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Abstract: The reality of instantaneous, global communication is redefining notions of time and space. Students can electronically travel beyond the school walls to reach across the neighborhood, the country, and the globe, to access ideas, further their inquiry, and potentially problem-solve. To use this capacity to its fullest, however, in addition to technical proficiencies, I suggest twenty-first century learners will have particular need for affective skills and dispositions: communication, collaboration, critical thinking, compassion, and cultural understanding among them. It is arguable how highly these skill sets are valued in current educational systems, but as these skill sets have points in
common with broadened definitions of creativity, I propose the art studio classroom as an advantageous setting for the two concepts to surface and merge. I explore social learning theory has an effective lens through which to develop affective skill sets and broadened definitions of creativity. With its components of modeling, observational and vicarious learning, reinforcement, and cognitive self-regulation, social learning theory leads to the idea of *self-efficacy*: the belief that one is capable of performing a specific task. It is this point in particular that I connect with broadened ideas of creativity and the development of affective and dispositional learning outcomes for twenty-first century learners.

Through a set of individual but closely linked essays, I portray relationships between social learning theory and creativity, crystallized teaching moments in my art studio classroom, my own identification with the subject, and a petition for an elevated status of affective dispositions within education. My focus is an examination and comparison of the properties of social learning theory (modeling, observation and vicarious learning, self-regulation, and self-efficacy) with expanding roles and definitions of creativity (fluency, flexibility, resilience, elaboration, cross-disciplinary thinking, motivation, and persistence). Through this writing, I present the studio art classroom and the process of art-making as a central point in an educational agenda that acknowledges teaching and learning for affective dispositions and the discrete properties of twenty-first century creativity.
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Introduction

The effects of globalization, the increased speed and access of communication, and the growing need for complex problem-solving skills puts new demands on the students of today and the workforce of tomorrow. In addition to technical proficiencies, the twenty-first century learner will profit from a corresponding behavioral intelligence. Collaboration, communication, compassion, cultural understanding, critical thinking, and creativity (Bassett, 2004) will be required skills to navigate compressed notions of time and space. The art studio, and the thinking and behavioral issues inherent within it, could play an increased role in a more holistic version of education.

My research involves finding an effective teaching strategy to develop creative behaviors. I believe this strategy involves social learning theory; a theory that, through
modeling and reinforcement, allows affective issues to surface, be recognized, and be addressed. At the same time, creativity has been redefined and expanded to include a wide array of behaviors and choices (Zimmerman, 2009; Freedman 2010) leading to the development of the same dispositional skills Bassett (2004) advocates for twenty-first century learning. Teaching for these dispositional behaviors is a different issue from teaching for the development of cognition and the accumulation of knowledge, which I believe many schools are already doing well. Teaching students the dispositional ability to apply knowledge to a new situation is a different challenge altogether; one I am afraid we are not meeting nearly as well. The dispositional abilities I hope to see in my art room—resiliency, flexibility, elaboration, persistence, and motivation, and their correlating cognitive abilities fluency, critical thinking, and divergent thinking—are necessary accompaniments to technological proficiency and scientific, mathematical, and linguistic prowess. In this paper and accompanying project, I advocate for a balanced educational approach that includes these dispositional learning outcomes.

My research presents various layers of thought and analysis. I explore social learning theory as a teaching framework for a studio art classroom. I consider contemporary definitions of creativity and use these definitions to directly relate aspects of social learning theory with studio art learning outcomes. I mine my action research journal for examples of these theories surfacing in my studio art classroom. I use reflective writing to ruminate about how theory and practice have added to my self-knowledge, growth, and abilities as an artist and teacher.

