

The Place of the Arts within Integrated Education

Raquel Sanz-Camarero*, Jairo Ortiz-Revilla and Ileana M. Greca

Department of Specific Didactics, University of Burgos, Burgos, Spain

* Area of Didactics of Plastic Expression, Department of Specific Didactics, Faculty of

Education, University of Burgos, c/Villadiego, 1, 09001 Burgos, Spain. E-mail:

rscamarero@ubu.es

The Place of Arts within Integrated Education

If we are to address the complex needs of contemporary education, then reflection on the arts when talking about integrated education is somewhat logical and should be considered as one principal objective of Arts Education. Current educational policies at the international level point towards a more integrated education, however, there is no consensus over a real arts integration, nor significant reflection within the classroom. This situation has worsened over recent years, even when the arts are being incorporated in some models of integrated education in full expansion. In this study, we present a state of the question of the place of the arts in integrated education. To do so, we place arts integration within its historical context, and define and explain four major problems (instrumentalization of the arts, undervaluation of the arts, poor teacher training, neglecting evaluation). We then go on to present the significance of the arts within integration as the basic axis of the existing theoretical discourse in the literature, defining five styles of integration according to their significance (subordinated or service-based, peripheral, collaborative, leading role, artistic). Finally, we compile and discuss the main approaches to have arisen in the context of arts integration. This study may be added to the contributions in defense of arts integration, rescuing and clarifying the currently submerged and confused debate, in order to restore its full potential in accordance with the new social and political demands.

Keywords: integrated education; disciplinary integration; arts integration; state of the question

Introduction

An integrated view of our surroundings is required, if we are really to understand the globalized and interconnected world that we inhabit and to seek answers to the needs of 21st century society (Klein, 2004, 2014). Engaging with the increasingly complex and interdependent problems that we face forces us to interconnect different fields of knowledge, causing us to end the conventional and isolated approaches of particular disciplines, and to deconstruct the walls between each one. As has been widely

discussed in epistemology (Frodeman et al., 2017), most of the challenges currently facing society cannot be addressed through the lens of one discipline but require the global insights of various disciplines and their creative interaction (as, for example, in the recent global pandemic). Hence, the increasing pervasiveness of disciplinary integration within multiple contemporary issues, for example, sustainability, climate change, feminism, etc., not only in the search for solutions, but also to select the most relevant problematic issues (Galafassi et al., 2018; Klein, 2018). In fact, according to Perales and Aróstegui (2021), in line with the current economic and cultural globalization, it is necessary to think of a more integrated education.

In the field of education, the integration of various disciplines has been proposed for over a century as a dynamic form of knowledge through which disciplinary boundaries are broken down (Beane, 1995). However, the approach of the teaching-learning process restricted to subject boundaries has always been rooted in the classroom.

If both the entry and the acceptance of integration within educational activity is still scarce, then the situation is even less encouraging for arts integration¹. We may recall that the justification of Arts Education (AE) has had to be reiterated on numerous occasions (Efland, 1976, 2002; Eisner, 1972; Freedman, 2003; Read, 1948, among others). AE is *per se* in a marginal situation within the curriculum, with almost no political, social, or media visibility (Huerta & Domínguez, 2014). Rarely considered as an active source of knowledge or understanding, the visual arts are, for example, praised

1 'The arts', a less restrictive term widely used in the literature, is employed when discussing integration. Nevertheless, the term 'art' is retained whenever used in the original source material. In addition, due to the authors' training and artistic backgrounds, some examples and references included throughout the manuscript belong to the field of visual arts.

as a source of delight, embellishing what is to be admired (Efland, 2002). However, AE is a discipline with similar processes and objectives to any other (Sullivan, 2005) and, as such, its place within integrated education has been widely defended, as an effective way of broadening knowledge, to arrive at solutions to significant problems for students. Its potential has therefore been justified for decades (Barry, 1996; Dawson & Kiger Lee, 2018; Efland, 2002; Eisner, 1972, 1991) and more recent voices have suggested that the arts are indispensable today as an essential constituent of integrated education, serving to initiate an intuitive comprehension among students, and helping them to resolve current challenges (Burgoyne, 2018; Galafassi et al., 2018; Gibbs et al., 2018; Tyszczuk & Smith, 2018), often beyond the theoretical groundwork of other disciplines.

Therefore, if the complex needs of students in contemporary education are to be addressed, then pondering the arts when talking about integrated education appears quite logical and should be promoted as a central objective of AE (Corbisiero-Drakos et al., 2021). However, the true nature of arts integration is discussed in very few studies. There has been some discussion on the importance of arts integration, even various reflections on the practices that integrate art, but there is neither consensus nor significant reflection on classroom practice (Burnaford et al., 2007; Parsons, 2004). This situation has worsened in recent years, as the subject is hardly explicitly discussed, even when current educational policies at the international level point towards a more integrated education (see the 21st Century Skills movement launched in the United States by the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2007) where the arts form part of some increasingly popular models of integrated education (Bequette & Bequette, 2012).

Faced with this scenario, not only do we consider it necessary to salvage the somewhat confused debate over arts integration, but we also feel that the debate must be

clarified, so as to restore its full potential in accordance with the new social and political demands. In this study, we present a state of the question of the place that the arts occupy in integrated education. To do so, we first contextualize arts integration in terms of its historical trajectory. Second, we identify and explain four major issues related to arts integration. Third, we present the significance of the arts within arts integration, as the basic axis of the existing theoretical discourse in the literature, and we specify five styles of integration according to their significance. We finally gather together and discuss the main approaches and initiatives to have arisen in the context of arts integration.

