

Copyright

by

Daniel Bruce Mauldin

May, 2011

PRACTICING WHAT I PREACH IN ART EDUCATION:
A NARRATIVE SELF-INQUIRY

A Dissertation Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by
Daniel Bruce Mauldin

May, 2011

PRACTICING WHAT I PREACH IN ART EDUCATION: A NARRATIVE SELF-
INQUIRY

An Abstract
of a Dissertation Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by
Daniel Bruce Mauldin

May, 2011

Mauldin, Daniel B. "Practicing What I Preach in Art Education: A Narrative Self-Inquiry." Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, University of Houston, May, 2011.

Abstract

Identified as the highest forms of cognition (Bruner, 1986), and as narrative illustrations of our lived experiences (Craig & Huber, 2007; Freeman, 2007; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), metaphors form the conceptual framework for this narrative self-inquiry (Clandinin, 2007; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clandinin & Connelly, 1990) into the art education philosophy and classroom practices of a doctoral student, teacher, and artist. Following the recommendations of Bullough and Pinnegar (2001), LaBoskey (2004), and Feldman (2006) as methodological guidelines for self-study, this inquiry explores the cultural origins, personal interpretations, and conceptual evolution of two novel metaphors, "Art is a Coyote," and "Art is a river," and how they influence the personal practical knowledge (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002; Dewey, 1964; Elbaz, 1980) of the researcher. Field texts (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) generated in three university level art education classes are analyzed and provide a vehicle for a research narrative (LaBoskey, 2004; McNiff, 2007) illuminating past personal, formative, contextualized experiences (Samaras, Hicks, & Berger, 2004) influencing the researcher's practice, and fostering the creation of new conceptual associations between the source domains of the metaphors and the researcher's continuing perceptions of practical experiences. Personal journaling is an integral part of this self-study and is held up as a tool vital to self-examination. The inquiry demonstrates the enlivening of an educator's practice

with deeply meaningful cognitive relationships built on the use of two novel metaphors, and expands the knowledge base of the field of art education by opening the metaphors, the researcher's professional practice, and the narrative of the researcher's self-inquiry to the scrutiny and individual contextualization of education professionals and other readers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Need for this Study	1
The Purpose of this Study	15
My Proposed Research	16
Hermeneutic Understanding of Vernacular Language	18
Summary	25
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	26
Introduction	26
Theoretical Framework of this Research	27
Historical Background of Art is a Coyote	27
Historical Background of Art is a River	89
Summary	106
III. RESEARCH METHOD	108
Introduction	108
Coming to Narrative Inquiry	109
Why Autobiography? Why Focus on Myself?	118
Resources for my Inquiry	122
Goals and Intentions of my Research	126
Utility and validity in my Research	127
The Large Contents of Self	130
Understanding the Path of Narrative Inquiry	133
Summary	135

IV.	Narrative of My Inquiry Process	137
	Introduction	137
	Narrative of the Inquiry	138
	Summary	172
V.	FINDINGS AND PROJECTIONS	173
	Introduction	173
	Findings	173
	Summary	195
	Projections	196
	REFERENCES	204
	APPENDIX A SYLLABUS 1	234
	APPENDIX B SYLLABUS 2	241
	APPENDIX C SYLLABUS 3	246

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1 Howling Coyote	x
2 Corn Husk Doll	166
3 River Klarälven	203



Figure 1. *Howling Coyote.* Thundafunda, 2010.

Chapter One: Introduction to the Problem

Introduction

Recent studies in art education have had a major impact on the way I think about art and art education. This impact is evident in metaphors I use to describe and consider the nature of art. For years a favorite metaphor, “Art is a coyote,” (Sawyers, 1981) summed up a philosophy of art reflected in my classes and in my studio. Lately I also use and ponder the metaphor, “Art is a river.” The new metaphor, to some, may appear to simply be another way to pepper conversations about a topic I enjoy or fresh material for a creative lecture, but something more important is afoot. In acts of contemplating and developing the metaphor, “Art is a river,” I am reexamining many years of beliefs and practices associated with “Art is a coyote,” and investigating how the metaphors are apparent in my practice.

Need for this Study

Metaphor is more than colorful or clever comparison. Metaphor is, “. . . a combination of imagination and reason” (Denshire, 2002, p. 31), used to convey more sense of meaning to a process or event than would other types of description (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Understanding a metaphor adds depth to learning. To use a metaphor is to use, “. . . a tool for opening and deepening understanding” (Clandinin, 2007, p. 18). The use of metaphor expands thought and discourse (Clandinin, 2007). Consider the metaphor, “Friends are treasures,” a quote from Horace Burns (1915-2000) in *What*

They Said (Phillips 2007, p. 341). It fulfills the basic requirement of being, “. . . the application of a word or phrase to an object or concept which it does not literally denote in order to suggest comparison. . . .” (Webster’s, 1994, p. 901), but also promotes deeper understanding of the value of friendship. Contemplating the metaphor deepens understanding by developing relationships between the two concepts being compared. The value associated with the idea, “treasure,” the rarity of finding a buried treasure, the monetary value of an imagined pirate’s trove, the care of keeping a literal treasure, and other concepts in our minds associated with the object, “treasure,” is contemplatively compared to the value of a “friend,” which is not an object but a set of abstract concepts dependent upon an object—another human being. Contemplating his metaphor provides a deeper understanding of Horace Burns’ view of friendship than if he had simply stated, “Friends are valuable.”

To use a metaphor is to combine creativity and reason (Richardson, 1994) in search of more complete understanding of complex concepts. In order to understand metaphor, one must make “an intuitive leap” (Deshler, 1990, p. 297) based on lived experiences. Dewey defined intuition as transcendent knowledge (Dewey, 1916) emanating from the individual based on experiences related to the concepts rather than from previously memorized or learned facts. In fact, metaphor is so important to developing complex concepts Clandinin cautions using “a restricted and confined language” (Clandinin, 2007, p.18) free of metaphor. Without it, “. . . the opportunity for insight and meaning making is flattened” (Clandinin, 2007, pp.18-19).

Metaphors can signify a belief system and promote meditative contemplation, further deepening understanding of an abstract concept. For thousands of years people have contemplated the metaphor stated in the 23rd Psalm, “The Lord *is* my shepherd” (Authorized King James Version). More than a comparison, this metaphor represents a way of life. Countless hours of devotion have been spent by millions of people expanding the depth of its meaning. Through the practices and sacrifices of untold numbers of lives, the metaphor has become to be considered truth. People throughout the world embrace it not as a literary device inviting comparison but as a statement of their faith, a description of lifestyle, a foundation of their religion, and a statement of absolute truth. The figurative metaphor is made literal through thoughts and actions.

The power of metaphor cannot be understated. We often hear and use common metaphors as statements of general comparison that may initially seem light hearted or conceptually shallow. One has “a heart of stone” or is “the apple of my eye.” Common metaphors seem simple but are actually complex summaries of experiences packed in a highly sophisticated delivery system that enables us to relate to others a more complete understanding of our related past, present, and planned experiences (Clandinin, 2007). Metaphor is “deceptively simple, though infinitely complex” communication (Craig, 2005). “Art is a coyote,” is a metaphoric summary of a philosophy developed and practiced in the classroom and studio for more than twenty-five years, and it provides a way to communicate simply that which is infinitely complex. It is an internally individualized and uncommon statement of comparison bound in my personal life and tailored to my personal experiences—a novel metaphor (Craig, 2005).

My introduction to the coyote metaphor is the beginning of a spiritual journey spurred by the hand of a shaman. It is the first day of an undergraduate art appreciation course at eight o'clock in the morning in a small auditorium filled with pre-class chatter. The lights dim and a projection lights up a large screen at the front of the room with a silent video of a slowly changing kaleidoscope—a mandala of sorts, I will later learn. The room goes quiet and from the shadows in the back of the auditorium, Dr. Phyllis Sawyers emerges in a mystic dance. She is slowly moving up and down at the knees, hands outstretched, feeling the vibrations in the room. Unnoticed at first, her presence is gradually evident as she makes her way down the staired aisle leading to the front podium. She pauses and turns at each step, her hands somehow feeling metaphysical vibrations in the air. She surveys the crowd—silhouettes in a darkened room, the backs of student heads, shadows in the light of the slowly evolving image on the giant screen down front. There is an obvious growing tension in the room. Her rhythmic dance demands reaction. Some students want to laugh; others are stupefied. Sitting down towards the front of the room, I am not realizing what is happening behind me. I am fixated on the giant mandala and the patterns revealed by its swirling circular evolution, oblivious to her presence. Making her way down the stairs, she is approaching just behind and above my left shoulder, dancing, swaying. I am suddenly jolted into reality, taken from my infatuation of the silent spectacle I had become a part of at the front of the room. Her hand is firmly on my head, grasping the entire skull with palm and fingers pressed firmly down. “You hear the music,” she said. Suddenly aware of it, I realize I am hearing music from inside myself. It stops instantly, snuffed by the

very awareness of it. For a second, I am dumbfounded then embarrassed as she, without hesitation, continues on her strange dance to the front of the auditorium. I wonder how she knows me, for in this brief intimate moment she seems to know everything about me. “How could she?” I wonder. Arriving at the podium, the dance fades to stillness and she speaks. “Art is a coyote. It will fool you. The coyote is a trickster,” (Sawyers, 1981) and she begins to pass out a syllabus.

The metaphor, “Art is a coyote,” is integral to understanding an art appreciation textbook, *Song of the Coyote* (Sawyers & Henry, 1980) and the accompanying course offered at Texas State University (formerly Southwest Texas State University). The instructor’s conviction to the metaphor is evident by the title choice and is apparent throughout the textbook. The coyote is a trickster. The role of the trickster is to enlighten. Through mischief, cunning acts of thievery, creating chaos or contradiction, or through imitation and mockery the trickster spurs us to contemplate the unconventional. The anthropomorphization of the coyote as a trickster is based on Southwest Native American mythology. The archetype is not unique. In African cultures, the trickster may be seen as a monkey, in Eastern cultures, a fox. In these cultures, the archetype’s role is to flaunt convention in order to expand the realm of what is possible. The trickster pushes boundaries to illuminate the human condition. Throughout history artists are cast in a similar role. For example, in the nineteenth century Gustav Courbet incited the wrath of upper-class Parisians when he used realism to depict the deplorable living and working conditions faced by lower classes. “Plain people of the kind Courbet shows us in his work were considered by the public to be

unsuitable for artistic representation. . .” (Tansey & Kleiner, 1996, p.967). In the late twentieth century the Guerilla Girls used parody, posters, performance, and protest to call for equal attention for women and minority artists in galleries and museums.

The art appreciation course and the instructor permanently affect my life. Over decades, the coyote comes to symbolize the enigmatic nature of creative inspiration, the transcendent nature of art, and the often unconventional actions of artists pushing the boundaries of convention. The metaphor is explored and contemplated over time through study and practice in my studios and classrooms, its concept growing in depth and heretic meaning. In art appreciation classes, design and drawing studios, art history courses, sculpture and ceramic studios, the metaphor helps me explain to students the “mystery” that is art. An example of this mystery of art is found in Xie He’s principles of Chinese brush painting written in the Sixth century. Xie He stated a painter did not copy nature and to try to do so is folly. The painter, He claimed, is an instrument through which Nature reveals itself (Tansey & Kleiner, 1996). The artist is the go-between Nature and the media or Nature and the viewer. The artist is a vehicle transmitting information between super-human and human. In Native American folklore this role is assigned to the coyote.

In studio art classes what I define as the coyote can be found through a mistake or careless act that forces a student to go beyond their preconceived ideas. Sometimes a mistake or disastrous decision breaks the conventions in a student’s head and forces creativity to intervene. Creativity often conquers studio disasters. If a student accidentally lobs off the arm of a figure being carved she or he can try to repair the damage and get

back on the path to the original image in mind or can use creativity to come up with a new idea for a final product that incorporates the event. I have found the best solutions often come from the latter—allowing the coyote to intervene in the face of a mistake.

The coyote that is art can confound students and teachers alike, posing questions whose answers are not immediately evident. On a Thursday afternoon before a Friday night gallery crawl in 1992 a group of serious-minded, quite bohemian and very talented undergraduates and I (their mother hen and graduate assistant to their instructors) show up early to a space filled with art and activity. People are rushing around, hanging pictures, placing sculptures, setting lights and getting ready for a big opening the following night. It is a “high end” gallery with all trimmings, right down to the espresso machine and gallery dog that seems to have taken over the receptionist’s chair. We are a day early but allowed to come in for a preview and after roaming through several rooms, we are looking at two dog chew toys on the floor in the corner. They are the kind of hard rubber chew toys designed to more durable than anything else, probably an injection mold process, and shaped like the cliché cartoon bone common to doggie treats. One is white, the other black. Both were somewhat used—scarred and chewed enough to roughen the surface but not enough to make them gross or misshapen. They seemed casually placed in the corner and there was a spotlight on them. One student asks the group their opinion, halfway joking. “Is it art? Or is this just where the gallery dog has been playing?” There was a chortle, a “yeah, right,” and then silence. After a few seconds a debate begins. Clearly the show is still under construction, but some works are already placed. We discuss the symbolism of the two

bones and the composition of their placement. Could they be art? There is no program or guide to inform us and we are not about to ask a very busy gallery owner who was kind enough to let us look around so we make up our own minds, some deciding yes and some no. We make bets and decide to return the next night during the opening to see if they are indeed to be considered a work of art.

Some may define my role in the scenario as one who should know the answer. I am a graduate student and Fellow at a leading school of visual arts. The undergraduates posed a question to which I should have an answer. But the truth is, I do not know if we are looking at art or dog toys. Worse, I can defend either position with the tenets of widely accepted art philosophies. I realize the coyote is laughing a hard belly laugh, flat out on his back with all four paws in the air as the words echo in my head, “The coyote is a trickster. He will fool you.”

Living the metaphor is more than understanding its stated comparison. Living it means adjusting behaviors and thoughts to ideas in tension. Over time I also cast the coyote in the roll of muse. It is the passion in lectures when I teach and is an inspiration to make art. If uninspired in the studio, the coyote is off roaming. When I am “on a roll” he is near. Moods are assigned to his presence or absence. In moments of heated inspiration it is his hot breathe that makes me sweat. When a new sculpture is celebrated, it is the coyote dancing. The metaphor is applied and re-applied to so many situations it emerges as a metaphysical abstraction signifying a general belief in the unseen energies that power creativity and inspire passion. The coyote is a muse coming and going in and out of the life of an artist, teacher, and student.

The philosophy captured by the coyote metaphor is evident in my beliefs and feelings about teaching. The coyote is often alone but can choose to run in packs and I try to apply the positive aspects of pack behavior to a studio full of students. In a healthy pack, students feel the desire to contribute to the benefit of all. It's an atmosphere in which students watch out for each other and function well as a group. In studio classes the trickster invites students to push beyond known conventions and previously known behaviors. Students in my classes are "free to howl," and through the years I have been blessed with gifted, blooming, or previously restrained students who have learned, in terms of the metaphor and the Sawyers text, to "hear the coyote singing." That is, they have reached beyond the obvious or mundane or easy and produce an object that transcends any preconceived plans or expectations and create an object that embodies "heretofore unknown truth" (Schol, 1992). They create an object that objectifies a transcendent experience or, in academic art classes, they experience the highest form of cognition. These moments and achievements are the great moments for teachers everywhere, regardless of the metaphor or philosophy that explains them, but for me the spirit embodied by the trickster archetype—in particular, the coyote—allows them to push past the conventions of their lives and experiences.

Concisely stated, "Art is a coyote," is a nutshell of what I believe to be true about art—containing years of practice and belief in a compact phrase. It is the foundation of a philosophy of art formed in the early eighties and guides the life journey taking me to age fifty and doctoral studies at University of Houston. The metaphor is a statement of lived experiences.

Doctoral studies begin a new path in learning. Prescribed studies in curriculum, education, and art education add depth to previous understanding and present ideas and philosophies previously unconsidered. A new metaphor comes to my mind. Its foundation is built on reading a popular physics book and a particular lecture one Friday night in an art education class. Since an unforgettable lecture is the impetus for a long embrace of, “Art is a coyote,” it is fitting another unforgettable lecture begins the contemplation and exploration of a new metaphor for art.

In a Friday night class, master and doctoral students gather for another evening of discussing the history of art education. Dr. Ndubuike walks around his desk and stands in front of the class. He is telling a story from his childhood to illustrate the role of quiet contemplation in a life full of art, art making, education, and plain hard work. As the story begins to unfold, his eyes close and his words, though carefully chosen, flow freely. He is traveling in his memories and we are with him in a small Nigerian village, his childhood home. His grandfather, a shaman, tells him, “Go and listen to the river. Come back and tell me what it says.” Little Onny (Ndubuike, 2004) makes his way to the river outside the village. On the banks he surveys the river up and down. He listens. Nearby women wash clothes among sounds of chatter and quick wet smacks against rocks. Above the sounds of the jungle he hears laughter from nearby children. He returns to his grandfather. “The river is full of the sounds of women’s chatter and children playing,” he proudly reports. “No. Go and listen again.” Onny returns to the river, this time more intent on listening all around. He knows his grandfather wants him to hear something, but what? He strains to hear the river itself. It ever-so-quietly gurgles

a light and lapping sound barely audible and somehow beneath the sounds of the jungle. The river's playful sounds delight Onny. He returns home and excitedly tells about the soft and quiet sounds the river makes as it laps at its banks. "No," his grandfather tells him. "You must go again and listen to the river." This time Onny is frustrated. What else is there to hear? On the way to the river he is confused and irritated. He approaches and stands at the river's edge and pondering and listening. He hears the women working. He hears the laughter of children. Beneath the sounds of the jungle there is the sound of the river lapping at its banks. What else could there be? Does the river speak? He strains to listen. The river utters no words. Standing and listening turns to sitting and waiting and then, finally, relaxing on the bank with his eyes closed. In darkness, Onny can hear the chatter from the women washing and the splashing of children playing. The river laps at its banks, and the endless noise of the jungle begins to blend with the laughter and lapping. Onny drifts in his thoughts. He thinks his father must have heard these same sounds and his grandfather before that and his great-grandfather before that. All the village men, women, and children hear these sounds when they close their eyes and think about the river. It is the sound of work and of play; of chatter and laughter and nature all around. Onny realizes he hears all that is precious and meaningful to him. It is as if he hears all that he carries inside his heart and mind. Running back to his grandfather, Onny exclaims, "I hear the river!"

I am as affected by Dr. Ndubuike's telling of his childhood memory as I am Dr. Sawyers' metaphysical eavesdropping on the music in my head. His story strikes a chord in my heart and mind. His memories link with my own in a lived experience of

Conle's (1996) "narrative resonance." Though raised in a small town in Northeast Texas rather than a Nigerian village, rivers play an important role in my childhood. Near Jefferson, the Black Cypress, Cypress, and Little Cypress Rivers form a chain broken and confused by lakes and bayous. On these waterways I catch my first fish, learn to swim, and water ski for the first time. Most of my childhood pets—squirrels, raccoons, armadillo, alligators, and deer—come from the woods surrounding Caddo Lake. Nights spent lantern fishing on my grandfather's barge, hot and lazy days in a sun-filled tin boat; endless miles of cypress trees hung with Spanish moss, the smell of baits and boats and motors that run on a mix of gas and oil are my lived experiences of the river. They are fertile memories assisting an intuitive leap (Deschler, 1990) to a new (to me) metaphor, "Art is a river."

The initial framing of the novel metaphor, "Art is a river," coincides with reading *A Different Universe (Reinventing Physics from the Bottom Down)* (Laughlin 2005). Laughlin's theory of reality is one of *emergence*. Emergence is a property of organized matter and a law of nature. Emergence is the reason we have predictability in our reality, even though physical reality is rather unpredictable (like in quantum mechanics). Most of Laughlin's book covers the problems with reconciling Newtonian laws with relativity, and Laughlin concludes relativity is not fundamental, but *emergent*—a collective property of the matter constituting space-time, that becomes increasingly exact at long length scales, but fails at short ones. Applying Dr. Laughlin's concepts to, "Art is a river," reinforces my initial feelings about the strength of the new metaphor. I remember being at the time very excited that a Nobel Prize winning

physicist's theory could help me think about art. The underlying principles with which art is created can be changed without affecting the emergent phenomenon of what we call artworks. Art can be created according to the tenets of many different philosophies or schools of style yet still be considered art. Though the statement may seem obvious, this is an especially important concept in art history and art appreciation classes.

In art appreciation classes, terms identifying the various movements and philosophies of the art world often end with "ism." The "isms" include classicism, idealism, realism, photorealism, naturalism, mannerism, romanticism, expressionism, impressionism, post-impressionism, modernism, postmodernism, futurism, tenebrism, fauvism, surrealism, minimalism, abstract formalism, symbolism, and conceptualism. Other art movements studied in survey courses are described with labels or classifications that aren't "isms"—Byzantine, Gothic, baroque, rococo, de stijl, Bauhaus, international, tribal, communal, pop, op, performance, nouveau, deco, installation, etc. Art may be taught and studied according to the tenets of postmodernism, feminism, formalism or the host of other isms and labels listed. Each has its advantages and disadvantages, but no single "ism" or philosophy can provide the end-all theory by which all art can or should be produced. At best each is but a partial view, however, many are defended with statements and manifestos that demand all current art practices cease and call for true artists and teachers to follow the newest, latest, most improved "ism." For example, One of the more radical and restrictive "isms" of the twentieth century—futurism—produces two of my favorite works of art, Marcel Duchamp's *Nude Descending a Staircase* (1912) and Umberto Boccioni's

Unique Forms of Continuity in Space (1913). The futurists' manifesto (Marinetti, 1925) calls upon others to dismiss previous methods and philosophies and follow the tenets of futurism.

The futurist manifesto written by F. T. Marinetti (1876-1944) in the early twentieth century rejects the science-based (objective) pursuit of realism, and the lofty ideals of neo-classicism, stating art can be nothing but violence, cruelty, and injustice (Marinetti 1925). His manifesto declares the futurists should rise to destroy the museums, libraries, and academies, and should fight moralism and feminism (Marinetti, 1925). Art, he claimed, should glorify war and militarism rather than gestures of freedom. Artists should reject beautiful ideas and scorn women (Marinetti, 1925). He equates studying great works of art from the past like students do in my art history classes to poison and rot (Ibid.).

Though it is the foundational philosophy of two of my favorite artworks, I cannot embrace the tenets of futurism. Even if the destructive elements are considered more in terms of passionate figures of speech rather than taken literally, futurism is (for me) exclusionary and restrictive; its negativity too destructive in its intentions. The ambiguity of my accepting artworks and rejecting the philosophy that created them is easily contextualized within the parameters of the coyote metaphor. The philosophy of art as a trickster accommodates the ambiguity. Also, I find that coupling Laughlin's theory of emergent behaviors with my river metaphor permits the ambiguity of rejecting a philosophy while accepting the art it produces by allowing me to conceptualize futurism as an eddy in the current of the river that is art. The eddy has its own rules and

boundaries that do not affect the emergent behavior of the river. Both metaphors accommodate the ambiguity and contradictions of the many art philosophies taught in art history classes.

The river metaphor is complex enough to survive initial efforts to successfully associate concepts within it to concepts in an art history class, and I believe further contemplation and reading will continue to boost its ability to reflect a cohesive philosophy of how art functions in my life and in my classrooms. It is possible it will grow in its ability to assist me in defining and understanding my philosophy and practice of making art. Like the coyote metaphor embraced for years if it is expected to survive it must be able to support and provide a platform for my feelings and experiences associated with practices in the studio and classroom. The concepts contained within the new metaphor need further analysis in order to clarify its implications and merits as a concise representation of a philosophy and practice.

The Purpose of this Study

Metaphor provides growth of imagination and reason (Denshire, 2002; Richardson, 1994), and I have come to depend on metaphor as a tool for supporting an understanding of the nature of making and teaching art. Two metaphors originating in transcendent moments allow meditative contemplation and opportunities for new meaning (Clandinin, 2007) to be associated with the abstract set of concepts described as teaching and making art. Development and analysis of the philosophical and practical

applications of the metaphor, “Art is a river,” will provide comparison and contrast to beliefs and practices historically associated with the metaphor, “Art is a coyote,” precipitating insight and deepening my understanding of teaching and making art. The ultimate goal is to apply this insight and understanding to my practice.

My Proposed Research

There is not a seminal question with which to begin this research, but there is clear purpose, direction, process, and product. An examination of possible statements of intention eliminates them because research hypotheses demand conclusions be reached. Quantitative study assumes, and then supports. Given the purpose of this study, I am sure that is not possible. Metaphors are, by nature, small narratives. They tell a story of comparison or contrast. They illuminate and explain. They invite participation. As narratives, they function to illustrate and inform our lives (Bruner, 1986; Craig, 2005; Craig & Huber 2007; Freeman, 2007). Qualitative methodologies outline perimeters agreeable to research and analysis of the implications of metaphors. Traditions in qualitative methodologies allow for personal, exciting, and relevant research considered to be “. . . particularly well suited to the investigation of people’s inner experience,” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007, p. 488) and “. . . demanding some new ways of thinking about what to research and how to do it” (Eisenhart, 2001, p. 24). Postmodern philosophy demands qualitative researchers to “. . . reject the objectivist orientation to scientific endeavor that is privileged by the entrenched power structure of the

professional research establishment” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007, p. 489) and embrace new and personal methodologies. In the tradition of qualitative research involving the investigation of lived experiences, I propose combining narrative and autobiographical research methods in an analysis of art making experiences in my classrooms and studios using current and historically accepted research in the fields of education and art, personal journals, and notes from art and art education classes to construct a learning experience that seeks heretofore unknown truth (Schol, 1992) about my practice as a teacher and artist. The intended research is a challenge to long held beliefs and a quest for greater understanding of the nature of art and art education. The intended research is a process more than product and a qualitative, philosophical, documented path of research and contemplation of the implications for personal philosophy, and practice of the two metaphors will generate relevant knowledge sharable with, and of interest to, peers.

Mark Freeman declares autobiography the “. . . inroad par excellence into exploring the dynamic features—as well as the profound challenges—of narrative inquiry . . . ,” and that narrative inquiry, “. . . might lessen the distance between *science* and *art* . . . ” (Freeman, 2007, p. 120). He continues, “We want to know not how things *happen*—how they always occur, given the eternal order of things—but how they *happened*, the operative presumption being that we can tell a cogent, believable, perhaps even *true* story of how the present came to be by looking backward and situating the movement of events within a more or less coherent narrative form” (Freeman, 2007, p. 122). He suggests looking backward and within oneself to discover

“ . . . whatever modicum of enlightenment there may be,” (Freeman, 2007, p. 127) or in the words of Schol, if it contains any heretofore unknown truth (Schol, 1992). Lest this line of thinking be misunderstood, I want to make it clear the purpose of my research is not, “ . . . to ponder the blurry line between novels and memoirs,” (Slater, 2000, p. 160) but to explore, grow, and enlighten through an analysis of what is perceived to be true and applicable to classroom and studio practices.

Hermeneutic Understanding of Vernacular Language in My Research

The words representing important concepts in my research are mostly common English and should not be understood as being strictly defined to create an airtight system of logic or proof. The terms used to define concepts are not specialized for my particular research and are acknowledged to be individualized and organic. To illustrate, I ask that you take a moment to visualize a mixing bowl. As you do this I cannot know what image comes into your mind. When I think of a mixing bowl the image in my mind is that of an eight-inch red ceramic bowl sitting on my kitchen shelf. It sits inside a larger yellow bowl I probably would think of if asked to visualize a *large* mixing bowl. There is a time some years ago that if asked to visualize a mixing bowl I would have thought of a stainless steel, narrow-bottomed bowl because that is what I was using in my kitchen at the time. My idea of *mixing bowl* is dependent upon my personal experience and when I ask you to think of a mixing bowl I assume your image is different than mine. Even so, we can discuss mixing bowls and understand each other

because of the shared general concept of a mixing bowl—a vessel used to combine ingredients. My research is not dependent upon the reader restricting his or her interpretation of *mixing bowl* to be the specific red ceramic bowl on my shelf and in fact, I believe such a restriction would limit opportunities for the reader to relate my ideas to his or her own. For clarity and a shared starting point, I will describe key terms used in my research. My descriptions are not, however, intended to limit the thinking and creativity of readers and I encourage readers to keep in mind their own individual interpretations of these terms as they consider my research.

Metaphor. My copy is outdated (1994) but I still turn to *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language* for a starting place when writing or preparing for class discussions and presentations. It's the result of training as much as it is a comfort. There's an online dictionary in "my favorites" on my browser, but opening the physical book, a huge volume, and turning its thin pages of small print seems a slightly religious experience. It reminds me of the near transparent pages of the first adult Bible I was given as an older child. I remember being ever so careful not to tear the pages. They feel "adult" compared to the thicker pages of a child's Bible and to tear a page would be a sin. It is tricky business being an always-careful-to-never-make-a-careless-turn-of-the-page adult when you're just twelve years old. The respect of printed volumes carries through today as I still look for an antique dictionary stand at flea markets and sales, hoping to find an honorable display for the bound representation of the English language. For Webster's (1994) metaphor is, ". . . the application of a

word or phrase to an object or concept which it does not literally denote, in order to suggest comparison with another object or concept, as in ‘A mighty fortress is our God’” (p. 901). For this dissertation metaphor is understood as a direct comparison in qualities or traits of two different objects, concepts, or ideas.

Webster’s provides me the bread for defining metaphor, but definitions and concepts related to metaphor from scholarly sources have meat in them. Making metaphors is the act of relating topics through imagination and reason (Denshire, 2002), to deepen learning (Clandinin 2007) by relating social and cultural issues (Fraser, 2000), to achieve higher forms of cognition (Bruner, 1986; Craig, 2005). In light of these scholars’ observations, metaphor becomes more than mere comparison. Metaphors enable teaching and promote deep understanding. They embody the complexities of the highest forms of thinking and learning.

This paper will use metaphor to describe metaphor and may find metaphor within metaphor—using the term itself to describe the term and locating the term within it. Logically, this seems illogical, but this is part of the nature of using and discussing metaphor. Creativity, cultural context, and imagination are not necessarily rational and to get a complete understanding of the complexity of some metaphors requires combining these sources of information. The mental pictures generated and experiences summed by metaphor are not painted monochromatically in single strokes like a picket fence. They are built up like a Renaissance painting with layers and variations of colors and strokes.

Target and Source Domains of Metaphors. Metaphor directly connects seemingly unrelated subjects. Metaphor uses a first subject or object that is intended to be compared to a second object or subject in some way. The two parts of the comparison are referred to as source and target domains (Kövecses, 2002). A metaphor's target domain is the subject or object to which attributes are ascribed and the source domain is the subject or object from which the attributes are borrowed. In the metaphors, "Art is a coyote," and "Art is a river," *art* is the target domain and the source domains are *coyote* and *river*. Systematically identifying or locating conceptual relationships between the target and source domains is referred to as "mapping" (Kövecses, 2002) or "unpacking" (Craig, 2005) the metaphor.

Coyote. The coyote is North America's wild dog (Project Coyote, 2009). Classified as *Canis Latrans*, and looking more like a small wolf or a petite German shepherd than a poodle or a beagle, it roams habitats ranging from mountains to desert, from snow to tropics. The coyote is most prevalent in brushy country so is also known as a brush wolf or prairie wolf. Most are tawny brown, about a foot and a half high at the shoulder and weigh about thirty pounds. Though coyotes live in pairs or small packs they prefer to hunt alone at night. Coyotes are stealthy hunters. In a pack they can bring down livestock, but their typical diet is small prey, plant matter, and (increasingly) man's garbage (Ellins, 2005; Fox & Papouchis, 2005; Parker, 1995). Some see the coyote only as a nuisance predator so in many places it is legal to hunt and kill coyote, and there has always been a bounty offered for them somewhere in the United States

(Coyote, 1993). Killing them is common enough that information on how to lure and kill them is more prevalent on the Web than information on their habits.

The coyote is steeped in lore and romanticism, mostly because of its long haunting cries in the night and the tales told by Native Americans of the Southwest and Northwest. Mythology of the Hopi, Navajo, Chinook, Nez Perce, Cherokee, Sanpoils, Sahaptin/Salishan, Comanche, and other nations portray the coyote as a trickster, creator, and protector acting to improve the human condition (Sawyers & Henry, 1980; Schoen & Armagost, 1992; Smith, 1997). The coyote metaphor described in this project is originally considered in the context of the Native American lore—an anthropomorphized coyote acting as go-between humans and “The Chosen” or “Others” described as spirit beings or Great Spirits (Reed, 1988; Schlosser, 2008; Schoen & Armagost, 1992).

River. A river is a path of water flowing from a source to a larger body of water but this simple definition offers little to promote expansion of the concepts contained in the metaphor, “Art is a river.” Like people, rivers come in all shapes and sizes. Life shows me rivers that flow above and below ground, and there are fast, slow, mighty, and lazy rivers. Rivers can run deep or be fordable on foot, divide a nation or continent, or unite a region and people. They can be described as clear, muddy, or white watered. A river is the result of the natural, physical laws that govern our environment. Rivers can vary so much in their individual physical characteristics I turn to Webster’s for a

starting point: “1. a natural stream of water of fairly large size flowing in a definite course or channel or series of diverging and converging channels. 2. a similar stream of something other than water: *a river of lava; a river of ice*. 3. any abundant stream or copious flow; outpouring: rivers of tears; river of words” (Webster’s, 1994, p. 1237).

Great literature and cinematography deliver personal glimpses of a river I may have never actually seen but through words and pictures visit in my mind. In print and on screen I can see the river through the eyes of adventurous young boys and wise older men; strong women and men; gamblers; saints, sinners, and the redeemed without ever leaving home. The river is defined for me as much in lyrics and music, costumes and props as it is in old Polaroid pictures and vivid memories of picnic baskets and coolers, fishing poles and water skis. It is difficult for me to place the Little Black Cypress River in the same category of phenomenon as the Amazon, Mississippi, Nile, and Yangtze Rivers but in essence they are the same. Rivers are ecosystems full of life, death, and all that comes between. In Neolithic times, rivers give rise to civilization and through thousands of years of history they continue to sustain a way of life, agriculture, commerce, transportation, and recreation for people all over the world. This proposed research acknowledges the physical characteristics of rivers but also considers their cultural, environmental, personal, and philosophical significance.

Narrative Resonance. Narrative resonance (Conle, 1996; Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002) allows us to communicate with stories and metaphors. It is a stimulation of

memories or mental associations generated by the words spoken, written, or illustrated by a storyteller or speaker. “In resonance, the connection is a metaphorical seeing of one cluster in terms of the other. An example from everyday life might be an occasion where some respond to a story told by saying, ‘that reminds me’ and then proceed to tell another story that is somehow connected to the first” (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002). I am able to understand and identify with another person’s story through narrative resonance. The process of understanding involves transference of an idea through personal associations. A story “speaks to us” because of narrative resonance. Narrative resonance allows me to understand on a very personal level the story in Chapter 1 that Dr. Ndubuike told in class about his memories of listening to the river near his childhood village in Nigeria. The high degree or large measure of narrative resonance is what makes the story unforgettable for me. So strongly connected is the cluster of my own memories to his I almost feel as if I, too, lived the story of listening to the river. In general, good storytellers strive for a high degree of narrative resonance.

Narrative resonance is also important to my artwork. As far as I have been able to discern I am able to “speak” to my viewers by providing (visual) information they associate with their own personal experiences and then with the individualized memories and emotions they associate with those experiences. Because of narrative resonance I am sometimes able to communicate on a deeply personal level with my viewers.

Summary

“Art is a coyote,” and “Art is a river,” are metaphors used to describe a philosophy and practice embraced by an artist and teacher. The first, “Art is a coyote,” is the metaphor introduced to me in a transcendent moment at the beginning of art appreciation class during undergraduate studies. After years of contemplation it is more than a metaphor. It is a succinct statement of a philosophy and practice. Reinforced by experience, it is a statement of belief that art is by nature a heretic phenomenon. I rely on the ideas within the metaphor to make sense of art and art education. The second metaphor, “Art is a river,” is a recently considered comparison and is also the product of a transcendent classroom experience. After initial considerations, it appears to be able to provide a vehicle for further contemplation into the nature of art and art education. Research and contemplation framed in a context of academic and studio art classes will reveal its strengths and weaknesses as a concise statement representing an infinitely complex belief system—an inroad to analysis intended to generate introspection into my classroom and studio practices.

Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

Introduction

The individual experiences associated with my initial introductions to the two metaphors, “Art is a coyote,” and “Art is a river,” are differentiated chronologically and categorically. They were introduced to me twenty-five years apart. “Art is a coyote,” was presented in a textbook and through the actions of its author. It was reinforced through life’s personal experiences and becomes part of a belief system but it was by nature an adopted child. Like the religion into which I was born, I simply accepted it for years without questioning its details. “Art is a coyote,” became as much a statement of faith *in* art as it is metaphor *for* art. The metaphor, “Art is a river,” was not a gift from the mind of another. It was a product of my own. The research being conducted at the time, my teachers, the written responses to articles and class assignments, the students, the books and articles I was reading all contributed to an intuitive moment when I became conscious of the metaphor “Art is a river.”

The target domain (Kövecses, 2002) of both metaphors—art—is a gelatinous concept, rarely (if ever) absolutely defined, and undergoing great changes in the last half of the twentieth and early in the twenty-first centuries (my lifetime). The gelatinous concept—art—is compared to what is initially supposed to be more concrete concepts of “coyote” and “river.” Of the two source domains (Kovecses, 2002) in the metaphors, one—the coyote—is a small mammalian predator associated with mythologies, folklore, psychological theories, and metaphysical concepts. This mammal

is a living organism. The other source domain—river—is a naturally occurring geologic phenomenon—a river is the result of the physical laws that govern our natural environment. Finding meaningful practical relationships within this set of concepts—art, coyote, river—is the essence of my research.

Theoretical Framework of this Research

Metaphors are a narration of personal practical knowledge (Conle, 1996; Craig, 2005). The metaphors, “Art is a coyote,” and “Art is a river,” are used to narrate my experiences teaching and making art. The daily decisions teachers make in the classroom are directly related to their personal practical knowledge (Conle Li, & Tan, 2002; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). Since these metaphors tell the story of my practical knowledge they must be evident in my decisions and actions in the classroom. This dissertation is aimed at discovering that evidence by examining how my classroom practices relate to the concepts framed by the metaphors, and how the concepts may be embedded in my practice.

Historical Background of Art is a Coyote

I can place the date and time the metaphor, “Art is a coyote,” was first presented but from there its path to becoming part of my philosophy is vague. There is not a moment I can point to and say, “Here is where the idea becomes a belief.” The

metaphor slowly becomes a summation of a philosophy not researched but intuited through life's experiences. Long ago a student (me) takes Dr. Sawyers' words as truth and through the years to come uses the idea as narration—told and retold to myself as well as others—of making and teaching art. To explore it academically is a personal adventure in itself. Research will add new dimensions to the metaphor. Like some of my art history students, I may experience the regret of taking the trip before taking the course. This is something I hear voiced by my students near the end of a semester with *Gardner's Art Through the Ages*. It is a regret of not knowing what you are looking at in the museum that occurs when reading about it later in class. It's the regret of seeing the Vatican and only much later learning about the creators and context of its art, of walking right past the small museum housing what will later be a favorite painting or sculpture, or missing the side trip but later reading about the wondrous ruins a brochure does not do justice. Not that one must read about art to appreciate the beauty of a particularly fine example, but knowledge can add great depth to an aesthetic experience. The literature review for this dissertation will bring depth to a philosophy built on life.