Figure 1 (Key Terms) lists and categorized much of the vocabulary I will be using in my writing. The ideas bound up in social learning theory unravel through a few key
phrases: modeling, observational learning, vicarious learning, reinforcement, self-efficacy, and reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 1977). We can begin talking about social learning theory through two concepts that occur in a group situation: modeling and observational/vicarious learning. Vicarious experience is based on modeling (a person exhibiting or acting out behavioral and affective patterns) and observation (another person paying attention it and remembering it). Social learning theory emphasizes interaction in the classroom, and Albert Bandura (b. 1925) gives a central role to modeling. That model could be the teacher, other students, or both. Younger students see older students doing "harder" tasks fearlessly, and they too will be more willing to try them.

"Acknowledgement that human thought, affect, and behavior can be markedly influenced by observation, as well as by direct experience, fostered the development of observational paradigms for studying the power of socially mediated experience" (Bandura, 1977, p. 76). The phrase "socially mediated" rings true with me for my responsibilities as a teacher. The students are looking to me as a model, and framing my thoughts through the lens of social learning theory helps me keep that thought in mind.

Another aspect to social learning theory is the self-regulatory process. People do not react to external influences alone. We have self-produced influences as well: we select, organize, and transform the stimulus around us. We are the shapers of our own experience.

As such, individuals are the principal agents of their own change. This part of social learning theory appeals to me. I want to model to my students that they are the principal
agents--the power behind--their own change by being the principle agent of my own change.

The changes I am looking for—in my own behavior and awareness and in that of my students—are culled from the writings of Freedman (2010), Zimmerman (2009), and Lehrer (2012). While studying creativity, these three writers have redefined it for the educational community by including subsets or individual characteristics of what was once thought of as a single frame of mind. (MacKinnon, 1964). These individual characteristics are: *elaboration* (the willingness to add details and take an idea further); *resilience* (the ability to bounce back from setbacks and obstacles); *flexibility* (the ability to deviate from a set plan); *fluency* (the ability to combine ideas and envision multiple or innovative solutions); *motivation* (the energy to engage); and *persistence* (the ability to keep working despite obstacles and delayed rewards). I believe using a social learning theory framework in the classroom, stressing modeling, vicarious learning, and reinforcement, will help develop these dispositional behaviors.

Finally, I believe these creative behaviors and tendencies, along with a social learning theory lens, will assist in the desired twenty-first century learning outcomes as articulated by Patrick Bassett, president of the National Association of Independent Schools. (Bassett, 2004; 2011). These learning outcomes can be summarized by the phrase the *Six C’s*: communication, compassion, critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and cultural understanding. These learning outcomes are both affective and cognitive; they are both individual and social. Twenty-first century education will need a balanced approach which gives all dispositions their full weight and measure.
Social Learning Theory, Redefinitions of Creativity, and Art Education

Social Learning Theory:
modeling,
observation,
vicarious Learning,
reinforcement
self-efficacy and reciprocal determinism

Redefinitions of Creativity:
fluency
flexibility
resilience
persistence
elaboration
motivation

Art Education:
A Platform for 21st C. Learning Outcomes
cultural understanding
compassion
communication
collaboration
critical thinking
creativity

Figure 1: Key terms
Relevance to My Situation

I am a studio art teacher, department head, and interim arts director in an independent school for girls. My school is currently in the process of revising its curriculum from one based on the Advanced Placement program to one of project-oriented interdisciplinary classes focused on individual inquiry. As the school administrators and the Board of Directors call for more creativity in the classroom (without a clear definition of what that is), I am, through my administration position, in an advantageous position for integrating my particular interests in studio art learning with other subjects. I participate in core committee meetings to revise the school curriculum. As an art educator and as a painter I feel my responsibility and my calling is to help my colleagues think beyond adding arts-type projects to standard academic content. My research attempts to understand creativity in terms of discrete modes of thought and action and how to develop these modes in studio work. I will then bring this understanding to my administrative work. I believe if teachers of all subjects understand and discuss the nature of creative thought and action more thoroughly, there will be greater likelihood of it becoming an integral part of twenty-first century learning.

