Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Primary Categories of Inquiry

Lovewell Institute and the Lovewell Method embody a philosophy that draws upon four primary categories of inquiry:

1. Interdisciplinary arts (including the disciplines of theatre, music, dance, design, film, and creative writing).

2. Education (including arts-based and nonarts-based).

3. Social sciences and psychology.

4. Creative process (including the spiritual and aesthetic aspects).

Each of these categories and subcategories has relevancy to Lovewell Institute's concepts and the Lovewell Method's procedures. This PDE/dissertation attempts to synthesize theories, ideas, research, and best practices gleaned from each of these categories. Although I have had substantial experience and training in each of these categories, it was not possible nor was it my intention to become an expert in every discipline contained in all of the categories. As I progressed through the process of writing this PDE/dissertation, I researched and read from the literature of each of these categories searching for the aspects that are applicable to the work being done by Lovewell Institute and through the Lovewell Method. Although some of the results of my inquiry into the relevant literature will be integrated throughout this entire PDE/dissertation, the following paragraphs will reflect the core of these findings.

Interdisciplinary Arts

Interdisciplinary art in its most basic form is reclaiming the lost art of "artistry." Artistry is taking responsibility for a creative work no matter what form it takes or what discipline or domain it requires. Interdisciplinary artistry is telling the stories of humanity

in the way they asked to be told, allowing the content to persuade the form. Of course, this kind of artistry needs to be grounded in fundamental knowledge of each discipline being engaged. This is not unusual in other domains. Before they specialize, medical doctors explore and train in various fields of science such as biology, physics, and chemistry, and attorneys study and combine various fields of law such as criminal law, real estate law, divorce, or maritime law. Some educational institutions are finally beginning to encourage cross training between various arts fields. Cross training in arts disciplines is one of the primary requisites for Lovewell staff and instructors.

In my research for this document, I discovered that there are no national or state standards for interdisciplinary arts. There is no national association for interdisciplinary arts. There are few assessment tools and not enough research aimed at the synergistic effect created by the commingling of the various art forms. There are only a few institutions of higher learning in America offering degrees in Interdisciplinary Arts. Among the notable ones are Columbia College in Chicago, Ohio University's School of Interdisciplinary Arts, University of Washington's Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Program, Lesley University, Northwestern University's Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences (Integrated Arts Program), and California Institute of Integral Studies.

These institutions and degree programs tend to specialize in various uniquely constructed combinations of arts concentrations such as film and media, paper arts and bookbinding, performance art and drama therapy, and Lesley University's innovative Creative Arts in Learning and Expressive Therapies Programs. Here is an illuminating quote from Northwestern University's (n.d.) Web site describing their Integrated Arts Program:

Philosophically, the Integrated Arts Program believes that making art provides a

> basis for its knowing. The program fuses knowing and doing, encourages a collaborative spirit among the students and faculty, and involves small classes and a remarkably individualized course of study. The program also encourages experimentation and risk taking and creates an environment conducive to both. (p. 1)

As director of the Interdisciplinary Arts Program at Nova Southeastern University (NSU), I am confronted daily with the challenges of explaining and justifying the academic and social benefits of this emerging field. I would welcome the opportunity to help establish a national association of interdisciplinary arts where like-minded artists, educators, and researchers can devise standards, share best practices, and design appropriate assessment and evaluation tools. Anderson (1995) shed light on the cultural value of integrated arts in his article *Rediscovering the Connection between the Arts: Introduction to the Symposium on Interdisciplinary Arts Education*:

> In the beginning, the arts were integrated with each other and with life. The modern Western conception of the arts as disciplines (for example, dance, painting, opera) did not exist. In the beginning, the arts were inseparable. They were artful objects and performance tied together in rituals and institutions that defined collective beliefs and values. They were not as some think today, a nicety, an overlay, an embellishment of high culture but ultimately of questionable necessity. Rather, they were seen as necessary and integral to the fabric of society. The arts, collectively, were the glue that held society together. (p. 11)

Later in the article, Anderson went on to say,

> In *Integrating the Arts: Renaissance and Reformation in Arts Education*, Phillip C. Dunn addresses opportunities presented to the arts in education as a result of

> reforms and concomitant educational strategies accompanying a broadening conception of the nature of intelligence. Dunn suggests two approaches--the interdisciplinary arts approach and the integrated approach--to address cultural diversity, modernist and postmodernist content, and issues of freedom and responsibility. He suggests that interdisciplinary arts teachers, like elementary teachers, should be trained as broad generalists who understand and use linkages between the arts. (p. 12)

Experts in the field of interdisciplinary arts seem to be suggesting that entering the field invites expanded thinking and extended boundaries. Irwin and Reynolds (1995) helped clarify this point in their article, *Integration as a Strategy for Teaching the Arts as Disciplines*:

> The major argument in the controversy surrounding teaching through disciplinary or interdisciplinary studies is that disciplinary knowledge is substantively different from integrative knowledge. Consequently, proponents of discipline-based knowledge often argue that disciplinary knowledge is more valuable than interdisciplinary knowledge, just as proponents of integrative curricula argue that interdisciplinary knowledge is more valuable than disciplinary knowledge. . . . Given the contextual nature of determining the breadth and depth of knowing in an area of knowledge, it seems timely to reconsider interdisciplinary or integrative studies as ways of moving beyond rigid conceptions in an effort to include emerging constructions of knowledge. . . . While disciplinary knowledge is guided by containment metaphors, integrative studies are characterized by metaphors of relatedness and pathways. For instance, it's not uncommon to hear words such as connectedness, connections, relatedness,

relationships, and process in our discourse about integration. (p. 17)

Later in the same article, Irwin and Reynolds (1995) described the unique role the arts play as one of the four major areas of study (humanities, sciences, fine arts, and practical arts) offered in the curriculum guide for the province of British Columbia, Canada. In the following quote, they referred to producing a musical theatre production as an interdisciplinary arts learning experience:

> Because curriculum guidelines for all subjects and all levels for the province of British Columbia are grouped into four broad areas, one of which is called fine arts, connections may be made among art, music, drama, and dance in authentic ways. Specific learning within each arts discipline is, however, still honored. Where it is appropriate to learn in a sequential and content-specific manner in one of the arts, this is done before connections are made among the broad field of experience outlined as the fine arts. An example of the above position is the launching of a musical theatre production. Each of the art forms involved needs to address discipline-specific content before embarking upon the production. Once plans are in place, then disciplinary knowledge-based aspects should be learned (separately) within the production before the final production is integrated and synthesized. (p. 16)

Although I have no information regarding the effectiveness of the program, this description serves as a good example of how the Lovewell Method maximizes the interplay between interdisciplinary arts and discipline-specific art. Lovewell Institute contributes yet another dimension to the experience by guiding students through the process of creating the content (themes, dialogue, lyrics, script, visuals, and choreography) before implementing the production. Irwin and Reynolds (1995) placed

this kind of educational approach within a solid contextual foundation when they further stated, “The third epistemological position follows Dewey in the belief that students should construct their own connections among subjects through problem-solving experiences” (p. 16). Lovewell Institute staffs all programs with a balanced variety of artists representing theatre, music, dance, and visual design. The Lovewell Method draws on each of these disciplines and offers training and experience in each.