A spiritual belief in unseen forces is intrinsically tied to the metaphor, "Art is a coyote," and it may have to be explored. Though it may be necessary, it is undesirable. I do not want academics casting a shadow on my faith. Maybe it can be avoided and I can come back later and erase this paragraph but this is not likely to happen. The coyote is a trickster, go-between humans and spirits and I believe making art is often a spiritual experience so the metaphysical aspects of this project should not be ignored.

Art is a Coyote: It Will Fool You. Introduced to me as a two-part statement, the metaphor is linked to a caveat. The complete thought (paraphrased) is, “Art is a coyote. It will fool you.” The first part is a metaphor comparing the characteristics of a coyote to those of art. Though a complex and clever critter the physical four-legged animal is not actually the source domain of the comparison. The source domain is a mythological figure in Native American narratives known as a trickster--the coyote is a trickster (see below). Immediately following the metaphor in the two-part thought is a notification or prediction that may initially be understood as, “Be careful! Things may not be as they seem!” or some such warning that acts of duplicity are afoot when the coyote is around. To fully “unpack” this metaphor (Craig, 2005; Knowles & Moon, 2006) some information on coyotes, tricksters, and the coyote-as-trickster is necessary. At the beginning of this project, I am prepared to offer little. I’ve seen and heard coyotes and I know the trickster is a mythological figure appearing in many cultures and eras. In Western culture, stories about tricksters are part of the oral literature of many nations of Native Americans and date to Paleolithic America. In Eastern mythology, the tales are available in more ancient documents and illustrated in paintings dating back hundreds of years. African tribes, too, possess stories featuring tricksters and the first time these stories reached my ears I was an American child listening to a story about Brer Rabbit. Tricksters are actually featured throughout my childhood in the cartoons of Warner Brothers and Disney, even in the advertising of breakfast cereal, though I had little idea of their presence, and knew nothing about their origins. As an adult, a review

of literature generated by scholars will reveal a broader image of the trickster than any I have experienced.

What is a Trickster? The trickster is, “. . . a supernatural figure appearing in various guises and typically engaging in mischievous activities, important in the folklore and mythologies of many primitive peoples and usually conceived as a culture hero” (Webster’s, 1994, p. 1512). The Oxford English dictionary places the word’s first appearance in English during the eighteenth century to designate someone as a cheat or liar and, “Trick is *dólos* in Homeric Greek, and the oldest known use of the term refers to quite a specific trick: baiting a hook to catch a fish” (Hyde, 1998, p. 18). Daniel Brinton first uses the word “trickster” to describe the mythological figure in 1885 (Hansen, 2001). Webster’s website offers three definitions of “trickster” and the first two use words like “dishonest,” “trickery,” “defraud,” and “illusion.” In popular culture the trickster is a con artist, hustler, swindler, thief, or smuggler and certainly not to be trusted. Webster’s third offering of definitions is closer to the concerns of this paper, “. . . a cunning or deceptive character appearing in various forms in the folklore of many cultures” (Webster’s, 2009, p. 1512). The overall tone of this information is negative and it’s no wonder why. A trickster is deceitful and in daily life people generally don’t like to be deceived. However, deceit is not an exclusively negative word, and being deceived is not always a negative experience. We often welcome deceit in the form of magic shows, masquerades, and haunted houses at Halloween and other special occasions set apart from daily life.

At the same time the trickster is partly divine (spirited, sacred, and extraordinary) and thoroughly animal (corporeal, common, and profane). He is “. . . an often amoral and comic troublemaker” (Columbia, 1993, p. 2784). But the trouble he causes is not trouble for trouble’s sake or just plain old fun. Tales of the trickster’s troubles are purposeful. “Tales of tricksters are ironic arenas in which corporeality and transcendence, the individual and society, meaning and the absurd, are mediated and celebrated” (Columbia, 1993, p. 2785). Almost every non-literate society has a cycle of trickster tales (Campbell, 2002; Hynes & Doty, 1993; Radin, 1955). They are so prevalent that Doty (1993) discusses the caution raised by many scholars against making universal generalizations about trickster figures before considering the significance and utility to the culture in which they are found. “As long as a number of shared characteristics are found in a large number of instances, it is possible to speak, albeit carefully, of ‘a trickster figure.’ Whatever one says generally still remains subject to revision by the specific aspects of individual belief systems” (p. 211).

The trickster figure in my life may be individualized by personal interpretation enough to be considered a singular phenomenon. My idea of a trickster, specifically the coyote, is built on my life’s experiences, few of which pertain to reading about tricksters. At the beginning of this dissertation research I am not familiar with what scholars say about tricksters. The coyote is an idea put in my head during an undergraduate class and it grew in meaning through personal experience. My personal coyote, I initially suppose, is so individualized by unique experiences and shaped by my own form of mysticism that it only categorically relates to what scholars refer to as a

trickster. However, my ideas about the trickster may not be as individual as I initially suppose. Jung (1959) states the trickster “. . . is obviously ‘psychologem,’ an archetypal psychic structure of extreme antiquity” (p. 260). Archetypes are a phenomenon sharing traits in all our minds. They are the characters and symbols in our mythologies and dreams; belonging to what Jung calls the collective unconscious (Jung, 1959).

Jung and the Collective Unconscious. “The hypothesis of a collective unconscious belongs to the class of ideas that people at first find strange but soon come to possess and use as familiar concepts” (Jung, 1959, p.3). Jung’s hypothesis states there is a subconscious mind present that is more or less the same in all human beings that has “contents and modes of behavior” that are identical and, “. . . constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us” (Jung 1959, p.3-4). The unconscious mind present in every one of us is termed *collective unconscious* and Jung provides a definition:

The collective unconscious is part of the psyche which can be negatively distinguished from a personal unconscious by the fact that it does not, like the latter, owe its existence to personal experience and consequently is not a personal acquisition. While the personal unconscious is made up essentially of contents which have at one time been conscious but which have disappeared from consciousness through having been forgotten or repressed, the contents of the collective unconscious have never been in

consciousness, and therefore have never been individually acquired, but owe their existence exclusively to heredity. (Ibid., p. 42)

The collective unconscious is, therefore, a universal rather than an individual phenomenon and certain representations within the collective unconscious are referred to as “archetypes.” Jung does not coin the term. He takes it from biblical exegeses by Philo Judaeus (20 BC – AD 50, Philo of Alexandria, Philo the Jew, Yedidia), Irenaeus (2nd century AD), and Pseudo-Dionysius (late 5th – early 6th century, Pseudo-Denys, Dionysius the Areopagite). In these early explanations, the archetypes are not made part of man by God, but are copied from existing forms by the creator and revealed to man through divine understanding. These are Augustine of Hippo’s (354 – 430 AD, Saint Augustine, Blesses Augustine, St. Austin) *ideas principales*, “. . . certain stable and immutable forms or reasons of things; contained in the divine intelligence, they are themselves not formed, and therefore are eternal and always related in the same way to each other” (S. Augustine in Jung, 1959, p.4). “The creator of the world did not fashion these things directly from himself but copied them from archetypes outside himself” (Irenaeus in Jung, 1959, p. 4).

The collective unconscious exists *in addition to* our own personal subconscious. This is highly debatable and easily misunderstood. Jung admits prior to stating his thesis, “Probably none of my empirical concepts has met with so much misunderstanding as the idea of the ‘collective unconscious,’” so he offers a definition, description, and proof (Jung, 1959, p. 42). I will not debate the issues raised in untold millions of pages written by psychologists, philosophers, scholars, teachers, and

students as reaction to/commentary on/elaboration of Jung's thesis. His work is used here as an explanation of the coyote metaphor *as it was presented to me*: It is here considered as background information to help me understand the trickster archetype. Jung (1959) says the collective unconscious is, “. . . not a personal acquisition” (p.42), and in his thesis defines it as

. . . a second psychic system of a collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals. This collective unconscious does not develop individually but is inherited. It consists of pre-existent forms, the archetypes, which can only become conscious secondarily and which give definite form to certain psychic contents. (p. 43)

He compares them to biological instincts, that is, a system of information with which we are born and stresses this is not a mystical or philosophical speculation, but a matter of empirical evidence as to the existence of universal forms of this kind. And the empirical evidence exists. Anthropologists, archeologists, mythologists and others agree there are identical patterns of behavior and ideologically identical narratives identifiable in most all tribal and “primitive” cultures (Campbell, 2002; Hynes & Doty, 1993; Jung, 1959).

The archetypes are symbolic figures deeply imbedded in our subconscious—the part of the mind, according to Jung, left to us from a time long ago in our evolution. The primordial mind has been buried, pushed away, long forgotten to the conscious mind and speaks to us through our dreams, visions, and the mythology told and re-told in oral

traditions as old as civilization itself. The contents of the primordial mind are passed down through generations in various forms, a good deal of which can be located in a culture's shared mythology and esoteric teachings (Jung, 1959, pp. 4-5). "Their immediate manifestation, as we encounter it in dreams and visions, is much more individual, less understandable, and more naïve than in myths . . . The archetype is essentially an unconscious content that is altered by becoming conscious and by being perceived, and it takes its color from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear" (Jung, 1959, p.5).

The characters known as archetypes appear in narratives older than civilization and in common dreams that are as old as humans themselves. The archetypes are personified as heroes or bandits, beauties, beasts, adventurers, warriors, athletes, kings, priests, gods, ghosts, tricksters and clowns. In mythologies they are portrayed by a variety of beings including deities: sun god or goddess, moon goddess, Mother Earth, The Creator, Shadow Monster, and the Devil. They are personifications of the concepts associated with idealized mother and father, jealous sibling, spoiled child or wise old man/woman. They are personifications of virtue and vice; of good and evil, knowledge, desire, and will. The archetypes are linked to our animal desires, fantasies, belief systems, hopes and fears at their very foundation and so widely represented in a society they appear in revered texts, artworks, folklore, morality, common symbols, and even in the dreams of individuals within the society. To be considered an archetype,

. . . certain symbols have to be isolated clearly enough to be recognizable as typical phenomena, not just matters of chance. This is done by

examining a series of dreams, say a few hundred, for typical figures, and by observing their development in the series. The same method can be applied to the products of active imagination. In this way it is possible to establish certain continuities or modulations of one and the same figure. (Ibid., p. 53)

Jung (1959) continues and describes individualized variations on the archetypes:

You can select any figure which gives the impression of being an archetype by its behavior in the series of dreams or visions. If the material at one's disposal has been well observed and is sufficiently ample, one can discover interesting facts about the variations undergone by a single type. Not only the type itself but its variants too can be substantiated by evidence from comparative mythology and ethnology. (p. 53)

The archetypes in my dreams and culture are the archetypes studied in my art history classes. Survey I classes start with the Paleolithic gem, *Venus of Willendorf*—discussed as an archetype of fecundity—and conclude in the Renaissance with Michelangelo's *David*—the archetypal hero. Archetypes appear in every medium, populating the landscape of art history.

Generalizing Tricksters. There is not an all-encompassing paradigm for the trickster; no single mode of representation or classic model that defines a canon for the

study of tricksters (Ballinger, 2004; Beidelman, 1993; Hynes & Doty, 1993; Jung, 1959). The trickster appears, “In picaresque tales, in carnivals, and revels, in magic rites of healing, in man’s religious fears and exaltations, this phantom of the trickster haunts the mythology of all ages, sometimes in quiet unmistakable form, sometimes in strangely modulated guise” (Jung, 1959, p. 260). Jung sees the tales of tricksters to be a narrative remnant of, “. . . an earlier, rudimentary stage of consciousness” (Jung, 1959, p.261), manifest through the process of evolution of the human mind. The mind looks back upon and into itself to find a trickster. “In his clearest manifestations he is a faithful reflection of an absolutely undifferentiated human consciousness, corresponding to a psyche that has hardly left the animal level” (Ibid., p. 260).

The first trickster I ever heard of is the coyote in Dr. Sawyers’ metaphor. He is the coyote of Native American mythology. I stop to clarify: He is Coyote in *some* Native American mythology. It is only as correct to group all Native American cultures together as it is to group all European—or Asian, or African, or Western—cultures together. However, one can speak of Native American cultures within the same context of generalizations made about “Western” or “Eastern” cultures. These types of generalizations are, indeed, very broad but necessary and useful. Native American cultures often anthropomorphize native animals as tricksters in their ancient narratives. Other cultures similarly include the fauna surrounding them in their mythology—like the Ancient Greek motifs of the bull, horse, great birds and creatures of the sea; the Ancient Egyptian’s motifs of the sun, the Nile, wild jackal, falcon, beetle, and lotus. There is a wide range of available possibilities for trickster characters in mythologies

extant in the environments of numerous cultures around the globe, past and present. So much so there is no single phenomenon that can be clearly outlined as *the* trickster. This fact in itself is not problematic except it can wreak havoc in the scholastic arena and for students studying tricksters. So much so that some even doubt a general discussion of tricksters is even possible.

For Ballinger (2004), Basso (1987), and Beidelman (1993) a particular trickster figure can only be defined within the contexts of its surrounding mythology and the culture of the individual tribe or society to which it belongs, and conclusions are questionable if held up for examination by members of another culture or tribe or held up for comparison to standards or cultural ideals held by another culture. Others argue, “The sheer richness of trickster phenomena can easily lead one to conclude that the trickster is indefinable. In fact, to define . . . is to draw borders around phenomena, and tricksters seem amazingly resistant to such capture; they are notorious border breakers” (Hynes & Doty, p. 33). However, Hynes and Doty (1993) also come to the conclusion that a generic trickster figure may at least be discussed informally if a course is steered, “. . . between those who see the trickster as so universal a figure that all tricksters speak with essentially the same voice and those who counsel that the tricksters belonging to individual societies are so culture-specific that no two of them articulate similar messages” (Hynes & Doty, 1993, p. 2). Accepting more generalized definitions of tricksters lead scholars and philosophers to be able to discuss St. Peter (Hynes & Steele, 1993), Mercurius (Hyde, 1998), Hermes (Doty, 1993; Hyde, 1998), Heracles (Kerenyi, 1972), and Krishna (Campbell, 2002; Hyde, 1998) as trickster figures. Popular culture

allows placement of Warner Brothers' Bugs Bunny and Wile E. Coyote (Bright 1993; Sax, 2001), Charlie Chaplin's Little Tramp character, and even a rabbit selling cereal alongside more traditional tricksters in the world's mythology. For my purposes—background information setting the stage to examine the trickster as a metaphor for art—the advice given by Hynes and Doty (1993) is an appropriate position, “. . . there are sufficient inherent similarities among these diverse figures and their functions to enable us to speak, at least informally, of a generic ‘trickster figure’” (p. 2).

Trickster Traits. A trickster often possesses super-human abilities allowing him to accomplish impossible tasks but behind the power he remains child-like or animal like in his reason and motivations. He is both bestial and divine, super-human and sub-human, naïve and cunning, wise and foolish. Jung (1959) attributes the bestial, sub-human, naïve and foolish side of the trickster to his unconsciousness. The trickster is often an animal with human and super-human abilities, a “primitive cosmic being of *divine-animal* nature on the one hand superior to man because of his superhuman qualities, and on the other hand inferior to him because of his unreason and unconsciousness” (Jung, 1959, p. 264). The unconscious, divine and bestial trickster is often represented by anthropomorphized animals. In both animal and human form, he is hero and anti-hero (Ballinger, 2004; Hynes & Doty, 1993; Kerenyi, 1972; Makarius, 1993). As hero the trickster is hailed for his success. As anti-hero, he is amusing and endearing.

The mythic hero transforms nature and sometimes, playing the role of a demiurge, appears as the creator, but at the same time he remains a clown, a buffoon not to be taken seriously. He checks the course of the sun, cleaves monsters asunder, and defies the gods; at the same time he is the protagonist of obscene adventures from which he escapes humiliated and debased. (Makarius, 1993, p. 67)

According to Ballinger (2004), Jung (1959), and Radin (1955), when the trickster is humiliated and debased, it is us that are humiliated and debased. His embarrassment is our embarrassment: His folly, our own.

“Admired, loved, venerated for his merits and virtues, he is represented as thievish, deceitful, parricidal, incestuous, and cannibalistic” (Makarius, 1993). As hero, these are questionable characteristics! To some the trickster must be a psychopath or the Devil himself. Radin (1955) explains the trickster’s function of creating/endorsing values is not based on ideals of good and evil. The Devil is the personification of evil and the trickster’s intentions are usually good though selfishly motivated. Hyde (1998) sees no devil in the trickster but acknowledges the confusion. He states, “Those who confuse the two do so because they have failed to perceive trickster’s great ambivalence. The Devil is an agent of evil, but the trickster is *amoral*, not *immoral*” (Hyde, 1998, p. 10). As for characteristics of the trickster representing the very definition of psychopath, Hyde (1998) is worth quoting at length:

Certainly there are parallels. Psychopaths lie, cheat, and steal. They are given to obscenity and, as one psychologist put it, exhibit, ‘a confusion of amorous and excretory functions.’ They’re not just antisocial, they’re foolishly so (they will commit thefts, forgery, adultery, fraud, and other deeds for astonishingly small stakes and under much greater risks of being discovered than will the ordinary scoundrel). While they are often smart, they have a sort of ‘rudderless intelligence,’ responding to situations as they arise but unable to formulate any coherent, sustainable long-term plan. (p. 158)

He continues describing the similarities:

They are masters of the empty gesture, and have a glib facility with language, stripping words of the glue that normally connects them to feeling and morality. Finally, they lack both remorse and shame for the harm and hurt that trail behind them. One way or another, almost everything that can be said about psychopaths can also be said about tricksters. (p. 158)

The trickster is not, however, an archetype representing a psychopath. Some argue he is not an archetype at all but, “. . . a symbolic pattern that . . . includes a wide range of individual figures” (Pelton, 1993, p. 3). He may be, “. . . the archetype that attacks all archetypes” (Hyde, 1998, p. 14), or, as some have suggested, not a single phenomenon but a classification or group of characters with certain similarities existing beyond the borders of any classification. Hynes (1993) outlines six characteristics shared by

tricksters appearing in many cultures, Babcock-Abrahams (1975) offers sixteen, and Carroll (1984) identifies seven distinct types of tricksters in North America alone. But most scholars admit no single trickster figure necessarily exhibits all identified characteristics outlined for the many mythical figures that can be grouped as tricksters (Ballinger, 2004; Beidelman, 1993; Koepping, 1985). Koepping (1985) states, “. . . not all substantive traits, such as thieving or rebelliousness, are carried through all cultural traditions or diverse genres through time, and therefore not all jesters, fools, or picaros are tricksters, while the trickster might contain properties common to all” (p. 199), and Hynes and Doty (1993) caution that, “Sometimes the term trickster may be applied to figures who could be described as ‘tricksterish’ at best by a strict constructionist . . .” (p. 24). As the name “trickster” suggests, however, all tricksters play tricks: On humans, on animals, on gods and spirits and even on themselves. The figure is sometimes the trickster tricked (like in the story of Fox setting out a tar baby to fool Brer Rabbit). The trickster, “. . . is the creative idiot, therefore the wise fool, the gray-haired baby, the cross-dresser, speaker of sacred profanities. . . .He is the mythic embodiment of ambiguity and ambivalence, doubleness and duplicity, contradiction and paradox” (Hyde, 1998, p. 7). Almost always, he is a shape-shifter and situation inverter (Koepping, 1985).

Trickster Forms. Though capable of shifting shapes or donning guises in order to cross boundaries, trickster figures are most often identified as having a predominant form. In Africa, the trickster appears most often as a tortoise, hare, or spider (each a

reflection of the local environment). The spider is the best known form for the trickster figure in Sierra Leone, Ghana, and the Ivory Coast (Finnegan, 1970). Just as it is for their contemporary descendants in central Ghana, the Ashanti, the Akan trickster is often a spider (Radin, 1952; Vescey, 1998). It is the Akan tale of the trickster getting fooled by one of his own tricks that one day becomes the American tale of the tar baby and Brer Rabbit (Ballinger 2004; Hynes & Doty, 1993). “Tortoise is most popular among the Yoruba; Hare is more prevalent in the grassland; Spider is most common in the forest areas” (Hynes & Doty, 1993). Bantu speaking people in Rwanda, Angola, Burundi, Zimbabwe, and South Africa often portray the trickster as a Hare. In other parts of Africa he appears in the form of an antelope or wren (Christen, 1998).

The trickster cycles held by Yoruba, Fon, Dogon, Ashanti, and Zande peoples in Africa have been documented by Evans-Pritchard (1967), Pelton (1993, 1980), and Radin (1952). The Yoruba call their trickster-god Eshu. The figure is also known as Elegba or Legba—a name shared by the Fon for their trickster-god. For the Fon, Legba is responsible for the earthly departure of the creator-god Mawu. Legba is the offspring of Mawu, and is given the task of watching over the affairs of humans. Early in the cycle of stories told by the Fon, Legba forces Mawu to live just off the earth, still within the reaches of human prayers and offerings. Later, Legba forces her farther into the heavens by tossing dishwater into the air, soiling her garments. She removes herself farther into the heavens, leaving the affairs of humans to be monitored by the trickster (Hyde, 1998; Pelton, 1993). The Dogon trickster, Ogo-Yurugu or “Lord of Random” is the rebellious trickster who (with his twin Nomo) acts on behalf of the creator-god.

They are responsible for divine speech, chaos, and have generative powers (Pelton, 1980).

In Korea, a traditional trickster, Horang-i takes the form of a tiger (Hynes, 1993; Zong, 1970). Japanese folklore includes *kitsune*, foxes with special powers, and *tanuki*, which is best described as a “raccoon dog” (*nyctereutes procyonides viverrinus*) or something akin to a badger (Ashkenazi, 2003; Vecsey, 1998). In China, Sun Wukong is the trickster Monkey King one of China’s most famous pieces of literature *Journey to the West*, a Ming dynasty novel first published in the sixteenth century. Sun Wukong takes more than seventy forms as he accompanies, protects, and of course tries to agitate the monk Xuanzang (Hsuan-tsang, Tang-Sanzang, Tripitaka) on his journey from China to India and back (McLeigh, 1996; Sax, 2001). In Northern Europe Reynard (Reynart, Reinecke, Reinhardus) the fox has many local variations, particularly in Great Britain, France, and Germany (Erdoes & Ortiz, 1998).

Tricksters appear around the world in human form, too. Being shape-shifters and boundary crossers, though, the human form is able to change into other forms in order to gain access to forbidden or guarded grounds or overcome an impossible situation. In Ancient Japanese mythology, the trickster figure of Susano-o (Susa no-o, Susanowo) appears as a once heavenly but now earth-dwelling warrior-deity, and the characters in classic Japanese literature, Tamato-Takeru, and Yoshitsune are both wondering trickster-warriors, the latter appearing with side-kick, Benkei (Ellwood, 1993; Slayford, 2009). In Tibet, the antics of Agu Tompa wreak havoc in Buddhist nunneries, fooling farmers, and engaging in questionable business dealings (Hyde, 1998). European human

forms of the trickster include Puck, Till Eulenspiegel, all types of jesters and fools, picaros, clowns, and leprechauns. In Brazil, the trickster Pedro Malasartes is a human culture hero preying on the rich and powerful (Almeida, 2006).

North American Tricksters. The trickster is represented in North America by, “. . . Raven on the North Pacific coast, Mink or Blue Jay farther south; on the Plains, the Plateau, and in California he is Coyote; in the Southeast he is Rabbit; in the Central Woodlands he is Manabozho or Wiskajak; the Iroquois call him Flint and Sapling; Glooscap is his name among the Northeast Algonquins” (Hyde, 1998, p.68). For the Winnebago Indians, he is Wakdjunkaga (Hynes & Doty, 1993; Radin, 1955) or, more properly, *Wak'djunk'aga* (D. Smith, 1997). The trickster is known as Nanabush—and variants, Manabozho and Winagojo—in the Northeast (Bastian & Mitchell, 2004). Among the Algonquian Indians there are several local variations of Manabozo (Hynes & Doty, 1993). He is Wenebojo in the Chippewa tribe (Barnouw, 1977), Iktomi among Siouan speaking people, and Veeho to the Cheyenne (Erdoes & Ortiz, 1999). Napi or Old Man is the trickster of tribes in the northern Rockies (Bastian & Mitchell, 2004). The Navajo call him Ma'i (Toelken, 1977) and the Kiowa call him Sanday (Archer, 2005) or Sendeh (Bastian & Mitchell, 2004). In all these manifestations he is,

. . . at one and the same time creator and destroyer, giver and negator, he who dupes others and who is always duped himself. He wills nothing consciously. At all times he is constrained to behave as he does from

impulses over which he has no control. He knows neither good nor evil yet he is responsible for both. He possesses no values, moral or social, is at the mercy of his passions and appetites, yet through his actions all values come into being. (Radin, 1955, p. xxiii)

The Menominee name for the trickster is Ma'nabush (Great Rabbit) and like many trickster figures in Native American tales, the character is generally presented as human (Ballinger, 2004). Some tricksters, like Old Man, Napi, and Wakdjunkaga are definitely human but we are given only a few details as to their physical appearance (Ballinger, 2004; Radin, 1955). Radin (1955) describes Wakdjunkaga as possessing, “. . . intestines wrapped around his body, and an equally long penis, likewise wrapped around his body with his scrotum on top of it. Yet regarding his specific features we are, significantly enough, told nothing” (p. xxiv), and Ballinger (2004) observes, “. . . we do not know what Nanabush looks like in other respects, but we do know that his penis is so long that he must carry it in a box on his back” (p. 39). “Iktomi, commonly referred to as Spider is—at least in the minds of some—a human with big round body like a bug, slim arms and legs (like a spider's?), and large hands and feet. He wears clothes of buckskin and a robe of coonskin” (Ballinger, 2004).

According to Ballinger (2004), “Wenebojo, Winabojo, Nanabozho, Nanibozhu, Nanabush, Manabozho are all one and the same Algonquian trickster” (p. 156). This type of generalization is common, as stories with similar plotlines are told by differing tribes featuring different forms (and names) of tricksters. “A person from another tribe might hear this story, smile, and say, ‘Oh yes, there’s that old Coyote up to his tricks

again.’ A Sioux might say, ‘We tell the same stories about Iktomi, the Spider,’ and the Eskimo would add, Up our way, it’s about the Crow” (Lopez, 1977, p. xii). Tribes also have nicknames for their trickster figures. According to Bright (1993),

Among many tribes, the trickster is called by some form of the epithet ‘Old Man’; thus, in Karuk, coyotes are called *pihneefick*, which is etymologically ‘Shitty Old-Man’—probably referring to tales of the trickster’s coprophagy. . . . Elsewhere, especially in the Plains area, the trickster has names of ostensibly human type, but coyote has many nicknames in various languages—for example, in Karuk, *tishraam ishkuuntihan*, ‘He who lurks n the grassy places.’ (p. 22)

Whether depicted as human, rabbit, spider, or coyote, tricksters are a common and consistent character featured in the narratives of most Native American tribes. One known exception is the Alabama-Coushatta tribe in East Texas. I was told by a tribe member they do not have a traditional cycle of stories about a trickster.

Descriptions of Native American tricksters are found in the journals and letters of explorers, clergy, missionaries, and traders dating to the fifteenth century (Stith Thompson [1929] dated European Jesuit Fathers beginning to record Native American oral traditions in 1633), but the scholarly record in my research dates to the late nineteenth century when anthropologists, ethnologists, and linguists turn their attention to the disappearing cultures and dying languages of Native American tribes. In 1868 Daniel Brinton (1837-1899) published the first edition of *Myths of the New World: A*

Treatise on the Symbolism and Mythology of the Red Race of America (the second edition followed in 1876, the third in 1896—it is still re-printed in paperback). In 1879 Congress established the Bureau of Ethnology (later Bureau of American Ethnology) to gather documents, illustrations, and other materials for the National Museum (which became the Smithsonian Institution). *Bulletins* and *Annual Reports* the Bureau of Ethnology published the work of luminaries in the field, revealing the rich cultures of Native America to the world. By 1881 Alice Cunningham Fletcher (1838-1923) was living with and documenting the Omaha, through the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard. The American Folklore Society and its *Journal of the American Folklore Society* were founded in 1888 and just after the turn of the century, Alice Cunningham Fletcher was its president. Also in 1888 Franz Boas' *The Central Eskimo* revealed a new direction in the philosophy of American anthropologists and ethnologists. Boas tried to free his writing from the prejudicial view of his own culture in favor of a methodology based on contextually specific observations—an essentially new way of thinking about archeology and ethnology. Boas' students (among them Edward Sapir, Alfred Louis Kroeber, John Swanton, Elsie Clews Parsons, Paul Radin, and Margaret Mead) continued his influence on American anthropology and ethnology.

A Boasian-influenced methodology is today preferred by American anthropologists and ethnologists. An illustration of Boas' philosophy is given by Kroeber (1998) when describing a Kwakiutl village set up for the Chicago Exposition of 1893:

Boas objected to Smithsonian exhibits that were ‘scientifically’ arranged to display the overarching evolutionary development of human cultures; for example, arrow points would be laid out in a sequence of their ‘progressive’ refinement, rather than collected according to their culture area or tribal provenance. The Smithsonian’s ‘Darwinian’ approach explained cultural phenomena in the metacultural terms of evolutionary development—as then understood (p. 14). This led Otis Mason and his fellow curators to account for parallel accomplishments or characteristics in different peoples as due to similar responses to like physical, environmental, and social situations. Boas argued explicitly that, to the contrary, unlike circumstances often produce cultural similarities—and the reverse, that similar circumstances often produce cultural differences. (p.14)

Boas’ paradox becomes a cornerstone of American anthropology. It overturns nineteenth century rationale of cultural development as a continuous progress forward and denies direct cause/effect relationships in cultural developments (Kroeber, 1998).

Important early twentieth century documentation and translation of Native American narratives and oral texts include the works of Karl Kroeber’s father, A. L. Kroeber (1876-1960) on traditions of the Arapaho and other nations of California; George Dorsey (1868-1931) on Pawnee and other nations of the West and Southwest ; Robert Lowie (1883-1957) on Shoshone, Arikara, Crow, and other nations of the Plains

and South America; Edward Sapir (1884-1939) on Chinook Wishram narratives and native languages including Dene, Navajo, Nootka, Paiute, Ute, Yana, and related Athabaskan languages; John Swanton (1873-1958) on Tlingit myths and languages of the Creek, Choctaw, Biloxi, and Ofo nations; and Truman Michelson (1879-1938) on Fox and Menomini narratives, and languages in the Algonquian family; Stith Thompson (1885-1976) for work developing a classification system for folk tales; James Teit (1864-1922) on Salishan and Sahaptin nations; Alfred Phinney (1903-1949) for translating Nez Perce oral traditions; Paul Radin (1883-1959) for documentation of Winnebago culture and oral literature; and Melville Jacobs (1902-1971) for audio recordings and documentations of Chinook Sahaptin, Alsea, Clackamas, Tillamook, and other dying languages. “The value of these materials lies in their authenticity, especially for readers who are able to follow the native language texts. Their weakness is that the technical linguistic format and the awkward literal translations have tended to limit readership to an academic audience” (Bright, 1993, pp. 11-12). It is the interpretations of these early achievements—not the translations themselves—that continue to be debated in the twenty-first century. For example stories told by the Winnebago Indian Sam Blowsnake appear in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century work of both Edward Sapir and Paul Radin.

Scholars and folklorists continue to debate interpretation, intention, and style in Blowsnake’s narratives (Ballinger 2004; Kroeber 2002). Unavoidably, traditional oral narratives are conceptually compromised when written in an essay format rather than recounted in person. Barre Toelken (Toelken & Scott, 1981) has achieved a script-like

method of recording oral literature that, to me, seems to breathe life into what could otherwise be “dead” essay-style documentation of stories meant to be recited (performed) rather than read.

The Coyote Trickster. Coyote is the most prominent and well known trickster figure in Native American oral literature and is similarly characterized in the narratives of the many Native American nations in the western half of North America (Ballinger, 2004). Bastian and Mitchell (2004) describe Coyote as, “. . . a complex, contradictory, and colorful figure that exists in virtually all Native American cultural traditions,” (p.76). “The basis of his character is the same in all myths that I have collected. He is a tremendous glutton, boastful, talkative, cunning, exceptionally inclined to the other sex, full of curiosity, a liar, a trickster, deceiving most adroitly, and is deceived himself at times. He comes to grief frequently because of his passions and peculiar qualities” (Kroeber, 2002, p. 271).

Erdoes and Ortiz (1999) document traditional Coyote stories from Blackfoot, Crow, Kalispel, Karuk, Klamath, Kutenai, Lipan apache, Miwok, Navajo, Nez Perce, Northern Pueblo, Paiute, Pueblo, Salish, Shasta, Southern Ute, Taos, Ute, Wichita, Yakima, Yurok, and Zuni nations. Add to this list Lopez’s (1977) sixty-plus stories collected from these and other nations including Beaver, Coos, Crow, Gros Ventre, Piegan, and Siuslaw; and Coffin’s collected stories (in Kroeber, 2002) from Comanche, Flathead, Southern Paiute, and Uintah Ute nations; and you can understand why Erdoes and Ortiz (1999) state, “. . . Coyote is the most popular prankster of all. Tales of

Coyote's wild and wicked adventures are told from the Arctic down to Mexico, and across the continent from ocean to ocean" (p. xiii). However, reducing the complexities of Coyote to the phrase "popular prankster" may mislead casual readers about his role in Native American oral literature. Coyote is not to be confused with popular tricksters in contemporary culture, and *the* Coyote in Native American cultures is not to be taken too lightly. It is false to assume Coyote in Native American oral literature is akin to characters in popular animal stories.

It is especially tempting to think that a trickster figure like Coyote is somehow to be equated with modern tricksters like Bugs Bunny—or, for that matter, Wile E. Coyote. But in the Native American context, Frog, Bluejay, Bear, and Coyote are not animals: They are First People, members of a race of mythic prototypes who lived before humans existed. They had tremendous powers; they created the World as we know it; they instituted human life and culture—but they were also capable of being brave or cowardly, conservative or innovative, wise or stupid.

(Bright, 1993, p. xi)

Tricksters in popular culture are generalized, simplified conceptual cousins of Native American tricksters and can be set aside as distinctly different from Coyote. Charlie Chaplin, Bugs Bunny, Wile E. Coyote, and the rabbit selling cereal are modern, shallow, "screw-top" versions of the traditional character.

Coyote Stories . . . , uh . . . Narratives. The stories themselves take me by surprise. They are not like anything I expected. I am shocked by some, disgusted by others, and amused by a few. These are not the kinds of stories I am used to reading. Using the word “narratives” versus “stories” is the first step I take in an effort to refocus the lens through which I see them. I will refer to them as narratives. Stories are something I can share with my mom, a friend, a child, or even someone I just met. Coyote narratives are not like that. Though there are authors who filter, clean, and rewrite—even invent—“Coyote stories” for children’s books (complete with a moral of the story, just like fairy tales) the authentic narratives from Native American oral traditions are not suited for contemporary children in Western culture. They are too raw, too coarse, and too *honest* for a juvenile audience. For example, in one story, Coyote disguises himself as a girl and his penis as a baby so three women bathing in a stream will take him in, protect and feed him. In other narratives, Coyote sends his long penis across a stream into a woman on the other side, impregnates a chief’s daughter, changes sex to marry the chief’s son, has intercourse with his own daughters, cooks and eats his own daughters, and removes teeth from women’s vaginas so sex will be pleasurable. His sexual appetite is voracious and uncontrolled. Coyote narratives also tell how he creates the earth, steals fire from the gods to bring warmth and cooking to mankind, and teaches humans how to fish. In a few Coyote is harmless but amusing—like those telling how he is responsible for Rabbit’s long ears or how he changes into a buffalo so he will always have something to eat.

After reading dozens and dozens of Coyote narratives I am convinced the truth of the metaphor, “Art is a coyote,” is not contained in the texts produced by scholars, anthropologists, and ethnologists recording and documenting Native American oral traditions. Whether written by a Native American (Morning Dove, 1934), a contemporary member of a Native American tribe (Smith, 1997) or translated and compiled with the assistance of Native Americans (Erdoes & Ortiz, 1998; Kroeber, 1998; Toelken & Tacheeni, 1981) or translated by scholars fluent in the native language (Bright, 1993; Thompson, 1929) the narratives “read” as fixed and dry text. Even with Toelken’s system of notations for pauses, gestures, changes of voice and audience responses the written narratives are shallow indications of the real experience of hearing an authentic Coyote narrative. Worse, even if I could hear the originals, they would deliver no meaning. It is not possible for me to experience the narratives as they are intended. They are forever held from me by differences in culture, language, and time. For me, the truth in the metaphor, “Art is a coyote,” may be located *around* the narratives, not *in* them. My research turns to the *way* the stories are told—in the *how* and *why* they are told. Examining the purpose and intention of Coyote narratives may reveal relationships between the target and source domains in the metaphor, “Art is a coyote.”

The How and Why of Coyote Narratives. Robert Conley (1997) describes oral traditions as “the heart and soul of a people” (p. vii). “They reveal the world view of the people from whose tradition they arose. They explain how things came to be and why

things are done the way they are, and they teach lessons of life” (Conley, 1997, p. vii). Coyote narratives explain how things are done and how certain physical realities came to be known to humans. They teach the important lessons in life—the ones that define quality of life in the minds and hearts of the people within whom the culture arose. For example, Coyote narratives explain how the sun, moon, and stars came to be in the sky; how humans learned to catch fish and make traps; and how people should behave towards their guests, friends, and enemies. More than folktales explaining how a particular animal got its spots, these narratives are responsible for setting moral conventions, establishing cultural boundaries, and instructing social conventions: They establish traditions and become traditions themselves. Through countless retellings they entertain, edify, and educate.

The Narrators, Translators, and Traditions. Not everyone can tell a good story. As proof of this, in a box somewhere in the attic I have a red ribbon with “Second Place” in gold letters on it from a storytelling competition in high school. My abilities improved some in college and as an undergraduate at University of Texas I was on the state-wide winning forensic speaking team. I admit I like to get good laughs (or a few tears) when telling the right story at the right time but my experiences are far removed from those who recount the Coyote narratives of Native American oral literature. Native American storytellers relate stories that have been handed down through untold generations and many in their audiences have heard the stories repeated all through their lives (Mourning Dove, 1934; Smith, 1997). Good storytellers were popular and always

in demand (Erdoes & Ortiz, 1999; Grinnell, 1926). They provided unforgettable entertainment.