I will advocate for the role studio art teachers, and the types of learning we espouse, can play as the faculty collaboratively plans our new interdisciplinary classes. If discrete components of creativity are teachable in an art studio, and if these discrete components of creativity are internalized through art-making, then students should be able to apply creative behaviors to other content. Creativity occurs in all domains, but the art studio, being as open-ended as it is, offers particular opportunities for creativity to surface and flourish. For some students the application of creativity to other domains is
perhaps a greater use of studio art learning as it results in a change of behavior as well as art-making knowledge. At the same time, I believe my own ability to teach the art-making knowledge, through recognition of affective issues and moments, and the compassion, vocabulary, and behavior with which to immediately and effectively address them, will be significantly enhanced.

My school is also entering its self-study year for the Pennsylvania Association of Independent Schools re-certification. I am on a committee to study innovative teaching. This group will provide a natural outlet for sharing my research on the overlaps between social learning theory, creativity, and the needs of twenty-first century learners. This committee is making a presentation at the 2013 Convention of the National Association of Independent Schools, and my research will be part of that presentation. The National Art Education Association has a sub-group for independent-school teachers, and perhaps my work will find an outlet there. In addition, I harbor the private goal of continuing my research and writing into the form of a publishable article for an academic journal.

**Statement of the Problem**

Even as schools are calling for greater creativity in the classroom, the disciplines of science and mathematics continue to hold sway as the bastions of academic rigor. This emphasis and their high-stakes performance tests, along with a growing concern for digital proficiency, may be relegating affective behaviors and creative dispositions to a subordinate position within the curriculum. Many educational theorists tout creativity as a twenty-first century need (Robinson, 2001/20011; Gardner, 1999; Langer, 1997), however, I am interested in seeing creativity assert its rightful place within the educational system in general and in my school in particular.
My first step in achieving this goal is finding an effective practice within my own discipline for teaching dispositional needs and for developing creative behaviors, thought, and outcomes. I wish to use my classroom as a theater for the teaching methods aligned with social learning theory: modeling, observation, reinforcement, vicarious learning, the development of self-efficacy, self-regulatory behaviors, and the creation of innovative thinking patterns, among others. I believe these social learning objectives dovetail with reconceptualizations of creativity to create specific crystallized teaching moments. These moments are separated from the more-or-less standard procedure of the working studio class and lead to the development of affective behaviors and creative dispositions. I believe a platform exists for an art educational philosophy dedicated to the blending of creativity with the discipline of mastering a medium—in essence, the working studio classroom—to hold an integral position in the curriculum of the most rigorously academic school.

I believe social learning theory’s sub-theory of self-efficacy will help make this blending possible. Bandura centers on the issue of self-efficacy—the belief one is capable of performing a certain task—(Bandura, 1977, p.3) and its relationship with one’s environment. How important is a strong sense of self-efficacy in the construction of knowledge and the possibility of originality? Can an art studio environment have a positive effect on a student’s sense of self-efficacy? Will an increased sense of self-efficacy achieve the desired twenty-first century learning outcomes?

Another question surrounding my stated problem is the nature of creativity itself. Part of the problem is that creativity is notoriously hard to define and may differ between cultures. A standard notion of creativity in Western culture is cited in Soren Klausen’s
article “The Notion of Creativity Revisited: A Philosophical Perspective in Creativity Research,” published in Creativity Research Journal in 2010. Klausen presents the definition given by Sternberg and Lubart (1999, p.3): “the production of ideas which are both novel and useful.” This definition does include the ideas of novelty, production, a mental contrast, and function or value. Although Klausen goes onto add to and refute aspects of this generally accepted definition, the major components of it are what I seek in my classroom.

Can creativity be taught? Some older studies say no (MacKinnon, 1964); it is an external inspiration. More recent research says yes (Lehrer, 2012; Klausen, 2010; McIntrye, 2008; Robinson2001/2011) and deciphers creativity as insight that must then translate to action. Can this internal insight be studied, broken down into steps and characteristics, and be something that gets learned, achieved, and externalized? How does it relate to the use of a medium? What prerequisites might there be for creative insight to occur? Will creativity have a greater practical importance in the light of solving twenty-first century problems?