The Lovewell philosophy also endeavors to help illuminate a broader perspective that the creative process applies not only to traditional artistic disciplines but also to other fields. Eisner (2002) described this new vision of how our culture could reframe the concept of art:

> The contours of this new vision were influenced by the ideas of Sir Herbert Read, an English art historian, poet, and pacifist working during the middle of the last century. He argued and I concur that the aim of education ought to be conceived of as the preparation of artists. By the term artist neither he nor I mean necessarily painters and dancers, poets and playwrights. We mean individuals who have developed the ideas, the sensibilities, the skills, and the imagination to create work that is well proportioned, skillfully executed, and imaginative, regardless of the domain in which an individual works. The highest accolade we can confer on someone is to say that he or she is an artist whether as a carpenter or a surgeon, a cook or an engineer, a physicist or a teacher. The fine arts have no monopoly on the artistic. (p. 4)

One of the primary challenges facing our cultural community is how to design balanced programs that mix, consolidate, and blend the separate elements of the artistic,

the social, and the educational realms into an "interdisciplinary package" that does not dilute or compromise the integrity of any of the discrete elements. In the spring of 2002, the Surdna Foundation released a research report entitled *Powerful Voices: Developing High-Impact Arts Programs for Teens*. The Surdna Foundation reported,

> Through this interim look, we learned much about the design, effectiveness, and impact on young people of extended art-making experiences with artists of stature. Overall, the evaluators found that the best work takes a holistic approach to the creative development of young people, combining a search for significant artistic development with purposeful development of individual life skills. (Forward, ¶ 2)

It was explained in the report that it

> includes a range of qualitative and quantitative data about the Arts Program, detailed case studies that illuminate the dynamics of successful programs in action, contextual information--from the fields of education, sociology, and the arts, and recommendations for future action. (p. 3)

In reflecting on the Surdna Foundation (2002) report, I realized that not everyone in a holistic arts education organization needs to have identical goals to assure effective programming. It was pointed out in the report that although adult staff and artists find value in teaching and learning a combination of artistic and social skills, teenage students find value exclusively in learning the arts-related skills. The needs of the staff and the students are at least parallel and complementary. I have observed this phenomenon with Lovewell Institute's artist/staff and teenaged students. The creative energy and emphasis on cooperation seem to create an embracing atmosphere wherein teaching and learning take place on various levels of interest simultaneously.

The Surdna Foundation (2002) convened focus groups made up of arts program staff and artist-leaders in four cities across America. These focus groups identified certain key issues and challenges facing established teen arts programs. One popular issue shared by all the groups is frustration with a dangerous field-wide misunderstanding of the "Artistic Versus Social Mission" controversy. Lovewell Institute deals with this issue on a regular basis. The following is from the Surdna Foundation report:

> Asked to discuss what distinctions they made between "social" arts programs that provide "safe havens" and those that focus on serious and progressive artmaking/performance, Focus Group participants asserted that they viewed them as essentially linked: acquisition of life skills deepens a student's artistic skills and acquisition of artistic skills deepens a student's life skills. "I didn't start with a social agenda," said an artist who works with economically disadvantaged teens. "It was really about artistry. It was about my work as an artist, and I needed the kids to help me, rather than vice versa." (p. 9)

The Surdna Foundation report went on to say,

> Focus Group participants reported that this seamless relationship between artistic excellence and work in community building is less widely acknowledged within the broader artistic arena--and sometimes even within their own institutions. The misperception persists that the interweaving of artistic and "social development" goals undermines artistic quality. (p. 9)

The current revolution in the way we gather and process knowledge has allowed the many passionate voices of arts, social, and educational reform to galvanize into a powerful community of like-minded advocates with an ever-clearer mission. Part of that mission is to prove that a nurturing creative environment (arts education) often produces

good art (aesthetics) and, in the process, creates a more enlightened community (social action). Paralleling that continuum, one could hypothesize that systemically a more compassionate and holistic approach to education could generate happier and healthier humans who would, in turn, create a more peaceful and successful global society.

Interdisciplinary art necessitates a deep involvement with the individual disciplines out of which it was born. The vast literatures of music, theatre, dance, and design have provided the foundation stones on which interdisciplinary art is built. Chapters 4 through 9 describe some of my experience with these discipline-specific bodies of literature and a few of the people who helped create them.

Through my research on this subject, I have come to realize how and why my life's journey has led me straight to interdisciplinary art and to the founding of Lovewell Institute. No other occupation could elicit the passion I have for my work. I am deeply fulfilled and enriched by composing, writing, researching, stage directing, and teaching those skills. These creative activities have blurred the line between work and leisure--between profession and hobby--and sometimes between the realities of art and the realities of life. But this is what interdisciplinary artists do. We create realities that tell the stories we literally must tell. History has shown us that these stories expressed through art are the artifacts and archives that ultimately define and preserve a civilization.

Education

There has never been a greater need for meaningful education and further research into new and innovative teaching and learning delivery methods. The current trend in education is to "drill and kill" with tedious exercises in math, science, and reading. The primary tool being used to implement this trend is fear of failing the tests and the "consequences" for not adhering to this rigid and forced approach to learning (regardless

of the learning styles, innate proficiencies, or motivating interests of the students and teachers). A need clearly exists for alternative approaches.

Sikes (1995), Assistant Director of the Arts Education Program at the National Endowment for the Arts, helped articulate this challenge in the following statement from his article in the *Arts Education Policy Review*, "From Metaphoric Landscapes to Social Reforms: A Case for Holistic Curricula":

> Homelessness and drugs, gang warfare and violence, and the physical devastation of housing projects compete for headlines with tales of child abuse, spouse abuse, and chronic welfare dependency. . . . no region and no city has been immune to the social problems of poverty; violent crime; ethnic strife; racism; and their eternal handmaiden, ignorance. While the arts might seem at best tangential to some of these problems, the loud music from boomboxes and passing cars, the gang graffiti on the walls of buildings, and the torn posters peeling from the walls of ancient row-houses tell a different tale. (p. 27)

The U.S. Department of Education's Digest of Educational Statistics (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005) reported that in 1998, the total funding for American Public Education was $325,976,011,000 for a total kindergarten-Grade 12 (K-12) enrollment of 51,610,806 students. This indicated that we spent an average of $6,316.04 per student in 1998. Even though teachers are generally underpaid and many schools are crumbling, it is clear that the fundamental problem with our educational system is not necessarily lack of funds, as many politicians would lead their constituents to believe. Some educators are proposing that it is more a lack of vision, insight, and enlightened leadership that renders our educational system ineffective and out-of-touch with the diverse learning styles of students and the real needs of our culture.

The debate among educational reformers has recently focused on clarifying the fundamental definition of what constitutes "intelligence." Due, in part, to the work of Gardner (1993, 1999) and his research on multiple intelligence, the education establishment is beginning to recognize the need to expand the standard definition of intelligence and develop strategies for addressing learning styles other than the traditional "verbal-linguistic" and "logical-mathematical" view of intelligence. Arts education will be a major beneficiary of this new information and one of its most powerful delivery systems. Those of us in the trenches of arts education have long known that many children who excel in arts programs often perform poorly in school or on standardized tests. We know their academic assessments do not accurately reflect the reality of their skills, competencies, and authentic intelligence. Our frustration stems from the fact that in the classroom or studio, we experience our students' true intellectual capacity, but we struggle with how to translate it into data or statistics that will be recognized and honored by the educational system. These students are slipping through the cracks. The system has no way of identifying or acknowledging their intelligence and so it goes unacknowledged.

