Art-Based Research of Constructivist Teaching

Tomislav Topolovčan
Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb

Abstract

This paper provides a critical analysis of art-based research in education, that is, in constructivist learning and teaching. It presents the methodological features and advantages of art-based research in terms of the axiological, ontological and epistemological features of the constructivist, participatory and critical scientific paradigm, and the manifestations thereof in teaching and learning. In this respect, art-based research belongs to qualitative research with an emphasis on narrative research, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case studies, including a series of qualitative methods for collecting data, primarily the creative process, autoethnographic introspection and expression, but also interviews, recordings and participatory observation. An analysis of the said scientific paradigms, the features of constructivist teaching, and art-based research indicates their compatibility based on the co-construction of knowledge as a creative process. Such ontological and epistemological features of learning are suitable for art-based research, as it is used to study the introspective processes of constructing one's own knowledge as a creative process and its results. This paper examines the implications of art-based research in the practical and theoretical investigation of the research of learning and teaching.

Key words: *art-based research; constructivism; education; learning; qualitative research methods; teaching.*

Introduction

The research of education is characterised by a number of different paradigmatic approaches, types of research, strategies for data collection and for the analysis of such data (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Creswell, 2012; Hatch, 2002; Hichcock & Hughes, 2003; Silverman, 2014; Walford, 2003). Such diversity in the research of education can be regarded as an advantage and a positive feature, especially in

terms of using both qualitative and quantitative research. Disagreements regarding qualitative methodology versus quantitative methodology have subsided, so that today experts no longer talk about their mutual exclusivity, but about complementation and combinatorial interaction (Creswell, 2009; Gorard & Taylor, 2004; Mertens, 2010). Certainly, both approaches can be used independently in view of the problems, goals, sample of subjects and other features of a particular study.

Along with the advantages of the quantitative approach, the qualitative approach is also particularly significant in education. Today, regardless of the historical differences in development (in particular in sociology) between the USA and the German tradition (Flick 2014a), qualitative research methods offer a number of advantages in the social sciences and humanities. An advantage of the qualitative approach in education is evident as research involves students in classes (small samples), their communication, and the learning process. Each class or school is different, so it is difficult to generalise certain findings and apply them to entire populations of subjects. In other words, what applies as a scientific fact or practice to a particular class in a particular school does not necessarily apply to some other classes, schools or educational systems. This is confirmed by the studies of educational system reforms (Sahlberg, 2010).

The qualitative approach is particularly significant for the research of constructivist learning; it shows that any type of learning and knowledge is but an individual (co-) construction resulting from an interaction between the individual and his/her physical or social surroundings (Oldfather, West, White, & Wilmarth, 1998; Pritchard & Woollard, 2010; Terhart, 1999; Tobias & Duffy, 2009). From this aspect, one could argue that different students acquire identical teaching content differently. Consequently, it is difficult to research such learning and teaching by using quantitative methods and standardised tests, scales, and instruments. The foregoing is confirmed by the accepted constructivist scientific paradigm (Creswell, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 2005).

In terms of the paradigmatic aspects of research, it should be emphasised as follows: regardless of whether qualitative or quantitative methodology is used, such approaches are not determinants of the paradigm, but the paradigm, to a greater or lesser extent, determines its own methodology. The methodology is a component of the paradigm, but it is not the determinant that determines it. Paradigms are primarily philosophically determined: axiologically, ontologically and epistemologically (Bognar, 2013; Creswell, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Mertens, 2010). It is only on the basis of such features that the methodology of a particular paradigm is determined.

Burell and Morgan (1979) present paradigms by using four aspects: ontological, epistemological, the question of human nature, and methodological (determined on the basis of the former three). Such classification was later described in detail and applied by Cohen et al. (2007). Contemporary bases for explaining the paradigm are axiology, ontology and epistemology (and the methodology appropriate for each of them). The value-related determination of research and the researcher, the question

of the notion of reality and knowledge, and the organisation of research in view of the previous three determinants are thus positioned (Mertens, 2010). It should be pointed out that a particular scientific paradigm does not embrace qualitative or quantitative methodologies as the only possible ones. Both research determinants may be combined and complemented, that is, a triangulation of the approach and methods of research is possible (Cohen et al., 2007; Creswell, 2009).

One of the first researchers to introduce the term paradigm was Thomas Kuhn (1962); it means the pattern used to think about something and to research that something. Kuhn recognised the significance of paradigms, but also their relativism, since the accumulation of knowledge in an area solidifies a particular theory (paradigm), but only up to a point. It is precisely the expansion of the fund of knowledge that later refutes the paradigm and forms a new one. That is to say there can be several paradigms, theories, perceptions of reality, and knowledge existing at the same time, and they may all be equally valid and practical. Contemporary methodological thinking mostly talks about the positivist, post-positivist, constructivist, critical and participatory paradigm (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). The positivist paradigm observes reality and understanding as something objective, outside the individual, something that is identical for all people, so it can be quantitatively measured and presumed. The post-positivist paradigm makes a similar observation, although it accepts in part that the understandings gained do not necessarily have to be accurate and objective for all people and societies. Although such understandings are gained and expressed quantitatively, they do not have to be the only ones possible. The constructivist paradigm points to the social (co-)construction of our understanding of reality, so it is subjective and difficult to measure and express quantitatively. Therefore, the qualitative methodology is more appropriate. The critical theory paradigm states that the role of the individual is determined by indoctrination applied by various centres of power and that each individual and society should strive for emancipation. In that respect, qualitative methodology is more appropriate, especially action research, because quantitative methodology mostly examines the pre-set presumptions that reflect the already existing organisation and structures of power. The participatory paradigm is aimed at practical knowledge, understanding via activities suitable for action research and change of praxis (see Creswell, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 2005, Patton, 2002 for a more detailed explanation of the paradigms above).

As already mentioned, paradigms are the axiological, ontological, epistemological and methodological approaches of research, explanations and understanding of the world. Along with the said paradigms, over the last few decades, (visual) art (consequently, also creativity) has been viewed as a means of insight (Hickman, 2008). Hickman (2008) states that one of the most significant debates on (visual) art as a way of knowing was the one dating back to 1973 and 1974 in the *Cambridge Journal of Education*. Art (and creativity) is not only a language to explain the world, which makes it considerably differentiated in relation to other ways of knowing the world,

since language is a way of categorising, labelling and giving meaning to our knowing of the world. According to Hickman (2008), (visual) art (and creative endeavours) is not a language in the formal sense of understanding the world, although it has certain aspects analogous to language. Art and creative endeavours as ways of knowing about the world go beyond language, because in that respect they can portray what cannot be said in words. According to Hickman, the foregoing would be the advantages of art and creativity in the research of education.

This paper focuses primarily on qualitative methodology (Berg, 2001; Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Flick, 2014b; Mey & Mruck, 2014; Patton, 2002) and the participatory and critical, and especially constructivist, paradigm (Guba & Lincoln, 2005), since it analyses constructivist learning and teaching based on participatory and social construction and the creation of individual and social knowledge (Oldfather et al., 1998; Pritchard & Woollard, 2010; Terhart, 1999; Tobias & Duffy, 2009). Such constructivist learning can also be researched by means of art-based research. Further in the text, the author will explain and compare constructivist learning and art-based research.

Constructivist Learning

Constructivist theories have their philosophical foothold in ontology and epistemology. As such, the theories are not new today. New approaches to research have practical applications, so von Glasersfeld writes (2003, p. 24):

> …there is nothing new about the ideas that make up radical constructivism. The only novelty may be the way they have been pulled together and separated from metaphysical embroidery.

The same author holds that (radical) constructivism is a model of rational understanding as opposed to the metaphysical approach that begins by describing the real world. Constructivism can be explained as philosophical, didactical and psychological theories (Kanselaar, de Jong, Andriessen, & Goodyear, 2002); these theories state that objective reality cannot be understood as such, but that people construct it at the individual and social levels.

Constructivism was separated from philosophy and the metaphysical approach in the early 20th century. Phillips (1995) presents an interesting analysis of constructivism where he explains its three types of ontological and epistemological rationale: is knowledge individually or socially constructed, is it possible to detect the existence or creation of something completely new, and is that the product of intellectual or physical activity? This paper is aimed at constructivism in teaching, that is, the didactic theory.

Radical and Social Constructivism in Learning

Constructivism in learning and teaching has several theoretical approaches based mostly on the works of Ernst von Glasersfeld, Jean Piaget, John Dewey, Lev

Vygostski and Paul Watzlawick. Constructivist learning is defined as a self-regulated, interpretative and non-linear process of constructing knowledge supported through active interaction with the environment – physical or social (Fosnot & Perry, 2005, p. 34). Philosophical, didactic and psychological studies define two main types of constructivism: radical and social (Pritchard & Woollard, 2010; Tobias & Duffy, 2009). It should be pointed out that there are some other types of constructivism, such as moderate, cognitive, and others. Regardless of the differentiation between the radical and social constructivism, both state that objective reality cannot be (fully) objectively grasped, but that these are subjective constructions of reality based on previous experiences, knowledge, emotions and communication.

Radical constructivism was formed by Glasersfeld and Smock referring to Piaget's genetic epistemology (von Glasersfeld, 2003). He posits that each and every individual constructs (creates) his/her own knowledge and understanding completely independently and individually. Such construction is the result of the awareness of the individual and the cognitive process of handling objects. Based on Piaget's understanding of human development, it is demonstrated that the process of constructivist learning is supported through the processes of assimilation and accommodation (Pritchard & Woollard, 2010).

Social constructivism is based on the presumption that each and every individual creates his/her own knowledge, but that such knowledge is primarily created through his/her interaction with the environment and other people (communication with society). Oldfather et al. (1998, p. 115) define social constructivism as follows:

> A theory of knowledge that holds that knowledge is constructed within a social context through language and other sign systems. A social constructivist perspective focuses on learning as sensemaking and not on the acquisition of knowledge that 'exists' somewhere outside the learner.

