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Abstract: It has been seen that teaching art education has taken different directions and multifaceted approaches. Many factors have played a direct or indirect role in shaping current trends in art education. It has an important role to play in the constructive transformation of educational systems that are struggling to meet the needs of learners in a rapidly changing world. However, this article argues that art education alone cannot resolve world challenges and problems. It assumes that good discipline of art education alone will never be good enough. It is enhanced by successful partnerships between related disciplines and strong relationships. As a result, art education today requires a comprehensive model to include all aspects of learners’ development such as the creative, cognitive, emotional, aesthetic, social and other related aspects of children, young people and life-long learners. This theoretical article attempts to provide a general historical review of the best-known models in art education in chronological order and to suggest a model for improving the quality of teaching art which is based on multidiscipline associated with art education.
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Introduction

Today, art disciplines along with other disciplines in professional education, general education, liberal arts and other related fields are delineating the knowledge base for art education practices. Major changes have taken place in the content and methods of preparing art teachers as well as in teaching art. In addition, many factors have played a direct or indirect role in shaping current attitudes and approaches to art education such as the Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE)\(^1\) theory, which includes most new directions in art education, such as the use of art museums in education, a multicultural approach to teaching art, visual cultures, new technology and standards for curriculum design and preparing art teachers are all part of leading preparation programmes in teaching art.

In addition, Day, in his study (2000) suggests that major changes are necessary in art teacher preparation programmes. These changes for university undergraduates include the expectation that they will study art-related disciplines, as well as becoming proficient in the domain of art education.

The great role of arts education in solving some of the world’s educational system problems was recognised by UNESCO throughout the first and second World Conferences on Arts Education. For instance, the major outcome of UNESCO’s second World Conference on Arts Education is the Seoul Agenda: Goals for the Development of Arts Education. The Seoul Agenda insisted that arts education has an important role to play in the constructive transformation of educational systems that are struggling to meet the needs of learners in a

\(^1\) DBAE is a model or a theory developed in the USA with funding from the Getty Education Institute for the Arts
In a rapidly changing world characterised by remarkable advances in technology on the one hand and intractable social and cultural injustices on the other (UNESCO, 2010). Moreover, the Seoul Agenda confirmed that arts education can make a direct contribution to resolving the social and cultural challenges facing the world today. From the author’s point of view, arts education alone cannot resolve world challenges and problems. At the same time, this article assumes that good discipline in art education alone will never be good enough. It is enhanced by successful partnerships between related disciplines and strong relationships. Art education today can often be enhanced by partnerships from a wide range of educational and non-educational disciplines and different organisations in the community. Within this framework, we should encourage creative partnerships at all levels between stakeholders of art education in community organisations.

In order to face issues that concern art educators today, the Seoul Agenda (UNESCO, 2010) offers a number of practical strategies and specific action items. One of these general strategies is to “Affirm arts education as the foundation for balanced creative, cognitive, emotional, aesthetic and social development of children, youth and life-long learners” (UNESCO, 2010, p.3). This strategy includes the following action items:

1.a (i) Enact policies and deploy resources to ensure sustainable access to:
   • comprehensive studies in all arts fields for students at all levels of schooling as part of a broad and holistic education,
   • out of school experiences in all arts fields for a diversity of learners in communities,
   • interdisciplinary arts experiences including digital and other emerging art forms both in school and out of school;
   • 1. a (ii) Enhance synergy between the different aspects of development (creative, cognitive, emotional, aesthetic and social).” (UNESCO, 2010, p.3).

As mentioned above, art education today requires a comprehensive model that includes all aspects of learners’ development such as the creative, cognitive, emotional, aesthetic, social and other related aspects of children, young people and life-long learners. Therefore, it is reasonable to use a balanced model with a variety of disciplines that may include different aspects of the human being. For this we need interdisciplinary arts experiences to be included in order to meet the challenges and needs of art learners today. Furthermore, “the arts should be gradually introduced to learners through artistic practices and experiences and maintain the value of not only the result of the process, but the process itself. Furthermore, since many art forms cannot be limited to one discipline, the interdisciplinary aspect of arts, and the commonalities among them, must be given more emphasis” (UNESCO, 2006:7).