In *Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development*, J. Catterall (as cited in AEP, 2002) addressed how the arts affect students falling through the cracks of public education:

> Feelings of competence and engagement can impact outlook and approach to schoolwork more generally--and research on the arts finds impacts showing both increased attendance and fewer discipline referrals. And the limited number of studies we found addressing special needs populations show that arts activities associate with particularly important outcomes: writing and reading skills, and (of great importance to struggling learners) sustained attention and focus. (p. 1)

The success of the education reform movement will depend not only on its ability to identify and address the true nature of intelligence but also how to achieve a balance with the other three essential intelligence components of the whole human: body, emotion, and spirit. I believe that imparting this balance is one of the real strengths of the Lovewell Method and at the core of the argument supporting the educational and social applications of interdisciplinary arts in general. With more single-family and two-career households than ever before, schools and teachers are being called upon to impart values, behavior standards, emotional guidance, and physical care-giving *in addition* to providing an education.

This situation poses an enormous challenge to the educational system in meeting the current needs of a new society. Is it possible for schools to devise a feasible plan to hand back some of that responsibility to the parents, the community, or possibly new partnerships with social programs? This would require strategic planning on a systemic level like our society has seldom seen. Local school districts, governmental departments of education, community and social service agencies, churches and religious groups, corporate leaders, parents and citizens will need to communicate, strategize, and collaborate on deeper and more meaningful levels than they ever have in the past. There is no way to calculate the massive mutual benefits that could result from this kind of cooperation and common-goal strategic planning.

Theatre, a journal published by the Yale School of Drama, asked Pulitzer Prize and Tony Award-winning playwright Tony Kushner and other artists and community activists engaged in theatre for social change to answer the question, “How do you make social change?” Kushner (2001) responded,

All art of every sort changes the world. Perhaps an artist aims at less direct,

> precise, immediate an effect than a president or legislator or banker or activist will have; but more effect, more potency, more agency than the ordinary is inevitably an artist's aspiration, and artists who choose to deny that are simply kidding themselves. Art is not merely contemplation, it is also action, and all action changes the world. (p. 1)

Later in the article, Kushner went on to say as follows:

> We have an unprecedented opportunity for growth here. We have a chance to put to use all the research that artists have been conducting in prisons, hospitals, shelters, schools, hospices, and communities. This is the moment to gather that knowledge together and turn it into wisdom. Whatever it takes, if we end this decade with a solid theory of art for social change, I say that's a good thing. (p. 3)

Why then, with the need for arts education programs rising, is the funding for the programs dropping? While educational funding for the arts suffers, general funding directly to the arts is also in danger. These dollars are critical to the future of the arts in America. Kinzer (2002) summed up this trend in his article in the *New York Times* stating that, "After years of steady expansion, public funding for the arts has begun to drop substantially as a long economic boom ends" (p. E2). In this article, he detailed budget cuts in arts programs recently occurring in Minnesota, California, Massachusetts, and Georgia. Kinzer went on to say that alarming cuts are also being made at city and county levels in such traditionally arts-friendly areas as New York City, Buffalo, and Seattle's King County. Though funding for the arts is not a major theme of this discussion, it affects everything Lovewell Institute does. Arts leaders and organizations are being forced to get more creative in devising ways to survive financially. Social entrepreneurism is a new field that endeavors to do just that. The Manchester Craftsman's

Guild in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, has been very successful at funding their own programs by earning revenue from the products produced through their arts workshops. Lovewell Institute has much to learn from the recent developments of social entrepreneurism.

Whether it is constructivism (Phillips, 2000), problem-based learning theory (Boud & Feletti, 1991), John Dewey (Campbell, 1995), Steiner (1923), Piaget (1977), Sizer (2004), or Montessori (1948/1976), the historical foundations are solid for methodologies centered on experiential interdisciplinary learning and learner-sensitive pedagogy. These pioneers in education have looked outside the traditional classroom for new learning methods. They have proposed creative ways of engaging students on their own terms and in the learning styles of their own discretion. The academic argument of disciplinary versus interdisciplinary methods ultimately may not have much significance because all incoming data eventually becomes integrated in the mind of the learner according to his or her discrete integrative brain patterns.

I recently took the Hermann Brain Dominance Inventory (Hermann International, 2000) and a subsequent workshop on interpreting my profile. It was reminiscent of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Briggs-Myers, 1977) and the subsequent workshop I took almost 10 years earlier. The Hermann Brain Dominance Inventory research materials indicate that the basic profile of an individual changes very little, if at all, during a person's lifetime. The results of both inventories indicated the same phenomena--that my psychological type functions best in the creative, intuitive, and conceptual interdisciplinary quadrants. These inventories confirmed what I already knew and that my profile has not changed much since I was a child. I am certainly not suggesting that all education be reframed as interdisciplinary but strongly suggest that the option be

available to those who learn most successfully through those expansive and inclusive methodologies that embrace creativity and address individual learning styles.

Gardner (1999) addressed the educational importance of the arts and humanities and how they can foster individuality:

> Everyone acknowledges the importance of science and technology, but it is also important to remember the necessity for the arts and the humanities. The sciences deal with general principles, universal laws and broad predictions; the arts and humanities deal with individuality. We learn about seminal historical figures in their individuality; we explore the psyches of diverse (and often perverse) characters in literature; we gain from artists' and musicians' reflections on their own emotional lives through their works. Every time we are exposed to a new individual--in person or in spirit--our own horizons broaden. And the possibilities of experiencing different consciousnesses never diminish. The humanist of classical times said, "Nothing human is alien to me"; and the saga of individual consciousness cannot be reduced to formulas or generalizations. (p. 218)

The concept of digging deeper into our creative consciousness for simple answers to difficult questions is encouraged and cultivated through the Lovewell Method. It is curious that public education has not put more emphasis on curricular approaches to creativity. Csikszentmihaly (1997), former chairman of the University of Chicago's Department of Psychology, addressed this subject in his book, *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*:

> You would think that given its importance, creativity would have a high priority among our concerns. . . . And what holds true for the sciences, the arts, and for the economy also applies to education. When school budgets tighten and test scores

> wobble, more and more schools opt for dispensing with frills--usually the arts and extracurricular activities so as to focus instead on the so-called basics. This would not be bad if the "three-Rs" were taught in ways that encouraged originality and creative thinking; unfortunately, they rarely are. Students generally find the basic academic subjects threatening or dull; their chance of using their minds in creative ways comes from working on the student paper, the drama club, or the orchestra. So if the next generation is to face the future with zest and self-confidence, we must educate them to be original as well as competent. (pp. 11-12)

By encouraging individuality and originality, the Lovewell Method invites the involvement of a wide variety of learning styles and diverse *intelligences*. Going inward to examine the realms of one's humanness is a primary objective of the Lovewell Method. In discussing the connections between multiple intelligences, self-examination, and educational goals, Gardner (1999) stated,

> Education in our time should provide the basis for enhanced understanding of our several worlds--the physical world, the biological world, the world of human beings, the world of human artifacts, and the world of the self. People have always been interested in these topics; contemporary disciplines have reworked insights from mythology, art, and folk language. (p. 158)

Much has been written about the academic value of specific arts disciplines. In his dissertation, *Perceived Contributions of Educational Drama and Theatre: A case study of Lovewell Institute for the Creative Arts*, Yoon (2000) discussed some of the academic benefits of educational theatre that are reflected in the Lovewell Method:

> There are 5 major benefits derived from educational drama and theatre: aesthetic, pedagogical, psychological, social and vocational. . . . Pedagogical benefits,

> according to Goldberg (1974), are the development of language skills and independent thinking. Through theatrical activities which involve various types of language practices, youth can develop their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills (Brizendine & Thomas, 1982; Silverman, 1983). McCaslin (1980) considers independent thinking as a particular value of educational drama and theatre since the creative product "is composed of the contributions of each individual and each member is encouraged to express his own ideas and thereby contribute to the whole." (pp. 15-16)