Lev Vygotsky is regarded as the founder of social constructivism (Oldfather et al., 1998; Pritchard & Woollard, 2010; Tobias & Duffy, 2009), although Langford (2005) claims that Vygotsky cannot be regarded as a constructivist in any respect. He claims that Vygotsky declared himself as a realist, and not a constructivist. Vygotsky developed his theory of social and cultural development together with the Soviet psychologists Luria, Rubinstein and Leontyev, who made up the "Vygotsky Circle". He places his theory within the framework of the proximal development zone; that is to say, one of the main characteristics of human development is that man is teachable and can learn through communication with others and from the experiences of others (Vygotsky, 1986). This theory (social constructivism) points to the connection between the individual and his/her culture, especially language and communication. The proximal development zone is the difference between what an individual can learn unaided and what he/she can do (learn) with guidance (Oldfather et al., 1998; Pritchard & Woollard, 2010). Research in the field of anthropology shows that understanding within a particular social community is constructed through language (Heath, 1983, according

to Oldfather et al., 1998). It follows that language is a tool to form understanding, notions, meaning, and the development of abstract opinion. On the other hand, it is deemed that various languages form various concepts and understanding of the same object. Along with Vygotsky, the theories of social learning of Albert Bandura and the theories of situational learning (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1996) are also relevant for social constructivism (in learning).

In terms of social constructivism, the importance of the concept of classroom culture should be singled out. Classroom culture means the totality of human interactions, values, rules, self-evident rules of behaviour, the understanding of roles, all connected with the role of language. Such knowledge is a social, and not only an individual, construction (creation) (Oldfather et al., 1998).

Constructivist Teaching

Constructivist teaching can be defined as the intrinsic forging of meaning and the creation of understanding of one's own learning processes in pupils based on the learning (and teaching) strategies, such as research, collaboration, discovery, problem-solving, and play. In this respect, one could say that learning is a cognition situated in a particular temporal, cultural, and social continuum. In constructivist teaching, pupils are regarded as intellectual and creative individuals; learning is aimed at helping pupils develop their opinions, and it is not the teacher that is the intellectual authority, but discourse and communication (Maclellan & Soden, 2004, according to Yilmaz, 2008, pp. 164-165). It is significant that constructivist teaching and learning also exist in the constructivist scientific paradigm. By summarising previous studies, Yilmaz (2008, pp. 167-168) describes constructivist learning (and teaching) as follows:

1. learning is an active process;
2. learning is an adaptive activity;
3. learning is situated in the context in which it occurs;
4. knowledge is not innate, passively absorbed, or invented but constructed by the learner;
5. all knowledge is personal and idiosyncratic;
6. all knowledge is socially constructed;
7. learning is essentially a process of making sense of the world;
8. experience and prior understanding play a role in learning;
9. social interaction plays a role in learning; and
10. effective learning requires meaningful, open-ended, challenging problems for the learner to solve.

In constructivist teaching, the role of the teacher is significantly altered in comparison to traditional teaching. The teacher is no longer an authority with knowledge, relaying information to pupils. In constructivist teaching, the teacher organises pupils' learning activities, pupils' learning experiences, and the learning environment. The teacher is the (co-)constructor of the pupil's knowledge. Knowledge, thus constructed, is not

managed from the outside — by having the teacher teach and relay his/her knowledge — but teaching is only an attempt to encourage the pupil to learn. In constructivist teaching, it is difficult to determine whether the pupil has actually learned anything. The teacher's teaching is not sufficient to initiate the pupil's learning process, because learning is an internal, introspective, and reflective process taking place within the pupil. In constructivist teaching, significance lies in the learning environment, the pupil's emotions, prior knowledge, mental and physical activities, the organisation of the teaching material, and interpersonal and intrapersonal communication. Oldfather et al. (1998, p. 22) present the following characteristics of constructivist teaching:

1) a primary goal orientation of the classroom is collaborative meaning construction;
2) teachers pay close attention to students' perspectives, logic, and feelings;
3) the teacher and students are learning and teaching;
4) social interaction permeates the classroom;
5) the curriculum is negotiated among all participants;
6) the curriculum and the physical contents of the classroom reflect students' interests and are infused with their cultures;
7) students' physical, emotional, and psychological needs are considered along with their intellectual needs; and
8) assessment is based on each individual's progression and not exclusively on competitive norms.

In terms of the learning environment, it should be mentioned that it puts an emphasis on the learning processes that are connected with real-life problems. Both the process and the result of learning are important. Constructivist teaching is pupil-oriented, so emphasis is placed on self-regulated learning, self-efficiency, and contextual learning. The pupil always constructs his/her knowledge in interaction with the environment.

Constructivist teaching can also be explained through the theories of situated learning or situated cognition (Brown et al., 1989; Collins, 1988; Resnick, 1987) and the activity theory (Engestrom, Miettinen, & Punamaki, 1999; Lave & Wenger, 1996; Leontyev, 1978, 2009). Situated learning is defined as a learning process in the interaction with one's social environment, where the application of what was learned in practice also results in learning (creating) new knowledge. In that respect, the pupil becomes a reflective practitioner. The pupil analyses what he/she has learned as well as himself/herself, his/her processes, activities, introduces new things, and makes self-evaluations. Such characteristics are very close to the elements of action research, because the pupil always analyses the existing situation, introduces new things, analyses, adjusts, creates, and once again introduces new things. Such learning is a creative process. It is justified to emphasise that the term reflective practitioner and the observation of teaching and learning as a reflective practice is not something new in the didactic theory and practice. Reflective practice has a long-standing didactic tradition (for more, see: Hall McEntee et al., 2010; Westbury, Hopmann, & Riquarts, 2000). We should mention that constructivist learning and teaching in reflective

practice appear in various interpretations and terminologies, especially in the didactic tradition of northwest Europe.

In conclusion, by summarising the definitions, aspects, and the characteristics of constructivist learning and teaching as a creative process, we can say that it is individual or collaborative

1) project-based learning;
2) experience-based learning;
3) problem-based learning;
4) learning by doing;
5) inquiry-based learning; and
6) play-based learning.

Such strategies of learning are also visible in the pedagogic and didactic ideas of Peter Petersen, Celestine Freinet, Maria Montessori, Georg Kerschensteiner, John Dewey, Rudolf Steiner, and others, that is, in the directions and movements of the reform pedagogy from the early 20th century (for more, see: Oelkers, 2010; Skiera, 2009). What is significant in the constructivist strategies of learning is that they are creative strategies. Constructivist learning creates knowledge. Drawing, painting, singing, dancing, and playing an instrument are the results of constructivist learning. In this respect, learning is always a creative process of finding things out or creating something new, which is also one of the main characteristics of the artistic process.

Art-Based Research

Research of the social sciences and humanities is traditionally accompanied by paradigmatic discussions in terms of "what is science" and "what is not science"; in other words, what kind of research can be labelled scientific, and what kind of research cannot. There are also questions of whether research in the said sciences can be scientific at all? Discussions were primarily related to qualitative methodology and quantitative methodology counterpoised by the two scientific camps. The camps were grounded on the methods of the *natural sciences* on the one hand and the *social sciences* and *humanities* on the other (Husen, 1988; Sekulić-Majurec, 2000, 2007). The natural sciences (also referred to as the "hard sciences") are connected with quantitative methodology, while the social sciences (also referred to as the "soft sciences") are frequently connected with qualitative methodology. The mentioned discussions were referred to as the "war of paradigms" (Keeves & Lakomsky, 1999; Sekulić-Majurec, 2007). As already mentioned, the intensity of such discussions has declined, and the two methodological approaches are now observed as complementary, not exclusive.

On the other hand, there are also discussions about the linking of scientific research and practice (McNiff, 1998). There is talk about the scientific research of creation. Since human activity is marked by creativity and the creation of new things, there is significant interest in determining how to research creation and education about creation (McNiff, 1998). The term "creation" is bound to the term (visual) "art" as a

creative process (Hickman, 2008; McNiff, 1998), so consequently the way in which (visual) artistic creation is researched becomes important (Knowles & Cole, 2008; McNiff, 1998).

Development of Art-Based Research

Rudolf Arnheim is significant for the shift in the positions of scientific research towards the research of (visual) artistic creation and creation in general. He contributed considerably to changes in the ways of understanding artistic (visual perception and visual art) creation and the perception of painting. Rudolf Arnheim set new foundations for the analysis of visual perception and visual art, thus marking the stepping stones for art-based research. His ideas, concepts, and theories are presented in books such as *Visual Thinking* (1969/1997), *The Power of the Center: A Study of Composition in the Visual Arts* (1982), and primarily *Art and Visual Perception: A Psychology of the Creative Eye* (1954/1974); they present stepping stones for a fresh and quite different approach to visual and artistic education.

Any creation is learning, especially as defined, conceptualised and researched by the constructivist theories of learning. Artistic creation is a form of learning, primarily expressed as a human constructivist activity. This confirms what (constructivist) pedagogues have already written about when dealing with art in general, but also when dealing with art as a way of cognition. The philosophical, but also pedagogical, ideas of John Dewey expressed in the book *Art as Experience* (1934/1980) are well known. Rudolf Arnheim (1954/1974) also refers to the ideas of the significant European reform pedagogue Georg Kerschensteiner in *Art and Visual Perception: A Psychology of the Creative Eye* and *Visual Thinking* (1969/1997).

In the human activity of learning and creation, the *process* and the *result* of learning are emphasised. Accordingly, it is justified to regard the research of creation, (visual) art and art education as the research of learning. This is confirmed by Barone and Eisner (1997) who mention the following as the characteristics of (visual) art-based educational research:

1. the creation of a virtual reality;
2. the presence of ambiguity;
3. the use of expressive language;
4. the use of contextualised and vernacular language;
5. the promotion of empathy;
6. the personal signature of the researcher/writer; and
7. the presence of aesthetic form.

At their cores, some of the elements of art-based educational research as described above correspond to some of the elements of constructivist learning.

Creation, artistic expression and constructivist learning are frequently heavily researched via quantitative methodology. Psychometry and the quantitative methods of research are often not sufficient to provide holistic answers to such problems. One

could say that quantitative methods are compatible with this kind of problem, but only to a certain extent. When it comes to the issue of research of the subjective processes of creation, (autoethnographic) introspection, narration, biographic research and the like, it is more appropriate to use qualitative strategies. This is particularly so because creation, art and constructivist learning are subjective and individual processes. For this reason, the past few decades have witnessed the development of that which is referred to as art-based research (Barone & Eisner, 2012; McNiff, 1998).