Historical contextualization of arts integration

Given that the history of integrated education has been extensively and thoroughly described elsewhere (Beane, 1997; Torres Santomé, 1994), in this section, a brief historical overview will be used to contextualize the subject of this study: arts integration².

The first discussions on integrated education take us back to the first two decades of the twentieth century. At that time, the organization of education into disciplines during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was questioned and a more holistic view of education was revindicated within pedagogical thinking (Dewey, 1921). These new currents of thought stressed the need for educational change, and advanced evidence of the danger of disciplinary fragmentation, and its effects on meaningful learning among students. Curricular separation prevented both teachers and students

² This contextualization is mainly based on the context of the United States, a representative country of the integrated education discourse later expanded worldwide.

from articulating critical reflection on reality (Torres Santomé, 1994). At the same time, rather than its characterization as merely a skill or a pastime, the inclusion of AE as a subject in the curriculum was discussed, so that it could assume a vital, functional role (D'Amico, 1936). With regard to integrated education, the arts and crafts movement, with great weight in industry, was a revolution, in so far as its aesthetic approaches were taught within industrial processes.

As from 1940 onwards, the dimensions and complexity of the problems imposed global scientific perspectives and procedures that surpassed the framework of any one single discipline (D'Hainaut, 1986). While education had been focused on the pure acquisition of knowledge, it now required more integrated learning focused on the resolution of problems close to the students' lives. Concern over arts integration began to take shape and various perspectives emerged. In some cases, AE began to be defended as a unified subject that encompassed knowledge of all artistic areas. In others, the importance of integrating arts within other subject matter was stressed. In the latter perspective, it was found that the arts tended to be presented, so as only to make other content more accessible. In this sense, D'Amico (1942) defended the arts integration with other disciplines, but stressed the need for the arts to retain their own identity.

In the 1940s and 1950s, integrated education proliferated in the United States, although problem-centered programs were still rare (Beane, 1997). The Cold War period within the US and state-sponsored interest in professional development within scientific-technological fields meant that integrated education was moved aside, so that conventional disciplinary structures could be imposed. Interestingly, this tendency did not initially take hold in AE, as the 1950s were highly influenced by the ideas of Lowenfeld and Brittain (1947), who defended the development of the creative capacity

of children and classroom experimentation over and above the acquisition of technical knowledge and skills. These ideas were maintained in the following decades.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Eisner and his colleagues (Eisner, 1987) called for AE to become another curricular discipline. Thus, AE was officially incorporated in the **US curriculum**, based on a proposal that went beyond artistic endeavor based on the natural expressiveness of children, which had up until then been dominant in schools.

Interdisciplinarity intensified during these decades, in part motivated by low levels of interest among students within the traditional educational system (Drake & Reid, 2020). Thus, arts teachers were expected to be well versed in the art forms they were teaching and art history, theory, criticism, and aesthetic approaches (Dunn, 1995). Later, Morin's (1990) discourse, emphasizing that complex thinking should be promoted by non-partitioned, non-divided, and non-reductionist knowledge, influenced the field of education. Under this premise, a multitude of concepts associated with integration emerged, such as globalized teaching, educational collaboration, democratic teaching, education by projects, and diversity of integration levels, etc. However, although there were many advocates of integration, it was never to become part of teaching practice (Bresler, 1995).

In the 20th century, as the globalization of economies, technologies, and the population expanded, new problems that required multidisciplinary solutions emerged (Ulbricht, 1998). In art, post-modernism flourished (Efland et al., 1996) and, with it, an AE open to plurality and multiculturalism, which questioned the delimited curriculum with content established as absolute truth (Agirre, 2000). The need to establish personal, community, cultural, historical, and scientific connections between disciplines not only promoted change in the content and the meaning of the disciplines, but also led to the merging of their boundaries (Efland et al., 1996). In addition, the curriculum had to

attend to diversity and to prepare students to understand the social and cultural reality influenced by the media; that is, to give didactic value to the messages of visual culture (Freedman, 2003; Duncum, 2002). These requirements meant that the focus of AE shone in a new direction that placed art in the context of other disciplines (Marshall, 2005). Gardner's (1983) ideas on multiple intelligences must be added to this panorama, which had notable repercussions on the defense of arts integration and its interconnections with other disciplines. Even so, attempts to develop meaningful links between subjects were very scarce or never happened in an authentic manner within the classroom (Dunn, 1995).

In the 21st century, the disciplinary problem remains and curriculum, as we know them, continue in general to be fragmented and compartmentalized. However, we are experiencing a process of evolution where current educational policies at the international level are pointing towards a more integrated education where competency development is necessary according to the complex needs of contemporary education. Studies on integrated education at all levels and, in particular, interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity, have emerged as a trendy word that is very much "à la mode" (Lawrence & Despres, 2004). Arts integration, also part of this trend, is even found in some widely used and increasingly popular integration models, as is the case of Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics (STEAM) integrated education. However, several authors have denounced a lack of true arts integration in these contexts (Bequette & Bequette, 2012; Hunter-Doniger, 2018, among others). At this point, the question naturally arises over the reasons why arts integration is found in this situation and what may have differentiated it from other disciplines where the conflict is not present. These doubts may be addressed through reflection on the problems related to integration, which are discussed below.

Issues surrounding arts integration

Like so many socio-cultural developments, rather than following a linear path, the contorted and changing path of arts integration has resulted in various problems.

As a starting point, it is important to note that Efland (2002) had previously alluded to three problems affecting AE. First, the tendency to consider AE as a mode of entertainment, a frivolous and optional occupation, with little contribution to the cultivation of the mind or the formation of the personality. Second, the serious lack of awareness of the substantive roles that the arts can play in overall cognitive development. And third, and partially related to the above, the insecurity of teachers at employing AE to develop cognitive skills. In turn, Eisner (1972, 1996) highlighted the lack or simplicity of any evaluation of artistic practices as another AE-related problem. As we shall see, these *a priori* "disciplinary" problems have also been reflected in arts integration.