I am also interested in ways post-modern and post-feminist researchers have expanded notions of acceptable forms of presenting research. In that vein, I present self-reflective writing, interpreting, and thinking. Do I express a personal voice in my writing, teaching, and researching, and does it hold interest for others? At the same time, however, I want my writing to be grounded in educational theory and psychological insights: how much art/artifice can one use to discuss and teach art and ideas and when might it become a self-indulgent distraction? Must all points be definitively made or can they be intuitively felt to achieve an acknowledged sense of validity?
My subject holds many potential foci. *Figure 2* (Cross-current of Ideas) illustrates specific overlaps between social learning theory, affective dispositions, and subsets of creativity which hold special interest for me. Vicarious learning—to want to do what others do—is a part of *motivation*. A history of past accomplishment couples with verbal reinforcement can lead to *self-efficacy* (the belief that one is capable of performing a certain task). Self-efficacy is also a motivational factor in a redefinition of *creativity*: the ability to envision what is not seen, and having the motivation to implement it step-by-step. *Flexibility* is a desirable trait for recognizing and following a better contingency. It is these ideas, traits, and relationships that I wish to more fully understand in my classroom, my students, and me.
Figure 2: Cross-current of ideas

Limitations of the Study
My study is limited by using social learning theory as a single focus as the conduit to teaching creativity within my own classroom. I felt that exploring additional teaching methods would have made the study unwieldy. I have accepted the idea of social learning theory as a useful guideline for teaching for creative outcomes and I have explored the
ways they coincide.

During the course of this study I have re-thought the critique process and how I can use it as a reinforcement measure, but in general I did not attempt to design tailored studio assignments for the purpose of creating teaching moments for dispositional outcomes. I wanted the issues of creative dispositions to arise through the process of drawing and painting. My intention was to dramatize the making of a drawing or painting as it involves or elicits creative choice and furthers the development of affective dispositions.

As I teach in an independent school for girls, my study may be influenced by how girls learn and interact as opposed to boys. My students are in the grade levels of nine through twelve and are taking art as an elective. Most, but not all, of the students come from privileged backgrounds, travel widely, and already have a wealth of experience behind them. They are well-read for high-school students, are enrolled in rigorous academic classes, and most feel parental pressure to succeed. It might be argued their motivation comes more from their parents than from an internal sense of well-being, although I am less likely to experience that pressure in the art room. Perhaps one or two students a year go on to major in studio art, with perhaps another one or two choosing architecture as a course of study. Many are also star athletes, sometimes holding a national ranking. In other words, although the student population is ethnically diverse, the general intelligence, accomplishment, and energy level is not. My students are articulate and high-functioning; I am not working with a student population at-risk. They are ready and willing to work with each other and with me. I do not have to overcome distrust or feelings of alienation.
Supporting Literature

My reading began with selected twenty-first century educational theorists (Robinson, 2001/2011; Gardner, 2011; and Langer, 1997). I wanted to read what I knew my administrators were reading. In order to influence any of the current and developing changes in the school, I felt it necessary to be able to relate my specificities and interests to the over-arching forward momentum of the school’s mission and vision as it is influenced by these types of writers. I wanted to know what my colleagues meant when they use terms such as creativity, dispositional behaviors, and innovation.

Robinson (2001/2011), Gardner (1999; 2011), and Langer (1997) discuss creativity and affective dispositions in broad philosophical terms within an educational paradigm. They do not focus on individual subject domains or the specificities of classroom management. As such, the reading provided me with an idea of how creativity and affective dispositions are considered from a more administrative or educational psychology point of view, but not from the daily workings of an art classroom. A source which more closely links the behavioral dispositions to the workings of the art classroom is Hetland, Winner, Veenema, and Sheridan’s Studio Thinking: The Real Benefits of Visual Art Education, published in 2007 by Teacher’s College Press.