Vividly I recall old *S'whist-kane* (Lost-Head), also known as Old Narciss, and how, in the course of a narrative, he would jump up and mimic his characters, speaking or singing in a strong or weak voice, just as the Animal Persons were supposed to have done. And he would dance around the fire in the tule-mat [sic] covered lodge until the pines rang with the gleeful shouts of the smallest listeners. (Mourning Dove, 1934, p. 10)

I equate the telling of Coyote narrative to performance art. As stated by Clark (1953), “A skillful Indian storyteller is an actor as well as narrator. His facial expressions are lively, his eyes twinkle, he gestures not only with his hands but with his feet, he changes his voice to fit characters” (p.2). Jacobs (1959) defines Chinook and Clackamas oral literature as closer to theater than literature:

I believe that stress upon Chinook literature as a kind of theater does better justice to its content, designs, and functions. Therefore emphases are upon actors, acts, scenes, epilogues, and the like, rather than upon plots, motifs, and episodes. The absence of psychological interpretation and notation of feelings in the native lines, the terse summarization of action, and the indications which we have that narrators gave dramatic

renditions warrant the deduction that recitals of stories resembled plays more closely than other forms of Western Literature. (p. 5)

Bright (1993, 1978), Toelken (1997), and others try to recreate for me the experience of “hearing” the narratives as I read them. Using notations that read similar to a script, they allow me to imagine the high-pitched and whiney voice (Ballinger 2004; Bright 1993) of Coyote and other characters. Through their efforts I can get a sense of the actions, gestures, and engagement of the audience in a performance given by talented Native American narrator. For example Toelken (1997) describes the slow, deliberate speech of a Navajo raconteur’s stylistically accentuated key words and actions. Kroeber (1998) with the help of Barre Toelken and Tacheeni Scott use an ethnopoetic method—with notations of action and context—to reveal the performance of narrators Sam Blowsnake of the Winnebago tribe and Yellowman, a Navajo, as they relate their versions of traditional Coyote narratives. Bright (1998) credits Dennis Tedlock and Dell Hymes developing ethnopoetic and a measured verse style of translating Native American traditional narratives in an effort to capture the “feel” of the narratives on paper. Barnouw (1977), Jacobs (1959), Kroeber (1998) and others work to provide an accurate representation of the physical experience provided by Native American narrators.

Some anthropologists and ethnologists only minimally acknowledge the importance of individual narrators. For example Ruth Benedict (1887-1948) and her mentor, Franz Boas (1858-1942), studied the Cochiti Indians beginning in the summer

of 1924. They recorded over 120 tales and developed a system to categorize traditional narratives. Alfonso Ortiz writes in a 1981 introduction to Benedict's work they (Boas and she) identified narrators only as numbered informants in their effort to obtain a scientific record and gave little description of individual personalities other than stating they were all women and, "Informant 4 was a very different individual from the others" (Benedict, 1981). The meaning of this statement is forever lost to me—along with the names of the narrators. Ballinger (2004) and Kroeber (1998) are critical of Coffin (1961) and others for failing to identify individual narrators. More frequently known than the names of the narrators are the names of the translators working with the scholars, ethnologists, and anthropologists. Ballinger (2002), Bright (1993, 1978), Kroeber (1998, 2004) and others credit individual translators. For example Bright (1978) credits Barry F. Carlson from University of Victoria for translating "Coyote and Gopher" from the Spokane language of eastern Washington Salishan tribes, Dale Kinkade from University of British Columbia for translating "Coyote and Rock" from the Columbia River area tribes, Harou Aoki for translating the Nez Percé language for "Coyote and Fox," Alice Schlicter from University of California, Berkeley, for translating Wintu language for "Coyote and Badger," and so on throughout his book. These translators represent a small handful of people who still speak or write many all-but-vanished languages of Native Americans.

When the Stories are Told. Toelken (1977), deAngulo (1973), Hynes and Doty (1993) and others describe the circumstances under which traditional Coyote narratives may be told. It must be "wintertime" as determined by nature: After the first killing

frost and before the first thunderstorm. It must be after dark. Hyde (1998) relates a story told by Father Jetté, a Jesuit minister living among the Ten'a tribe of Athabascan Indians. Father Jetté became frustrated trying to write the stories he would hear after dark. "Nobody would repeat the stories in daylight, and at night whenever he struck a match to light a candle, the story-teller fell instantly silent" (Hyde, 1998, p, 314). To tell them in the daytime time may cause bad luck (or even baldness [Erdoes & Ortiz, 1999]). In some tribes they must be told only in the presence of at least two people familiar with the story (Erdoes & Ortiz 1999). Strict adherence to tradition, however, varies from tribe to tribe and from author to author. For example, Mourning Dove (1939), a Salish speaking Native American states, "The best Coyote stories are usually heard at wakes, while family and friends are sitting up all night with the deceased. During the darkest of the night, old ladies will begin to tell the most outrageous stories, helping to relieve the grief and keep everyone awake" (p. ix). She continues, "Stories can only be told when they do not interfere with more vital activities. Thus, they are usually limited to winter evenings. Exceptions are permitted, however, among leading families when they are passing a site mentioned in legend" (Mourning Dove, 1934, p. ix). Lewis Hyde (1998) introduces his *Trickster Makes this World* with a story about hitchhiking on a road north of Winslow, Arizona, when, "Just after sundown three Navajo men in an old green Chevy picked me up" (p. 3). As they drive across the desert, the headlights occasionally reveal coyotes crossing the road or in the roadside brush and the men start a conversation discussing coyotes. The conversation leads to Hyde hearing for the first time the Coyote narrative known as the "Eye Juggler" or

“Coyote Learns to Throw His Eyes” that is shared among many differing tribes (Archer, 2005; Coffin, 1961; Grinnell, 1926). Because traditions vary in restricting when the stories are told, and the fact there are those willing to defy tradition, I am able to read Coyote narratives in texts available any time of the year. Toelken (1977) acknowledges to his readers his book is a violation of the tradition he praises.

Tradition and Change. In his *Folklore of the Winnebago Tribe*, David Lee Smith (1997) discusses his role as tribal historian in preserving the tradition of Native American oral literature. “I can trace my family line back to 1640 through the Thunder Clan. There has been an oral traditionalist in my family since that time, and when I pass on to the Spritland, a younger member of my family and clan will take up my stories and pass them on to another generation” (D. Smith, 1997, p. 6-7). With his efforts, “This way of storytelling is not about to change even in these modern times” (p. 7). I cannot help think to myself as I write this Smith, like many devoted to preserving rich cultural traditions must make compromises and these compromises have a direct impact on tradition. The stories he tells are already compromised by translation them into English and by committing them to writing. Writing kills living oral literature (Ballinger, 20004; Phinney, 1934).

Other changes come from native and non-native sources alike. For example, Mourning Dove’s 1934 *Coyote Stories* are written in a Western fashion with a moral expressed at the end of each tale. In the forward to the text, Chief Standing Bear of the

Oglala Sioux states her legends are not completely faithful to Salishan tradition. “They have been sanitized, and the portions that she called ‘ugly’ have been removed. Nor are they as casual or spontaneous as they would be in native settings” (p. ix). Tristram Coffin’s (1961) *Indian Tales of North America: An Anthology for the Adult Reader* may initially mislead readers because of the subtitle. It would seem Coffin has left intact for the adult reader what Mourning Dove edited as “ugly.” This is not the case. Coffin freely edits “unprintable words and concepts” well known by scholars to exist in Coyote narratives (Kroeber, 1998). Coffin also combines narratives for continuity and imposes stylistic unity more suitable for a Western audiences’ enjoyment (Coffin, 1961). Ballinger (2004) and Kroeber (1998, 2002) are critical of imposing Western viewpoints to these narratives.

Clark (1953) edits and rewrites traditional Coyote narratives. For example, in one entry of *Indian Legends of the Pacific Northwest* she combines narratives about Coyote fooling the Beaver Women and freeing the salmon they have trapped, Coyote teaching humans to fish, and Coyote teaching humans to cook and smoke fish into a single story.

Most of the legends from printed sources I have re-written. Some I have developed from collectors’ literal translations. Others I have condensed. A few are excerpts from long, rambling narratives. In four, I have made minor changes in order to omit the references to bodily functions found in many tales collected for anthropological purposes. Most of the stories taken from the writings of pioneers I have re-written to restore as much

as possible the simplicity, directness, and vividness that are evident in the best written records that delighted me when I heard the Indian storytellers. (Clark, 1953, p.3)

Peter Blue Cloud, a Mohawk, continues the tradition of Coyote narratives with original stories written in the latter half of the twentieth century. In *Elderberry Flute Song: Contemporary Coyote Tales* (1982) he writes not only the G-rated “Why Coyote Eats Gophers,” but also the bawdy “How Coyote Got His Penis Back,” and the short, joke-like “Coyote, Do You Understand the Theory of Relativity?” In one of Blue Cloud’s more lascivious narratives, Coyote is selling wax penises at a street fair and drills a hole in the table so he can insert his own penis for buyers to fondle. “Coyote stuffed money and phone numbers into his pocket but the excitement wouldn’t allow his prick to soften enough to remove it from the hole in the table . . . What the hell is this one of the cops demanded of Coyote, getting ready to grab this obvious trouble-making-faggot-militant-son-of-a-bitch” (Blue Cloud, 1982, p.113-114). At the end of my notes on his work is scribbled, “The book is not worth any more attention at this (and most likely future) point.”

It is worth observing I am put off by Blue Cloud in a manner reflecting the need to edit felt by early scholars. Some of Blue Cloud’s work uses vulgar and pedestrian language. I found this more offensive than anything I read in the traditional stories collected by anthropologists, ethnologists, and scholars. For example, Lopez (1977), Phinney (1934), and Sapir (1909) include the somewhat bawdy traditional narratives

about Coyote's sexual escapades but they do not offend me as much as Blue Cloud's stories. Toelken (1977) comments on this subject, "Sexual references, as well as stories of cannibalism and bodily functions, were almost invariably expurgated from popular collections in the past, often with a note from the collector indicating he (or she) saw no reason to collect such 'off-color' tales for fear of offending the sensitive reader" (p.xix).

I am not a "sensitive" reader but Blue Cloud's use of slang is offensive to me.

Traditional Native American oral literature does not use vulgar language. The narratives refer to a penis as a penis or a vagina as a vagina (in their own language, of course).

There are no examples of slang or vulgar synonyms when referring to body parts in any of the traditional Coyote narratives I read during my research. Erdoes and Ortiz (1998) state, "It should be noted . . . that there are no 'dirty' words in Indian languages. A penis is a penis, not a 'dick' or 'peter' and a vulva is just that, never a 'twat' or 'snatch'" (p. xxi). The 1903 *Publication 81* of the Field Columbian Museum presents stories from the Arapaho Indians from Oklahoma and Wyoming. In it, "Several tales about sex and body functions are told only in Latin" (Sienkewicz, 1996). Erdoes and Ortiz (1999) state, "Indian Tricksters are undeniably amorous. Some of the tales are explicit and erotic, but never what white Americans would call pornographic. An earthy innocence surrounds these kinds of stories. Women and children enjoy them as well as men. As Lame Deer used to say, 'We are not Christian missionaries. We think differently'" (p. xx). Tristram Coffin (1961) cautions the reader, ". . . must be warned the stories are not intended to be cute, quaint, childish, or even vulgar. They are the ancient and revered legends of a primitive people" (p. xvi).

Nez Percé Texts (1934) was published relatively late in the decades-long effort to record dying Native American cultures (from the late nineteenth century until World War II). In the introduction to his book Archie Phinney (1903-1949), a Nez Percé himself, addresses changing (and disappearing) traditions in Nez Percé narratives:

A distinct change in the character of Nez Perce folktales has taken place during the past fifty years. Tales tend no longer to be faithfully reproduced in the forms of the old language but to be revitalized by the personal speech flourishes and interpretations of narrators who are striving, on one basis or another, for new aims for their narratives. This particularly obvious among English speaking natives. The recorder himself has, upon occasion, written tales out of a fairly accurate memory and found that new speech forms employed, forms no less facile than the old ones, and new standards of dramatization felt, invariably altered the character of the tales. (Phinney, 1934, pp. vi-vii)

The changes he observes in the narratives and the Nez Percé culture go hand in hand.

In *A Coyote Reader*, Bright (1993) collects and translates narratives from Karuk, Clackamas and Kathlamet Chinook, Cupeno, Diegueno, Nez Percé, Southern Paiute, and Yana tribes. He is fluent in Karuk and feels his Karuk stories are the most authentic of the translations in his book. The other narratives' original languages are ones, "... with which I have only second-hand acquaintance, gained through interlinear texts, grammars, and dictionaries. Nevertheless I feel that my translations have an aesthetic

authenticity that is greater than that of the prose versions—and greater than any that could be produced by simply paraphrasing the prose versions without consideration of the original languages” (Bright, 1993, p. xiii). Authenticity and accuracy are concepts too well defined for strict application to oral literatures. “. . . European tales have been codified in writing for centuries, and their full written forms are taken as more or less standard. American Indian narratives, by contrast, have been recited and transmitted orally, sometimes with relatively accurate memorization, sometimes not. Thus most stories have no single complete and ‘correct’ form” (Bright, 1993, p. xiii). The “standard” versions of these tales are held in the minds of the narrator and audience rather than in texts. “Translations may appear unduly cumbersome in places or perhaps bizarre from the point of view of English usage. Inadequacies of translation are due to the impossibility of finding word equivalents, and to the effort to maintain the very strictest literal meanings and at the same time to provide for nuances and richness of expression important in the native words” (Phinney, 1934, p. x).

Coyote narratives traditionally have formulaic openings (Ballinger, 2004). Similar to the Western custom of opening fairy tales with, “Once upon a time . . .,” Coyote stories usually begin with “Coyote was going there,” or, “Coyote was going along (as he always does/having always done so)” (Ballinger 2004; Kroeber, 1998). There are cases where traditional opening lines are not translatable. For example, Zuni stories begin with *son’ahchi*, “. . . a word used only in this context and which cannot be translated into English” (Ballinger, 2004, p.13). Non-native and Native American authors alike often omit a traditional opening.

The plots of Coyote narratives are deceptively simple and direct, “. . . with little use of subplot or variety” (Coffin, 1961, p. ix). Coffin (1961) claims “. . . the primitive mind is incapable of the subtleties and probing we have come to expect of our own narrators,” and tellers rely on the single plot because, “. . . it needs no pattern of organization, no characterization, or real setting, it can spring up even in the most naïve of minds” (p. x). He states that to enjoy Indian tales, we must take them, “. . . at the level of which their authors were capable,” which does not include “logical accuracy” (p. xii). Kroeber (1998) states Coffin’s view of Native American myth is “uselessly naïve” (p. 7), and that complexity is present but simply unknowable by non-native audiences.

Coffin assumed that whatever was worth understanding in Indian myths his readers could comprehend without assistance. I have more respect for the difficulties the myths pose to us. They were created out of conditions about which we remain largely ignorant. The nature of their special artistry differs radically from what we unthinkingly assume constitutes literary art. My experience in studying and teaching this material are, indeed, built upon unfamiliar kinds of ‘logic,’ and they arise out of and sustain oral cultures, the experience of which is alien to our print-dominated society. (Kroeber, 1998, p.7)

Simple statements by narrators of long-held oral literature function like shorthand for long sentences and concepts (Barnouw, 1977; Jacobs, 1959). The stories are not simple. It is our view of them that is simple. Their depth can only be clearly seen through the

lens of the culture telling the stories (Ballinger 2004; Bright, 1993; Hynes & Doty, 1998). “You had to be there” is a cliché often heard when a narrative does not convey to a listener the richness of an event or circumstance. Cliché or not, it applies to the narratives in Native American oral literature. The retelling over years, “. . . resulted in a slow, careful refining through the imaginativeness and verbal skills of many tellers. Constantly revised, the stories became more dense, more subtle, their form gradually perfected to an economic sharpness like a well-flaked arrow point—with every word and sentence contributing to an increasingly complex and nuanced meaningfulness” (Kroeber 2004, p. 3). Oral literatures thus come to have implied meanings that may never be fully understood by outsiders. Much of the context is contained in “coded signals” (Jacobs, 1959) given by the narrator that resonate only with the native audience. Narrators, “. . . usually delivered relatively bare bones of their stories, while the native audience immediately filled in with many associations, and feelings which a non-member of the group could not possibly have” (Jacobs, 1959, p. 1).

Typically, there is no particular order to a cycle of Coyote narratives. “There is no overall unity that demands what order the various incidents must take, nor does it really matter whether incidents are subtracted or added in the beginning, middle, or end for in no absolute sense does a beginning, middle, and end exist” (Coffin, 1961, p. x). Radin (1955) imposes “order” on the Winnebago cycle of trickster tales. After collecting and recording narratives he concludes there is a rational (Western) progression of Coyote’s deeds and degree of consciousness and presents the cycle with a beginning, middle, and end. Ballinger (2004), Kroeber (1998), Toelken (1977) and

others point out that just because there is a cycle that can be arranged serially does not mean that the narratives were actually ever told in order. When told in the traditional manner, Coyote narratives are not ordered in any preset sequence. “There were great complexes of stories, some that, strung together, could be weeks in the telling. Other stories were told only once in a person’s lifetime” (Toelken, 1977, p. xx). Their formulaic conclusions reflect the traditional openings—with Coyote continuing on his way, back on a roaming path, unaffected by recent events (Ballinger, 2004; Phinney, 1934). I notice this provides for the next tale—regardless of the order they are told—to begin with Coyote trotting along on his way.

Why Tell Coyote Tales? Coyote narratives are clearly intended to be entertaining (Coffin, 1961; Erdoes & Ortiz, 1999; Kroeber, 1998, 2004). They are deeply satisfying and often involve play and laughter in the audience (Hynes, 1993; Kroeber, 1998; Mourning Dove, 1934). Not so much hold-your-belly laughing or falling-out-of-your-chair laughing, the narratives inspire a warm and knowing laughter from those who have heard the stories many times and appreciate a good narrator once again taking them along on a Coyote adventure. For first timers laughs are often giggles and delightful squeals (Jacobs, 1959; Mourning Dove, 1934; Yellowman, 1998). “Humor is undoubtedly the deepest and most vivid element in this mythology, the element that animates all the pathos, all the commonplace and the tragic, the element that is most wasted by transliteration. Indian humor of this kind does not incite to

laughter. There is nothing hilarious or comical but there is the droll, the ludicrous and the clever exaggeration” (Phinney, 1934, p. ix).

As a non-native unfamiliar with the subtleties of Native American cultures, some of the humor in these stories escapes me. For example why would I find it amusing that Coyote sits down to feast and afterwards makes love to his wife before going on the warpath the next morning? It seems to me these are rather sensible ideas before facing the possibility of death. However, every Winnebago knows this is funny because warriors in their culture do not indulge in such pleasures before battle (Ballinger, 2004). In these moments in the narratives the soft laughter of adults and giggles of children come from an audience who knows these acts are taboo and that only a fool would disregard them.

In Ballinger (2004) Yellowman, a Navajo storyteller explains listeners do not laugh during trickster stories because the stories are funny; they laugh at what Ma’i is doing. “Hearing the laughter, those with ears to hear understand that Coyote’s escapades are not acceptable” (p. 63). Kroeber (1998) tells a story about Barre Toelken asking Yellowman why, if Coyote is so important his name cannot even be mentioned in summer months, do you tell funny stories about him. Yellowman replies, “They are not funny stories. . . Many things about the story are funny, but the story is not funny” (Kroeber, 1998, p. 225). Then Toelken asks, “Why tell the stories?” Yellowman replies, “If my children hear the stories, they will grow up to be good people; if they don’t hear them, they will turn out to be bad” (Kroeber, 1998, p. 225). I speculate the life lessons in the narratives are more than I ever imagined. Yellowman seems absolute in his belief

in the stories. Toelken then asks, “Why tell them to adults?” Yellowman explains, “Through the stories everything is made possible” (Kroeber, 1998, p. 225). Almost every ethnologic record, scholarly text/article, and popular book I examined for this literature review agrees with Hynes and Doty (1993), these narratives “. . . are often entertainments involving play or laughter, but they are entertainments that are *instructive*” (p. 202).

Contained in many of the narratives are lessons in civility, survival, and self-control. An example is found in de Angulo’s (1973) recounting of the cycle of Coyote narratives held by the Pit River (Achomawi) tribe. Fox and Coyote create the world and then try to get along together in it. To create the world, Fox makes a clod of dirt “with his thoughts.” They sing and dance in the sky. Fox suggests making the world from the clod of dirt. Coyote asks, “How are we going to do that?” Fox responds, “Sing!” Fox tells Coyote to close his eyes and they both sing. When Coyote opens his eyes, the clod of dirt has grown quite large. Again he closes his eyes and they sing. The earth stretches before him as they dance and sing in the sky. Each time Coyote closes his eyes and sings, Fox enlarges the earth. When earth is grown they leap to the ground and become best friends. They live together in the same winter lodge and the Pit River Indian cycle of Coyote narratives continues with stories of Coyote using and abusing Fox’s good and generous nature. When they are hungry, Fox takes a special bowl to the high corner of the room, taps on the rafters and commands, “Come! Pine Nuts!” and the bowl fills with pine nuts pouring from the rafters. Coyote watches him and one day when Fox is away, Coyote thinks to himself he, too, can do this trick and he takes Fox’s bowl up to

the rafters in the corner of the room. He taps on the rafters and commands “Come! Pine nuts!” They fall from the rafters and Coyote eats and eats until he is full but the nuts keep coming. They fill the bowl, then the floor, then the room. Finally the winter lodge explodes with nuts flying everywhere. When I first read this narrative I could not help but recall Disney’s version of Goethe’s (1797) *Der Zauberlehrling* (*The Sorcerer’s Apprentice*) with Mickey Mouse. Mickey plays the apprentice who enchants a broom to help him haul water and gets in literally over his head. Coyote learns the same lesson as Mickey and *der zauberlehrling*—not to meddle with powers or summon allies that cannot be controlled. The Pit River cycle continues with Coyote trying to imitate, best, or steal from Fox. After Coyote “borrows” Fox’s wife, Fox has finally had enough and decides not to live with Coyote anymore.

Coyote narratives are teaching tools (Smith, 1997). They are a source of learning and provide a means for developing accuracy of learning (Grinnell, 1926; Toelken, 1977). “The learning of these stories must have been a fine training for the memory of the young, who were frequently examined by their elders to see how completely they had assimilated the tales so often repeated to them” (Grinnell, 1926, p. xxiii). Mourning Dove (1934) describes Salishan Coyote narratives as so being so enjoyable that she and the other children, “. . . thought of this as all fun and play, hardly aware that the tale-telling and impersonations were a part of our primitive education” (p. 10).

Radin (1955) points out survival training in the narratives. For example, in the “Eye Juggler” narrative common to many tribes, Coyote learns to throw his eyes up into the air or a tree so he can see great distances. He is instructed he can only do this trick

three times in a row and warned of the consequences if he does. However, being Coyote, he assumes his abilities are not limited by some silly rule taught to him and throws his eyes into the air a fourth time and they don't come back! While temporarily blinded (he later sweet-talks other animals into loaning him one of their eyes), Coyote finds water by feeling along for the types of trees that always grow near a river or stream. By knowing which trees grow near water and being able to recognize them by feel, Coyote is able to survive. Other Coyote narratives describe basic survival skills like how to cook eggs by burying them over coals; how to catch and smoke salmon; how to cook meat in fat; and the gastric consequences of eating certain insects, grasses, and bulbs.

Coyote narratives reinforce commonly held boundaries, rules of culture, and taboos (Babcock-Abrahams, 1975; Hynes & Doty, 1993; Radin, 1955). Through Coyote's selfish lusts, he commonly impregnates young women. When his wife no longer satisfies him he turns to his daughters. Being animal, he gets rather involved with his own excrement. He lies, cheats, and will do anything to get what he wants (Bastian & Mitchell 2004). These acts violate beliefs held by the community and are pointed out, held up for amusement at Coyote's expense. In doing so, they confuse and create—establishing a philosophical “anti-structure” that reinforces social structure (Babcock-Abrams, 1975). Hynes and Doty (1993) quote Max Gluckman, “In belief systems where entertainment is not separated from education, trickster myths can be a powerful teaching device utilizing deeply humorous negative examples that reveal and reinforce the societal values that are being broken” (p. 207). Kroeber (1998) agrees and states,

“Their purpose is to subject cultural practices—and the psychological and social forces that created them—to careful scrutiny to assess whether or not institutionalized practices need to be revised or can be reaffirmed” (p. 3). The narratives allow a way to vent and examine feelings, frustrations, and motivations in the social hierarchy of tribal community (Radin, 1955). The guidelines for successful interpersonal relationships and acceptable behaviors in the community are illustrated in the narratives.

They pointed out the moral that an inordinate ambition to equal others in accomplishment invariably leads to failure. Coyote’s ambition to duplicate the feats of others, or to enrich himself at their expense, led to his downfall. In a like manner, not all are destined to be wealthy, to be men of social prominence in the tribe, such as headmen and singers. Not that industry, thrift or ambition are tabu [*sic*], but the child should early be impressed with the necessity of staying within proper bounds.

(Luckert, 1984, p. 20)

The Nez Percé narrative told by Wá yi’látpu and translated by Phinney (1934) illustrates this caution against inordinate ambition and the importance of being satisfied with one’s role in life:

Coyote was going along upstream hungry, as usual. He came upon a big, fat buffalo bull. Coyote said to him, “Friend, I am hungry. Is it so impossible that you change me into a bull just like you, so that I, too,

could become fat and sleek? Bull heeded him not the least. He only wandered away grazing and not a word would he reply to Coyote. Coyote was insistent. He said again and again, “I wish that I, too, were a bull so that I could get fat. (p. 9)

Coyote is clearly envious of Bull, whose character is rather aloof. Phinney (1934) continues with his translation:

Finally Bull got tired of hearing this and said to him, “Coyote! You are inveterately foolhardy in the things you do; you could never do what I might ask of you. You are becoming a great bother.” Coyote replied, “No, friend, I will do exactly what you tell me to do. Here I see you fat and sleek. Here is much grass and you live well, while, you see, I am painfully hungry. I will do just anything you tell me.” Bull then said to him, “Then go over there and lie down.” Coyote accordingly went and lay down. “Absolutely do not flee; do not move when I dash at you. You must, absolutely, remain still and I will heave you upward with my horns.”—“Yes, friend, why should I flee?” replied Coyote as he lay down. (p. 9)

Somehow I sense the self-doubt in Coyote’s words. Still, Bull obliges him:

Bull went off to the side and there he incited himself to terrific anger. He tore up the turf; he threw dirt upward; he bellowed and breathed clouds of vapor from his nostrils. He became terribly angry and then he dashed

upon Coyote. But Coyote had been glancing at Bull and had seen him become so terrible. He saw Bull come at him and he jumped quickly aside. “Now that is what I spoke of –that you would run away,” Bull said to him. “Let me try again, just once more,” Coyote said. “I will not move next time.” But Bull went away even though Coyote beseeched him weepingly. Coyote followed, tearfully entreating him, “Once more, just one more; I will not run away again. (Phinney, 1934, p.9)

Surely Bull was no more surprised than I when Coyote “chickened-out.” I can almost hear the storyteller’s high-pitched voice crying for another chance. The story continues:

Bull said to him at last, “You are most bothersome to me. Now I will try you once more and if you move do not beg me anymore, for I will heed you never again. We are trying for the last time.” Coyote placed himself on the designated spot again and Bull went aside, as before, to become terribly angry. Now he dashed at Coyote. This time Coyote steeled himself and Bull threw him high into the air with his horns. Coyote fell and suddenly became a buffalo bull. He walked away and went along grazing. He would see all kinds of things and eat them. (Phinney, 1934, p. 9)

Though the story could end here with Coyote having gained a bit more courage and a happy ending. However, Wá yi’látpu’s narrative continues its illustrated lesson:

Then finally he parted with the other bull which now wandered off somewhere feeding. Here now another coyote met him and recognized him as erst Coyote. “Oh, friend, how is it, friend, that you have become like that? I am terribly hungry; I wish that you would make me like that, too.” Coyote-Bull only looked at him sullenly, and walked away to feed, unmindful of what the other said. (Ibid., pp. 9-10)

Now that Coyote has Bull’s cool attitude the story loops with what in music is described as *D. C. al Coda*, and tickles the listener with a sense of *déjà vu*. Several Coyote narratives I found in my research used this repetitive action device.

The coyote insisted, “Friend, make a bull of me, too. I fare piteously and you are very fat.” Coyote-Bull then spoke to him. “You are very bothersome. You would never do those things which I would ask.” “Yes, friend, I will follow out absolutely every word you say. Try me.” “You have been a nuisance to me,” Coyote-Bull said to him. “But place yourself there and I will dash upon you angrily and toss you into the air with my horns. You absolutely are not to move. If you run away do not tearfully entreat me for another chance. (Ibid., p. 10)

Coyote is well aware of his own previous behavior when cautioning his fellow coyote not to beg for another chance if he gets frightened and jumps out of the way. Even though outwardly a bull, Coyote is still himself. It is easy to see one’s own fault in

others. Wá yi'látpu's story seems to have lessons inside lessons. Phinney (1934) completes the translation:

The coyote now placed himself there while Bull made himself angry. He bellowed and pawed the ground. He imitated in every way those things that he had seen the other bull do. Now Bull dashed upon him and oh! He picked him up and hurled him upward with his horns. Now coyote fell – *thud!* to the ground he fell still a coyote. At the very same moment Bull, too, changed back into a coyote. Here they were suddenly standing there, both coyotes. They stormed and they scolded each other. “You! You have caused me to change back into a coyote. There I was a bull living happily and you caused me to change back into a coyote.” “Ha, you imitator! You thought you could make me into a bull too, as the other one did to you.” Now one chased the other up the valley. The coyotes chased each other. Then one lost interest and forgot that. “Thus I was acting silly – had become a bull.” He went along up the valley from there unmindful of all that had happened. (p. 10)

Coyote remains unchanged, even after all the changes. He forgets and continues on his way and his way is not one of mindfulness. Wá yi'látpu's audience, however, take the lessons with them.

Coyote narratives teach us how to laugh at ourselves (Ballinger, 2004; Hynes & Doty, 1993; Smith, 1997). An illustration is found in a Lipan Apache tale related by

Antonio Apache (1998) in which Coyote is going along and comes upon wasps dancing inside an old horse skull. He wants to join in the dance so he pokes in his finger into the skull, and stretches it enough to get his head inside, but cannot get all the way inside to join the wasps in their dance. He gets stuck with the skull on his head and goes roaming about. Coming upon a village, people see the horse-skull alive and believe it has supernatural powers. They line up to worship it. One by one all the villagers throw pollen on Coyote and offer food. A crazy boy hides a big stick under his arm and when he gets to the front of the line strikes the skull hard, breaking it all to pieces and revealing Coyote. Coyote laughs at the people as he goes on his way. He is a little embarrassed being covered with pollen, but delighted with his tomfoolery. The villagers are left to laugh at themselves and reflect on their behavior (Apache, 1998).

I found similar versions of this narrative in Hynes and Doty's *Mythical Trickster Figures* (1993), Morris Opler's *Myths and Legends of the Lipan Apache Indians* (1940), and Karl Kroeber's *Artistry in Native American Myths* (1998). All three sources cite Apache origins. Barnouw's *Wisconsin Chippewa Myths and Tales and Their Relation to Chippewa Life* (1977) relates the Lac du Flambeau Chippewa tribe's version told with a moose skull. Radin (1955) credits the story to Siouan-speaking Winnebago tribes from central Wisconsin and eastern Nebraska. It is important to remember there are no "original" versions of these narratives (Greenway, 1965).

These types of narratives, ". . . profane nearly every central belief, but at the same time they focus attention precisely on the nature of such beliefs" (Hynes & Doty, 1993, p. 2). The narratives hold up communal ideals for reflection and consideration.

“Their purpose is to subject cultural practices—and the psychological and social forces that created them—to careful scrutiny to assess whether or not institutionalized practices need to be revised or can be reaffirmed” (Kroeber, 2004, p. 3). They validate cultural order through example (Ballinger, 2004; Radin, 1955).

Coyote’s buffoonery frees the imagination from conventional social roles (Ballinger, 2004; Babcock-Abrahams, 1975). His behavior clearly goes against cultural practices. Through his antics, Coyote, “. . . roils the tribal waters of life lest they go stagnant” (Hynes, 1993, p. 212). The narratives allow the audience to experience disorder within order; an experience, “. . . within the bounds of what is permitted, that which is not permitted” (Kerenyi, 1972, p. 185). Consequently, these narratives are a driving force in the community’s morality (Radin, 1955). The narratives provide a means for both conservation and growth. Street (1972) states, “To question everything in a society would lead to anarchy; to preserve everything would lead to stagnation; the conflict is presented, and the balance achieved” (p. 97). By questioning convention Coyote confirms and reaffirms what is acceptable and desirable for a culture. In a practical observation, Berry (1994) adds, “And the stories tell us of the importance of proper conduct and the perils of behaving badly. . . If you jump into the water and the water is too deep, you will drown. Just like the Coyote” (p. 8).

There is a certain comfort provided by the chaos of Coyote’s behavior. It comes from both reaffirmation of the group’s beliefs and the bonds formed in the dark on cold winter nights as young and old gather together to hear the stories passed to yet another generation. Mourning Dove (1934) describes it a bond that expresses hope for the future

and gives shape to the past. Bastian and Mitchell (2004) summarize, “Coyote stories were told to entertain young and old alike, to dramatize and convey the value of appropriate behavior, to instruct listeners in survival and getting along with each other, and to provide a sense of tribal identity” (p.77).

The Narratives are Sacred. It is important to recognize the fact that Coyote narratives are religious stories. They are, after all, part of the mythology of a people. They explain creation and the mysteries of life. They are heretic parables that relate the morals of society. The narrator, then, can be understood as clergy. In Native American cultures, “The storyteller is one whose spirit is indispensable to the people. He is magician, artist, and creator. And, above all, he is a holy man. His is a sacred business” (Caduto & Bruchac, 1991, [introduction pages not numbered]). Do not let the pronoun “he” mislead you. Narrators in Native American cultures are as likely to be women as men (Barnouw, 1977; Bright, 1998; Jacobs, 1959; Phinney, 1934). Not all Native American oral literature is considered sacred. Much of it can be categorized as either myth or legend. For the Winnebago nation, this is the difference between *waikan* (myth) and *waantsea* (what is recounted); for the Gros Ventres it is *hanta* ‘*antya* or *waantsea* (Ballinger, 2004). For me, these terms seem to define sacred versus secular—the acts of the supernatural versus the acts of nature and humankind. These labels, however, lose their meaning in light of the concept that most all Native American cultures hold all of nature as sacred. The nuances of a people’s religion is often difficult to grasp for an outsider such as myself.

Sacred is defined as, “1. Devoted or dedicated to a deity or some religious purpose; consecrated. 2. entitled to veneration or religious respect by association with divinity or divine things; holy. 3. Pertaining to or connected with religion, as literature, music, etc. (opposed to profane and secular). . .” (Webster’s, 1994, p. 1259). I can define Coyote narratives as a sacred art form—sacred by definition of their topic and art by definition of the narrator’s live performance. In my mind, Dr. Sawyers’ mystic dance that introduced me to the metaphor, “Art is a coyote,” still conjures the unseen metaphysical spirit permeating belief in Coyote. I compare her swaying movements to an imagined storyteller rocking back and forth to songs from the tribe in a rhythmic sway before another tale is recounted. I’ve seen the same in my grandmother’s country church before the preacher begins his sermon. It is the gentle movement of veneration and it prepares the body and soul to receive divine truth. Whether I believe coyote stole fire from the gods or created the earth is immaterial. The stories are told as religious truth and Coyote knowledge is set apart from the common lessons of daily life. By telling only members of the tribe or recounting the stories only in the dark or wintertime they are separate from the mundane or ordinary. The supernatural Coyote changes forms to accomplish a task or feat—a fact I cannot help but relate to the many avatars taken on by gods featured in the stories held by the world’s religions.

By examining the how, when and why the stories are told I can state a few primary connections between the source and target domains in the metaphor—that is, I am starting to understand certain concepts are relative to both art and Coyote. By examining the narratives about Coyote, their context and purpose I have come to

understand the narratives (like art) are considered “special” and set apart from the mundane or ordinary. Both art and Coyote narratives can be said to have entertaining and educative purposes; and both can function as a lens through which to examine culture. Art and sacred Coyote narratives can also serve to buttress group identity. These are powerful roles in any culture. Out of all these concepts by far the most personally significant concept is sacredness. I have long held in faith that making art is “sacred business.” In my lifetime the art field has been dominated by modernism and post-modernism. Neither are particularly fertile grounds for anything having to do with religion. The modernist has no god and the post-modernist wears a picture of someone else’s god on a T-shirt and defines his or her own meaning for it. Kidding aside, spirituality is not at the forefront of either of these movements/philosophies. The former has no room for metaphysics in its human-centric world and the latter’s disdain for meta-narratives rejects the possibility of higher truth.

The sacred nature of Coyote narratives has provided the most personally meaningful link between the target and source domains in the metaphor, “Art is a coyote.” Though early in my research Jung (1959) told me the trickster is partly human and partly divine I did not fully grasp the statement. By examining the work of ethnologists, archeologists and scholars documenting Native American oral literature I am much more conscious of the divine aspects of Coyote. Whether it was Sapir’s (1934) description of Louis Simpson’s reverence for Coyote, the aboriginal people’s faith in the Coyote narratives, or the successful diligence with which others worked to reveal Coyote’s nature to the world I cannot say. I do know I now recognize the sacred

nature of Coyote. The Coyote is divine. He embodies metaphysical spirit. Dr. Sawyers knew this years ago when she danced into art appreciation class. I did not fully recognize Coyote as a religious figure it until now.

The metaphor, as it was presented to me, however, is not, “Art is a Coyote narrative.” The metaphor is, “Art is a Coyote.” Notice the “c” in Coyote is capitalized. Now that I have a basic understanding of the *real* Coyote rather than the one I intuited as I went along through art’s and life’s experiences, I feel the need to signify in the metaphor by capitalization that it is not just any old coyote I am talking about, it is *the* Coyote. By reading the narratives and discovering what is, as stated earlier, *around* the narratives I have a much clearer picture of what is *in* them. They contain the essence, the spirit, of Coyote. The conceptual environs (how, when, and where) of the narratives have set in my mind an image of Coyote I never would, or could, have considered on my own.