When talking about arts integration with other academic disciplines, a variety of perspectives, interests, and objectives have often been reflected (Bresler, 1995). In our research, we have been able to identify four major issues related to arts integration that have been discussed in the literature over the past three decades and which are still valid in the current political-educational context:

- (1) Instrumentalization of the arts: integrating the arts only as an aid to achievement in one or more disciplines diminishes the value of the arts in themselves, because it implies that the arts have no independent curricular objectives. An issue on which many authors have spoken out (Brewer, 2002; Eisner, 1991, 1998, 2002; Efland, 2002; Greer; 1997; Hetland et al., 2007; Marshall, 2010, 2014; May, 2013; Overland, 2013; Walker et al., 2011; Wiggins, 1996, among others), contending that the arts often become subsidiaries of other disciplines,

which pushes aside an artistic identity or imposes a bias of one discipline over another. For example, Sotiropoulou-Zormpala (2016) complained that: "both those who design curriculum and the educators who follow them tend to regard the arts as necessary only when they are proven to contribute to children's performance in the 'serious' academic disciplines" (p. 43). Roucher and Lovano-Kerr (1995) pointed out that "the arts are often used as simplistic illustrations, as hand-maidens to enrich other subject areas, rather than as rich and complex sources of content and skills for students" (p. 20). Although other authors have defended arts integration as enhancing the academic performance of other disciplines (Aprill, 2001; Bresler, 1995; Burnaford et al., 2007; Catterall, 1998), Eisner (1998) insisted that what is truly important is its defense on the basis of what it can bring to students and not in terms of what it can contribute to other fields.

- (2) Undervaluation of the arts: in most of the integrated proposals in which they are included, the arts are all-too-often undervalued and lose value as a discipline or their content is watered down, leaving something merely illustrative and devoid of artistic meaning (Brewer, 2002; Fisher & McDonald, 2004; LaJevic, 2013; May 2013; Smith, 1995; Wiggins 1996). Authors such as Veblen and Elliott (2000) warned that in programmes where the arts are integrated, the artistic curriculum is threatened, as it is no longer capable of providing deep and meaningful arts-related learning experiences. Therefore, using resources related to artistic endeavors (such as painting or singing songs) does not mean that they are directly addressing the AE curriculum. In fact, Ulbricht (1998) proposed some guidelines that the new integrated programs should follow, precisely so that the arts retain their integrity.

- (3) Poor teacher training: little or no preliminary teacher training leads to a lack of awareness of arts integration and, therefore, to low levels of interest in integrated practices that include the arts (Bresler, 1995; Burnaford et al., 2001; LaJevic, 2013). In various studies (Barry, 1996; Betts, 2005; Fisher & McDonald, 2004; Krug & Cohen-Evron, 2000), it has been shown that educational programs require greater formative effort and collaboration between faculty staff whenever there is arts integration. Therefore, unaware of the possibilities and benefits of arts integration, far from considering it for their teaching, teachers perceive it as one more burden that makes it impossible to address the set curriculum (Barry, 2004). In this regard, there is a need to support educators within integrated education and to clarify how the arts may be taught in an integrated way (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 2002).
- (4) Neglecting evaluation: in many cases, the evaluation of the arts within integrated education is limited to checking the final overall result of a product or to the award of "extra credit points" (Lajevic, 2013). Therefore, if artistic learning is not evaluated in the same way as the other disciplines, it could be fostering the problem described under point 2. As Errázuriz (2002) indicated, there are still those who believe that artistic practice, due to its expressiveness and subjective nature, should be fundamentally free, in which "anything goes" with no need for evaluation. However, Eisner (2002) commented that evaluation is a necessary condition for responsible teaching and a fundamental process that stimulates student growth and development in the arts. In addition, he proposed a set of conditions that influence learning in the arts and that could serve as criteria for their evaluation in integrated proposals.

As may be observed, these issues surrounding arts integration imply, among others, a disparity of interests and interpretations that are directly related to its application in the classroom. Thus, we have found that the literature on practical examples of arts integration offers perspectives that are as divergent as there are styles and roles for arts integration, as well as differing levels of sophistication for their integration. In addition, we have perceived both semantic amalgamations and terminological imprecisions that do nothing but hinder the way forward. All these problems are evidence that there is as yet no theoretical and, therefore, no practical consensus on arts integration within the classroom.

Significance and styles of arts integration

Given the polysemy in works on arts integration, on occasions by the same authors, it appears necessary to identify the relevant aspects that are taken into account when discussing arts integration. To that end, we investigated the common points underlying all discourse and detected that the central issue is the significance of the arts when speaking of their integration. Beginning with this focal point shared by all authors, we defined five styles of integration and assigned a characteristic label to each style (subordinate or service-based, peripheral, collaborative, leading role and artistic) each of which represents a different significance attributed to the arts (see Table 1).

[Insert Table 1 here]

In relation to the aforementioned terminological imprecisions, several authors interposed two totally different issues: terms relating to the significance of arts integration and the sophistication of the levels of integration between the different disciplines (multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, etc.). We might anticipate that those levels of sophistication will not be found in Table 1, since they have already been previously defined (Bresler, 1995), but it is relevant to clarify that

each level is circumscribed within the collaborative style, since it always requires significant disciplinary collaboration (albeit in different ways).

Arts integration approaches and initiatives

In view of the diversity of existing initiatives and positions, it is worth mentioning that arts integration, although without consensus, has generated sustained interest throughout the twentieth century and, due to the rise of integrated education internationally defended from the new educational policies, represents a relevant line of research within the field of AE today.