Art-based research is primarily developed in the area of the qualitative methodology of creative art-therapy, psychology and psychiatry (Mcniff, 1998). It is possible to define it as the art-based research of the *process* and the *results* of creation and art education. Along with the analysis and research of the result of creation, either material or intellectual, art-based research is to a considerable extent directed at the internal processes taking place in the creator when creating a particular work (Barone & Eisner, 2012; McNiff, 1998). Art-based research includes a number of different methods of research. It includes various paradigmatic approaches and methods of collecting data and their analysis. That itself enables a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Art-based research is derived from scientific research and artistic creation. In that respect, it integrates the two fields and neutralises the former rigid demarcation lines. Although art-based research has a significant role in art-therapy (Gilroy, 2006; McNiff, 1998), due to its characteristics it is important in the research of education. It should be pointed out, however, that Eisner (2002) mentions certain differences between the artistic and scientific forms of research. Such a form of research is aimed at various forms of artistic creation, such as literary forms, performance, music, the visual arts, and new media (Knowles & Cole, 2008).

Characteristics of Art-Based Research

In art-based research, introspection is important. Introspection is concerned with the research of the internal processes of thinking, doubts, conflicts, redefinitions and ideas occurring in the creator when making a particular work of art or learning. In that respect, creators observe themselves. Introspection can also be presented in art-based research as autoethnographic introspection (Davies & Ellis, 2008), because any thoughts about oneself have elements of ethnographic research. Research based on autoethnographic introspection begins with detailed textual notes (descriptions and records) about the internal workings of thinking, processes, ideas, and conflicts. Such records can later be analysed qualitatively, just like any other written records.

Although art-based research includes a number of various methods and approaches, in this paper the author focuses only on the qualitative approach and methodology. In this respect, based on paradigmatic determinations (Guba & Lincoln, 2005), art-based research uses the established qualitative strategies of collecting and analysing data (Berg, 2001; Creswell, 2007, 2012; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Flick, von Kardoff, & Steinke, 2004).

In terms of scientific paradigms (Cohen et al., 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 2005), it is more difficult to place art-based research in normative paradigms, i.e., the positivist or post-positivist. Namely, due to its axiological, ontological and epistemological features, art-based research is better suited to interpretative paradigms, i.e., the critical, constructivist, and the participatory paradigm. It is possible to categorize it in such a way, because creation, learning and art education arise from the ontological and epistemological rationale that views our reality, our world, and our knowledge as something subjective, individual, susceptible to change and momentary (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Art-based research can be placed in the constructivist paradigm, because it arises from the construction of personal cognition (knowledge) and introspection. Any knowledge, cognition and, consequently, material creation are subjective and individual, especially artistic creation, which is unique. This method can also be placed in the participatory paradigm, because it follows from the connection between scientific research and practical activity. Our understanding of the world and our construction of knowledge are viewed through activity and action. In other words, the world can be understood through action, collaboration and creation. It is also possible to place it in the critical paradigm. Finley (2005) claims that art-based research is compatible with the critical theory because it aims to change the existing practice, introduce new things and emancipation. In addition to all the methodological characteristics of art-based research, it is also deemed useful to have it implemented in action research. Action research — as a relevant research strategy of the critical paradigm — is appropriate for the research of creation as its aims are the creation of new things and reflective practice (Bognar, 2006; McNiff & Whitehead, 2002; Reason & Bradbury, 2001).

Art-based research can also be positioned amongst Creswell's (2007) established five approaches to qualitative research: 1) narrative research; 2) phenomenology; 3) grounded theory; 4) ethnography; and 5) case study. Since art-based research is aimed at internal mental processes within the creator, it can be explained as narrative research as it focuses on people's life stories. It focuses on their interpretations, story-telling and descriptions of life, events and experiences. While narrative research is aimed mostly at the individual, phenomenology focuses on research of the same phenomenon in different people. In that respect, it seeks persons who have experienced the same event (such as disease, death, war), and investigates their experience and description of the phenomenon, time period or event. In that sense, art-based research applies as it seeks to find out one's internal interpretation of the experienced phenomena. Any individual description of an event or phenomenon is basically introspection and interpretation of oneself. Art-based research also applies in ethnography. Other than enabling introspection in terms of one's internal individual processes during a particular activity, it also enables insight into a particular social community of people living side by side. It enables introspective insight into certain values, habits, customs, beliefs, and the culture of a small or large social community. It can begin with an individual, and it can be expanded to the research of several participants. Art-based research enables

the building of a grounded theory. According to Creswell (2007), grounded theory is the inductive building of a theory based on a qualitative collection of data. The aim of building a grounded theory is to find patterns and latent structures, and not only the literal description of a particular problem. Art-based research enables insight into creation, so it is possible to develop an autonomous theory about a particular phenomenon or problem because such perceptions, ideas, internal processes, one's own thoughts, and the thinking process of an individual during his/her creation are subjective. In view of its characteristics, art-based research enables (and mostly is) case study. It follows from the above that art-based research enables various qualitative approaches to research.

Along with various qualitative approaches, art-based research includes a number of various methods for collecting data and their processing. In this respect, by referring to the typology of qualitative data collection methods (Berg, 2001; Cohen et al., 2007; Creswell, 2007, 2012; Silverman, 2014), in art-based research data can be collected through interviews, group interviews (focus groups), explanations, observations (participatory observations), content analysis, personal constructs, picture and photograph analyses, etc. It is important to note that any collecting and analysing of data arise from detailed written records (descriptions, transcripts). Based on an analysis of such detailed descriptions and transcripts (the transcript of an interview), explanations are derived, concepts formed, and theories constructed. In other words, it is particularly convenient to build a grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Glasser & Straus, 2006; Mey & Mruck, 2011) on art-based research.

It is apparent from the definitions, descriptions and characteristics of art-based research that such research includes a series of paradigmatic determinations, various qualitative approaches and various qualitative methods of data collection aimed at constructing a theory of internal processes taking place in the creator during the creative process. Such research also allows for an analysis of the final creative result.

Comparison of Art-Based Research and Constructivist Learning

Based on the description of constructivist learning and art-based learning, it is possible to regard some of their elements as compatible. In other words, to a certain extent, it is appropriate to connect, and research and compare, constructive learning and art-based learning.

On the basis of the characteristics of constructivist learning defined as a construction of one's own knowledge, it is justified to believe that it is always the process of creating something new. Constructivist learning manifests itself as an active and collaborative process, a process in which the individual provides meaning to certain objects, communication and ideas. It is the individual who creates knowledge. Such learning is always independent, but it takes place in interaction with one's physical or social surroundings. The knowledge and abilities acquired as described are individual

processes and *results*. In other words, no matter how many different pupils learn the same subject matter, the same skills or competences, they always learn and develop them differently. Therefore, there are no two persons with the same knowledge about a particular object. In simpler terms, ontologically and epistemologically, there is an objective reality, but it is impossible to completely understand it objectively. Accordingly, learning is an intrinsic, subjective, internal and individual process of building something new. Learning is a creative process, same as artistic creation.

On the other hand, art-based research is a strategy for the research of various forms of artistic creation (painting, dancing, music, etc.). Further, art-based research makes it possible to research any human activity. Art-based research is equally aimed at the final *result* of creation, but also at the internal *processes* taking place in the creator. The result/product does not necessarily have to be material; it can also be intellectual. Research of the mentioned internal processes in the creator during creation has a special role in art-based research. In that respect, the emphasis is on what the creator is thinking, how he/she develops ideas, internal conflicts, ways of resolving tasks, setting problems, and intrapersonal communication. Such internal processes can be researched by (autoethnographic) introspection, the recording of one's ideas, interviews and observations of the creator.

It follows that learning is a creative, subjective, individual and productive process, and since art-based research enables insight into such processes, constructivist learning can also be researched in this way. Taking into consideration the characteristics of constructivist learning and art-based research, their compatibility is visible. In other words, as learning is an individual and internal process, it is justified to research it through introspection, the analysis of one's own thoughts, ideas, conflicts, etc. It is justified to research it by using art-based research.

Art-based research is compatible with action research, because it is the research of human activity that aims at change. Learning is a reflective and creative process, which constitutes some of the characteristics of action research. It is justified to point to the convenience of building a grounded theory on the basis of art-based research, because any creative process is unique and individual.

The compatibility of art-based research and constructivist learning as described above has its implications on practice. Namely, learning and teaching should not be observed as the reproduction of information where pupils must listen to what the teacher says or copy something from the board. Quite the contrary, learning is a creative process where pupils create something new by learning: new values, new knowledge, and new abilities. In learning, the internal psychological states, emotions, ideas and thoughts of the person learning are always paramount. It is therefore appropriate to organise pupil-oriented teaching, where the pupil learns through problem-based learning, play-based learning, learning by doing, and cooperative learning. These are all creative processes, and as such can be researched by using art-based research. Therefore, art-based research can be an element of the didactic

strategies of learning, where pupils apply reflective practice, that is, analyse their processes of learning and, by doing so, learn.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above provided analysis of the characteristics of learning as described by the constructivist theories and art-based research, we can mention several mutually compatible features. It is justified to say that learning is a creative process, and the acquisition of knowledge, and the development of skills, abilities and values, is the creation of something that did not exist before. Such learning is active learning, that is, problem-based learning, inquiry-based learning, cooperative learning, play-based learning, and learning by doing.

On the other hand, methodologically speaking, it is justified to consider the research of learning as a creative process to be cognitively useful. In this respect, it is appropriate to research it through art-based research. This results in an analysis of the end product (result), but also of the internal processes and psychological states of the person creating the new thing. There is insight into the thinking, ideas, thoughts, and the internal dialogue of the creator with his/her work of art. From the ontological and epistemological aspects, this is important information, because learning is a subjective and constructive process. Learning defined in such a way can hardly be evaluated through standardised tests, as any knowledge is unique.

In sum, learning is an ***internal*** (intrinsic, but also social) and ***creative*** process of constructing one's own knowledge where both the ***process*** and the ***result*** of learning are important. Art-based research examines ***internal*** (intrinsic) processes of ***creation*** directed all at once at the ***process*** and at its end ***result***. It is, therefore, appropriate to use art-based research for the research of (constructivist) learning and teaching.