Coyote, Himself. Initial readings of traditional Coyote narratives left me cold. I didn’t warm up to Coyote until I picked up Bright’s (1993) *A Coyote Reader*. My notes on this text indicate my skeptic frame of mind when I started Bright’s book. At the top of the page I wrote,

This is an odd little book. Ballinger’s (2004) criticism of Bright has left me prejudiced before I start and the table of contents makes me wonder about the authenticity of these tales. The chapters start with *The Coyote*

by Mark Twain. I notice that William Bright's name appears quite often as author or co-author of these Coyote tales. I wonder about his qualifications and will give the matter further attention but for now here are the notes. (personal research notation)

Then the notes proceed with an observation that the chapter titles are characteristics of Coyote: Coyote the Wanderer, Coyote the Bricoleur, Coyote the Glutton, Coyote the Thief, Coyote the Cheat, Coyote the Outlaw, Coyote the Spoiler, . . . the Loser, . . . the Clown, . . . the Pragmatist, . . . the (Horny) Old Man, and so on. In the Introduction, my curiosity about Bright's qualifications is satisfied. Bright is fluent in Karuk and worked in the field with ". . . great storytellers no longer living, who introduced me to Coyote: Nettie Reuben, Julia Starritt, Chester Pepper, and Mamie Offield" (Bright, 1993, p. xv). Bright has a certain reverence for Coyote that becomes evident as the book unfolds, and he has been studying traditional Coyote narratives since the 1970s. I find myself admiring Bright, Coyote, and the great tradition of the narratives. Early in the book Bright quotes a passage about coyotes from Mark Twain's (1913) *Roughing It*. Of course, this is really not fair. Twain has the ability to make a can of paint enviable. I head to the library and pick up a copy of *Roughing It* so I can read the entire passage.

The cayote (sic) is a long, slim, sick and sorry-looking skeleton, with a gray wolf-skin stretched over it, a tolerably bushy tail that forever sags down with a despairing expression of forsakenness and misery, a furtive and evil eye, and a long, sharp face, with slightly lifted lip and exposed teeth. He has a general slinking expression all over. The cayote is a

living, breathing allegory of Want. He is *always* hungry. He is always poor, out of luck and friendless. The meanest creatures despise him, and even the fleas would desert him for a velocipede. He is so spiritless and cowardly that even while his exposed teeth are pretending a threat, the rest of his face is apologizing for it. (Twain, 1909, p. 17)

His description is as accurate as it is delightful. Twain (1909) continues:

And he is *so* homely!—so scrawny, and ribby, and coarse-haired, and pitiful. When he sees you he lifts his lip and lets a flash of his teeth out, and then turns a little out of the course he was pursuing, depresses his head a bit, and strikes a long, soft-footed trot through the sage-brush, glancing over his shoulder at you, from time to time, till he is about out of easy pistol range, and then he stops and takes a deliberate survey of you; he will trot fifty yards and stop again—another fifty and stop again; and finally the gray of his gliding body blends with the gray of the sage-brush, and he disappears. All this is when you make no demonstration against him; but if you do, he develops a livelier interest in his journey, and instantly electrifies his heels and puts such a deal of real estate between himself and your weapon, that by the time you have raised the hammer you see that you need a minié rifle, and by the time you have got him in line you need a rifled cannon, and by the time you have ‘drawn a bead’ on him you see well enough that nothing but an

unusually long-winded steak of lightning could reach him where he is now. (p. 17)

Twain's "cayote" is not the Coyote in Native American oral traditions. It is *canis latrans*, the coyote still heard singing in the night in urban (and even suburban [Gill, 1970, 1965; Project Coyote, 2009]) areas across America. Bright (1978) makes an argument that mythological Coyote's character is based on the biological coyote and Twain's description plays to my romantic side: The friendless hungry wanderer tugs at my heart. The biological face of coyote becomes the face of Coyote in my mind. Twain has given me the image of Coyote that mentally animates the Native American narratives. It replaces the fuzzy portrait I have of Coyote as a cross between the cartoon character Wile E. Coyote and the dog-like mammal in nature documentaries. Melville Jacobs (1959) describes his experience searching for a mental picture of Coyote, "I obtained definite responses from northwest states Indians when I asked, as I often did, a question such as What did Coyote look like in the Myth Age? . . . I always obtained a succinct reply. In every instance it amounted to, 'He (or she) looked just like a person'" (p. 6). He goes on to explain the Indian viewpoint that Coyote was a human-like being with the supernatural spirit and powers of a coyote. At a later time Coyote metamorphosed into the mammal we know as a coyote.

Hundreds of Native American stories depict Coyote as greedy, thieving, cunning, lazy and irreverent (Bastian & Mitchell, 2004). He is depicted as an outlaw and a glutton who cheats and is regularly cheated (Bright, 1978), a wanderer (de Angulo, 1973; Kroeber, 1981) living in the cracks of society (Babcock-Abrahams,

1975; Ballinger, 2004). He is also described as, “. . . godlike creator, the bringer of light, the monster-killer, the thief, the miserable little cheat, and of course, the lecher” (Erdoes & Ortiz, 1984, p.xiv). All these different adjectives and labels are attached to Coyote for a reason: In his stories, Coyote earns them. There’s a story (or two, or more) to go with each and every one. For example when Coyote takes flight with the sun he lacks the discretion to keep his mouth closed about what he sees all day on the ground below him. He comments on all he sees, causing quite a bit of embarrassment and infuriating all the people on the ground who want their private affairs kept that way. Soon he is no longer permitted to fly in the sky with the sun (this narrative is described in Hyde [1998] as an Interior Salish story and told in Kroeber [1998] as a Chinook Wishram tale—the Louis Simpson [a Wishram storyteller] version appears in Sapir [1903]).

This same impetuous Coyote who cannot hold his tongue as he flies with the sun is the bungler who fills Fox’s house with nuts and is also the Promethean Coyote (Bright, 1993; Hynes & Doty, 1993) who has the wherewithal to steal fire from the gods as a gift to mankind. He is clever enough to design the first fish trap. The contrasts are extreme. This may make Coyote the most paradoxical character in all of Western literature, “. . . for he combines the attributes of many other types that we tend to distinguish clearly. At various times he is clown, fool, jokester, initiate, culture hero, even ogre. . . He is the central character for what we usually consider many different types of folk narratives” (Abrahams, 1968, p. 170-171). I find this complexity attractive. It stimulates a broad range of reactive emotions. I pity and admire Coyote

while at the same time loathe and envy him. The contrast in emotions strikes a chord in me and I realize my previously simplistic muse is now a complex character. The intuited, self-defined coyote in the metaphor so long in my life is now Coyote with a wide range of contrasting attributes assigned by generations of Native Americans. He is Coyote the wanderer, the creator, the self-absorbed animal breaking the boundaries of what is acceptable.

Art is a Coyote. The complex chord struck in my mind by Coyote is familiar. It rings of art. I can relate much of what is said about Coyote to art. Art often stirs the cultural waters and it is known to hold up ideals and values for scrutiny. One illustration of this point is Marcel Duchamp's *Fountain* (1917). Duchamp (1887-1968) found a mass-produced urinal, signed it "R. Mutt," and exhibited it as sculpture. It questioned just about every aspect of the ideals and values held by the art community and public. Most were forced to reexamine their beliefs about authenticity, craft, and the role of the artist. It is easy to map similarities between the personalities and lifestyles of many well-known artists and that of Coyote. Coyote-like character is seen in the love-affairs of Picasso and the marginality of the lifestyles of artists such as Toulouse-Lautrec and Paul Gauguin. Warhol is easily framed as the genius-buffoon. Coyote and artists create new forms. They explore possibilities. They can be culture heroes. The commonalities in the source domain "Coyote" and the target domain "Art" in the metaphor, "Art is a Coyote," multiply as I consider them. As I continue to ponder my research I am confident more will be discovered. In light of the fact that just weeks ago I turned my

attention to the how's and why's of Coyote narratives looking for connections in the target and source domains of the metaphor because I could not find them between “art” and “Coyote,” it is surprising to find a growing fabric of connections in my mind between the two. Personal, intuited and limited original understanding of the implications of the metaphor has been supplemented with academic research and clarification. The metaphor has new depth, new possibilities for interpretation and practice. It may be desirable to integrate the characteristics and functions of Coyote in Native American oral literature with classroom activities and behaviors.

Historical Background of Art is a River

Rivers and Art. The metaphor, “Art is a river,” is my own creation. Not that I own the words themselves but it is not something I read or was told. It is a product of my own mind: a novel metaphor. Novel metaphors are a direct manifestation of personal knowledge and experience (Craig, 2005). The metaphor is a product of my experiences with art—making it, teaching it, studying it. The utterance and contemplation of the novel metaphor, “Art is a river,” makes it possible to share and advance my knowledge about art. Chapter 1 states art and rivers are emergent phenomenon—compilations of individual random behaviors that are ordered at large scales. There are identifiable currents—movements—in the waters of a river and in the trends of art history. This is among first conceptual relationships I explored between the source and target domains of the metaphor (see Chapter 1). Other conceptual links

between the target and source domains in the metaphor have become apparent. Art and rivers are reactive to their environments. They both are fed by contributions from many sources. Both can be said to further civilization. The source domain, “river,” is found in common metaphors about time, life, dreams, ideas, and emotions. Rivers are deeply embedded in the collective memory of mankind. Most scholars agree “the land between the rivers” gave rise to agriculture and civilization. Empires have been built on (and destroyed by) rivers. Not just structural empires, the same can be said of financial empires. River power started the Industrial Revolution and brought electricity into our homes. The river that long ago cleaned our clothes on a flat rock with a stick is the river helping generate the electricity for our washing machines today. Most of us grew up reading about rivers in geography, history, science, and literature classes. I still remember the difficulty of learning how to spell, “Mississippi.” I also remember being awed to the point of tears by the work of the Colorado River as I stood on the south rim of Grand Canyon—a powerful memory if there ever was one. As a source domain in the novel metaphor, “Art is a river,” *river* is indeed a large set of concepts and personal experiences. Reviewing the literature will require narrowing the focus of my research. Following Freeman’s (2007) directive, it is my intention to understand *how* I arrived at the metaphor by situating the event in a narrative examination of the circumstances in which it occurred.

Chapter 1 explains the metaphor first occurred to me after Dr. Ndubuike’s inspiring lecture and that at the time I was reading about physics. Situating the event in more detail requires looking backward trying to remember and visualize the past.

Thankfully I am assisted by personal journals. I call them “journals” here but they have other names. They are “sketchbooks,” “notebooks,” and, in practice, sometimes function as “scrapbooks.” I often call them *The Constant Random* because they are not organized by any strict set of rules. Over the past few volumes they are less random and filled more than anything else with notes relating to classes. Through them I can determine what I studied, read, and contemplated at the time when “Art is a river” first occurred to me. By examining them, I can describe and the circumstances surrounding the metaphor’s beginning—the conceptual environs of the metaphor’s birthplace. The journals provide a record, a map, an inroad to three dimensions of narrative inquiry space: time, place, and relationship (Craig & Huber, 2007). They provide a tool that allows me to assemble the history of the narrative in terms of a sequence of related and reinforcing experiences.

Time, Physics, and Japanese Gardens. The journals record specific topics of interest being pursued during the metaphor’s conception. Theories on the nature of time and reality play an important role in the process, as do studies of Japanese gardens, books about physics, and discussions with doctoral peers in classes. Creating the metaphor was a process. Months pass between the first appearance in my journal of thoughts relating to the source domain and the eventual succinctly stating its relationship to the target domain. Between the two are pages and pages of notes revealing the thoughts occupying my mind any particular day. The topics vary greatly and include physical theory, art theory, and Chinese geomancy in Japanese gardens.

The pattern of development of the metaphor is most obvious at a large scale and in hind sight. Day to day entries seem random but are organized by class notes. At no time did I set out to “invent” a new metaphor for art. “Art is a river” is a product of the natural progression of events as they occurred.

In Life’s narrative it is difficult to say where a particular story or events begins. I place the beginning of the development of the metaphor in Dr. Ndubuike’s history of art education class for the sake of clarity. One could say it begins before that when I actually registered for the class or before that when I was accepted to the doctoral program or before that when I was in the Texas Room at the San Antonio public library and made the life altering decision to go back to school. I sincerely believe, however, that the beginnings of the metaphor are related to events in Dr. Ndubuike’s Friday night class and that the narrative of how I came to the river metaphor makes the most sense if its beginnings are anchored to an outstanding moment in my memory. Dr. Ndubuike’s story of the river is one of those moments (see Chapter 1). Dr. Ndubuike’s class also required a timeline project, bringing to the forefront of my studies ideas about time. This led to reading popular books on theoretical physics, a major factor in the creation of the metaphor.

In Dr. Ndubuike’s Friday night history of art education class, students signed up for a time period to research and examine in terms of the art world, world events, education, and predominant social ideas. The objective of the project was to be able to discuss the political, scientific, economic, and cultural events that affected the arts and art education during a specific period of time. The assignment generated class

discussions about the perception of time and relationships between events in time—one of my favorite subjects and another reason I enjoyed the course.

On the corner of one page in my journal is a quote from Heraclitus (535-475 BC). “Upon those who step into the same rivers, different and again different waters flow.” Unfortunately the quote is not referenced; it is just a boxed in note at the bottom of a page where I was writing about student evaluations. In popular culture I’ve seen the quotation condensed to read, “You cannot step in the same river twice” (Thinkexist, 2009); “No man ever steps in the same river twice, for it’s not the same river and he’s not the same man” (Brainyquote, 2009); and “You could not step twice into the same rivers; for other waters are ever flowing on to you” (Phillips, 2007, p. 708). What Heraclitus actually said was in Greek, of course, but the best, most accurate translation to English I found is, “On those stepping into rivers staying the same other and other waters flow” (Graham, 2009, section 3, paragraph 2). I believe the message in this statement is an important concept to the origins of my metaphor, “Art is a river.” For me, making art is stepping into a stream of creative energy. Its flow makes exact repetition impossible. Exact repetition requires mechanization. For me and many of my students repetition means an *attempt* at reproduction while still channeling a stream of creative energy.

At this point in my journal I have begun to relate the source domain “river” to concepts relating to time. The precious moments I traveled in my mind to Little Onny’s childhood village by the river (see Chapter 1) are accompanied by studies and discussions relating to the perception of time. Observations about the properties of time

and notes on ways of thinking about time pepper my journals, but after Dr. Ndubuike's class, the subject appears consistently. Many understand time as something that "flows," so a river is a common metaphor for time. In popular culture, Nat King Cole (1919-1965) sings, "Time and the river, how swiftly they go by" (Cole, 1961), fiction writer Mary Alice Monroe titles her novel about healing time spent fly fishing *Time is a River* (2008), and journalist John Swaim remembers the violence of the early 1970s on the Mekong River in Cambodia and Vietnam in his novel, *River of Time* (1997). Head of Theoretical Astrophysics Center at the University of Copenhagen, Igor Novikov, titles his collection of essays on time, *The River of Time* (1998). He states, "Ever since I started reading popular science books on physics, I have regarded it as self-evident that time is synonymous with empty duration, that it flows like a river and carries in this flow all events without exception. This stream is unalterable and unstoppable, going in a never-changing direction: from past to the future" (Novikov, 1998, p. 2). After his opening, Novikov continues and explains that time is much more than, "empty duration" and explores exceptions to our perceived continuous flow of time. John Dewey (1859-1952) makes similar observations decades before Novikov. Dewey states, "Time as empty does not exist. Time as an entity does not exist. What exists are things acting and changing, and a constant quality of their behavior is temporal" (Dewey, 1939, p. 210). Time, according to Dewey, is common to all works of art. "As science takes qualitative space and time and reduces them to relations that enter into equations, so art makes them abound in their own sense as significant values of the very substance of all things" (Dewey, 1934, p. 207). Time is experienced qualitatively. "To be forced

to wait a long time for an important event to happen is a length very different from that measured by the movements of the hands of a clock. It is something qualitative” (Dewey, 1934, p. 207). Further, Dewey describes qualitative time as having infinitely diversified qualities. He credits the arts for enabling science to grasp and effectively communicate information about time. “I think . . . without the arts, the experience of volumes, masses, figures, distances, and directions of qualitative change would have remained something dimly apprehended and hardly capable of articulate communication” (Ibid., p. 208). Dewey credits art as the source of higher thinking in physics. Decades later, Leonard Shlain expounds on this thought.

In *Art and Physics* (1991) Shlain correlates all the major advances in physics to advances in fine arts. He credits *avant garde* and accomplished artists for providing visual preludes to advances in theoretical physics. He begins his argument with the works of the Ancient Greeks and continues with examples from the Renaissance up through the twentieth century. For example he credits European Renaissance artists Giotto di Bondone (1276-1337), Alberti (1404-1472), and Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) rediscovering the science of pictorial perspective and predictive measurement of space that ultimately enable Copernicus (1473-1543) to correctly identify the center of the solar system. In the nineteenth century Manet (1832-1883) and Cezanne (1839-1906) begin to flatten pictorial space and deny the use of a single viewpoint and mathematical perspective (a stylistic standard for centuries). Their stylistic achievements lead Georges Braque (1882-1963) and Pablo Picasso (1881-1973) to develop cubism representing completely fractured space and time and perspective.

Physicists exploring non-Euclidean space and Einstein's (1879-1955) development of his theory of relativity (and proof of physical impossibility of a single viewpoint of space) follow these great changes in traditional use of pictorial space. Not that any particular physicist studied the paintings of Giotto, Cezanne or Picasso, but that the painting styles of these artists provide a visual representation of developments in theoretical physics (Shlain, 1991).

Entries within a few pages of each other in my journal have highlighted text from Shlain (1991), Dewey (1934), and Davies (1983) that echo Einstein's statement that time, as measured by change, does not exist and, "... the distinction between past, present, and future is only an illusion, however persistent" (Albert Einstein quoted in Davies, 1983, p. 128). A mention of Einstein's *gedankenexperiment* involving two clocks—one moving and the other at rest—is followed by notes taken from Shlain (1991) stating perceptions of time are dependent on the observer and here once again the source domain "river" appears. In describing Confucian perception of time, he likens time to an imagined river,

... and human awareness to a man standing on its bank facing downstream. The future approaches him from behind and becomes the present only when it arrives alongside where he is standing and first conscious of it out of the corner of his eye. Thus, before he can assimilate the present, it is past already. The present washes away to become history in front of the observer. The recent past is nearer and can

be seen more clearly. The distant past is far away ahead of him, its features only dimly perceivable. (Shlain, 1991, p. 163)

He continues with a description of a traditional Japanese ceremony held in royal gardens with meandering streams intended to embody this philosophy. Servants place boats with drinks and lines of poetry into the stream, which float to guests along the banks. “The royal entourage could never know what the future behind them was about to deliver because they were facing the past by looking forward” (Shlain, 1991, p. 164). The future is, “. . . surprises arriving from behind” (Ibid., p. 164). It is worth noting that the phrases “because they were facing the past by looking forward” and “surprises from the future arriving from behind” are underlined in my journal. I do not remember it now, but at some point I was reading my notes and underlined the words with a red pen. As an extension of these ideas, the next page is divided by long black lines and in different blocks are notes on the Japanese embodiment of this way of thinking about time: the *Kyokusui-no-en* (Feast by the Winding Stream) water poetry ceremony. *Kyokusui* or (*gyokosui*) translates as a meandering stream lined with stones (Nitschke, 1993). *Kyokusui-no-en* is a courtly tradition of the Heian era which has been revived at Motsu-ji Temple in Hiraizumi (Nitschke, 1993), Jonan-gu Shrine in Kyoto (Japanican, 2008; Kyototravel, 2008), and Dazaifu Temmangu Shrine outside Fukuoka (Japanguide, 2008). Descriptions of the ceremony differ slightly but participants wearing *juni-hito* (the elegant and cumbersome twelve-layer robes from Heian era courtly fashion) are seated at small desks under umbrellas along the winding stream and are obliged to compose 31 syllable poems—*waka*—as they drink the sake that floats by on little boats.

Each participant adds a line to the poem which is then ferried to the next guest. The Kyokosui-no-en is an elaborate expression of a thinking game I have played in classes in which one student writes a line and passes it on to the next student who adds another to eventually create a story (I have also observed fellow teachers applying the idea to drawing exercises). Now the concept of this classroom practice is linked in my mind to the flowing of time and an elaborate ceremony on the banks of a winding stream.

The same page in my journal describing Shlain's (1991) example of Confucian perspective of time continues with notes on a *kyokosui* added to a famous garden in 1702 and the next page abruptly changes topics (to Fagg [2003] suggesting how the finite speed of light and quantum non-locality can be considered physical analogies of God's transcendence), demonstrating why I often call my journal *The Constant Random*. It allows me to explore any topic that comes to mind or that presents itself through a web link, a book in the library near the one I'm looking for, or article I just run across. Class notes lend some order by appearing between the seemingly random information and illustrations. There are positive and negative aspects to using my journals this way. On the positive side, the random nature of the journal format allows me spontaneity. I do not feel limited or inhibited when using them. I give myself the creative freedom to use them for whatever comes next. Anything goes: any topic, any time. Generally, however, I fill the journals chronologically. The most obvious negative aspect is that it makes it difficult to later find notes on a particular article or subject unless I remember where they occurred chronologically. To help alleviate this problem I have over the past few years added stick-on tabs to the edges of the pages of finished

volumes that identify important authors, subjects, and sections of notes. I have also duplicated notes from research on my computer and filed them alphabetically by subject. I use the neat, easy to read computer files for work but still have the “original experience” recorded in handwriting in the journals.

The Unseen Energy. After an entry about Fagg’s (2003) faith in the speed of light and quantum mechanics pointing to the nature of God, the journal continues with class notes. These are followed by an examination of Schwab’s (1969) *The Practical: A language for curriculum* before they return to Shlain’s (1991) *Art and Physics*. After Shlain, there are notes from another Schwab article followed by the beginnings of notes examining an article in the *New York Times* on moral instinct. These are interrupted (but continue later) by a description of vivid dreams. Looking at this flow of subjects—from religion, to teaching, to physics, to morality, to dreams—I am reminded once again why I often call my journal *The Constant Random*. One of the dreams described was experienced several times in a single night. These dreams play a significant role in precipitating the metaphor, “Art is a river.” I wrote that I dreamed about compartments or cubby holes that seemed to be a cross between what used to be seen behind a hotel desk and a printer’s tray. It was, “. . . empty and demanding” (personal journal) and trying to provoke action from me. It wanted something: answers. It wanted my knowledge. “I did not feel the panic to fill it. I only was to provide the first compartment: The river exists! We all know it exists” (personal journal). When later writing about it I reasoned I was filling the first compartment with the foundational

principle of what I know to be true about life: There is a river of energy that flows through all things.

Chinese call the energy flowing through the world *qi* (or *ch'i*). In Japan, it is *ki*. For Taoists it can be defined as “universal sympathy and intersubjectivity joining together all of nature” (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002). I describe it as a breath of energy that flows through all things. East Asian cultural, social, political, economic, and aesthetic activities have for centuries been intertwined with channeling, enhancing, attracting, and directing *qi*. There is an interactive relationship between *qi* and art (Chung, 2006). In East Asian brush painting *qi* is said not only to flow through the subject which the artist is painting but also through the artist, his brush, and into the finished lines of the finest paintings (Chung, 2006; Tansey & Kleiner, 1996). Dewey (1934) states it is impossible to separate an individual work of art from its local cultural experience. Belief in this energy is so strong and palpable it is impossible to separate East Asian artworks from concepts associated with *qi* (Chung, 2006). Though far removed from East Asian cultures I believe in the mysterious force flowing through my art and life. Chapter 1 states I traditionally visualize and associate this energy with the coyote roaming in and out of the life of an artist. At this point in my journal—the description of a dream—concepts I traditionally locate in the source domain “coyote” are also being associated with “river.” This is the fertile ground from which the metaphor will grow.

The Coyote Leads to a River. While writing about the dreams in my journal, my source domain “river” is expanded to include concepts about beliefs and experiences with the unseen energy of life—linking the river to my metaphysical beliefs. Within the text are crude illustrations and a circle around the spot where I killed a mosquito that had rested on the page. I wrote, “Here I killed a mosquito. Another example of the river and the events that occur when you are in it versus on its banks (or in a particular current, eddy, tributary, or whatever)” (personal journal). Two of these words—current and tributary--recorded in my journal about a dream later assisted finding relationships between the target and source domains the metaphor, “Art is a river.” The following semester I would use the concepts “current” and “eddy” in a paper addressing the history of conflicting art movements and philosophies students learn in my art appreciation and art history classes. In the bottom corner of the page are a few sentences speculating on the importance of having the dream several times in the same night and why the fact the river exists is significant. I recorded this dream was a new way to frame my studies in art and the next page continues where I left off with my notes from Pinker’s (2008) article on moral instinct. Linking the source domain “river” to beliefs in the unseen energy of life is an important step to developing the metaphor, “Art is a river,” however, before the exact metaphor appears in my journal I read Laughlin’s (2005) *A Different Universe (Reinventing Physics from the Bottom Down)*. Its contribution to the metaphor, “Art is a river,” cannot be understated. It expanded the source domain and target domains to include the concept of “emergence.”

In 1998 Robert Laughlin received the Nobel Prize in physics for his work with Daniel Tsui and Horst Stormer that revealed fractional elements of electrons. In 2005 he published *A Different Universe (Reinventing Physics from the Bottom Down)* in which he argues for accepting a new paradigm of *emergence* to replace reductionism for understanding the fundamentals of particle physics and the physical laws of the universe. At issue is the fact the simple rules of Newtonian law fail at the sub-atomic level. Laughlin's new theory allows for this failure. "Emergence means complex organizational structure growing out of simple rules. Emergence means stable inevitability in the way certain things are" (Laughlin, 2005, p. 200). It is why unpredictability at subatomic scales produces predictability in our reality. Simple and absolute laws are based on deeper laws but are independent of them in the sense the deeper laws can change without affecting the emergent (higher) law. The emergent law is our reality. Newtonian law can be reconciled with quantum mechanics because the emergent observable reality is a stable product even though underlying sub-atomic reality is not. "The issue is not that the underlying rules are wrong as much as they are irrelevant—rendered impotent by principles of organization" (Laughlin, 2005, p. 45). We can predict our ongoing reality. Perception is not the difference. The difference is an example of transcendence, a powerful principle flowing from our internalizing and regulating perceptions of the organization of nature. "The laws of nature we care about, in other words, emerge through collective self organization and really do not require knowledge of their component parts to be comprehended and exploited" (Ibid., p. xi). Laughlin turns to art as a metaphor for his theory, "Nature is full of highly reliable

things that are primitive versions of impressionistic paintings. A field of flowers rendered by Renoir or Monet strikes us as interesting because it is a perfect whole, while the daubs of paint from which it is constructed are randomly shaped and imperfect” (Laughlin, 2005, p. 7). I believe there is room for debate about the randomness of Monet’s daubs of paint but Laughlin’s illustration is successful in assisting me to comprehend the basic idea of his theory. Comprehension of a work of art is not dependent on knowledge or analysis of its components and Newtonian Law can be exploited even if I don’t know where a particular electron will be.

According to Laughlin, “The tendency of nature to form a hierarchal society of physical laws is much more than an academic debating point. It is why the world is knowable” (Ibid., p. 8). Emergence is a transcendent property in nature and in art. Application of Laughlin’s theory of emergence to the field of art leads me to record in my journal that if art is emergent the underlying principles can change without affecting the emergent phenomenon—works of art. As stated in Chapter 1, this is an especially important concept for art history and art appreciation classes. Works of art are not dependent on the underlying philosophy with which they were created.

The journal continues and in the middle of several pages containing notes on modernist and postmodernist philosophies I commented with a green crayon in the margin, “Eddies in the river” (personal journal). At this point the metaphor is firmly established in my mind. The following semester (Spring 2008) I narrate a relationship between the target and source domains in the metaphor to fellow students in a seminar class:

Overlapping, intertwined, competing theories make the river that is art difficult to navigate at times and a smooth ride at others. The rapids and falls are easy to spot and become popular places—lines at the museum. Elsewhere the river’s surface hints at deep eddies and currents, but you have to be in the water to truly experience them. Mostly the current is made of “isms.” They are powerful individual movements that can combine into formidable forces in the flow, but are usually individual vortices that develop like eddies according to surrounding influences. Like eddies, “isms” are independent and run in opposition to the currents.(personal paper submitted for education research class, College of Education, University of Houston, January 2008)

I am disappointed my journal does not record a eureka moment when the exact words, “Art is a river,” come to mind. The words, “The river is art,” appear some 55 pages after the description of the dream in which I declare the river exists. These pages are filled with notes from articles on the serious nature of play (Henig, 2008), notes from a curriculum development text (Oliva, 2005), a dozen-or-so pages of notes from a philosophy of art education class, and a long section of review notes for my doctoral comprehensive examination. The dozen-or-so pages of notes on art philosophy play a key role in my thinking about the metaphor, “Art is a river.” These pages address conflicting philosophies and articles by several scholars, philosophers, teachers, and critics. They include notes on the problems of when presenting cultural artifacts in a museum setting (Chung, 2003) and Martin Heidegger’s (1889-1976) *The Origin of the*

Work of Art. A Morris Weitz (1916-1981) article denouncing aesthetic theory is followed by Tom Anderson's (1993) *Aesthetics as Critical Inquiry*. There are three pages of notes on feminist art, comments on Gablik's (1989) *Deconstructing Aesthetics*, and notes from conversations and articles comparing modern and post-modern art forms and philosophies.

During these approximately 55 pages one volume of my journal ends, another begins, and many different and conflicting points of view are considered and studied. At the end of this section are the notes from reading Laughlin's (2005) *A Different Universe*. His theory of emergence allows me to see an inclusive point of view encompassing all the conflicting philosophies and statements filling the previous pages. As is true to insight, in the midst of conflicting information and irrelevances, significance emerges. After notes on Laughlin's book I write, "... appropriate to current experience is seeing the river as a metaphor for art" (personal journal).

Rather than an exact moment when I am compelled to write, "Art is a river," the journal instead reveals the process of developing the metaphor by recording experiences contributing to its creation. In hindsight these experiences are seen as enabling the development of (or recognition of) relationships in a set of domains—time, rivers, *qi*, conflicting art philosophies, and physical laws. Developing and recognizing these relationships seems to precipitate the intuitive leap to realize the novel metaphor, "Art is a river."

Summary

Research has expanded my understanding of the source domains in the metaphors, “Art is a Coyote,” and “Art is a river.” At the beginning of my research the source domain in the metaphor, “Art is a Coyote,” consisted mostly of intuited, self-narrated ideas regarding the metaphysical energy believed to be associated with, among other things, art. These ideas were based on decades old memories of lectures given by the author of an undergraduate art appreciation text. I had never before read accounts of Native American oral literature. Digging into the origins of the metaphor expanded the source domain with a clearer understanding of concepts associated with trickster figures in Native American oral literature and left me with a much more clear understanding of Coyote, the character and source domain intended by the metaphor’s author, Dr. Phyllis Sawyers. The source domain in the metaphor, “Art is a river,” has been framed in the context of its origins. A strong relationship between the source domains “Coyote” and “river” has been revealed: Both were initially related to the belief there are unseen energies associated with art and with life. Years ago, my original concept of the coyote was based on a deeply moving classroom experience then expanded to include my strong belief in the metaphysical. The coyote was likened to the creative energy of art; a muse of sorts; a creative energy embodied by my vague idea of tricksters. The river domain was also initially associated with a deeply moving classroom experience and then expanded with thoughts about time and the metaphysical energy flowing through all things. Belief in this energy provided fertile ground for the initial growth of both

metaphors. Through contemplation and reinforcing experiences the metaphors have become concise expressions of a complex narrative.

Chapter Three: Research Method

Introduction

The metaphors, “Art is a Coyote,” and, “Art is a river,” sit at the confluence of personal experience, research, reason, and imagination. Both metaphors are tools for deepening understanding of concepts associated with the complex target domain of art. They signify a belief system and enable meditative contemplation about the nature of teaching and making art. Metaphors are, by nature, small narratives telling the story of a comparison or contrast that serve to illuminate and explain. Metaphors illustrate our lived experiences (Bruner, 1986; Craig & Huber, 2007; Freeman, 2007). “Art is a Coyote,” and “Art is a river,” are verbalizations, representations, and instantiations of my lived experiences of making art in classrooms and studios. As I continue to use, contemplate, expand, and share these metaphors, a natural question arises: Do I put them into practice? What I am asking is, do my actual classroom actions reflect the metaphors? How do they manifest themselves in my practice? Figuratively speaking, where can I point and say here is Coyote or here the river metaphor is evident in my classroom experiences? LaBoskey (2004), states, “. . . ‘practicing what we preach’ must be an inherent guide to our pedagogy and one that needs continuous monitoring” (p. 819). My continuing use of the metaphors warrants examination of my practice for applications and evidence of the metaphors. Narrative traditions in qualitative methods are well suited for relevant investigation of the inner experience of life’s stories (Clandinin, 2007; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Within the perimeters set by qualitative methods of investigation of lived experiences, I propose a narrative autobiographical

examination and analysis of art teaching and art making practices in my classes and studios; a narrative self-study of how two powerful, novel metaphors are evident in my practice and how their presence and influence contributes to teacher education in the arts education area.

Coming to Narrative Inquiry

I was first introduced to the general principles of qualitative research just a handful of years ago during the introduction to a two-semester long research methods class—a class commonly referred to as “statistics.” Qualitative inquiry seemed a vague concept and I initially placed it in a category “opposite” quantitative research methods. During the statistics class I found quantitative methodology fascinating and was very excited—and, okay I’ll admit it: impressed with myself to be able to understand the algebra, graphs, and formulae associated with quantitative research. After all, I was fifty and had not seen “real math” (in the form of an algebra course) since I was a senior in high school. When registering for the statistics course, I was apprehensive about having the necessary math skills for the course. So much so I spent a week at the library over the summer brushing up my math skills before starting the fall semester. I had used geometry more than algebra throughout my career and the result was forgetting most of the algebra I once knew. Some things about geometry I’ll never forget. “Pie are round, cornbread are square,” still informs me how to calculate the area of a circle.

This silly bit came from my high school geometry teacher and by remembering it I will go to my grave knowing how to calculate the area of a circle. Circles are

important to my work. I use them often in my sculptures and often need to calculate their circumference or area. An argument can be made that returning to the mathematical formulae associated with circles again and again over the years has continually refreshed that knowledge but my nostalgic heart and the smile on my face tell me I remember how to calculate the area of a circle because I remember Mr. B telling a joke in geometry class that ended with the punch line, “No. Cornbread are square, pie are round.”

Back to my point: I was excited about quantitative research because I was doing well in the class and understanding the calculations and formulae associated with those wonderful curves. It all seemed so logical and neat, sterilized and condensed. It was like quantitative research was trying to capture and show me pure truth in mathematical form. I was so excited about understanding the mathematics that I even tried to create equations representing art objects. I, in hindsight, realize that I was more excited about understanding the mathematical calculations and reasoning behind the formulae than I was with the reality of applications of quantitative methods. As the class proceeded I was beginning to seriously wonder how I would apply quantitative methodology to studying and researching art education.

Quantitative research required me to have a hypothesis: If I do x then y will occur. In order to prove or disprove my hypothesis, I was supposed to set up an experiment between two groups of participants, provide some sort of intervention to one group but not the other, and then determine if the effect of that intervention is what I predicted it would be. The point being to control all variables between two groups of

participants, intervene in one group with a particular action, and then observe whether or not my hypothesis is correct. A good deal of the class was spent on defining and analyzing different types of validity associated with experimental designs. We studied threats to internal validity like maturation, instrumentation, statistical regression, selection mortality, imitation or diffusion of treatments, compensatory rivalry, and resentful demoralization. I learned how randomization of the two groups of participants helps prevent conflicts with most of these issues but then we moved on to other types of validity: convergent validity, discriminant validity, construct validity, content validity, and criterion validity. I also learned experimental methodology isn't very popular in education research. It seems so much is done to control the *internal* validity of an experiment that the *external* validity is threatened. In other words, the findings often do not transfer to real world situations because the experiment was carried out in a situation that was *too controlled*! At this point in the class, we briefly addressed the alternative to experimental quantitative research that had been mentioned only during the course introduction: Qualitative research.

Qualitative research, I was told, focused on feelings and perceptions—what I associated with something like shades of grey rather than the black and white of mathematical calculations. My instructor told us qualitative research methods reveal facets of human behavior that quantitative designs are meant to circumvent: Human experiences, subjective views, the perceptions of individuals, individuals' feelings, and situations in context (Watson, 2005). I was intrigued. As I studied qualitative methods, the excitement and personal satisfaction of meeting the challenges presented by the

math associated with quantitative methods began to fade and be replaced by excitement about the possibilities of probing experiences, perceptions, feelings, and contexts associated with qualitative methodology. I instinctively, intuitively knew it would be a better match for me to research art education through experiences, perceptions, and feelings than it would be for me to research art education through mathematical formulae and controlled experiments. Qualitative research better matched my personality and, arguably, my subject area (Eisner, 1981, 1998). I am more in touch with feelings and perceptions than I am numbers and formulae; more sensitive than rational.

My notes towards the end of that class state qualitative research embraces the complexity of an experience by exploring depth and scope of perceptions of participants' feelings and thoughts. I was taught that, unlike quantitative research, qualitative research is not predictive. It focuses on narrative accounts and descriptions of events, interpretations, context, and meaning. The goal is to describe and understand phenomenon by revealing how experiences are felt and perceived and the meaning they have for those whose experiences are being studied (Watson, 2005). Qualitative research relies on description and interpretation of an experience in a way that captures the richness of the experience. It is intended to explain ways in which a particular person in a particular situation takes action, accounts for, and perceives particular day-to-day situations (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007). As a qualitative method, narrative inquiry is based on the very human need to communicate our experiences to one another. Narrative inquiry also pushes beyond satisfying this need to share our experiences in

stories and seeks to understand and make meaning of our experiences (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). After two semesters of quantitative methods I registered to take a course in qualitative methods.

In the course on qualitative methods I began to replace in my mind the mean, median, mode, and isolated experiments of quantitative methodologies with the five commonplaces of education research; subject matter, learners, teachers, curriculum making, and milieu (Schwab, 1973). These five commonplaces of educational scholarship and research operate through discovery, coalescence, and utilization—discovery of one another, coalescence of what is discovered, and utilization of what is coalesced as body of concerns that function to generate new educational tools and purposes (Schwab, 1973). In my notes from the class I wrote that rather than the stable (stagnant) inquiry required by quantitative methodology, Schwab suggested scholars get out of the academic ivory tower and conduct more flexible inquiries to target the actual problems of classroom practices. Herein lays another part of my attraction to qualitative inquiry. The problem with most experimental research is that it remains in academic circles and never actually reaches teachers in the classroom. In the years I had been teaching community college; not once in all my classroom problem solving did I turn to academic research for a solution. I never looked to the ivory towers. Later I would read Liburd (2007) addressing the same when she described a major problem with academic research, “I believe the information that eventually reaches the practitioner’s community has appeared ‘too esoteric and impractical’ (Eisner, 1998, p. 10), ‘irrelevant and counterintuitive’ (Cochran-Smith & Little, 1993, p. 10) and has little impact on

classroom practice” (Liburd, 2007, p. 58). Let me state this concept stronger: It has been my experience that most classroom teachers do not read academic research. So how do they manage to share what they know about the commonplaces? They tell stories. Schwab’s (1973) operatives of discovery, coalescence, and utilization of the commonplaces are carried out in the stories teachers tell each other. The stories I am referring to are informal yet informative stories we share on the phone, over a drink, in meetings, or in passing between classes. Narrative inquiry recognizes the importance of these stories and provides to both researchers and practitioners a methodology capable of containing and studying them.