Within this context, in this section, we present and discuss the main approaches and initiatives that have in some way addressed arts integration:

- **Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE):** one of the most relevant approaches within the field of AE. The term was coined by Greer (1984) and promoted by Elliot W. Eisner from the Getty Center of Education in the Arts at Los Angeles, California. It arose as a result of fresh calls for scientific development stemming from the US educational reforms of the 1960s, in which art was claimed as another defined and structured school discipline (Clark et al.,1987). Based on the content and procedures of art education, it was organized into four parent disciplines: aesthetics, criticism, art history, and studio art. DBAE also took part in Music Education through the so-called Discipline Based Music Education (DBME) (Patchen,1994). Initially it was proposed as a model for the integration of several fields of knowledge linked only to the arts and, therefore, within the same nature of knowledge. In other words, it was proposed as an integrated approach, but limited to the framework of the arts, which therefore places this approach within what we have called the ‘artistic style’ (Table 1) in the previous

section. Subsequent adaptations of DBAE sought to expand and to interconnect all arts (visual arts, music, dance, theater, design, etc.), but also with humanistic, social, and environmental and cultural issues (Chalmers, 1996; Delacruz and Dunn, 1996; Hamblen, 1997). DBAE has been so influential that it has become the bedrock for a variety of arts integration initiatives. For example, the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC) initiative developed by various organizations within the United States and the Comprehensive Holistic Assessment Task (CHAT) program of the Florida Institute for Art Education, sponsored by the Getty Center of Education in the Arts. In this case, integration transcends the arts, as the central artistic theme of the unit is related to content from different disciplines such as social studies, geography, literature, poetry, history, music, science, and mathematics.

- Abordagem Triangular (AT): an approach proposed by Barbosa (2010), presented as a reformulation of the Triangular Approach or Triangular Methodology (Barbosa, 1991). It proposes the articulation of perceptual, cognitive, analytical and creative processes around three main actions: 1) Creating art; 2) Seeing and reading the image, the work or the field of meaning of art; and 3) Contextualizing what is expressed and the images and objects that are read in historical, social, experiential, subjective, contexts, etc. Prioritizing visual art, the objective of this approach is to develop perception and imagination to grasp the surrounding reality, to develop the critical capacity to analyze images, objects, and perceived reality. AT defends a reality composed of mental processes that are not dependent on disciplines. In this sense, we can understand this approach as transdisciplinary, located within the collaborative style.

- **Arts Integration:** one of the approaches that most explicitly address arts integration. Proposed by Silverstein and Layne (2010) within the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, they defined it as "an approach to teaching in which students construct and demonstrate understanding through an art form. Students engage in a creative process which connects one art form and another subject area and meets evolving objectives in both" (p.1). This approach requires the teacher to set goals in relation to both the arts (visual arts, dance, drama, and music) and the other disciplines. Thus, the student body is a participant in holistic meaningful learning, fitting into the style we have termed collaborative. Linked to this approach, the Kennedy Center established the Changing Education Through the Arts (CETA) program, which has gradually expanded to schools in several U.S. states.
- **Arts-Based Learning (ABL):** an approach that emerged at the beginning of the 21st century within the field of education and then expanded to other fields such as medicine, nursing, economics, etc. Although the exact definition of the term varies according to authors and there are some variants (Arts-Based Pedagogy, Arts-Based Teaching or, simply, Arts-Based), this approach is usually linked to the use of the arts (quilting, murals, photography, poetry, sculpting, dancing, theatre, drama, drawing, mask making, music, narratives, literature, and film) as a means for learning other disciplines, especially from the field of science (Rieger & Chernomas, 2013), which we could frame within the subordinate style. However, among other authors, Marshall (2014) maintained that ABL is not only an approach for teaching academic content from other disciplines, but is intended for artistic objectives. Hulsbosch (2010) has advocated ABL as a multicultural pedagogical strategy where critical engagement and learning

through the arts facilitates a deeper understanding of the world, validates self-knowledge, and offers a multiplicity of interpretive positions. It implies moving within the peripheral or collaborative styles. Conceived at Harvard University by leading researchers Howard Gardner and Steve Seidel, Arts Propel is one of the most famous initiatives based on this approach.

- Arts Integration and Infusion (ArtsIn): proposed by Hartle et al. (2015) is an arts-based approach to learning. Visual arts, dance, theater, music, and media arts are integrated with other disciplines in the early childhood classroom to generate rich cognitive connections. These characteristics suggest the approach be placed in a collaborative or leading-role style, depending on the emphasis placed on the arts. The key concepts of the ArtsIN approach (Universality, Embodiment, Language, and Advancing Development) are the principles that guide teaching and research production from an arts-integrated perspective.
- Visual Culture: emerging from Efland et al. (1996), the approach diluted disciplinary boundaries and broke with the idea that AE is implicitly associated with the Fine Arts. It considers the arts as a form of sociocultural production in which all types of visual culture (multicultural forms, the Fine Arts themselves, mass media, etc.) should be included in AE. This approach goes beyond an exclusively arts-based AE, incorporating other disciplines, to the point of constituting an emerging and transdisciplinary field (Duncum, 2002); we are therefore talking of a collaborative style. It has three main strands: first, an expanded canon that offers a very inclusive list of images and artifacts; second, a focus on how we look at images and artifacts and the conditions under which we look at them; and third, the study of images within their context as part of social practice.