Art-based research as a rule belongs to the framework of qualitative methodology. It is possible to place it amongst interpretative paradigms, that is, in the constructivist, critical, and participatory paradigms. Art-based research can be used in art-therapy, in the research of all forms of artistic creation and learning. It is possible to use it as an element of the didactic strategies of active learning, especially as a segment of reflective practice.

Art-based research is a relatively new methodological strategy, but it can prove significant for research in the social sciences and humanities through its further development, perfection, and expansion.

References

Arnheim, R. (1954/1974). *Art and visual perception: A psychology of the creative eye*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Arnheim, R. (1969/1997). *Visual thinking*. London: University of California Press.

Arnheim, R. (1982). *The power of the center: A study of composition in the visual arts.* London: University of California Press.

Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (1997). Arts-based educational research. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp. 73–116). Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (2012*). Art Based Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bognar, B. (2006). Akcijska istraživanja u školi [Action research at school]. *Odgojne znanosti, 8*(1), 209-227.

Bognar, B. (2013). Pedagogija na putu prema pluralizmu znanstvenih paradigmi i stvaralaštvu [Pedagogy on the way towards pluralism of scientific paradigms and creativity]. In N. Hrvatić, & A. Klapan (Eds.), *Pedagogija i kultura* (pp. 101-111). Zagreb: Hrvatsko pedagogijsko društvo.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 32-42. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018001032

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounding theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.

Collins, A. (1988). *Cognitive apprenticeship and instructional technology*. Cambridge: BBN Labs Inc.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry* & *research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research. Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.

Davies, C. S., & Ellis, C. (2008). Autoethnographic Introspection in Ethnographic. In P. Liamputtong, & J. Rumbold (Eds.), *Knowing differently: Art-based and collaborative research methods* (pp. 99-118). New York: Nova Scotia Publisher, Inc.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1934/1980). *Art as experience*. New York: A Wideview/Perigee Book.

Eisner, E. W. (2002). *Reimagining schools: The selected works of Elliot W. Eisner*. London: Routledge.

Engeström, Y., Miettinen, R., & Punamäki, R.-L. (Eds.) (1999). *Perspectives on activity theory*. Cambridge: University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511812774

Finley, S. (2005). Arts-based inquiry: Performing revolutionary pedagogy. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 681-694). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flick, U. (2014a). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243

Flick, U. (2014b). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flick, U., von Kardorff, E., & Steinke, I. (Eds.) (2004). *A companion to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fosnot, C. T., & Perry, R. S. (2005). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In C. T. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives and practice* (pp. 8-33). New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

Gilroy, A. (2006). *Art therapy, research and evidence-based practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (2006). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. London: Aldine Transaction.

Glasersfeld, E. v. (2003). *Radical constructivism. A way of knowing and learning*. London: Routledge Publication.

Gorard, S., & Taylor, C. (2004). *Combining methods in educational and social research*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 192-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall McEntee, G. et al. (Eds.) (2010). *At the heart of teaching: A guide to reflective practice*. London: Teachers College Press.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hichcock, G., & Hughes, D. (2003). *Research and the teacher: A qualitative introduction to school-based research*. London: Routledge.

Hickman, R. (2008). The nature of research in arts education. In R. Hickman (Ed.), *Research in art & design education: Issues and exemplars* (pp. 15-24). Bristol and Chicago: Intellect.

Husen, T. (1988). Research paradigms in education. In J. P. Keeves (Ed.), *Educational research, methodology and measurement* (pp. 16-22). Oxford: Pergamon Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01815504

Kanselaar, G., de Jong, T., Andriessen, J., & Goodyear, P. (2002). New technologies. In R.-J. Simons, J. van der Linden, & T. Duffy (Eds.), *New learning* (pp. 55-82). Dodrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Keeves, J. P., & Lakomsky, G. (1999). *Issues in educational research*. Amsterdam: Pergamon Press.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Langford, P. E. (2005). *Vygotsky's developmental and educational psychology*. New York: Psychology Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1996). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leontyev, A. N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness, and personality*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Leontyev, A. N. (2009). *Activity and consciousness*. Pacifica, CA: Marxists Internet Archive.

McNiff, S. (1998). *Art-based research*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2002). *Action research: Principles and practice*. London, Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203199961

Mey, G., & Mruck, K. (Eds.) (2011). *Grounded Theory Reader*. Köln: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-93318-4

Mey, G., & Mruck, K. (Eds.) (2014). *Qualitative Forsching. Analysen und Diskussionen – 10 Jahre Berliner Methodentreffen*. Berlin: Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-05538-7

Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Oelkers, J. (2010). *Reformpädagogik: Entstehungsgeschichten einer international Bewegung*. Leipzig: Klett und Balmer Verlag Zug.

Oldfather, P., West, J., White, J., & Wilmarth, L. (1998). *Learning through children's eyes: Social constructivism and the desire to learn.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Phillips, D. C. (1995). The good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher, 24*(7), 5-12. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X024007005

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research* & *evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pritchard, A., & Woollard, J. (2010). *Psychology for the classroom: Constructivism and social learning*. London: Routledge.

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of action research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Resnick, L. (1987). Learning in school and out. *Educational Researcher*, *16*(9), 13-20.

Sahlberg, P. (2010*). Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* New York: Teacher College Press.

Sekulić-Majurec, A. (2000). Kvalitativni i/li kvantitativni pristup istraživanjima pedagoških fenomena – neke aktualne dvojbe [A quantitative and/or qualitative approach to the research of the pedagogical phenomena – some current dilemmas]. *Napredak, 141*(3), 289-300.

Sekulić-Majurec, A. (2007). Kraj rata paradigmi pedagoških istraživanja [The end of the war of pedagogical research paradigms]. *Pedagogijska istraživanja, 4*(2), 189-202.

Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Skiera, E. (2009). *Reformpädagogik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Eine kritische Einführung*. München: Oldenburg.

Terhart, E. (1999). Konstruktivismus und Unterricht. Gibt es einen neuen Ansatz in der Allgemeinen Didaktik? *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 45*(5), 629-647.

Tobias, S., & Duffy, T. M. (Eds.) (2009). *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* New York: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Walford, G. (Ed.) (2003). *Doing educational research*. London: Routledge.

Westbury, I., Hopmann, S., & Riquarts, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Teaching as a reflective practice: The German didactic tradition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Yilmaz, K. (2008). Constructivism: Its theoretical underpinnings, variations, and implications for classroom instruction. *Educational Horizons, 86*(3), 161-172.

Tomislav Topolovčan
Department of Education
Faculty of Teacher Education
University of Zagreb
Savska cesta 77, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
tomislav.topolovcan@ufzg.hr

Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje konstruktivističke nastave

Sažetak

U radu je kritički analizirano umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje u odgoju i obrazovanju, odnosno u konstruktivističkom učenju i nastavi. Prikazana su metodološka obilježja i prednosti umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja s obzirom na aksiološka, ontološka i epistemološka obilježja konstruktivističke, sudjelujuće i kritičke znanstvene paradigme te njihovih manifestacija u nastavi i učenju. U tom je pogledu umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje pozicionirano u kvalitativna istraživanja s naglaskom na narativno istraživanje, fenomenologiju, utemeljenu teoriju, etnografiju i studiju slučaja koje uključuju niz kvalitativnih metoda prikupljanja podataka, ponajprije stvaralački proces, autoetnografsku introspekciju i ekspresiju, ali i intervjue, zapise i sudjelujuće promatranje. Analizom navedenih znanstvenih paradigmi, obilježja konstruktivističke nastave i umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja ukazano je na njihovu kompatibilnost baziranu na (su)konstrukciji znanja kao stvaralaštva. Takvim ontološkim i epistemološkim obilježjima učenja odgovara umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje jer se time istražuju introspektivni procesi konstruiranja vlastitog znanja kao stvaralačkog procesa i njegova rezultata. U radu su prikazane implikacije umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja u praksi i teorijskom promišljanju istraživanja učenja i nastave.

Ključne riječi: *kvalitativne metode istraživanja; konstruktivizam; nastava; odgoj i obrazovanje; učenje; umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje.*

Uvod

Istraživanja odgoja i obrazovanja karakterizira niz različitih paradigmatskih pristupa, vrsta istraživanja, strategija prikupljanja podataka i njihove analize (Cohen, Manion i Morrison, 2007; Creswell, 2012; Hatch, 2002; Hichcock i Hughes, 2003; Silverman, 2014; Walford, 2003). Takvu je raznolikost istraživanja odgoja i obrazovanja moguće smatrati njihovom prednošću i pozitivnim obilježjem. Posebice u pogledu primjene i kvalitativnih i kvantitativnih istraživanja. Prijepori oko kvalitativne i kvantitativne metodologije su smanjeni, tako da se danas u stručnim krugovima više ne govori o

njihovoj međusobnoj isključivosti, već o nadopunjavanju i kombiniranju (Creswell, 2009; Gorard i Taylor, 2004; Mertens, 2010). Svakako, i jedan i drugi pristup moguće je samostalno primjenjivati s obzirom na problematiku, ciljeve, uzorak ispitanika i druga obilježja pojedinog istraživanja.

Uz prednosti kvantitativnog pristupa, u obrazovanju je izrazito značajan i kvalitativni pristup. Danas, bez obzira na povijesne razlike razvoja (posebice u sociologiji) između SAD-a i njemačke tradicije (Flick, 2014a), kvalitativne istraživačke metode nude niz prednosti u društvenim i humanističkim znanostima. Prednost kvalitativnog pristupa u odgoju i obrazovanju je vidljiva jer se radi o istraživanjima na učenicima u razredima (malim uzorcima), njihove komunikacije i procesa učenja. Svaki razred ili škola je posebnost za sebe, te je pojedine spoznaje teško generalizirati na cijele populacije ispitanika. Drugim riječima, ono što kao znanstvena spoznaja ili praksa vrijedi za jedan razred u nekoj školi ne mora nužno vrijediti ili biti primjenjivo u nekim drugim razredima, školama ili obrazovnim sustavima. To potvrđuju i studije reformi obrazovnih sustava (Sahlberg, 2010).

