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Abstract

The purpose of this action research study was to gain an understanding of the learning experiences and outcomes of 12 undergraduates enrolled in Creative Dance, a general education choreography course, in Fall 2019 and the teaching strategies and practices that guided their learning. Research questions that guided this study were: what does student work reveal about their learning and the teaching strategies that guide their learning? and what curricula and teaching changes will more effectively facilitate student learning processes and stronger outcomes? Qualitative data included standard instructional materials created for and utilized in the course and students’ choreographic and written work. The teacher-researcher coded, analyzed, and interpreted the data within three subareas of student learning: cognitive domain of learning, development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance, and affective responses to learning experiences. Plans for modifications of teaching materials, strategies, and practices for Fall 2020 to improve facilitation of emerging adult learning of choreography were outcomes of this research. Interpretation of findings revealed the need for teaching modifications to support (a) the interrelationships between thinking, moving, and feeling; (b) learning as a cyclical process; and (c) learning as a social process more strongly using both Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle and Arnett’s (2000) Theory of Emerging Adulthood as a theoretical foundation. This study contributes to dance education and the wider field of higher education by serving as an example of critically reflective teaching and course design that used student experiences to guide teaching modifications.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This action research study focused on gaining an understanding of the learning outcomes and experiences of 12 undergraduate students enrolled in a one-semester introductory choreography course at a medium-sized state university in Massachusetts and the teaching strategies that guided their learning. The purpose of this study was to use information revealed in the data – student work and instructional materials – to change my teaching materials, strategies, and practices and to guide emerging adult learning in the course more effectively in subsequent semesters. It was anticipated that a deeper investigation of these documents through qualitative analysis would reveal aspects of learning and teaching that are overlooked in the every-day instruction and assessment practices of my teacher role. Action research was the preferred methodology for this study, as I aimed to investigate my teaching in a specific learning context and use the outcomes of this study to make positive changes in my instruction. The 12 participants were students who completed the course, titled Creative Dance, in Fall 2019 and who volunteered their coursework for this study.

This introductory chapter begins with information about the background and context of the action research study. The research problem and questions that have guided this investigation are then explained, followed by an overview of the research design and information about the researcher’s perspectives and assumptions. Additional components of this chapter include the rationale and significance of the study and key terminology.

Background and Context

The context for this action research study includes the specific details about the learning environment in which the research took place. This includes the dance experience and interest of the students, a general overview of the course, and the theoretical foundation and teaching
intentions underlying my teaching practices. My background as a dance artist and educator, certainly a significant contributing factor to the research context, will be shared towards the end of this chapter.

**Students’ Dance Experience**

The majority of students enrolled in my general education dance courses over the past eight years at a four-year, liberal arts state university in Massachusetts were not majoring in dance; they were undergraduates majoring in other disciplines and enrolled in the course to fulfill an arts requirement for graduation. There has been a variety of dance experience and interest in the classes. Some of these students had received formal training in a variety of dance forms at local dance studios, while others experienced dance as part of their family cultures. Other students’ exposure to dance might have been limited to, for example, Beyoncé’s newest online music video, reality dance competition shows such as Americas Best Dance Crew, or the experience of their own bodies as they moved to the beat of a song playing on their iPhones or through their car radios. Some were interested in learning about dance and demonstrated effort to learn while others demonstrated minimal interest and effort beyond earning a passing grade.

Anecdotal evidence from teaching Creative Dance, an introductory choreography course for non-dance majors, for 13 of the previous 14 consecutive semesters showed that most student enrolled in the course without seeing any application to their lives beyond the three-credit performing arts requirement for graduation.

**Information About the Course**

Course information available to students and their academic advisors to assist with their course selection was minimal. For example, the following description for Creative Dance was available for students enrolling for Fall 2019 courses via the university’s online Catalog Search:
“This course investigates the theory of dance through participation, composition, lecture, discussion, and film. Students learn about the elements of space, time, force, movement, and style” (Bridgewater State University, n.d.a). The day and time of the course, the instructor’s name, and the number of credits (three) were also provided. It was assumed that students might have heard additional information about the course and/or instructor from peers who have previously taken the course.

Students gained a better understanding of the course expectations after reading the syllabus (Appendix A), attending class, and taking on the roles of dance artists. They learned about choreography, the art of making dances, through their experiences as individual choreographers, artistic collaborators, performers, and informed audience members. They learned the basic elements of choreography by actively dancing and creating their own movement rather than passively observing and imitating my movement. I served as their guide by providing dance terminology, concepts, and tools for students to use as they crafted original dances. They learned by not only speaking and writing about and observing the terms, concepts, and tools, but by embodying them; they demonstrated their understanding with their bodies.

Instructional strategies to guide student learning included participating in individual and collaborative movement exercises (both set choreography and improvisation), completing individual and collaborative choreographic projects, participating in class discussions, viewing dance on video, completing writing assignments, and observing live dance performances inside and outside of the classroom. In addition, they reflected upon their learning experiences through weekly journal entries and experienced giving and receiving peer feedback on their choreography and performance throughout their creative process for their two main choreographic assignments of the semester: Midterm Composition and Final Composition. This
performing arts course aimed to provide opportunities for students not only to embrace and express themselves as individuals, but also to connect and acknowledge similarities within a group of emerging adults with diverse backgrounds and different levels of dance experience, academic majors, and career plans.

Assessments in Creative Dance included homework assignments (online journals entries, written responses to videos of their own performance and dances viewed online, and short choreographic assignments performed live in class), a written response to a live dance performance on campus, a midterm choreographic project and written reflection, and a final choreographic project and written reflection. Student participation and professionalism were also an assessment category.

**Theoretical Foundations for Teaching**

While creating and revising instructional materials and strategies for Creative Dance over recent years, I have been viewing the learning and development of the undergraduate students in the dance studio through the lenses of the Theory of Emerging Adulthood (Arnett, 2000) and Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, 2015). Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy (Anderson et al., 2001) was the framework utilized for creating the student learning outcomes that guided my teaching choices investigated in this study.

In his Theory of Emerging Adulthood, Arnett (2000) postulated the existence of a transitional period of development between adolescence and adulthood – approximately ages 18-25 – in industrialized societies. During this period, the individual relies less on others for direction and moves towards greater self-regulation (Tanner, 2006). Considering that undergraduate students were entering the dance studio with different backgrounds and life experiences, they may be at different positions en route to adulthood and, therefore, have
different capacities for independent thinking and self-direction. For example, some students arrive as passive learners who prefer to be told what they need to memorize for the assignments and exams, while other students arrive to college with the curiosity and desire to learn with less reliance on the professor. Some are dependent upon the teacher for knowledge and direction and might not have had the opportunity to develop a sense of agency and self-directed approach to learning. Others are self-directed students who are motivated and take the initiative for their learning. In the dance classroom, for example, some dancers may be ready and willing to improvise, choreograph their own dances, and take creative risks while others may be apprehensive to do so and instead look to the teacher to tell them what movement to create and perform. Many students are positioned in between these two examples of learners.

As an attempt to provide learning experiences that I felt to be beneficial to emerging adult learning and development regardless of their major or career path or their readiness for self-direction, I created and scaffolded in-class activities, assignments, and assessments based on active learning and my desire to transition my teaching towards student-centered practices. Student-centered, or learner-centered, approaches to teaching increases opportunities for students to take responsibility for their learning by placing less emphasis on the teacher as the main container of knowledge (Blumberg, 2008) and acknowledges subjective awareness and experience as integral to learning. This is opposite to instructor-centered, or content-centered, teaching where the teacher assumes sole responsibility for all aspects of student learning, including choice of content and perspectives shared in class (Blumberg, 2008) and is more about what the teacher knows and decides to share rather than inviting the knowledge and perspectives that the students can contribute to their and their classmates’ learning.
Student-centered approaches for assessment, for example, include practices such as the teacher providing constructive feedback and formative assessments – assessments within the learning process rather than at the end – to enable students to work through mistakes and demonstrate growth and mastery and the teacher encouraging students to provide self- and peer feedback (Blumberg, 2008). Instructor-centered practices for assessment, in comparison to the example above, omit opportunities for students to learn from mistakes and revise their work en route to mastering the material, rely on summative assessments – assessment at the end of the learning process – and omit student self- and peer assessments and feedback (Blumberg, 2008).

The use of self- and peer feedback throughout the creative process in Creative Dance aligns with a student-centered approach to assessment. This is rather consistent regardless of class size. My ability to implement learner-centered approaches of providing frequent constructive feedback and formative assessments, however, varies based on class size. When the class size was small – as it was in Spring 2020 Creative Dance with six students – I was able to provide frequent feedback and assessments to all students. There are less opportunities for me to do so for choreographic assignments when the class size is 19, as was the case in Fall 2019. My desire for students to receive frequent feedback throughout their creative process regardless of class size led me to seek out teaching and learning strategies that encourage students to take on a greater role in providing self- and peer feedback. David Kolb’s (2015) Experiential Learning Theory and four-stage Learning Cycle provided a solution to this feedback problem.

Experiential learning is generally defined as learning from experience (Kolb, 2015). Kolb (2015), who developed Experiential Learning Theory, defined learning as a process where “knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (p. 49). Through my years of teaching Creative Dance at the university, I observed that many students viewed learning as an
end point rather than a process. For example, they quickly completed a choreographic assignment, sat down on the floor, and waited for me to give them their next task rather than revisit, revise, and strengthen what they have already created. The implementation of Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle – a process of experiencing, reflecting, thinking, and acting – was one instructional strategy used to promote learning as a process by encouraging students to provide, receive, and integrate self- and peer-feedback multiple times as they created their dances. The use of the Learning Cycle as a systematic process for critical inquiry aligned with student-centered practices by acknowledging subjective awareness and experience as integral to student learning, giving students greater responsibility with regards to their feedback and assessment, and placing less emphasis on me, the teacher, as the main container of knowledge, provider of feedback, and assessor of learning.

When revising the student learning outcomes for Fall 2019 – what students should be able to know and demonstrate after successfully completing the course – I chose Anderson et al.’s (2001) Revised Taxonomy of the cognitive domain as my guide. Since this framework is utilized in various disciplines, I assumed it would build an effective foundation to guide my teaching of Creative Dance while also providing me with shared pedagogical terminology for communicating learning outcomes and experiences with colleagues across disciplines. The original Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956), created as a hierarchical framework for defining educational objectives, categorized learning into three domains: cognitive (mental processes associated with learning), affective (feelings and values associated with learning), and psychomotor (movement/motor skills associated with learning). The Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al., 2001) better reflects the active nature of learning by changing the six categories of the cognitive domain in the original Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) from noun to
verb. *Application*, for example, became *applying*. In addition, this Revised Taxonomy adds a second dimension, the knowledge dimension, for assessing the four types of knowledge that students utilized in their cognitive processes. I used the categories of the Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al., 2001) – remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating – and their associated verbs to write the student learning outcomes for Fall 2019.

**Statement of the Problem**

As a teacher of Creative Dance, I have focused student learning outcomes, assessments, and activities primarily on the demonstrated expansion of students’ choreographic knowledge and skills within the cognitive domain of learning outlined in the Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al., 2001) along with the observable growth in their performance of their choreography. Minimal focus has been devoted to the affective domain of learning (Krathwohl et al., 1964) or affective responses to learning, yet anecdotal evidence from teaching this course in previous semesters and outcomes of a pilot study that I conducted on Creative Dance in Spring 2019 revealed that students’ attitudes and feelings greatly impacted student performance and learning in the course and their attitudes and feelings changed over time. Additionally, although this course is largely focused on demonstration of choreographic skills via movement, psychomotor taxonomies (Dave, 1970; Harrow, 1972; Simpson, 1966, 1972) have not been utilized in course development as a framework for creating learning outcomes.

I have grown curious about the degree by which my teaching practices facilitate emerging adult learning – with regards to their learning process and outcomes via written and choreographic products – within the cognitive, affective, and physical domains of learning and promote the education of the whole person as a thinking, sensing, moving being capable of expressing through dance. This research study is an outcome of this curiosity and my underlying
desire to understand student learning and to improve my teaching effectiveness in Creative Dance, especially for students who are not pursuing careers in dance. I have spent time revising this course over the years to include student-centered practices as explained previously, but how do I know the degree to which what and how I have been teaching is having a positive impact on student learning? I seek to facilitate learning (Brookfield, 1991), and this action research study feeds my desire by formally investigating the connections between my teaching and student learning. Dance Educator Jan Erkert (2003) stated, “analytical knowledge confirms intuitive choices and challenges old beliefs” (p. xiii), and this study enabled me to reflect critically upon my teaching practices, values, and assumptions so that I could facilitate more effective learning experiences for my students.

This particular course and student population were chosen because it is a course that I have taught consistently and would most likely be assigned to teach again. Data was readily available, as the documents utilized as data in this study – student work and instructional materials – were standard for the course and would have been created and collected even if the study did not take place. It was important for me to use this standard teaching and learning documentation and to not ask students to do anything in addition to their normal coursework to participate in this study; I wanted to see what was revealed from revisiting previously assessed student work and instructional materials from new perspectives. I questioned, what does student work reveal about their learning, and how do my teaching strategies guide this learning? Although I continually use student work and feedback to guide my teaching within a semester-long course and between semesters, I had yet to analyze student learning more deeply through a formal action research process. I believe that doing so would have the potential to reveal
valuable information about student learning that is otherwise overlooked in my day-to-day teacher role.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this action research study was to gain better understand the learning outcomes and experiences of 12 undergraduate college students enrolled in Creative Dance, a general education choreography course, and the teaching practices that facilitated their learning. Outcomes of this study were expected to be used to plan modifications of my teaching materials, strategies, and practices for Fall 2020 to improve facilitation of emerging adult learning. The study aimed to address the following questions with regards to the cognitive domain of learning, affective responses to learning experiences, and the development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance:

1. What does student work reveal about their learning and the teaching strategies that guide their learning?
   
   a. What teaching strategies strengthen the quality of student learning experiences and outcomes?

   b. What teaching strategies hinder student learning experiences and outcomes?

2. What curricula and teaching changes will more effectively facilitate student learning processes and stronger outcomes?

**Research Design Overview**

The teaching and learning in Creative Dance were studied after obtaining approval from the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) at both my teaching institution and Lesley University for the inclusion of student participants in the research. This research aimed to represent a contextual approach to learning (Giguere, 2015), as the learning context was essential to understanding
student experiences. Action research methodology was used in this study (Giguere, 2015; Hinchey, 2008; McNiff, 2002, 2017; Norton, 2009; Tomal, 2003) to gain a deeper understanding of a specific learning and teaching context. I took action to understand the learning experiences and outcomes of dance students – all of whom were not majoring in dance – as a gateway for evaluating my teaching practices, improving my teaching, and coming to a greater understanding of how these practices have impacted student learning.

Throughout this research process, I was immersed in Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle; I was teaching, observing and assessing student work, reflecting upon my teaching strategies and observations, planning and implementing changes to my teaching, and setting the foundation to repeat the cycle again in Fall 2020. This type of inquiry was second-person action research (Reason & Bradbury, 2008); instead of solely examining my personal teaching practices and experiences, I also investigated the experiences of students by valuing and incorporating students’ voices expressed their written work and choreography. Rather than limiting my questions to what students have learned from me, I asked, “what can I learn about my teaching from my students?”

Data in this study included student documentation (writing assignments and videos of choreographic assignments submitted as coursework) and teacher documentation (syllabus, assignment prompts, class plans, observation notes, and teacher memos). Analysis included both deductive and inductive components. Deductive analysis included the use of priori codes within the organizational categories (Maxwell, 2013) of the cognitive domain of learning (Anderson et al., 2001), the knowledge dimension of learning (Anderson et al., 2001), the affective domain of learning (Krathwohl et al., 1964), and psychomotor domain of learning (Dave, 1970; Harrow, 1972; Simpson, 1966, 1972). Inductive analysis aimed to reveal themes of student learning that
lay outside of the pre-selected taxonomies. Each of the three subareas required a different path of inductive analysis and coding strategies. Connecting steps were used to identify relationships among the student’s written data and videos of their choreographic performance and to critically reflect upon my teaching strategies by identifying relationships between the student data and my teacher data.

Expected outcomes of this investigation included using findings to plan the modification of teaching materials, strategies, and practices for Creative Dance in Fall 2020 to support emerging adult learning and development more effectively. Changes were to be made to student learning outcomes, assessment strategies, and prompts for activities and assignments according to Wiggins and McTighe’s (2011) three-stage backwards design process to improve the facilitation of student learning and strengthen the quality of student work.

**Rationale and Significance**

This study is an example of action research focusing on higher education dance pedagogy. Outcomes of this study have direct, immediate, and practical application; this study aims to benefit the learning of future Creative Dance students through the improvement of my teaching effectiveness. Viewing this study from a broader perspective, I am drawn to dance educator and scholar Miriam Giguere’s (2015) explanation of four distinct ways in which action research and dance education can support one another: “enhancing self-reflective teaching and curriculum design, taking responsibility for teaching outcomes, giving voice to dance students and teachers, and adding to the body of rigorous dance research” (p. 27).

This study contributes to dance education and the wider field of higher education by serving as an example of critically reflective teaching and course design. Although context-specific, the teaching practices, pedagogical terminology, and critical reflection in this research
cross disciplinary boundaries and provide a doorway for communicating about emerging adult learning within and beyond the dance discipline. Most importantly, this action research enabled me to acknowledge and take responsibility for my teaching and the role that I play in facilitating student learning experiences and outcomes. As scholar and biology professor Jamie Jensen (2011) stated, “your advanced degrees and years of experience do not definitively qualify you as excellent educators. It takes dedication, self-reflection, and amenability to be great educators, and to adequately serve the students we have been appointed to teach” (p. 35).

This study also provides an opportunity to give voice to my experiences as a dance educator – someone who is both a teacher and a learner – alongside the experiences of dance students. This study shares student learning experiences and outcomes within a general education dance course for non-dance majors, a population that is underrepresented in current dance education research. Although there are some published studies focusing specifically on general education dance courses in the United States (Bond & Gerdes, 2013; Morris, 2012; Risner, 2014; Stark, 2009), these studies are sparse in comparison to those focusing on dance majors’ courses.

Additionally, this study contributes to the area of emerging adult learning by focusing on the learning experiences of undergraduates in their late teens and early twenties who are presumed to be living within the transitory period of emerging adulthood. While most of the emerging adult research has been on four-year residential college students because of their ready availability and accessibility (Arnett, 2016), this study focuses on emerging adult learning at a university with over 50 percent commuter students (Bridgewater State University, n.d.b).

**The Teacher-Researcher**

Each dance educator has a unique dance history that has shaped their pedagogical practices, teaching values, and underlying epistemological assumptions. Working as a
collaborative dance artist for 16 years – including some of my emerging adult years – and dance faculty member at a state university for eight years has provided me with experiential knowledge that serves as the starting point for my scholarship focusing on dance pedagogy in support of emerging adult learning in higher education. Action research, a form of self-reflective inquiry (McNiff, 2002), is grounded in experiential knowledge. As a researcher engaging in this form of inquiry, I acknowledge that my values and lived experiences have influenced my research process (Ponterotto, 2005) and positionality, just as they have greatly shaped my teaching practice. Specific values and experiences that have contributed to my teaching and this research are explained below. These include a shift in my perspective on dance, growing as an emerging adult through the collaborative, choreographic process, using experiential learning practices in support of emerging adult learning and development, creating a community via collaboration, and, finally, statements of my positionality.