Creativity has been the subject of many art education-oriented articles and articles within the field of psychology in recent years. Creativity Research Journal is an invaluable resource, although many of its articles are quantitative and test-oriented; not my major interest(Kee, 2006; Ruscio & Amanile, 1999; Smith & Faldt, 1999). Others seem more in the realm of philosophy (Aymen-Nolley, 1999; Klausen, 2010), and while interesting, is not easily applied to a classroom setting. Sources for theories of creativity
from the last half of the twentieth century (MacKinnon, 1962; Lowenfeld, 1968; Fryer & Collings, 1001) present creativity as more of a single mindset or individual characteristic, sometimes referring to the Greek *inspiration*, and should remain free from adult intervention. The majority of contemporary writing divides creativity into separate functions which manifest itself in a variety of contexts and for a variety of purposes (Klausen, 2010; McIntyre, 2008; Lehrer, 2012).

From a more art education-based framework, I considered recent research on creativity and how it was being redefined in the process. (Zimmerman, 2009; Friedman, 2010). Lehrer (2012) dissects creativity into discernable steps, processes, and functions. I was interested in how the art studio amplifies these definitions, steps and necessitating conditions. I then considered creativity through the lens of psychology (MacKinnan, 1964; Smith, 2008) to view it in a context beyond art and art education. I focused on the characteristics of creative people and the changing theories of creativity from a solitary activity to a more social, collaborative orientation for problem-solving. Even the redefinitions of creativity, however, do not address the specific feelings, moments, and opportunities for learning presented in a working studio class. This is my goal: a work of synthesis between theory, practice, and my own creative self-reflection.

I predicted the overlapping fields of education, creativity, and psychology coalesce in the field of social learning theory, and indeed they did. The founders of social learning theory are Albert Bandura (b. 1925) and Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934). Vygotsky focuses primarily on the field of language acquisition and the zone of *proximal development* (when an individual is ready to learn something new). It is Bandura’s ideas of self-efficacy and reciprocal determinism that most relate to my current study. Bandura
discusses the terms I would be acting out and promulgating in my classroom: modeling, attention, reinforcement, observational learning, vicarious learning, self-efficacy, and reciprocal determinism. Pajares (2002) is the current leading expert on Social learning Theory and has authored and gathered together a trove of past and current research on his website [www.des.emory.edu/mpf/self-efficacy.html](http://www.des.emory.edu/mpf/self-efficacy.html)

Much of the research listed on Pajares’ website centers on issues of students and self-efficacy, but mostly in the realm of music, health, and athletics (Pajares, 2002); very little on the subject of self-efficacy and visual art has been published. (The website [www.des.emory.edu/mpf/self-efficacy.html](http://www.des.emory.edu/mpf/self-efficacy.html) lists two dissertations in progress: one by Francesca Cridland of the University of Tasmania, Australia, on *The Influence of a Visual Arts Program on Self-Efficacy and Achievement*, and the other by Gabriel Cimaomo, from the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain, on *Self-Efficacy, Motivation and Creativity.*) I have not found scholarship connecting the three ideas (social learning theory, redefintions of creativity, and the needs of twenty-first century learners) to the specificities of art-making itself.
Research Design

Figure 3: The Broad Premise

Figure 3: The Broad Premise summarizes my reading and my research design. I started with the largest idea: art education as a platform for Bassett’s (2004/2011) outcomes for twenty-first century learning. I then moved to the writers on creativity and
how they are redefining it in the process. Finally, I tackled the specificities of social learning theory from the primary source of Albert Bandura. My goal was to transform theory into praxis; to find ideas I could translate into my studio teaching life. From this reading, I wanted to be deliberately speculative and reflective to make my own connections between the classroom, the primary source reading in psychology, and the newer research on creativity. As I continued my research, I was both delighted and dismayed to uncover articles similar to my own thinking. The articles I found, however, (Prabhu, Sutton & Sauser, 2008; Carlsson, 2002) differ in one major respect from my work: my classroom. My work remains its own as it unfolds in the specific context of place.

