eight questions. The test had forty sets of six unknowns (the unknowns being variations of the six standard colors with their intermediates, tints, and shades). The child was asked to pick the predominant known color (from a six color chart) in each of the sets of unknowns. The time limit was twenty minutes.

The data received by the testers was contrary to previously assumed expectations. The entire test was designed for examination of native ability, but the results strongly favored education and experience. The Originality of Line Drawing test seemed to be a constant kind of intelligence increasing very little through the years and then widening experience seemed to be responsible for the increase in ability.¹

The Recognition of Proportion test, the Knowledge of Subject Matter test, and the Analysis of Problems of Perspectives test all depended predominantly

on either education or experience or both. The Observation of Light and Shade test seemed to correlate closely with chronological age. The Visual Memory of Proportion depended largely on motor skills. The Recognition of Color test indicated that color recognition is primarily a physical ability improving with age and experience.

The correlation of a retest was .87 which indicates a satisfactory degree of reliability. The correlation between the test scores and class work was approximately 50%. Some students who did exceptionally well on the test had a B-, C+ class grade, and other students who did rather poorly had class grades of A's. This would seem to indicate that the more imaginative creative students were stifled by the restrictive set-up of the test, while the less creative ones did exactly as they were told and scored highly.

This test's value is further reduced by its time limitations. The student is presented with an unusual situation and he has one to two minutes per problem to formulate his answer. Very few of the world's genius would have liked to have attempted to do their creative thinking in so ridiculous amount of time. It seems rather obvious that if one is required to invent ten creative uses for a popsicle stick, in ten minutes, one would not be creating but rather accepting any idea in order to meet the time limitations.

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., 9.
6 Ibid., 11.
The Seven Drawings Test

Another widely used test during the 1940's was the Seven Drawings test. This set of tests were constructed different types of drawing ability. The test format was for the student to draw from memory, from imagination, from a slide, from a movie, and one drawing of the child's choice.

As an evaluative device these tests immediately revealed many faults. The instructions, to the student and teacher, were not explanatory or clear enough, and several technical faults were present in the slide and movie.

Although the tests themselves were faulty, the researchers did gain a lot of information. They decided to build up a series of devices that could be used to observe and experiment on the child's production of and appreciation of art work. These devices were then programmed to extract samples of student aesthetic response or constructive work to be recorded as data for further research and experimentation. The Seven Drawings tests were scraped as a test and used as a tool instead.

The Cleveland staff who constructed the Seven Drawings test also published a manual for teacher use in grading the art works of children. They defined most of the principal terms used in art for the teacher's and student's benefit. They also questioned experts and teachers about the usefulness of the manual, but unfortunately, did not get enough of a teacher response to make any valid conclusions. Their questionnaire was in the form of analysis and a list of characteristics believed to be of significant value in spotting potential talent in young children. The questionnaire also listed the developmental stages of a normal child.
for the first time. The researchers made lists of certain traits missing among younger children, that then becomes more prevalent and other traits dying out with maturation that had not really been connected before.

Properly constructed tests can serve as a check on the art instruction program, and could aid in pointing out weak or low spots.

These educators felt that the reasons for testing in art education are as follows:

1) We can understand the improvement of any child in terms which he can understand, 2) we can compare the work of various children in a class at any time and note their relative improvement, 3) we can see what happens if we try different methods and determine which method gives better results, 4) we can make it clear to other teachers and even to the children just what our standards are and they can see for themselves when their work falls below, and 5) comparison can be better made with a scale than by guess or the various opinions of various teachers.7

These are excellent objectives, but, unfortunately, these tests do not measure them or help to accomplish these goals.

SUMMARY

Unfortunately these so-called creativity tests do not measure aesthetic judgment, in the sense of measuring right from wrong, good or bad. They measure only the extent to which an individual agrees with the opinions of the group that created the test. These test simply operate to standardize public taste, which unfortunately, is happening rapidly enough as it is. In art, conformity is not a virtue.

Another valid objection to these art tests is that the tests...
themselves present the child with an adult conception of what is good or bad. It is ridiculous to assume that a child thinks like an adult in terms of likes or dislikes. These creators of art tests also present the child with an unusual situation and he has one to six minutes to formulate the 'right' answer. The author doubts that a highly creative youngster would be thrilled to connect eighteen dots in two minutes to make an 'interesting' picture. He would be bored to tears.

There is a definite need for evaluative tools but art tests, as they are now constructed, do not measure creativity on the part of the child. Art tests can be effective in art history classes where there are more facts that can be measured if desired.


CHAPTER IV

OTHER EVALUATIVE TOOLS

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of evaluative prowess is essential in the arts. The lack of absolute standards in art requires the student to set up his own personal criterion in order to evaluate and to prepare future goals for action.¹

Several forms of evaluation for teacher and student use have been devised and in practice for several years. Some of these forms have improved with use and experience while others have shown negative value.

The student needs to reach a stage where he is capable of impartially evaluating his work and that of his fellow students. One would have to start working with the child early to develop in him good, sound, aesthetic judgment. Self-evaluation in art is included to aid students in becoming more sensitive in dealing with their own experiences and to enable them to form new concepts or to clarify and enrich those concepts of which they are already in possession. Students are encouraged to participate in value judgments of their own ambitions to enable them to sense the direction they need to follow in their progress through their art experiences. During the early years, teacher reinforcement may have

to be made often but practice in self-contemplative processes not only improves his evaluative ability as he matures but improves product quality as well.