Similar to the students in my classes, I did not major in dance in college. Although I absolutely loved to dance, and it had been a passion of mine since I started taking dance classes at the age of seven, I – like my students – did not view it as a viable academic discipline to pursue as a major. I did not view dance as academic; it was a fun stress-reliever and break from my academic pursuits, not a viable career path. At that time, I felt that dance did not teach me anything beyond dance steps, as I only used my brain and physical talent to memorize and imitate the movements created by my teachers. Based on those valuable yet limited experiences and beliefs, I chose to minor in dance in college while pursuing what I viewed as a more legitimate degree: a Bachelor of Science in Biology.

Through various dance technique and theory courses in college and an opportunity to assist my late dance professor, Danna Frangione, with teaching dance at a high school in Taiwan
for four weeks, dance was revealed to be a powerful means of non-verbal communication, a bridge for interpersonal and cross-cultural connection, and a platform for creating a sense of community. This experience of community and connection in the studio boosted the credibility of dance as an area worthy of deeper investigation, and I decided to pursue graduate studies in dance.

While earning a Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) in dance, I began to see how dance could extend beyond the boundaries of the dance studio and connect with other areas of interest. My interdisciplinary interest was fueled with courses in anatomy/kinesiology, athletic training, and neuroscience where I integrated dance with science. Blending seemingly different content areas and life experiences carried over into my choreographic thesis project where I integrated baseball and dance as a means to bridge my interests inside and outside of the studio and to engage audiences who may not otherwise be drawn to watching dance. The interdisciplinary potential of dance is highlighted in my work as an educator by encouraging Creative Dance students to invite their everyday experiences and interests into our classroom and integrate them with dance. Students have the freedom to choose the topics that they want to research and express through their choreography – including their own life experiences and/or non-dance related themes – and to create and sequence movement that they feel best represents their topic. Such practices, grounded in experiential learning, support the perspective that dance knowledge is not restricted to the boundaries of the dance studio, dance discipline, or dance professor.

Creative Dance includes many collaborative activities, which is influenced by my working process as a professional dancer first in New York City (NYC) and now in Boston. After graduate school, I was invited into Gibney Dance, a non-profit modern dance company in NYC, and for four years, three times per week, was a choreographic collaborator with the
Artistic Director, Gina Gibney, and five other female dancers in the studio. Instead of teaching us movement that she created, Gibney gave us physical problems to solve on our own or in small groups, such as to create movement that reflects being strongly bound to the earth and within a four-by-four-foot square on the floor. I improvised and choreographed in every rehearsal, expressed my voice through movement rather than learning and imitating the movement of others, and taught movement to my fellow artists that would later be integrated into evening length dances performed for the NYC dance community.

My artistry and interpersonal skills grew exponentially while working with Gibney Dance. The methodological problem solving that I loved as a biology major and that I viewed as a cognitive process existing only in math and science was explored kinesthetically throughout the choreographic process. I was creating and learning through my moving body and experiencing the creative process as a learning process. Trust, sensitivity, and clarity of communication – physical and verbal – with oneself and others were some of the invaluable products of the consistent, collaborative working process experienced in the studio.

I became more independent and learned to trust myself to make movement choices, offer creative solutions, speak up for myself, and take the initiative to lead, because dance was no longer an individual endeavor. I was experiencing learning as a continual, social process of experimentation, negotiation, and discovery with multiple paths to a variety of artistic outcomes rather than one particular solution. I contributed to the creating and sharing knowledge with my fellow artists. I was an emerging adult who became more independent and self-directed through my active participation in the collaborative, choreographic process.

Having developed a stronger sense of self and self-direction as a result of my in-studio collaborations as a professional dancer, along with my observations of artistic growth as a result
of the in-studio collaborations of Creative Dance students over the years, I began to wonder how my teaching practices and the creation of a classroom community could support college students during a time when they are moving towards adulthood, a place of greater self-awareness, independence, and self-guidance. My understanding of experiential learning through my dance practice and teaching, and the knowledge derived through direct experience, has led me to dive deeper into Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, 2015) with the goal of utilizing its practices in support of emerging adult learning. I view Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle and its reflective components as strategies for guiding students to move beyond an act of experiencing movement towards a place of learning – learning about themselves, the work that they create, and dance as a vehicle for expression and connection.

It is not a surprise that my experiences with the collaborative, creative process in the professional dance arena have served as the foundation for the collaborative activities and learning community in Creative Dance. Strong, supportive communities were born from my collaborations in the dance studios. Trust, mutual respect, support, and inspiration grew within our company of dancers over time. This is this type of supportive learning environment that I strived to create for, and with, dance students as their teacher.

Experiential learning emphasizes learning as a social process that is grounded by experience and interactions between an individual and the environment (Kolb, 2015). In this study, the environment includes the people – teacher and students – within the college dance studio. Just as the relationships cultivated through my professional work in the studio both in NYC and my current work with Weber Dance in Boston have been integral to, and greatly impacted, the choreography that was created, the relationships that I cultivated with my Creative Dance students were integral to, and greatly impacted, my teaching and research. Qualitative
methods of inquiry have enabled me to embrace my insider role in our classroom community as a teacher-researcher who invited student voices to be shared through their written and choreographed work in class and in this study, where they were invited to be co-creators of knowledge and my teachers.

Even as I assumed my researcher role, I acknowledged that I was first and foremost the students’ teacher. I was also a student, however; I was simultaneously learning about the students, myself, and my dance discipline as a teacher-researcher. I align with late educator and sociologist Robert Bellah’s (1983) belief that I am not outside or above the beings who I was studying; I am not able to know or understand students better than they know themselves. Bellah’s (1983) work opened my eyes to the ethical considerations of social science research and the notion that subjectivity is an inherent part of such research with the observer and the observed inextricably linked. Ultimately, I was the lens through which I interpreted the data to generate meaning of student learning and my teaching strategies, and this is but one interpretation.

Interpretation plays a significant role in the arts, and subjective interpretation is an integral component of my life as a dance artist and educator. In the area of choreography, audience members can all watch the same dance yet interpret the meaning of the movements and the relationship between the dancers in different, yet equally valid and compelling ways. These varied responses are heard in Creative Dance when students share their interpretations of work performed in class, on video, and on stage. Qualitative action research allows for, and values, the recognition and sharing of individuals’ unique experiences, perceptions, and interpretations.

This study used students’ products to reveal aspects about students’ learning from the students’ perspectives. Their experiences also revealed information about my teaching strategies,
those that are conscious, unconscious, and habitual. This type of learning in which knowledge is a process, is shared, and is co-constructed aligns with my experiences as a collaborative artist. This epistemological viewpoint supported by action research is the foundation for my teaching and scholarship. Van Manen (1991) defines pedagogy as “a fascination with the growth of the other” (p. 13), and I am truly fascinated not only with the growth of my students, but also with what they can teach me about how I can better guide their growth.

Since there are no pedagogical requirements for faculty in higher education, it is up to me to recognize the gaps in my teaching and the limitations to my experience and act accordingly. This requires active, critical reflection and the openness to shift my teaching practices and philosophy to prioritize student learning (Marshall, 1991). Teaching and learning are not two separate entities; teaching approaches greatly impact student learning and outcomes (Postareff, Lindblom-Ylänne, & Nevgi, 2007). By engaging in action research, I aim to follow the footsteps of the foundational scholars of experiential learning, including William James, John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Jean Piaget:

These scholars not only studied experiential learning; they lived it. They approached their scientific inquiry as learning from experience, examining their own personal experience, using careful observation, building sophisticated and creative theoretical systems, bringing a passionate advocacy for their ideas for the betterment of humanity. (Kolb, 2015, p. 21)

These individuals were examples of curious, life-long learners who did not merely write and talk about their perspective on learning. They lived and learned holistically as experiential learners, and this is how I strive to live and learn as a teacher-researcher.
Assumptions

I entered this investigation with six assumptions about the course’s benefits to students, the benefits and limitations of using pre-selected taxonomies in data analysis, and the expectation of revealing teaching practices of mine that are habitual and/or in need of clarification, particularly those focusing on assessments. These assumptions are summarized below. Chapter Five explains the ways in which my findings supported and challenged these assumptions.

1. Creative Dance offered non-dance majors learning outcomes and experiences beyond, and more useful than, what was stated in the current student learning outcomes.

2. Using common cognitive, affective, and psychomotor taxonomies of educational objectives would enable me to speak more effectively about the similarities and differences in learning and teaching of dance with colleagues across disciplines.

3. Using the three learning domains acknowledged in Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) as the foundation for data analysis and course redesign would enable me to create more holistic learning experiences and outcomes that take into account the thinking, feeling, sensing, and moving capacities of students.

4. Due to the social nature of the learning environment and our focus on dance as a vehicle for individual expression, interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of learning will be revealed in the data. Anecdotal evidence from teaching this course in previous semesters and outcomes of a pilot study that I conducted on Creative Dance in Spring 2019 revealed that 1) students often felt self-conscious performing in front of the class, 2) their self-consciousness and/or comfort was revealed in their dance performance, and 3) their comfort level was positively influenced by working with their peers and by the supportive nature of our classroom.
5. Assumption #4 above led me to further assume that there could be important aspects of student learning that might not easily fit into the organizational categories of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor taxonomies.

6. This study will enable me to look critically into many aspects of my teaching, particularly my assessment practices. My habitual tendencies towards viewing and assessing student learning will be revealed, along with the need to clarify how I view and assess learning within the three domains.

Definitions of Key Terminology

The following definitions of terms will be useful for understanding this research study.

**Action research**: a formal process of self-reflective inquiry that enables practitioners to investigate, evaluate, and create theories about their practices with the aim of changing or improving their practices (McNiff & Whitehead, 2005)

**Affective response**: a feeling or emotional response to an experience

**Affective domain of learning**: This domain focuses on the student’s attitudes, values, motivation, beliefs, emotions, and acceptance or rejection of a value (Savickiené, 2010). Krathwohl et al. (1964) list five categories of learning within the affective domain: receiving, responding, valuing, organization, characterization by a value or value complex.

**Choreography**: the art of making dances

**Cognitive domain of learning**: This domain focuses on the mental processes of learning. Anderson et al.’s (2001) Revised Taxonomy of the cognitive domain – a revision of the original Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) – lists six categories of learning within the cognitive domain: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating.
**Experiential Learning / Experiential Learning Theory:** Experiential Learning (Kolb, 2105) is primarily acquired by direct experience with the subject matter; it is learning in action. This type of learning validates students’ life experiences as viable sources of knowledge and moves way from the notion of the teacher as the sole vessel of knowledge. Rather than existing as an isolated perspective separate from cognitive views on learning (e.g., prioritizing the understanding of information) and behaviorist views on learning (e.g., omitting subjective experience), experiential learning is a holistic perspective that integrates experience, perception, cognition, and behavior in the learning process (Kolb, 2015). Although experience is integral to learning, experience alone does not result in learning (Kolb & Yeganeh, 2011). Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) defines learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb, 2015, p. 49).

**General education course:** Creative Dance, a general education course, fulfills a fine and performing arts requirement within the Core Curriculum at our liberal arts institution. This course lies outside of the dance major curriculum, and any major can enroll in the course.

**Higher Education:** post-secondary education that leads to earning an academic degree

**Learning:** Learning in this study aligns with ELT’s (Kolb, 2015) definition of learning - “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (p. 49) – and epistemological perspective as outline above. Learning is a process, not an end point.

**The Learning Cycle:** Kolb’s (2015) Experiential Learning Cycle places experience into a systematic, four-stage process of critical inquiry: concrete experience (experiencing), reflective observation (reflecting), abstract conceptualization (thinking), and active experimentation (acting) (p. 51). The Learning Cycle can be best envisioned as a learning spiral, rather than a circle (Kolb, 2015); an individual does not begin and end this learning process possessing the
same knowledge. The outcomes of this learning spiral are modifications of ideas and behaviors that ultimately lead to new experiences, and the spiral begins again.

**Psychomotor domain of learning**: This domain acknowledges the body in the learning process and is based on physical skill development. Dave (1970), Harrow (1972), and Simpson (1966, 1972) each created a taxonomy for learning within the psychomotor domain.

**Reflective practices**: In Creative dance, students experience reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983), reflection on action, and Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle. They are encouraged to notice their thoughts, feelings, and physical sensations *while* dancing (reflection-in-action), write about their experiences *after* the experience (reflection on action), and participate in a systematic reflection process (The Learning Cycle) throughout their choreographic process.

**Student-centered/Learner-centered teaching** (Weimer, 2013): This type of teaching approach gives students some responsibility and control over their learning processes, encourages peer collaboration, and encourages reflection on the hows and whys of learning.

**Student learning outcomes**: These statements, often listed on a syllabus, reflect what students should be able to know and demonstrate after successfully completing a course.

**The Theory of Emerging Adulthood**: Arnett (2000) coined the term *emerging adulthood* for the distinct period of development between adolescence and adulthood – approximately ages 18 to 25 – in industrialized societies that is characterized by five features: age of identity exploration, age of instability, self-focused age, age of feeling in-between, and age of possibilities. According to this perspective, students in this study would be categorized as emerging adults.

**Undergraduate**: a student who is enrolled in a university and working towards earning a bachelor’s degree
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter explores literature in seven areas of focus as related to this action research study: lack of pedagogical training requirements for faculty in higher education, action research, theory of emerging adulthood, experiential learning, reflective practices in dance education, taxonomies of learning, and sociological considerations for dance educators. Information outlining the lack of pedagogical requirements for college teachers in connection with the aims of action research support the intentions of this study. Content on emerging adult learning and development, based on Arnett’s (2000) Theory of Emerging Adulthood, provides a deeper understanding of the transitory life stages of the undergraduate student participants. Experiential learning, particularly Experiential Learning Theory and The Learning Cycle (Kolb, 2015), is explored as one perspective on learning that values learning as a cyclical process rather than an outcome. Information is also shared about the philosophical foundations of reflections and types of reflections utilized in dance education.

Literature on taxonomies of learning are also included to provide information about ways in which learning can be assessed in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. These taxonomies serve as the frameworks for the deductive component of data analysis utilized in this study. This chapter concludes with sociological considerations for dance educators with regards to viewing and assessing dance students’ work – specifically the movement of their bodies – from a third-person perspective and embracing culturally relevant teaching. Available literature focusing on the intersections between dance pedagogy and these seven areas of focus are included.
Lack of Pedagogical Training Requirements for College Teachers

Jenson (2011), biology educator and scholar, questioned why teachers in K-12 education must take pedagogy courses, pass exams, and meet state standards to obtain their teaching license, yet there are no definitive pedagogical requirements for teaching in higher education. A terminal degree – master’s or doctoral – is generally what is required to teach in academia (Jensen, 2011). In his dissertation titled, “An Analysis of the Master of Fine Arts Degree as Preparation for Dance Faculty Roles in United States' Institutions of Higher Education,” Kahlich (1990) also wondered why college and university faculty are not held to the same standard as K-12 teachers with regards to pedagogical training “since it is the graduate school that perpetuates, develops or lessens the quality of higher education through the training of faculty members for college and university teaching” (pp. 1-2).

Despite facing similar challenges in the classroom, Jenson (2011) notes that teacher preparation and accountability are greater for secondary education teachers than higher education faculty; undergraduates pursuing a degree in secondary education must learn the subject matter, receive pedagogical training to teach this information, and usually learn about the growth and development of their students through courses in child and adolescent development. Graduate programs focus more so on mastery of material, where the future professor gains knowledge of a particular subject through class work and research (Kugel, 1993). Graduate students are rarely required to take pedagogy courses (Jensen, 2011). While some may serve as teaching assistants, they may not receive the structured pedagogical support to prepare them for effectively serving in this teaching role (Robinson & Hope, 2013). Hudson (2020) noted that professors are not receiving training in diversity that would prepare them for teaching in multicultural classrooms. Additionally, there are no expectation that college faculty stay informed of research in
pedagogical practices the way that they stay informed of the content within their field (Weimer, 2001).

A terminal degree, a Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) degree or Doctoral degree, is often required to teach full time in dance departments in academia, but pedagogical training is not always included in the graduate curriculum. The National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD) an accrediting organization who sets standards for dance degrees in the United States, does not list specific pedagogy requirements for M.F.A. students, as it is a practice-based degree with 65% of the total degree credits focusing on studio studies (National Association of Schools of Dance [NASD], 2020); pedagogy courses, if offered, can contribute towards their Academic Studies degree requirements.

NASD does strongly recommend that graduate dance students are provided with teacher preparation and, if possible, for both dance majors and non-dance majors. The emphasis, however, is on preparing to teach within a dance major curriculum:

As appropriate to primary and secondary areas of concentration and to individual career objectives, preparation for teaching should include an introduction to the pedagogy of subject matter considered fundamental to curricula for undergraduate dance majors, including performance, choreography, dance theory and history, dance from a breadth of cultures, technology, and performance. (NASD, 2020, p. 103)

NASD (2020) considers dance minor programs within a university’s general education program. The goals and objectives of dance major curriculums, however, may be different from those in general education curriculums, and thus the teaching and learning needs may be different. Similarly, obtaining a PhD from a research institution may not adequately prepare a teacher for a teaching job at a two-year college, for example, as the missions and teaching
environments of research-focused institutions differ from teaching-oriented institutions (Murphy, 2001).

Weimer (2001), professor emerita and teaching and learning scholar, states that teachers in higher education often learn how to teach through their practice of teaching, and the knowledge gained through their teaching is known as wisdom of practice. Wisdom of practice can arise not only via self-reflection but also by looking more closely at student learning. For example, Schmid (2012) stated that teachers can move beyond assessing student work for grading purposes and use student work as evidence of their learning to inform instructional modifications. One way of doing so is through a formal process of action research that aims to question, understand, and improve their teaching practice by blending theory with practice. Similar to knowledge gained via wisdom of practice, knowledge to action researchers is a “living process” that is created from “experiences of living and learning” (McNiff & Whitehead, 2005, p. 29).

**Action Research**

Action research is a formal process of self-reflective inquiry that enables practitioners to investigate, evaluate, and create theories about their practices with the aim of changing or improving their practices (McNiff & Whitehead, 2005). McNiff (2013) breaks down action research to its base words: action and research. Action refers to looking closely at “what you do” and includes critically reflecting on the social, political and/or historical contexts of one’s teaching practice (p. 25). The research component is a systematic inquiry that includes gathering data and reflecting on the action revealed in the data, generating evidence from the data, and drawing conclusions based on the evidence revealed. When presenting one’s work, one must
move beyond mere descriptive reflections to include reasons and purposes underlying the actions (McNiff, 2013).