The Lovewell Method stresses the importance of balance between the mind, body, and spirit. Volumes have been written about the relationship between these three core elements of humanity. In the act of conceiving, writing, and physically acting out their own stories, Lovewell students absorb and internalize the content. In *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, Gardner (1983) discussed this delicate balance in educational terms:

> Skilled use of one's body has been important in the history of the species for thousands, if not millions, of years. In speaking of masterful use of the body, it is natural to think of the Greeks, and there is a sense in which this form of intelligence reached its apogee in the West during the Classical Era. The Greeks revered the beauty of the human form and, by means of their artistic and athletic activities, sought to develop a body that was perfectly proportioned and graceful in movement, balance, and tone. More generally, they sought a harmony between mind and body, with the mind trained to use the body properly, and the body trained to respond to the expressive powers of the mind. (p. 207)

Later on in his discussion, Gardner (1983) went on to say,

> A description of use of the body as a form of intelligence may at first jar. There has been a radical disjunction in our recent cultural tradition between the activities of reasoning, on one hand, and the activities of the manifestly physical part of our nature, as epitomized by our bodies, on the other. This divorce between the "mental" and the "physical" has not infrequently been coupled with the notion that what we do with our bodies is somehow less privileged, less special, than those problem-solving routines carried out chiefly through the use of language, logic, or some other relatively abstract symbolic system. . . . It is also worthy of note that psychologists in recent years have discerned and stressed a close link between the use of the body and the deployment of other cognitive powers. (p. 208)

The domain of education has much to gain from the arts. As a pioneer in the fields of education and psychology, Dewey (1934) laid the groundwork for using the arts in the classroom. Alexander (1987), in his book *John Dewey's Theory of Art, Experience and Nature*, summarized Dewey's position on intellectual expression through the arts and aesthetics:

> One does not have to read far in Dewey to discover the central emphasis he places on art and aesthetic experience. Art epitomizes the resolution of "hard and fast dualisms"; it is the "culmination of nature"; as intelligent action integrating means and ends, art is the "greatest intellectual achievement in the history of mankind"; art is not only the ultimate judgment on a civilization, it *is* civilization. Finally, as noted, Dewey himself acknowledges that the crucial test for any philosophy's claim to understand experience is its aesthetics. (p. 1)

The interdisciplinary arts could be a driving force in education reform. Part of

Lovewell Institute's mission is to offer practical experience, research, and opportunities towards this goal. Eisner (2002) offered encouragement and inspiration to educators who share his vision:

> Our destination is to change the social vision of what schools can be. It will not be an easy journey but when the seas seem too treacherous to travel and the stars too distant to touch we should remember Robert Browning's observation that "Man's reach should exceed his grasp or what's a heaven for." Browning gives us a moral message, one generated by the imagination and expressed through the poetic. And as Dewey said in the closing pages of *Art as Experience*, "Imagination is the chief instrument of the good." Dewey went on to say that, "Art has been the means of keeping alive the sense of purposes that outrun evidence and of meanings that transcend indurated habit." Imagination is no mere ornament, nor is art. Together they can liberate us from our indurated habits. They might help us restore decent purpose to our efforts and help us create the kind of schools our children deserve and our culture needs. Those aspirations, my friends, are stars worth stretching for. (p. 11)

Social Sciences and Psychology

The prevalence of national and international associations dedicated to various forms of arts therapies attests to the wide range of activity in the arts as applied in therapeutic and social settings. Some examples of these professional organizations are American Music Therapy Association, National Association for Drama Therapy, American Dance Therapy Association, American Art Therapy Association, National Association for Poetry Therapy, American Society of Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, National Expressive Therapy Association, Society for the Arts in

Healthcare, Arts and Healing Network, Art in the Public Interest, and Community Arts Network (CAN). These are just a few of the groups that represent the growing interest and involvement in the arts as an instrument for personal and social transformation. These organizations provide a wealth of information, contacts, resources, research, and best practices related to the way each arts discipline contributes to the health and well-being of individuals and our society. The interdisciplinary aspect of this movement is characterized by the National Coalition of Creative Arts Therapies Associations (NCCATA), an umbrella organization that advocates for the common goals of the various discipline-specific organizations. The NCCATA (2006) spoke about its mission:

> These therapies use arts modalities and creative processes during intentional intervention in therapeutic, rehabilitative, community, or educational settings to foster health, communication and expression; promote the integration of physical, emotional, cognitive and social functioning; enhance self-awareness; and facilitate change. Each member association has established professional training standards including an approval and monitoring process, a code of ethics and standards of clinical practice, and a credentialing process. Annual conferences, journals, and newsletters for each association foster professional development, as well as educate the public and allied professionals about each discipline. Although unique and distinct from one another, the creative arts therapies share related processes and goals. (p. 1)

The Lovewell Method employs techniques and activities derived from all of these disciplines. The unique phenomenon that occurs in the Lovewell classroom is how the disciplines all blend together to envelop the participants with a plethora of options that seem to spontaneously match up with their psychological, emotional, and intellectual

needs. For 20 years I have watched this occur in workshop after workshop and still grasp for words to describe how it happens. This is the same phenomenon that so appeals to many students, parents, psychologists, artists, and educators who experience a Lovewell project but have difficulty expressing the "how" of it.

I am convinced that part of this phenomenon is due to a number of factors that occur simultaneously in the Lovewell learning environment. Students are encouraged to use their own experiences as the basis for their artistic contributions. The staff is trained to build the Lovewell projects around the students' personal experiences by placing them within a social and aesthetic context. This consequently creates an atmosphere of openness, candor, and vulnerability wherein personal issues, social issues, and artistic issues commingle. There is often a palpable sense of excitement and discovery surrounding Lovewell projects.

Csikszentmihaly (1997) shed more light on how this synergistic phenomenon might help pave the way for solving social and psychological problems:

> Creative problems generally emerge from areas of life that are personally important. We have seen that many individuals who later changed a domain were orphaned as children. The loss of a parent has a huge impact on a young person's life. . . . Unless one finds words, ideas, or perhaps visual or musical analogies to represent the impact of the loss on one's experience, it is likely that the parent's death will cause violent pain at first, a generalized depression later, and with time its effects will disappear or work themselves out unconsciously, outside the range of rational control. (p. 365)

By giving a voice to aspiring artists from a wide variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, the Lovewell Method helps identify and confront difficult issues. Csikszentmihaly (1997)

continued as follows:

> Other problematic issues in early life include poverty, illness, abuse, loneliness, marginality, and parental neglect. Later in life the main reasons for unease may involve your job, your spouse, or the state of the community or of the planet. Lesser concerns may derive from a temporary threat: the scowl of a boss, the illness of a child, the change in the value of your stock portfolio. Each of these is likely to interfere with the quality of life. But you will not know what ails you unless you can attach a name to it. The first step in solving a problem is to find it, to formulate the vague unease into a concrete problem amenable to solution. (pp. 364-365)

During the pioneering days of establishing Lovewell Institute, I began keeping a file on arts-related "community building" and personal development programs. I was interested in finding out who believed as I did that arts education was one essential piece of a much larger puzzle that pictured the whole child, the whole family, and the whole community as inextricable parts of each other and possibly a holistic reality that could improve the quality of life and help sustain a thriving culture.