Teachers “. . . authentically share their stories of practice in safe places they or others may have created or found. In these “knowledge communities” (Craig, 1995), their personal practical knowledge is made explicit to themselves and to others” (Craig & Olson, 2002, p. 115). Teachers create their own narrative authority (Olson, 1995) when they express their personal practical knowledge through stories. By sharing their personal practical knowledge, “. . . teachers validate and consolidate their experiences as individuals and as members of a professional community. Tensions are revealed and insights are offered that enable situations to be revisited, reassessed, and restoried” (Olson & Craig, 2001, p. 116). The cornerstone to a knowledge community (Craig, 1995) is trust. In the years I spent as an adjunct at local community colleges I came to trust only a few select individuals to whom I would turn when I needed help, inspiration, to swap stories or just get good advice. A story I rarely tell comes to mind. I

hope it illustrates how a trusted group of fellow teachers helped me through a surprise situation.

Quite a few years ago I was teaching an art history class at a local community college and on the first day of class a student on a reclining wheelchair—more of a bed—was pushed into my room by his caregiver. Seeing the large apparatus with all the gadgets, batteries, cords, blankets, and pillows took my mind for a moment to the difficult times spent with ill and dying friends over the years. The care giver pushed the student about eight feet into the room and stopped, surveying the rows of desks for a place to accommodate the apparatus. My mind returned to the present and I somehow automatically walked over to the first row of desks by the door and started sliding them back on the carpet to make room for the assistant and the large apparatus carrying the student. The students who were already seated in the area came to their feet and helped. As I was re-arranging the furniture I glanced at the student reclined on the wheeled bed. When we made eye contact, he let out a groan—a guttural sound without identifiable construction. I was startled but tried not to show it and nodded to him with a smile. His eyes and head wandered, seemingly without control. Finally his assistant spoke, introducing the student and herself. The student's name was R. I made brief eye contact with R and said it was good to meet him, then turned back towards my desk, walked over to it, picked up the class roster, and began calling roll. I know I was nervous and shaking like a leaf inside but noticed the roster in my hands was steady as I called out names and began to meet all the students. When I came to his name, the student in the wheeled bed made another guttural sound. It was loud and many of the other students

were startled, but now we all knew R's name. When R acknowledged his name some other students turned towards him and made successful attempts at the social gestures of recognition: a nod, a smile, eye contact, or hand gesture. I wondered if R saw them. A couple of students stifled a guffaw (I was mortified). Somehow I got through that first class with a calm exterior even though R occasionally startled us all with guttural sounds that I could not at first determine if were in response to something I said, an image on the screen, or simply a manifestation of his handicap. I simply acknowledged them with a nod to him.

That afternoon I began to contact a small group of trusted individuals for help and advice; and to vent my frustrations. I was angry at an administration that would include in my class a student with such a severe handicap without preparing me. I was angry at myself for not knowing how to properly interact with R. Most of all I needed to contact my inner circle of trusted peers because I needed to share the story of my day in order to review my actions, get feedback, and get prepared for Wednesday's class when I would see R again. Did I do okay? Did I handle the situation right? How do I interact with R? These were the questions burning up the phone lines by that night. Before I leave this story I'll tell you everything worked out just fine. I wound up contacting the office of students with disabilities (at the advice of a many-year veteran teacher) and worked closely with them for the duration of the semester. I learned to extend the boundaries of my interpersonal communication skills. The point of my story is that in my time of need I did not immediately turn to my administration nor to scholarly sources. I turned to other teachers I trusted. We shared stories and they critiqued my

actions. Together we worked out a strategy for future performance. I received and exchanged nonjudgmental responses” that enabled me to examine my previous actions and revise my practical knowledge in “nonthreatening ways” (Craig & Olson, 2002, p.128). These are the functions of a knowledge community (Craig, 1995).

In the above story I have only briefly related to you the story of my first encounter with R. It could be expanded considerably—from more detail; to more of the chronology; to include personal feelings and perceptions; to include multiple perspectives; to offering new perspectives through reliving and retelling; and to determine possibilities for future practices. In other words it would be possible to conduct a narrative inquiry into the experience. As it is, however, it is a simple retelling of a complex experience. Even so, in the act of recounting part of the events comprising that experience I have in my mind briefly revisited my practice and planned for future actions. By relating the story to you I have also offered an experience that you may contextualize within your own practical knowledge. This is another reason I am drawn to narrative research: Both large complex narratives and small condensed narratives can contribute to learning and extend the boundaries of our personal practical knowledge. Sometimes one can lead to the other. I saw a brief public interview with a teacher who wrote his “last lecture” (Pausch, 2008) and was quite affected, so I bought the popular book and experienced an expanded narrative that moved me even closer to the teacher’s personal experience of being diagnosed with a terminal disease and literally writing his last lecture. Through his narrative authority the lessons of what is important in life were reinforced and given new context for me.

Though at the time I lacked the vocabulary to describe them as such, for years I have been part of and observed knowledge communities that can develop in college-level studio art classes. My studio art courses often entail a good deal of time spent together as a class without the focus of a lecture or demonstration; a time for hands-on studio experiences. Students naturally exchange stories as they work beside each other for hours at a time—providing a fertile ground for the development of a semester-long (or longer) lived knowledge community (Craig, 1995). In these situations many small narratives can “stack up” or be combined into meta-narratives that analyze popular cultural trends or even slowly reveal a student in crisis. Learning from one another’s narrative authority occurs on many different scales, in an endless variety of contexts, an entire spectrum of complexity, and all levels of intimacy. In my research for Chapter 2, I discovered narratives shared among a people can even establish and preserve tribal and national identities. The range and power of narratives and narrative authority cannot be understated. Narrative inquiry legitimizes what is already known to work successfully: The telling of stories.

Why Autobiography? Why Focus on Myself?

To say a self-study is the best path for my research may, to the ears and mind of a listener or reader, sound “self-indulgent and narcissistic” (Seaman, 2006). Though it would not surprise me to hear someone describe me as such (along with moody and irritable), my reasons for choosing a self-study method are at best only related to mirror gazing. Not that mirror gazing is a bad idea. But massaging my ego while I do it would

definitely put-off the reader and that would be a negative contribution towards achieving the purposes of this study. My intention is not to preen but to improve. “The allure of self-study appears to relate to the desire to better understand the nature of teaching and learning about teaching and to develop a genuine sense of professional satisfaction in that work” (Loughran, 2006, p. x). I love teaching and continuously seek the experience of having a “good class.” Having a good class means I don’t have to wear a hair shirt home from work. It means that day’s classroom experience was successful in terms of learning and feeling good about it. It means the students had a good class, too, because if they *don’t* have a good class, I *can’t* have a good class. When my students walk out the door, when I am gathering papers and turning out the lights a review process begins and I ask myself, “How did I do?”

Samaras, Hicks, and Berger (2004) state

Personal history self study is increasingly becoming an essential methodology towards teacher educator’s personal and professional growth and especially to improving their teaching practice and impacting their students’ learning. Through a personal history self-study approach, professors and their students are able to construct significant life events to inform them of their professional identity formation and to help them make meaning of their pedagogy and the connections of their practice to theory. (pp. 905-906)

Reviewing personal history is how I naturally make sense of the world around me and my experiences in it. In the context of my research, personal history does not concern

itself with the negligible moments and memories of day-to-day life. It's probably of no concern to the reader the color of shoes I wore on a given day. Personal history in the context of this research will focus on the nodal moments (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001) of teaching experience. "We refer to personal history as those formative, contextualized experiences that have influenced teachers' thinking about teaching and their own practice" (Samaras, Hicks, & Berger, 2004, p. 990). Personal history in my research focuses on "historical or life experiences related to personal and professional meaning making" (Samaras, Hicks, & Berger, 2004, p. 910).

It has been known for many years teachers in general are well-suited for self-study. They are in a constant state of adaptation and adjustment in response to "the needs and concerns of *their* students in *their* context [and] seem naturally drawn to examine practice through self-study" (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986, cited in Loughran, 2006, p. ix). Liburd (2007) informs me self-study was officially recognized in 1992 when Division K of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) held a symposium entitled, "Holding up the Mirror: Teacher Educators Reflect on their Own Teaching" (p. 58). The symposium led teacher educators across the globe to formalize self-study methodology into a defined and rigorous form of inquiry. By 1994, AERA recognized the special interest group, Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP). In 2004 the first handbook of self-study was published. I found the two volumes of *International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education* (Loughran, Hamilton, LaBoskey, & Russell, 2004) on reserve in the M. D. Anderson

Library at University of Houston. The handbook informs and guides my intentions for self-study.

As well as a teacher, I am an artist and my own worst critic. It is part of my nature to self-review my practice and self-critique my art. I see best the glaring (to me) mistake that was welded over and polished down or the patched, sanded, and painted over mistake in a sculpture. Often, I am the only one who first sees a flaw in line character or not-quite-perfect spacing when walking up to one of my pieces. As the creator and designer of my art I am the only one who sees the ideal in my mind on which a work was based. I know when the execution is not up to par. Ask any artist and they will likely tell you the same. However, I state emphatically that sometimes artists, teachers, and many other professionals—most certainly I—often get too close to their work to see its flaws. LaBoskey (2004) provides guidelines for self-study that include checks for being blind to the forest. She states self-study 1) is self-initiated and self-focused; 2) is aimed at improvement; 3) employs multiple, mainly qualitative methods; 4) is interactive at one or more stages of the process; 5) is validated through constructing, testing, sharing, and re-testing of exemplars of teaching practice. By sharing and re-testing our created exemplars, teachers validate their practices and are not only insured against myopia but also against self indulgent narcissism. Feldman (2006) additionally prescribes conditions of self-study:

The first feature of a self-study methodology is that it brings to the forefront the importance of the self. It is the problematic nature of our awareness of our selves and of our being in the world that is the most

fundamental concern of existentialist thought. . . The second feature is that a self-study methodology would make the experience of teacher educators or other practitioners a resource for research. . . The third feature of a self-study methodology is that it would urge those who engage in self-study to be critical of themselves and their roles as researchers and practitioners. (p. 46)

Feldman continues and adds, “The actions that we perform as part of, or as a result of, our self-studies are tied to our sense of responsibility for ourselves and to others, and these ensure that self-study goes beyond ‘navel gazing’ and helps to improve our lives and the lives of those for whom we care” (Feldman 2006, p. 47). It is my intention to follow LaBoskey’s (2006) five guidelines and meet Feldman’s (2006) three conditions in my self-study of how the Coyote and river metaphors are evident in my practice.

Resources for my Inquiry

The written records of my classes are a vast field of information for research. The physical lines of text in the syllabi, assignments, and notes are associated in my mind with innumerable narratives. The two combine into an enormous amount of information that must be reduced to a manageable size. There is an obvious natural break available. Recent years of practice differ greatly from the sum of my career. Community college sculpture and art history classes have been temporarily replaced with university education and art education classes. My most recent practical

experiences as a teacher are in three undergraduate classes aimed at preparing beginning teachers to use art in their elementary school practices (ARED 3305). The record of these classes will be the source of information for my inquiry. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) refer to the records created by practitioners as “field texts” (p. 92). The field texts of my two ARED 3305 classes include the syllabi; assignments; notes from demonstrations, lectures, and discussions; notes on assigned reading, student and teacher evaluations; student works; and entries in my personal journal created for, or in response to, aspects of classroom experiences. This volume of field texts may be an unmanageable amount of information. For a more manageable study, I plan to start with reviewing the syllabi, work assignments, and student works produced in the three ARED 3305 classes. Entries in my journal pertaining to the three classes as well as entries made during the progress of my inquiry are vital to the process of, and documentation of, my inquiry. My intention is to look back and situate these field texts in the context of my research. The ideal product of this review is a selected field of exemplars warranting a more detailed analysis.

A syllabus generally sets the parameters for a class. It outlines the course’s subject boundaries and informs students of the workload and evaluation methods, classroom policies, and special considerations. It introduces the instructor and lends organization to the class. For students it offers what is likely their first view of the course. Examining the syllabus is often the first thing we do *as a class*. It becomes a reference for the entire semester. From both sides of the desk I have turned to the class syllabus to clarify an assignment or double-check due dates. The “character” and “feel”

of the syllabus indicate what to expect in the course. Even the phrasing affects students' perceptions of the instructor and of the difficulty of the course (Ishiyama & Hartlaub, 2002). Former supervisors describe them as contracts protecting the instructor and the school. I have been warned a good syllabus is clear in addressing the common problems that may occur in the classroom and that it should also cover my "behind" for all foreseeable future problems. A document that can do that would be impressive. A syllabus can provoke physical reactions. Typos in a syllabus have sent a flush of embarrassment over my face. A lengthy syllabus can cause a stomach to tighten. Careful construction of syllabus is required to initiate a comfort level that allows students to freely approach instructors (Perrine, Lisle, & Tucker, 1995). As a teacher I have fretted over constructing syllabi and as a student I have been frightened by them enough to drop the course. These powerful documents need to be included in my inquiry.

In the ARED 3305 syllabi, work assignments are briefly described and examinations are scheduled, but at the top of my head I don't recall many of the details. It has been two years since I've read either one. Part of me wants to stop typing and look at them now to project a research path, but this may predispose me to conclusions before the inquiry even begins. As I remember, the syllabi describe work assignments that include large and small projects: articles to be read and commented on; hands-on media assignments; model lesson plans; and PowerPoint presentations of planned art activities. The assignments are created with specific goals and objectives. They are

aimed at providing learning experiences that further art education. I expect them to be ideal hunting grounds for manifestations of the coyote and river metaphors.

Student products often reveal to me as much about the teacher as they do the student. For this reason alone they should be included in the field of information for my analysis. The products created by students are physical embodiments of what they are learning. As a group, student products can indicate to an instructor the clarity of an assignment, the depth of learning that occurred, and the overall effort of both students and teacher. A group of student products can indicate a department's or school's budget, cultural leanings, and level of academic rigor. Student products connect the outside world to the classroom or school. An entire community can rally for or against a school based on their opinions of student generated products. They are embodiments of achievement. As such, student products from the three ARED 3305 classes should be re-visited and reassessed within the contexts of the coyote and river metaphors and for what they might reveal about the unseen forces driving my teaching and analysis of my teaching practice.

I hope the syllabi, assignments, student products, and journal entries provide a research source of exemplars which I can evaluate for the possibilities of further analysis. Each of the exemplars will be re-visited and examined in Chapter 4. They will be the primary focus of my efforts, and I intend to situate them in context of my novel metaphors. The narratives composed for Chapter 4 should demonstrate the choices of exemplars, and decisions choosing among them, are made logically and with due consideration.

Goals and Intentions of My Research

The path of my inquiry is charted toward discovering how my chosen metaphors can deepen my understanding of the nature of teaching and making art. My goals are to improve my teaching through an analysis of how the metaphors relate to my practice and to produce a narrative account of the research that enables the reader to contextualize her or his experience within my own. In general, the goals of qualitative research are to describe and understand a phenomenon and to study how the experience is felt and perceived; the meaning it has for those whose experience is being studied; and to make available to others that research. Within the parameters of qualitative research, Freese and Beck (2006) examine how self-study allows teacher educators to frame and then re-frame their practical knowledge within a context of their own unique circumstances. Their research provides educators new ways to examine beliefs and practices—new ways of “viewing and conducting teacher education” (Freese & Beck, 2006, p. 1). By following the conditions and guidelines provided by LaBoskey (2006) and Feldman (2006) stated earlier, I intend to create research meeting the criteria set for self study by Bullough and Pinnegar (2001):

A self-study is a good read, attends to the nodal moments of teaching and being a teacher educator and thereby enables reader insight or understanding into self, reveals lively conscience and balanced sense of self-importance, tells a recognizable teacher or teacher educator story,

portrays character development in the face of serious issues with a complex setting, gives place to the dynamic struggle of living life whole, and offers new perspective. (p. 19)

These criteria commingle with the conditions and guidelines related earlier to form a rigorous and challenging methodology. Their addition requires me to reach beyond the context of sharing with readers a self-focused self-criticism aimed at self-improvement to the larger context of utilizing novel metaphors to enhance understanding of art, practice, and life.

Utility and Validity in My Research

Self study “informs the work of teaching” (Loughran, 2006, p. x). It is my intention to examine the roles of two novel metaphors in my teaching and art practices in an effort to discover heretofore unknown truth (Schol, 1992) about my beliefs and actions. This research allows me to reframe my practical knowledge and be critical of my actions in a pursuit of better performance. Through this inquiry I will claim both my professional and personal narrative authority (Olson, 1995) as a way of illuminating my practice to others. My narrative telling is educative telling (Olson, 1995). It educates the self as well as others. For the self it becomes a treatment for improvement. For others it provides an example for their own unique contextualization. Self-study moves away from linear ideas of generalization (Holt-Reynolds, 1991; Samaras, Hicks, & Berger,

2004) to instead provide unique perspectives that are shared with others who, rather than identically repeat them, uniquely contextualize them within their own experiences.

In qualitative research the researcher him/herself is the main measurement device—i.e., the researcher acts as the instrument by isolating themes and relationships (Watkins, 2005). Though qualitative methods do not rely on the traditional instrumentations and treatments practiced in quantitative research, in a discussion of relationships between action research and positivist, linear methodologies, McNiff (2007) suggests the act of narrative sharing or relating a narrative may be compared to treatment in quantitative methods in the sense narratives can be told for a desired outcome or effect. One of the goals of my research is to improve my teaching practice. That is, my research is intended to have an impact on the participant. In this case, the research itself can be discussed as treatment. For example some time after researching the educative aspects of Coyote narratives during my review of literature for Chapter 2, I find Conle, Li, and Tan (2002) relating oral literature to contemporary research such as my own. They acknowledge, “Although the connection teacher educators make between narrative and practical knowledge is a relatively recent phenomenon, it has a long history elsewhere. Oral cultures generally have relied on storytelling to pass on their cultural knowledge and social wisdom” (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002, p. 432). This affirmation of a relationship between the narratives in Native American oral traditions and contemporary teachers’ narrative knowledge helps reinforce my positive feelings about the current path of my research. I interpret these feelings to be a positive outcome

of the research and therefore a positive treatment already occurring in the research process.

As a narrative self-study unfolds, relationships develop between the researcher and resources that may not generalize to a larger population. Narrative research is a “profoundly relational form of inquiry” (Clandinin, 2007, p. xv). This research is intended to analyze the relationships between personal practices and novel metaphors held up as representatives of a philosophy. Personal, practical knowledge is always tentative and in flux (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002; Dewey, 1938; Polanyi, 1958). The metaphors themselves continue to develop depth in their meaning. Much the opposite of the goals of quantitative research designs, a stable predictable, repeatable outcome is not possible and, in fact, undesirable. This study is intended to be unique. It should be considered a general model rather than template for other researchers. My inquiry is offered as a prospect rather than an ideal (LaBoskey & Lyons, 2002).

McNiff (2007) suggests I generate a narrative account of the research process. This narrative forms the structure of Chapter 4. By communicating my personal theories and analysis of the novel metaphors in my practice I allow others to challenge, extend, transforms and translate (LaBoskey, 2004; Liburd, 2006; Loughran, 2004) the metaphors, “Art is a Coyote,” and “Art is a river.” Making my inquiry available to the public opens my practice, my research, and the metaphors themselves to the scrutiny, challenges, and contextualizations of others. I confess I am apprehensive. The difference between saying and explaining them out loud and analyzing them in a dissertation is considerable. It is the difference between having the ability to discuss the

narratives of the metaphors and my practice in person versus writing with enough detail and accuracy to allow others to decide the validity of my inquiry without the benefit of conversation. In narrative inquiry, validity is defined as trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Lyons & LaBoskey, 2002; Mosher, 1990). Validity in a narrative self-study is based on the inquirer giving true representations of his or her feelings and intentions, truthful descriptive contents, and using a comprehensible—[and written]—language (Conle, 2000; Liburd, 2006). The study should provide enough analogical detail for the reader to apply it to his or her own applications (Eisner, 1998). Creating a successful narrative analysis of the metaphors in my practice raises a tall challenge, indeed.

The Large Contents of Self

There is a primary direct participant—the researcher. Indirectly, however, there are many participants. My dissertation committee chairperson functions as a participant in the role of guide and counsel. Soon the entire dissertation committee will be participants in determining the path of my dissertation research. There are also countless indirect participants represented by data in the form of a personal journal and the materials generated in my classes. A narrative autobiographical inquiry naturally involves many lives. Bruner (1991) explains self-disclosed autobiography, “. . . seems also to be intersubjective or ‘distributed’ in the same way one’s ‘knowledge’ is distributed beyond one’s head to include the friends and colleagues to whom one has

access, the notes one had filed, the books one has on one's shelves" (Bruner, 1991, p. 76). It is a mistake to think of the self as possessing a single subjectivity isolated or "hermetically sealed" from the intersubjectivity others (Bruner, 1991; Freeman, 2007). Freeman (2007) refers to what he terms the "narrative unconscious" which,

. . . refers broadly to those culturally rooted aspects of one's history—particularly those issuing from such 'secondhand' sources as books, movies, and other media—that are at once highly influential in shaping the process of autobiographical understanding but of which one may remain largely unaware. From this perspective, I have suggested, autobiography is not simply a matter of representing one's life from birth until death but rather a matter of discerning the multiple sources—firsthand, secondhand, personal and extrapersonal, near and far—that give rise to the self. (p. 139)

For example, my concepts in the domain, "river," as described in Chapter 1 include not only my own vivid memories of fishing and boating on rivers but also books, movies, photographs, and the unforgettable story a professor told in class about his childhood near a river. In the sum of my inner experiences—my *self*—the domain, "river," includes actual memories of Grand Canyon as well as the plunging leap to escape pursuit taken by Butch Cassidy and Sundance Kid in Roy Hills's 1969 movie of the same name. The first includes vivid memories of the wind in my face and an emotional welling of tears while the other is a more vague remembrance of a vicarious experience set in dark theatre. They are both, however, part of my personal source domain in the

metaphor, “Art is a river.” In light of this concept, the inquiry is opened widely to experiences beyond the single participant.

Autobiographical narrative inquiry, “. . . also presupposes the existence of historical consciousness, which may be understood as that specific form of narrative consciousness that entails and interpretive engagement with the ostensibly unrepeatable past” (Freeman, 2007, p. 122). Analytic hindsight generates knowledge through this engagement with the past. Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998) describe the larger self as including one’s whole life, actions, texts read, ideas considered, people known, and concepts that go beyond the self to include others. Conle, Li, and Tan (2002) affirm the connection between vicarious experience and practical knowledge in *Connecting Vicarious Experience to Practice*. Building on Dewey’s recognition of the “. . . very large capital of an exceedingly practical sort . . .” (Dewey, 1964, p. 322) noticed in beginning teachers. Conle, Li, and Tan (2002) research and affirm, “There is an intimate interaction between a student teacher’s ‘practical knowledge’ (Elbaz, 1980) and his or her vicarious experience of autobiographical description of someone else’s experience” (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002, p. 449). Further, they reveal that in this type of interaction has more than an additive effect on practical knowledge but actually modifies prior practical knowledge (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002).

Understanding the Path of Narrative Inquiry

I am beginning a narrative self-study, a journey down a path of self-discovery spurred by my natural desire to improve personally and professionally. Metaphorically speaking, research paths are not explored in a single stride. A path is traversed one step at a time, with a projected direction, and may not be fully walked or explored before a preferred detour is taken. True to this concept, my research plan has a clear direction but I want it to remain fluid (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Schwab, 1960). Seaman (2006) reinforces the value of the fluid research path metaphor:

A fluid inquiry allows the researcher to follow the winding path laid out by the data, not the straight, narrow path ‘governed by theories, methodological tactics, and strategies’ [Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 121]. This path is, at the same time, both convergent and divergent, depending on the direction of the traveler. The above metaphor may be incomplete – the fluid path laid out by the data may or may not be followed. Indeed, the researcher may stray from the path into the narrative wilderness, abandoning theory in favor of storied instinct. (p. 47)

On a path of self-study the data may lead to fortunate detours. By reassessing the past, researchers may reframe previous actions in ways that lead to new and more productive actions (Schön, 1983; 1987).

The physical record of my classes in the form of syllabi, work assignments, student products and the practical knowledge accumulated in my classrooms and studios combine to form a rich and varied field for finding a research path. The intended path through this field of information is guided by my dissertation committee chairperson; my intentions of relating a coherent, truthful, and useful narrative; the desire to follow the conditions, guidelines, and criteria prescribed by Bullough and Pinnegar (2001), LaBoskey (2006), and Feldman (2006); and the research process itself. The first steps of the path of my research are the clearest in my vision and within only a few feet there are hidden details that may hold surprises.

Successive steps on my research path will be determined through assessment of my surroundings: The process of re-visiting, re-assessing, and re-storying (Olson & Craig, 2001) my practice through field texts may lead to detours on the path, so to project exactly what steps will occur beyond a starting point may be a detriment to the process of narrative inquiry. To say I'll see what's coming when I see it coming sounds flippant and irresponsible but the mindset behind such a statement is one of prepared flexibility. In the process of re-visiting a syllabus I may need to turn to previous syllabi for comparison or to reconsider the origins of an assignment before proceeding; or find it necessary to physically recreate a class assignment in order to relive and reassess the experience. These are the types of detours requiring prepared flexibility and the intuition to sometimes step backward or to the side before moving ahead with research. The written records of my classes hold an infinite number of possible paths.

Complicating the path further is the fact this inquiry process is cyclical. The practical knowledge of the single participant/researcher develops as the research and analysis continues, making the narrative self-study research process an endless cycle. An analysis of my practical classroom applications of the metaphors expands the boundaries of and reveals further relationships between the metaphors' target and source domains, which, in turn, provide more opportunities for examining previous and possible classroom applications. The research affects my practical knowledge which in turn affects my practice, which in turn affects the path of the research. The methodology of my inquiry is continuous—"unfinished and unfinishable business" (Elbaz-Luwisch, 2007, p. 375). "Teacher action is partly shaped by tacit knowledge derived from prior experience, while each new experience in turn shapes the pool of personal practical knowledge available for further action" (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002, p. 432). As narrative research continues, new practical knowledge provides an opportunity for better informed actions.

Summary

Utilizing syllabi, work assignments, and student products from two ARED 3305 classes as resources for a narrative self-study, I plan to analyze my classroom practices for evidence of two metaphors representing what I believe to be true about art and art education. It looms large as a challenging and provocative process inherently bound to an endless cycle of introspection and action. The validity, utility, and trustworthiness of

this undertaking come from the mindful execution of a process determined by knowing professionals and through the larger implications of sharing my experience with others. I intend to illuminate and expand the boundaries of what I know to be true rather than explain and cement prior knowledge. My narrative research path may have many forks I cannot predict, but it is my intention to discover ways the coyote and river metaphors not only have been but *can be* manifest in my classes' documents, activities, and products. Through the processes of self-study undertaken as a narrative inquiry, I hope not only to improve my own professional practice but also to positively influence the decisions of others committed to the practices of art and art education.

Chapter 4: Narrative of the Inquiry

Introduction

My embrace of two novel metaphors, “Art is a Coyote,” and “Art is a river,” as representations of what I believe to be truthful about art and art education; and summaries of my lived experiences teaching, making, and studying art is put to scrutiny by LaBoskey’s (2004) suggestion that, as an inherent guide to our practices, educators should “practice what they preach” (p. 819). Do I practice what I preach? If so, there may be evidence of the metaphors in the field texts (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) generated in my classes—the written record I keep filed away in drawers, on discs and hard drives. Most recently, my teaching assignments were education classes; specifically, ARED 3305 during the spring and summer semesters of 2007; and in the summer semester of 2008. ARED 3305 classes are aimed at providing elementary school teachers the basic concepts of the practice of teaching art; art theory; and at the integration of art-making, art criticism, aesthetics, and art history into elementary school curriculum (UH Course Catalog, 2007). An analysis of the syllabi, class assignments, student products, and personal journal entries associated with these classes may reveal evidence of the metaphors and allow me to answer the question of whether or not I practice what I preach. That is, the process of assembling the field texts, looking back and revisiting them, contemplating their content, comparing their similarities and differences, and remembering the experiences associated with the texts may allow me to identify and then situate concepts in them within the source domains of my two chosen

metaphors. Following McNiff's (2007) recommendation, I am creating a narrative account of the inquiry. Ideas contained in the field texts and related in my narrative may have strong narrative resonance (Conle, 1996) for others in the area of art education, enabling them to identify and uniquely interpret their own experiences through the concepts and ideas highlighted or revealed by my process of self-inquiry.

Narrative of My Inquiry Process

Assembling Field Texts. The physical process of assembling the field texts for my inquiry starts by opening the top drawer of the oh-so-low-tech black metal filing cabinet anchoring my home office just to the right of the desk. Teachers always have filing cabinets. I realize this is a digital age and some of the contents of this hulking immovable object could be scanned or transcribed and then discarded in the recycle bin but for now that project will wait. Besides, the filing cabinet is a horse and buggy of my times and I am a sentimental type with memories of standard black, four-drawer filing cabinets that reach as far back into my childhood as I can remember. Both of my parents were teachers (later both elementary school principals) and their written records of life and work were kept in filing cabinets just like the one at the end of my desk. Mine holds copies of my birth certificate, university transcripts, and representations of much of what came between: Taxes; death certificates; everything automobile and insurance related; employment records and medical matters; gardening; appliances; leases; loans; momentous announcements, diplomas, and the written records of most of

my college and university classes. A section of folders in the front of the top drawer are ARED classes. I take out all the 3305s, lay them on the corner of the desk to begin reviewing them and head to the kitchen to brew a cup of coffee.

When I return to my desk, coffee in hand, the first thing I realize is the top folder has to be returned to the filing cabinet. I snort a breath of amusement: My review is off to a roaring stop. The top folder holds papers from an ARED 3305 class in the fall of 2007 when I was a teaching assistant rather than instructor. As I re-file the folder, I contemplate my action. It is a didactic gesture. I am returning the folder because I initially think that, technically speaking, the contents of the folder are not part of the field texts being reviewed for this inquiry. Then I realize it is impossible to not consider its contents. My research for Chapter 3 allows me to understand my experiences as teaching assistant are a permanent feature of my practical knowledge and cannot be treated like a written document and simply be filed away or completely removed from consideration in this inquiry. Though I close the drawer of the filing cabinet, the experiences represented by the folder remain with me.

The cup of coffee and the review of the folders begin with little sips. Breaks between sips improve the palette of both: The coffee cools to a drinkable state and my mind assembles thoughts about what I just read. I get up and down a dozen times as the pages get turned. Names of students are among the first things I notice as I glance through the pages. Many bring a face to mind. Among the grade lists on sheets of paper; notes for lectures and demonstrations; attendance sheets; notes from assignments and discussions; sign-up sheets; and other pages spanning the spectrum between useful

record and useless mementos are the syllabi. These are the documents I pull from the folders before setting them aside.

Syllabi. The initial review of the syllabi is recorded in my journal as a detailed entry neatly written in lines of small script. I turned the journal ninety degrees when I started writing (so that pages are vertical like large versions of standard notebook paper rather used as a horizontal rectangle) to set this entry apart from the previous pages. It is a small but significant ritual marking the beginning of a new research experience. If I were printing from my computer, it would be like changing the printer setting to “portrait” rather than “landscape.” Typically, I use my journal in the landscape mode.

My notes open with the observation that looking for metaphors in the articles assigned to be read by the class would be a good project. There is no further elaboration of the thought and the notes continue with comments comparing different sections of the three syllabi. I later contemplate the reading list idea: It would be interesting to steer my research path towards the reading list, take a detour and focus this inquiry on the work of others rather than on my own. The thought causes me, for a moment, to doubt my choice of undertaking a self-study but the thought quickly passes. For now, I decide that rather than looking back to the reading lists of past semesters, my thoughts can be directed forward to future lists that I surely will make and distribute to classes. When reading, reviewing, criticizing, or recommending articles and books about art and art education, I should mentally situate them in the context of my metaphors. Through the ideas, philosophies, and studies of other teachers, artists, researchers, and authors I can

continue to define and strengthen my understanding of the Coyote and river metaphor source domains, and the relationships they may have with the target domain, art. I write a reminder in my research notes to remember to situate future readings in the context of my two metaphors but, honestly, I don't think I need to be reminded. Thinking about the Coyote and river metaphors is becoming second nature.

Most sections of the three syllabi are similar, but there are also clear differences. As a group they represent three generations of borrowing and copying; editing and adapting; and experimenting. The syllabus used for the class in the spring semester of 2007 was used to create the syllabus for summer 2007, and then both of them were used to create a syllabus for the summer 2008 class (here I begin to refer to them as Syllabus 1, Syllabus 2, and Syllabus 3 for clarity and brevity of reference). The parts that worked well one semester were used again the following semester and the parts that didn't work well were replaced with something new. Not that Syllabus 1 is any sort of "original." It too was created by borrowing, copying, and adapting. The logo at the top was taken from the university's website and the course description came from the university's course catalog. I used the objectives, reading list, and other sections almost verbatim from the syllabus used for classes when I was a teaching assistant. Two of the required projects described in Syllabus 1 were taken from the syllabus of another instructor who teaches the same course and was willing to help guide me as I taught ARED 3305 for the first time. Remembering back through years of syllabi writing, it seems this is how they were all created—through collaboration, borrowing, copying, and adapting. When writing my first art history syllabus I was given at least two examples from my

supervisor and, as I recall, borrowed a third from a fellow adjunct instructor. My first sculpture syllabus was a compilation of my supervisor's, a fellow adjunct's, and that of the instructor whose place I was taking. It has been the same when I taught painting, drawing, design, and art appreciation for the first time. My filing cabinet has many examples of syllabi, lesson plans, and assignments given to me by supervisors and peers. I believe this fact reflects the nature of the teaching profession. Teachers teach and share not only with their students but with each other.

Which leads me to ask, how much of the syllabi considered for this inquiry is original? The ARED 3305 syllabi are products of my own choosing and assembling, but not products of my own original thought or design. Immediately, another question comes to my mind that raises the greatest doubts about the chosen path of my inquiry. If the syllabi are not mine—my own work, my own creation—why would I look for evidence of the metaphors in them? I begin to wonder if the decision to include the syllabi in the field texts to be considered for my inquiry makes sense. Then, I reason syllabi are not supposed to be original works. As stated above, mine are compilations or collages of ideas from multiple sources. I am responsible for choosing parts for and then assembling the completed work. They are a reflection of my practice and beliefs rather than a statement of original thought. Originality (or lack thereof) should not be a stumbling block in the mental processes of analyzing their contents.

The contents of the syllabi are similar. Under the university's logo, the syllabi begin with the course number and course title, followed by the instructor's name, and instructor contact information. Sections are identified by headings: Course Description;

Course Requirements and Evaluation; Required Reading; Supply List; etc. Each of the syllabi has sections for attendance policies and describes assistance available for handicapped students. Only Syllabus 1 has a section with the heading, Recommended Readings. Syllabus 2 and Syllabus 3 have the heading, Supply List. Syllabus 2 and Syllabus 3 also differ from Syllabus 1 by having sections for NAEA Standards and TEKS Guidelines. The differences in the syllabi start to stand out, but overall it seems the section headings are typical and similar to other syllabi I have read or been given as examples.

Class Objectives. My journal notes all three syllabi state the same goals and objectives for the courses. They are, in fact, identical and I copied them from the example syllabus my supervisor gave me the first time I taught ARED 3305. Under the heading, Course Description, are sub-headings for goals and objectives. The goals are referred to as what ARED 3305 will explore and the objectives are labeled, Objectives. After reading the objectives several times I decide to consider them as the first section of the syllabi to examine and consider in depth. Rather than re-writing them in long hand in my journal I open my computer, highlight and copy some text, paste, and then print a page with the objectives on it. I cut it down to 7" x 2" and tape it onto the journal page I am writing. It's a fun little cut and paste activity (digitally and physically) that allows me to play while I work. Just flipping through the pages will show a reader I enjoy taping and pasting pieces of paper into my journal.

Next to the taped-in list of objectives, my notes read, “. . . of them, the third stands out immediately . . . isn’t this what I am doing with my metaphors?” The third objective is for students to develop a personal philosophy of education. After realizing this is what I am doing (continuing to develop my personal philosophy) with my metaphors, I add another note, “Shouldn’t that read *art* education?” Whether in art education or education in general, the point is the same. Both the students and I are developing our personal philosophies to better our practice.

Since my inquiry (this inquiry) is directed toward improving my teaching through a search for evidence of my personal philosophies—philosophies contained in, or represented by, my two chosen metaphors—in my practice, when asking students to develop their philosophies, should I encourage them to use metaphors? If I accept metaphors as the highest form of cognition (Bruner, 1986), isn’t it a disservice to students *not* to encourage them to define their philosophies in terms of metaphors? Answering affirmatively to both, I project a change in my practice: In future classes, I should work with and encourage students to not only develop a personal philosophy of art (in education classes, this would be a philosophy of education or art education), but also ask that they frame their philosophies in terms of a metaphor. If students are, at first, daunted by the process of individually framing their philosophies in terms of metaphors, it could be a group exercise, or ongoing class discussion. How it will be done will depend on the characteristics of the individual class, but the more I consider it the more seems a sound idea.

The second and fourth objectives, “To demonstrate understanding of how artworks and subject areas can be meaningfully connected,” and, “To articulate how art education relates to curriculum through the study of issues, historical periods, and current art practices” (Appendix B, Syllabus 2), are also noteworthy. In my journal I write that one contains “that wonderful word, connected,” (personal journal), and together the two objectives suggest students seek to understand the big picture of integrating different subjects, historical periods, and practices with art and art education. My river metaphor immediately comes to my mind. In Chapter 2, Shlain (1991) and Laughlin (2005) are found to strongly outline and analyze connections between developments in sciences, mathematics, and languages and developments in art. Reading their work and thinking about their ideas is part of what led to my developing the river metaphor. Associating their ideas with source domain in the metaphor enables my cognition of relationships between concepts in art history and art philosophy allows me understand art and art history as emergent phenomena. Making these connections between art and different subjects, historical periods, current and cultural art practices are reasons to love, read, study, and teach art history. The general concepts of making connections and outlining relationships between different subjects and historical practices, and the practices associated with making art that are contained in the second and fourth objectives are so essential to what I would define as a good art history class that I stop to dig into my files and see if something similar appears in my art history syllabi from classes I used to teach. It has been eight years since I have seen one of those syllabi.