The Aims of the Study

There were two aims behind this article. The first aim was to provide a general historical review of the best-known models in art education in chronological order. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to review these art education models to identify key aspects of a new model for contemporary art education. The second aim was to suggest a model for improving the quality of teaching art which is based on multidisciplines associated with art education.
Method of Literature Review

In order to suggest a new model for art teaching and learning, it was necessary to do a survey of the literature review regarding the history of curriculum development in art education models. Therefore, theory-based research was used in this descriptive analysis article. The history approach was also used to help the author understand the historical development of art education and the underlying theory behind this development and suggest a new model accordingly.

Models Development in Art Education

The organisation of schooling and further education has been associated with the idea of a curriculum. In order to implement curriculum theory, it is necessary to develop models, which can be used for practical implementation of teaching in any subject (Al-Amri, 2005). The author regards these models as a bridge between curriculum theory and practice in terms of teaching art education in schools or in any art programme. Moreover, Figg (1989) sees models as a ‘map’ to help art teachers rationalise what they do and so they can justify their practice with confidence that might strengthen the place of art, craft and design in education.

In this article, the author gives an overview of the development of curriculum models in art education, which have helped prepare better teachers of art education. The author begins by reviewing the literature on art curriculum models.

Three orientations in art education curriculum programmes can be discerned from the literature: society-based curricula, subject matter-based curricula and child-based curricula. These three orientations seem to be broken down into a number of elements relating to specific emphases. According to Eisner (1972), there are three types of art education programme which can be categorised as studio-oriented programmes, creative design-oriented programmes and humanities or related arts programmes. These three types of curriculum orientation help demonstrate how the theory of curriculum models in art education has been shaped over time. As mentioned above, the model is a map or a bridge between theory and practice in art education; for this reason, the author of this article briefly reviews the best-known models in chronological order as mentioned in the Al-Amri study in 2005, and shown below.

Design-manufacture Model (1830s-1840s)

The first model is the ‘Design-Manufacture Model’, which was implemented in the 1830s and 1840s in the UK. This model focused on training potential designers and creating a design consciousness. It required knowledge of the principles of design. The system involved the drawing and measuring of straight lines to start with, progressing through to the copying of geometrical shapes (Robinson, 1989).

Memory Drawing Model (1897)

The above model developed into the ‘Memory Drawing Model’. This transition involved students in using their memories when trying to copy shapes, whereas in the previous model
they were copying without thinking or using memory. Robinson (1989) states that “Smith’s students viewed lantern slides of animals and had then to draw them from memory, as if from another viewpoint. His method, known as ‘shut-eye drawing’, was a way of impressing the form of the object on children’s minds” (p.14). It can be said that the two models above focus on copying and imitating art objects without any attention to students’ abilities and interests or creative self-expression.

Read’s Model (1943)

Herbert Read was an Englishman who wrote Education Through Art, which was published in 1943. It has been one of most significant contributions to art education in the world. Read’s model consists of three different aspects of teaching art. These components are as follows: first, self-expression, which meets the individual’s need through feelings, emotions and thinking, as well as through creative imagination; second, observation, which reflects the individual’s desire to record his/her impressions, to clarify his or her conceptual knowledge, to build up his/her memory, and to construct things that aid his or her practical activities; third, appreciation, which is the qualitative reaction to the quantitative results of self-expression and observation (Read, 1943). In fact, the Read model was seen as an effective model for art programmes until recently, especially when the programme focused on self-investigation in materials with connection to self-expression.

Lowenfeld’s Model (1947) (Child-Based Model)

The Child-Based Model was developed by Lowenfeld in 1947, building on the free expression in Read’s model. Lowenfeld’s idea was based on the artistic development of the child and psychoanalytic constructs. In this model, art is not the goal itself but rather a method for creative child development through the free expression of art making. One of most negative things about this model is the emphasis on the child without attention to the knowledge base (Lowenfeld, 1947). Of course, children’s feelings and personal expression should be considered and respected but as Benzer (2000) indicates, these components—children’s feeling and self-expression—are starting points for children’s art and not the end. This kind of criticism resulted in art educators starting to think about the knowledge base, with or without attention to a child-based theory, as is seen in the following models.