Kvalitativni je pristup posebno važan za istraživanja konstruktivističkog učenja koje ukazuje na to da je svako učenje i znanje individualna (su)konstrukcija u interakciji pojedinca s fizičkom ili društvenom okolinom (Oldfather, West, White i Wilmarth, 1998; Pritchard i Woollard, 2010; Terhart, 1999; Tobias i Duffy, 2009). S tog je aspekta moguće reći da različiti učenici različito spoznaju identične nastavne sadržaje. Stoga je teško takvo učenje i nastavu istraživati kvantitativnim metodama i standardiziranim testovima, skalama i instrumentima. Tome u prilog ide i etablirana konstruktivistička znanstvena paradigma (Creswell, 2007; Guba i Lincoln, 2005).

U pogledu paradigmatskih određenja istraživanja valja naglasiti: bez obzira na to je li primijenjena kvalitativna ili kvantitativna metodologija, takvi pristupi nisu determinante koje određuju paradigmu, već paradigma, u većoj ili manjoj mjeri, određuje svoju metodologiju. Metodologija je sastavnica paradigme, ali ne i determinanta koja je određuje. Paradigme su ponajprije filozofski određene: aksiološki, ontološki i epistemološki (Bognar, 2013; Creswell, 2007; Guba i Lincoln, 2005; Mertens, 2010). Tek na temelju tih obilježja je određena metodologija pojedine paradigme.

Burell i Morgan (1979) prikazuju paradigme s pomoću četiri aspekta: ontološkog, epistemološkog, pitanja ljudske prirode i metodološkog (koji je određen na temelju prethodnih triju). Tu klasifikaciju su poslije detaljno opisali te primjenjivali i Cohen i sur. (2007). Suvremene osnove za objašnjenja paradigme su aksiologija, ontologija i epistemologija (i njima primjerena metodologija). Time je pozicionirano vrijednosno određenje istraživanja i istraživača, pitanje pojma stvarnosti i znanja te organizacije istraživanja s obzirom na prethodne tri determinante (Mertens, 2010). Valja naglasiti da određena znanstvena paradigma ne prisvaja kvalitativnu ili kvantitativnu metodologiju kao jedino moguću. Moguće je kombinirati i nadopunjavati oba istraživačka određenja, tj. moguća je triangulacija pristupa i metoda istraživanja (Cohen i sur., 2007; Creswell, 2009).

Pojam paradigme među prvima je uveo Thomas Kuhn (1962) što označava obrazac po kojem je nešto promišljano i istraživano. Kuhn je prepoznao značaj paradigmi, ali i njihov relativizam budući da akumulacija znanja u nekom području učvršćuje pojedinu teoriju (paradigmu), ali tek do određene razine. Poslije ju upravo proširenje fonda spoznaja pobija i formira novu. Odnosno, može postojati više istodobnih paradigmi, teorija, poimanja stvarnosti i znanja, a da budu jednako valjane i praktične. U suvremenom se metodološkom promišljanju uglavnom govori o pozitivističkoj, postpozitivističkoj, konstruktivističkoj, kritičkoj i sudjelujućoj paradigmi (Guba i Lincoln, 2005). Pozitivistička paradigma promatra stvarnost i znanje kao nešto objektivno, izvan osobe, jednako svim ljudima, pa ju je stoga moguće kvantitativno mjeriti i pretpostavljati. Postpozitivistička paradigma slično promatra, iako djelomično prihvaća da dobivene spoznaje ne moraju biti točne i objektivne za sve ljude i društva. Iako su takve spoznaje dobivene i izražene kvantitativno, one ne moraju biti jedine moguće. Konstruktivistička paradigma ukazuje na individualnu i društvenu (su) konstrukciju spoznaje o stvarnosti, pa je ona subjektivna i teško ju je kvantitativno mjeriti i izraziti. Stoga joj je primjerenija kvalitativna metodologija. Paradigma kritičke teorije polazi od toga da je uloga pojedinca određena indoktrinacijom iz različitih centara moći te da svaki pojedinac i društvo treba težiti emancipaciji. U tom je pogledu primjerenija kvalitativna metodologija, a posebice su primjerenija akcijska istraživanja, jer kvantitativna metodologija uglavnom provjerava unaprijed postavljene pretpostavke koje odražavaju već postojeći ustroj i strukture moći. Sudjelujuća paradigma usmjerena je na praktična znanja, spoznaje putem aktivnosti kojima odgovaraju akcijska istraživanja i promjene prakse (o objašnjenjima pojedine paradigme više kod: Creswell, 2007; Guba i Lincoln, 2005, Patton, 2002).

Kao što je spomenuto, paradigme su aksiološki, ontološki, epistemološki i metodološki pristupi istraživanju, objašnjenju i razumijevanju svijeta. Uz navedene paradigme, u posljednjih je nekoliko desetljeća i (likovna) umjetnost (a samim time i stvaralaštvo) razmatrana kao način spoznaje (Hickman, 2008). Hickman (2008) navodi da je jedna od najznačajnijih debata o (likovnoj) umjetnosti kao načinu spoznaje bila ona iz 1973. i 1974. godine u *Cambridge Journal of Education*. Umjetnost (i stvaralaštvo) nije samo jezik kojim se objašnjava svijet, čime je značajno diferencirana u odnosu na ostale spoznaje svijeta, budući da je jezik način kategoriziranja, etiketiranja i davanja značenja spoznajama o svijetu. Prema Hickmanu (2008) (likovna) umjetnost (i stvaralaštvo) nije jezik u formalnom obliku razumijevanja svijeta, iako ima određene aspekte analogne jeziku. Umjetnost i stvaralaštvo kao spoznaje idu dalje od jezika, jer u tom pogledu mogu opredmetiti neizrecivo. Prema Hickamnu su upravo u tome prednosti umjetnosti i stvaralaštva u istraživanjima odgoja i obrazovanja.

Ovaj je rad ponajprije usmjeren na kvalitativnu metodologiju (Berg, 2001; Creswell, 2007; Denzin i Lincoln, 2005; Flick, 2014b; Mey i Mruck, 2014; Patton, 2002) te sudjelujuću i kritičku, a posebice konstruktivističku paradigmu (Guba i Lincoln, 2005), budući da analizira konstruktivističko učenje i nastavu utemeljenu na

sudjelujućoj i socijalnoj konstrukciji te kreaciji vlastitog i socijalnog znanja (Oldfather i sur., 1998; Pritchard i Woollard, 2010; Terhart, 1999; Tobias i Duffy, 2009). Tako definirano konstruktivističko učenje moguće je istraživati i s pomoću umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja (engl. *art-based research*). U daljnjem tekstu bit će objašnjeno i komparirano konstruktivističko učenje i umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje.

Konstruktivističko učenje

Konstruktivističke teorije imaju filozofsko uporište u ontologiji i epistemologiji. Kao takve te teorije danas nisu nove. Novi su pristupi proučavanju i nove su praktične primjene, pa von Glasersfeld u vezi s tim piše (2003, str. 24):

> „…*nema ništa novoga u idejama o konstruktivizmu. Jedina je novost eventualno način na koji su objedinjene te ideje, te njihovo odvajanje od metafizičkog tumačenja*".

Isti autor smatra da je (radikalni) konstruktivizam model racionalne spoznaje, za razliku od metafizičkog pristupa koji polazi od opisivanja stvarnog svijeta. Konstruktivizam možemo objašnjavati kao filozofske, didaktičke i psihološke teorije (Kanselaar, de Jong, Andriessen i Goodyear, 2002) koje smatraju da objektivnu stvarnost kao takvu nije moguće spoznati, već da je ljudi individualno i društveno konstruiraju. Od same filozofije i metafizičkog pristupa konstruktivizam je odvojen početkom 20. stoljeća. Zanimljivu analizu konstruktivizma prikazuje Phillips (1995) koji objašnjava njegove tri ontološke i epistemološke racionale: je li spoznaja (znanje) individualno ili socijalno konstruirana, je li to otkriće postojećeg ili stvaranje potpuno novoga te je li to proizvod intelektualne ili fizičke aktivnosti? Ovaj je rad usmjeren na konstruktivizam u nastavi, odnosno na didaktičku teoriju.

Radikalni i socijalni konstruktivizam u učenju

Konstruktivizam u učenju i nastavi ima više teorijskih pristupa, utemeljenih uglavnom na radovima Ernsta von Glasersfelda, Jeana Piageta, Johna Deweya, Lava Vygostskog i Paula Watzlawicka. Konstruktivističko je učenje definirano kao samoregulirani, interpretativni i nelinearni proces građenja znanja potpomognut aktivnom interakcijom s okolinom – fizičkom ili socijalnom (Fosnot i Perry, 2005, str. 34). Na temelju filozofskih, didaktičkih i psiholoških studija definirane su dvije glavne vrste konstruktivizma: radikalni i socijalni (Pritchard i Woollard, 2010; Tobias i Duffy, 2009). Valja naglasiti da postoje i još neke vrste konstruktivizma kao što su umjereni, kognitivni i dr. Bez obzira na diferencijaciju radikalnog i socijalnog konstruktivizma oba polaze od toga da objektivnu stvarnost nije moguće (u potpunosti) spoznati kao objektivnu, već su to subjektivne konstrukcije stvarnosti utemeljene na prethodnim iskustvima, znanjima, emocijama i komunikacijama.

Radikalni konstruktivizam oblikovali su von Glasersfeld i Smock pozivajući se na Piagetovu genetičku epistemologiju (von Glasersfeld, 2003). On polazi od pretpostavke da svaki pojedinac u potpunosti samostalno i individualno konstruira (kreira) vlastito

znanje i spoznaje. Takva je konstrukcija rezultat svijesti pojedinca i kognitivnih procesa baratanja objektima. Na temelju Piagetovih spoznaja ljudskog razvoja ukazuje se da je proces konstruktivističkog učenja potpomognut procesima asimilacije i akomodacije (Pritchard i Woollard, 2010).