I initially envisioned my writing about these explorations as taking shape within three discrete sections: a report-like research paper about social learning theory and its potential as a teaching framework in the art studio; stories from my action research journal; and self-reflective essays about my teaching and my thinking about my teaching. As I continued to question and be questioned, however, the separate categories began to break down and re-arrange themselves. Ideas began to build in terms of subject matter as opposed to style.

I wondered if each essay--my term for a short, non-fiction piece of writing circumnavigating a central topic--could contain all three elements: factual background information when needed, examples from the classroom floor, and my ruminations and experiences combining the two. That's when I decided on a series of linked essays about creativity, social learning theory, and the needs of twenty-first century learners to describe my project.
There is certainly a chance for failure in a series of linked essays. It is somewhat amorphous, to be sure, but the freedom in this moniker allowed me to initially tackle the corners of my research as separate elements, and then, through time, find the driving narrative or force that held them together. Will it, in the end, add up to a whole and have meaning? Conversely, can I ask anyone else (i.e., my students) to take a risk if I am not willing to do so myself? I defend my choice by rationalizing that if I want my students to take risks, I must model the same willingness. I also defend my choice by acknowledging that these essays were written for me, as a foray into a different way of thinking and as a writing experiment. These essays are the residue of my research into social learning theory and its potential applications to creativity and my particular way of teaching.

The linking--between the essays and between the ideas--comes from me; I wanted to be somewhat playful with the writing. I wanted to create a personal but credible tone with my words and shape them into voices; I also wanted them to be carried along on a cadence so they would ring in your head as you read them. My writing is meant to be an acknowledged conversation between me and you, whoever you might be.

If we acknowledge there is a reader, then we are forced to acknowledge there is also a writer. This acknowledgement between reader and writer is expressed by my use of two typefaces. My more objective writing is expressed through a plain typeface: this is the explanation of social learning theory terms, ideas, and how they can relate to affective learning. My boldface type in italics is more subjective: it is indicating ruminations, personal experiences, or my asking the reader or myself direct questions.
The printed page isn't a given; there is a person at the other end of those words with a pen in her hand. I am that person now, and I wanted my writing and my voice to find various connections, and how I might wish to use them, between three fields of study: social learning theory, creativity, and the needs of twenty-first century learners. This thinking-turned-into-writing is in itself an act of creativity. I am creating the whole: I am weaving together, through words, strings of an imagined three-dimensional cobweb.

The primary subject of my essays is my teaching process itself, and I wanted, at least temporarily, to think about expanding my teaching by looking at my art studio through the disciplinary lens of psychology and social learning theory. This lens focuses on affective and behavioral outcomes. Affective outcomes are ones based on emotions, and I am interested in developing the emotional stamina which makes persistence and resilience possible. My interest in teaching for positive affective and behavioral outcomes has grown steadily over the years and is now accompanied by an interest in the role teaching for affective outcomes plays in education. I wanted to explore my teaching process as based not only on symbols (words and the language of drawing and painting), but on social learning theory's other categories of communication and experience: direct, vicarious, and self-regulatory.

I kept an action research journal from November through May. I recorded many instances of social learning theory ideas, crystallized teaching moments, and affective dispositional behaviors surfacing in the classroom. In the true spirit of Vygotsky (1978), I tried to see the classroom as a complete narrative and put the individual voices (the students and mine) into this larger context. I was looking at all times for the interstices between the subjects that would focus my project into a whole, if only for a few fleeting
moments. The classroom is nothing if not fluid; moments come and moments go; to be replaced by another situation, another student, another need. We (the students and I) focus on these moments, label them, discuss their function in the evolution of personal art-making and cultural change, and project how they can be used in other subjects and in life at large. I use these instances and words throughout my accompanying project.