Barkan’s Model (1962)

In the USA, Barkan (1962) refers to Bruner’s book (1960) entitled The Process of Education, which focused on the structure of the curriculum, which should focus on a disciplines base. Therefore, Bruner’s idea of the curriculum disciplines began having an impact on art education; as a result of this, Barkan (1962) suggested that art history and art critique are also models of inquiry along with art production. As MacGregor (1985) states “Barkan’s proposal mentioned three roles for the student: producer, historian and critic” (p.23), however, the

---

2 Walter Smith was an Englishman who tried to develop the first programme in art education in the UK and then he was brought to the USA to develop the first required courses in art and to train teachers in its use (Chapman, 1978).
role of aesthetician was missing from the model, which can be regarded as a weakness of this model. However, the development of this kind of thinking can be regarded as the starting point for developing a curriculum based on these disciplines.

Chapman’s Model (1969)

In the USA also, Chapman’s paper (1969) was in many respects a refinement and a clarification of the theoretical structures that had been developed for the CEMREL model (Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory) and other models, as Efland (1989) points out. The basis for her model was the integration of the elements from earlier curriculum developments, such as Read (1943), Lowenfeld (1947) and Barkan (1962). Chapman’s model is based on a matrix consisting of two elements: functions of general education and the major goals of art education. As a result, she comes up with a model consisting of three major goals which are: (1) personal response and expression in art, (2) awareness of the artistic heritage, and (3) awareness of the role of art in society. From the author’s point of view, it can be said that this model is trying to make a balance between child-based models, by indicating personal expression in art, and the knowledge-based models, by demonstrating artistic heritage and the role of art in society. However, this model has not been implemented in practice although it can be said that Chapman’s model form is the basis for the CEMREL and DBAE models.

Eisner’s Model (1972)

Eisner (1972) supports the use of the model approach to curriculum development by stating that “the use of the model concept in teaching is a powerful one because much of what we learn from other people is by observing how they function and they feel when they do so” (p.182). Eisner defines three domains for art curricula models. They consist of the following components: the productive, the critical and the cultural. He also identified these domains as areas in which art educators can plan and develop art curriculum materials and learning activities. However, it can be said that this approach does not include aesthetics as a discipline in the art curriculum and this is seen as an on-going weakness in art curriculum development.

Cemrel’s Model (1977)

This model, established in the USA by the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) and widely known as CEMREL’s Model for Aesthetic Education, consists of the following four components: (1) The artist and his works, (2) The language of art, (3) The role of art in society, and (4) The artistic process and production. As Sevigny (1987) points out, the CEMREL model can be perceived to be an antecedent of Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE). During the 1970s, a number of books were published supporting this approach to teaching art, for example, Chapman’s Approaches to Art in Education (1978). However, this model was not implemented widely as part of the formal curriculum in the USA where other models, such as DBAE, made a strong impact with its references and applications to the school curriculum.
Allison’s Model (1982)

In the UK, Allison (1982) suggested a model for designing an art curriculum, which consisted of four domains, as follows: first, the expressive/productive domain, which is concerned with expressing art through the production of artwork; second, the perceptual domain, which focuses, according to Allison (1982), on “the development of skills which expand the capacities to see and, feel and comprehend form, colour and texture as part of the encounter with the visual/tactile environments and which are fundamental of aesthetic experience” (p.62); third, the analytical/critical domain, which concerns the skills of analysing, interpreting and evaluating aesthetic qualities in order to develop the capacities identified by Eisner (1972) as being the concern of this domain; fourth, the historical/cultural domain, which includes the context of the meaning of artwork, focusing on the historical/cultural as part of the artistic work (Allison, 1982). Allison thus includes the context of production in learning in addition to the artists and the artwork itself. It can be seen that there are some common elements between Allison’s model (1982) and Eisner’s model (1972). As Figg (1989) mentions, there seems to be a general agreement between the two models on the considerations which are embraced by these four domains.

Figg’s Model (1985)

Figg’s article (1985) entitled ‘A Curriculum Model for Primary School’ clarifies the relationship between the content and the student’s behaviour, which forms the basis of her model for designing curricula. Her model is based on the relationship between the student and the environment that surrounds him or her. Figg’s Model consists of a matrix, containing two headings: first, Objectives of Art Education and their Functions (commutation, expression, vision, appreciation, analysis and recording) and second, Content, which includes universal and local heritage as well as the elements, styles, materials and techniques of art making.