I am disappointed. The first art history syllabus I pull from the files has a list of objectives (though they are not labeled as such) but the list does not include a statement suggesting students develop connections between art and subjects, historical periods, and current practices. I look at other art history syllabi and find the same. However, filed with the syllabi is a document I also distribute to classes to get them to see an encompassing view of art history. It does not directly state that students should develop connections between art and different subjects, historic periods, and current practices, but it does ask students to develop awareness of what art forms cultures borrow and pass on to other cultures, and to be able to trace evolutions of styles. For example, at the end of the class a student should be able to see Classic and Hellenistic Greek influence in Roman Republic art and the Ancient Egyptian influence in Archaic Greek art. Being able to identify the borrowing and passing on of art styles and trends from one culture to another may be considered “making connections,” but, reading it today, I believe the concept is not stated clearly enough to precisely reflect my river metaphor. My source domain in the river metaphor includes the concept of a well-defined, whole and recognizable form made of strong and identifiable individual components. The difference is the “big picture” document asks students to be able to identify the interacting parts but does not directly ask them to identify the whole form. In the context of recent years developing and using the river metaphor, I decide the document could be improved; reworded to better reflect the ideas contained in, and represented by, the river metaphor. My inquiry is affecting my perception of practices in classes eight years ago. I shouldn’t be surprised. Conle, Li, and Tan (2002) document this effect

of new information on prior practical knowledge. Their research suggests new modifications to teachers' personal practical experiences are not simply additive, but affect all prior personal practical knowledge.

Grade Requirements. In my journal I note grading is explained in all three ARED 3305 syllabi, and decide to look at the grading sections of the syllabi as the next example for my inquiry. An initial comparison reveals the obvious similarities between two of the three. In Syllabus 1 and Syllabus 3 grading procedures are explained under the heading, "Course Requirements and Evaluation." Syllabus 1 and Syllabus 3 describe in detail the assignments for the course and the percentages they will count towards the final grade. Participation in the class is defined and contributes 5% of the final grade in Syllabus 1, 10% in Syllabus 3. Written responses to assigned readings are described and assigned 25% in Syllabus 1, 10% in Syllabus 3. In Syllabus 1 and Syllabus 3 the midterm project is worth 10% and the final is worth 20%. I feel I do not need to continue the list and, instead, write "etc." in my journal, and turn my attention to Syllabus 2. But before I move on with my journal notes, here I'd like to continue with thoughts on the changes made between Syllabus 1 and Syllabus 3 in the percentages assignments count towards a final grade. Later in my journal I will re-write and complete the list of assignments and percentages I earlier stopped short with an "etc." as part of a deeper analysis of the differences. The analysis does not reveal evidence of the Coyote or river metaphors, but leads me to contemplate the differences in percentage points and realize they indicate behavior changes that occurred in my practice. That is,

the changes in percentages represent a process of trying one method, evaluating my experience with it, and then amending or replacing it with a method I believe better suits the class and me. For example, from one syllabus to the next, the grade weight of reading responses is reduced, the weight of class participation is increased, and a journal requirement is added.

In Syllabus 2, the heading for the section describing grading procedures simply reads, “Grades,” and this is but one aspect of the document that adds up to reveal a total feel and character that is quite different from that of Syllabus 1 and Syllabus 3. The introduction, grading procedures, the inclusion of a calendar, and the informal language set it apart from the other two. In Syllabus 2, information simply listed at the top of Syllabus 1 is written as a paragraph of complete sentences. The first word in the opening paragraph is, surprisingly, hello. After the greeting is a welcome, followed by the course name and number, dates, time, location, and instructor’s name, all written in conversational language. Syllabi, in my experience, are not started like a friendly letter to students. Using this casual opening is deliberately unconventional. Why did I do it? I look back and try to answer. My wording is aimed at deflecting students’ possible expectations of having a typical class; it gives them an initial glimpse into their instructor’s personality; and it makes informative communication enjoyable. All the necessary information is there, so it is thorough, but it is more personal and conversational than a simple list at the top of the syllabus. The tone seems too informal when I read it now, but at the time it was an attempt to help create in the beginning moments of class a friendly and relaxed, but not lackadaisical, environment. The

“Grades” section of the syllabus further reveals the class environment I was trying to achieve that semester.

Under the heading, Grades, the syllabus reads:

The class has discussed the grading rubric for the semester, and we have concluded the mid-term and final projects will be graded on a fifteen point scale, and a ten point scale will be used in grading co-operation, manners, responsibility; organization, taking risks, individuality, and homework assignments. All grades will be assigned by the students themselves; in other words, grades will be peer evaluations.
(Syllabus 2, Appendix B)

How, and why, did I produce such an unusual (for me) rubric? It is unusual because in past classes, I have based the grading rubric mostly on completed assignments with a small percentage of the final grade based on attendance. The small attendance percentage was mainly intended to encourage students to be present in class rather than attempt to complete assignments on their own and forgo attending classes. I typically worked out the percentages of different assignments ahead of time and went into class on the first day with a complete syllabus, including the grading rubric. For this particular semester, I experimented with an approach new to me. I wanted the students to feel fully in charge of their own performance by participating in the development of the grade requirements. On the first day of ARED 3305, Summer IV, 2007, the new students and I discussed what they believe is essential or important to having a

successful class. I stood at the dry erase board, made lists, and facilitated the discussion. We talked about desirable aspects of student and teacher behaviors, different types of assignments, evaluations; and classroom environments. Through this discussion, the class expressed their expectations, hopes, concerns, feelings, and indirectly voiced the formative ideas of their teaching philosophies. From the lists made on the board, they created their own grading rubric for the semester. It reflected a mindset that, at the time, was far removed from, and in many ways more informed than, my own. I had never included respect, manners, individuality, or risk-taking as part of the grading requirements in any of the syllabi for my classes. My grading procedures had always been largely based on assignments or projects and only minor consideration was given to the importance of positive classroom behaviors (like attendance). The students in this class were mostly sophomore and junior elementary education majors and I believe the rubric we developed together reflected what they hope to one day see in their own students. The process of developing their own rubric provided a means of sharing their ideas with other future teachers, and it empowered the students with control over their own evaluation methods. Through discussion and democratically developing the rubric, the students taught both the teacher and themselves about each other. Most importantly, the process began to generate the rare bird called *ensemble*. The class became aware of itself *as a class* rather than being a group of individuals responding to my directions. Though it was at my insistence that a mid-term and final collectively comprise 30% of their grade, the students took a vital and active role in their own, and each others',

classroom experiences. I wonder now what would have happened if I had let go of my pre-existing ideas about the mid-term and final.

The Calendar. Of the three syllabi, only Syllabus 2 includes a calendar. My initial thought is to skip over it because it is unique to the three. I glance through it and it occurs to me that this is all the more reason to consider it more carefully. It lists activities for each of the 22 days the class is scheduled to meet. Listed for July 5th is a course introduction, dialog about the early art experiences of each student, and a movie. On July 6th, students conduct in-class group research based on topics assigned July 5th. On July 9th, students analyze artworks and begin their studio experiences. Mid-term project presentations are scheduled for July 24th, final presentations for August 8th, and the final examination is scheduled for August 9th. All these entries seem typical as I describe them here. What stands out is the bold-lettered statement appearing at the end of the entry for July 9th: “For the rest of the semester, the class will follow this pattern: dialog about research assignments, new research assigned, followed by studio experiences and/or PowerPoint presentations prepared by the students or instructor” (Syllabus 2, Appendix B). Though the statement is not quite true (the mid-term and final presentations are clearly scheduled, as is the final), it indicates the daily classes will follow a set routine and entries for each class day from July 10th through the 23rd, and July 25th through August 7th read exactly the same: dialog, research assignments, studio experiences, and presentations.

When I was working on Syllabus 2 and typed out the calendar for the first time, the text lined up in a repeated pattern that looked monotonously repetitive. True to the overtly informal tone set up at the beginning of the syllabus, immediately after the calendar I inserted a sentence directly addressing students with “Looks monotonous, huh? It won’t be” (Syllabus 2, Appendix B). When re-reading the statement during this inquiry, I was both put-off and embarrassed. I was put off because it sounded more like a threat than anything else. Maybe if I had inserted an exclamation point at the end of “It won’t be,” it would have an air of excitement rather than that of an ominous promise. I was embarrassed because, in hindsight, it was too informal language for a syllabus. The *huh* adds a flavor of ignorance, stylistically close to *duh*. The intention of the statement was to alleviate apprehension students may have at reading such a repetitive calendar. Now, it reads like it would exacerbate any such apprehensions. I can honestly say that if it did create any apprehension or negative impression, it quickly faded. As I remember it, the semester developed into one of the best teaching experiences I have known. It seemed ideal. The class was a ship sailing under its own breeze.

There was a high level of student participation and a general feeling of comradery in the classroom. The students’ enthusiasm seemed to feed off each others’. They came to class prepared. They freely and respectfully shared knowledge and opinions. Because of their attitudes, I really wanted to be in class and made an extra effort to prepare special presentations and activities based on what I was learning about them. What might be the most important contributing factor to this positive interaction

is the fact that the students all got to know each other. I moved them around at the beginning of each class. The students sat beside, and worked with, someone new each time the class met.

The primary motivation for continually changing where my students sat was a comment made by one student in a class the previous semester. An older student, returning to school after many years of marriage, child rearing, professional work, and divorce told me no one ever spoke to her in her classes. Day after day she watched groups of students sit beside each other. Those familiar with each other talked about their lives and schoolwork as they developed friendships. She was in her third semester of an isolation broken only by interactions with instructors. Whether this was her fault or that of the other students (I suspect a combination of both) was not as much a concern to me as that I knew I could prevent this from happening in my class. I could make certain all my students were in a situation that enabled them to become familiar with each other. Secondly, I had observed in the past students who sat beside each other all the time were prone to developing cliques that were fertile grounds for the calloused and sarcastic behavior known as eye-rolling. Many teachers have seen this dreadful development: A student asks a question or makes a comment that provokes other students to roll their eyes in a silent mocking or belittling of the question or comment. Almost invariably, the intended target of the insult implied by the eye-rolling is a student outside any developed cliques. It is a painful experience to become aware you are the target of such behaviors, and it has happened to me during doctoral studies. Clique behaviors like eye-rolling did not develop when I moved the students each day. I

didn't insist my students like each other; I provided a way for them to become familiar with each other. This familiarity is what I believe led to the general feeling of cooperation and goodwill in the classroom that semester. It created an environment in which it seemed everyone—both students and teacher—wanted to make an extra effort towards the success of the class.

A symbol of the entire experience is an artifact on the shelf just to the left of my desk at home. It is a plaster paperweight made by casting a positive from a negative mold and given to me by class members at the end of the semester. They hid its production from me. They must have been sly to keep me from seeing it because I moved from table to table when the class was working with media. Made as a cooperative effort, it is signed by each student. I cherish it and still am tickled they worked together to pull off such a surprise.

Did my syllabus contribute to setting up such a good class? It may have, but many other conditions must exist for students to be motivated to work together behind the teacher's back. Did the students bond together this way just because I moved them around all the time? What else did I correctly do to have such a class? This question is as important as my current inquiry and it deserves a substantial answer. For now, it will be put away to circulate in my thoughts as my current path of inquiry continues to examine the field texts associated with three ARED 3305 classes.

Assignments and Products. Initial consideration of assignments given to the three ARED 3305 classes begins with making comparative lists of the assignments described in the three syllabi. Assignments are described only briefly in the syllabi, so I turn to my paper files then to files on my computer in order to assemble a more complete record. I am surprised at how few text documents related to assignments are filed. Most of the digital record of assignments is in the form of PowerPoint presentations. I find the daily journal of one class drops off mid-semester. Of the two good templates I thought I had filed for examples of lesson plans I now find only one. The less I find, the more my surprise turns into disappointment and self-chastising about record-keeping. Luckily, there are dozens of examples of student responses to assignments and through their similarities I can deduce some of the details of different types of assignments. For example, all the student lesson plan assignments require a grading rubric, statements of the appropriate TEKS guidelines, and describe the conceptual basis for the lesson. Responses to assigned reading are required to be written as personal responses (rather than critique of the article) in paragraph form. There are written and verbal assignments, temporal and plastic, those written in and out of class, and those to be completed by individuals and those completed in groups. In all three classes, most all of my assignments require written responses—even the studio media assignments require students to write about their experiences. Based on the similarities of available student products, I think there must be some clarity in the directions given for the lesson plans and written responses to reading and studio assignments.

As I continue to review and dissect the assignments, I realize I am analyzing and writing a critique of my assignment-writing and record-keeping abilities rather than searching for evidence of the Coyote and river metaphors. This detour away from my intended research path reveals needs for changes to improve my practice, a major goal of my inquiry. Feldman (2006) urges self-inquirers to be critical of their role as researcher as well as practitioner. My research path has revealed the need for me to better execute my office skills, refreshed my belief students excel when they feel in charge of their own evaluation, reminded me of the importance of providing an environment in which my students get to know each other, and fanned the desire to discover what I correctly do in my classes to encourage comradery. Should I understand this as success in my inquiry? If so, my research missed its mark but happily found other targets. Though I am enjoying the recalling of classroom experiences, reviewing my actions, and fine tuning my syllabi and assignments, I want something else. I want to look for actions and evidence in my practice that reveal the magic of Coyote and the splendor of the river. Questioning if this is even possible, I am stumped and pull away from the process. Days pass. I ponder and wonder about the path of my inquiry. Mental digging is camouflaged as inaction.

The Break. In the interim, I hit the road. The Coyote compels me to travel. The road a trickster travels is a spiritual road as much as it is a physical one (Hyde, 1998). Being on the road frees my mind for hours at a time, allowing it to wonder much freer than my actual presence on a long stretch of asphalt. Unlike Coyote padding along with

only his wits, I travel with the comforts of home in a big brown box on wheels. There's a comfortable bed and bath; complete kitchen; living area with sofa, lounge chairs, stereo and computer; Wi-Fi keeps me connected and a world of information accessible. One might ask, so what's the point of being on the road? For me, it's the constantly changing scenery, meeting new people, and the feeling of being untethered and open to adventure. Sometimes unbelievable things happen on the road. I've met Doc Holiday and danced with the Devil, seen pink rain and frozen fog, watched the desert bloom. The unbelievable, though, is rare and on this trip I attend my niece's wedding, visit an old friend, and lose a little money gambling. What the trip does towards furthering my inquiry is invaluable.

On the road I begin to mentally process the experience of reviewing my ARED field texts and plan for continuing my inquiry. Having lost momentum, I plan to revisit Chapter 3 to get a running start. I hope it gives me direction and inertia. After making several entries in the "ship's log" onboard my motor home, I begin to be aware it is a conceptually different experience than using my journal at home. The ship's log does not require or record an artistic mindset. It is about neither research or ideas, nor creativity. The ship's log is about facts. It contains receipts and records, calculations, pictures, and brief descriptions of current travels. Using it leads me to examine how I feel about my personal journal and its role in this inquiry.

Including my personal journal in the field texts of this inquiry has made me feel a little uncomfortable. I have been free-writing much of my research and thought

processes directly into it and this is making me feel vulnerable and self-conscious because it may imply my journal is an open book.

I write mostly in spiral bound compositions books, but often turn directly to my journal when free-writing descriptions of dreams, personally significant moments, describing holiday activities, or even just whining about something. Over the last few years, I tend to record important notes, the work from certain classes, and notes from research considered part of a larger process directly into it. But most often, I write on poor quality papers spiral bound into subject composition books like the ones a lot of students take to school. From them, I copy the important or valuable (or sometimes only salvageable) parts and entries into my personal journal, or into computer files, on to grocery lists, or into letters or my address book. Like a filter of sorts, the spiral bound composition books keep my journals mostly free of mundane things like jotted down phone numbers and grocery lists. Copying class and research notes from them allows me to review the notes and reinforce them through the process of re-writing.

Inexpensive composition books also function like stand-ins for a more important player that is too valuable to be out on location. Notes are mostly brought home to the journal rather than the journal leaving the house. Most of the original pages of notes and scribble in the composition books are eventually discarded. This method of using composition books allows me to sort of edit my journal before I actually write in it. Editing is not really possible when I am free-writing in my journal. A line can be scratched out or a drawing x-ed out, but it's still there behind the overlaid lines and I typically don't remove pages. I was trained not to. Many years ago, my teacher, Don,

insisted I number the pages in my sketchbooks (a root of the journals I keep today) in order to prevent me from tearing out and discarding them (thus hiding from him any progress, or lack thereof). Don led me to understand if I am forthright with my sketchbook it is not necessary to remove pages in order to start over on an idea or entry. In fact, to do so disregards the importance of design or idea evolution, and hampers his ability to assist in my growth as an artist. *The Constant Random* is an archive of progress and if pages are missing I cannot review personal growth, or lack thereof. When I do choose to enter ideas, notes, sketches, and images directly into the journal and bypass the spiral bound filters, the journal preserves a record of my self in its truest, most honest state. When recopying into it, it reinforces knowledge and experiences as much as it preserves them.

Though I often share my journals during a class or conversation, including them in my dissertation makes me feel like they have to be more available to a general audience. This is a problem. My journal is a personal record of life and it includes items I do not want to share with everyone. Among the few times I have been unabashedly open in a group of people with my journal is during a few doctoral classes that developed and functioned as knowledge communities (Craig, 1995). In these environments, the pursuit of knowledge suspends personal judgment and genuine peer support encourages honest communication. My peers recognize my (as well as their own) journals as highly useful and deeply personal tools of education and growth. One solution to feeling hesitant to share one's journal in public I have observed in peers is to keep more than one, or even a variety of, ongoing journals. I've tried it but prefer

working with one volume at a time. Lately, I hesitate to re-copy from the composition books as much as I usually do, and seldom free-write into it. I don't like feeling vulnerable and self-conscious, but I also don't want to ignore my journal. When looking back through it and finding missing chunks of time I always wonder what was going on at the time in my life or in my head.

Continuing the Inquiry. After re-reading Chapter 3 I return to the field texts of the ARED classes with a renewed sense of momentum and re-ask the question, do I practice what I preach? Is there evidence of the metaphors in my practice? In my practice I experiment with new ideas and try to reach for new learning experiences for my students and me. These experiments are documented in the changes made in syllabi and assignments. There is an ongoing process of omitting what doesn't work or is unsatisfactory for one reason or another and replacing it with something new to try. Assignments that are remembered as successful are repeated. The repeated assignments in the three ARED 3305 classes are presentations of lesson plans incorporating art media; studio experiences in paper, paint, clay, and found objects; and assigned readings. The largest portion of my records of student products answering to these assignments consists of digital presentations. On file are seventy-plus student-created PowerPoint presentations on artists, lesson plans, and media projects. I find only about two dozen examples of student-written responses to readings and studio experiences. After more self-chastising about record-keeping I open some files survey the list of students' presentations.

The files are identified either by the name of the student and/or the topic of the presentation, and grouped by semesters. It is not a perfect filing system but the files are well-enough ordered by semester, name, and titles. As I start to read the list of files displayed on my screen, a flood of associated narratives runs through my head. A name triggers my memories of a student who burst into tears on the first day of class; another reminds me of the special challenges faced by a student returning to school late in life; and another of the added difficulties women face in many non-Western cultures. The names represent people and their stories more than the completed assignments they identify. After skimming and musing over the names and titles, I start to open the presentations one by one.

One presentation is a lesson plan for a biology class that focuses on the life-cycle of frogs and culminates with students making construction paper frogs (complete with pipe cleaner tongues catching flies). Another lesson plan studies the life-cycle of butterflies and makes simple, symmetrical butterflies using coffee filters, clothes pins, and water colors. There is a lesson plan that studies Seurat's pointillism and then uses construction paper, scissors, and glue to create landscapes on manila paper; one in which students simply draw and color nutritious meals onto paper plates after studying the food pyramid; and one that makes tissue paper collages after studying caterpillars and reading a popular children's book, *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* (Carl, 1969). Artists chosen by the students for their presentations range from Dali, Cassatt, Degas, and Monet to Rothko, Kandinsky, and Warhol; from Van Eyck to Dr. Seuss; from well-known illustrators and fashion designers to creators of pop-up books and children's

stories. Regardless of topic—from artists to favorite pets to piñatas—all the lesson plans use simple, inexpensive materials for their accompanying studio activities—mostly construction paper, glue, scissors, paints, paper, and a few specialty items like the aforementioned pipe cleaners, coffee filters, and clothes pins. My future elementary school teachers write lesson plans on topics from clouds and rainbows to the Holocaust and racism. There seems to be no boundaries to the range of topics.

Reviewing the presentations put me in touch with clearer memories of students, classes, stories, and presentations and is a productive step in my inquiry. It allows me to conceptually situate the presentations within the context of my river metaphor. The individual presentations represent a great variety of thought and because of their similarities they can be conceptually grouped as a larger category: Lesson plans incorporating art activities. Further consideration firmly connects the assignments to my river metaphor. Each student's personality, individual developing practice, and teaching philosophy contribute to the development of these traits in the entire class (and the teacher, too). The products answering to my assignments are a river of art education with identifiable currents made of individual thoughts and actions.

In the process of revisiting the presentations, I also begin to think the right questions are being asked and connections are being made, but I may be looking at the outer rings of my target. Whether or not my students' works contain evidence of the Coyote and river metaphors is a relevant question but may not be the most important to my inquiry. I refocus the question to the lesson plans. If the lesson plan is written to encourage individualized behaviors, can I consider this as temporal evidence of a

relationship between concepts in the source domain of the river metaphor and my practice? The idea individual behaviors become ordered at large scales is the basis for Laughlin's (2005) theory of emergence, a concept vital to the river metaphor. Does my practice encourage these individualized behaviors? Surely, it must. Otherwise—and I have seen this in many open houses, parents' nights, and interscholastic competitions—the student products would be more homogenized in both topic and integrated art activity.

Practice is, however, more than assignments, syllabi, and student products. Class time was devoted to preparing and viewing digital presentations of lesson plans. Even more class time was spent with in group discussions and working with art media. Is there evidence of the metaphors in the everyday classroom experience? Isn't this the meat of my practice—the sum of ongoing interaction with students?

I answer affirmatively and begin to reflect on one of the presentations I opened earlier. A student (Student H) bravely chose to reveal her personal passion for dolls through a lesson plan written for an elementary school social studies class. In the process, she reaffirmed her cultural heritage and self-identity. Her lesson plan introduced the rich history of corn husk dolls and then described how to make corn husk dolls representing specific historical cultures or use them as illuminations of our own. In a shortened version of her planned art activities, our class (acting as her pupils) quickly made simple corn husk dolls. She guided the class through our initial experiences of making a basic doll as we chatted about our own ideas for applications and modifications of the concept and material. Corn husks, to the surprise of many in the

class, are a durable and inexpensive media for crafting and art activities. The media requires only water for soaking the husks and few, if any, tools. As our dolls took form, Student H provided something extra: Thread and a cowry shell to make small necklaces for them. Throughout the semester her research path and art experiences had repeatedly exposed her to the roles of cowry shells in African, Native American, Oceanic, and other cultures, and she shared with us her story of the shell's personal significance. It was a moving experience. As the class gathered up our finished dolls and grouped them together on a back table to dry, several students hugged each other.

Student H's PowerPoint presentation does not reveal this experience. If a reader were to open a file and view Student H's lesson plan PowerPoint presentation on corn husk dolls, (s)he would not see or know the related story. It's one of those had-to-be-there stories. You had to be there when the student first recognized the cowry shells she used in her crafts were sewn into the garments of a tribal king she saw during a presentation on body adornments. You had to be there on the class field trip to the Menil Collection to witness her excitement when she first discovered cowry shells set into artifacts of great cultural, economic, and religious significance. And you had to be there when she realized the objects of her passion could be used as teaching tools and her so-called hobby is not simply a personal indulgence. Her dolls can function to encourage communal bonding and reinforce cultural heritage. There is cultural and temporal power in her dolls. For me, this is evidence of the Coyote metaphor.

The evidence is not contained in the text or digital file of Student H's presentation. It is the temporal associations and relationships I construct between my

observations of (and participation in) Student H's experiences; outcomes with her corn husk dolls; and the traditional experiences and outcomes associated with the telling of Coyote narratives. Hynes and Doty (1993) describe Coyote narratives as entertainments involving play that are instructive. Coyote narratives free the imagination (Ballinger, 2004; Babcock-Abrahams, 1975) and hold up the values and customs of a society for scrutiny (Hynes & Doty, 1993; Kroeber, 1998). They assist in examining one's role in life (Phinney, 1934) and help construct cultural identity (Bastian & Mitchell, 2004). Student H's corn husk dolls and cowry shells mirror these functions. Through what can be misunderstood as simple objects of entertainment, she explored cultural heritage, held up her ideals for scrutiny, and significantly contributed to the bonding of students in the class. I believe she strengthened and redefined her self-perception through the study and use of her dolls and shells that summer. I believe she positively affected most, if not all, her fellow students. She certainly permanently affected me. The corn husk doll she taught me to make holds a place of honor in my home. As much as it represents a set of concepts, it embodies for me a spirit of inspiration. I cannot help but associate it with the similar role the Coyote metaphor has played in my life, my art, and my teaching. The physical presence of the doll continually refreshes my memories of participating in learning at its best.



Figure 2. *Corn Husk Doll*. By the author during student presentation, 2007.

Locating the Evidence. The path of my inquiry is leading me towards stating there is no explicit or physical evidence of the Coyote and river metaphors in the field texts associated with three ARED 3305 classes. The syllabi do not state either metaphor; nor are they directly implied in the course descriptions, goals, objectives, assignments, grading procedures, or student products. Stating there is no explicit or physical evidence of the metaphors should not be misconstrued as stating the metaphors are not apparent in my practice, or that there is no evidence of any kind. The evidence is there, at the boundaries of these documents. It is neither explicit or physical, nor tangible. Metaphors are rarely explicit, tangible, absolute, or even predictable. Metaphors are small narratives constructed by directly stating a comparison or relationship between the target and source domains to which they refer. As novel metaphors, “Art is a Coyote,” and “Art is a river,” are small narratives I use to narrate experiences and ideas specific to my own personal practical knowledge. They are inexplicit, intangible, relative, and individualized narratives made even more personal through this self-inquiry. Though intangible, there is evidence the metaphors contribute to the ways I conduct my practice.

The process of my inquiry is revealing and reinforcing conceptual connections between my classroom experiences and the source domains of the metaphors. Revealing and reinforcing these connections is made possible through my memories of classroom experiences and predisposition towards the two metaphors. Following the recommendations of Clandinin and Connelly (2000), and Clandinin (2007), I may be able to provide further insight into these connections by situating them within the

commonplaces of narrative inquiry. The environment in which narratives of experiences take place; the past, present, and future of people and events related to the experiences; the surrounding factors and forces; the relationships between the players; the personal, prior experiences of the inquirer; and other influences can be addressed within the framework of these commonplaces.

Clandinin and Connelly (2000), and Clandinin (2007) recommend narrative inquirers interweave the commonplaces of temporality, sociality, and place as a method of making sense of their lived experiences. The commonplace of temporality describes people and events in transition; that is, within a framework of past, present, and future (Clandinin, 2007; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The sociality commonplace addresses social context. It is the surrounding factors and forces that influence the inquiry and the inquired upon. The place commonplace can be deceptively, simply defined as the environments in which experiences, narratives of the experiences, and the inquiry itself, take place. Can the framework of three commonplaces assist further revelations of the metaphors in my practice? At first, I am daunted by the question.

The three commonplaces of narrative inquiry (Clandinin, 2007; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 2006) imply an encompassing, even overwhelming, view of the landscape to be examined in an ideal inquiry into teaching and teacher practices. I envision this landscape as a life's work, by nature incomplete and impossible to complete (Elbaz's [1980] unfinished and unfinishable business). Clandinin and Connelly (2000) state there is no rank of importance and all commonplaces interact with each other. Standing in this landscape, I must choose which

to first address, though theoretically one cannot be addressed without considering the affects of the others (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 2006). Of first concern to, but by no means that which is determined to rank as most important to, my inquiry is the commonplace of temporality. Rather than of major or more importance than the others, this is the commonplace upon which my eye falls when surveying this complex landscape. That is, concepts related to this commonplace stand out among other details in the landscape against the background of my most recent experiences—namely, that of writing this inquiry.

If I figuratively draw lines to isolate the commonplaces into individual categories, I can state the predominance of the evidence of the metaphors in my practice is temporal evidence, reasoned and remembered over time, based on associations between my classroom experiences, my past experiences with the metaphors, the source domains of the metaphors, and the present process of self-inquiry. The evidence consists of conceptual relationships. These relationships predate this inquiry and are located in my memories of lived experiences.

The process of researching the origins and exploring the source domains of the Coyote and river metaphors created new complexities to relationships between the source domains and lived experiences. Research added depth to my understanding of both metaphors. Revisiting the past with the mind of the present allowed me to map even more complex connections within these relationships. It also generated new feelings. I looked back at a syllabus and felt embarrassment at the wording, and later the pride and pleasure of accomplishment with classroom experiences it generated. The

emotional journey from embarrassment to pride was not a short trip. It required temporarily stepping back from the inquiry. This allowed me the space to rethink my research path. I revisited and reassessed recalled experiences of the classes, concentrating on the narrative fragments in my mind more than the files I keep. Without the narrative fragments provoked by a simple doll and a painted paperweight, I might not have been able to make the journey from embarrassment over wording in a syllabus to pride in the learning environment it helped to create. The tangible forms allowed me to assemble intangible moments and memory fragments into a larger experience of learning. The objects conjured moments of learning held onto physically as well as temporally.

Revisiting memories of students and the classroom assist my journey more than my analysis of pages of field texts. Here, figurative lines drawn around temporal commonplace quickly seem to blur, leading me to further understand Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) recommendation the commonplaces be considered non-exclusively. The temporal commonplace is not isolated. The physical and social environs of my experiences (the commonplaces of sociality and place) affect the temporal constructions I make between the past and present.

If I draw imaginary lines to isolate the place commonplace in narratives recounted and studied during my inquiry, I find new relationships between the functions of place in Coyote narratives and the narratives of my experiences in an ARED classroom. The narratives occur in places of trust, isolated from the "real" world. Place contributes to the developing of deep bonds between people. In Native American

Coyote narratives, it might be the physical space of a kiva, the personal space of a funeral or special gathering in the dark of night, or a place of trust like William Bright found himself in when he first heard a Coyote tale (in the front seat of a Chevy truck as he hitchhiked across the desert late one night [Bright, 1993]). In an ARED 3305 class, I create a trusted place by continuously rearranging students around a group of tables. Place contributes to the success of learning and the success of the very complex process of a simple gathering of individuals developing into a group with a clear identity. At this point in my example, the commonplace of sociality begins to blur my imaginary lines around place commonplace.

Trusted spaces do not develop in isolation. Place and sociality commonplaces are central to every facet of Native American Coyote narratives revealed to me in Chapter 2. In broad and general terms, there is a relationship between the trust I want to create in my classroom and the trusted environments in which Coyote narratives to be told. Though the culture, people, and traditions surrounding Coyote narratives lie far beyond the boundaries of my lived experiences, place commonplace allows me to perceive a thread of similarity between my practice and the complex fabric of trust Native American storytellers shared with their audiences. Discerning, discovering, tracing this conceptual thread of similarity allows me to strengthen the relationships I continue to construct between the Coyote metaphor and my practice.

Summary

Evidence of the Coyote and river metaphors in my practice is intangible. I am predisposed, by the nature of my ongoing relationship with the metaphors, to finding conceptual connections between the metaphors and my practice. My unique personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998; Dewey, 1938) allows me to situate my students' products, practices, and budding philosophies within the source domain of the river metaphor by framing them within the context of Laughlin's (2005) concepts of emergent behaviors. I am able to understand my students' works as eddies and currents in the river of art education. Concepts in the source domain of the Coyote metaphor can also be connected to classroom experiences I associate with students' products. I perceive conceptual connections between the purposes of traditional Native American Coyote narratives and past learning events in my classroom. Some of these connections organize narrative fragments provoked by evocative artifacts. Though they are constrained by the authorized knowledge of syllabi, course goals and objectives, and written assignments, the connections are identifiable at the boundaries of these documents through thoughtful reflection guided by recommended methods of narrative-self-inquiry, enabling me to relate the metaphors to specific settings and interactions in my practice.

Chapter 5: Findings and Projections

Introduction

Following LaBoskey's (2004) suggestion, in Chapter 3 I ask, "Do I practice what I preach?," and propose an analysis of the syllabi, work assignments, and student products associated with my ARED 3305 classes for evidence of the metaphors, "Art is a Coyote," and "Art is a river." I find intangible evidence in the form of rational relationships I create between my teaching experiences and concepts in the source domains of the two metaphors. Understanding LaBoskey's (2004) question as an invitation to introspection and self-evaluation rather than a choice between affirmation and indictment, I answer with a narrative self-inquiry illuminating how my practice reflects conceptual relationships between my personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998; Dewey, 1938) and the source domains of the metaphors.

Findings

The Metaphors. Examining how I situate my teaching and art related experiences in the source domains of the metaphors enriches my thought processes, enables self-criticism, and provides a vehicle for alignment of theory with practice. An ongoing relationship with the metaphors, "Art is a Coyote," and "Art is a river," allows me to create conceptual connections between the metaphors and classroom experiences. I use the word *create* purposefully. The connections are not pre-existent and revealed by

digging as an archeologist for bones. They are built on connections unique to my own mind and personal practical knowledge. Just as personal practical knowledge is always tentative and in flux (Conle, Li, & Tan, 2002; Dewey, 1938; Polanyi, 1958), so are these temporal connections.

Before this dissertation process, “Art is a Coyote,” a metaphor present in my life for over twenty-five years, encapsulated for me the enigmatic nature of experiencing, making, and teaching art. Research and the process of narrative inquiry significantly expanded my understanding of the metaphor, its source and target domains, and how I relate to it my lived experiences. The coyote as a metaphor long in my life is enlarged with Coyote, the prominent figure in Native American oral literature. By revisiting and reconsidering the field texts and recalled experiences from three ARED 3305 classes, and situating them within the newly expanded source domain, Coyote, I am able to build and identify new conceptual relationships between the metaphor and my practice. When I decide to allow the students in one ARED class to determine their own grading rubric by examining their ideas of what constitutes a successful class, the source domain of the Coyote metaphor intersects my practice. The process pushed the boundaries of my own past conventions of syllabus writing. It was a chance taken to step outside normal procedures that focused attention on the convention, a prominent theme in the Coyote narratives of Native American oral literature. In my inquiry, narratives describing efforts to provide a classroom environment that promotes development of group identity; enables discovery of cultural heritage; and encourages students to examine conventions, are conceptually connected to the purposes and outcomes of

Coyote narratives. Exploring concepts I situated within the commonplaces of narrative inquiry (Clandinin, 2007; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 2006), precipitated the realization there is a relationship between trusted spaces in classroom and the sacred, trusted space of Coyote narratives. This realization enabled me to reach beyond the limits of the field texts to revisit and re-evaluate narrative fragments provoked by artifacts from the classes. A doll and a paperweight are shown to embody concepts in the source domains of the metaphors.

Revisiting the origins of the metaphor, “Art is a river,” clarifies its development and further embeds it in personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998; Dewey, 1938), allowing construction of new conceptual relationships between the metaphor’s source domain and my practice. I conceptually relate the theory of emergent behaviors (Laughlin, 2005) to classroom environments that encourage multiple viewpoints and respect individuality while promoting the development of a group identity. The conceptual relationship is evident in my practice when I continually relocate students around the classroom and when assignments encourage individualization of student products.

Answering to the Goals of Self-inquiry. In Chapter 3, I set as the goal of my inquiry LaBoskey’s (2006) recommended aim for self-inquiry, self-improvement. I also ask a lot of questions. Do I put the metaphors into practice? Do my actual classroom actions reflect the metaphors? How do they manifest themselves in my practice?

Figuratively speaking, where can I point and say here is Coyote or here the river metaphor is evident in my classroom experiences? This barrage of questions that, when written out, reads more like its coming from an impatient child in the back seat of the family car than a serious attempt at framing an analysis of my practice, is summarized by a more general question: Do I practice what I preach? My inquiry does not lead me to a set of direct and complete answers to the questions. It leads to a mindset of self-improvement through self-research.

The inquiry process reveals my record-keeping needs considerable improvement. I need to be more aware of writing style. The two are related by a reason that may familiar to many teachers and other professionals. I do not devote enough time and thought to the “office skills” side of my job. It’s easy for me to love the subject matter and work toward developing experiences associated with teaching and helping others make and find a place for art in their lives. Teaching, as a profession, requires more than a love of subject and ability to design lesson plans. The profession has a major clerical component to it and I should answer better to its requirements. The surprising part of the discovery that I need to keep better records is the fact that, before this inquiry, I thought I did. The quality of an archive is not truly known until something needs to be retrieved.

As well as revealing a need for better record-keeping, the inquiry highlights a need for the records themselves to be bettered before they are better-kept. This highlight is cast mostly on the syllabi. The language and content needs to be more carefully controlled. There is a happy medium between friendly letter and sterile document and I

need to locate it when composing a syllabus. Objectives and goals should be individually reviewed and considered rather than simply copied onto the next syllabus. Including my metaphors in principle, if not in fact, in the syllabi I prepare for classes will assist in aligning practice and theory, as well as establish their presence early in the semester.

The syllabi examined for this inquiry are mostly assemblages from other sources. I made a few changes but mostly they are copied materials. The changes I made in the syllabi better reflect my beliefs about teaching practice than the copied sections. For example, after two semesters of experience teaching ARED 3305, a journal requirement is added to Syllabus 3. The journal requirement added to Syllabus 3 is worth 20% of a student's final grade in the class (making it a very important addition). The addition reflects my belief artists and teachers should keep some kind of journal, a belief based on my own learning and vision for my students' learning.

Journaling is inextricably intertwined with my life's learning. One of the first lessons I remember learning from my journal is that the little lock and key on the dairy I started in elementary school was just for show and trust is a concept much larger than anything that can be insured with a small leather strap and decorative brass lock. Through the years, I learned my journal can be a time-machine-mirror through which I am able to gaze upon and examine my past self. Future decision-making is improved with hindsight sharpened through journaling. Journaling leads me to calmed and rational thinking by allowing a vent for negative feelings. Describing experiences in a personal journal gives them concrete form for review and reinterpretation, thus

recording knowledge and promoting knowledge creation. To be able to look back at a physical document chronicling my life allows me to make critical evaluations of character and personal growth. Development of my self-identity is tied to my journaling. It is difficult to create self-deception if a contradiction to that deception is available in my own handwriting. By asking my students to keep a journal, I am asking them to get to know themselves. I am asking them to create opportunities for reflection and self-evaluation, asking them to give themselves a source of knowledge creation, and promoting a tool they can use to better inform their self-identity.

The semester before I wrote a journal requirement into Syllabus 3, my faith in journaling was heavily buttressed with experiences in doctoral classes. I saw peers pull miracles from them. Journaling can play a vital role in personal growth. They can be a confidant, a therapist, a friend. Mine is often a source of guidance when I lack direction. Journals also enable us to look into the past and witness a direct response to an experience as it was experienced rather than as it is later remembered. It is my nature to, and on occasion fault that I, color memories with experience. *The Constant Random* can be referenced for truth and context under layers of color I later applied. Adding a journal requirement to Syllabus 3 brings my practice more into alignment with my beliefs. An even closer alignment of belief and practice would be to encourage students to use their journals to develop and discuss their own novel metaphors that frame or narrate their teaching philosophies and personal practical knowledge.