- Art Research Integration (ARI): devised by Marshall (2014), an approach for the classroom application of arts-based research methodology (Barone & Eisner, 1997). The author describes the following guidelines necessary to bring this approach to the classroom: first, one begins by identifying an idea or concept to investigate or a research question to pursue. From there, the ideas associated with that concept or question are extracted and mapped. Next, information and images related to the concept or question are gathered, examined and researched. Along the way, disciplinary boundaries are crossed (Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Social Sciences, among others) and relationships are established with real life outside of school. The approach is therefore framed within the collaborative style.
- STEAM education: by including the A for arts in STEM education, Yakman (2008) advanced the acronym STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics). She proposed a non-hierarchical structure in which different fields of study are interconnected with each other. Although the term arts is a very broad one, Yakman (2008) compiled a classification of fields that fell under the A of STEAM: "Physical, Fine, Manual, Language and Liberal (including Sociology, Education, Politics, Philosophy, Theology, Psychology, History and more)" (p. 346). Their common nexus is that none of them have been invited into the "hard sciences" club of STEM education, nor have they been formally included in the structure that is considered vital for the creation of more qualified citizens. Thus, Yakman (2008) defined STEAM education as "Science and Technology, interpreted through Engineering and the Arts, all based in a language of Mathematics" (p. 351). This vision has been changing and evolving through the coexistence of different theoretical models in what has been widely

popularized as integrated STEAM education (Ortiz-Revilla et al., 2021).

Currently the most sophisticated and interesting positions of this approach are focused on problem solving (Herro & Quigley, 2017; Quigley & Herro, 2016).

The use of A as a means of learning for STEM subjects, where the arts are considered, insofar as they provide a number of benefits to these disciplines, has been criticized. It is argued that when the arts (and the rest of the humanistic disciplines) are considered a goal in themselves and not just a gateway to STEM subjects then that cross-disciplinary and sustained student learning is truly achieved (Bequette & Bequette, 2012; Ortiz-Revilla et al., 2021; Zeidler, 2016).

Thus, depending on where the learning objectives have been focused, this approach has been framed in a subordinate, peripheral, or collaborative style.

There are currently a large number of STEAM initiatives at the international level (Commonwealth of Australia, 2021; Corfo & Fundación Chile, 2017; Korea Foundation for the Advancement of Science and Creativity [KOFAC], 2012; Morales et al., 2019, among others). It should be noted that the long-standing school improvement program based on the arts integration Higher Order Thinking (HOT) approach of the state of Connecticut in the United States has also adopted STEAM.

There are other programs that do not adhere to any particular approach, such as the emblematic A+ Schools in North Carolina; Arts for Academic Achievement (AAA), implemented in Minneapolis public schools; Chicago Arts Partnership in Education (CAPE), which established a cooperative network among Chicago schools; A Basic Curriculum (ABC), which sought to ensure quality AE in South Carolina schools; and Schools, Parents, Educators, Children, Teachers Rediscover the Arts (SPECTRA) in Ohio.

Finally, we have in our review found other approaches such as creative self-expression (Lowendfeld & Lambert Brittain, 1947), Art Education for Life (Anderson, 2003), and Art Thinking (Acaso & Megías, 2017), which although not presenting an explicit relationship with integration, might by their nature converge with this vision.

Conclusions

In a political context where integrated education is gaining more and more prominence, the aim of this study has been to present a state of the question of the place of the arts within the dialogue surrounding integrated education, salvaging the currently confused and submerged debate on arts integration and clarifying it, in order to restore its potential utility.

In this study we have, at the beginning of the twentieth century when the dialogue on integrated education was beginning to emerge in the United States, seen how AE was still struggling to be included in the curriculum. Thus, for several decades it was repeatedly necessary to justify the value of the arts for education, even with a consolidated discourse on its benefits (Efland, 2002). Years later, when AE was already part of the curriculum, the presence of the arts within integrated education has not been free of controversy. The utilitarian sense has marked the entire trajectory of arts integration, and a much-repeated criticism is that integrated educational proposals include no true arts integration, as they often appear to be subordinated to other disciplines.

The problems that were already affecting AE have also been reflected in arts integration and remain valid in the current political-educational context. In many cases, the arts are instrumentalized in favor of other disciplines or directly undervalued by poorly trained teachers. In the same way, the lack of attention to the evaluation of artistic learning has also been maintained.

In spite of these problems and in addition to the polysemy of terms used to describe arts integration, we have also found that the significance of the arts is the central issue when talking about integration. Thus, we have defined five styles that facilitate the identification of the very diverse ways and means with which the arts can appear to be integrated with the other disciplines. This classification therefore represents a valuable tool for analyzing the significance of the arts within different integrated proposals. In this way, it will be possible to evaluate their didactic value, rejecting those proposals that shy away from the search for authentic learning outcomes for each discipline involved in disciplinary integration.

The very diversity of perspectives and the semantic amalgamation of the terms employed in the literature on manifestation of arts integration is evident in the wide variety of existing approaches and initiatives. While there has been progress in furthering the understanding of arts integration (especially in the context of programs with funding opportunities), a review of the major approaches shows evidence of the lack of a robust theoretical consensus that would make the political demands required feasible. In particular, it may be seen both in the diversity of significance and, therefore, styles of integration that the arts acquire, and in the objectives pursued by the various approaches. As already stated by Wiggins (2001), Lajevic (2013) and, more recently, Van Baalen et al. (2021), the lack of a consensual approach guiding practices is the main cause of the precarity of the arts within integrated education, the focus of current educational policies, as we have commented, originated mainly from the United States and which have been expanding worldwide (Kereluik et al., 2013).

The educational horizon that will answer the needs and problems of the 21st century must be found in the search for more holistic teaching-learning processes (Drake & Reid, 2018). It is therefore, necessary to continue working towards integrated

education and its underlying issues, starting by working from the legislation on a greater concretion of effective forms of integrated education that include a genuine integration of the arts. As a result of this study, we consider that AE having a place in the curriculum is not enough in itself, nor should arts integration be reduced to the artistic disciplines. However, neither can proposals be permitted where the arts are said to be integrated, although they are merely used as a tool to make other disciplines more attractive or, even less so, that the arts are only there to make integration and its results aesthetically attractive.