The First Generation of the DBAE Model (1980s)

Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) is a model developed in the USA with funding from the Getty Education Institute for the Arts. Allison and Hausman (1998) point out that:

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts [now called the Getty Education Institute for the Arts] was established in 1982. Its stated goal was to improve the quality and status of the visual arts education in the United States public schools. The Center provides support for an approach, which integrates content drawn from related disciplines: art making, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. These approaches have been called ‘Discipline-Based Art Education’. (p.123)

The DBAE approach goes further than simply trying to understand the artist’s works; it aims to improve quality of understanding through the study of four sub-disciplines: aesthetics, art criticism, art history and art production. The idea is that through these sub-disciplines, students become more observant, more conscious and gain a greater feel for art. Gilbert et al. (1989) argue that “The general goal for DBAE is a developed understanding of the visual arts for all students” (p.138). It is important to remember that this model is not a totally new approach but a development of the models outlined above. However, it has a new idea for
integrating the structures for teaching visual arts in schools. This model is widely implemented in schools in the USA and there are a lot of published articles that describe the nature of this model and how it could be implemented in different school settings and levels.


According to Lindstrom (1994), the Arts PROPEL project, supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, was started in 1985 and brought to its conclusion in June 1991. The purpose was to study artistic learning during the later elementary and high school years. The theoretical framework for the Arts PROPEL was based on Howard Gardner’s *Multiple Intelligence Theory (MI)*. According to Eisner (1998:19), “MI provides not only simply a justification for art in schools, but a framework for teaching art in a more comprehensive way in order to reach a greater range of students”. Furthermore, this project concentrated on three art forms: imaginative writing, music and visual arts. The development of these is seen to depend on the development and use of three competencies: production, perception and reflection. The name PROPEL is an acronym of production, perception, reflection and learning, and these components form the basis of the Arts PROPEL model. These competencies are important because, as Simmons (2001) suggests:

> Production, the creation of original art work, was the central concern, with process considered as important as product. Perception, a necessary complement to making art, involved observation of subject matter, investigation of materials, and the study of cultural resources including especially relevant artworks. Thus, art history and art criticism were not ends in themselves, but means to foster more informed and inventive art making…Reflection called for students to document their creative process in words and images. Reflections were often recorded in journals, but could also be written on reflection sheets, or even on the backs and borders of final work. (p.20)

Supporters of this model point to the emphasis on process as well as on product. The model integrates production with perception and reflection, allowing students to look, to talk, to write and to think as part of the process of creating works of art. Also it provides many opportunities for self-and peer-assessment as well as teacher-student assessment (Lindstrom, 1994).

**Art Model for the National Curriculum (England, 1990s)**

The Art and Design Model for the National Curriculum in England consists first of Investigation and Making, and second of Knowing and Understanding. However, in the author’s view, these two competencies do not reflect any specific disciplines in art, but are generic and could be employed in any other areas of a school’s curriculum. On the other hand, these competencies could, of course, be regarded as approaches to learning in and through art. Also, from these targets, it can be said that there are two general ways of engaging in the arts. Individuals can be involved in producing their own original work, and in responding to existing work. As the Arts in Schools project team (1990:8) indicates: “We refer to these two respectively as making and appraising. Both are of equal and fundamental importance in arts education”. In fact, making and appraising involve a number of related processes in-
cluding exploring, forming, presenting, responding and evaluating. These processes are related, according to the Arts in Schools project (1990), not only in terms of art making but also in terms of theory. This model for the National Curriculum in England has been developed to incorporate knowledge, skills and understanding. The model incorporates four competencies, which are: (1) Exploring and developing ideas, (2) Investigation and making art, craft and design, (3) Evaluating and developing work, and (4) Knowledge and understanding (The National Curriculum online: 2003).

The Second Generation of the DBAE Model (1990s-2004)

As a consequence of widespread criticism of the first generation of the DBAE model, and as a result of educational reforms in art education during the 1980s and early 1990s, the second generation of DBAE was developed. Many art educators, such as Wilson and Rubin (1997), Clark (1997), MacGregor (1997), Greer (1997) and Hamblen (1997, 1992-1993) saw the second generation of DBAE not just as an approach to instruction but also as an educational reform initiative, based on a consortium of change communities. Hamblen (1997) identifies some major changes in this model, such as: expanded and inclusive curriculum content, art instruction integrated with other subject areas, teacher-originated curriculum, variable approaches to assessment. There have been changes regarding art content in the second-generation DBAE, such as: (a) re-thinking on creative expression, (b) social consciousness and (c) multiculturalism (feminism, environmental responsibility, cultural pluralism, etc).