Action research as a form of critical inquiry serves as a bridge between the theory and practice in education, where “Theory is no longer seen as only communicated symbols to represent thought, but as enacted through the lives of people who recognize themselves in relation with one another for personal and social purposes” (McNiff, 2013, p. 16). Giguere (2015), dance educator and scholar, defines five key factors in action research: critical self-reflection; moving beyond one’s singular perspective to include the experiences/voices of the participants; being an active participant in the research process; engaging in an iterative process of inquiry comprised of a cycle of observing, questioning, data gathering, analyzing, and action planning that results in new experiences to investigate; desiring for change and/or improving is the motivation behind the research.

Other terms for this form of inquiry are practitioner research, practice-led research, and practice-based research (McNiff, 2013). Action research differs from reflective practice in that action research includes taking strategic action to address a problem or question (Young, 2018). McNiff (2013) warns of the loose use of the term action research:

Therefore, instead of maintaining that research must generate theory of some kind, ‘action research’ is often domesticated into ‘telling stories’. More than one book on the market accepts only practitioners’ descriptions of their work as legitimate research, and this becomes a teenager form of action research, rather than showing the need for mature and thoughtful explanations and an articulation of the significance of explanatory frameworks. (p. 6)
Action research enables teacher-researchers to take steps to find answers to questions that arise from their teaching (Prevots, 2009) and to hold themselves accountable for their teaching practices (McNiff, 2013). Giguiere (2015) points out that in dance education, this requires going beyond looking solely at one’s teaching practice from the first-person perspective to include the experiences of one’s students.

**Action Research in Dance Education**

Cameron Frichtel (2017) noted that qualitative dance education research is relatively new and cited Stinson et al.’s (1990) study – published 30 years ago – as groundbreaking for exploring dance students’ perceptions. Dance teacher-scholars in higher education have since immersed themselves in qualitative research within their familiar classroom environments and have critically reflecting upon their teaching practices within a formal action research process (Dyer, 2010, Morris, 2012; Stark, 2009; Young, 2018). Dyer’s (2010) study is one such example. Since dance teacher observations provided incomplete information about the student experience, Dyer (2010) sought to assess whether students in her dance technique courses were truly experiencing what she believed they were and to discover what they were taking away from their class experiences. Dyer critically reflected upon her constructivist, emancipatory, and transformative teaching practices by inviting her students to contribute to shaping the learning environment, reflecting upon her pedagogical practices within the contemporary dance technique classroom, and reflecting upon if/how the students’ roles and identities within the classroom related to their values, beliefs and actions outside of the classroom. Data included transcribed classroom discussions, student journals, informal student interviews with open-ended questions, and teacher journals with noted reflections and observations.
Many students in Dyer’s (2010) class noticed discrepancies between their experiences inside and outside of the studio (e.g., social behaviors and ways of communicating) but, by the end of the semester, many recognized that the democratic experiences inside the dance studio could extend to their lives outside. Dyer found that not all students welcomed her student-centered pedagogical approaches, and her attempts to provide them with greater responsibility for their own learning resulted in some students not receiving the type of feedback that they desired to reach their goals. This study resulted in more questions surrounding how teachers should facilitate learning for students whose pedagogical values are different from their teachers and who find it challenging to redefine their identities through transformative learning practices. Dyer’s findings supported her desire to be continually self-aware and critically reflective of the sociocultural implications of her teaching and to investigate how her values, beliefs, and assumptions impacted her students’ learning and self-perceptions.

Another example of action research in the dance classroom, although for secondary education, was a study from Harding and Haven (2009). The aim of their study was to assess the impact of a six-week period of peer feedback on the transferability of skills and knowledge from the studio/classroom to a final performance. The authors, one speech teacher and one dance teacher, were interested in utilizing peer feedback to promote the learning, application and practice of performance skills in classrooms of 30 and 25 high school students, respectively, where there was usually little to no time devoted to practicing, revising, and receiving feedback on such skills. Data included student surveys, performance assessments, teacher journals, field notes from other educators who observed the class, and student reflections.

Harding and Haven’s (2009) study revealed that, overall, peer coaching had a positive impact on the classroom community, confidence building, the revision process, self-awareness,
and the final performance in both the speech and dance classrooms. Teacher journals indicated that teaching communication skills and creating a rubric was not enough to adequately prepare students for the challenges of coaching their peers. Since peer coaching had a positive impact on the transfer of classroom skills to performance and the creation of the classroom community, the authors intended to keep peer coaching in the curriculum but with greater flexibility of groupings, more consistent teaching of coaching/communication skills, and the addition of a note-taking sheet to record feedback that was received. They brought up the possibility of adding a high-stakes performance with those outside of the class for the speech class and including greater self-monitoring in the dance class by reducing the number of self-reflections and planning sheets.

Theory of Emerging Adulthood

Many American students entering college directly from high school or shortly after graduating are straddling a wide line between adolescence and adulthood. The socioeconomic factors of the United States’ industrialized society and knowledge-based economy have contributed to a prolonged transitional state to adulthood with greater heterogeneity compared to previous generations who had fewer, more defined opportunities after graduation from high school (Arnett, 2000; Zarrett & Eccles, 2006). Jeffrey Arnett (2000) postulated that emerging adulthood is a distinct and prolonged period of development that exists between adolescence and adulthood in industrialized societies. This period is inclusive of individuals between the approximate ages of 18 to 25. Arnett’s (2000) theory is known as the Theory of Emerging Adulthood.

Arnett (2000) coined the term emerging adulthood for this particular period of life and described it as the most heterogeneous life stage; there is more demographic variability and
instability compared to other life stages as individuals explore various directions in love, work, and world view and experience frequent change before settling into long-term life commitments. More individuals are choosing to enroll in college and, therefore, postpone moving into long-term adult roles and commitments such as marriage, parenthood, and work (Arnett, 2000, 2011). According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics (2019), the total number of 18- to 24-year-olds enrolled in college increased from 25.7% in 1970 to 40.9% in 2018.

The relationship between the individual and society shifts during emerging adulthood as the individual relies less on others for direction and moves towards greater self-regulation (Tanner, 2006). This time of transition can be filled with a variety of feelings from excitement to uncertainty and fear, coupled with the negotiation of a new degree of freedom with the responsibilities of an adult (Arnett, 2004). This period of development is demographically and subjectively different from other stages of life (Arnett, 2000). While earlier developmental theories and research from Erikson, Levinson, and Keniston spanning from the 1950s through the 1970s served as the theoretical framework for the Theory of Emerging Adulthood, Arnett (2000) described the development of 18- to 25-year-olds specifically in relationship to contemporary, industrialized societies.

Emerging adults no longer view themselves as adolescents, yet they do not position themselves as adults either (Arnett, 2000). Arnett (2004) argued that this transitory state between adolescence and adulthood is now long enough to be defined as a separate life stage with five features: age of identity exploration, age of instability, self-focused age, age of feeling in-between, and age of possibilities. These features may exist in other life stages, but they are more common and peak in emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2007).

---

1 The most recent data available was from 2018.
Rather than being universal, emerging adulthood is a culturally constructed life stage with subjectivity playing a role in one’s perceptions and attainment of adulthood. Studies of emerging adults have shown that individualistic qualities of character, such as accepting responsibility for oneself, making independent decisions, and becoming financially independent, are stronger markers of adulthood compared to the universal demographic and role transitions such as finishing college, establishing a career, and marriage (Arnett, 1998; Sharon, 2016). Therefore, the age range of 18 to 25 is used as “the roughest marker” for emerging adults due to the demographic and subjective variability during this life stage (Arnett, 2000, p. 471). The Society for the Study of Emerging Adulthood (n.d.), an international organization focusing on deepening the understanding of the development of emerging adults, specified their targeted age range as approximately 18 to 29.

Tanner (2006) offered another angle on emerging adulthood. Drawing from life span theory and a developmental systems perspective, she proposed emerging adulthood as a gradual three-stage recentering\(^2\) process influenced by the developmental stages that precede this period and one that greatly impacts the adult development to follow. “Recentering constitutes a shift in power, agency, responsibility, and dependence between emerging adults and their social contexts – primarily experienced by emerging adults as a period during which parent regulation is replaced with self-regulation” (Tanner, 2006, p. 27). Stage one in the Unites States begins at the threshold between adolescence and emerging adulthood, at age 18 when an individual gains legal and social responsibility but is still largely connected to and dependent upon family. Stage two, emerging adulthood, consists of temporary explorations in the areas of education, career, and intimate relationships while the individual’s position is negotiated as separate from, yet still

\(^2\) The spelling of recentering is consistent with Tanner’s (2006) description of emerging adulthood as a three-stage recentering process.
connected to, family. Stage three represents young adulthood, a time that is characterized by stability, consistency of self and long-term commitments to career, personal relationships, and possibly children.

Although there is an overall trend towards greater independence and self-sufficiency from stages one to three, Tanner (2006) stated that a large degree of variability exists among individuals immersed in the recentering process with regards to the paths that are carved toward adulthood. Additionally, an individual’s developmental history impacts readiness for recentering (Tanner, 2006). A college classroom, therefore, may consist of emerging adults who are living within different stages of the recentering process and who may reflect different degrees of independent thinking and self-direction.

**The College Context**

Arnett’s model of emerging adulthood can be seen as an interdisciplinary approach that blends psychological and sociological perspectives on identity formation and considers the sociocultural factors that impact development (Tanner, 2006). Arnett (2000) noted that identity formation – something usually attributed to the adolescent period – takes place in emerging adult population through explorations particularly in the areas of love, work, and one’s worldview. According to Illeris (2013), professor of lifelong learning at the Danish University of Education, “the concept of identity is about a person being in the world, who one experiences being, and how one relates to and wants to be experienced by others” (p. 1).

College provides the social environment for intellectual development and both personal and social identity formation (Kaufman, 2014). From the symbolic interactionist perspective, Kaufman (2014) stressed that the social interactions that students have with others shapes who they are and impacts the students’ perceptions of self and others. The social interactions and
learning experiences within college learning environments, therefore, can greatly influence a student’s meaning making process. Emerging adults’ worldviews evolve through exposure to a variety of college courses, along with explorations of romantic relationships and various career possibilities (Arnett, 2016a).

Arnett (2016a) pointed out that residential colleges and universities are ideal social settings for exploring numerous possibilities for love, work, and worldview. Residential colleges “represent a social island set off from the rest of society, a temporary safe haven where emerging adults can explore possibilities in love, work, and worldviews with many of the responsibilities of adult life kept at bay” (Arnett, 2016a, p. 219). While higher education institutions include students who fall outside of the rough emerging adulthood age marker of 18 to 25, the majority of college students are within this age range; in Fall 2017, 18- to 24-year-olds made up 65.9% of the total enrollment for full and part-time college students with known ages at degree granting institutions in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019b). Those under 18 made up 7.4%, while ages 25 to 29 made up 10.3% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019b). If the age range that the Society for the Study of Emerging Adulthood uses for emerging adulthood – 18 to 29 – is considered, this population made up 76.2% of the total enrollment for full and part-time college students in Fall 2017.

**Criticism of Theory of Emerging Adulthood**

Emerging Adulthood has gained widespread support (Arnett, 2007), yet criticism of EAT does exist (du Bois-Reymond, 2016; Furstenberg, 2016; Hendry & Kloep, 2010; Silva, 2016). Critics of Arnett’s theoretical constructs of Emerging Adulthood have pointed out that his focus

---

3 The most recent data available was from 2017.
4 These are institutions granting associates degrees or higher and participating in the Title IV federal financial aid program (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019b).
is primarily on Western industrialized societies and students of higher education (Hendry & Kloep, 2010). Arnett (2016a) acknowledged that data from students at four-year residential colleges are not “representative of most emerging adults” (p. 221). Tanner (2006) noted that while the features of emerging adulthood are the same for individuals regardless of whether they attend college or not, their developmental paths and life experiences do differ; college significantly influences one’s development, but it is not a definitive characteristic of this life period.

Arnett had also been criticized by educators for not looking at Emerging Adulthood Theory (EAT) through a socioeconomic lens (du Bois-Reymond, 2016; Furstenberg, 2016; Silva, 2016). Silva (2016) pointed out that EAT’s emphasis on an age of exploration, choice, and possibility does not take into consideration the experiences and the lack of opportunities of poor and working-class individuals. Arnett (2016b) acknowledged the existence of distinct differences in the lives of individuals across various social classes but argued that there are strong enough similarities to apply the term emerging adulthood across class lines. Data from a national survey of 710 18- to 25-year-olds living in the United States showed that differences in the five features of emerging adulthood between three social class groups divided according to the mother’s level of education were not statistically significant (Arnett, 2016b).

Arnett understood that variability exists even within this life stage and utilized the term in a pluralized form – emerging adulthoods – to reflect many possible paths. Silva (2016) was interested in moving beyond whether or not EAT applies across social classes to how EAT applies to different social classes, as there are numerous paths toward adulthood. Institutions of higher education may have emerging adults from various socioeconomic backgrounds with different degrees of choice and possibility with regards to their life paths, including first-time
college students.

du Bois-Reymond (2016) and Furstenberg (2016) shared numerous concerns about the quality and interpretation of the survey data used in Arnett’s (2016b) study with regards to social class. For example, only the mother’s level of education was used as an indicator of socioeconomic status. The father’s level of education and parental income were omitted. In addition, du Bois-Reymond (2016) argued that variations in the meaning of the responses on Arnett’s quantitative survey could easily exist between social classes; positive responses to poll data on Arnett’s survey such as “At this time of my life, it still seems like anything is possible” can have different meanings for individuals in lower, middle, and higher socioeconomic classes (du Bois-Reymond, 2016, p. 243). Therefore, Arnett’s findings should not be applied too broadly to all social and cultural contexts to fit his theory.

Arnett (2016c) responded to the criticism in a follow up article; he recognized that responses to quantitative survey questions can have various meanings and following up with post-survey qualitative investigation would help to gain an understanding of the various meanings behind the responses. Furstenberg (2016) suggested the need for more data analysis, including important comparisons across age groups using national data and longitudinal studies to follow participants through consecutive periods of development. In response, Arnett (2016c) agreed with Furstenberg’s (2016) statements on using national data for comparative studies with hope that constructive conversations surrounding EAT would continue in order to gain a deeper understanding of emerging adult experiences across the globe.

**Lack of Research in Emerging Adulthood**

Research on emerging adulthood is growing, with an increase from 11 empirical studies published in 2003 to 186 in 2014 and the creation of a journal devoted to this topic in 2013,
Emerging Adulthood (Swanson, 2016). Both Arnett and his critics agreed that more research is needed in the area of emerging adult development (Arnett, 2016c; du Bois-Reymond, 2015; Furstenberg, 2016; Tanner, 2006). Most of the research has been on four-year residential college students because of their ready availability and accessibility (Arnett, 2016a). According to Arnett (2016a), the best way to understand the differences between college students and other emerging adults was to conduct comparative studies, yet it has been challenging to find a sample outside of the college environment.

Swanson (2016) found that college and adulthood was the top demographic topic found in her review of emerging adult literature from 2000 to 2015 and argued that more research comparing college and noncollege emerging adults is needed. Other demographic groups found in need of research are underrepresented and minority groups (Swanson, 2016). Tanner (2006) believed that a segmented focus on pre-adult and adult development in education, research, and practice that omitted the development across the emerging adult transition period has contributed to the research gap in this area. According to Kaufman (2014), studying the social interactions within college institutions through an ethnographic lens could contribute to this research void by providing insight into college student experiences, including their social interactions and how these interactions contribute to their identity formation.

Arnett (2011) believed that cross-cultural studies of emerging adulthood were also needed, but they require more than mere comparisons; cultural belief systems must be taken into consideration, as these underlying beliefs shape how individuals interact with the world. Swanson (2016) believed that more international comparisons of emerging adult experiences are needed to assess whether emerging adulthood stands as a cultural theory. In addition, Swanson (2016) stated the significance of using longitudinal studies for assessing the developmental
 process and change emerging adults experience over a period of time.

Organizations currently contributing to this area of research are the Society for the Study of Emerging Adulthood (n.d.) and the Society for the Study of Human Development (n.d.), an interdisciplinary organization that takes an integrative approach to understanding the development across the various stages of life. *Emerging Adulthood* is an interdisciplinary and international journal devoted to research on emerging adults from ages 18-29 published in association with the Society for the Study of Emerging Adulthood (SAGE Publishing, n.d.).

**Experiential Learning**

Experiential learning is generally defined as learning from experience (Kolb, 2015). From this perspective, learning can take place anywhere; it is not restricted to school environments. Knowledge is not acquired solely by reading, writing, and talking about a subject or by listening to a teacher. It is primarily acquired by direct experience with the subject matter; it is learning in action. This type of learning validates students’ life experiences as viable sources of knowledge and moves way from the notion of the teacher as the sole vessel of knowledge. Traditional forms of experiential learning are utilized in higher education to connect education, work, and personal development through practice-based activities such as internships, work/study programs, student teaching, and laboratory research.

**Criticism of Experiential Learning**

Critics of experiential learning argued that knowledge acquired via first-hand experience is filled with bias and errors in judgment (Buckmann & Schwille, 1983; Eisenstein & Hutchinson, 2006) and, therefore, can lead to ambiguous and misleading conclusions (March, 2010). March (2010) viewed experiential knowledge as separate from academic knowledge, stating that knowledge is acquired more so from others – experts and authorities – and is
accepted or rejected without questioning its connection to individual experience. If experiential and academic are positioned as either-or at separate ends of a learning continuum, “the picture that emerges is that experiential learning is haphazard, unreliable, and misleading, and it must be corrected by academic knowledge” (Kolb, 2015, p. xx).

Kolb (2015) argued that bias and limitations exist in other forms of knowledge acquisition as well; researchers may make unwarranted assumptions about their data and make broad sweeping generalizations without considering the specificity of context. Rather than approaching experiential knowledge and academic knowledge as either-or in higher education, common ground can be found by taking into consideration the strengths and limitations of each epistemological viewpoint as educators create effective learning practices for meeting course content objectives, learning-style objectives, and growth and creativity objectives.

**Experiential Learning Theory**

Kolb’s (2015) Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) serves as bridge between the differing epistemological viewpoints mentioned above. In ELT, learning is defined as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb, 2015, p. 49). Although experience is integral to learning, experience alone does not result in learning (Kolb & Yeganeh, 2011). Both experience and transformation of the experience are necessary for learning and knowledge creation. Kolb’s theory addresses concerns about the unreliability of subjectivity by providing theoretical support for learning from experience and placing experience into a systematic process of critical inquiry: The Learning Cycle.

**The Learning Cycle.** Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle consists of four stages known as adaptive learning modes: concrete experience (experiencing), reflective observation (reflecting), abstract conceptualization (thinking), and active experimentation (acting) (Kolb, 2015, p. 51).
Figure 1 is a visual display of this cycle. Utilization of all four learning modes leads to the highest degree of learning (Kolb, 2015) with subjective experience is at the center of the learning process (Peterson et al., 2015). The active learning process of engaging in all four learning modes enables students to move away from instructor-centered learning and toward student-centered learning and higher levels of thinking.