As Morin (1990) commented, the problems of today's society must be addressed within the different spheres that surround us all and, in that regard, the arts assume a fundamental position for the comprehensive education of students. As with other disciplines, AE has its own curriculum and is itself a value. For example, what sense does it make within a society where the visual and audiovisual arts are gaining importance to exclude both the visual and the audiovisual arts from an integrated proposal when any interpretation of the surrounding reality will require visually literate citizens? Moreover, the arts play a crucial role in the expression of ideas, feelings and emotions, which is usually worked on from the earliest educational stages. An aspect that should not be forgotten in integrated proposals, as it is really important for students to face up to different situations with feelings of self-confidence. The fact of integrating the arts with other disciplines encourages students to value both their own and other people's experiences positively. Thus, arts integration turns the classroom into a favorable setting for fostering relationships between students, something inherent to real life where people linked to different disciplines are expected to work collaboratively. These and other qualities clash with reality. In Spain, for example, although the new educational legislation emphasizes an integrated approach to problems, it includes the

new STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) competency in which the arts and other humanistic disciplines are utterly abandoned, even though the STEAM variant exists.

In an educational system where, on the one hand, there is a demand for a more integrated education and, on the other, disciplinarity is the general trend at the international level, we are aware that there is a long road to go to achieve real plans for arts integration. This study may be added to other contributions that defend arts integration, a very much needed educational initiative within the current of integrated education.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation (Spain) who financed the research project PCI2S (PDC2021-121498-I00).

Disclosure statement

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

References

- Acaso, M., & Megías, C. (2017). *Art Thinking: como el arte puede transformar la educación*. Paidós.
- Agirre, I. (2000). *Teorías y prácticas en educación artística. Ideas para una revisión pragmatista de la experiencia estética*. Universidad Pública de Navarra.
- Anderson, T. (2003). Art education for life international. *Journal of Art and Design Education*, 22(1), 58-66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5949.00339>
- Aprill, A. (2001). Toward a finer description of the connection between arts education and student achievement. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 102(5), 25-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632910109600013>
- Barbosa, A. M. (1991). *Imagem no ensino da arte: anos 80 e novos tempos*. Perspectiva.
- Barbosa, A. M. (2010). *A imagem no ensino da arte: anos 1980 e novos tempos*. Perspectiva.

- Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (1997). Arts-Based Educational Research. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (2nd ed., pp. 73-116). American Educational Research Association.
- Barry, N. H. (1996). Integrating the arts into the curriculum. *General Music Today*, 9(2), 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104837139600900204>
- Barry, O. (2004). The artistic and professional development of teachers: a study of teachers' attitudes toward and use of the arts in teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(1), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103260072>
- Beane, J. A. (1995). Curriculum integration and the disciplines of knowledge. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 616–622. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20405413>
- Beane, J. A. (1997). *Curriculum integration: designing the core of democratic education*. Teacher college press.
- Bequette, J. W., & Bequette, M. B. (2012). A place for art and design education in the STEM conversation. *Art Education*, 65(2), 40-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2012.11519167>
- Betts, J. D. (2005). Theatre arts integration at a middle school: teacher professional development and drama experience. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 19(1), 17-33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08929092.2005.10012574>
- Bresler, L. (1995). The subservient, co-equal, affective, and social integration styles and their implications for the arts. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96(5), 31-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632913.1995.9934564>
- Brewer, T. M. (2002). Integrated curriculum: what benefit? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 103(4), 31-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632910209600296>
- Burgoyne, S. (2018). *Creativity in theatre: theory and action in theatre/drama education*. Springer.
- Burnaford, G., Aprill, A., & Weiss, C. (2001). *Renaissance in the classroom: arts integration and meaningful learning*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Burnaford, G., Brown, S., Doherty, J., & McLaughlin, H. J. (2007). *Arts integration frameworks, research & practice: a literature review*. Arts Education Partnership.
- Catterall, J. S. (1998). Does experience in the arts boost academic achievement? A response to Eisner. *Art Education*, 51(4), 6-11, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.1998.11654333>
- Chalmers, F. G. (1996). *Celebrating pluralism: art, education, and cultural diversity*. Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

- Clark, G. A., Day, M. D., & Greer, W. D. (1987). Discipline-Based Art Education: Becoming students of Art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21(2), 129-193. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3332748>
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2021). *Sculpting a national cultural plan*. https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House/Communications/Arts/Report
- Consortium of National Arts Education Associations. (2002). *Authentic connections: interdisciplinary work in the arts*. National Art Education Association.
- Corbisiero-Drakos, L., Reeder, L., Ricciardi, L., Zacharia, J., & Harnett, S. (2021). Arts integration and 21st century skills: A study of learners and teachers. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.26209/ijea22n2>
- Corfo & Fundación Chile. (2017). *Preparando a Chile para la sociedad del Conocimiento. Hacia una coalición que impulse la Educación STEAM*. https://winnova.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/STEM_FCh_digital.pdf
- D'Amico, V. (1936). The arts in education now. *Design*, 38(2), 8-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00119253.1936.10741177>
- D'Amico, V. (1942). *Creative teaching in art*. International Book.
- Dawson, K., & Kiger Lee, B. (2018). Drama-based pedagogy: activating learning across the curriculum. Intellect.**
- Delacruz, E. M., & Dunn, P. C. (1996). The evolution of Discipline-Based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 30(3), 67-82. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3333322>
- Dewey, J. (1921). *Democracy and education. An introduction to the philosophy of education*. The Macmillan Company.
- D'Hainaut, L. (1986). *Interdisciplinarity in general education. International Symposium on Interdisciplinarity in General Education*. UNESCO.
- Drake, S. M., & Reid, J. L. (2018). Integrated curriculum as an effective way to teach 21st Century capabilities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 31-50. <https://doi.org/10.30777/apjer.2018.1.1.03>
- Drake, S. M., & Reid, J. L. (2020). 21st Century competencies in light of the history of integrated curriculum. *Frontiers in Education*, 5(122). <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2020.00122>
- Duncum, P. (2002). Visual culture art education: why, what and how. *Journal of Art and Design Education*, 21(1), 14-23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5949.00292>