As a result, the content of DBAE not only derives from the four disciplines–art history, art criticism, aesthetics and art production–but also derives from a broad range of visual arts, including folk, applied and fine arts forms from western and non-western cultures, and covers a period from ancient to contemporary times. It also includes newer visual media, such as photography, film, video and the computer (Dobbs, 1998). However the DBAE’s model is complex in terms of practice for contemporary art education as identified by Dunn (1995), although it is a possible way to improve the quality of art teaching (Al-Amri, 2005).

From the above literature review, it is seen that the early models in teaching art focused on skills of art making without attention to the knowledge or the nature of the learners and then the changes have taken place in the forms of self-expression and child-based approaches which emphasised the individuality and uniqueness of the learners. As a result of art education reform, disciplines such as art history, art criticism and aesthetics along with art production have appeared since the early 1960s and shaped the teaching and learning of art practice since that time until today. However, limiting the teaching of art education by focusing only on some disciplines made art educators think of alternative approaches and suggest various ways of teaching and learning. Therefore, the author adopts a multifaceted approach to teaching art education today as a result of current changes in our global society. The model proposed in this article is influenced more by the core elements of the DBAE without limiting it to these elements only and leaves the door open to adopt other related disciplines as much as the situation of teaching art requires; this makes the suggested model different in scope and flexibility compared with teaching models of art that have been applied so far in art education.
The Suggested Model for Multidiscipline-based Art Education

In this theoretical article, the author is suggesting a model (Figure 1) for improving the quality of art education teaching. This conceptual model is based on the first and second generations of the DBAE theory, as well as on contemporary concepts related to current practice in art education.

In this model, each discipline should be taught as an essential component of contemporary art education and as a foundation for a cross-curriculum. Therefore, each discipline is regarded as a focal point to be focused on in each art programme. Someone might ask why we teach art education today in relation to these specific disciplines. From the author’s point of view, these disciplines reflect current trends in the field of art education, as well as a comprehensive approach to current practices.
As shown in Figure 1, this model consists of seven dimensions that represent the core principles for practising art education teaching. Therefore, there are four basic foundations for the art education curriculum, which are: Knowledge, Teacher, Student and Community. In order to teach art today, teachers, art educators and curriculum designers should look at these dimensions in equal measure. Moreover, there are eight core disciplines, which represent the basic disciplines of the first and second generations of the DBAE. These are: Art History, Art Criticism, Aesthetics, Art Production, Visual Culture, Multiculturalism, New Technology, Museum Education, and Related Disciplines.

Through a strong relationship between art on the one hand and other disciplines on the other, art educators should make a bridge with other related disciplines and integrate them as core concepts when we teach art education. These are divided into three dimensions.

The first dimension includes: Conceptual-Based Art Education, Knowledge-Based Art Education, Research-Based Art Education, Theory-Based Art Education, Behavioural-Based Art Education, Criticism-Based Art Education, Aesthetic-Based Art Education and History-Based Art Education.

The second dimension includes: Pragmatic-Based Art Education, Productive-Based Art Education, Psychological-Based Art Education, Community-Based Art Education, Economical-Based Art Education, Political-Based Art Education, Emotional-Based Art Education and Sensual-Based Art Education.

The third dimension includes: Group-Based Art Education, Collaborative-Based Art Education, Individual-Based Art Education, Minorities-Based Art Education (Migrants-Based Art Education), Human-Based Art Education, Global-Based Art Education, Regional-Based Art Education and National-Based Art Education.

The consequences of some of the above dimensions in teaching and learning could be summarised in Figure 2 as shown below.

![Figure 2: The Consequences of Some Dimensions in the Suggested Model](image)

From Figure 2, it can be seen that there are five inter-connecting dimensions of the suggested model. They can be considered as nested contexts each impacting on the other. For example, Individual-Based Art Education normally starts with a person as an individual focusing on
free self-expression and this individuality might include minorities or migrant groups. Each dimension could be expanded to include what could be taught regarding community-based art education and then art educators could consider what they could do in order to make art education broader toward national, international and global-based art education. The author briefly describes some dimensions of the suggested model in more detail, as shown below.