One group that successfully blends arts education with social action is known as City at Peace. It was formed in 1989 out of the vision of Esther Cilveti and her experience with a cultural exchange program in the Soviet Union sponsored by the Peace Child Foundation. Her vision involved creating a domestic project called City at Peace in her hometown of Rochester, New York. Peace Child changed its name to Creative Response in 1992 and went out of business in 1994 due to financial difficulties. Out of the ashes of that organization sprang City at Peace (2002) which stated its mission to be as follows:

> City at Peace, Inc. is a local youth development organization located in Washington, DC that uses the performing arts to teach and promote cross cultural understanding and non-violent conflict resolution. With an emphasis on youth-led programs and artistic excellence, the organization challenges participants to affect positive community change in pursuit of a city at peace. (p. 1)

This is a good example of a vision of creative process, educational reform, and social action catalyzing and evolving a new synergistic domain that stretches the boundaries of each field while furthering the understanding and practice of a new brand of interdisciplinary thinking. The limitation specific to City at Peace, from my point of view, is that its primary agenda of "world peace" constrains the scope of artistic and personal self-expression. If a child needs to express the truth of his or her abusive, traumatic, or violent personal situation, sometimes the child does not yet see peace as the solution and is perhaps not fully aware of the real conflict that the organization wants them to resolve. Sometimes survival or self-protection is as far as the abused child can see. Those needs must be expressed first--the fires at home must be put out before the world's fires can be fought.

In the Lovewell process, a form of therapy is achieved through facing and expressing the truth of the pain in abusive or unacceptable situations. Confronting a personal truth is more important to the Lovewell process than imposing an arbitrary resolution to an abstract problem. The Bauen Camp is an arts education program for teens built around a distinctly different educational and social mission than City at Peace but equally important. A letter from J. Holt (personal communication, October 10, 2003), The Bauen Camp's Executive Director, inviting Lovewell to join the Bauen Coalition explained,

> Using playwrighting, theatre games, improvisation, creative movement and object making, the session will teach youth how to use the arts to develop and present a community gathering that responds to the issues of wilderness and conservation. The public gathering will be held in the Kerns Wildlife Habitat directly adjacent to the [Bauen] Camp.

Later in the letter, J. Holt went on to say, "The Bauen Camp endeavors to build a camping community that is creative, diverse, socially responsible, ecological, democratic, and nurturing."

In a phone conversation with J. Holt (personal communication October 15, 2003), I became aware that here is an arts lover who owns a ranch in the beautiful Wyoming wilderness and realizes the power of the arts to convey important messages to young people. She knows how to provide kids with the kind of hands-on lasting emotional experience that occurs when the splendors of nature ignite passions and inspire aesthetic statements. J. Holt has harnessed that phenomenon and made it available to young people in need of meaningful life-affirming experiences. I look forward to continuing a dialogue with J. Holt and, as she suggested, search for a way for The Bauen Camp and Lovewell Institute to collaborate on future projects.

In discussions with the Executive Directors of Peace Child and The Bauen Camp regarding the missions and goals of our respective organizations, I came to understand one of the fundamental differences between Lovewell and other creative arts education programs. Lovewell's methodology does not enforce a philosophical, religious, moral, or social agenda on the young artists. This allows for themes to emerge unencumbered from the individual minds, hearts, imaginations, and souls of the participants. In the Lovewell Method, the only rules of thumb in this area are that the message be of personal value to

the artist and that the message be delivered artfully with the utmost regard for freedom of expression. Collaboration is more difficult under these circumstances because the theme and subject matter must be arrived at collectively instead of being prescribed by the sponsoring organization or funding source.

I admit there have been a very few times when, because of restricted funding sources or influential parents or social program leaders, I have reluctantly been willing to experiment by imposing an agenda on a group of young artists in a Lovewell context. It never worked very well. It seemed to me that we were risking turning out young proselytizers instead of self-realized creative artists. Normally, in these situations, the returning Lovewell students and staff will resist any attempt to limit their artistic freedom. This is in no way a value judgment on arts programs that have a specific social or moral agenda. It is a practical observation that helps me shape and refine the pedagogy and procedures that guide the Lovewell methodology. This connects with the Surdna Foundation's (2002) findings mentioned earlier wherein all the students (unlike the staff) were interested exclusively in the art, not in the social agenda of the program.

It is the very process of resolving the "give and take" in arriving at a consensus on the theme and subject matter that gives the Lovewell students a sense of what synthesis is all about. In discussing pros and cons and assigning the polemics to characters that subsequently explore the many viewpoints of the issues being considered, Lovewell students learn to listen, to communicate, to collaborate, and to expand their thinking on matters that are of interest to them and their peers.

Americans for the Arts (2003) is becoming a powerful new force in shaping the future of arts education and community arts initiatives in America. It was created in 1996 in a merger between the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies and the American

Council for the Arts. On their Web site, they refer to themselves as the preeminent arts advocacy organization in the nation sponsoring high-profile annual events such as Arts Advocacy Day in Washington, DC, the National Arts Award Gala, the Nancy Hanks Lecture on Arts and Public Policy, Government Leadership in the Arts Awards, and the YouthARTS Resource Initiative. Americans for the Arts not long ago received an unprecedented donation of $120 million from philanthropist Ruth Lilly. It is currently canvassing its constituents on how to spend the money, a situation not common in arts circles.

Here is some of the relevant and illuminating statistical information provided by Americans for the Arts (2003) that I found reflected on their Web site:

> Young people who participate in the arts for at least three hours on three days per week through at least one full year are:
>
> 4 times more likely to be recognized for academic achievement
>
> 3 times more likely to be elected to class office within their schools
>
> 4 times more likely to participate in a math or science fair
>
> 3 times more likely to win an award for school attendance
>
> 4 times more likely to win an award for writing an essay or poem. (p. 1)

The Web site went on to report as follows:

> Young artists, as compared with their peers, are likely to:
>
> Attend music, art, and dance classes nearly three times as frequently
>
> Participate in youth groups nearly four times as frequently
>
> Read for pleasure nearly twice as often
>
> Perform community service more than four times as often. (p. 1)

Learning Through The Arts (LTTA; Royal Conservatory of Music, 2004) is a

relatively new organization that resembles Americans for the Arts but reflects a decidedly international viewpoint on creative expression and arts education. The Royal Conservatory of Music in Ontario, Canada, sponsors LTTA. It relies on a research-based instructional model and works closely with teachers and schools creating curriculum integration models, assessment tools, managerial expertise, program evaluation, and in-class facilitation. With 40,000 students in the program, LTTA is intent upon transforming Canada's educational landscape. With a heavy emphasis on professional development for teachers and strategic planning with artists, students, parents, and educators, LTTA reflects a spirit of cooperation, open-mindedness, and focused collaborative determination sometimes absent from American initiatives. It stands to reason that a country that has established an effective national health care system could also deliver an effective transformation of its educational system.

Gallery 37 (2003) Center for the Arts in Chicago has a unique angle on arts education and social transformation. According to their mission statement published on their Web site they endeavor to

> Provide meaningful employment and training in the arts to Chicago's youth, without regard to gender, race, family income level or physical ability; create a mentoring program between artists and established artists; increase public awareness of the importance of the arts and arts education; foster cultural awareness; promote partnerships of public and private organizations; increase employment opportunities for professional artists. (p. 1)

Gallery 37 (2003) clearly emphasized the "job training and placement" aspect of its mission. It was originally conceived in 1991 in urban Chicago as a summer jobs program. It now serves more than 4,000 youth and has been replicated in 15 American

cities as well as in the United Kingdom and Australia. Partnerships with the Chicago Public Schools and the University of Illinois have enhanced the scope and effectiveness of its programs.