- Dunn, P. C., (1995). Integrating the arts: renaissance and reformation in arts education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96(4), 32-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632913.1995.9934556>
- Efland, A. D. (1976). The School Art Style: A Functional Analysis. *Studies in Art Education*, 17(2), 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1319979>
- Efland, A. D. (2002). *Art and cognition: integrating the visual arts in the curriculum*. Teachers College.
- Efland, A. D., Freedman, K., & Stuhr, P. (1996). *Postmodern art education: an approach to curriculum*. National Art Education Association.
- Eisner, E. W. (1972). *Educating Artistic Vision*. Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. W. (1987). The role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's schools. *Art Education*, 40(5), 6-45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.1987.11652036>
- Eisner, E. W. (1991). What the arts taught me about education. *Art Education*, 44(5), 10-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.1991.11652891>
- Eisner, E. W. (1996). Evaluating the teaching of art. In D. Boughron., E. W. Eisner & J. Ligtoer (Eds.), *Evaluating und assessing the visual arts in education: international Perspectives* (pp. 75-94). Teachers College.
- Eisner, E. W. (1998). Does experience in the arts boost academic achievement? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 100(1), 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632919809599448>
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *Arts and the creation of mind*. Yale University Press.
- Errázuriz, L. H. (2002). *¿Cómo evaluar el arte? Evaluación de la enseñanza de las artes visuales a nivel escolar: práctica, mitos y teorías*. Ministerio de Educación.
- Fisher, D., & McDonald, N. (2004). Leading purposeful curriculum integration with and through the arts. *Teaching Artist Journal*, 2(4), 240–248. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1541180xtaj0204_5
- Freedman, K. (2003). *Teaching visual culture: curriculum, aesthetics and the social life of art*. Teachers College.
- Frodeman, R., Klein, J. T., & Pacheco, R. (Eds.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Galafassi, D., Kagan, S., Milkoreit, M., Heras, M., Bilodeau, C., Juarez Bourke, S., Merrie, A., Guerrero, L., Pétursdóttir, G., & David Tàbara, J. (2018). ‘Raising the temperature’: the arts in a warming planet. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 31, 71-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.010>
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind. The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Basic Books.

- Gibbs, P., Neuhauser, L., & Fam, D. (2018). Introduction - The art of collaborative research and collective learning: transdisciplinary theory, practice and education. In D. Fam, L. Neuhauser & P. Gibbs (Eds.), *Transdisciplinary theory, practice and education* (pp. 3-9). Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93743-4_1
- Greer, W. D. (1984). A discipline-based art education: approaching art as a subject of study. *Studies in Art Education*, 25(4), 212-218. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1320414>
- Greer, W. D. (1997). DBAE and art education reform. *Visual Arts Research*, 23(2), 25–33. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20715911>
- Hamblen, K. A. (1997). Second generation DBAE. *Visual Arts Research*, 23(2), 98-106. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20715919>
- Hartle, L. C, Pinciotti, P., & Gorton, R. L. (2015). ArtsIN: Arts Integration and Infusion framework. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 43, 289–298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-014-0636-7>
- Herro, D., & Quigley, C. (2017). Exploring teachers’ perceptions of STEAM teaching through professional development: implications for teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, 43(3), 416-438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2016.1205507>
- Hetland, L., Winner, E., Veenema, S., & Sheridan, K. (2007). *Studio thinking: the real benefits of visual arts education*. Teachers College.
- Huerta, R., & Domínguez, R. (2014). Research in arts education: new environments and challenges ahead. *EARI-Educación Artística Revista de Investigación*, 5, 11-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7203/eari.5.4139>
- Hulsbosch, M. (2010). Multicultural education through Arts-Based Learning and teaching. *Multicultural Education Review*, 2(2), 85-101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005-615X.2010.11102876>
- Hunter-Doniger, T. (2018). Art infusion: ideas conditions for STEAM. *Art Education*, 71(2), 22-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2018.1414534>
- Kereluik, K., Mishra, P., Fahnoe, C., & Terry, L. (2013). What knowledge is of most worth: teacher knowledge for 21st century learning. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 29(4), 127-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2013.10784716>
- Klein, J. T. (2004). Prospects for transdisciplinarity. *Futures*, 36(4), 512–526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2003.10.007>
- Klein, J. T. (2014). Discourse of transdisciplinarity: looking back to the future. *Futures*, 63, 68-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.08.008>