Socijalni konstruktivizam utemeljen je na pretpostavci da pojedinac sam stvara svoja znanja, ali ih ponajprije stvara u interakciji s okolinom i drugim osobama (komunikacijom s društvom). Oldfather i sur. (1998, str. 115) socijalni konstruktivizam definiraju kao:

> *„Znanje koje je konstruirano u društvenom kontekstu pomoću jezika i drugih znakova nekog sustava. Socijalni konstruktivizam je usmjeren na učenje stvaranja smisla, a ne na prihvaćanje znanja koje „egzistira" negdje izvan osobe (učenika)".*

Začetnikom socijalnog konstruktivizma smatra se Lav Vygotsky (Oldfather i sur., 1998; Pritchard i Woollard, 2010; Tobias i Duffy, 2009). Iako Langford (2005) tvrdi da se Vygotskog ni po čemu ne može smatrati konstruktivistom. On tvrdi da se Vygotsky deklarirao realistom, a ne konstruktivistom. Vygotsky je svoju teoriju socijalno-kulturnog razvoja razvijao zajedno sa sovjetskim psiholozima Luriom, Rubinsteinom i Leontyevim, koji su činili „Vygotskjev krug". On svoju teoriju pozicionira u okvire zone proksimalnog razvoja. Odnosno, jedno od glavnih obilježja ljudskog razvoja jest da je čovjek poučljiv i može učiti komunikacijom s drugima te iz tuđih iskustava (Vygotsky, 1986). Ta teorija (socijalni konstruktivizam) ukazuje na povezanost pojedinca i njegove kulture, poglavito jezika i komunikacije. Zona proksimalnog razvoja predstavlja razliku onoga što pojedinac može napraviti sam i što može učiniti (spoznati) s pomoću drugih (Oldfather i sur., 1998; Pritchard i Woollard, 2010). Istraživanja u području antropologije pokazala su da je razumijevanje unutar neke društvene zajednice oblikovano s pomoću jezika (Heath, 1983, prema Oldfather i sur., 1998). Iz toga proizlazi da je jezik alat za formiranje razumijevanja, pojmova, značenja te razvoj apstraktnog mišljenja. S druge strane smatra se da različiti jezici oblikuju različite koncepte i razumijevanje istog objekta. Uz Vygotskoga, za socijalni konstruktivizam (u učenju) su važne teorije socijalnog učenja Alberta Bandure i teorije situacijskog učenja (Brown, Collins i Duguid, 1989; Lave i Wenger, 1996).

Govoreći o socijalnom konstruktivizmu, valja naznačiti važnost koncepta razredne kulture (engl. *classroom culture*). Razredna kultura podrazumijeva ukupnost međuljudskih odnosa, vrijednosti, pravila, samorazumljivih pravila ponašanja, razumijevanje uloga, a sve je to povezano s ulogom jezika. Takvo znanje je socijalna, a ne samo individualna konstrukcija (kreacija) (Oldfather i sur., 1998).

Konstruktivistička nastava

Konstruktivističku nastavu možemo definirati kao unutarnje stvaranje značenja i kreiranje razumijevanja vlastitih procesa učenja kod učenika na temelju strategija učenja (i poučavanja) kao što su istraživanje, surađivanje, otkrivanje, rješavanje

problema i igra. U tom je pogledu moguće reći da je učenje situirana kognicija u određenom vremenskom, kulturnom i socijalnom kontinuumu. Obilježje konstruktivističke nastave je da su učenici intelektualne i stvaralačke individue; učenje je usmjereno na razvoj učeničkog mišljenja; intelektualni autoritet nije učitelj, već diskurs i komunikacija (Maclellan i Soden, 2004, prema Yilmaz, 2008, str. 164-165). Važno je što su konstruktivistička nastava i učenje pozicionirani i u konstruktivističkoj znanstvenoj paradigmi. Uzimajući u obzir prethodne studije, Yilmaz (2008, str. 167-168) konstruktivističko učenje (i nastavu) opisuje na sljedeći način:

1) učenje je aktivan proces,
2) učenje je aktivno prilagođavanje,
3) učenje je situacijsko i kontekstualno,
4) znanje nije pasivno preneseno i primljeno, već oblikovano od onoga koji uči,
5) znanje je osobno,
6) znanje je društveno oblikovano (u društvenom kontekstu),
7) temeljni je proces stvaranja smisla i razumijevanja svijeta,
8) iskustvo i prijašnja razumijevanja ključna su za učenje,
9) za učenje je važna društvena interakcija,
10) (učenje zahtijeva rješavanje smislenih, otvorenih i izazovnih problema.

U struktivističkoj je nastavi uloga učitelja u znatnoj mjeri promijenjena u odnosu na tradicionalnu nastavu. Učitelj više nije autoritet koji posjeduje znanje i koji predaje informacije učenicima. U konstruktivističkoj nastavi učitelj je organizator učenikovih aktivnosti učenja, organizator učenikovih iskustava učenja i okoline učenja. Učitelj je (su)konstruktor učenikova znanja. Tako konstruirano znanje nije upravljano izvana učiteljevim poučavanjem i prenošenjem znanja, već je poučavanje tek pokušaj poticanja učenikova učenja. U konstruktivističkoj je nastavi teško odrediti je li se učenje u učeniku zaista i dogodilo. Učiteljevo poučavanje nije jedini dostatni element za pokretanje učenikova procesa učenja, jer je učenje unutarnji, introspektivni i refleksivni proces koji se događa u učeniku. U konstruktivističkoj je nastavi važna okolina učenja, važne su učenikove emocije, predznanja, psihičke i fizičke aktivnosti, organizacija nastavnih sadržaja, interpersonalna i intrapersonalna komunikacija. Oldfather i sur. (1998, str. 22) prikazuju sljedeća obilježja konstruktivističke nastave:

primarni je cilj nastave suradničko smisleno konstruiranje značenja
1) učitelj uvažava učenikovo mišljenje i osjećaje
2) učenici i učitelj zajedno poučavaju i uče
3) društvena interakcija dominira u nastavi
4) o kurikulu odlučuju svi sudionici
5) kurikul i okolina učenja odražavaju učenikove interese i kulturu
6) uz intelektualne, prihvaćene su i učenikove fizičke i čuvstvene potrebe
7) vrednuje se individualni napredak pojedinca.

Govoreći o okolini učenja valja naznačiti da ona stavlja naglasak na procese učenja koji su povezani sa stvarnim životnim problemima. Važan je i proces i rezultat učenja.

Govori se o nastavi usmjerenoj na učenika, pa je naglasak na samoreguliranom učenju, samodjelotvornosti i kontekstualnom učenju. Učenik uvijek u interakciji s okolinom konstruira vlastito znanje.

Konstruktivističku nastavu moguće je objasniti i teorijama „situacijskog učenja" (engl. *situated learning, situated cognition*) (Collins, 1988; Brown i sur., 1989; Resnick, 1987) i teorijom aktivnosti (engl. *activity theory*) (Engestrom, Miettinen i Punamaki, 1999; Lave i Wenger, 1996; Leontyev, 1978, 2009). Situacijsko je učenje definirano kao proces učenja u interakciji s društvenom okolinom, pri čemu se praktičnom primjenom naučenog istodobno uči (kreira) novo znanje. U tom pogledu učenik postaje refleksivni praktičar. Učenik analizira naučeno, analizira samoga sebe, svoje procese, svoje aktivnosti, uvodi novitete i provodi samoevaluaciju. Ta obilježja veoma su bliska elementima akcijskog istraživanja, jer učenik uvijek iznova analizira postojeće, uvodi novitete, analizira, korigira, kreira i nanovo uvodi novitete. Tako je opisano učenje kreativni proces. Opravdano je naglasiti da pojam refleksivnog praktičara i promatranje nastave i učenja kao refleksivne prakse nije novitet u didaktičkoj teoriji i praksi. Refleksivna praksa ima dugu didaktičku tradiciju (više vidjeti kod: Hall McEntee i sur., 2010; Westbury, Hopmann i Riquarts, 2000). Možemo naznačiti da se konstruktivističko učenje i nastava u refleksivnoj praksi pojavljuju u različitim interpretacijama i terminologijama, posebno u sjeverozapadnoj europskoj didaktičkoj tradiciji.

Na kraju, uzimajući u obzir definicije, aspekte i obilježja konstruktivističkog učenja i nastave kao kreativnog procesa, možemo ukazati na to da je to individualno ili suradničko:

1) projektno učenje (engl. *project-based learning*),
2) iskustveno učenje (engl. *experience-based learning*),
3) učenje rješavanjem problema (engl. *problem-bades learning*),
4) učenje usmjereno na djelovanje (engl. *learning by doing*),
5) učenje istraživanjem i otkrivanjem (engl. *inquiry-based learning*) i
6) učenje igranjem (engl. *play-based learning*).

Te strategije učenja vidljive su i u pedagoškim i didaktičkim idejama Petera Petersena, Celestine Freineta, Marije Montessori, Georga Kerschensteinera, John Deweya, Rudolfa Steinera i dr., tj. u pravcima i pokretima reformske pedagogije s početka 20. stoljeća (više kod: Oelkers, 2010; Skiera, 2009). Konstruktivističkim se učenjem stvara znanje. Slikanje, crtanje, pjevanje, plesanje i sviranje rezultati su konstruktivističkog učenja. U tom je pogledu učenje uvijek stvaralački proces otkrivanja ili stvaranja nečega novoga, što je jedno od glavnih obilježja i umjetničkog procesa.

Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje

Istraživanja društvenih i humanističkih znanosti tradicionalno su obilježena paradigmatskim raspravama „što jest znanost" i „što nije znanost", odnosno koja istraživanja mogu biti etiketirana kao znanstvena, a koja ne. Na kraju krajeva,

i pitanjima mogu li istraživanja u tim znanostima uopće biti znanstvena? To su ponajprije bile rasprave o kvalitativnoj i kvantitativnoj metodologiji postavljene između dva znanstvena tabora. Tabori su bili pozicionirani oko metoda *prirodnih znanosti* (engl. *science)*, te *društvenih* i *humanističkih znanosti* (engl. *humanities)* (Husen, 1988; Sekulić-Majurec, 2000, 2007). Prirodne znanosti (nazivane i „čvrstim"; engl. *hard*) vezane su uz kvantitativnu metodologiju, a društvene su znanosti (nazivane i „mekim"; engl. *soft*) često vezane uz kvalitativnu metodologiju. Spomenute su rasprave nazvane „ratovima paradigmi" (Keeves i Lakomsky, 1999; Sekulić-Majurec, 2007). Kao što je već naznačeno, s vremenom je smanjen intenzitet tih rasprava i ta dva metodološka pristupa promatraju se kao dopunjavajući, a ne isključivi.