Figure 1

*The Learning Cycle (Kolb, 2015)*

The Learning Cycle (Kolb, 2015) includes two dimensions of learning/knowing: grasping experience and transforming experience. The grasping, “taking in of information,” can be achieved through one’s concrete experience or through abstract conceptualization (p. 51). The

*Note.* This figure was adapted from Kolb (2015).
transforming of one’s experience, how one interprets and modifies one’s behavior, occurs via internal reflection or by action within one’s environment. The process of experiencing, reflecting, thinking, and acting can be best envisioned as a learning spiral, rather than a circle (Kolb, 2015); an individual does not begin and end this learning process possessing the same knowledge. The outcomes of this learning spiral are modifications of ideas and behaviors that ultimately lead to new experiences, thus beginning the cycle again but from a position of newly accumulated experiences and knowledge.

**Epistemological Perspective.** The epistemological perspective of ELT differs from the traditional behaviorist and idealist perspectives education, which perceive elements of thought to be fixed and underlie outcome-based learning (Kolb, 2015). Learning is not limited to an internal, individual process that takes place in school environments; learning occurs in all settings, throughout all life stages, and involves interactions with one’s environment. Rather than existing as an isolated perspective separate from cognitive and behaviorist views on learning (e.g., prioritizing the understanding of information and omitting subjective experience, respectively), experiential learning is a holistic perspective that integrates experience, perception, cognition, and behavior in the learning process (p. 31).

Experiential learning emphasizes learning as a social process, rather than an end point, that is grounded by experience and interactions between an individual and the environment. The process of experiential learning is more about how learning takes place rather than the content and outcomes representing what is learned (Kolb, 2015). Knowledge is “a transformation process, being continuously created and recreated, not an independent entity to be acquired or transmitted” (p. 50). ELT represents a constructivist perspective on learning (Kolb & Kolb,
with four types of knowledge created via combinations of grasping and transforming experience within The Learning Cycle: divergent, assimilative, convergent, and accommodating.

Additionally, ELT is a student-centered, rather than instructor-centered, perspective. Kolb’s (2015) model aims to “empower learners to trust their own experience and gain mastery over their own learning” while also providing an explanation for how individuals learn (p. 53). ELT aligns with andragogical, student-centered practices by acknowledging subjective awareness and experience as integral to one’s learning and placing less emphasis on the instructor as the main container of knowledge. Andragogy, a term used by adult learning theorists, translates to “the art and science of helping adults learn” (Knowles, 1980, p. 43). This perspective includes six assumptions of adult learners: self-directedness, need to know the value of what they are learning, use of experience in learning, readiness to learn, orientation to learning, and intrinsic motivation (Chan, 2010; Ozuah, 2005).

Theoretical Support. The foundation for Kolb’s (2015) ELT is found in the work of William James, John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Jean Piaget. When writing the second edition of his renowned text, *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*, Kolb acknowledged William James as possibly the first person to describe the cycle of experiential learning (Kolb, 2015, p. xviii). James’ view of radical empiricism served as the epistemological roots for ELT; James believed that all there is in life is experience, whether one is experiencing one’s inner world (i.e., thoughts) or one’s outer, physical world (Kolb & Kolb, 2009). He believed that bringing conscious, intentional attention to one’s learning process could improve one’s learning (Kolb, 2015).

John Dewey shared James’ pragmatist view and is often recognized as the father of experiential education. Dewey’s (1910) notion of reflective thinking as a continual process and
as a necessity for acquiring and questioning knowledge relates to ELT. “To maintain the state of doubt and to carry on systematic and protracted inquiry – these are the essentials of thinking” (Dewey, 1910, p. 13). Rodgers (2002) outlined Dewey’s perspective on reflection with regards to four criteria:

1. Reflection is a process that enables a learner to make meaning of their experiences and move from one experience to another with an understanding of their interconnectedness.

2. Reflection is a systematic process of thinking with its foundation in scientific inquiry.

3. Reflection does not occur in isolation; it needs to occur via interactions with others.

4. Reflection requires that the learner sees value in their growth and the growth of others.

Dewey’s perspective on the continuity of learning via experience aligns with the notion of a learning spiral as “every experience influences in some degree the objective conditions under which further experiences are had” (Dewey, 1997/1938, p. 37). Dewey’s reflective thinking process was a continual, systematic process that enables one to generate meaning from their experiences, gain a deeper understanding of the interconnectedness of their experiences, and carry their new understanding forward into their new experiences. Figure 2 displays this learning spiral. His process-based, constructivist perspective on knowledge acquisition contrasts the outcome-focused, behaviorist perspective found in traditional, instructor-centered education practices.

Lewin’s influence on ELT included the foundation for a testable theory connected to practice and the interdependency of the individual and the environment. His goal-directed learning process included a cycle of experience/action, reflection, analysis of action, and use of
this analysis to modify behavior and have new experiences (Kolb, 2015). He utilized the subjective experience to test abstract concepts and used feedback processes to evaluate outcomes. In doing so, he engaged in action research. Additionally, Lewin’s belief that the individual and the environment are interdependent has shaped Kolb’s parameters of Learning Spaces (Kolb, 2015; Kolb & Kolb, 2005). Learning spaces in ELT consist of one’s inner environment - the personal experiences that are shaped by the social interactions - and one’s outer environment (Kolb & Kolb, 2005) and include the physical, cultural, institutional, social, and psychological dimensions of the individual (Kolb, 2015). Learning that takes place within the social context of the college classroom informs an emerging adult’s inner and outer environment, all of which contribute to the shaping of one’s identity.

Figure 2

Dewey’s Model of Experiential Learning

Note. This image was conceptualized by Kolb (2015, p. 34).

In the area of development, Piaget’s work on cognitive development theory has been foundational to ELT (Kolb, 2015). Cognitive development theory is a linear, four-stage evolution
of an individual’s cognitive development (Piaget, 2003). Piaget highlighted the interactions between the individual and the environment in learning as one develops higher levels of thinking from the active and concrete learning of a child towards the abstract and reflective learning of an adult (Kolb, 2015). In developing ELT, Kolb (2015) took the work of these foundational scholars and made experiential learning applicable to, and testable via, current educational contexts. While higher education implements traditional examples of practice-based learning such as internships, laboratory studies and work/study programs, ELT make experiential learning applicable to any learning context and academic course.

**Experiential Learning and Development.** According to ELT, how students learn shapes their personal development (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). It is a multilinear, rather than unilinear, social process that builds upon personal and social knowledge (Kolb, 2015). This differs from perspectives such as Piaget’s (2003) which view cognitive development as both a linear process and a prerequisite to learning. Additionally, while Piaget describes development as being cognitive, ELT provides a more holistic view of development with four dimensions: “affective complexity, perceptual complexity, symbolic complexity, and behavioral complexity” (Kolb, 2015, p. 204).

Kolb’ (2015) ELT was also influenced by social constructivism through the work of psychologist Lev Vygotsky. Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development focused on what an individual could do with assistance from others and what the individual could do independently (Shah & Rashid, 2017). By scaffolding assignments, educators can guide students through the Zone of Proximal Development according to the students’ level of development (Kolb, 2015) and guide them towards acting more independently (Shah & Rashid, 2017). The Learning Cycle
can serve as a structure for such scaffolding (Kolb, 2015) and for helping students “learn how to learn” (Kolb & Kolb, 2009, p. 297).

**Lack of Literature on The Learning Cycle and Dance Education.** Online searches using the database ERIC (via EBSCO) resulted in one finding specifically for college dance courses with the following combination of words *Kolb’s Learning Cycle* and *higher education and dance*; the article focused on Kolb’s Learning Style Inventory rather than The Learning Cycle (Bolles & Chatfield, 2009). The same keyword search with the word “Kolb’s” omitted resulted in a second article focusing on Learning Styles in dance rather than the Learning Cycle (Heiland, 2019). Broadening the search criteria to (a) “experiential learning” and “higher education” and “dance” and (b) “Kolb” and “higher education” and “dance” presented articles on the following college dance-related topics:

- archival projects in dance history (Randall, 2012)
- designing an internship program in dance (Risner, 2015)
- a dance education study abroad program (Mabingo, 2015)
- the use of role playing in a teaching workshop at a dance conservatory in Spain (Torregrosa et al., 2017)
- dance and ELT’s Learning Styles (Bolles & Chatfield, 2009; Heiland, 2015, 2019)
- teaching methods for “whole” ballet in Korea (Choi & Kim, 2015)
- dance and architectural design pedagogy (Ersoy, 2011).

While there were zero findings on dance education articles focusing specifically on the implementation of Kolb’s four-stage Learning Cycle into college dance courses, additional articles connecting learning in dance with ELT’s Learning Styles were found (Gravenhorst,
2007; Peterson et al., 2015). Widening the search to include reflective practices used by college dance teachers and students that lied outside of The Learning Cycle resulted in more findings.

**Reflective Practices in Dance Education**

Brenda Pugh McCutchen (2006), former professor and dance education consultant with over 35 years of experience in arts in education, viewed reflective thinking as a form of critical thinking and student-centered learning needed in dance education. Although her specialization was in K-12 dance education, her perspective on reflective inquiry as beneficial for dance student learning also applies to higher education. McCutchen believed that reflection:

- helps students see value in their learning experiences
- promotes student-centered learning by encouraging students to generate personal meaning from their experiences
- helps experiences move from short-term to long-term memory
- contextualizes learning via comparisons of new and previous experiences
- aids in a student’s ability to articulate aspects of their learning (i.e., their understanding of experiences, perceptions, feelings, meanings)
- supports aesthetic growth and a student’s understanding of their growth

Reflective practices are widely used in dance education, but much of this information has not been published, and European scholars have contributed to the majority of the publications (Risner, 2017). Tembrioti and Tsangaridou (2014) offered a review of literature on reflective practices in dance. Risner (2017) acknowledged, however, that fewer than 10 publications were identified in their paper and even less where empirical studies. In addition, Risner (2017) only found three relevant articles via a keyword search for reflections in The Journal of Dance Education (JODE), the blind reviewed publication of the National Dance Education
Organization. JODE devoted the five articles in their Fall 2017 issue to reflective practices in dance education.

A search for articles focusing on reflective practices in dance education resulted in reflections as a beneficial learning tool for dancers (Cooper, 2013; Dryburgh & Jackson, 2016; Glaser, 2015; Leijan et al., 2008; Leijan et al., 2009b; Wilson, 2009), as a means for increasing student confidence and self-direction (Cooper, 2013; Glaser, 2015; Leijan et al., 2008), and for supporting curiosity for life-long learning (Cooper, 2013; Glaser, 2015). Articles have also been published with a focus on dance teacher pedagogical reflections (Batson, 2010; Debenham & Lee, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2017; Lerman, 2008; Mabingo, 2018; Ostern & Oyen, 2014; Roe, 2017; Stinson, 2001; Streets, 2011; Zeller, 2017), auto-ethnographic explorations of one’s teaching (Kaktikar, 2016), using reflection in undergraduate dance teacher training and/or pre-service teaching experiences (Barry, 2017; Sööt & Anttila, 2018; Stevens & Huddy, 2016; Suppo & Swank, 2020), specific reflective practices that could be implemented into dance courses (Barry, 2017; Davenport, 2006; Giguere, 2012; Weidman, 2018), and other dance-related areas including dance/movement therapy that are beyond the scope of this literature review.

Minimal literature was available for reflective practices utilized in non-major dance courses in the United States. The majority of the findings on reflective practices in higher education dance courses involved dance majors or those pursuing a professional career in the dance field as a performer, choreographer and/or dance teacher (Barry, 2017; Cooper, 2011; Dryburgh & Jackson, 2016; Glaser, 2015; Heiland, 2015; Leijen, et al., 2008; Leijan et al., 2009b; Mabingo, 2015; Randall, 2012; Risner, 2015; Sööt & Anttila, 2018; Stevens & Huddy, 2016; Torregrosa Salcedo et al., 2017; Wilson, 2009; Zeller, 2017). Cooper’s (2013) study was
unique in that it focused on reflections made by non-dance majors; twenty-eight out of 29 undergraduate dancers in Cooper’s beginning ballet class were not dance majors.

Cooper’s (2013) study focused on using four reflective writing assignments to promote student engagement and confidence. By engaging in this reflective practice, Cooper’s students became more metacognitively aware of their learning, developed greater knowledge about their bodies, experienced a boost in their confidence and engagement with their ballet performance, and were able to apply their newfound knowledge for personal growth both inside and outside of the studio. The reflective writing assignments enabled Cooper to create an environment of co-participatory learning, where she and her students learned from one another. The student reflections served as information from which she assessed her teaching objectives and modified her teaching. Cooper was able to integrate student-centered practices into ballet technique, a traditionally instructor-centered genre, through student reflections while also serving as a model for her students by reflecting upon and modifying her teaching.

**Philosophical Foundations of Reflection in Education**

Leijen et al. (2008) described three philosophical traditions as the foundation for reflections in dance education: pragmatism, critical social theory, and Kantian. They suggested that Dewey’s pragmatist philosophy, discussed earlier as foundational to ELT, supported a cyclical and continual reflection process that promoted conscious awareness of thought and action, a necessity for acquiring and questioning knowledge. Reflection from the critical social theory perspective included challenging one’s assumptions as a means for changing habitual patterns of thought and action. Critical reflection, as defined by Mezirow (1990), challenged “the validity of presuppositions in prior learning” (p. 12). This perspective moves beyond the level of the individual and extends into perceptions of their world. The third approach, developed by
Procee (2006), was based on the Kantian view of judgment as a means for making connections between knowledge gained through experience and application to context. This approach viewed reflection as a “means both to compare and to hold together one’s conceptions and experiences in order to act with more self-confidence” (Leijen et al., 2008, p. 226).

**Reflection Types Used in Dance Pedagogy in Higher Education**

Since there are various types and interpretations of reflective practices, Leijen et al. (2008) conducted a qualitative study to determine the type of reflections utilized in higher education dance courses for students pursuing careers as performers or choreographers. Seven dance technique teachers and six choreography teachers from four different four-year academies in the Netherlands voluntarily participated in one to two rounds of interviews. Data was analyzed through an open coding process followed by further organization into pragmatist, critical social theory, and Kantian reflection types. From the analysis, researchers created a model of reflective practices in dance education that incorporated examples from their first round of interviews. Data analysis revealed five types of reflection, with four aligning with the Kantian perspective and one aligning with the pragmatist perspective (p. 231). Dancers in the teacher participants courses reflected on:

(a) how they applied dance concepts to their dance practice (Kantian)

(b) how they applied concepts acquired through awareness of oneself and one’s physical possibilities to their dance practice (Kantian)

(c) new dance concepts and principles acquired from their dance practice (Kantian)

(d) new concepts and principles related to themselves that they acquired from their dance practice (Kantian)
(e) their development over time, aspects of their practice that need further attention, and plan of action for moving forward and improving (pragmatist) (p. 231)

Reflection types (a) and (b) were most widely used by teachers in this study, and the teachers always guided these reflections. Some teachers believed that it was the dancer’s responsibility to self-direct the process for reflection types (c) and (d). Teachers always guided the students for reflection type (e) with the goal of developing awareness of one’s growth over the course of the semester. One type of reflection not found in the dance technique or choreography courses was that of the critical social theory perspective, although discussions surrounding the social, cultural, and historical contexts of dance did occur as a means for deepening their understanding of various dance contexts as well as dance as an art form.

**Challenges with Reflective Practices**

There are inherent challenges associated with introducing reflective practices in the classroom. Leijen et al. (2009a) conducted a study gain an understanding of the difficulties that dancers encounter with reflective activities in dance courses. Their research included semi-structured interviews with seven dance technique teachers and six choreography teachers at a university in the Netherlands. The challenges found via data analysis aligned with the difficulties expressed in other disciplines in higher education: general difficulties across various processes of reflection and difficulties with describing, evaluating, and relating to multiple perspectives. Pavlovich (2007), management educator and scholar who has published about student journaling as a means for developing a reflective practice, found that her students faced some similar difficulties. For example, her students were challenged by using a personal voice to express themselves in writing instead of the passive and neutral voice that they were accustomed to using in academia.
In their study, Leijen, et al. (2009a) elaborated on the four categories of challenges that students faced with reflection: general difficulties such as dealing with emotions and personal aspects that arise, moving beyond general comments, and expressing one's voice in writing; difficulties noticing and describing details of experiences; difficulties evaluating experiences such as omitting positive aspects of the experience, waiting for the teacher to provide feedback, and lacking criteria; and difficulties relating to multiple perspectives such as focusing on moving in “the right way” rather than considering alternative ways of moving (p. 320). To assist with the challenges of reflection in the classroom, the authors proposed four suggestions for the effective teaching of reflection:

1. Provide prompts to encourage students to reflect upon both the challenging and positive aspects of their dance experiences. Since movement can feel different from how it looks, video can be used as a feedback tool for students to observe their movement from perspective of the teacher and/or audience.

2. Have clear criteria for students to evaluate their reflections. This can be provided by the teacher or determined by the student.

3. Incorporate peer feedback.

4. Create a safe and trusting environment to support the private nature of reflection.

To facilitate reflective practices for students in her course more effectively, Pavlovich (2007) created five guidelines for students to follow when writing their journals: (a) clarify the topic of their reflection, (b) describe a singular situation, (c) describe their emotional response, (d) include an analysis that consists of both personal reflection and information from course readings, and (e) explain what was learned and the actions that were changed. Using these guidelines across multiple reflection assignments, she promoted reflection as a method of
describing, analyzing, creating meaning, and acting that encouraged her students “to learn how to learn” (p. 294). Pavlovich used the same five guidelines as criteria for assessing student journal entries. This enabled her to move through the evaluation challenges caused by the subjective nature of journaling, as journals required different grading criteria compared to standard means of assessment.

**Learning Domains and Associated Taxonomies**

The process of experiential learning, including The Learning Cycle and its inherent reflective components, is concerned with the process of how learning takes place rather than what is learned (Kolb, 2015). Yet, when developing a college course, teachers make decisions about student learning outcomes – what they believe their students should know and/or be able to do at the end of the course – which often guide the direction of assessments and learning activities. According to Bloom et al. (1956) learning objectives are “explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process. That is, the ways in which they will change in their thinking, their feelings, and their actions” (p. 26). Bloom et al. (1956) identified three domains of learning for which student learning outcomes can be created and assessed: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

The cognitive domain includes the mental processes involved in learning, from the foundational process of recalling information to more complex intellectual skills such the ability to analyze and evaluate information. The affective domain refers to a student’s attitudes, values, and appreciations. The psychomotor domain includes observable motor skills. Numerous taxonomies have been developed for classifying learning objectives within these three domains. These taxonomies serve as frameworks for organizing and classifying student learning behavior into categories with distinct characteristics and levels of complexity (Anderson et al., 2001).
Taxonomies of the Cognitive Domain

The cognitive domain was the first taxonomy to be developed by Bloom et al. (1956) in *The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain (Handbook 1)*, as this was the prioritized domain for curriculum development and testing at that time. Bloom et al.’s (1956) Taxonomy, known as Bloom’s Taxonomy, has since become the most widely recognized framework utilized today for creating learning outcomes (Bagchi & Sharma, 2014) and as a pedagogical language for curriculum development and instruction (Bertucio, 2017). The authors believed that a taxonomy for defining educational objectives would be useful for educators; the purpose of the taxonomy was to assist educators with more clearly stating their educational goals and outcomes using specific, descriptive terms within a hierarchical framework. This specificity of a classification system could make it “easier” for educators to plan learning activities and assessments and to become more aware of the type of learning behaviors emphasized, or not emphasized, within particular learning plans (p. 2).