- Klein, J. T. (2018). *Learning in transdisciplinary collaborations: a conceptual vocabulary*. In D. Fam, L. Neuhauser & P. Gibbs (Eds.), *Transdisciplinary theory, practice and education* (pp. 11-23). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93743-4_2
- Korea Foundation for the Advancement of Science and Creativity. (2012). *Policy directions of STEAM education: introductory training of KOFAC STEAM*. Foundation for the Advancement of Science and Creativity.
- Krug, D. H., & Cohen-Evron, N. (2000). Curriculum integration positions and practices in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 41(3), 258-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2000.11651680>
- LaJevic, L. (2013). Arts integration: what is really happening in the elementary classroom? *Journal for Learning through the Arts*, 9(1), 1-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21977/D99112615>
- Lawrence, R. J., & Després, C. (2004). Futures of transdisciplinarity. *Futures*, 36(4), 397-405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2003.10.005>
- Lowenfeld, V., & Lambert Brittain, W. (1947). *Creative and mental growth*. Macmillan Co.
- Marshall, J. (2005). Connecting art, learning, and creativity: a case for curriculum integration. *Studies in Art Education*, 46(3), 227-241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2005.11650076>
- Marshall, J. (2010). Five ways to integrate: using strategies from contemporary art. *Art Education*, 63(3), 13-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2010.11519065>
- Marshall, J. (2014). Transdisciplinarity and art integration: toward a new understanding of art-based learning across the curriculum. *Studies in Art Education*, 55(2), 104-127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2014.11518922>
- May, B. N. (2013). Arts integration: what's the problem? *General Music Today*, 26(2), 5-8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1048371312464374>
- Morales, M. P. E., Anito, J. C., Avilla, R. A., Sarmiento, C. P., Palisoc, C. P., Elipane, L. E., Ayuste, T. O. D., Butron, B. R., & Palomar, B. C. (2019). *The Philippine STEAM education model*. Philippine Normal University.
- Morin, E. (1990). *Introduction à la pensée complexe*. ESPF Éditeur.
- Ortiz-Revilla, J., Sanz-Camarero, R., & Greca, I. M. (2021). Una mirada crítica a los modelos teóricos sobre educación STEAM integrada. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 87(2), 13-33. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie8724634>
- Overland, C. T. (2013). Integrated arts teaching: what does it mean for music education? *Music Educators Journal*, 100(2), 31-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432113497762>

- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2007). *Framework for 21st century learning*.
http://www.p21.org/documents/P21_Framework_Definitions.pdf
- Parsons, M. (2004). Art and integrated curriculum. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.),
Handbook of research and policy in art education (pp. 775-794). Lawrence Erlbaum
Associates.
- Patchen, J. (1994). *Discipline-Based Music Education: a conceptual framework for the
teaching of music*. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.
- Perales, F. J., & Aróstegui, J. L. (2021). The STEAM approach: implementation and
educational, social and economic consequences. *Arts Education Policy Review*. Advance
online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2021.1974997>
- Quigley, C. F., & Herro, D. (2016). "Finding the joy in the unknown": implementation of
STEAM teaching practices in middle school science and math classrooms. *Journal of
Science Education and Technology*, 25(3), 410-426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-016-9602-z>
- Read, H. (1948). *Education through art*. Pantheon.
- Rieger, K. L., & Chernomas, W. M. (2013). Arts-based learning: analysis of the concept for
nursing education. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship*, 10(1), 53-
62. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijnes-2012-0034>
- Roucher, N., & Lovano-Kerr, J. (1995). Can the arts maintain integrity in interdisciplinary
learning? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96(4), 20-25.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632913.1995.9934554>
- Russell-Bowie, D. (2009). Syntegration or disintegration? Models of integrating the arts
across the primary curriculum. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 10(28), 1-
23. <http://www.ijea.org/v10n28/>
- Silverstein, L. B., & Layne, S. (2010). What is arts integration? In L. Silverstein, A. L. Duma
& S. Layne (Eds.), *Arts integration schools: what, why, and how* (Tab. 2, pp. 1-7). The
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts/Changing Education Through the Arts
(CETA) program.
- Smith, R. A. (1995). The limits and costs of integration in arts education. *Arts Education
Policy Review*, 96(5), 21-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632913.1995.9934562>
- Snyder, S. (2001). Connection, correlation, and integration. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(5),
32-70. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3399705>

- Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, M. (2016). Seeking a higher level of arts integration across the curriculum. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 117(1), 43-54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2014.966288>
- Sullivan, G. (2005). *Art practice as research: inquiry in the visual arts*. Thousand Oaks.
- Torres Santomé, J. (1994). *Globalización e interdisciplinariedad: el curriculum integrado*. Morata.
- Tyszczyk, R., & Smith, J. (2018). Culture and climate change scenarios: the role and potential of the arts and humanities in responding to the '1.5 degrees target'. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 31, 56–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.007>
- Ulbricht, J. (1998). Interdisciplinary art education reconsidered. *Art Education*, 51(4), 13-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.1998.11654335>
- Van Baalen, W. M., de Groot, T., & Noordegraaf-Eelens, L. (2021). Higher education, the arts, and transdisciplinarity: a systematic review of the literature. *Research in Education*, 111(1), 24–45. <http://doi.org/10.1177/00345237211005799>
- Veblen, K. K., & Elliott, D. J. (2000). Integration for or against? *General Music Today*, 14(1), 4–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104837130001400103>
- Walker, E. M., Bosworth McFadden, L., Tabone, C., & Finkelstein, M. (2011). Contribution of drama-based strategies. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 25(1), 3-15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08929092.2011.569471>
- Wiggins, R. A. (1996). Integrating the arts into the curriculum is the wrong mind set. A response to Barry. *General Music Today*, 10(1), 5–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104837139601000103>
- Wiggins, R. A. (2001). Interdisciplinary curriculum: music educator concerns. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(5), 40-44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3399707>
- Yakman, G. (2008). STΣ@M education: an overview of creating a model of integrative education. *PATT-17 and PATT-19 Proceedings*, 335-358. <https://www.iteea.org/File.aspx?id=86752&v=75ab076a>
- Zeidler, D. L. (2016). STEM education: a deficit framework for the twenty first century? A sociocultural socioscientific response. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 11(1), 11-26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-014-9578-z>