**Individual-based Art Education**

In this kind of art education approach, the author aims to acknowledge that everyone has different learning styles and ways of producing artwork. Individuality in this model is based on free self-expression in art as well as the artistic development of children, learners and artists. Therefore, feelings, interests and personal expressions should be considered and respected as an approach for stimulating creative practice in art education. Moreover, this component with other possible approaches should be seen as a starting point to acknowledge self-aesthetics awareness, knowledge and beauty of globalisation. As a result, the movement of teaching art should start from individuality toward social, regional and international perspectives. And freedom of expression is the key concern for activating this component of the current model. This model acknowledges the uniqueness and importance of a learner’s own way of practising art while addressing the transformative interactions between individual interests and global interests.

**Community-based Art Education**

As mentioned in Ulbricht (2005), the definition of community-based art education has several concepts, such as: organised community art programmes to develop artistic skills; programmes for empowering special groups such as children, parents, groups of artists, young people and/or groups with special needs; programmes that promote contextual learning about local art and cultural heritage; community service projects; or regarding public art itself as a form of community-based education. All these possibilities can be regarded as implementations of this dimension. Naidus (2008) also sees community art as engaging and connecting people with their feelings, their pasts, their dreams toward a creative dialogue between communities. As a result, Community-Based Art Education should consider what happens in and outside the classroom and what happens in the world of parents and communities in relation to what happens inside the school.

**Multiculturalism Art Education**

Multicultural art education is concerned with studying art from diverse cultural perspectives and different human contexts from different nations and cultures. Multiculturalism Art Education should be part of every art curriculum in any nation. This means that learners should embrace the concept of culture in their own lives, on campus and in the society in which they live, which requires a special method of and approach to teaching art with pure knowledge of a student’s own culture as well as cultures of the globe. In this component of the model, students attempt to expand and challenge their existing thinking, knowledge and attitudes toward more advanced levels of discussion and art production and reflection. According to the Road Map for Arts Education,
Any approach to Arts Education must take the culture(s) to which the learner belongs as its point of departure. To establish confidence rooted in a profound appreciation of one’s own culture is the best possible point of departure for exploring and subsequently respecting and appreciating the cultures of others. (UNESCO, 2006:7)

**Global-based Art Education**

This type of art education deals with all global issues and concerns in terms of visual art practices as well as global cultures. It allows for art educators, teachers and students at international level to cooperate in international groups to work together toward the aims of Global-Based Art Education. This kind of cooperation will transfer knowledge and implementation from world-wide good art education experiences. As Anderson (2010:4) emphasizes: “Today, we can’t afford a narrow tribal focus. The world is too small, too connected. Attitudes and actions are universal in their potential consequences”. He also emphasizes that we must become globally tribal as well as locally recognised and we must include all people rather than just people who are similar or live close to us. This opens the door to adopting new opportunities to cooperate in international groups to construct a global art community for art education practices. This dimension might include issues such as global citizenship and friendship, peace, cultural diversity and rapprochement of cultures. Global-Based Art Education will serve the Seoul Agenda in achieving the following action items:

3.d (i) Focus arts education activities on a wide range of contemporary society and culture issues such as the environment, global migration, sustainable development;
3.d (ii) Expand multi-cultural dimensions in the practice of arts education and increase intercultural mobility of students and teachers to foster global citizenship;
3.d (iii) Apply arts education to foster democracy and peace in communities and to support reconstruction in post-conflict societies. (UNESCO, 2010, p. 10)

**Human-based Art Education**

According to Anderson (2010:5) “This assumes that the aesthetic, which lies at art’s heart, can and should be used for therapeutic, administrative and educational purposes to promote equity and social justice with the goal of developing a global community and which moves beyond traditionally narrow disciplinary confines. If the central concern is to integrate art with human concerns, inquiry may be best centered on significant human themes across disciplines and media, leading where ideas and spirit and intuition take one”.

**Knowledge-based Art Education**

Knowledge is more than information or discipline. Knowledge is everything we have studied about art education including knowledge about art and knowledge of art which means including knowledge from history, criticism and aesthetics as well as knowledge of making art with references to techniques and the process of art production. Feeling is also the kind of knowledge art education should seek, and by understanding the modernism of feeling and responding to and for art, we could create a unique way of thinking which challenges students to develop skills in critical, creative and reflexive thinking. As a result of this component,
students will understand and recognise that there are multiple ways of knowing and constructing knowledge and that art is one important approach to understanding the world. One possible meaning of Knowledge-Based Art Education relates to human knowledge, experience, beliefs and behaviours in the form of visual art education.