This cognitive framework, based in behaviorist psychology, relied on observable actions as representations for cognitive processes (Bertucio, 2017). Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) was intended to provide educators with a shared terminology for speaking about curriculum and assessment in a way that was neutral and did not reflect judgments on particular learning objective and behaviors or their underlying philosophies. However, the authors do acknowledge a lack in neutrality in that “Only those educational programs which can be specified in terms of intended student behaviors can be classified” (Bloom et al., 1956, p. 15).

The hierarchical taxonomy for the cognitive domain included six categories ordered from simple and concrete to more complex and abstract degrees of intellectual abilities and skills each
with their own hierarchical sublevels: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation. (See Table 1 for an outline of the cognitive categories and their descriptions and subcategories.) Moving up beyond the foundational level of recalling knowledge and towards the full range of cognitive processes assists with promoting meaningful, rather than rote, learning (Mayer, 2002). For the level of 2.00 Comprehension, students could demonstrate their understanding of what is being communicated through 2.10 translation or move towards deeper levels of understanding: 2.20 interpretation and 2.30 extrapolation.

**A Revision of Bloom’s Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain.** Anderson et al. (2001) saw application of Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom, et al., 1956) to education at the turn of the twenty-first century, but felt that a revision was necessary, as new knowledge on teaching, learning, and child development had been acquired over the 40 plus years since the original publication. The Revised Taxonomy created by Anderson et al. (2001) and outlined in Table 2 differed from the original Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom, et al., 1956) with changes in the areas of emphasis, terminology, and structures and the addition of second dimension: a knowledge dimension.

Emphasis, terminology, and structures of the original Bloom’s Taxonomy were modified in the revision (Anderson et al., 2001). For example, while the original Bloom’s Taxonomy emphasized assessment, the focus of the Revised Taxonomy was in “planning, instruction, assessment, and the alignment of these three” (p. 263). The Revised Taxonomy provided examples for its actual use in curriculum design and instruction. The original Taxonomy focused primarily on assessment by providing examples of test prompts. Additionally, while the original Taxonomy focused mostly on the six cognitive categories, the Revised Taxonomy included
detailed descriptions of the sublevels, along with examples of their use, which, in turn, aims to facilitate a deeper understanding of the six cognitive categories.

Table 1

*Categories of Bloom et al.’s (1956) Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sublevels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.00 Knowledge     | Remembering (through recollection and recognition) | 1.10 Knowledge of specifics (e.g., terminology, facts, methodology, theories)  
|                    |             | 1.20 Knowledge of ways and means of dealing with specifics  
|                    |             | 1.30 Knowledge of universals and abstractions within the field |
| 2.00 Comprehension | Understanding what is being communicated | 2.10 Translation  
|                    |             | 2.20 Interpretation  
|                    |             | 2.30 Extrapolation |
| 3.00 Application   | Applying knowledge correctly to a new situation without being prompted or guided | none |
| 4.00 Analysis      | Breaking down information into its integral parts and knowing the organization of, and relationships between, these parts as contributors to the whole | 4.10 Analysis of elements  
|                    |             | 4.20 Analysis of relationships  
|                    |             | 4.30 Analysis of organizational principles |
| 5.00 Synthesis     | Combining elements from many sources to create a new, integrated product | 5.10 Production of unique communication  
|                    |             | 5.20 Production of a plan, or proposed set of operations  
|                    |             | 5.30 Derivation of a set of abstract relations |
| 6.00 Evaluation    | Judging the value of something (i.e., ideas, methods) based on criteria and standards | 6.10 Judgments in terms of internal evidence  
|                    |             | 6.20 Judgments in terms of external Criteria |

*Note.* The table was adapted from Bloom et al. (1956).

Changes were also made to the terminology. For example, the six cognitive categories and their associated sublevels were changed from noun form of the original Bloom’s Taxonomy.
into verb form to reflect verb-noun relationships stated in learning objectives more clearly:

“Educational objectives indicate that the student should be able to do something (verb) to or with something (noun)” (p. 265). Category 2.0 Comprehension changed to the verb form Understand, and the sublevel for interpretation changed to the verb form interpreting. The verbs are the cognitive processes of the cognitive dimension (e.g., interpreting) and the nouns are the knowledge acquired or constructed as indicated by the knowledge dimension (e.g., factual knowledge).

Table 2

**Categories of the Revised Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Category</th>
<th>Category Definition</th>
<th>Cognitive Processes (Sublevels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Remember</td>
<td>Remembering knowledge</td>
<td>1.1 Recognizing 1.2 Recalling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Understand</td>
<td>Creating meaning from what is communicated</td>
<td>2.1 Interpreting 2.2 Exemplifying 2.3 Classifying 2.4 Summarizing 2.5 Inferring 2.6 Comparing 2.7 Explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Apply</td>
<td>Carrying out or using a procedure correctly for a familiar or unfamiliar situation</td>
<td>3.1 Executing 3.2 Implementing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Analyze</td>
<td>Breaking down information into its integral parts and knowing the organization of, and relationships between, these parts as contributors to the whole</td>
<td>4.1 Differentiating 4.2 Organizing 4.3 Attributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Evaluate</td>
<td>Judging the value of something based on specific criteria and standards</td>
<td>5.1 Checking 5.2 Critiquing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Create</td>
<td>Combining or reorganizing elements to create a new, integrated, and functional whole</td>
<td>6.1 Generating 6.2 Planning 6.3 Producing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. This table was adapted from Anderson et al. (2001)*
Some terms were retitled and repositioned within the new taxonomy. Structural changes included moving *evaluating* down to the fifth level in the revised Taxonomy and moving *synthesis* up to the highest level of complexity, changing the term to *creating*. Both the original Bloom’s Taxonomy and Revised Taxonomy are structured on a continuum from lower levels to higher levels of cognitive complexity. Unlike the original Bloom’s Taxonomy, however, the Revised Taxonomy does not reflect a strict cumulative hierarchy.

**The Taxonomy Table.** While the original Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom, et al., 1956) focused on one dimension – the cognitive dimension – the Revised Taxonomy (Anderson, et al., 2001) added a second dimension: the knowledge dimension. The sublevels of the foundational 1.0 Knowledge level of original Bloom’s Taxonomy were removed from the cognitive domain to comprise the knowledge dimension of the Revised Taxonomy with four types of knowledge: factual, conceptual, procedural, and new to this Revised Taxonomy, metacognitive. Factual knowledge is specific knowledge of terminology, details, and elements. Conceptual knowledge includes knowledge of categories; principles and generalizations; and theories, models, and structures. Procedural knowledge is knowing the process for doing something and includes knowledge of skills and algorithms, techniques and methods, and criteria for determining when a process should be used. Metacognitive knowledge includes strategic knowledge, knowledge of cognitive tasks, and self-knowledge associated with cognition and the knowledge of one’s cognition.

Anderson et al. (2001) created a Taxonomy Table to show the relationships between the six cognitive categories of the cognitive dimension and the four types of knowledge in the knowledge dimension (Appendix B). It is a visual tool for classifying outcomes and for assessing alignment in one’s teaching practices. Teachers can place a learning outcome in the appropriate
cell of the Taxonomy Table according to how it was intended, taught, and assessed and then see if the classification reveals alignment or misalignment between their teaching intentions, instructional practices, and assessment practices.

**Revised Taxonomies in Arts in Higher Education.** Hanna (2007), music educator and scholar, argued that student learning in music can be assessed similarly to learning in other disciplines via the Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al., 2001). Since music education was not included as one of the vignettes exemplified by Anderson et al. (2001) to explain the use of the Revised Taxonomy, Hanna (2007) explored how the Revised Taxonomy could be utilized in an artistic discipline with assessment practices that lie outside of standardized testing. She applied the Revised Taxonomy to music education by analyzing objectives for nine national standards in music education and placed examples of each into cells of the Taxonomy Table. Hanna believed that utilizing the Revised Taxonomy could serve as a tool for teaching and music program evaluations via shared terminology for communication and assessment. Although she acknowledged overlap between the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains in student learning, she chose to focus on the cognitive as the “most effective route for producing an articulate, holistic, yet objective set of assessment criteria and shared academic language for the field” (Hanna, 2007, p. 8).

Anderson et al. (2001) stated that there was always an expectation from the origination of Bloom et al.’s (1956) Taxonomy that the Taxonomy would be modified over time as it was used in different disciplines, as education evolved, and as new knowledge arose. Heiland (2018), dance educator and scholar, created a modified version of the Revised Taxonomy specifically for dance notation pedagogy. She created a taxonomy using aspects of Anderson et al.’s (2001)
Revised Taxonomy along with Roger Wagner’s\(^5\) revised version of original Bloom’s Taxonomy to represent the dance notation-based literacy outcomes associated with creating and performing. Similar to Hanna (2007), Heiland clarified the cognitive processes and knowledge dimensions of student learning outcomes and made them explicit by classifying them into their appropriate cells within her taxonomy. Rather than focusing solely on the cognitive domain, however, she also classified dance notation-based literacy outcomes within Simpson’s (1972b) psychomotor domain taxonomy and a taxonomy that combined the affective domain – which she cited as Anderson et al. (2001)\(^6\) – with Fleener et al.’s (2001) Conative Factors taxonomy.

**Criticism of Cognitive Domain Taxonomy.** Bloom et al.’s (1956) Taxonomy has been criticized for promoting a distinct separation between cognitive and affective aspects of learning (Bertucio, 2017), mind-body dualism (Bertucio, 2017), thinking processes as separate from content and meaning (Bertucio, 2017; Krathwohl et al., 1964), and the behaviorist view of assessing observable actions as the outcomes of education without considering the internal shifts that students experience as a result of learning experiences (Ferris & Aziz, 2005). Bertucio (2017) argued that the Taxonomy highlighted evaluation of learning over the experience of learning and that the knowledge being assessed was more so reflective of what could be known and observed by the educator rather than what is known by the student. This methodological framework prioritized assessment over the value of the learning (Bertucio, 2017).

The original Bloom’s Taxonomy focused on a hierarchy of cognitive processes independent of the content or the value of the content being learned (Krathwohl et al., 1964). It

---

\(^5\) The website reference cited in Heiland’s (2018) article for Wagner was no longer available to add to the reference list for this study.

\(^6\) It should be acknowledged that Anderson et al. (2001) spoke specifically about the cognitive domain and associated knowledge dimension, not the affective domain. Krathwohl et al. (1964) created the affective domain taxonomy, which will be discussed later in this chapter.
was also based in Cartesian mind-body dualism (Bertucio, 2017); the cognitive domain did not factor in the body as significant to thinking processes. A keyword search within *Handbook I* for the term “dance” resulted in one finding; dance was listed in a multiple-choice prompt in the music discipline for assessing level 1.00, the Knowledge dimension: “26. The minuet is the only dance movement commonly included in this musical type” (Bloom et al., 1956, p. 91).

**Bloom’s Taxonomy Clarification.** While Bloom was the editor and contributing author for *Handbook I* focusing on the cognitive domain, his name is often mislabeled with the affective and psychomotor taxonomies (Wilson, 2016). Bloom et al. (1956) defined three domains of learning in *Handbook I* – cognitive, affective, psychomotor – but only the cognitive taxonomy was developed and outlined in the text. Although Bloom was a co-author for the taxonomy of the affective domain, *The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook 2: Affective Domain* (Krathwohl et al., 1964), Krathwohl is the first author, and Bloom is listed as the second. In addition, Bloom was not involved in the creation of a psychomotor taxonomy. Dave (1970), Harrow (1972), and Simpson (1966, 1972a) independently developed taxonomies for the psychomotor domain. Therefore, statements linking Bloom’s Taxonomy to the psychomotor domain and noting Bloom as the main author of the Affective Taxonomy are mislabeled.

**Taxonomy of the Affective Domain**

Eight years after the original cognitive Taxonomy was published, Krathwohl et al. (1964) created a taxonomy for the affective domain of learning. This framework acknowledged the role that a student’s interests, attitudes, values, and appreciations play in learning. These affective aspects of learning were placed along a continuum from simply being aware of a phenomenon via focused attention to internalizing the phenomenon to the degree that it guides the student’s
behavior – for example, internalizing and consistently living according to a value. The Affective Taxonomy is comprised of five hierarchical categories from simple to more complex degrees of internalization: receiving, responding, valuing, organization, characterization by a value or value complex. Similar to the cognitive domain, each category has its own sublevels as displayed in Table 3. Krathwohl et al. (1964) acknowledged an emotional component in student learning and assigned a sublevel to the category 2.00 Responding that reflects a student’s emotional response to a phenomenon: 2.3 Satisfaction in response. This sublevel, however, was arbitrarily placed in this continuum according to where it appeared most often and where it seemed to be significant to the objectives (Krathwohl et al., 1964).

Table 3

*Categories of the Taxonomy of the Affective Domain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Category</th>
<th>Category Definition</th>
<th>Sublevels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Receiving</td>
<td>Being aware of a phenomenon and willing to receive or attend to it</td>
<td>1.1 Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Willingness to receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Controlled or selected attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Responding</td>
<td>Doing something with the phenomenon besides simply perceiving it</td>
<td>2.1 Acquiescence in responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Willingness to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Satisfaction in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 Valuing</td>
<td>Feeling that the phenomenon has worth; behavior is a result of a commitment to a value rather than compliance</td>
<td>3.1 Acceptance of a value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Preference for a value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Organization</td>
<td>Organizing values into a system; determining the interrelationships; establishing dominant values</td>
<td>4.1 Conceptualization of a value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Organization of a value system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Characterization by a value or value complex</td>
<td>Acting consistently according to one’s values and integrating the values into one’s world view</td>
<td>5.1 Generalized set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Characterization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* This table was adapted from Krathwohl et al. (1964).
**Challenges of Assessing Affective Outcomes.** Krathwohl et al. (1964) noted inherent challenges to assessing learning in the affective domain. The affective domain focuses more on the internal and private aspects of a student’s values, attitudes, and beliefs, and these were assumed to take a longer time to develop. Additionally, the private nature makes it difficult to assess whether a student is responding honestly about an interest, for example, or responding with the aim of pleasing the teacher. The level of satisfaction a student has in responses to a learning experience may not be easily observed, as some students tend to hide their emotions. The accuracy of the students’ recollection of experiences that they are commenting on can also be questioned.

**Taxonomies of the Psychomotor Domain**

Although acknowledged in *Handbook I* of the cognitive domain (Bloom et al., 1956), a psychomotor taxonomy was never created by the originators of Bloom’s Taxonomy of the cognitive domain; the creators of the original Bloom’s Taxonomy did not view classification of the psychomotor domain as useful to secondary or higher education at that point in time. Dave (1970), Harrow (1972) and Simpson (1966, 1972a) each developed their own classifications of the psychomotor domain. These taxonomies focused on the development of motor skills from and placed them onto continuums from simple to complex. Harrow’s (1972) and Simpson’s (1966, 1972a) taxonomies are outlined in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. Categories of Dave’s (1970) Psychomotor Taxonomy include the following:

1. Imitation observing, copying, and imitating someone else’s movement
2. Manipulation performing by following instructions or by memory
3. Precision executing skills accurately and smoothly without errors and without assistance or instruction
4. Articulation relating and combining multiple skills to meet special situational requirements

5. Naturalization performing at a high level consistently with ease; automated/unconscious performance

The highest level in Harrow’s (1972) taxonomy, 6.0 Non-discursive Communication, applies to choreographing and performing; it represents performing creative, expressive movements. The highest level in Simpson’s (1972a) taxonomy, 7.0 Origination, also relates to choreography, as she provided the example of making a dance as an outcome.

Table 4

*Categories of Harrow’s (1972) Psychomotor Taxonomy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sublevels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reflex Movements</td>
<td>Performing involuntary, instinctive actions</td>
<td>1.10 Segmental reflexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20 Intersegmental reflexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30 Suprasegmental reflexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fundamental Movements</td>
<td>Performing basic movements</td>
<td>2.10 Locomotor movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.20 Non-locomotor movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.30 Manipulative movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceptual Abilities</td>
<td>Interpreting and adjusting to environmental stimuli</td>
<td>3.10 Kinesthetic discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.20 Visual discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30 Auditory discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40 Tactile discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50 Coordinated abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical Abilities</td>
<td>Developing endurance, strength, flexibility, and agility</td>
<td>4.10 Endurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20 Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.30 Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.40 Agility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skilled Movements</td>
<td>Adapting basic, fundamental movements to new circumstances and performing</td>
<td>5.10 Simple adaptive skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with a degree of proficiency</td>
<td>5.20 Compound adaptive skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.30 Complex adaptive skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Non-discursive Communication</td>
<td>Performing innate and learned movements used to communicate in everyday</td>
<td>6.10 Expressive Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>life; performing aesthetic and creative movements (as a form of art)</td>
<td>6.20 Interpretive Movements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The table was adapted from Harrow (1972).
Table 5

Categories of Simpson’s (1966, 1972a) Psychomotor Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sublevels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Perception</td>
<td>Becoming aware – via sensory cues – before taking purposeful action</td>
<td>1.1 Sensory stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Cue selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Set</td>
<td>Experiencing readiness/willingness to act</td>
<td>2.1 Mental set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Physical set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Emotional set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Guided Response</td>
<td>Performing basic abilities that are the foundation of more complex skills while under the guidance of an instructor or in response to judging one's performance based on external criteria</td>
<td>3.1 Imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Trial and error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Mechanism</td>
<td>habitually responding with a certain degree of confidence and proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Complex Overt Response</td>
<td>performing complex movements smoothly, efficiently, and skillfully with minimal energy expenditure</td>
<td>5.1 Resolution of uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Automatic performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Adaptation</td>
<td>effectively modified movement according to new situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Origination</td>
<td>creating a dance or a new game that requires a physical response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The table was adapted from Simpson (1966, 1972a).