My essays are to be taken as writing to be thought about, chewed over, and remain in the back of one’s mind as each teacher steps into her individual situation. As each teacher is an individual, I feel I have to mention the connection between theory and practice; the glue, or the will, that is holding this precarious balance of ideas together: me. My research design includes personal essays about my research evolution, my identification with the subject, and thoughts that arose during the process.

Although my goal is to explore social learning theory as a best practice for desired twenty-first century learning, I do not think there is one definitive answer for all situations; I explore this framework as a very useful paradigm, but I would not presume to present it as one that fits every circumstance. Every situation in the classroom is dealt with anew on a case-by-case basis.

I bring my questions about my own process out onto the studio floor: I did the same with the research project. For precedents of this nature I turned to the recent examples of post-feminist sociologists Richardson (2010), McCormack (2000), and Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis (1997). All four writers drop the omniscient voice of a supposedly pure, objective research and allow their own voices to be part of the process; all four writers acknowledge research as an interactive exchange. I wanted my research practice
to echo my teaching process, and I wanted my teaching process to be influenced by my research, writing, and thinking.

**Conclusion**

The primary purpose of my study was to invigorate my classroom teaching. I started my questioning by keeping an action research journal. After a month or two of entries I realized the subject which kept surfacing again and again was affective dispositions: a student’s desire to engage, her ability to persevere, the flexibility to follow divergent paths or explore unpredicted opportunities, her belief in her ability to do specific tasks, her resiliency to recover from setbacks, and her ability to envision her own path. After systematically researching back archives of art education academic journals, I found the subject of social learning theory resonated with the observations of my action research journal.

Social learning theory fit the bill on two levels: it addressed the dispositional tendencies which are part of the contemporary, enlarged definitions of creativity, and it supplied me with a fresh way of thinking about the relationships between myself and my students. My school is in the process of changing from the vertical flow of knowledge (from teacher to student and back again) inherent in the Advanced Placement program to a more horizontal exchange of knowledge between teacher, student, and resources outside the school walls. Social learning theory’s emphasis on modeling, observational learning, reinforcement, and self-efficacy allows more inclusion of outside-the-school sources without losing the intimacy and teacher-student bonding which is a *raison d’etre* of an independent school.
I was left with the question of how these new ideas would merge with my subject matter: the specificities of drawing and painting. The combination of primary sources in psychology, scholarly articles in creativity research and art education, and my own teaching experience coalesced to offer several directions. I see ways to translate self-efficacy in both beginning and more advanced levels: through the liminal skill acquisition of drawing and design, specific problem-solving geared toward conceptual blending, and a more student-led critique process at the beginning and advanced level. My classroom, consisting as it does of multiple grades, is almost a Petri dish for vicarious learning. The natural process of making art offers opportunities for resiliency, flexibility, fluidity, persistence, and innovation; we will all experience them for ourselves and see others go through them as well, including the teacher.

My research, findings, and approach will find its way to the core curriculum committee of the school, thanks to my administrative position. I look forward to discussing my work with my fellow department chairs as we create inter-disciplinary classes. I am on a committee for innovative teaching for our Independent School self-accreditation year, and I am part of a Powerful Learning Practice group making a presentation at the 2013 National Association of Independent School Convention. More than those formal opportunities, however, I look forward to joining ad hoc discussions around the school, where so much groundswell of feeling and change occurs. In the lunchroom, at the fitness center, at early morning coffee gatherings; it is these unforeseen, chance encounters which are vital to the energy and life of a school. I look forward to being a positive element in these exchanges, and to being open to what these
exchanges bring to me. This attitude is a direct result of my study; it is the emotional valence I wish to model to my students and my colleagues.
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2007   Baldwin Benefits Grant, The Baldwin School
2004   Work on Paper Prize, The Wayne Art Center
2003   Fellowship Prize, Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts
1999   Leeway Foundation Grant
1997   Purchase Prize, Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts
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