Organizations such as Peace Child, The Bauen Camp, and Gallery 37 have built a reputation on focusing upon and fully utilizing arts education programs designed to carry out their respective agendas of peace, conservation, and artist employment. The leadership of each organization has identified and met the needs of artists, students, and their communities by being responsive to the resources available and creating programs that fit the unique opportunities offered in their area.

There are other organizations, initiatives, and passionate individuals out there meeting the challenge and making significant contributions to the emerging field forming at the intersection of art, education, personal growth, and community building. It is difficult to describe this holistic intersection because it reflects many perspectives based on the particular alchemical mix of the participants. What these organizations do is more than professional arts projects, it is more than arts education programs, and it is more than community arts initiatives. It is a tango of synergism and creativity.

Other entities involved in defining and meeting similar challenges are resource organizations such as the Kennedy Center's ArtsEdge Organization, Arts for Learning (Young Audiences), the Educational Theatre Association, the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts, the Creative Coalition, the Manchester Craftsmen's Guild, Community Performance, and One Community-One Goal. There are also some powerful smaller educational, social, and arts organizations such as the Desisto School, Artsgenisis, and Artserve. Some individual visionaries in these areas are Augusto Boal, Linda Frye Burnham, Kathleen Gaffney, Richard Geer (not the actor), Jules Corriere,

Leslie Neal, Teo Castellanos, and William E. Strickland.

The Lovewell philosophy has also been informed by the humanistic psychological theories of Maslow (1970) and Rogers (1951). Maslow's "hierarchy of needs" identified *self-actualization* as the highest level of need that allows humans to fulfill their potential. According to Maslow, this level embraces qualities such as creativity, beauty, wholeness, playfulness, self-sufficiency, and transcendence of opposites since they contribute to "peak experiences" as part of the journey to self-actualization. These are qualities that are nurtured within the Lovewell culture. Although the Lovewell experience is not currently positioned as a psychological practice or therapy, there are strong arguments for its therapeutic benefits.

Rogers' (1951) theory of "client-centered" therapy, with its emphasis on congruence, empathy, and respect, is a model for the way that the Lovewell Method achieves its goals of honest self-expression and artistic excellence. Roger's idea of "unconditional positive regard" for the client is the cornerstone of policy for the way Lovewell instructors interact with the students. The "fully-functioning" person, according to Rogers, is open to new experiences, living in the present moment, trusting of oneself, and willing to experiment and be creative. These qualities parallel the qualities embedded in the Lovewell process. The influence of Maslow and Rogers on the Lovewell Institute and Method will become apparent in the following chapters.

Creative Process

This following quotation, taken from *Creative Life* by Moustakas (1977), illustrates the guiding creative principle that I have experienced since I wrote my first song and saw my first play performed:

Our powers hear our own songs; they want to listen. If you do not sing your own

> songs, if you do not play your own music and speak your own words, if you do not live your own silences, then the powers within you will not know where to find you. They will not know how to work for you. (p. 30)

Over my lifetime, I have attempted to let these powers know where to find me and how to work for me. The students in Lovewell programs often experience this module of confidence as they discover their creative power for the first time. I remember as a teenager making the conscious decision to expand my creative powers. I even went as far as purchasing books on the subject. I do not recall any of them being a particularly interesting read compared to actually creating something, but the desire to understand the process and get better at it stayed with me.

The textbook I require for my Creative Process course at NSU is one of the most informative and enlightening that I have found on the subject. *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention* is actually a research project undertaken by Csikszentmihalyi (1997) mentioned earlier. This study is based on in-depth interviews with 91 individuals, average age of 60, from various fields who have been widely acknowledged for living lives of extraordinary creativity. The list includes such notable talents as Madeleine L'Engle, Ravi Shankar, Linus Pauling, Benjamin Spock, Jonas Salk, Eugene McCarthy, Kitty Carlisle Hart, Jack Anderson, Ed Asner, and Gunther Schuler. In describing the nature of creative process, Csikszentmihalyi (1997) stated,

> Creativity. . . is a process by which a symbolic domain in the culture is changed. New songs, new ideas, new machines is what creativity is about. But because these changes do not happen automatically as in biological evolution, it is necessary to consider the price we must pay for creativity to occur. It takes effort to change traditions. . . . If we want to learn anything, we must pay attention to the

> information to be learned. And attention is a limited resource: there is just so much information we can process at any given time. (p. 8)

Later in the chapter, Csikszentmihalyi (1997) went on to say,

> To achieve creativity in an existing domain, there must be surplus attention available. This is why such centers of creativity as Greece in the fifth century B.C., Florence in the fifteenth century, and Paris in the nineteenth century tended to be places where wealth allowed individuals to learn and to experiment above and beyond what was necessary for survival. It also seems true that centers of creativity tend to be at the intersection of different cultures, where beliefs, lifestyles, and knowledge mingle to allow individuals to see new combinations of ideas with greater ease. In cultures that are uniform and rigid, it takes a greater investment of attention to achieve new ways of thinking. In other words, creativity is more likely in places where new ideas require less effort to be perceived. (p. 8)

This quotation describes one reason why methodologies based on acceptance and collaboration are critical to a society that is so in need of renewal and regeneration. Csikszentmihalyi's (1997) book also reinforced the emphasis the Lovewell Method places on the awareness and importance of the *balance* between the creative arts and the interpretive arts as explained in chapter 1 and Appendix B. His thoughts further support the extraordinary effort Lovewell Institute puts into establishing a safe and nurturing environment in which creativity can flourish.

There have been numerous attempts to assess, quantify, and classify creativity. The Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (Torrance Center, 1993) is one of those attempts. In the test, subjects are asked to combine simple shapes into complete or partial pictures.

It is still largely dependent on only visual and linguistic applications of intelligence. Although tests and assessments may be informative on certain aspects of creativity, there seems to be an aspect of the creative process that continues to elude measurement--so far, the only definition we can attach to this aspect is mystery. Some cultures believe that mystery is a divine motivator, more to be danced with than conquered.

Here is what Moustakas (1977) had to say about this elusive and often mysterious aspect of the creative process:

> One lets go of the ordinary, the safe and familiar, of extraneous rules, of the system, and while the conscious controlling side is dropped, the most distinguished, undisclosed characteristics of the self shine forth. Then the individual is not determined by convention and routine, but by an unusual reality, by open senses that see for the first time. (p. 28)

Later in the chapter, Moustakas continued, “The creative cannot be scaled down to products, to facts, or observable data. It rides on the horizons and fills the heavens. It is incomparable and can never be subsumed under categories of production, definition, and logic” (p. 29).