**Overlap Between Learning Domains**

Although thought of as separate domains, the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains are not mutually exclusive. The domains were separated to clarify objectives, but this act does not reflect a separation within the student’s learning processes (Bertucio, 2017). Overlap exists between the cognitive and affective aspects of learning (Mottet, 2015), for example, including the mind and emotions (Immordino-Yang & Demasio, 2007). Even the authors of the cognitive and affective taxonomies cited research that connected the cognitive and affective aspects of learning (Anderson et al., 1964; Bloom et al., 1956; Darling, 1965). The authors of *Handbook II* on the affective domain stated the following:

> It was evident in our work that, although one could place an objective very readily in one of the three major domains or classes, no objective in one class was entirely devoid of some components of the other two classes. The domains evidently represent emphases...
and perhaps even biases in the statement of objectives. We hesitated to adopt this
threefold division except on the practical grounds that objectives are so stated (and
intended) that they fall rather easily into one of the three divisions. (Krathwohl et al.,
1964, p. 8)

Simpson (1971) acknowledged that the psychomotor domain involved aspects of both the
cognitive and affective domain, including the affective component of a student’s “willingness to
act” (p. 60). The first category in her psychomotor taxonomy, 1.0 Perception – experiencing
sensory awareness that precedes action – paralleled the first category in the Affective Taxonomy,
1.00 Receiving – becoming aware of, and willing to attend to, phenomena and stimuli (Simpson,
1972a). Hanna (2007) found overlap between cognition and motor skills in music education; she
made connections between the procedural knowledge category of Anderson et al.’s (2001)
Revised Taxonomy and the psychomotor skills necessary for “performing, improvising,
composing, arranging, and conducting” (p. 14).

**Sociocultural Considerations for Dance Educators**

Before even entering the studio, students carry judgments about how their bodies look
and assumptions about how they should move based on the bodily ideals set by the wider society
and the dance subcultures that they have been exposed to. The emphasis that the American
society places on one’s appearance promotes the viewing of bodies as objects to be compared
with bodily ideals (Radell et al., 2014). This view can be challenged or perpetuated through the
pedagogical practices of a dance educator, since assessment in studio courses is often based on
what is observed of the students’ bodies from the teacher perspective. The body plays a role in
one’s self-identity (Shilling, 1993), and emerging adults are immersed in the developmental
process of shaping their identities (Arnett, 2000). Since identity is created, shaped, and changed
via learning (Illeris, 2013), classroom experiences throughout college can greatly influence how students see themselves and where they position themselves in their world.

**External Gaze and Body Objectification**

In the dance studio, mirrors, videos, and peer and instructor comments are used to provide feedback on a student’s performance. While these are beneficial learning tools, relying too much on external means of feedback can result in negative outcomes, one of which is body objectification. According to Calogero (2012), psychology educator and scholar, “To objectify is to make into and treat something that is not an object as an object, which can be used, manipulated, controlled, and known through its physical properties” (p. 574). Body objectification is perceiving the body merely as a physical entity to be gazed upon, manipulated, and controlled. Out of the concern for how one’s body appears to others, the body is viewed and treated as a project to be shaped (Cregan, 2012; Hughes-Decatur, 2011; Pickard, 2013; Shilling, 1993). Self-objectification occurs when an individual internalizes the external gaze of others (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Murnen, 2012). This may lead to self-conscious body monitoring (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) born out of placing greater value on how one’s body appears to other people rather than how one’s body feels or what it can do (Murnen, 2012).

Receiving external feedback in a dance class can be very helpful to one’s learning. Mirrors, for example, can be a positive learning tool for providing critical visual feedback to dancers about the position of their bodies (Diehl, 2016), particularly for beginning dance students who are visual learners and can benefit from seeing what the moving body is doing in order to improve their performance (Radell et al., 2014). Relying too much on the mirror or videos of their performance, however, can be limiting; students may rely on and trust the two-dimensional visual image of themselves more so than their bodily sensations; they focus more on
what they look like than how the movement feels (Radell et al., 2014). This use of the mirror emphasizes the body as an object to be viewed and corrected from the outside in (Green, 2003) and may lead students to perceive their bodies as a collection of distinct parts rather than a unified whole (Radell et al., 2014). Dance students learn to rely on and trust the mirror and the teacher feedback more so than their somatic sensations and tend to view themselves as objects rather than sensing, feeling beings (Radell et al., 2014).

Green (2003), dance educator and scholar, argued that viewing and evaluating one’s body as an audience member would and the desire for teacher correction and validation promotes body objectification, as feedback is provided specifically for attaining a specific external shape. She believed objectification of the body to be a result of the Cartesian mind/body duality that underscores Western society. According to Cheever (2000) “We lack a sense of our "soma," or body consciousness based on a sense of a whole, embodied self interacting with our environment, human or otherwise, in a manner integrating both body and mind” (para. 18). This mind-body split does not simply separate and the mind from the body and place greater significance on the mind; it creates a deeper divide that causes a disconnect from internal physical sensations and the holistic experience of living in one’s body and results in the objectification of one’s body (Green, 2003). Individuals tend to seek information and direction about their bodies from external resources rather than their own bodies, thus cultivating passive relationships with their bodies and causing them to disconnect from their bodily authority (Johnson, 1993); dance teachers know better than students do about their bodies. This objectified body-focus and shaping of one’s body contribute to the formation of, and become an expression of, one’s individual self-identity (Shilling, 1993).
The Body and Self-Identity

Consideration of one’s appearance and the shaping of one’s body contribute to the formation and expression of one’s self-identity (Shilling, 1993). Identity is often thought of as being a cognitive construct rather than a somatic construct (Caldwell, 2016), causing individuals to become removed from the sensations and wisdom of their bodies (Johnson, 1993). Turner (2008) explained that identity is tied up with an individual’s connection to others: “to have a personal identity as a separate individual is to have a certain coherence and continuity both from the point of view of the self and others. What I am is bound up with my ability to recognize myself and the continuous recognition of myself by others” (p. 54).

Identity is shaped by the experiences that an individual has in society. When bodies are continually viewed as objects and projects to be shaped, bodies can easily be viewed as “less than.” Body satisfaction or dissatisfaction can be experienced when societal body ideals are internalized and assessments are made with regards to the degree by which the ideals are met (Tiggeman, 2012). An individual can exist in a perpetual state of “bodily-not-enoughness” (Hughes-Decatur, 2011, p. 73). The body, therefore, is not only an expression of a person’s identity; it is central to that person’s sense of self (Shilling, 1993) and, especially for women, closely tied to their self-worth (Leavy et al., 2013). How an individual feels about their body impacts that person’s sense of self and interactions with the world. Canfield (2002) mentioned that “body identity” is closely tied to one’s social self (p. 26); identity is shaped through a person’s interactions with others (Canfield, 2002; Kaufman, 2014), and sense of self also influences a person’s social interactions (Ropers-Huilman et al., 2016).

From these points of view, identity consists not only of how individuals perceive themselves, but also the consideration of how the individual would like to be perceived by other
people. This relates to the value is placed on viewing bodies from a third-person perspective. It is a standard practice in dance to consider what a dancer’s body looks like from a third-person perspective, as it is the body that communicates something to the audience. Bridging the mind/body divide, Caldwell (2016) viewed the sensing body as integral to one’s identity by saying “instead of I think, therefore I am, perhaps we can state I move (and sense), therefore I think” (p. 226).

**Encouraging a First-Person Perspective of One’s Body**

Integrating the first-person perspective of movement into dance classes can lead to empowerment, self-awareness, self-growth and self-confidence. According to Thomas Hanna (1991), “somatics is the field which studies the soma: namely, the body as perceived from within by first-person perception” (p. 31). Somatic education uses sensory motor learning as a means for connecting mind and body (Cheever, 2000). Somatic practices involve the mental, emotional, and perceptual aspects of movement and view an individual from a holistic perspective (Rato & Alvez, 2020). Rather than focus on the form and shape of the body while dancing, somatics in dance education encourages students to dance “from the inside out” (Burnidge, 2012, p. 45). Somatic practice may focus on aspects of movement such as how the body is moving, the direction of the body’s movement through space, and awareness and restructuring of habitual movement patterns to move with greater efficiency and ease (Rato & Alvez, 2020).

Some examples of movement-based somatic practices include Laban Movement Analysis (LMA)/Bartenieff Fundamentals, Alexander Technique, Feldenkrais Method, Trager Approach, Ideokinesis, and Body Mind Centering (Burnidge, 2012). Engaging in the self-awareness and inner sensing inherent to these somatic practices can encourage self-confidence (Burnidge, 2012).
and strengthen one’s sense of self (Burnidge, 2012; Cheever, 2000). Cheever (2000) summarizes
the inner sensing as a gateway to a greater sense of self:

In developing our awareness in this way, with Feldenkrais and other methods of somatic
education, we develop a kinesthetically attuned "inner eye--almost as if we come to "see
inside" ourselves as we develop a felt sense of ourselves acting in the world…As we
develop that enhanced, kinesthetically based self-image, we develop "an inner I," or a
growing sense of our selves, that incorporates what we are sensing inside as well as
outside of us…a felt sense of how our different body parts move through space and
connect with one another and the environment. That includes performing simple actions,
such as rolling over, as well as more complex activities… (para. 22-23)

Burnidge (2012) pointed out that incorporating somatic principles in education includes
consideration not only what one is teaching but also how one is teaching. Her approach to
teaching dance, which she referred to both human-centered and “soma-feminist,” reflects an
intersection of somatic pedagogy and democratic/feminist pedagogy (p. 39). This somatic
approach challenges traditional, authoritarian views of teaching and learning in dance by shifting
the student-teacher relationship, guiding students to become aware of their “inner sensations,
movements, thoughts, feelings, and mind–body connection,” guiding students to be active
participants where they become more responsible for their learning and growth, and building a
safe, supportive learning community that supports deep self-investigation and reflection (p. 44).
The individual voices, backgrounds, and experiences of the students are valued as “diversity of
thought, knowledge, culture, and personal identity” is embraced (Burnidge, 2012, p. 38).
Barbour (2016) noted that somatic dance practices provide space for student knowledge and
identities – personal, family, and cultural – to be valued and celebrated.
Embracing Culturally Relevant Teaching

Anderson (2015) believed that dance educators have an important role for influencing how the body is viewed and valued by society, particularly with regards to challenging ableist views of the body. She encouraged teachers and choreographers to become aware of teaching and choreographic methodologies that support the embodiment of dancers with disabilities – visible or invisible – and the creation of an inclusive classroom and choreographic process. She stated that “Often form-based dance approaches were and still are based on specific bodily aesthetics, which are related to social oppressions such as ableism, sizeism, racism, sexism, and classism.” Anderson (2015) offered a principles based approach to teaching which includes pedagogy that focuses on dance principles (i.e., movement qualities) instead of form and on an individual’s creative expression instead of imitation. Such teaching approaches value expression within a dancer’s individual range of ability rather than striving to perform according to a bodily ideal.

Albright (1998/2013) discussed the intersection of dance and disability by exploring companies and artists who worked with dancers with disabilities and sharing her personal experience with disability, which she came to view as strategic abilities. She stated:

In order to examine ableist preconceptions in the dance world, one must confront both the ideological and symbolic meanings that the disabled body holds in our culture, as well as the practical conditions of disability. Watching disabled bodies dancing forces us to see with a double vision, and helps us to recognize that while a dance performance is grounded in the physical capacities of a dancer, it is not limited by them. (p. 300)
There are numerous dance companies today who work with dancers with disabilities and who strive to challenge the perceptions of dance and disability. Candoco Dance Company (n.d.), Kinetic Light (2019), and AXIS Dance Company (n.d.) are a few. AXIS Dance Company (n.d.) is a resource for dance educators, as they currently offer physically integrated dance classes online and offer teacher trainings to provide educators with tools for creating an inclusive dance environment.

McCarthy-Brown (2017) emphasized that dance is not only a bodily experience, “Dance is a cultural experience. It is a racial experience. It is a gendered experience” (p. 14). She has provided frameworks for dance educators to use when moving towards embracing culturally relevant teaching, diversity within their curriculum, and critical dance pedagogy. Such pedagogical perspectives aim to ensure that historically marginalized groups – whether due to “culture, race, class, gender, sexual orientation or limited physical abilities” – are valued and supported rather than oppressed in education (McCarthy-Brown, 2017, p. 16).

McCarthy-Brown (2017) defines culturally relevant teaching as “a method of teaching that adapts instructional tools and content to relate to the cultural affinity of students” (p. 10); this teaching relates to the students’ cultural background and beliefs and communication and learning styles. She defines critical dance pedagogy as “an application of critical pedagogy (teaching approach that examines systems of power) to the dancing body” (p. 18). Critical dance pedagogy encourages dance teachers and students to question the systems of power that govern the who, what, when, where, and whys of dance and dance education, from the types of resources and dance content in class to who performs, who is funded, who dictates the value of dance, and who is supported in their learning of dance (McCarthy-Brown, 2017). These
perspectives support student-centered learning that is inclusive of all learners, including those in marginalized groups.

Although research in cultural diversity within college dance programs has taken place, Schupp and McCarthy-Brown (2018) took a new approach by investigating students’ perceptions of diversity in dance major programs. They did so to better understand what was working well from the students’ perspectives and they types of changes that were needed in order to respond to current day shifting demographics. Outcomes of their research included questions for dance educators to “grapple” with when revising their programs to better reflect the cultural diversity in our country (p. 18). Although their research focused on dance major programs, the questions about language and content that arose from their investigation can be pondered by educators desiring to create more inclusive learning experiences on the course level:

- Does the course title accurately reflect the course content?
- How can I bring more specificity to naming the exercises and devices I am teaching in my improvisation and choreography class to better situate the cultural contexts of the practice?
- What assumptions are built into my language and how can I, and my students, question those assumptions? (Schupp & McCarthy-Brown, 2018, p. 17)
- Am I including this content because it interests me or because it is culturally relevant to my students?
- Am I including diverse perspectives in my course materials?
- Am I selecting content that both honors what my students bring to class and moves them forward?
Does the content I’ve selected reflect the diversity of cultural perspectives in the historical construction and practice of a given dance form? (Schupp & McCarthy-Brown, 2018, p. 18)

Shupp and McCarthy-Brown (2018) stated that deconstructing language – even within the title of an individual course – is a step toward deconstructing whiteness in dance, as cultural values are reflected in language and course work.

Chapter Two Summary

This chapter provided an overview of seven areas significant to this action research study focusing on dance pedagogy in higher education. Lack of pedagogical training requirements for faculty in higher education was discussed first as an impetus for pursuing action research methodology. This form of self-reflective inquiry enables practitioners to investigate and evaluate their teaching practices with the goal of changing or improving their practices.

Emerging Adulthood Theory (Arnett, 2000) provided contextual information about the developmental life stage of undergraduates between the approximate ages 18 to 25 in the college classroom. This was followed by experiential learning and Experiential Learning Theory, particularly Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle, as one perspective on learning that can be utilized in support of emerging adult learning and development. Information about reflective practices in dance education was included. The cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of learning and their associated taxonomies were then discussed as a means of determining and assessing student learning outcomes. Sociocultural considerations for a body-based discipline concluded this chapter. Available literature on dance pedagogy in connection with these seven areas was included.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the methodology used in this action research study. This study focused on the learning experiences and outcomes of 12 undergraduate students enrolled in Creative Dance – a one-semester general education choreography course – and the teaching strategies that guided their learning. The goal of the research was to use data findings about student learning to change my teaching strategies so that I could more effectively facilitate emerging adult learning in future semesters of Creative Dance. In this chapter, methodological choices, research paradigm, and my teacher-researcher role are discussed. Additional components of this chapter include the research setting, student participants, data collection and analysis, and ethical concerns. Research questions that guided the methodological choices for this study were:

1. What does student work reveal about their learning and the teaching strategies that guide their learning?
   a. What teaching strategies strengthen the quality of student learning experiences and outcomes?
   b. What teaching strategies hinder student learning experiences and outcomes?

2. What curricula and teaching changes will more effectively facilitate student learning processes and stronger outcomes?

These questions were addressed by analyzing data – student work and instructional materials – through the lenses of three specific subareas: the cognitive domain of learning, the development of physical skills in relationship to choreography and performance, and affective responses to learning experiences.
Methodological Choices

Qualitative research methods guided the sampling, data collection and analysis, and personal interpretation and meaning making of the data in this study. Since I was studying aspects of a particular teaching context with existing documentation, qualitative research approaches enabled me to utilize data that was readily available within the context of my teaching setting to address my research questions. I investigated my teaching strategies and practice and the learning outcomes and experiences of students in the class that I was instructing, thus purposeful sampling (Light, Singer, & Willet, 1990) was utilized.

My study was specific to the context of the studio learning environment and the people who made up this particular learning community: the students and teacher (me). I collected and analyzed existing written course materials, written observation data, and movement-based data on video. More specifically, these materials included standard instructional documents that I created (syllabus, assignment prompts, class plans, observation notes, teacher memos) and work that students created in the course – written work in response to open-ended assignment prompts along with their performance and choreography performed in class and recorded on video.

This study utilized action research methodology (Giguere, 2015; Hinchey, 2008; McNiff, 2013, 2017; Norton, 2009; Tomal, 2003); I took action to understand the learning experiences and outcomes of students, come to a greater understanding of how my teaching practices impacted student learning, evaluate my teaching, and to improve my teaching. This action research enabled me to look closely and critically at my teaching strategies that guided student learning in a choreography course and make positive changes for teaching the course in subsequent semesters.
This inquiry included first-person and second-person action research (Reason & Bradbury, 2008); instead of solely examining my personal teaching practices and experiences from my experience (first-person), I also investigated the experiences of students by valuing and incorporating students’ voices via their text and choreography (second-person). Rather than limiting my questions to what students may be learning from me, I investigated what I could learn about my teaching from my students.

Research Paradigm

This study invited student work created in class to reveal aspects about students’ learning from the students’ perspectives. In addition, their experiences revealed information about my teaching practices, both conscious and habituated. Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, 2015) was the theoretical foundation for Creative Dance. This perspective on learning validates students’ life experiences as viable sources of knowledge and moves way from the notion of the teacher as the sole vessel of knowledge. This type of learning in which knowledge is a process, is shared, and is co-constructed aligned with my experiences as a professional dancer and collaborative choreographer for the past 16 years. This epistemological viewpoint was the foundation for my teaching and research. It was also the foundation for this study aimed at gaining a better understanding of the learning context within Creative Dance and formulating meaning from the data collected within this context.

More specifically, Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle was the framework for this action research as I engaged with four learning modes over the course of this investigation: concrete experience (of teaching), reflective observation (recorded via teacher memos and observation notes during the semester and researcher memos and observation notes throughout the investigation), abstract conceptualization (while analyzing, interpreting, and drawing conclusions
from the data), and active experimentation (planning modifications to teaching materials, strategies, and practices). The completion of one round of The Learning Cycle and simultaneous start of the next round will officially commence as begin teaching the course in Fall 2020. At that point, I will begin to experience teaching from a greater place of understanding and knowing generated from this study.

**My Teacher-Researcher Role**

Since I was the teacher for Creative Dance, I was an active, rather than passive, teacher-researcher and an integral member of the community in which I was studying. I created and distributed all of the instructional materials utilized in the course and guided and assessed student work throughout the semester, the majority of which contributed to the data collected and analyzed in this study. I aimed to create a supportive community for the students as a teacher. Just as the relationships cultivated through my work as a professional dancer in the studio have been integral to, and greatly impacted, the choreography that was created, the relationships that I had with the student participants were integral to, and greatly impacted, my teaching and their learning. This was true for my research as well; I recognized that my values and lived experiences played a role in my research process (Ponterotto, 2005).