Tracing the origin of “Art is a river” would have been nearly impossible without my journal and its tangible record of my thoughts. In the process of my research I have

used it to organize and preserve ideas, record the chronology of a process, assemble a chain of concepts, and compare my practice to the theories on which it is based. During this inquiry it has been both doted over and ignored. I have scrawled and scribbled, taped and colored in it. Parts are carefully written, parts are scrawled notes, some of it is research, some of it celebration, and some of it is personal whining. Like many who keep journals, I am willing to share parts, but not all of it. I hope to have revealed to readers the complex and rewarding relationship I have with it and want them to feel encouraged to share, develop, or spend more time with their own. I want readers to understand through example a personal journal is not subject to any rules other than those made by its author. That being said, my inquiry demonstrates my journal and journaling techniques need improvement. A step in the right direction may be decreasing my concern for how others may judge it. Many who journal, journal daily. My journal habits are not regulated by the days as much as they are by the experiences within those days. I wonder, will I ever have the discipline to make daily journal entries?

Sections of *The Constant Random* can be identified as illustrating the progression of knowledge acquisition to knowledge use and knowledge creation. For example, the series of research notes digging into an enigmatic figure in the source domain of a novel metaphor coalesce into new ideas centered on a complex and divine being, and its role in Native American oral literature. This knowledge is used to create new ideas about conceptual relationships between the source domain of the metaphor and my practice. The physical act of writing in my journal allows me to make known,

review, consider, and reconsider ideas and thoughts related to my self-inquiry process. In text and images, the journal reads like a synopsis or chronicle made of, and dispersed by, random fragments of a larger narrative. It describes and reveals my interpretations of isolated experiences within the larger context of the ongoing life narrative of a teacher, student, and artist. Situating, considering, revisiting, and analyzing past events generates new knowledge to be acted upon in future events, and helps make sense of the narrative fragments. Making sense of these narrative fragments translates into new perceptions of self-identity, while the making explicit my perceptions of events enables a more developed narrative authority (Olson, 1995).

My journal assists recording and archiving notes and descriptions of processes. I use it to filter brainstorming and it provides something of a sounding board for creative impulses. Figuratively speaking, it functions as co-researcher. I imagine co-researchers bounce ideas off each other, elaborating on some while deciding to reject others. They keep each other abreast of developments and provide moral support. My journal has played a similar role in this inquiry. Interestingly, our relationship breaks down during the inquiry process. I believe the break resulted from stress generated by a lack of trust and the need to hold on to some degree of personal privacy. Towards the end, I was only writing in composition books, not speaking to my journal. Why? It could be immediacy and disposability of the composition books became better suited to my method as the inquiry progressed. It could be that I was avoiding or ignoring it for more complex reasons like feelings of vulnerability and insecurity. It could be that my inquiry has generated a division in my journal between what is now considered to be work and

what has traditionally been considered delightful occupation. It may be just a creative slump, slight depression, or the fact that I feel using *The Constant Random* in this inquiry process has made it too predictable or imposed rules on how I use it. My intuition tells me it is a complex combination of all these things but digging too deeply into my relationship with my journal goes beyond the boundaries of this inquiry. I defensively and lightheartedly declare most any teacher's or artist's ongoing personal journal would be a field day for a good psychiatrist.

My inquiry fulfills guidelines and recommendations for self-inquiry by LaBoskey (2006), Feldman (2006), and Bullough and Pinnegar (2001) enumerated in Chapter 3. Through constructing and sharing narratives of my teaching practice, I have provided a resource that encourages others to be self-critical of their roles as teachers and researchers by highlighting the role of self (Feldman, 2006) in a self-initiated inquiry aimed at self-improvement (LaBoskey, 2006). This self-initiated and self-focused method of inquiry (LaBoskey, 2006) displays a balanced sense of self-importance, tells a recognizable story, and portrays character development within a complex setting (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). It offers new perspectives and attends to the nodal moments of teaching (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). The narratives and narrative fragments throughout my dissertation describe the unforgettable teaching moments and learning experiences in my life and practice: Transcendent classroom experiences, a first encounter with a severely handicapped student, students working together to create a gift for their teacher, a student reaching out to a class and finding not only acceptance but a renewed sense of self-identity are examples of these moments

and experiences. Nodal moments (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001) are familiar to all teachers. They are often relived in our minds and by sharing mine I may induce the reader to more readily address their own.

In a self-inquiry, moments and experiences are laid open to analysis that is personally revealing (Feldman, 2006) and self-critical (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). I write my interpretation of multi-faceted events the reader of which may interpret within their own context and arrive at a different conclusion than I. Such is the nature of self-inquiry. Revisiting and rethinking experiences opens them to new interpretations and layers them with new meanings, both for the self and, ideally, the reader. The judgments made in the processes of self-examination and self-criticism are ultimately, I hope, fair and contextually resonate within the reader's own experiences. Though narrative self-inquiry is interactive at stages of the process (LaBoskey, 2006), my inquiry is ultimately about me. It is aimed at improving me through improving my practice. Self-improvement is inextricably tied to self-identity and identity-making.

Self-identity is described as self-perceptions of reflexive interactions between the self and society (Brown, 1998; Stets & Burke, 2010). I understand this as looking back to review and identifying my perceptions of my behaviors and then comparing those perceptions to what I believe to be the perceptions of others in order to locate myself within the pre-existing boundaries of whatever society or social structure the behaviors are taking place. Contemplating this idea leads me to say it is no wonder self-identity is such a huge field of psychology. The possibilities are endless. Self-perception, self-awareness, self-concept, and self-esteem intertwine with social context,

social expectations, and self-expectations in perpetually shifting and changing relationships. The process of my self-inquiry, from its inception to the current words I am writing can be defined as a path or process of self-identification, attempting to situate my perceptions of the perceptions of others within the boundaries of specific social structures. Students, peers, classrooms, groups of teaching professionals, and even my journal itself form these social structures. When reviewing and identifying my perceptions of students' responses to my behaviors, I locate my perceptions within the boundaries of a social structure I define as a successful classroom or a successful learning environment. When I review and identify my perceptions of my practice, I locate perceptions of my behaviors within a social structure I define as the teaching profession. The same can be said of other groups whose boundaries intersect my self-identity.

Boundaries and Perceptions of Boundaries. I understand boundaries to be physical, cognitive, and combinations of the two. Framed in this context, my inquiry examines illuminates, extends, and creates new boundaries between two novel metaphors and my practice. As the inquiry began, research expanded pre-existing boundaries of a novel metaphor, "Art is a coyote," to the larger, "Art is a Coyote." The difference between the two—the capitalization of *Coyote*—signifies a substantial expansion in my knowledge of the metaphor's source domain with information on the role, character, and traditions surrounding the trickster, Coyote, in Native American oral literature. Establishing a method for my inquiry in Chapter 3 set up methodological

boundaries for locating evidence in my practice of the Coyote and river metaphors. I assumed evidence would be found in the field texts from art education classes in the form of statements that reflect or directly refer to concepts in the source domains of the Coyote and river metaphors. Be it direct or indirect, explicit or implied evidence, existing temporal relationships were revealed; and new ones were created. In this process, I had to redefine previous boundaries considered as evidence located in the field texts (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) to include narrative fragments, evocative artifacts, and threads of similarity between philosophical concepts.

This inquiry draws attention to my journal. In the past, *The Constant Random* has been regarded as somewhat boundary free, or free of a set rules for content or order. More recently, stressful feelings generated a need to establish boundaries. These boundaries are situated within the realm of self-disclosure and involve feelings of vulnerability. The boundaries are recognitions of necessary divisions between work and play; of what is public and what is private. Creative mood, motivation, and audience contribute flexibility to these boundaries within and without *The Constant Random*. Within a knowledge community (Craig, 1995), the boundaries are extended by trust. In other environments, they may be “reeled in” in order to preserve, promote, protect, or even obscure self-identity. I am not sure how to resolve this issue or even if it is, in fact, an issue that needs to be resolved. It is conceivable to me that borderland tensions (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007) may, in appropriate contexts, be personified as healthy provocateurs.

Thought processes generated by my inquiry allow me to define impermeable and permeable boundaries between the source domains in the Coyote and river metaphors and my personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998; Clandinin, 1986; Dewey, 1938). For example, earlier in this inquiry, Bright (1993), Kroeber (1998), Erdoes and Ortiz (1984), Phinney (1934), and others allow me to realize permanent boundaries of time, lost cultures, and lost languages exclude any possibilities of my having direct physical experiences of traditional Coyote narratives. The originals are now ghosts of a collective frame of mind held by long-standing cultures now all but removed from existence. There is an odd kind of cruelty to being exposed to the great achievements of cultures long passed or destroyed. Admiration of, or wonder at, the achievements is coupled with feelings of loss and longing. After years of studying and teaching art history, I should be used to these feelings. With Coyote narratives, however, my experience is more even more temporal in nature than memories, and all the more cruel. I have in my mind memories of going to a chapels and museums and being overwhelmed by the physical experiences of Michelangelo's (1475-1564) *David* (1501-04) and *Moses* (1513-15); and Piet Mondrian's (1872-1944) *Pier and Ocean* (1915). There is no such experience available for the great works of art in traditional Native American oral literature. Their performance is long buried in history. For me, they only exist in text.

At the beginning of this inquiry, this is perceived as an impermeable boundary between Coyote narratives and my available experiences. I thought I could poke holes in its fabric by perceiving similarities between the traditional roles of the narratives and

desired experiences in my classroom; by associating concepts surrounding the narratives to behaviors in my practice; and by connecting through narrative unconscious (Freeman, 2007) and narrative resonance (Conle, 1996) the vicarious experiences precipitated by research of Coyote narratives to my personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986; Dewey, 1938)—a process described by Conle, Li, and Tan (2002). These are exemplified in this inquiry when I perceive the value of trust in both my classroom and Coyote narratives; question personal conventions established in syllabi and grading rubrics; encourage a student to embrace entertainments that are instructive; and when a travel break taken in the middle of this inquiry is conceptually likened to Coyote padding along on his spirit road (Hyde, 1998). Eventually I come to realize I am not poking holes in a once-impermeable boundary between Coyote narratives and my available experiences. The impermeable boundary of time was a misperception. Reading text, rather than experiencing a live performance, had actually allowed me to resituate the narratives within a new, subjective and quite permeable set of boundaries—those of narrative resonance (Conle, 1996), imagination, and personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986).

The relationships between my practice and the metaphor, “Art is a river,” can be situated within similar boundaries. In Chapter 2 the origins of my river metaphor are traced through a process of development described within the boundaries of narrative resonance, personal practical knowledge, and imagination. Dr. Ndubuike’s river story resonated in my own personal practical experience in a transcendent classroom moment. Imagination linked this experience to knowledge currently being developed in the

arenas of Japanese gardens, emergent behaviors, and the nature of time. Did the realization of the metaphor require an intersection of all three boundaries? I believe the answer is yes, but there was another interaction present, that of creativity. Creativity interceded to expand the intersection of the narrative resonance between Dr. Ndubuike's narrative, my imagination, and personal practical knowledge. From that expansion emerged the thought, "Art is a river."

The Elephant in the Room. Looking back, in Chapter 1 I state my desire to avoid the topic of metaphysical beliefs and acknowledge it may be necessary to address the issue due to my belief in spiritual aspects of making art, and Coyote's role as go-between spirits and humans (p. 29). When tracing, in Chapter 2, the origins of my river metaphor, a significant portion of its source domain is found to be constructed around a belief in mysterious forces flowing through art and life. I locate these forces to the source domains of both the Coyote and river metaphors. At this point, the elephant is in the room. Partly to avoid the elephant, in Chapter 3, I set up an inquiry method intended to locate evidence of the metaphors in field texts. In the back of my mind I thought this may allow me to slip around metaphysical concepts and spiritual beliefs about art. Focusing on the field texts revealed the borderland tensions (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007) between actual practice and the written documents of curriculum. To ease this tension, my inquiry path veered away from the written documents towards recalled experiences. This is when the room began to shrink and the elephant grew even larger. I finally, undeniably, ran smack into the elephant when I constructed a conceptual relationship

between my desire to create an environment of trust in the classroom and the sacred trust surrounding traditional Coyote narratives. When I realized I had bumped into the elephant, I figuratively backed up and said excuse me by literally returning to that section of Chapter 4 and re-writing it to focus attention towards concepts of trust and place commonplaces rather than sacred trust and sacred places. Now, towards the end of my inquiry, acts of ignoring and deliberately glossing over concepts significant to my dissertation topic are beginning to generate feelings of regretful omission for not discussing the elephant in the room. The elephant in the room is an idiom representing changes in my perceptions and associations of meanings in the metaphors. My inquiry has expanded the personal boundaries of the metaphors' meanings and brought to the foreground previously unconsidered or inconsequential philosophical and practical concerns about their applications to my teaching practice. The elephant in the room is the issue of teaching metaphysics.

A large component of significant artworks is metaphysical. Such a statement may be more palatable if prefaced by saying all realms of art are subjective. The idea of the metaphysical in art is highly debatable. For me, it is a fact; an absolute truth. The most significant achievements in art are enabled by unseen forces. Brilliant works of art are not made by mere craft of hand or words of history. They are produced by activities situated at intersection of human activities and the unseen forces that flow through time and life. Fifteen hundred years ago, Xie He (6th century) defined the artist as an instrument through which nature reveals itself. The artist acts as a conduit for *qi*, the vital energy flowing through all nature, all of us, and our entire universe (Chung, 2006;

Tansey & Kleiner, 1996). Many artists, throughout time and across cultures feel their talents extend beyond their physical self, and their highest achievements are assisted by spiritual forces. Can I, should I teach this? Should I be encouraging and assisting students to study and connect with the unseen forces flowing through our lives and our world? This may be close to teaching religion.

In art history classes, we frequently discuss religion. Extant ancient objects are often funerary objects. Most ancient buildings and building sites studied in a Survey I class are sacred by design, location, or decree. Studying art forms in ancient Western European history is impossible without delving into religion, as is studying the arts of any peoples indigenous from the Americas, Asia, Africa, Australia, or anywhere else. It is within acceptable social boundaries, necessary and permissible, to discuss religion when discussing works of art in an art history class because it is difficult to understand the aesthetics and meanings of works of art without situating them within the boundaries of a culture's beliefs and ideas. But I ask myself, if I am teaching a class on how to make art, not how it was made in a particular culture or time, or why it was made, but how to make it, shouldn't I be teaching metaphysical beliefs? It is easy to leave the question unanswered by deference. I mostly teach beginning art classes and can justifiably (perhaps) leave the overarching issues for other settings. I tell myself beginning students need to first understand craft before attempting higher concepts of expression, and students need to learn foundational concepts like the elements and principles of design, and color theory before more advanced art concepts are approached.

The presence of the metaphysical in the source domain of both the Coyote and river metaphors indicates my belief art is inherently connected to metaphysical concepts. The trickster is a go-between the boundaries of the secular and the divine (Hynes & Doty, 1993; Schlosser, 2008; Schoen & Armagost, 1992). The source domain of the river metaphor includes ideas about a flow of unseen energies. Both metaphors illustrate my belief significant expressions of art connect the secular to the sacred. I am, at heart, a romantic idealist and seek spirituality. In the privacy of my studio, metaphysical beliefs are freely expressed through symbols and rituals. What about my classroom practices? At first glance, metaphysical beliefs found in the source domains of the metaphors are not immediately apparent in my classroom practices. Given the heretic nature of defining, and maybe defying, boundaries between sacred and secular, can they be? Given the social boundaries of keeping religion separate from academic classrooms, should they be? If I came into class every day and lit a candle on my desk and asked students to meditate on divine beings and unseen forces before we begin, it may be easier to answer these questions. I wish I could base an answer on such obvious and empirically definable behaviors. Instead, I consider practical use of the two metaphors.

Saying the words, “Art is a Coyote,” to a class of art or art education students is conceptually different than saying, “Art is Little Red Riding Hood.” Little Red Riding Hood is not a sacred character, nor is she featured in any religious narratives or beliefs. Saying, “Art is Little Red Riding Hood,” does not require students examine a source domain that includes religion or metaphysical beliefs. It does not cross the boundary

between religious and academic classroom environments (though it may cause students to examine the boundary between what their teacher says and sanity). If I said to an art or art education class, “Art is Moses,” or, “Art is the apostle Peter,” or “Art is the Virgin Mary,” students may more readily feel I have brought religion into the classroom and violated the boundary between church and school, between academic and spiritual studies. They are more likely to situate Moses, Peter, and Virgin Mary within a context of religious figures. Technically, the Coyote is a religious figure. Promoting in classes the metaphor, “Art is a Coyote,” promotes art as a relationship with a divine being, a *first person* existing long before humans (Bright, 1993; Hyde, 1998), featured in the spiritual beliefs of Native Americans, who acts as go-between the gods and humans.

Whether or not this is perceived as such by students, I am, through use of the Coyote and river metaphors, promoting the belief students must find ways to connect to a divine force in order to produce significant works of art. Does this cross the socially constructed and culturally sensitive boundary between academics and religion, classroom and church? It may for more students more sensitive to, or culturally predisposed to, borders between matters of faith and academic endeavors. Some students may never give it a second thought; others may consider the metaphors as two representations of many possible philosophies of art. Before introducing metaphysical issues into classes I should investigate local policies. Local policies—formulated in classrooms, grade levels, schools, and districts—constitute the largest sectors of planning and implementing school curriculum (Oliva, 2005). Some local policies may be stricter or more easily perturbed than others.

Blair (1996) states most belief-based challenges to art class curriculum pertain to issues of nudity and originate more from school board members than individual students or groups of parents, but challenges to curriculum from religious points of view are not uncommon. She informs me when Christian viewpoints and prayers are typically challenged while many other beliefs are unchallenged in the name of cultural awareness, exemplifying exceptions like protests at one school against dream-catchers during a cultural awareness week. She documents complaints and attempts at censorship aimed at wide range symbols, from peace symbols, to rainbows, to the color black. Stinespring (1990) suggests instructors resist individuals who plead religious objections to curriculum intended to broaden knowledge, but acknowledges all points of view must be considered. He cites an example of a student protesting any eyes-closed visualization in art classes. Donovan (2005) pleads for plurality and tolerance in conflicts between curriculum and spiritual convictions. Blair (1996), Stinespring (1990), Jeffers and Parth (1996), Donelson (1973), and others agree adequate preparation, information, and communication are necessary protections against adversities to teachers' rights to intellectual freedom and meaningful curriculum. That being said, the issue is ultimately resolved by local policies and local boundaries. For me, these determine what an individual instructor should or should not teach in any school classroom.

Like the source domain in the Coyote metaphor, the source domain in the metaphor, "Art is a river," contains personal spiritual beliefs. Other concepts in its source domain such as multiple points of view coming together into a whole, emergent behaviors ordering chaos, and art movements—the isms—as eddies in a river current

allow a large number of possible interpretations and extrapolations. The river metaphor's large source domain provides a wide range of ideas and discussions that may resonate within the personal practical knowledge of students without full disclosure of my personal metaphysical beliefs about the nature of making art. Am I dishonest by omission if I leave out of discussions the spiritual aspects of the river metaphor's source domain? Is such an omission some sort of pre-emptive self-censorship in the face of possible opposition from, or offense to, others? I decide to let myself off the hook on this one: No, it is not dishonest to remove one's faith from academic discussions and classroom lessons. Provided, of course, such an omission does not in some way arbitrarily or artificially limit the discussion, or reduce the integrity of a lesson.

Because of the circular nature of my thinking processes, this thought leads me back to ponder, if I truly believe there is a metaphysical aspect to art, is it a disservice to students if I fail to teach accordingly? Asked this way, my answer is yes, it is. If I answer the same question, asked differently, with opposing answers, am I indecisive? Confused? No. I am trying to find a definitive answer to a question continuously in flux. Such an answer is unknowable *a priori*. It must be considered within the context of specific and individualized situations. Each situation generating tensions between the boundaries of belief and curriculum, faith and academia should be carefully considered and must rely on judgments founded on the whole of one's personal practical knowledge. The specific challenges to an art curriculum incorporating spiritual beliefs and activities cannot be predicted. They also should not be a surprise.

Continuing Conceptual Relationships. Re-reading and reconsidering is a constant process in writing this inquiry. Over several days, a sentence from a few paragraphs above guides my thoughts to a significant shift in the conceptual boundaries of the river and Coyote metaphors. I assemble conceptual relationships between the two metaphors into a larger picture. The river metaphor encourages multiple points of view as much as it represents my personal beliefs and experiences. Chapters 1 and 2 explain its source domain accommodates philosophies and practices of futurism, naturalism, realism, cubism, and all other isms, movements, and trends in the field of art. Though it may be as obvious as the nose on my face, I am just now realizing the Coyote metaphor can be situated within, and defended by, concepts in the source domain of the river metaphor. Within the source domain of “Art is a river,” “Art is a Coyote” is not a powerful philosophical presence identifiable an eddy in the river’s current (like an ism), but can be conceptually perceived as a small ripple in the river’s waters; or as an individual contribution to the underlying chaos of the emergent behaviors identified as the river that is art. Conceptually placing the Coyote metaphor within the boundaries of the river metaphor’s source domain is a major shift in my thinking. Does it diminish the Coyote metaphor? It may. I believe the river metaphor may eclipse the Coyote metaphor. How did I, in the initial explorations of the river metaphor, miss such an obvious relationship? Was I wearing blinders of habit? Was I too close to the trees? Maybe I had placed the Coyote metaphor on such a high pedestal I could not see it clearly. After all, I have embraced the Coyote metaphor for more than a quarter of a

century. There is much to consider. Through consideration, relationships with the metaphors continue to evolve.

Summary

The mindset of self-improvement generated by the question, “Do I practice what I preach?” guides an introspection into the relationships between my practice and two novel metaphors, “Art is a Coyote,” and “Art is a river.” These relationships are conceptual links established between the source domains of the metaphors, my personal philosophy of teaching and making art; and my perceptions of classroom experiences. Field texts, my journal, student products, and recalled narrative fragments are referenced, re-visited, and re-examined within the context of a self-inquiry aimed at improving my practice. The process reveals issues pertaining to record-keeping, writing syllabi, and language use that can be fairly easily addressed and, hopefully, rectified. Other revelations of the process are more complex issues not as easily addressed, with which definitive rectification is not possible, and perhaps, undesirable. They are realizations of definitions and roles of boundaries, and awakenings to the movements and interactions between them.

Through the self-inquiry process, boundaries of my personal journal have been located and, perhaps, crossed. Journaling is part of my self-identity, and provides an honest chronicle of my self-perception. A journal’s role as a mirror of the present and window into the past is vital to a self-inquiry. Unfortunately, including it in this inquiry

led to feelings of vulnerability and a desire for stronger boundaries between my personal and private life. The boundaries of the source domains of both metaphors has been examined, enlarged, re-examined, and entirely re-situated. The river metaphor now encompasses, “Art is a Coyote.” My inquiry leaves unresolved issues concerning my journal, and indicates continuing changes in my relationships with both metaphors. It leaves me questioning and set to explore possible tensions between the boundaries of own metaphysical and spiritual beliefs and the boundaries of what is acceptable in local art and art education curriculum.

Projections

This inquiry reveals a rich and meaningful relationship with metaphors that function within my own personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998; Dewey, 1938). It also provides an example of how self-inquiry into one’s personal journal affects self-perceptions. Including a personal journal in the field texts of a narrative self-inquiry is not a process to be undertaken lightly. Doing so has affected the way I perceive and use my journal, and brought attention to issues with self-identity. It was included because it is an informative resource, invaluable to self-study. I wish I had foreseen how including it would bring feelings of vulnerability and insecurity to my relationship with it. Without facing these feelings, I will not be able to fully possess the experiences and the personal practical knowledge it represents and illuminates. Much

can be accomplished towards fully owning and farming the feelings, abilities, desires, memories, and ideas it chronicles.

I intend to augment temporal evidence of the metaphors in my practice revealed in this inquiry with tangible, physical evidence. Will a class that plans for discussions and activities connecting the physical to the metaphysical look different than any other class? I don't mean wearing robes and chanting. Or do I? Stopping to think, I like the chanting idea, and art students sometimes wear smocks. Of course, I am kidding. There is, after all, a place for humor in my inquiry. In actuality, the class will most likely resemble my other art and art education classes and provide opportunities for researching and discussing historical precedents, examining contemporary practices and applications, and individualized hands-on explorations of artistic processes. The idealist in me hopes the most significant differences observed after introducing the Coyote and river metaphors, and metaphysical issues, into my art classes are exemplified by increased quality of students' learning experiences and resulting products. I may be able to introduce the metaphors in an art appreciation class by assigning a research lesson based on how spiritual experiences are represented in art forms of different cultures, or open a class discussion in an art education class with a PowerPoint presentation based on the Coyote and river metaphors. I would relish the challenge of developing a sculpture class based on visual manifestations of spiritual energies. Spiritual experiences, however, are not assigned. They occur.

Several months ago, sitting at my desk and looking out the window, I watched a car pull into my neighbor's driveway. Joan is an origami artist and teacher, and cars

come and go frequently from her studio home. I usually notice the comings and goings of the neighborhood with aware glances from my desk, but for some reason I turned in my chair and watched the car park. The driver was in no hurry. A mature woman got out of the car. Wearing a hat, and sensible shoes, she carried her purse long on its strap. It hung low, balancing her slightly frail gait. She assembled herself at the car door and turned to navigate the sidewalk. After a few steps she stopped, gathered her purse strap and slowly bent down to the ground to pick something up. It was a leaf. As she straightened up, she held the leaf out in front of her, the stem between her fingers, her arm slightly out and bent at the elbow as if she were holding out a rose (rather than a leaf). For a while she did not move. She studied the leaf. She admired it, contemplated it, and turned it with a twist of her fingers. When she was done, a slow stoop and a deliberative reach returned the leaf to the spot where it was found. Her movements, to me, seemed reverent. She continued on her way to Joan's front door and I began to wonder about the leaf. As she disappeared inside, questions poured over me. What did she see in the leaf? Was it the color that held her attention? Was it the structure? Did she admire its curl and texture? Did she sense its weight, its presence, its life, its death? When she gazed into the leaf, did she hear the song of the coyote (Sawyers & Henry, 1980)? Did she sense the river of energy that flows through all nature? Did she have a moment of spiritual participation with that which is divine?

The German Romantic painter, Philipp Otto Runge (1777-1810) guides my thinking:

. . . each leaf and each blade of grass teems with life, the earth lives and stirs beneath me, all resounds together in a single chord, then the soul jubilates aloud and soars into the boundless space around me, and there is no below and no above, no time, no beginning, and no end. I hear and feel the living breath of God who holds and carries the world . . . (Bisanz, 1970, p. 49)

I believe the lady with the leaf had a spiritual experience. Her gaze at the leaf took her beyond admiration of color and form. The leaf provoked in her a spiritual experience; a moment with God or gods, or Coyote, or *qi*, or whatever anyone chooses to call that which is divine. Her experience was metaphysical, and I believe she went into her art lesson better prepared because of it.

The personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998; Dewey, 1938) represented by, “Art is a Coyote,” and “Art is a river,” is flexible and transferable. There are many possibilities for introducing to my students the metaphors and concepts in their source domains. Their application to art curricula should be contextually appropriate, and agreeable to school policy. Future students should not be made to feel they need to adopt the metaphors to do well in my classes. The metaphors should not appear on a test, or be assigned as a required essay or project theme. What I want to share with students, want students to learn and use and take with them through their lives, are the concepts in the metaphors’ source domains rather than the metaphors themselves. They have little value as slogans.

My metaphors do not frame concrete realities. Art is not literally a four-legged mammalian nuisance predator, North America's wild dog (Project Coyote, 2009), nor the anthropomorphized mythological character in Native American oral literature. Art is not literally something wet and flowing. "Art is a Coyote," and "Art is a river," represent mental processes and possibilities. They allow me to construct meaningful narratives from past, present, and future experiences. They enable my work. By situating my personal philosophies of art and art education within the source domains of the metaphors I am able to teach and create with ongoing faith in the existence of an ideal towards which to strive. They provide heretic truths by which to abide. The metaphors allow me to believe there will always be something mysterious and unknowable about my practice, something more into which inquire and ponder.

Relationships between concepts, life experience, and personal beliefs narrated by the Coyote and river metaphors have been layered with new information, experiences, and ideas throughout this dissertation process. The health and growth of my relationship with the metaphors can be encouraged with future actions. An analogy comes to mind: A seed needs fertile soil no matter how much water it is given. For my metaphors to continue their growth they need to be provided the right soil, not just my continued watering through analysis. They need to be exposed to an art teaching and art making environment, discussed and shared with others, and be tended with continued analysis, contemplation, and input. I should often hold up the metaphors for examination, allow their fruit and flowers to nourish and beautify my life experiences.

Will there be a time when flower and fruit are spent? When the river metaphor sprang from my mind, I thought its purpose may be to replace my long-lived relationship with “Art is a Coyote.” Instead, it instigated a process of enlarging the Coyote’s presence in my life. After a few short years, the river metaphor’s source domain grew to encompass the Coyote metaphor. Rather than replace the Coyote metaphor, it fortified it.

After twenty-five years, the Coyote metaphor is even more vital and important to my general philosophy of art than when it was first introduced to me. The source domains of both metaphors reach far into history. Many have spent their careers peering into the seemingly unreachable past to understand and preserve Coyote narratives that were developed over untold numbers of generations; work for which I am very grateful. Rivers have occupied the minds of poets, priests, and engineers alike since the beginnings of civilization. They have occupied the dreams, served the needs, and sustained the lives of untold billions. I see no end to my faith in the unseen energies in art and life, no approaching obsolescence to the metaphors’ source (or target) domains. Both metaphors are intricately entangled with my beliefs and experiences making and teaching art.

Consequently, I am permanently predisposed to finding conceptual links between my teaching practice and the novel metaphors, “Art is a Coyote,” and “Art is a river.” Effects of “narrative unconscious” (Feldman, 2007, p. 139) and “narrative resonance” (Conle, 1996, p. 297) may now also predispose readers of my inquiry to finding conceptual connections between teaching practices and the source domains of

the Coyote and river metaphors. These connections may be situated within a framework of their own practice or used to conceptually frame the teaching practices of others, of teaching art education, or even teaching practices as a whole.

By revisiting, pondering, questioning, and reassessing my practice, art and art education philosophies, and the source domains of the metaphors this inquiry attends to social, practical, and personal purposes of research. The narrative of this inquiry is offered up to the scrutiny and individual contextualization of education professionals (and other readers), and is intended to contribute to educational research and theory. Through my research, contradictions and alignments between ideas represented by my chosen metaphors and actual practices in my classroom are examined and clarified. The process undertaken in this inquiry results in a sense heightened my self-awareness and sharpened perceptions of self-identity. New meaning is given to existing beliefs, and philosophies are examined for new possibilities and implementations. Further research and contemplation will continue to expand my relationship with, understanding of, and application of, the metaphors and their source domains.



Figure 3. *River Klarälven* .Venteco, 2010.

References

- Abrahams, R. D. (1968). Trickster, the outrageous hero. In T. P. Coffin (Ed.), *Our living traditions: An introduction to American folklore* (pp. 170-178). New York: Basic Books.
- Almeida, L. de, & Portella, A. (2006). *Brazilian folktales*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Anderson, T. (1998). Aesthetics as critical inquiry. *Art Education* 51(5), 49-55.
- Apache, A. (1998). Wasps catch Coyote's head in an old horse skull. In K. Kroeber, *Artistry in Native American myths*, p. 190. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Archer, J. (2005). *The first fire: Stories of the Cherokee, Kickapoo, Kiowa, and Tigua*. Lanham, Maryland: Taylor Trade.
- Ashkenazi, M. (2003). *Handbook of Japanese Mythology*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
- Babcock-Abrahams, B. (1975). A tolerated margin of mess: The trickster and his tales reconsidered. *Journal of the Folklore Institute*, 11(3), 147-48.

Ballinger, F. (2004). *Living sideways: Tricksters in American Indian oral traditions*.

Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Ballinger, F. (1989). Living sideways: Social themes and social relationships in Native American trickster tales. *American Indian Quarterly*, 13(1), 15-30.

Barnouw, V. (1977). *Wisconsin Chippewa myths and tales and their relation to Cheppewa life*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Baringer, S. K. (2003). Brer Rabbit and his Cherokee cousin: Moving beyond the appropriation paradigm. In J. Brenen (Ed.), *When Brer Rabbit meets Coyote: African-Native American literature* (pp. 114-138). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Basso, E. B. (1987). *In favor of deceit: A study of tricksters in an Amazonian society*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Bastian, D. E., & Mitchell, J. K. (2004). *Handbook of Native American mythology*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO.

Beidelman, T. O. (1993). The moral imagination of the Kaguru: Some thoughts on tricksters, translation and comparative analysis. In W. J. Hynes and W. G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, contexts, and criticisms* (pp. 174-192). Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Benedict, R. (1981). *Tales of the Cochiti Indians with introduction by Alfonso Ortiz*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Bisanz, R. M. (1970). German romanticism and Philipp Otto Runge: A study in nineteenth-century art theory and iconography. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Blair, L. (1996). Strategies for dealing with censorship. *Art Education* 49(5), 57-61.

Brainyquote (2009). Heraclitus quotation. Retrieved November, 2009, from Website http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/h/heraclitus_2.html.

Bright, W. (1993). *A Coyote reader*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Bright, W. (1978). Coyote stories. *International Journal of American Linguistics Native American Texts, series 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Brenan, J. (Ed.). (2003). *When Brer Rabbit meets Coyote: African-Native American literature*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Brown, J. D. (1998). *The self*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1991). Self-making and world-making. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 25, 67-78.
- Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher* 32, 13-21.
- Caduto, M. J., & Buchac, J. (1991). *Native American stories*. Golden Colorado: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Campbell, J. (2002). *The inner reaches of outer space: Metaphor as myth and as religion*. Novato, California: New World Library.
- Carl, E. (1969). *The very hungry caterpillar*. New York: Penguin Young Readers Group.

Carroll, M. P. (1984). The trickster as selfish-buffoon and culture hero. *Ethos* 12(2), 105-31.

Chung, S. K. (2006). Aesthetic practice and spirituality: *Chi* in traditional East Asian brushwork. *Art Education*, 59 (4), 33-38. Reston, Virginia: National Art Education Association.

Chung, S. K. (2003). The challenge of presenting cultural artifacts in a museum setting. *Art Education* 56 (1), 13-18.

Christen, K. A., & Gill, S. D. (1998). *Clowns and tricksters: An encyclopedia of tradition and culture*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Clandinin, D. J. (Ed.). (2007). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1990). Narrative experience and the study of curriculum. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 20(3), 241-253.

- Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions. In D. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative Inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp.35-75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clark, E. (1953). *Indian legends of the Pacific Northwest*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Coffin, T. P. (Ed.). (1961). *Indian tales of North America: An anthology for the adult reader*. Philadelphia, PA: American Folklore Society, Inc.
- Cole, N. K. (1961). Time and the river. *Nat King Cole: Singles*. Re-released by Capitol Records, 01/22/2008.
- Conle, C. (2000). Narrative inquiry: Research tool and medium for professional development. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 23 (1), 49-63.
- Conle, C. (1996). Resonance in pre-service teacher inquiry. *American Educational Research Journal* 33 (2), 297-325.
- Conle, C., Li, X., & Tan, J. (2002). Connecting vicarious experience to practice. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 32 (4), 429-452.

Conley, R. (1997). Forward. In D. L. Smith (Ed.), *Folklore of the Winnebago tribe*, pp. vii-viii. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *American Educational Research Journal* 43(2), 257-293.

Coyote (1993). In *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (5th ed.), p. 674. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Craig, C. J. (2005). The epistemic role of novel metaphors in teachers' knowledge constructions of school reform. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 11 (2), 195-208.

Craig, C. J. (1995). Knowledge communities: A way of making sense of how beginning teachers come to know. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 25 (2), 151-175.

Craig, C. J., & Huber, J. (2007). Relational reverberations: Shaping and reshaping narrative inquiries in the midst of storied lives and contexts. In D. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp.251-279). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Craig, C. J. & Olson, M. R. (2002). The development of teachers' narrative authority in knowledge communities: A narrative approach to learning. In N. Lyons & V. K. LaBoskey (Eds.), *Narrative inquiry in practice: Advancing the knowledge of teaching* (pp. 115-129). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

deAngulo, J. (1973). *Coyote and Old Doctor Loon*. San Francisco, CA: Turtle Island Foundation.

Denshire, S. (2002). Metaphors we live by: Ways of imagining practice. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 2(2), 28-46.

Deshler, D. (1990). Metaphor analysis: Exorcising social ghosts. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning* (pp. 296-313). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. (1964). Relation of theory to practice in education. In R. Archambault (Ed.), *John Dewey on Education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York, NY: Perigree Books. Reprinted in 1980.

- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Collier Books.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: The Free Press, Simon and Schuster, Inc.
- Donelson, K. L. (1973). A few safe assumptions about censorship and the censor. *Peabody Journal of Education* 50(3), 235-244.
- Donovan, M. (2005). Religion, neutrality, and the public school curriculum: Equal treatment or separation? *Catholic Lawyer* 43(1), 187-218.
- Dorsey, G., & Kroeber, A. L. (1903). Traditions of the Arapaho, *Publication 81 of the Field Columbian Museum*. Chicago, IL: Field Museum.
- Doty, W. G. (1993). A lifetime of trouble-making: Hermes as Trickster. In W. J. Hynes & William G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, context, and criticisms* (pp. 46-64). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Doty, W. G., & Hynes, W. J. (1993). Historical overview of theoretical issues: The problem of the trickster. In W. J. Hynes & W. G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, context, and criticisms* (pp. 13-32). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

- Eisenhart, M. (2001). Educational ethnography past, present and future: Ideas to think with. *Educational Researcher*, 30(8), 16-27.
- Eisner, E. W. (1998). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Eisner, E. W. (1981). On the differences between scientific and artistic approaches to qualitative research. *Educational Researcher* 10 (4), 5-9.
- Elbaz, F. (1980). The teacher's practical knowledge: A case study. Doctoral dissertation. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto.
- Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (2007). Studying teachers' lives and experience: Narrative inquiry into K-12 teaching. In D. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp.357-382). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellins, S. R. (2005). *Living with coyotes*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ellwood, R. S. (1993). A Japanese mythic trickster figure: Susa-No-O. In W. J. Hynes and W. G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, contexts, and criticisms* (pp. 141-158). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Erdoes, R., & Ortiz, A. (1984). *American Indian myths and legends*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Erdoes, R., & Ortiz, A. (1999).. *American Indian trickster tales*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (Ed.). (1967). *The Zande trickster*. Oxford Library of African Literature. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Printing.

Fagg, L. (2003). Are there intimations of divine transcendence in the physical world? *Zygon* 38 (3), 559-572.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Floden, R. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed). *Handbook of research on teaching*, (3rd ed.), (pp. 505-526). New York, NY: MacMillan.