Herbert A. Simon, a pioneer in artificial intelligence, won the Nobel Prize for Economics in 1978 and taught Computer Science and Psychology at Carnegie-Mellon University. Although he served on the faculty while I was a student, he did not teach either of my undergraduate psychology courses, but I did work with one his students on several artistic projects. Paul Newbury was a graduate computer science student involved in research and development of artificial intelligence and, having a great affinity for recording technology, helped me archive my original musicals on tape. This was my first opportunity to closely observe the artful intersection of creativity and technology. Paul

was thoughtful and creative and volunteered hours recording and mixing my music. He had great command over the recording and mixing equipment and would tell me what was technically possible and then allow me to test those limits with creative experiments. CMU has long benefited from Dr. Simon's visionary leadership and support of creativity. In my research for this discussion, I discovered an article by Simon (2001) in the *Kenyon Review* that expressed his unique perspective on creativity. It was entitled "Creativity in the Arts and the Sciences," and here is a short excerpt that I found relevant:

> Whereas there has been less cognitive research on creativity in the arts than creativity in the sciences, the picture of the creative process that emerges from the work that has been done is much the same in the two cases. . . . All of the evidence we have today about the creative process . . . argues that the processes that yield creative products are basically identical with the processes that human beings use in their daily thinking about all sorts of matters, simple and complex, mundane, and esoteric. We do not need a separate theory of creativity; at most we need a theory of the conditions under which the usual processes of human thinking are likely to produce something that is new and valuable or interesting. (p. 217)

This is where the recent work of Gardner and his friend Csikszentmihaly has become so important to the development of creativity in modern culture. They both have written about these "conditions" that encourage and enable humans to be creative. These are the conditions that the Lovewell culture endeavors to create. In addressing the relationship between intelligence and creative individuals, Gardner (1999) stated,

> By the time they are capable of carrying out work that will be judged as creative, they already differ from their peers in ambition, self-confidence, passion about

> their work, tough skins, and to put it bluntly, the desire to be creative, to leave a mark on the world. (p. 120)

In the same chapter, Gardner (1999) stated,

> Let me underscore the relationship between my definitions of intelligence and creativity. Both involve solving problems and creating products. Creativity includes the category of asking new questions--something that is not expected of someone who is "merely" intelligent, in my terms. . . . However, to understand the concept of creativity in its full-blown sense, one must look at people who have clearly affected domains: composers like Richard Wagner and John Lennon, writers like Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Virginia Wolfe, scientists like Marie Curie and Niels Bohr, moviemakers like Ingmar Bergman and Steven Spielberg. . . . I maintain that distinct progress occurred in the social science domain when the psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihaly proposed that we should not ask who or what is creative but, instead, ask where creativity is. (pp. 116-118)

It is significant to note here that one of Gardner's historical models of creative thinking, Richard Wagner, has also written about, theorized upon, and consciously expanded the technology of interdisciplinary arts, which he called Gesamtkunstwerk (total art work). In the theatre that was custom built for him and his new ideas by King Ludwig II of Bavaria, Wagner introduced numerous features that revolutionized the interdisciplinary aspects of opera--among these were an enlarged orchestral pit sunken below the stage instead of in front of it, a water trough large enough for gondola and swans to float between the audience and the action onstage, and huge cauldrons of boiling water that created "steam curtains" to mask the scene changes and allow the music and action to continue uninterrupted during the visual transitions (Gutman, 1968).

It is also significant that Gardner, Simon, and Csikszentmihaly all tended to make the assumption that although creativity is absolutely essential to a healthy society, it is more helpful to examine what creativity is and how to create a social environment conducive to creativity rather than to emphasize the personality traits and characteristics of creative individuals. This is from Gardner (1999):

> We do not know enough about creativity to be sure what predisposes one creator to become an influencer and another a maker, or why some solve problems, others create new theories, and still others become performers of a ritualized or high stakes, nonritualized form. I suspect that there is a connection between intellectual strength and mode of creativity. For example, those with an affinity for interpersonal intelligence are more likely to become influencers or performers. Those with strong logical-mathematical intelligence are more likely to become masters and theory builders. (p. 124)

Creativity does not seem to want to be captured and forced into a three-dimensional frame of reference. I would venture to say that the reason it is so difficult to construct effective research around creative process is that creative process *is* research. How can one pioneer without exploring all the aspects of the unknown territory? How can one venture out and attempt to create something authentic and meaningful without learning everything possible about the related subjects? The best way to learn about creativity is to create something. The Lovewell Method encourages teachers who teach the arts to continue making art. Composing music, writing dialogue and lyrics, directing original works, and being a part of various creative teams doing artistic projects are activities that keep me informed and enthused about teaching interdisciplinary arts. The passion that a teacher feels for the subject is often transferred to the student as

inspired and motivated learning. We all remember our teachers who were especially connected to the content they were teaching and, as a result, motivated us with the same enthusiasm.

What prevents someone from being creative? May's (1975) book, *The Courage to Create*, is a compilation of a series of lectures on creativity he delivered over the years at Harvard, Princeton, Yale, and the University of California. It is a seminal work in the exploration of the creative process. As a psychoanalyst, May was particularly sensitive to the deeper implications of the pathology of creativity, especially as it related to technology and to the serious potential for dehumanization of our culture as a result. May wrote about this intriguing subject:

> Such channeling of creativity into technical pursuits is appropriate on one level but serves as a psychological defense on a deeper level. This means that technology will be clung to, believed in, and depended on far beyond its legitimate sphere, since it also serves as a defense against our fears of irrational phenomena. Thus, the very success of technological creativity--and that its success is magnificent does not need to be heralded by me--is a threat to its own existence. For if we are not open to the unconscious, irrational, and transrational aspects of creativity, then our science and technology have helped block us off from what I shall call "creativity of the spirit." By this I mean creativity that has nothing to do with technical use; I mean creativity in art, poetry, music, and other areas that exist for our delight and the deepening and enlarging of meaning in our lives rather than for making money or for increasing technical power. (p. 68)

This issue of dehumanization through creative technology is of special interest to me, but as I further researched that area, I decided not to make it a major theme of this

discussion. It is a vast realm worthy of much further inquiry and dissertations of its own. It will undoubtedly be a theme in my postdoctoral studies. My point in citing May (1975) is the inevitable presence in creative process of what he calls creativity of the spirit.

Matters of the spirit are ever present in the worlds of art and creativity. Over the years, I have often personally wrestled with this issue, and Lovewell Institute and the Lovewell Method continue to explore ways of dealing honestly and effectively with the spiritual implications of art making and the creative process. Lovewell Institute is not in any way a religious organization. Students do get inspired as a result of the process, and religious barriers often dematerialize as unity consciousness naturally builds during the Lovewell experience. The Learning Meditations (as discussed in chapter 9) make Lovewell a target for those who are wary of possible veiled religious programs. They have every right to be cautious, and as a parent of four, I have exercised that right. The volatile process of addressing the human spirit in authentic arts education makes it extremely important for Lovewell Institute to clarify these issues as much as possible.

When I sensed that part of the effectiveness of the Lovewell Method included establishing a nurturing environment and an atmosphere of acceptance and mutual honor, I devised the Learning Meditations as a tool that enhanced creative flow and set the tone and energy for the working sessions. In a 1992 Kansas workshop, I dealt with concern from parents and arts executives over references in our script to tarot cards, Ouija boards, and palm reading. I was told that these things were used to communicate with the devil so I brought it up with the students. By the end of the damage control, most of the students decided that in their small and sensitive community, it was wise to cut all the "metaphysical references" out of the show. The Lovewell Method encourages freedom of expression and I pointed that out to them. But in this case, and to their credit, the students

decided they could express themselves without the references. Future projects would be different.

There is no religious agenda in the philosophy, mission, activities, materials, or policies of Lovewell Institute. There is, however, an undeniable connection to some related issues because of the nature of the creative process to the divine resources of the human spirit. To deny this truth would be to deny the integrity of the Lovewell Method. The challenge, therefore, is to allow the spiritual connections to occur without judging them or trying to make a ministry of them. Over the years, there have been several attempts by over-zealous staff members to make a personal ministry out of Lovewell. Those attempts have been resolved successfully by adhering steadfastly to the aesthetic core of Lovewell Institute's philosophy--the core of *creative process*.