Utilizing qualitative methods of inquiry allowed me to contribute to the creation of a community by immersing myself into the studio world with the student participants, providing an opportunity for their voices to be heard, and inviting them to be co-creators of knowledge and my teachers by sharing their experiences. Therefore, I was both a teacher and learner immersed in Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle; I was teaching, observing, and assessing student work; reflecting upon my teaching strategies, observations, and students’ written and choreographed work throughout the research process; processing and interpreting findings revealed in student
and teacher data, planning, and implementing changes to my teaching; and will repeat the cycle when the university returns to on campus instruction.

**Research Setting**

Research took place at a public, non-profit four-year liberal arts institution in Southeastern Massachusetts where I taught during the Fall 2019 semester. The medium-sized university is one of six state universities in Massachusetts. Data documents collected from the Office of Institutional Research showed that out of the 9,463 undergraduates enrolled during Fall 2019, 59% were female, 41% were male, and 96% were residents of Massachusetts (Bridgewater State University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.a). Race/ethnicity were as follows: 70.7% were White, 11.7% were Black, 7.9% were Hispanic, 5.2% were two or more races, 2.2% were Asian, 1.8% were unknown, <1% were Native American, and <1% were Native Hawaiian, with 27% students of color and <1% international students (Bridgewater State University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.b.). Thirty-seven percent of undergraduates were low income; 53% were first generation college students; and the average age was 22 years (Bridgewater State University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.b).

The class year breakdown for Fall 2019 was as follows: 21% freshman, 21% sophomores, 26% juniors, 30% seniors, and 3% unclassified (Bridgewater State University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.b). Over 50% of current students are commuters (Bridgewater State University, n.d.b). For the 2019-2020 academic year, in-state tuition and fees totaled $10,732, out-of-state tuition and fees totaled $16,872, and room and board cost $13,300 (Bridgewater State University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.a).

The 75-minute Creative Dance class met 25 times, approximately twice per week for 15 weeks. This general education course fulfilled a fine and performing arts Core Curriculum
requirement for graduation, and it was not a required course for dance majors (Bridgewater State University, n.d.c.). This was one of three sections of Creative Dance offered in Fall 2019. I taught this one section.

**Student Participants**

This study utilized purposeful sampling (Light et al., 1990) as I investigated the teaching and learning of undergraduate students within a course that I was instructing. Twelve students out of the 19 students enrolled in Creative Dance volunteered to participate in this study. Of the 12 student participants, 11 were female and one was male. One identified as Hispanic or Latina/o, one identified as Cape Verdean, and 10 identified as Caucasian. Compared to the university’s demographic date for all undergraduate students, there was a greater percentage of White students and international students in this participant sample. 7.9% of all undergraduates were Hispanic, while 8.3% of student participants identified as Hispanic or Latina/o. There were no Black, Asian, Native American or Native Hawaiian students in this study. Of the students who opted to not participate, two were male and five were female.

There were four freshmen, five sophomores, two juniors, and one senior with an age range of 18 to 23 and average age of 19. None of the students were majoring in dance. Students were majoring in the following disciplines with three students majoring in two disciplines: Biochemistry (one student), Communications Studies (one student), Criminal Justice (two students), Early Childhood Education (one student), Elementary Education (two students), Health Science (one student), History (one student), Psychology (three students), and Special Education (three students). Academic minors included Dance (one student), Psychology (one student), Special Education (one student), and Sociology (one student). Two students had taken a dance course taught by me during the previous academic year.
Dance experience varied within the student population. Four students had no formal dance training prior to this course, while eight students had formal training at dance studio. One student had one to two years of formal training and one student had three to five years of training. Six students had 10 or more years of formal training. Six students have not choreographed a dance before and six have some choreographic experience. These experiences include choreographing dances for a cheerleading squad, a college dance group on campus, and young dancers at a dance studio. Three students mentioned choreographing either a solo or a senior dance – interpreted as one that took place during their senior year of high school – but the context was not explicitly stated (e.g., for a dance studio/recital, high school dance performance, dance competition).

The range of earned final grades for 12 student participants was from A to B- with a mean average of an A. For the seven students who chose not to participate in this study, the earned final grade range was A to B- with a mean average of a B+. All students, regardless of whether or not they volunteered to participate, experienced in the same class activities and assignments. All data collected in this study was standard for the course. Student participants were not asked to do anything in addition to their usual in-class participation and coursework aside from signing a waiver of consent and choosing whether or not to volunteer their demographic information.

**Ethical Considerations**

After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Boards at both my teaching and doctoral institutions, I shared information about my research with the students. Risks to the students were minimal, yet students could have experienced discomfort because the research took place within the context of a college classroom where students received grades from me, the
teacher-researcher. As an attempt to alleviate this discomfort, I shared information about this research, explained that participation was optional and would have no bearing on their grade whatsoever, and stated that I would not know who volunteered to participate until after final grades were submitted. Students were informed both verbally and on the consent forms (Appendix C) that they could withdraw their participation at any time.

A fellow faculty member at the university collected the consent forms – which were placed in an envelope by the students and delivered to the Dance Faculty office on Thursday, December 19, 2019 – and delivered them to another colleague on campus. This second colleague held the forms securely in her office until after I submitted the students’ final grades to the university. Final grades for Creative Dance were submitted online on Thursday, December 26, 2019, and I picked up the consent forms on Thursday, January 2, 2020.

**Benefits to participants**

Some students may have appreciated that their words and experiences were valued by their professor and would make a positive contribution to dance education research and other students’ learning experiences. Otherwise, there were no concrete benefits to the student participants.

**Data Collection**

All data collected in this study was existing data. It was standard material utilized for my teaching of Creative Dance and would be created and/or collected and used for student assessment and teacher reflection even if this formal study was not taking place. Triangulation of data was achieved via qualitative methods of collecting and utilizing document data, videos of students’ choreography, and observation data. Data collected from students included written reflections and online journal entries with open-ended questions and performances of their in-
class choreography recorded on video. Teacher data included the syllabus, assignment prompts, class plans, teacher memos, and observation notes recorded on rubrics while watching videos of student performance during the semester. Researcher memos and observation notes drafted during analysis and interpretation were also utilized.

Student data included written documentation and videos of performance. Written documentation included 11 weekly online journal entries and two longer reflection assignments. All of these assignments were in the form of qualitative surveys with open-ended prompts and were collected via Blackboard, the university’s online learning management system. Online journals were collected for 11 out of the 15 weeks. The number of prompts/questions for each journal ranged from 3 to 7, with a total of 56 prompts in all. Grades earned were provided on Blackboard for each journal entry, and, at times, teacher feedback was also provided on Blackboard. Journal entries were copied from Blackboard into a Microsoft Excel document and saved onto my computer for analysis.

Two longer reflection assignments were collected during week seven (Midterm Reflection) and 16 (Final Reflection) of the semester. Midterm and Final Reflections were downloaded to my computer and assessed outside of Blackboard. Grades earned and teacher feedback were provided directly on the students’ Word or PDF document, saved onto my computer as a new PDF with my comments, and emailed to the students.

Student data also included videos of in-class performances of their choreography. Students’ Midterm Compositions and Final Composition were recorded so that I could assess their performance and choreography outside of class. These compositions were longer choreographic assignments of 45-60 seconds and 75-90 seconds, respectively. Videos were recorded on my computer and saved in iMovie.
Teacher data included standard instructional materials, observation notes, and teacher memos. Standard instructional materials utilized in this research were the syllabus; assignment prompts for students’ online journals, reflections, and choreographic assignments; and class plans outlining the sequence of activities for each class meeting (both original plans created prior to class and the revised plans with changes made spontaneously during class). In addition, observation notes were created while watching videos of student work. Rubrics were used to record these notes while assessing the Midterm and Final Compositions recorded on video (Appendices D and E, respectively) during the semester. Additional observations notes were recorded while watching these videos during data analysis. Fifteen teacher memos were written directly after class over the course of the semester.

Confidentiality and Data Storage

Since the classwork used as data was assessed as part of students’ grades for the course, anonymity was not possible. Names were changed in this writing so that their information remained confidential. Participating students had the option to choose pseudonyms for themselves; five students provided their own pseudonyms, and I created names for seven students who either (a) did not provide a pseudonym, (b) provided their own name as their pseudonym, or (c) provided a classmate’s name as their pseudonym. Participating students discussed peer feedback in their writing, and I created a new pseudonym each time a non-participating student was mentioned. I am the only one with access to the data. Files were initially saved on my personal computer for data analysis and then moved to an external hard drive where they will be stored for five years in case grades are questioned. After five years, I will erase the data.
Data Analysis

Data analysis commenced after final grades were submitted. Analysis methods vary between the three subareas of focus: cognitive domain of learning, development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance, and affective responses to learning experiences. The categorizing strategy of coding was used to discover similarities and differences in the data and for labeling, categorizing, and comparing data (Maxwell & Miller, 2008) within each subarea. Connections between student data and teacher data were also explored with the aim of gaining a deeper understanding of the impact of teaching strategies and practices on student learning. Collectively, data analysis consisted of a hybrid approach that started with deductive analysis in each of the three subareas – specifically looking at learning within the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains – and then widened to inductive analysis in subareas two and three to allow data to speak for itself and determine the path of my analysis. In all three subareas, I continually asked, “What comes up for me during data analysis that could lead me in a certain direction?” As characteristic of qualitative research, this inductive analysis was open-ended and emergent rather than pre-determined (Glesne, 2016).

Although analysis for each subarea is outlined individually, the analysis process moved between the three subareas in a non-consecutive fashion. When I hit a roadblock in one subarea that required more time to work through, I stepped back and shifted my focus to analyze data in another subarea. Time away from a subarea often enabled me to revisit the data at a later date with greater clarity. This process also enabled me to take notes on potential areas of overlap between the three subareas.
Subarea One: The Cognitive Domain of Learning

The focus of data analysis in this subarea was to gain an understanding of the cognitive processes and knowledge types revealed in student work, the intentions of the teaching strategies and practices that guided student learning in the cognitive domain, and the areas of alignment and misalignment between teaching and learning in this domain. Student data was analyzed first, followed by analysis of teacher data and use of comparative strategies to investigate the relationships between teaching and learning in the cognitive domain. My insider perspective as the one who created the instructional materials and taught the course enabled me to code and classify the student data and teacher data to my best ability and according to what I deemed to be the most accurate classification, while keeping in mind the overall teaching and learning context.

Analysis in the cognitive domain of learning began with coding student’s Final Reflections, a summative assessment aimed to demonstrate the culmination of the students’ semester-long learning in combination with the performance of their Final Composition. This data was coded according to priori codes – pre-determined codes – and organizational categories (Maxwell, 2013) based on Anderson et al.’s (2001) Revised Taxonomy of the cognitive domain. The hierarchical levels of the six cognitive categories and the four knowledge types in the Revised Taxonomy served as initial organizational categories. The associated sublevels of the cognitive categories – cognitive processes – and knowledge subtypes served as priori codes. Data analysis revealed two additional types of knowledge and was adjusted accordingly; data was recoded to include six organizational categories representing six knowledge types and one category for experience to distinguish between having an experience and demonstrating knowledge. Appendix F lists the organizational categories and priori codes used for this step of analysis.
The additional knowledge categories resulted in the modification of Anderson et al.’s (2001) Taxonomy Table to represent the knowledge dimension in our course more accurately. The modified table, The Creative Dance Taxonomy Table (Appendix G), served as a data matrix (Maxwell, 2013) for displaying results of analysis that were later used for comparing student and teacher data and drawing conclusions about the relationships between teaching and learning in the cognitive domain. Such modifications to the taxonomy were encouraged by Bloom (as cited in Anderson et al., 2001), who stated the following in a memorandum circa 1971:

Ideally each major field should have its own taxonomy of objectives in its own language—more detailed, closer to the special language and thinking of its experts, reflecting its own appropriate sub-divisions and levels of education, with possible new categories, combinations of categories and omitting categories as appropriate. (p. xxvii-xxviii)

Student Final Reflection data was analyzed multiple times by prompt and per student to ensure consistency of coding over time, between student data, and between student and teacher data. Codes for analyzing student work per Final Reflection prompt were recorded into a table in Microsoft Word. (Appendix H displays a section of the table.) For per student analysis, codes were typed in the PDF files of the Final Reflections. Common cognitive process and knowledge dimension pairings found in student responses to Prompt 4 of their Final Reflection – which summarized their creative processes for their Final Compositions – were classified and placed into appropriate cells of the Creative Dance Taxonomy Table with general descriptions appropriate to the course (Appendix I). Appendix J provides specific student data examples for each classification.
Teacher data (Final Reflection prompts and syllabus) was analyzed according to the same priori codes and organizational categories as student data (Appendix F). Student learning outcomes (SLOs) listed on the Fall 2019 syllabus were found to be in need of a revision in order to proceed efficiently with analysis. SLOs which included more than one cognitive process and/or knowledge type in the statement were unpacked so that each process and type could be classified individually. SLOs that were unclear with regards to the types of cognitive processes and knowledge they were referring to were clarified. Revised SLOs for Fall 2019 were created and placed into the Creative Dance Taxonomy Table with descriptive text for greater ease and efficiency when compared to data displayed in other Creative Dance Taxonomy Tables (Appendix K). My knowledge of teaching and learning in the course and my intention for the assignment prompts enabled me to determine what I believed was the correct classification (Anderson et al., 2001), particularly for statements that were vague.

Teacher intentions for Prompt 4 of the Final Reflection were then coded and classified into its own Creative Dance Taxonomy Table (Appendix L) with descriptive text. Since the distinction between statements of experience and statements of knowledge was needed for this classification, Final Reflection prompts were analyzed through the lens of the four learning modes of Kolb’s (2015) Learning Cycle – concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation – to see which modes students were being encouraged to experience and share in their writing. Online journals prompts were also analyzed according to these four learning modes. Appendix M includes the tables used to record Learning Modes implied in online journal prompts. Appendix N provides specific examples of online journal and Final Reflection prompts with their implied Learning Modes. The final step in data analysis for subarea one included comparing the Creative Dance Taxonomy Tables representing
student data and teacher data for Prompt 4 of the Final Reflection and the Revised Fall 2019 SLOs to determine areas of alignment and misalignment between teaching intention and student learning.

**Subarea Two: The Development of Physical Skills in Relationship with Choreography and Performance**

The focus of data analysis in this subarea was to gain a deeper understanding of the students’ physical skill development with regards to choreography and performance and the teaching strategies and practices that guided their development. Analysis shifted between teacher and student data in order to investigate the relationships between the teaching and learning of physical skills in the course. Prior to analyzing videos of student performances for skill assessment, I looked closely at Dave (1970), Harrow (1972) and Simpson’s (1966, 1972) psychomotor taxonomies to determine which of their categories and subcategories could potentially be observed in the students’ Midterm and Final Compositions. The taxonomies’ focus on skill proficiency revealed that I needed to clarify the specific choreographic and performance skills that could be assessed via observation alone and which skills required writing in Final Reflections to support observations. This clarification was made before analyzing videos of student work (Appendix O).

Analysis of student data began with deductive analysis of videos of student choreography and performance within the psychomotor domain using priori codes and organizational categories (Maxwell, 2013) based on the hierarchical levels within the three separate psychomotor taxonomies (Dave, 1970; Harrow, 1972; Simpson, 1966, 1972). After viewing the videos multiple times for half of the student participants and attempting to assign priori codes to my observations according to the subcategories of the three psychomotor taxonomies, I came to
the conclusion that these pre-selected taxonomies were extremely limiting; the majority of the levels and sublevels in the taxonomies were deemed not applicable to assessing choreographic outcomes based on individual expression in our course. Each level in each taxonomy was reviewed multiple times, allowing me to feel secure about this conclusion.

Analysis then shifted to an inductive approach to analyzing teacher data (rubrics for Midterm and Final Compositions) inspired by the psychomotor taxonomies’ focus on assessment via observation alone. As a result, I revisited my rubrics and teaching intention with the following questions in mind: (1) which choreographic and performance skills are highlighted in this course?; (2) which choreographic and performance skills could be observed via movement alone?; (3) which choreographic and performance skills need written support?; (4) what were the various levels of proficiency for the choreographic and performance skills being assessed? My answers to these questions served as the compass that directed the path of my analysis in this subarea, which ultimately focused on the topics of confidence, creativity, and earned deductions found in both student and teacher data.

Since students were assessed on their demonstrated level of confidence in their Midterm and Final Compositions, the next step in analysis included required me to identify the parameters that I used to assess confidence and lack thereof in a performance. Theses parameters were revealed by comparing videos of Midterm and Final Composition performances and looking for patterns in my observation notes recorded during analysis and on rubrics during the semester. These parameters included a student’s focus (i.e., direction and movement of their eyes) and facial expressions while performing and their body language while entering the performance space, exiting the space, and bowing. A student’s ability to perform with full engagement was not a parameter for confidence, as this performance ability was a not a primary focus in class
during Fall 2019. Assessing such a parameter would give experienced dancers an unfair advantage over those without dance training and performance experience.

Next, I watched videos of these student performances for any observable differences in the parameters for confidence as demonstrated in their body language between these two performances. I recorded observation notes on my computer and also referred to the students’ Midterm and Final Composition rubrics for any handwritten notes that were recorded previously about the students’ demonstration of confidence in their performance. I compared individual students’ performances of their Midterm Compositions to the performance of their Final Composition using the videos and my recorded notes.

Students were also assessed on their demonstration of creativity, which led me to look at student and teacher data for signs of how creativity was defined, discussed, and assessed in the course. I referred to students’ Week 3 Online Journals, which asked them about their views of creativity, and videos of their Midterm and Final Compositions to gain an understanding of their perspectives. I reviewed teacher data (syllabus, reflection prompts, online journal prompts, and class plans) for statements on creativity. I also reflected upon my own perspective on creativity based on my years of teaching and professional dance experience as it applied to a choreography course for students who were not pursuing a career in the dance field.

The final piece of data analysis for the development of physical skills in our course included looking at the hard copies of rubrics that I completed for students’ Midterm and Final Compositions for any patterns in students’ earned deductions. (Appendix P is an example of a completed Midterm rubric). I noted patterns revealed in the rubric data in a Microsoft Word document and compared this to other teacher data to identify relationships between these performance outcomes and my teaching strategies and class plans; this included reviewing
teacher memos for any related statements and analyzing class plans via magnitude coding to see if there were relationships between the concept areas in which students earned deductions and the frequency of their exposure to, and explorations of, the concept areas.

**Subarea Three: Affective Responses to Learning Experiences**

The focus of data analysis in this subarea was to gain an understanding of students’ affective responses to their learning experiences and interpret how teaching strategies and practices influenced these responses. Student data was analyzed first. Outcomes of student data analysis directed the focus for the analysis of teacher data and for investigating the relationships between students’ affective responses and teaching strategies and practices.

Data analysis began deductively by assigning *priori* codes and organizational categories (Maxwell, 2013) to students’ Midterm Reflections, Final Reflections, and online journals based on the five hierarchical levels and sublevels of The Affective Domain Taxonomy (Krathwohl et al., 1964). Analyzing student data through the lens of the Affective Domain Taxonomy proved to be limiting; the majority of the student data could not be sufficiently assessed according to its hierarchical levels and sublevels, as the course was not designed to assess student learning outcomes in the affective domain. As a result, I set aside the affective taxonomy and allowed the data to guide the analysis process. This inductive approach led me to Affective methods of coding (Saldana, 2016) for analyzing students’ Midterm Reflections, Final Reflections, and online journal entries as a means to acknowledge and label subjective aspects of their learning experiences expressed in their writing.