Feldman, A. (2006). Using an existential form of reflection to understand my transformation as a teacher educator. In C. Kosnik, C. Beck, A. R. Freese, & A. P. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study: Studies of personal, professional, and program renewal* (pp. 35-49). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Finnegan, R. (1970). *Oral literature in Africa*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Fletcher, A. C. (1900). *Indian story and song from North America*. Republished with introduction by H. Myers, 1995. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Fox, C. H., & Papouchis, C. M. (2005). *Coyotes in our midst: Coexisting with an adaptable and resilient carnivore*. Sacramento, CA: Animal Protection Institute.

Fraser, D. (2000). *Sin, Hope and Optimism in Children's Metaphors*. Presented at AARE conference, Sydney, Australia, 4-7 December, 2000. Retrieved April 7, 2009, from AARE Web site: <http://www.aare.edu.au/00pap/fra00393.htm>.

Freeman, M. (2007). Autobiographical understanding and narrative inquiry. In D. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp.120-145). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Freeman, M. (2002). Charting the narrative unconscious: Cultural memory and the challenge of autobiography. *Narrative Inquiry*, 12, 193-211.
- Freese, A., & Beck, C. (2006). Introduction to Section 1—Personal renewal. In C. Kosnik, C. Beck, A. R. Freese, & A. P. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study: Studies of personal, professional, and program renewal* (pp. 1-3). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Gablik, S. (1989). Deconstruction aesthetics, toward a responsible art. *New art examiner* 16 (1) 32-35.
- Gall, M., Gall, J. & Borg, W. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Pearson Books. .
- Gill, D. A. (1970). The coyote and the sequential occupants of the Los Angeles basin. *American Anthropologist*, 72 (4), 821-826.
- Gill, D. A. (1965). Coyote and urban man: A study in cultural animal geography. In J. Minghy (Ed.), *Occasional papers in geography. Canadian Association of Geographers*, B. C. Div., No. 7, 68-84.
- Graham, D. W. (2009). Heraclitus quotation. Retrieved November 2009 from <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/h/heraclit.htm>.

Greenway, J. (Ed.). (1965). *The primitive reader: An anthology of myths, tales, songs, riddles, and proverbs of aboriginal peoples around the world*. Hatboro, PA: Folklore Associates.

Grinnell, G. B. (1926). *By Cheyenne campfires*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. Reprinted in 1929 by Yale University Press, and 1971 by Bison Books.

Hamilton, M. L. & Pinnegar, S. (1998). Reconceptualizing teacher practice. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 1-4). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc.

Hansen, G. P. (2001). *The trickster and the paranormal*. Philadelphia, PA: Xlibris.

Hayes, J. (1983). *Coyote and Native American folk tales*. Santa Fe, NM: Mariposa Printing and Publishing.

Heidegger, M. (1971). *The origin of the work of art*. (Trans. A. Hofstadter). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Henig, R. M. (2008). Taking play seriously: What can science tell us about why kids run and jump. *New York Times Magazine* 38 (45), 60-75.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (1991). *Practicing what we teach*: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, East Lansing, MI. Sponsored by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, D.C., Research Report 91-5.

Hyde, L. (1998). *Trickster makes this world: Mischief, myth and art*. Edinburgh, UK: Canongate Books Ltd.

Hymes, Dell (1994). Coyote, master of death, true to life. In Brian Swan (Ed.), *Coming to light* (pp. 286-306). New York, NY: Vintage.

Hynes, W. J., & Doty, W. G. (Eds.). (1993). *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, context, and criticisms*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Hynes, W. J., & Steele, S. J. (1993). Saint Peter: Apostle transfigured into trickster. In W. J. Hynes & W. G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, contexts, and criticisms* (pp. 159-173). Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Hynes, W. J. (1993). Mapping the characteristics of mythic tricksters: A heuristic guide. In W. J. Hynes & William G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, contexts, and criticisms* (pp. 33-45). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Hynes, W. J. (1993). Inconclusive conclusions: Tricksters—metaplayers and revealers.

In W. J. Hynes & W. G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, contexts, and criticisms* (pp. 202-218). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Ishiyama, J. T., & Hartlaub, S. (2002). Does the wording of syllabi affect student course assessment in introductory political science classes? *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 34 (3), pp. 567-570.

Jacobs, M. (1959). *The content and style of an oral literature: Clackamas Chinook myths and tales*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Japanican. (2008). Jonan-gu Shrine tourist information. Retrieved November, 2008, from Web site:

<http://japanican.com/japaninfo/Detail.aspx?BookID=10638&category=E>.

Japanguide. (2008). Dazaifu Temmangu Shrine tourist information. Retrieved February, 2008, from Web site: <http://www.japan-guide.com/e/e5002.html>.

Jeffers, C. S., & Parth, P. (1996). Relating controversial contemporary art and school art: A problem-position. *Studies in Art Education* 38(1), 21-23.

- Jung, C. G. (1959). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious* (Trans. R. F. C. Hull). New York, NY: Bollingen Foundation, Inc.
- Kerenyi, K. (1972). The trickster in relation to Greek mythology (Trans. R. F. C. Hull). In P. Radin (Ed.), *The trickster: A study in American Indian Mythology*, (pp. 173-91). Re-printed in New York, NY: Schocken Books.
- Knowels, M., & Moon, R. (2006). *Introducing metaphor*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Koepping, K. P. (1985). Absurdity and hidden truth: Cunning intelligence and grotesque body images as manifestations of the trickster. *History of Religions* 21, 191-214.
- Kosnik, C., Freese, A., & Samaras, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study: Studies of personal, professional, and program renewal*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kroeber, K. (2004). *Native American storytelling: A reader of myths and legends*.

Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Kroeber, K. (Ed.). (2002). *Creation myths of primitive America*. Santa Barbara, CA:

ABC-CLIO.

Kroeber, K. (1998). *Artistry in Native American myths*. Lincoln, NE: University of

Nebraska Press.

Kroeber, K. (Ed.). (1981). *Traditional literatures of the American Indian: Texts and*

interpretations. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Kyototravel. (2008) Jonan-gu Shrine tourist information. Retrieved November, 2009,

from Web site: http://www.kyoto.travel/events/kyokusui_no_en_festival.html.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2006). Course assignments for self and program renewal: Learning to

lesson plan. In C. Kosnik, C. Beck, A. Freese, & A. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a*

difference in teacher education through self-study: Studies of personal,

professional, and program renewal. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical

underpinnings. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell

(Eds.), *International handbook of self study of teaching and teacher education*

practices, (pp. 817-869). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Laughlin, R. (2005). *A different universe: Reinventing physics from the bottom down*. Cambridge, MA: Basic Books.

Leary, M. R., & Tangney, J. P. (2003). *Handbook of self and identity*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Liburd, D. (2007). *One teachers's curriculum journey with junior high school striving Readers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Houston College of Education, Houston, TX.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lopez, B. H. (1977). *Giving birth to Thunder, sleeping with his daughter: Coyote builds North America*. Kansas City: Sheed Andrews and McMeel, Inc.

- Loughran, J. (2006). Introduction. In C. Kosnik, C. Beck, A. R. Freese, & A. P. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study: Studies of personal, professional, and program renewal* (pp. ix-xii). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Lyons, N., & LaBoskey, V. K. (Eds.). (2002). *Narrative inquiry in practice: Advancing the knowledge of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Luckert, K. W. (1984). Coyote in Navajo and Hopi tales. In Father B. Haile (Ed.), *Navajo coyote tales: The Curly Tó Aheedliinii version*, pp. 3-28. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Makarius, L. (1993). The myth of the trickster: The necessary breaker of taboos. In W. J. Hynes & W. G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, contexts, and criticisms* (pp. 66-85). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.
- Marinetti, F. (1925). *Manifesto of futurism*. Retrieved May 27, 2008 from Web site: <http://cscs.umich.edu/~crshalizi/T4PM/futurist-manifesto.html>
- McNiff, J. (2007). My story is my living educational theory. In D. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp.308-329). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McLeigh, K. (1996). *Myth: Myths and legends of the world explored*. New York, NY: Facts on File, Inc.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*, (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Monroe, M. A. (2008). *Time is a river*. New York, NY: Pocket Books, a Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Mosher, E. (1990). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies. *Harvard Education Review* 60 (4), 415-442.

Mourning Dove (1934). *Coyote stories: Edited and illustrated by Heister Dean Gui with notes by L. V. McWhorter (Old Wolf) and a foreward by Chief Standing Bear, Oglala Sioux*. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd. Reprinted in 1990 by Bison Books, with introduction and notes by Jay Miller. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Novikov, I. (1998). *The river of time* (Trans. by V. Kisin). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Ndubuike, D. I. I. (2004). *I too dream America: Ethnographic approach to multicultural education, a socio-cultural and cross-cultural perspective*. Victoria, BC, Canada: Trafford Publishing, Inc.
- Nitschke, G. (1993). *Japanese gardens: Right angle and natural form*. Germany: Benedikt Taschen Verlag.
- Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (1996). Narrating the self. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25, 19-43.
- Oliva, P. F. (2005). *Developing the curriculum* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Olson, M. R. (1995). Conceptualizing narrative authority: Implication for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 11 (2), 119-135.
- Olson, M. R., & Craig, C. J. (2001). Opportunities and challenges in the development of teachers' knowledge: The development of narrative authority through knowledge communities. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 17 (7), 667-684.
- Opler, M. (1940). Myths and legends of the Lipan Apache Indians. *Memoirs*, 36. New York, NY: American Folk-lore Society.

Parker, G. (1995). *Eastern coyote: The story of its success*. Halifax, Nova Scotia:

Nimbus Publishing.

Pausch, R. (2008). *The last lecture*. New York, NY: Hyperion

Pelton, R. D. (1993). West African tricksters: Web of purpose, dance of delight. In W.

J. Hynes & W. G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, contexts, and criticisms* (pp. 122-140). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Pelton, R. D. (1980). *The trickster in West Africa: A study of mythic irony and sacred Delight*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Perrine, R. M., Lisle, J., & Tucker, D. L. (1995). Effects of a syllabus offer of help, student age, and class size on college students' willingness to seek support from faculty. *The Journal of Experimental Education* 64, 41-52.

Phillips, N. A. (Ed.). (2007). *What they said: The ultimate authoritative book of quotations*. Raleigh, NC: Sweetwater Press.

Phinney, A. (1934). *Nez Percé texts*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Pinker, S. (2008). The moral instinct. *New York Times Magazine*, January 13, 2008, 32-37.

Pinnegar, S., & Daynes, J. G. (2007). Locating narrative inquiry historically. In D. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp.3-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Toward a post-critical philosophy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Project Coyote (2009). Retrieved April 23, 2009, from Web site:
<http://www.projectcoyote.org>.

Radin, P. (1955). *The trickster: A study in American Indian mythology*. New York, NY: Schocken Books.

Radin, P. (1952). *African folktales and sculpture*. New York, NY: Bollinger Foundation.

Reed, E. D. (1988). *Coyote tales from the Indian pueblos*. Santa Fe, NM: Sunstone Press.

Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 516-529). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Russell, T. (2004). Tracing the development of self-study in teacher education research and practice. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1191-1210). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Samaras, A. P., Hicks, M. A., & Berger, J. G. (2004). Self study through personal history. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 905-942). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sapir, E. (1909). Wishram Texts. *Publications of the American Ethnological Society, Volume II*, Edited by F. Boas. Leyden: Late E. J. Brill Publishers and Printers. Reprinted from the edition of 1909 by AMS Publishing 1974, New York, NY: AMS Press, Inc.

Sawyers, P. (1981). Introduction to fine arts class lecture, Summer I, Texas State University (formerly Southwest Texas State University), San Marcos, TX.

Sawyers, P., & Henry, F. (1980). *Song of the coyote: Freeing the imagination through the arts*. Boston: American Press.

Sax, B. (2001). *The mythical zoo: An encyclopedia of animals in world myth, legend, and literature*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Schlosser, S. E. (2008). *Tricksters*. Retrieved May 1, 2009, from American Folklore

Web site: <http://www.americanfolklore.net/tricksters.html>.

Schoen, L. M., & Armagost, J. L. (1992). Coyote as cheat in Comanche folktales.

Western States Folklore, 51(2), 202-207.

Schol, D. (1992). *Outline for critiques* (class handout), School of Visual Arts,

University of North Texas.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for*

teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*.

New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schwab, J. J. (1973). Translation into curriculum. *The School Review*, 81(4), 501-522.

Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *The School Review*, 78

(1), 1-23.

Schwab, J. J. (1960). What do scientists do? *Behavioral Science* 5(1), 1-27.

- Seaman, M. L. (2006). *First-year teacher, second time around: A narrative self-study of teaching in higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Houston College of Education, Houston, TX
- Shlain, L. (1991). *Art and physics: Parallel visions in space time and light*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Sienkewicz, T. J. (1996). *World mythology: An annotated guide to collections and anthologies*. Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Slater, L. (2000). *Lying: A metaphorical memoir*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Slayford, L. (2009). *The history and significance of Benkei*. Retrieved September, 2009, from <http://www.helium.com/items/1601955-the-history-and-significance-of-benkei>.
- Smith, C. (1997). Coyote, contingency, and community: Thomas King's green grass, running water, and postmodern trickster. *American Indian quarterly*, 21(3), 515-534.
- Smith, D. L. (1997). *Folklore of the Winnebago tribe*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2010). A sociological approach to self and identity. In M. Leary and J. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity*, pp. 128-152. Washington: Guilford Press.

Stinespring, J. A. (1990). Fundamentalism religion and art teaching: Responding to a changing world. *Art Education* 43(3), pp. 50-53.

Street, B. K. (1972). The trickster theme: Winnebago and Azande. In A. Singer & B. Street (Eds.), *Zande themes: Essays presented to Sir Edward Evans Pritchard*, pp. 82-104. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.

Swaim, J. (1997). *River of time*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Tansey, R., and Kleiner, F. (1996). *Gardner's art through the ages*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Thinkexist (2009). Heraclitus Quotation. Retrieved November, 2009, from Web site: <http://thinkexist.com/quotes/heraclitus/2.html>.

Thompson, S. (1929). *Tales of the North American Indians*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. First printing by Midland Books, 1966.

Thundafunda (2010). *Howling Coyote*. Copyright free wallpaper retrieved November

13, 2010, from <http://thundafunda.com/33/animals-pictures-nature/howling-coyote-pictures.php>.

Toelken, B. (1977). Forward. In B. Lopez, *Giving birth to Thunder, sleeping with his daughter: Coyote builds North America* (pp. xi-xvii). Kansas City: Sheed Andrews and McMeel, Inc.

Toelken, B., & Tacheeni, S. (1997). Poetic retranslation and the “pretty languages” of Yellowman. In K. Kroeber (Ed.), *Traditional American Indian literatures: Texts and interpretations*, pp. 65-116. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Torres, T. J. (2009). Self-study: *I am six degrees from special education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Houston College of Education, Houston, TX.

Trickster (1993). In *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (5th ed.), pp. 2783-84. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Twain, Mark (1909). *Roughing it*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
Reprinted in 2003 by Dover Publications, Inc.

UH Course Catalog (2007). University of Houston. Houston, Texas.

Vecsey, C. (1998). The exception who proves the rules: Ananse the Akan trickster. In W. J. Hynes & W. G. Doty (Eds.), *Mythical trickster figures: Contours, contexts, and criticisms* (pp. 106 -121). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Venteco (2010). *River Klarälven, Värmland in Sweeden*. Royalty free image retrieved November 13, 2010 from StockXchng Web site:
<http://www.sxc.hu/photo/1175358>.

Watkins, M. (2005). Education research class lecture. Spring semester, College of Education, University of Houston, Houston, TX.

Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language (1994). New York, NY: Gramercy Books.

Weitz, M. (1956). The role of theory in aesthetics. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 15 (1956), 27-35.

Yellowman (1998). Coyote and prairie dogs. In K. Kroeber, *Artistry in Native American Myths*, pp. 180-187. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Zong, I. (2005). *Folk tales from Korea (4th ed.)*. Elizabeth, NJ: Hollym Publishers.

APPENDIX A

SYLLABUS 1

University of Houston  College of Education

COLLABORATION FOR LEARNING & LEADING

ARED 3305

Section 00962 Art in Elementary Schools

Farish Hall room 302

Tuesdays 5:00p – 8:00p

Daniel Bruce Mauldin, MFA

University of Houston Course Description

ARED 3305: Art in Elementary Schools—provides elementary classroom teachers with the basic concepts of current art education theory and practice. Emphasis is placed on the creation of interdisciplinary curricula and the integration of art-making, art criticism, aesthetics, and art history in successful ways for elementary school students.

Instructor

Bruce Mauldin

Email: dbmauldin@uh.edu

Telephone: College of Education 713.743.5000

Office hours by appointment Tuesdays 4:00p – 5:00p

This class will make accommodations in accordance with 504/ADA guidelines. Please call the Center for Students with Disabilities at 713.743.5400 to address your needs, or speak with the instructor for more information.

Additional Course Policies and Procedures

The following information is designed to help the class run smoothly. The instructor reserves the right to make additions and adjustments as necessary.

Recommended Readings

Readings are assigned to provide important background and core information. A few readings will be read during class, all other readings will be read outside class. Course readings are available on WebCT. You must be registered for ARED 3305 to access these readings.

Coloring books and related activities, drawing is learnable, teachable skill (1978). *Fine Arts Section, Division of Curriculum Development, Texas Education Agency*, PA5 835 07.

Student Teaching Handbook (2002). Retrieved June 19, 2005 from <http://websites.quincy.edu/~educatn/studntteachinghandbook.pdf>

Attenborough, D. (2002). There's more to it than just looking: The art museum as an integrated learning environment. In Y. Gaudelius & P. Speirs (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues* (pp. 291-301).

Barrett, T. (1992). Criticizing art with children. In *Art Education: Elementary*, A. Johnson (Ed.), Washington, DC: NAEA, (pp. 115-129).

Barrett, T. (2002). Interpreting art: Building communal and individual understandings. In Y. Gaudelius & P. Speirs (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues* (pp. 291-301).

Bates, J. K. (2000). Three types of productive activities: Closed-ended, open-ended, and laissez-faire. In *Becoming an art teacher*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing (pp. 22-25).

Dobbs, S. M. (1998). *A guide to discipline-based art education in and through art*. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Education Institute for the Arts.

Duncum, P. (2003). Visual culture in the classroom. *Art Education* 56(2), 25-32.

Duncum, P. (2002). Clarifying visual culture art education. *Art Education* 55(3), 6-11.

Duncum, P. (1999). What elementary generalist teachers need to know to teach art well. *Art Education* 52(6), 33-37.

Knight, W. B. (2006). Using contemporary art to challenge cultural values, beliefs, and assumptions. *Art Education* 59(4), 39-45.

Lew, L. Y. & McLure, J. W. (2005). Chinese dragons in an American science unit. *Art Education* 58(4), 39-45.

Milbrandt, M. K. (1998). Postmodernism in art education: Content for life. *Art Education* 51(6), 47-53.

Preble, D., & Preble, S. (2004). The nature of art. In *Artforms: An introduction to the visual arts* (pp. 2-14). Upper Saddle River, JF: Pearson Education, Prentice Hall.

Unsworth, J. M. (2001). Drawing is basic. *Art Education* 54(6), 6-11.

Wachowiak, F., & Clements, R. D. (2006). *Emphasis art: A qualitative art program for elementary and middle schools*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Walker, S. (2004). Understanding the artmaking process: Reflective practice. *Art Education* 57(3), 6-12.

Required readings for the Course

The Recommended Readings list (above) will be augmented by readings distributed by the instructor or posted on WebCT. Required readings will be distributed throughout the semester. Some, but not all, of the required readings appear on the Recommended Reading list. Each of the required readings has an accompanying written reflection due on WebCT.

Website for the Course

You need to be registered for ARED 3305 to log on to WebCT for course materials.

- Available via WebCT at <http://www.uh.edu/webct>
- Click on: "Check User Name" to obtain user name and password
- If you are using a home computer, do a browser check, install the recommended Java plug-in, and disable pop-up blockers to ensure compatibility with WebCT.
- Enter user name and password to log in
- Click on "Selected Readings" on the home page to obtain readings
- Correspondence can be posted through WebCT mail or to the instructor's UH email address

Course Description

This course provides pre-service teachers opportunities, through readings, classroom discussions, artistic activities, and field based activities to discover, learn, and apply diverse applications of artistic processes and arts-based learning to the elementary classroom. Diverse applications of collaborative explorations from field-based activities to class interactions, groups, and teams pursuing, discovering, and applying visual information and constructing interactive instructional units to achieve the course objectives. Through diverse opportunities for research, application, and guided practice students become strong leaders of art-based learning and its connective interplay with other disciplines. Students will explore attitudes, perspectives, and philosophies regarding art and art education in preparation to find meaningful ways to integrate visual art into the art classroom.

ARED 3305 will explore:

- Art's role and function in our daily lives
- Community resources available to enhance the integration of artmaking, art criticism, aesthetics, and art history
- Ways to look at, write about, and interpret artworks
- The role and value of art education for children
- Methods and strategies for teaching meaningful art lessons to children
- Basic studio experiences with a variety of art materials, styles, and techniques
- Integrating looking at, discussing, and artmaking into other subject areas

Objectives

- To critically look, discuss, question, and write about works of art
- To demonstrate understanding of how artworks and subject areas can be meaningfully connected

- To develop a personal philosophy of education
- To articulate how art education relates to curriculum through the study of issues, historical periods, and current art practices
- To build confidence in a variety of art media through artmaking
- To demonstrate basic knowledge of community art resources

Course Supplies

A traditional, digital, or disposable camera is required for documenting your work. A notebook for notes, in class brainstorming and reflections is also required. Students will supply materials needed for the mini-lesson project. Supplies will be provided for all other art studios.

Integration of Technology

All students will 1) use the internet to collect data 2) use a camera to create digital images to document their work, and 3) make presentations using PowerPoint or other presentation software.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Participation (5%)

Each student is expected to participate actively in class activities. Active participation involves coming to class prepared, responding to questions, and engaging in class activities and assignments. It is expected that students will arrive on time and stay for the entirety of the class. Attendance is an important part of participation. More than 2 absences will lower your grade by one letter, unless a doctor's excuse is provided. Keeping up with assignments is also important for active participation. Late assignments will not receive full credit.

Reading Responses (25%)

A reading response will be written for each required reading. Directions for the response will be posted on WebCT. Responses should be approximately at least half a typed page using language appropriate to the college level and submitted online using WebCT Vista.

Looking at Art Responses and Personal Reflections of Art Experiences (15%)

Artworks will be viewed in class and at local museums, art centers, and/or galleries for critical analysis and reflection. There will be one off-campus visit to a museum or art center that is required. A one page typewritten response following the format specified on WebCT is required. Additionally, you will track your progress in the course through personal reflections of art experiences.

Digital Story/Mini-Lesson (10%)

Each class member will present a 5-10 minute lesson to the class addressing a specific historical period of art or a biography of a specific artist. This presentation will be presented in a 2 minute digital story using PhotoStory3 followed by a 5-7 minute reinforcing activity. The 2 minute digital story should include the following:

1. A brief description of the person or historical periods (at least 3) major characteristics and its importance
2. Examples of artwork
3. Artists and artworks of the same period
4. How this artist or historical period connects to an elementary curriculum

The reinforcing activity focuses on some aspect or characteristic outlined in the digital story that extends, reinforces, and/or applies information taught in the lesson.

Studio Art Projects and reflections (15%)

Exploration of art processes and materials will be presented periodically during class sessions. Reflections for all projects will be submitted to WebCT.

Midterm Project (10%)

This project includes a one page educational philosophy, an altered artwork reflecting that philosophy, using a portrait, and an artist's statement describing the reasons for your artistic decisions.

Final Project (20%)

The final project includes the following 4 parts:

Part 1 – Three examples of how you would incorporate art into your elementary classroom, including one complete lesson plan. This lesson plan integrates art into your content area using the lesson planning model.

Part 2 – Unwrapping an art work using questioning strategies

- a. Recruit a partner (someone from outside of class) to “unwrap” a work of art through discussion using questioning strategies
- b. Turn in an audio tape or CD and a transcript of the conversation
- c. Write a one page reflection on this experience
- d. Write a one page reflection describing your partner's experience
- e. Include your name and partner's name and phone numbers, and:
 - i. Date and time spent in gallery
 - ii. Artwork's name and artist's name in discussion
 - iii. Transcript of the conversation
 - iv. Tape or CD of the conversation
 - v. A one page reflection on your experience

Part 3 – Final Presentation

You will also present a synopsis of the final project in a 10-15 minute PowerPoint (6-10 slides) covering all 5 topics. Suggestions for success are:

- a. Use images where possible to support your points
- b. Summarize and chunk information
- c. Provide main points in text on slide and add additional verbal examples
- d. Tell why you made choices and what did or did not turn out as expected
- e. Explain what you might do to change something in the future

Part 4 – Overall reflection

Write a reflection describing your learning experiences in ARED 3305

Evaluation Methods

Grades will be assigned on the following basis: A 95-100, A- 90-94, B+ 87-89, B 84-86, B- 80-83, C+ 77-79, C 74-76, C- 70-73, D+ 67-69, D 64-66, D- 60-63, F 59 or lower.

Academic Dishonesty

Students are expected to abide by the university's academic honesty policy in all matters concerning this course (<http://www.uh.edu/dos/hdbk/acad/achonpol.html>). Penalties may include failure of the entire course, and referral to the department chair for additional penalties.

Incompletes

Students will not be allowed to take an Incomplete in this course due to poor planning on their part. If you find you do have a legitimate reason for an Incomplete, please talk with the instructor as soon as possible to discuss the situation and to identify the documentation that will be required to support your request. Please review the University of Houston catalog to review conditions under which an incomplete may be granted.

APPENDIX B

SYLLABUS 2

COLLABORATION

FOR LEARNING & LEADING

Hello, and welcome to ARED 3305. The course title is Art in Elementary Schools, section 00425, Summer IV, 2007, and we meet in Farish Hall, room 302. The class begins today, July 5th, and continues through August 8, 2007. We'll meet Monday through Thursdays from 10:00am until 2:00pm, and also on Friday, July 6th from 10:00am until 2:00pm. Your instructor is Daniel Bruce Mauldin, MFA, who can be reached by email at dbmauldin@uh.edu or by phone at 713-397-2716.

This course presents pre-service teachers opportunities to learn and apply diverse applications of artistic process artistic activities, group discussion, readings, and personal discovery. Our personal discoveries will be shared amongst ourselves, so that we learn from each other. This course is designed to provide future elementary educators with a basic understanding of art and its role in education. We will address the basic principles of art education theory and practice for the elementary classroom.

Course Description

This course presents pre-service teachers opportunities, through readings, classroom discussions, artistic activities, and field based activities to discover, learn, and apply diverse applications of artistic processes and arts-based learning to the elementary classroom.

Diverse applications of collaborative explorations from field-based activities to class interactions, groups, and teams pursuing, discovering, and applying visual information and constructing interactive instructional units to achieve the course objectives. Through diverse opportunities for research, application, and guided practice students become strong leaders of art-based learning and its connective interplay with other disciplines. Students will explore attitudes, perspectives, and philosophies regarding art and art education in preparation to find meaningful ways to integrate visual art into the art classroom.

ARED 3305 will explore:

- Art's role and function in our daily lives
- Community resources available to enhance the integration of artmaking, art criticism, aesthetics, and art history
- Ways to look at, write about, and interpret artworks
- The role and value of art education for children
- Methods and strategies for teaching meaningful art lessons to children

- Basic studio experiences with a variety of art materials, styles, and techniques
- Integrating looking at, discussing, and artmaking into other subject areas

Objectives

- To critically look, discuss, question, and write about works of art
- To demonstrate understanding of how artworks and subject areas can be meaningfully connected
- To develop a personal philosophy of education
- To articulate how art education relates to curriculum through the study of issues, historical periods, and current art practices
- To build confidence in a variety of art media through artmaking
- To demonstrate basic knowledge of community art resources

ADA Statement:

When possible, and in accordance with 504/ADA guidelines, we will attempt to provide reasonable academic accommodations to students who request and require them. Please call the Center for Students with DisABILITIES at ext. 3-5400 for more assistance.

NAEA Standards and TEKS Guidelines

The classes in the art education program are developed according to the National Visual arts Standard proposed by the National Art Education Association (NAEA) and the guidelines of Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) For Fine Arts. NAEA standards and TEKS guidelines provide a comprehensive conceptual framework for art education classes in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. The following NAEA standards are emphasized in this course: (1) understanding and applying media, techniques, and processes, (2) choosing and evaluation a range of subject matter, symbols, and ideas, (3) understanding the visual arts in relation to history and culture, (4) reflecting upon and assessing the characteristics and merits of a student's own work and the works of others. TEKS four basic strands provide broad, unifying structures for organizing the knowledge and skills students are expected to acquire: (1) perception--students rely on their perceptions of the environment developed through increasing visual awareness and sensitivity to surroundings, memory, imagination, and life experiences, as a sources for creating artworks; (2) creating expression/performance--students express their thoughts and ideas creatively, while challenging their imagination, fostering reflective thinking, and developing disciplined effort and problem-solving skills; (3) cultural and historical heritage--by analyzing artistic styles and historical periods, students develop respect for the traditions and contributions of diverse cultures; (4) critical evaluation--students respond to and analyze artworks, thus contributing to the development of lifelong skills of making informed judgments and evaluations.

Additional Information

This class relates to the College of Education conceptual framework: Collaboration, Learning, and Leading. Students in this class will participate in a number of collaborative activities such as studio critique, class discussion, studio problem-solving, and museum visits. Students will be involved in collaborative art critique in which they judge various works of art as future educators. Learning is emphasized in this class through hands-on studio projects and class debates. Each student will take turns facilitating a mini art lesson and presenting their museum experiences. These activities offer students opportunity for leadership in teaching.

Each student is required to give two Power Point presentations integrating art activities and lesson plans.

Reading will provide important core and background information for the class. Students will write reflections on readings assigned throughout the class.

All students will search the Internet to collect data, be able to create and manipulate digital images, and create Power Point presentations. Access to a computer is required. The College of Education has provided us access to computers and a large selection of software by developing CITE lab on the third floor of Farish Hall. You will need to create an account by visiting the CITE lab.

Grades

The class has discussed the grading rubric for the semester, and we have concluded the mid-term and final projects will be graded on a fifteen point scale, and a ten point scale will be used in grading co-operation, manners and respect, responsibility, organization, taking risks, individuality, and homework assignments. All grades will be assigned by the students themselves; in other words, grades will be peer evaluations.

Attendance

Attendance is mandatory. If you do not come to class, you cannot fulfill the grading rubric.

Calendar

Classes are scheduled July 5th through August 9th.

July 5th, is the course introduction class, and dialog about early art experiences of each student. A movie will set the tone for the semester.

July 6th, students will conduct research assigned on July 5th.

July 9th, students will analyze artworks and begin studio experiences. We will share what was discovered conducting the research assigned on July 5th. **For the rest of the semester, the class will follow this pattern: dialog about research assignments, new research assigned, followed by studio experiences and/or Power Point presentations prepared by the students or instructor.**

July 10th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 11th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 12th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 16th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 17th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 18th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 19th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 23rd, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 24th, students' mid-term projects are presented

July 25th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 26th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 30th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

July 31st, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

August 1st, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

August 2nd, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

August 6th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

August 7th, dialog, research assignments, and studio experiences, and presentations

August 8th, students' final projects are presented

August, 9th is the final examination

Looks monotonous, huh? It won't be.

APPENDIX C

SYLLABUS 3

COLLABORATION

FOR LEARNING & LEADING

ARED 3305

Art in Elementary Schools

Summer IV, 2008

Daniel Bruce Mauldin, MFA

Instructor's Opening Statement

Hello, and welcome to ARED 3305. The course title is Art in Elementary Schools, section 10640, Summer IV 2008, and we meet in Farish Hall, room 302. The class first day of class is 07/07/08 and it continues through 08/12/08, every weekday from 10:00a until noon. I am your instructor, Bruce Mauldin, and you can reach me through the Curriculum and Instruction Department offices in 256 Farish Hall, 713.743.5000, by email at dbmauldin@uh.edu, and cell phone 713.397.2716.

This course presents pre-service teachers opportunities to learn and apply diverse applications of artistic process artistic activities, group discussion, readings, and personal discovery. Our personal discoveries will be shared amongst ourselves, so that we learn from each other. This course is designed to provide future elementary educators with a basic understanding of art and its role in education. We will address the basic principles of art education as well as theory and practice for the elementary classroom.

Course Description

ARED 3305, "Provides elementary classroom teachers with the basic concepts of current art education theory and practice. Emphasis is placed on the creation of interdisciplinary curricula and the integration of art-making, art criticism, aesthetics, and art history in successful ways for elementary school students" (www.uh.edu retrieved July 2008).

This course presents pre-service teachers opportunities, through readings, classroom discussions, artistic activities, and field based activities to discover, learn, and apply diverse applications of artistic processes and arts-based learning to the elementary classroom. Diverse applications of collaborative explorations from field-based activities to class interactions,

groups, and teams pursuing, discovering, and applying visual information and constructing interactive instructional units to achieve the course objectives.

Through diverse opportunities for research, application, and guided practice students become strong leaders of art-based learning and its connective interplay with other disciplines. Students will explore attitudes, perspectives, and philosophies regarding art and art education in preparation to find meaningful ways to integrate visual art into the art classroom.

ARED 3305 will explore:

- Art's role and function in our daily lives
- Community resources available to enhance the integration of making art forms, art criticism, aesthetics, and art history
- Ways to look at, write about, and interpret artworks
- The role and value of art education for children
- Methods and strategies for teaching meaningful art lessons to children
- Basic studio experiences with a variety of art materials, styles, and techniques
- Integrating looking at, discussing, and making art into other subject areas

Objectives of the Course

- To critically look, discuss, question, and write about works of art
- To demonstrate understanding of how artworks and subject areas can be meaningfully connected
- To develop a personal philosophy of education
- To articulate how art education relates to curriculum through the study of issues, historical periods, and current art practices
- To build confidence in a variety of art media through hands-on experience
- To demonstrate basic knowledge of community art resources

ADA Statement

When possible, and in accordance with 504/ADA guidelines, the university will attempt to provide reasonable academic accommodations to students who request and require them. Please call the Center for Students with DisABILITIES at ext. 3-5400 for more assistance.

NAEA Standards and TEKS Guidelines

The classes in the art education program are developed according to the National Visual arts Standard proposed by the National Art Education Association (NAEA) and the guidelines of Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) For Fine Arts. NAEA standards and TEKS guidelines provide a comprehensive conceptual framework for art education classes in the Department of

Curriculum and Instruction. The following NAEA standards are emphasized in this course: (1) understanding and applying media, techniques, and processes, (2) choosing and evaluation a range of subject matter, symbols, and ideas, (3) understanding the visual arts in relation to history and culture, (4) reflecting upon and assessing the characteristics and merits of a student's own work and the works of others. TEKS four basic strands provide broad, unifying structures for organizing the knowledge and skills students are expected to acquire: (1) perception--students rely on their perceptions of the environment developed through increasing visual awareness and sensitivity to surroundings, memory, imagination, and life experiences, as a sources for creating artworks; (2) creating expression/performance--students express their thoughts and ideas creatively, while challenging their imagination, fostering reflective thinking, and developing disciplined effort and problem-solving skills; (3) cultural and historical heritage--by analyzing artistic styles and historical periods, students develop respect for the traditions and contributions of diverse cultures; (4) critical evaluation--students respond to and analyze artworks, thus contributing to the development of lifelong skills of making informed judgments and evaluations.

Course Supplies

A notebook for notes, in class brainstorming, and reflections is required. Students will supply materials needed for individual projects. Supplies will be provided for all other art studio activities. A digital camera is recommended for the course, but students should not purchase a camera for the course!

Integration of Technology

All students will search the Internet to collect data, be able to create and manipulate digital images, and create digital presentations. Access to a computer is required. The College of Education has provided us access to computers and a large selection of software by developing CITE lab on the third floor of Farish Hall. You will need to create an account by visiting the CITE lab.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Participation (10%)

Each student is expected to participate actively in class activities. Active participation involves coming to class prepared, responding to questions, and engaging in class activities and assignments. It is expected that students will arrive on time and stay for the entirety of the class. Attendance is an important part of participation. More than 2 absences will lower your grade by one letter, unless a doctor's excuse is provided. Keeping up with assignments is also important for active participation. Late assignments will not receive full credit.

Research Responses (10%)

A research response will be written for each assigned topic. Responses should be approximately at least half a page typed page using language appropriate to the college level and submitted on hard copy, or may be submitted in a journal.

Personal Journal/Chronicle (20%)

Journaling or keeping a written record of notes, drawings, illustrations, ideas, and research is an important tool for making and teaching art. Students are required to keep a binder for this purpose.

Digital Presentation on an Artist (15%)

Each class member will present a 5-10 minute lesson to the class addressing a specific artist. This presentation will be presented in a 3 minute digital presentation using PhotoStory, PowerPoint, or MovieMaker, followed by a 5-7 minute reinforcing activity.

The 2 minute digital presentation should include the following:

1. A brief description of the person and historical period's major characteristics.
2. Examples of artwork
3. Artists and artworks of the same period
4. How this artist's work could be integrated into an elementary curriculum

The reinforcing activity focuses on some aspect or characteristic outlined in the presentation that extends, reinforces, and/or applies information taught in the lesson.

Studio Art Projects and Reflections (15%)

Exploration of art processes and materials will be presented periodically during class sessions. Keep a notebook of ongoing information that will be shared with the rest of the class.

Midterm Project (10%)

This project is a one page educational philosophy, an altered artwork reflecting that philosophy using a portrait, and an artist's statement describing the reasons for your artistic decisions. The project is created in your class notebook.

Final Project (20%)

The final project for the class is a digital presentation of a lesson plan written for elementary school students incorporating an art activity into the subject matter of your choice. The presentation should follow the lesson plan format we will study in class and several examples will be examined before this project is started.

Evaluation Methods

Grades will be assigned using the following point spread: A = 95-100, A- = 90-94, B+ = 87-89, B = 84-86, B- = 80-83, C+ = 77-79, C = 74-76, C- = 70-73, D+ = 67-69, D = 64-66, D- = 60-63, F = 59 or lower.

Academic Dishonesty

Students are expected to abide by the university's academic honesty policy in all matters concerning this course. (<http://www.uh.edu/dos/hdbk/acad/achonpol.html>). In particular, plagiarism, "Representing as one's own work the work of another without acknowledging the source," whether intentional or unintentional, will not be tolerated. Penalties include failure of the entire assignment and referral to the department chair for consideration of additional action.

Incompletes

Students will not be allowed to take an Incomplete (grade of "I" assigned for the course) in this course due to poor planning on their part. If you find you do have a legitimate reason for an Incomplete, please talk with your instructor as soon as possible to discuss the situation and to identify the documentation that will be required to support your request. Please review the University of Houston catalog to review conditions under which an incomplete may be granted.