**Research-based Art Education**

Research in art education is a kind of artistically relevant mode of inquiry which reflects the artistic modes of knowing for more effective research. Research-Based Art Education is a basis for investigating theoretical knowledge as well as practical knowledge. According to La Pierre (1997), the nature of research in art focuses on intuitive, spatial and concrete elements, which characterise the cognitive structures of artistic accomplishments. The nature of art itself is the difference between research in art education and other disciplines. As a result, the nature of learning activities in art education includes the creation of art, as well as reflecting the appreciation, observation, interpretation, critique and philosophising about creative arts. These characteristics of the nature of learning and teaching in art education have important implications for research methods in art. Accordingly, we could implement the idea of teachers as researchers or students as researchers. In this case, the researchers, teachers or students in art education are looking, thinking and observing from an artistic perspective.

**Emotional-based Art Education**

Emotional-Based Art Education is an approach that lines the learner’s mind with feelings and emotional matters. The emotional process is one aspect of human existence. Moreover, transmission of art education into artistic emotional practices within the current environment is becoming more essential, especially in transferring knowledge into emotional aspects toward moral behaviour in local and international societies. According to the Road Map for Arts Education (UNESCO, 2006:5), Damasio emphasises that:

> Emotional processing is an integral part in the decision-making process and works as a vector for actions and ideas, establishing reflection and judgment. Without an emotional involvement, any action, idea or decision would be based purely on rational terms. Sound moral behavior, which constitutes the solid grounding of the citizen, requires emotional participation.

According to the Road Map for Arts Education, today’s growth in art education should reflect a greater focus on emotional processes instead of developing only cognitive learning skills. Accordingly, art education today should seek to encourage emotional development with a balance between cognitive and emotional development in order to support the moral behaviours and different aspects of peace in the global environment.

This concept is related to other connected concepts, which are the creative economy and creative industry. As Stahle-Fraser (2010) argues: “We need to think differently and diverge from old ingrained approaches to investment and not just about artworks but about new and innovative ways to drive the new creative economy in many different sectors”.
Therefore, the transition to include the basic ideas of creative economy in art education curriculum will require some changes in the role of art education today toward a new transition of the creative manufacture art education model. This part of the model may give art education more tangible values for society.

**Conclusion**

In this suggested model, the discipline structure of art as a comprehensive approach includes objectives in traditional art disciplines of art education, but also incorporates art history, art criticism, visual culture studies, modern technology and creative self-expression as well as related disciplines. The various components of this model are indeed addressed as individual disciplines introduced separately; a cross-disciplinary approach is more appropriate as each discipline is just as likely to offer authentic contributions to art education today as themes explored and focuses on instruction for teaching in and through art education.

Therefore, while a multidisciplinary approach is presented as a model of art education, and art production is at its heart, its interdisciplinary nature allows for the integration of other discipline areas in exploring chosen themes of interest to be focused on teaching and learning matter.

By introducing this model, the author aimed to give both art teacher and students the flexibility to explore different aspects of different disciplines and themes that were of interest to them personally in the national, regional and global community. Moreover, the author encouraged both student and teacher to tie their selections to any discipline chosen to be focused on. The flexibility in this model means an ability to adapt new disciplines and themes related to art and the art education curriculum and to see possibilities of links within these disciplines and a willingness to find innovative relationships.

As a conclusion, this theoretical article has provided a general historical review of the best-known models in art education in chronological order. This was to identify key aspects of a new model for contemporary art education as suggested by this article.

Finally, this model can be regarded as a starting point for developing a new vision based on this Multidiscipline-Based Art Education Model, which may improve the quality of teaching art. To be effective, it requires changes in teaching methods and in teacher training; and creating interdisciplinary arts experiences partnerships. The suggested model is enhanced by successful partnerships between related disciplines in connection with art education aims and actions. However, this model should be implemented and evaluated to see its effectiveness. In general, it could be said that the Multidiscipline-Based Art Education Model is adequate to some degree, especially for resolving some social and cultural challenges facing the world today, but that, like all other models, it needs periodic and systematic examination and implementation. Furthermore, we should remember that a good art education discipline alone will never be good enough. It is enhanced by successful partnerships between related disciplines and strong relationships with focus on interdisciplinary arts experiences.
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