Check-lists

A check-list or rating scale, either teacher or student made, equips the student with several categories of the more observable aspects of his work and enables him to grade himself from good to poor.

Speaking of check-lists and rating scales, John W. M. Rothney writes, They usually suffer from inadequate definitions of the terms to be rated, so that what is satisfactory to one person may be unsatisfactory to another...and, the foregoing are major limitations, but there are many minor ones...2

In fact there are so many problems in such lists and scales that it is puzzling why they continue to be so widely used.

The basic difficulties lie in the 'judgment' aspects of rating. In accepting a rating scale one also accepts the philosophy of the person who constructed it.3

Where term definitions can be made concise and not subject to so much confusion, rating scales and check-lists could provide the student with an-on-the-spot aid in determining some standards that may be lacking in his work. He could also, upon occasion use the list to evaluate other students work. The major drawback to a check-list, or any evaluative tool, is that the student needs to know what to look for concerning composition, design, line, color, etc., and to be able to


3 Ibid.
of his weaknesses, of his recognition of aesthetic and expressive qualities in his work. In the exercise of self-evaluation the student identifies himself anew with his creation. In doing so, he relives his success, his struggle, and his pleasure or displeasure.  

The instructor needs to nurture and encourage this type of self-evaluation all that he possibly can. One cannot give too much emphasis concerning self-evaluation as an important landmark on the path to maturity.

SUMMARY

The development of evaluative prowess is essential in the arts. The lack of absolute standards requires the student to set up his own personal evaluative criterion.

The student needs to reach a stage where he is capable of impartially evaluating his work and that of his fellow student. The child needs to be worked with early in his art life in order to establish good, sound, aesthetic judgment. Self-evaluation in art is included to aid students in becoming more sensitive in dealing with their own experiences and to enable them to form new concepts or to clarify those concepts they have already formulated.

There are several evaluative tools available for use by the student but, unfortunately, they are not as clear and effective as they need to be for the student to use them to function evaluatively on his own.

One tool now in the research laboratory that would be very

---
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

RE-STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The problems considered in this study are those concerned with the evaluation of children's art. Principal consideration will be given to term ambiguity, the value and construction of tests, the exploration of methods previously used, and research on more effective means of evaluating art work.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to secure information for use in this paper, the author read articles in educational magazines, books, and copies of art tests. The information gathered from books and magazines was concerned with methods of evaluation in art programs. The material was gathered with an eye toward evaluative techniques that could be proposed for future use.

FINDINGS

Due to the limited amount of time for this study, there were no polls or questionnaires taken. The findings are restricted to the observations made from reviewing the information gathered from books, magazines, and art tests. These findings are included in this chapter in the form of conclusions and recommendations.
CONCLUSIONS

Evaluation is a very important problem in art education that needs to be dealt with immediately. The various problems of evaluation need to have further research done on them in order to clarify and to develop more effective means of evaluation.

Since it is important that students, in the art program, be given every opportunity to learn and to grow artistically, it is necessary to develop a means of evaluation that will aid them in doing so.

As long as there are problems in evaluation, there will continue to be risks that classroom instruction is not giving the students learning sequences that are effective. Effective, clear methods of evaluation, preferably self-evaluation, enables the student to see what mistakes he has made and hopefully, ways to improve and eliminate those errors.

Evaluation appears to be a confusing subject and many instructors have not been trained in methods of evaluation, therefore it is difficult for them to teach their students effective evaluative techniques. In order to guide the student in self-evaluation, instructors need to have some method of learning effective evaluative techniques and tools in order to function most effectively in their role.

The practice of totaling up the grades, adding machine fashion, must stop. Mere numerical averages is not a valid indicator of how much the student has matured through the art experience. Instructors
must consider the total child, his strengths and weakness, his progress or lack of it, his interests and feelings about the art experience, in order to formulate a true judgment. The instructor must be willing to review his estimate of the child as different factors emerge, and make his judgment in combination with all known components of the child.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After examining the material gathered concerning evaluation and evaluative techniques, several general recommendations have become evident. Many factors need to be considered in the development of a sound effective program of evaluation. These factors include the instructor, the pupil, the subject area, and methods of evaluation.

Recommendation I

There is a need for further research on evaluation in art.

Basis:
Art educators should be deeply concerned about using the best evaluative techniques available. New techniques need to be developed to give the art educator an effective and usable method of evaluation.

Recommendation II

Due to the great amount of ambiguity, there is a need for further work in the refinement of definitions used in the field of art.

Basis:
Several expressions relating to art and art education appear often in art literature and classes. Their very general meanings can cause misunderstanding between pupil and instructor.
Recommendation III

A. There is a need for a more effective means of evaluation for both student and teacher in the school art program.

Basis:
Evaluation can play an important part in improving the art program and the student's progress.

B. There is a need to develop an evaluative technique that can be used by the student during the art experience.

Basis:
The student would have the advantage of being able to evaluate his work during creation which would result in greater aesthetic change and improved work.

Recommendation IV

The instructor needs to structure his art program so that evaluation can play an important part in aiding the child's artistic growth.

Basis:
Students need to understand how and why their work is being evaluated.

Recommendation V

There is a need for a different method of communicating the child's artistic standing other than that of the letter grade.

Basis:
Letter grades motivate the child to earn a higher letter grade not learning.
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