Those experiences with religious enthusiasts taught me an important lesson about the Lovewell Method--that even though the process often opens the heart and liberates the spirit, Lovewell Institute must maintain an artist-driven identity. Spiritual connections made through the arts can transcend religious labels and theological categorization. I was recently awe-inspired on a tour of the Catholic cathedrals in Oaxaca, Mexico. I am not a Catholic, but the spiritual renewal I received from the sheer beauty of the art and architecture was unaware of religious credentials. In a meditation dome listening to a sitar playing ancient Hindu ragas, I was inspired in a way that could only be described as spiritual, but being so affected by the music did not make me a Hindu. I have had similar experiences in temples in Thailand, Japan, Italy, Peru, France, Germany, and Sweden under a host of diverse religious banners, and the art has always spoken directly to my spirit regardless of the culture, the language, or the nuances of the theology.

In November 2000, *American Theatre* devoted an entire issue to the relationship

between the art of theatre and spiritual experience. The opening quote of the feature article "The Spirit and the Flesh: Christianity, Judaism and the Theatre," was from an essay entitled "God on the Gymnasium Floor" by Kerr (2000):

> [The theatre] remembers, plainly, that it came out of a religious or ceremonial impulse, out of mythic rite, and sometimes out of god-induced ecstasy. To find itself again, to find a new way of being itself, it must go back to its sources, beyond Euripides as much as Albee, beyond form and even coherence into the dim intuitive gropings by means of which flesh became spirit and spirit flesh. (p. 17)

UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute recently conducted a study of 112,232 undergraduate students attending 236 diverse colleges and universities across the country entitled *The Spiritual Life of College Students: A National Study of College Students' Search for Meaning and Purpose* (Astin & Astin, 2004). The study was designed to help understand "how college students conceive of spirituality, the role it plays in their lives, and how colleges and universities can be more effective in facilitating students' spiritual development" (p. 2). The following statement is from the "Executive Summary" of this research project:

> The study revealed that today's college students have very high levels of spiritual interest and involvement. Many are actively engaged in a spiritual quest and are exploring the meaning and purpose of life. They also display high levels of religious commitment and involvement. As they begin their college experience, freshmen have high expectations for the role their institutions will play in their emotional and spiritual development. They place great value on their college enhancing their self-understanding, helping them develop personal values, and

encouraging their expression of spirituality. (p. 3)

These are the very issues the Lovewell Method addresses and weaves into the curriculum as outlined in chapters 9 and 10. At the present moment, most of our traditional educational institutions are not addressing these issues. Astin and Astin (2004), the principal investigators of the Spirituality in Higher Education Study, had more to say about America's institutional failure to meet students' needs in this area:

> The project is based in part on the realization that the relative amount of attention that colleges and universities devote to the 'exterior' and 'interior' aspects of the students' development has gotten out of balance . . . we have increasingly come to neglect the student's inner development--the sphere of values and beliefs, emotional maturity, spirituality, and self-understanding. (p. 1)

When the founders of the United States of America made the decision to separate the church and state, they did not imply separating the human spirit from public education. Lovewell Institute has developed innovative ways in which to deal with matters of the spirit within an educational context without getting into the controversy of church and state. The Learning Meditations (chapter 9) delve directly into these "interior" issues such as the meaning and purpose of life; the benefits of compassion; the questioning of personal values; and the development of emotional maturity, social awareness, and self-understanding.

The Yoon (2000) Study of Lovewell Institute

When I first met with Dr. Yoon in 1998 to discuss his proposed study of Lovewell Institute, I was deeply involved with the details of keeping an understaffed not-for-profit organization operating on a daily basis. I had little time to reflect on the history or academic significance of Lovewell Institute because I was consumed with the duties of

directing the workshops, recruiting, marketing, negotiating contracts, writing proposals and preparing budgets. I was pleased that someone felt that the Institute and our activities were important enough to be the subject of a doctoral dissertation. Dr. Yoon set up a formal interview with me in January of 1999 during which I answered questions regarding my relationship to the Institute as the founder, and my observations of the effects of some of the Institute's activities.

In his dissertation, *Perceived Contributions of Educational Drama and Theatre: A case study of Lovewell Institute for the Creative Arts*, Yoon (2000) focused on 22 formal scripted interviews with Lovewell staff members, former student participants, and their parents. The purpose of the study was to examine Lovewell Institute's perceived contributions to the academic, vocational, and social development of the participants in the Lovewell programs (Yoon, 2000). Yoon's study was limited to the perceptions of the interviewees and the materials available for review at that time (videos and printed material produced by Lovewell Institute).

Part of the value of the Yoon (2000) study is that it made it abundantly clear that further research was needed on this subject – research that explored the inner workings of the Lovewell Method and the philosophy and pedagogy on which it is based. Yoon's work was an inspiration for this study and a significant contribution to the literature shedding light on Lovewell Institute and the educational, social and vocational value of its programs.

Summary of the Literature Review

This study relies on the integration of these four primary areas of inquiry:

1. Interdisciplinary arts (including the disciplines of theatre, music, dance, design, film, and creative writing).

2. Education (including arts-based and nonarts-based).

3. Social sciences and psychology.

4. Creative process (including the spiritual and aesthetic aspects).

In the area of Interdisciplinary Arts, I have examined the literature of academic institutions with related programs such as Columbia College in Chicago, Ohio University's School of Interdisciplinary Arts, University of Washington's Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Program, Lesley University, Northwestern University's Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences (Integrated Arts Program), and California Institute of Integral Studies. I have also explored the philosophical nature of the emerging field of interdisciplinary arts through the works of Anderson (1995), Irwin and Reynolds (1995), Eisner (2002), and the Surdna Foundation (2002).

The educational aspects of Lovewell Institute and the Lovewell Method have been informed by the work of Sikes (1995), Gardner (1993/1999), Kushner (2001), Kinzer (2002), Phillips (2000), Boud & Feletti (1991), Dewey (1934), Campbell (1995), Steiner (1923), Piaget (1977), Sizer (2004), Eisner (2002), Yoon (2000), Alexander (1987), Krishnamurti (1981), Suzuki (1983), and Montessori (1948/1976). These educators have been cited throughout this document. Also, studies such as *Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development* (Arts Education Partnership, 2002) and *Powerful Voices: Developing High-Impact Arts Programs for Teens* (Surdna Foundation, 2002) have been valuable resources in this area.

The ways in which the social sciences and psychology interact with Lovewell Institute have been examined through the lenses of Rogers (1951), Jung (1964), Maslow (1970), Csikszentmihaly (1997), Cederborg (2005), Eisner (2002) and various organizations such as American Music Therapy Association, National Association for

Drama Therapy, American Dance Therapy Association, American Art Therapy Association, National Association for Poetry Therapy, American Society of Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, National Expressive Therapy Association, Society for the Arts in Healthcare, Arts and Healing Network, Art in the Public Interest, Community Arts Network (CAN), and the National Coalition of Creative Arts Therapies Associations.

The area of creative process has been explored by examining the works of Moustakas (1977), Simon (2001), Csikszentmihaly (1997), Torrance Center (1993), Gardner (1993/1999), May (1975), McNiff (1998), Kerr (2000), Wilber (2000) and a wide variety of individual creative artists with whom I have had the good fortune to collaborate. These individual creative artists are cited throughout this document and are appropriately listed in the reference section.

This review of literature revealed that although there are various individuals and organizations involved in the area of arts education linked to specific agendas, there were none found that synergize the specific areas of interdisciplinary arts, education, social sciences and creative process in the way that Lovewell Institute does. This study focuses on the unique integration and merging of domains and disciplines that define Lovewell Institute and the Lovewell Method.