S druge strane, vode se rasprave i o povezivanju znanstvenih istraživanja i prakse (McNiff, 1998). Govori se o znanstvenim istraživanjima stvaralaštva. Budući da je ljudska djelatnost obilježena stvaralaštvom i kreiranjem noviteta, od značajnog je interesa pitanje kako istraživati stvaralaštvo i odgoj stvaralaštva (McNiff, 1998). Uz pojam stvaralaštva vezan je i pojam (likovne) umjetnosti kao stvaralačkog procesa (Hickman, 2008; McNiff, 1998), pa je shodno tome bitno kako istraživati i (likovno) umjetničko stvaralaštvo (Knowles i Cole, 2008; McNiff, 1998).

Razvoj umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja

Za promjenu pozicija znanstvenih istraživanja u odnosu na istraživanja (likovnog) umjetničkog stvaralaštva, i općenito stvaralaštva, bitan je Rudolf Arnheim. On je znatno pridonio promjeni shvaćanja umjetničkog stvaralaštva i percepcije likovnog djela. Rudolf Arnheim postavio je nove temelje analize vizualno-likovnog stvaralaštva, a time naznačio i polazišta za umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje. Njegove ideje, koncepti i teorije iznesene u knjigama kao što su *Visual Thinking* (1969/1997), *The Power of the Center: A Study of Composition in the Visual Arts* (1982), a ponajprije *Art and Visual Perception: A Psychology of the Creative Eye* (1954/1974) su postale polazišta za novi i bitno drugačiji pristup u vizualno-likovnom odgoju.

Svako je stvaralaštvo učenje, posebno kako ga definiraju, konceptualiziraju i istražuju konstruktivističke teorije učenja. Odnosno, i umjetničko je stvaralaštvo oblik učenja, ponajprije izraženo kao ljudska konstruktivistička djelatnost. To potvrđuje što su već otprije i (konstruktivistički) pedagozi pisali o umjetnosti općenito, ali i umjetnosti kao načinu spoznaje. Poznate su filozofske, ali i pedagoške ideje John Deweya iznesene u knjizi *Art as Experience* (1934/1980). I Rudolf Arnheim (1954/1974) se u knjigama *Art and Visual Perception: A Psychology of the Creative Eye* i Visual Thinking (1969/1997) referira na ideje značajnog europskog reformskog pedagoga Georga Kerschensteinera.

U ljudskoj aktivnosti učenja i stvaralaštva naglašeni su i *proces* i *rezultat* učenja. Shodno tome, opravdano je istraživanja stvaralaštva, (likovne) umjetnosti i umjetničkog odgoja promatrati kao istraživanja učenja. U prilog svemu spomenutome Barone i Eisner (1997) kao obilježja (likovnog) umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja odgoja (engl. *art-based educational research*) navode:

1) kreiranje virtualne stvarnosti,

2) prisutnost dvosmislenosti,

3) ekspresija,

4) upotreba konteksta i jezičnih narječja,

5) prisutnost empatije,

6) osobni pristup istraživanju,

7) prisutnost estetike.

Tako opisani elementi umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja odgoja u svojoj su bazi ujedno i neki elementi konstruktivističkog učenja.

Stvaralaštvo, umjetničko izražavanje i konstruktivističko učenje često su teško istraživani kvantitativnom metodologijom. Psihometrija i kvantitativne metode istraživanja često nisu dostatne za davanje holističkih odgovora na takve probleme. Moguće je reći da su kvantitativne metode kompatibilne za navedenu problematiku, ali samo do određene razine. Kada dođe pitanje istraživanja subjektivnih procesa stvaralaštva, (autoetnografske) introspekcije, naracije, biografska istraživanja i dr., primjerenije su kvalitativne strategije. Posebice jer su stvaralaštvo, umjetnost i konstruktivističko učenje subjektivni i individualni procesi. Stoga je u nekoliko posljednjih desetljeća razvijeno ono što se naziva umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje (Barone i Eisner, 2012; McNiff, 1998).

Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje ponajprije je razvijeno u području kvalitativne metodologije kreativne art-terapije (engl. *art-therapy*) psihologije i psihijatrije (Mcniff, 1998). Moguće ga je definirati kao umjetnošću uvjetovano istraživanje *procesa* i *rezultata* stvaralaštva i umjetničkog odgoja. Uz analiziranje i istraživanje stvaralačkog rezultata, bilo materijalnog ili intelektualnog noviteta, umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje bitno je usmjereno na unutarnje procese koji se odvijaju u stvaraocu (autoru) prilikom stvaranja nekog djela (Barone i Eisner, 2012; McNiff, 1998). Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje obuhvaća niz različitih načina istraživanja. Obuhvaća različite paradigmatske pristupe i metode prikupljanja podataka i njihovih analiza. Samim time je moguće kombinirati i kvalitativne i kvantitativne metode. Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje izranja iz znanstvenih istraživanja i umjetničkog stvaralaštva. U tom su pogledu integrirana ta dva područja i neutralizirane prijašnje krute granice njihova razdvajanja. Iako umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje ima značajnu primjenu u art-terapiji (Gilroy, 2006; McNiff, 1998), ono je zbog svojih obilježja bitno i u istraživanjima odgoja i obrazovanja. Treba, međutim, naglasiti da Eisner (2002) ukazuje na određene razlike između umjetničkih i znanstvenih istraživanja. Takav oblik istraživanja usmjeren je na različite oblike umjetničkog stvaralaštva kao što su: pismeni radovi (engl. *literary forms*), performans (engl. *performance*), glazba (engl. *music*), likovna umjetnost (engl. *visual art*) i novi mediji (engl. *new media*) (Knowles i Cole, 2008).

Obilježja umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja

U umjetnički utemeljenom istraživanju bitna je introspekcija. Introspekcija je usmjerena na istraživanja unutarnjih procesa razmišljanja, nedoumica, konflikata,

redefinicija i ideja koje se događaju u stvaraocu prilikom izrade nekog rada, umjetničkog djela ili učenja. Pritom stvaraoci proučavaju sami sebe. Introspekciju je u umjetnički utemeljenom istraživanju moguće prikazati i kao autoetnografsku (engl. *autoethnographic*) introspekciju (Davies i Ellis, 2008), jer svako promišljanje pojedinca o samome sebi ima obilježja etnografskog istraživanja. Istraživanja utemeljena na autoetnografskoj introspekciji polaze od detaljnih tekstualnih bilješki (opisima i zapisima) unutarnjih razmišljanja, procesa, ideja i konflikata. Takvi zapisi poslije mogu biti kvalitativno analizirani kao i drugi pismeni zapisi.

Iako umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje obuhvaća niz raznovrsnih metoda i pristupa, u ovom se radu usmjeravamo samo prema kvalitativnom pristupu i metodologiji. Zbog toga se na temelju paradigmatskih određenja (Guba i Lincoln, 2005) u umjetnički utemeljenom istraživanju koriste etablirane kvalitativne strategije prikupljanja i analiziranja podataka (Berg, 2001, Creswell, 2007, 2012; Denzin i Lincoln, 2005; Flick, von Kardoff i Steinke, 2004).

S obzirom na znanstvene paradigme (Cohen i sur., 2007; Guba i Lincoln, 2005) umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje teže je pozicionirati u normativne paradigme, tj. pozitivističku ili postpozitivističku. Naime na temelju aksiološkog ontološkog i epistemološkog određenja umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje primjerenije je pozicionirati u interpretativne paradigme, odnosno u kritičku, konstruktivističku i sudjelujuću paradigmu. Tako ga je moguće pozicionirati jer stvaralaštvo, učenje i umjetnički odgoj proizlaze iz ontološke i epistemološke racionale koje na stvarnost, svijet i znanje gledaju kao na nešto subjektivno, individualno, promjenjivo i trenutno (Guba i Lincoln, 2005). Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje moguće je pozicionirati u konstruktivističku paradigmu jer polazi od konstrukcije vlastite spoznaje (znanja) i introspekcije. Svako znanje, spoznaja, a time i materijalne kreacije subjektivne su i individualne, posebno umjetničko stvaralaštvo koje je jedinstveno. Tu je metodu moguće pozicionirati i u sudjelujuću paradigmu, jer proizlazi iz povezivanja znanstvenih istraživanja i praktičnog djelovanja. Na spoznaju svijeta i konstrukciju znanja gleda se kroz aktivnost i djelovanje. Odnosno, svijet je moguće spoznati djelujući, surađujući i stvarajući. Moguće ga je i pozicionirati u kritičku paradigmu. Finley (2005) tvrdi da je umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje kompatibilno s kritičkom teorijom jer teži promjeni prakse, novitetima i emancipaciji. Uz sva metodološka obilježja umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja smatra ga se korisnim implementirati i u akcijska istraživanja. Akcijska su istraživanja, kao značajna istraživačka strategija kritičke paradigme, primjerena za istraživanje stvaralaštva, jer su usmjerena na kreiranje novoga i refleksivnu praksu (Bognar, 2006; McNiff i Whitehead, 2002; Reason i Bradbury, 2001).

Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje moguće je pozicionirati i u etabliranih Creswellovih (2007) pet pristupa kvalitativnih istraživanja: 1) narativno istraživanje (engl. *narrative research*), 2) fenomenologiju (engl. *phenomenology*), 3) utemeljenu teoriju (engl. *grounded theory*), 4) etnografiju (engl. *ethnography*) i 5) studiju slučaja (engl. *case study*). Budući da je umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje usmjereno i na

unutarnje mentalne procese u stvaraocu, moguće ga je objasniti kao narativno istraživanje, jer je usmjereno na životne priče ljudi. Usmjereno je na njihove interpretacije, pripovijedanje te opisivanje života, događaja i iskustva. Dok je narativno istraživanje usmjereno uglavnom na pojedinca, fenomenologija je usmjerena na istraživanja istog fenomena kod različitih osoba. Traže se osobe koje su iskusile isti događaj (određenu bolest, smrtni slučaj, ratne strahote i dr.), te shodno tome njihovo viđenje i opisivanje tog fenomena, vremenskog perioda ili događaja. U tom je pogledu primjenjivo umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje jer teži unutarnjoj interpretaciji proživljenih fenomena. Svako je individualno opisivanje nekog događaja i fenomena u svom temelju introspekcija i interpretiranje samoga sebe. Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje primjenjivo je i u etnografskim istraživanjima. Osim što omogućuje introspekciju u unutarnje procese pojedinca prilikom određene aktivnosti, omogućuje i uvid u određenu društvenu zajednicu ljudi koji žive zajedno. Omogućuje introspektivni uvid u određene vrijednosti, navike, običaje, vjerovanja i kulturu neke manje ili veće društvene zajednice. Može polaziti od pojedinca, a moguće ga je proširiti na istraživanja više sudionika. Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje omogućuje izgradnju utemeljene teorije. Prema Creswellovoj (2007) definiciji utemeljena je teorija induktivna izgradnja teorije na temelju kvalitativnog prikupljanja podataka. Izgradnjom utemeljene teorije žele se pronaći obrasci i latentne strukture, a ne samo doslovno opisati neki problem. Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje omogućuje uvid u stvaralaštvo, pa je moguće izgrađivati autonomnu teoriju o nekom fenomenu ili problemu, jer se radi o subjektivnim percepcijama, idejama, unutarnjim procesima, vlastitim mislima i razmišljanjima pojedinca tokom njegova/njezina stvaralaštva. Zbog svojih obilježja umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje omogućuje (što uglavnom i jeste) i studiju slučaja. Iz navedenoga i opisanoga vidljivo je da umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje omogućuje različite kvalitativne istraživačke pristupe.

Osim različitih kvalitativnih pristupa umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje obuhvaća i niz različitih metoda prikupljanja podataka i njihove obrade. U tom pogledu, pozivajući se na tipologije kvalitativnih metoda prikupljanja podataka (Berg, 2001; Cohen i sur., 2007; Creswell, 2012; Silverman, 2014), u umjetnički utemeljenom istraživanju podatke je moguće prikupljati intervjuima, grupnim intervjuima (fokus grupama), obrazloženjima, opažanjima (sudjelujućim opažanjima), osobnim konstruktima, analizom sadržaja, analizama slika, fotografija i dr. Važno je da svako prikupljanje i analiza podataka polaze od detaljno pisanih zapisa (opisa, transkripata). Na temelju analize detaljnih opisa i transkripata (transkript intervjua) izvode se objašnjenja, oblikuju koncepti i izgrađuju teorije. Odnosno izrazito je pogodno graditi utemeljenu teoriju (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin i Strauss, 2015; Glasser i Straus, 2006; Mey i Mruck, 2011) na temelju umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja.

Iz definicija, opisa i obilježja umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja vidljivo je da takvo istraživanje obuhvaća niz paradigmatskih određenja, različite kvalitativne pristupe i raznovrsne kvalitativne metode prikupljanja podataka koji su usmjereni na izgradnju

teorije o unutrašnjim procesima koji se događaju u stvaraocu prilikom stvaralaštva. Takva istraživanja omogućuju i analizu završnog kreativnog rezultata.

Komparacija umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja i konstruktivističkog učenja

Iz opisa obilježja konstruktivističkog učenja i umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja moguće je pojedine njihove elemente smatrati kompatibilnim. Odnosno, u određenom je segmentu primjereno povezivati te istraživati i uspoređivati konstruktivističko učenje s umjetnički utemeljenim istraživanjem.

Polazeći od obilježja konstruktivističkog učenja koje je definirano kao konstrukcija vlastitog znanja, opravdano je smatrati da je to uvijek proces kreiranja nečega novoga. Konstruktivističko učenje manifestirano je kao aktivan i suradnički proces, proces u kojem pojedinac sam daje značenje pojedinim objektima, komunikaciji i idejama. Pojedinac sam stvara znanje. Takvo je učenje uvijek samostalno, ali u interakciji s fizičkom ili društvenom okolinom. Tako stečena znanja i sposobnosti individualni su *procesi* i *rezultati*. Drugim riječima, koliko god različiti učenici učili isti nastavni sadržaj, stjecali iste sposobnosti ili kompetencije, oni ih uvijek drugačije nauče i razviju. Stoga ne postoje dvije osobe s istim spoznajama istog objekta. Pojednostavljeno, ontološki i epistemološki objašnjeno, postoji objektivna stvarnost, ali ju je nemoguće do kraja spoznati kao objektivnu. Shodno svemu navedenome, učenje je intrinzičan, subjektivan, unutarnji i individualni proces izgradnje nečega novoga. Učenje je stvaralački proces, kao i umjetničko stvaralaštvo.

S druge strane, umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje jest strategija istraživanja raznih oblika umjetničkog stvaralaštva (slikanje, plesanje, sviranje i dr.). Osim toga, s umjetnički utemeljenim istraživanjem moguće je istraživati svaku ljudsku aktivnost. Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje podjednako je usmjereno na završni *rezultat* stvaranja, ali i na unutarnje *procese* koji se odvijaju u stvaraocu. Taj rezultat/produkt ne mora nužno biti materijalan, već može biti i intelektualan. Posebnu pažnju kod umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanje zauzima istraživanje spomenutih unutarnjih procesa u stvaraocu prilikom stvaranja. U tom se pogledu naglasak usmjerava na to što stvaratelj razmišlja, kako razvija ideje, unutarnje konflikte, na koje načine rješava zadatke, kako postavlja probleme i ostvaruje intrapersonalnu komunikaciju. Takve unutarnje procese moguće je istražiti (autoetnografskom) introspekcijom, bilježenjem vlastitih ideja, intervjuiranjem i promatranjem stvaratelja.

Iz toga je vidljivo da je učenje kreativan, subjektivan, individualan i stvaralački proces, a budući da umjetnički usmjereno istraživanje omogućuje uvid u takve procese, moguće je na taj način istraživati i (konstruktivističko) učenje. Uzimajući u obzir obilježja konstruktivističkog učenja i umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja, vidljiva je njihova kompatibilnost. Drugim riječima, budući da je učenje individualan i unutarnji proces, opravdano ga je istraživati introspekcijom, analizom vlastitih misli, ideja, konflikata i sl. Opravdano ga je istraživati umjetnički utemeljenim istraživanjem.

Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje kompatibilno je i s akcijskim istraživanjem jer je to istraživanje ljudske djelatnosti kojom se teži promjeni. Učenje je refleksivan i stvaralački proces, a to su neka od obilježja akcijskog istraživanja. Opravdano je ukazati na pogodnost izgradnje utemeljene teorije na temelju umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja, jer je svaki stvaralački proces jedinstven i individualan.

Tako opisana kompatibilnost umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja i konstruktivističkog učenja ima implikacije i u praksi. Naime, učenje i nastavu ne treba promatrati kao reproduciranje informacija, pri čemu učenici moraju slušati što učitelji govore ili prepisivati s ploče. Upravo suprotno, učenje je stvaralački proces u kojem učenici učenjem stvaraju nešto novo, nove vrijednosti, znanja i sposobnosti. U učenju su uvijek bitna unutarnja psihološka stanja, emocije, ideje i razmišljanja osobe koja uči. Stoga je primjereno organizirati nastavu koja je usmjerena na učenika, za vrijeme koje učenik uči rješavanjem problema, uči igrom, uči djelujući i suradnički. To su upravo stvaralački procesi, a kao takve ih je moguće istraživati umjetnički utemeljenim istraživanjem. Stoga umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje može biti i element didaktičkih strategija učenja, prilikom kojih učenici primjenjuju refleksivnu praksu, tj. sami analiziraju svoje procese učenja i tako uče.

Zaključak

Na temelju analize obilježja učenja kako ga opisuju konstruktivističke teorije i umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja možemo ukazati na nekoliko njihovih međusobnih kompatibilnih značajki. Naime, opravdano je tvrditi da je učenje stvaralački proces, a stjecanje znanja, razvoj vještina, sposobnosti vrijednosti je stvaranje noviteta. Takvo je učenje aktivno učenje, odnosno učenje rješavanjem problema, učenje istraživanjem, suradničko učenje, učenje igrom i učenje usmjereno na djelovanje.

S druge strane, u metodološkom pogledu, opravdano je smatrati spoznajno korisnim istraživati učenje kao stvaralački proces. U tom ga je pogledu primjereno istraživati i s pomoću umjetnički utemeljenog istraživanja. Time se dobiva analiza krajnjeg noviteta (rezultat), ali i unutarnjih procesa i psihičkih stanja osobe koja stvara novitet. Dobiva se uvid u razmišljanja, ideje, misli i unutarnji dijalog stvaratelja sa svojim djelom. S ontološkog i epistemološkog aspekta to su bitne informacije, jer je učenje subjektivan i konstruktivan proces. Tako definirano učenje teško je moguće vrednovati standardiziranim testovima budući da je svako znanje jedinstveno.

Uzimajući sve u obzir, učenje je *unutarnji* (intrinzični, ali i socijalni) i *stvaralački* proces konstrukcije vlastitog znanja u kojem su bitni i *proces* i *rezultat* učenja. Umjetnički utemeljenim istraživanjem istražuju se *unutarnji* (intrinzični) procesi *stvaralaštva* jednako usmjereni i na sam taj *proces* i na njegov krajnji *rezultat*. Zato je za istraživanja (konstruktivističkog) učenja i nastave primjereno koristiti se umjetnički utemeljenim istraživanjem.

Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje generalno se ubraja u okvire kvalitativne metodologije. Moguće ga je pozicionirati u interpretativne paradigme, odnosno u

konstruktivističku, kritičku i sudjelujuću. Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje moguće je primjenjivati u art-terapiji, istraživanju svih oblika umjetničkog stvaralaštva i učenja. Moguće ga je primjenjivati i kao element didaktičkih strategija aktivnog učenja, osobito kao dio refleksivne prakse.

Umjetnički utemeljeno istraživanje relativno je novija metodološka strategija koja daljnjim razvojem, usavršavanjem i proširivanjem može biti značajna za istraživanja u društvenim i humanističkim znanostima.