The first level of analysis included assigning Emotion Codes (Saldana, 2016) to data by labeling emotions and feelings that were stated by the student in their Midterm and Final Reflections and online journals. Emotion Codes were noted directly on the student data.
documents on my computer, and a list of the codes was created (Appendix Q). The Emotion Codes alone, however, were too broad and did not speak about the situational factors that potentially inspired these affective responses. Therefore, the second level of analysis involved subcoding (Saldana, 2016), organizing the data into primary codes and subcodes. The Emotion Codes (e.g., nervous) became the primary codes and the situational factors (e.g., performing alone in front of the entire class) contributing to these primary codes served as subcodes. This was first performed separately for the Midterm Reflection, Final Reflection, and online journals and saved in three separate files.

The primary codes and subcodes of all three files were then combined into one document, organized, and further refined. Appendix R is an example of this step of analysis. Data was then analyzed in two different ways. First, data was analyzed again through the lens of Krathwohl et al.’s (1964) taxonomy of the affective domain by noting data that was explicit about students’ satisfaction with their learning experiences, sublevel 2.3 in the taxonomy. Secondly, and the final step for analyzing students’ affective responses to learning, was themeing the data (Saldana, 2016), categorizing the data according to common themes that were revealed. Once themes were revealed, I revisited all of the students’ written data for each of the themes to ensure consistency of coding across and within each theme and to add and omit data as needed in support of the theme. These themes were then used as starting points for determining the connections between students’ affective responses and teaching strategies and practices.

Thematic outcomes of the analysis of student data guided the path of teacher data analysis and the strategies used to identify relationships between students’ affective responses and my teaching. Teacher data for this step of analysis included class plans, teacher memos, and syllabus. These instructional documents were analyzed for any statements that connected with
the themes that were revealed in the student data. For example, since repetition of learning experiences arose as a theme in this subarea, class plans, teacher memos, and the syllabus were analyzed through the lens of repetition. Magnitude coding was used to analyze class plan data for determining the frequency of specific in-class performance experiences implied in student writing. Tables were created in Microsoft Excel to document the frequency of specific performance experiences, such as the number of classes in which they performed alone in front of an audience compared to performing with their peers. (Appendix S is an example of this table). Teacher memos were analyzed by looking for comments that referenced repetition or a lack there-of, and the syllabus was analyzed for any mention of repetition. A similar process for analyzing teacher data according to what was revealed in student data and strategies for investigating connections between student and teacher data was followed for the other two findings in this subarea.

Steps Towards Reliability

I entered this analysis with the desire to be consistent with my codes, categories, and themes over time as a measure for reliability. I repeated my analysis of the same data multiple times in each subarea over the course of a six-month period and moved between subareas in a non-linear fashion. For example, after completing two rounds of analysis in the cognitive domain of learning, I moved to analyze the development of physical skills before returning to the cognitive domain. This back and forth shifting and returning to re-code the same data set within a subarea enabled me to compare my interpretations.

Over time, my understanding of the cognitive domain taxonomy, in particular, increased as a result of continuing to read supporting literature and, even more so, by seeing examples of the various cognitive processes and knowledge types implied within the data. As a result, my
interpretations of the data shifted since my first analysis; I was able to view the data with a cleaner lens, so to speak. I questioned my earlier analysis and revised some of my codes accordingly.

I focused on ensuring, to my best ability, that I was consist with my interpretations across the various data documents within each of the three subareas and across subareas. I had to continually remind myself that coding is an interpretive – rather than a fixed – process and to focus on being clear, explicit, and consistent with my coding choices across the data documents. While doing so, I tried to make sure that I was allowing the data to speak for itself rather than impose a biased interpretation or force data into pre-determined categories that were not an appropriate fit. Allowing room for the data to speak is what enabled me to set aside the pre-determined affective and psychomotor domain taxonomies and instead utilize affective and physical aspects of learning revealed in the data to guide my analysis in these subareas.

Modification of Instructional Strategies

Findings in this research study guided the modification of my instructional materials, strategies, and practices for Fall 2020 according to Wiggins and McTighe’s (2011) three-stage backwards design process. Revised materials include student learning outcomes, assessment strategies, and prompts for activities and assignments. Plans for modifying teaching strategies and practices based on the findings of this study are discussed in Chapter Five.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations to this study. The interpretive nature of qualitative research can be viewed as a limitation; researcher subjectivity was inherent to this research as I served the dual role of teacher and researcher. In addition, while this study included various forms of student and teacher data, some aspects of teaching and learning in the course were
omitted. This study also lacked representation of student voices across various races and physical abilities; the majority of student participants were White, and none communicated the existence of physical impairments or limitations. These aspects, if included, would have resulted in a deeper understanding of student learning across a more diverse population of learners and of the impact of my teaching strategies on their learning.

**Researcher as Instrument**

Subjectivity is an inherent part of social science research with the observer and the observed inextricably linked. Ultimately, I was the lens through which I interpreted the data. I must acknowledge, however, that my interpretation of the data is but one interpretation. I was the sole researcher analyzing, interpreting, and constructing meaning, and other researchers might have drawn different conclusions. Prior to my researcher role, I was the teacher. This insider perspective as one who was fully immersed and active in the research setting can be viewed as both an asset and hindrance to this research, as my biases, assumptions, and lived experiences have ultimately shaped how I view teaching and learning. I have had to continually check my biases and assumptions as I analyzed the data so that I could allow the data to speak for itself.

I continue to respect and honor the students’ voices shared through their writing and performance, and I was and am grateful to be learning from them. Through this study, I attempted to gain a deeper understanding of students’ learning experiences, yet it is not possible to fully understand the experiences of another. Additionally, written statements and videos of student performances do not fully reflect the knowledge gained or utilized in the course. My interpretation of student experiences reflected in the data is only a fraction of the totality of their lived experience in class.
Omitted Data

Some teaching materials and instructional strategies that could impact student learning were not included in this study. These include documentation that is not a standard practice for the course - video recordings of class periods, video recordings of all choreographic assignments, dialogue from student midterm meetings, follow up communication – and additional writing assignments and field notes.

**Video Recordings of Class Instruction, Interactions, and Movement.** I strongly believe that interpersonal relationships between teacher and student and between students greatly shape student learning. Video recordings of all class sessions would paint a clearer picture of these interactions, as the current data does not reveal how information was exchanged verbally or physically. Videos would also be a record of peer interactions in class and could potentially be another tool for better understanding interpersonal aspects of learning. There was a lot of dialogue in Creative Dance, and this was not included in the existing teaching documents utilized as data for this study.

In addition, all of the videos used in this study were of set choreography, choreography that is planned and can be repeated the same way in every performance. Students were not recorded while performing movement improvisations – moving on the spot in response to instructions without planning. Online journals provided information about their experiences improvising, but videos of their improvisations could reveal additional information about the development of their physical learning that is not accessible via set choreography. Therefore, this research did not include videos of class meetings to observe how students’ movement changed, if at all, over time. Videos of Midterm and Final Compositions were used as the basis for assessing observable growth over time for this research.
Videos of Short Choreographic Assignments. Videos of shorter movement assignments were not included in this study. This was decided for a few reasons. First, only three out of 11 shorter movement assignments were recorded. Second, movement in these shorter assignments often changed shortly after it was performed. Process and experimentation were often prioritized over the product in the shorter assignments, as class time was used to manipulate their choreography according to new dance concepts.

Third, large groups of students – as many as 10 at a time – performed these movement assignments simultaneously. It was extremely challenging to fit all students into the frame of the camera for the duration of their performance and to ensure that every student was seen and not obstructed by another student. Fourth, and most importantly, recording groups of students on video often pulled my focus away from the students’ work and towards making sure that they were in the frame of the camera. This shift of focus prevented me from being fully present and able to observe and guide the students as needed. Once again, I prioritized my teacher role over my researcher role.

Dialogue from Student Midterm Meetings. I held individual meetings with each student to watch and discuss their Midterm Compositions and discuss aspects of their Midterm Reflections. Each meeting lasted approximately 15 minutes. We watched their midterm performance together on my laptop, and students expressed what they believed they did well and the ways in which they could improve their work. I shared my feedback, both affirmations and where I felt that they could improve, so that they could apply this information to future assignments. The main information shared with the student was derived from my observation notes on the rubric that was included as data in this study (Appendix D). Audio and video recordings of such meetings were not a standard practice in this course, and thus were omitted.
Recordings of the delivery of this information and the student responses during the meeting could provide additional information about student learning, my teaching, and interpersonal aspects of teaching and learning.

**Additional Writing Assignments.** Students completed and submitted four Video Viewing assignments via Blackboard, a dance performance response at the end of the semester, and one additional reflection assignment during week two. The open-ended video assignments enabled students to make connections between class concepts and experiences and online videos of dance. Students also completed an open-ended essay assignment in response to a live dance performance that they were required to attend on campus. These assignments were not included in the IRB. The Week 2 Reflection served a comparative reference for students when completing their Final Reflection at the end of the semester.

In addition, some students did not submit all writing assignments. Eleven out of 12 students submitted Final Reflections, and data from this assignment contributed to many of the findings. Finding A1 in subarea three was based on student data within one particular online journal, and eleven out of 12 students submitted this journal assignment.

**Minimal Field Notes.** It was extremely challenging to keep detailed field notes on the work of 19 students in class, particularly when multiple students are performing simultaneously. My focus was primarily on observing what was happening in class and responding accordingly and instantaneously via verbal words and actions. I was simultaneously balancing a micro view focusing on individual students – and a macro view – taking in the entirety of the classroom community. My teacher role was prioritized over my researcher role, as my primary focus was being fully present and available for all of my students.
No Follow Up Communication. This study did not provide opportunities for follow up communication after the semester ended. Follow up surveys and/or interviews asking students to reflect on specific aspects of their learning experiences could have provided greater clarification about teaching and learning with regards to the three subareas of focus in this study. It was a conscious choice, however, to not ask students to do more or to devote more time than the course requirements required. Students are busy, and I feared that requesting a post-semester follow up would prevent students from volunteering to participate in the study.

Lack of Diversity in Student Participant Sample

Diversity – with regards to race, gender, and physical abilities – was not represented across the student participants. Ten of the 12 student participants (83%) identified as Caucasian, so the majority of student data reflected the learning experiences and outcomes of White students. One student identified as Hispanic or Latina/o (8.3%) and one international student identified as Cape Verdean (8.3%). There were no Black, Asian, Native American, or Native Hawaiian students in this study. Only one out of the 12 participants identified as male. In addition, none of the twelve students communicated the existences of a physical impairment that called for academic or physical accommodations to support their participation and/or overall learning in the course. Having greater diversity across the student participants with regards to race, gender, and physical abilities would have provided a more inclusive and wider representation of student voices and learning, particularly from those whose voices are less represented in research, education, and in society at large.

Chapter Three Summary

In summary, this chapter provided a detailed overview of the research design for this action research study. Qualitative methods were used to assess student learning in Creative
Dance and the teaching strategies and practices that guided their learning within three subareas: the cognitive domain of learning, the development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance, and affective responses to learning experiences. Twelve undergraduate students voluntarily offered to participate in this study. The majority of their written and choreographic work completed for class served as student data, while my standard teaching materials (syllabus, rubrics, assignment prompts, class plans, observation notes, and teacher memos) were used as teacher data. Analysis included both deductive and inductive approaches.

Interpretations and conclusions were determined from research findings within and between the three subareas and from steps used to identify relationships between student learning revealed in the data and teaching strategies and practices. Rather than aim for generalizability, this study focused more on transferability of outcomes to the teaching of a general education choreography course; the outcomes guided the plans for modifying instructional materials, strategies, and practices for Creative Dance in Fall 2020 according to Wiggins and McTighe’s (2011) three-stage backwards design process. Steps were taken towards researcher reliability and the acknowledgement of the limitations of the study. Additionally, I acknowledged my interpretation as the teacher-researcher as but one interpretation.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

The purpose of this action research study was to gain a better understanding of the learning experiences and outcomes of 12 undergraduates enrolled in Creative Dance, a general education choreography course, and the teaching strategies and practices that guided their learning. Outcomes of this research were used to plan modifications of teaching materials, strategies, and practices for Fall 2020 to improve facilitation of student learning. This chapter presents the key findings revealed from analysis of student and teacher data in three subareas of learning in the course: the cognitive domain of learning, the development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance, and affective responses to learning experiences. A total of 10 findings emerged from these three subareas:

Subarea One: The Cognitive Domain of Learning

C1. Two additional types of knowledge were revealed to be integral to, and outcomes of, the students' thinking throughout their choreographic and performance processes: Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge.

a. Student data revealed a distinction between stating an experience and demonstrating Experiential Knowledge.

b. Student data revealed a distinction between stating an affective response and demonstrating Affective Self-Knowledge.

C2. Student Learning was assessed as a linear, rather than cyclical, process.

C3. Procedural Knowledge of choreographic tools and techniques was not evident in student writing, assignment prompts, or student learning outcomes.

Subarea Two: The Development of Physical Skills in Relationship with Choreography and Performance
P1. A narrow perspective on creativity served as the foundation for creating and assessing student choreography.

P2. Choreographic and performance skills, learned and assessed, and their associated levels of proficiency were not made explicit.

P3. A direct relationship was revealed between students’ earned deductions for the compositional element of Time and lack of class time devoted to this content area.

P4. A student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing could not be sufficiently measured from a third-person perspective using the set assessment parameters.

Subarea Three: Affective Responses to Learning Experiences

A1. The majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]) experienced shifting feelings and/or emotions over the period of a singular performance.

A2. The majority of students (10 out of 12 [83%]) reported feeling more comfortable, more self-confident, and/or less nervous performing in class as a result of repeating learning experiences.

A3. For the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]), peer influence extended beyond providing beneficial critical feedback for the development of their peers’ choreography to inspiring feelings of satisfaction and/or positive shifts in students’ affective responses to learning activities through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions.

In this chapter, each subarea and its associated findings are discussed separately with supporting details and data. Student data examples are included as written by the students; punctuation, capitalization, and other writing errors were left as originally stated and without
adding “[sic]” in order to maintain the fluidity of the statements. The aim of this chapter is to provide the reader with a better understanding of what the data revealed about student learning experiences and outcomes and/or the teaching strategies that guided their learning. Chapter Five probes deeper into the interpretations of these findings and the resulting plans for teaching modification for Creative Dance in Fall 2020.

**Subarea One: The Cognitive Domain of Learning**

The purpose of data analysis in this subarea was to gain an understanding of the cognitive processes and knowledge types revealed in student work, the intentions of the teaching strategies and practices that guided student learning in the cognitive domain, and the areas of alignment and misalignment between teaching intentions and learning outcomes in this domain. This section presents key findings in the cognitive domain of learning obtained from text-based student data (Midterm and Final Reflections, online journals) and teacher data (Final Reflection prompts, online journals prompts, class plans, and syllabus). Analysis in this subarea revealed three main findings for student learning in the cognitive domain:

C1. Two additional types of knowledge were revealed to be integral to, and outcomes of, the students’ thinking throughout their choreographic and performance processes:

**Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge.**

a. Student data revealed a distinction between stating an experience and stating Experiential Knowledge.

b. Student data revealed a distinction between stating an affective response and stating Affective Self-Knowledge.

C2. Student Learning was assessed as a linear, rather than cyclical, process.
C3. Procedural Knowledge of choreographic tools and techniques was not evident in student writing, assignment prompts, or student learning outcomes.

Each of these three findings are presented separately with supporting data. Capitalization and italics are used throughout this subarea to distinguish cognitive categories, cognitive processes, and knowledge types, from one another more easily. The COGNITIVE CATEGORIES are in all capitals. The cognitive processes are in lower case italics. The Knowledge Types have the first letter of each word capitalized. For example, students demonstrated their ability to UNDERSTAND/translate Conceptual Knowledge in their Final Reflections. It is important to acknowledge, however, that written statements do not fully reflect the knowledge gained or utilized in the course. These findings are my interpretations of student statements based on my knowledge of teaching and learning within this course. Findings also included outcomes of comparisons between student data and teaching data to determine areas of alignment and misalignment between teaching and learning.

The interpretations of these findings and their application to teaching modifications for Creative Dance in Fall 2020 are explained in Chapter Five. As findings in the cognitive domain are being introduced, it is necessary to remember that analysis in this subarea focused on student writing in their Final Reflections, and this writing did not demonstrate the physical act of CREATING/choreographing a dance. Their Final Compositions demonstrated this ability. The Final Reflection and Final Composition, together, enabled students to demonstrate the various cognitive and physical processes that contributed to CREATING/choreographing a dance.

Finding C1: Two additional types of knowledge were revealed to be integral to, and outcomes of, the students’ thinking throughout their choreographic and performance processes: Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge.
Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge were revealed in Final Reflection student data as knowledge types integral to, and outcomes, of their learning processes as choreographers and performers. Analyzing the Final Reflection student data solely according to the four knowledge types of The Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al., 2001) as initially proposed for this study proved to be limiting; there was data coded in the cognitive dimension – cognitive processes with assigned priori codes – that could not be paired with any of the pre-established organizational categories representing Factual, Conceptual, Procedural, or Metacognitive Knowledge. A wider view of the knowledge types that contributed to, and were outcomes of, the students’ thinking processes demonstrated in their Final Reflections revealed Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge as additional knowledge types that were utilized and generated.

This revelation contributed to the creation of the Creative Dance Taxonomy Table, displayed as Table 6. This table is a modified version of Anderson et al.’s (2009) Taxonomy Table of the Cognitive Domain adapted for our course to represent the cognitive processes and knowledge types in our course more clearly as revealed in student data. (See Table 6), Student data revealed a distinction between REMEMBERING an experience and making statements demonstrating an UNDERSTANDING of Experiential or Affective Self-Knowledge. These distinctions were necessary in order to classify data most appropriately into the Creative Dance Taxonomy Table. While analyzing and classifying data, it was important to keep in mind that Experiential Learning is a process, not an outcome; a singular statement made by a student in a summative Final Reflection assignment might have implied Experiential Knowledge, but looking at the totality of the student’s experience through their work over time – when prompted accordingly – would a paint a clearer and stronger picture of their Experiential Knowledge.
Table 6

*The Creative Dance Taxonomy Table*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION (Anderson et al., 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 REMEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. META-COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. AFFECTIVE SELF-KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table is a revision of Anderson et al.’s (2001) Taxonomy Table specifically adapted for Creative Dance.

**Experiential Knowledge**

The distinction between stating an experience and stating Experiential Knowledge became more evident with repeated data analysis as examples were revealed in students’ Final
Reflection data and as I allowed myself to look beyond the text and take into account my knowledge of what and how students learned in the course. Statements that simply *recalled* a student’s experience performing and/or choreographing without implying a deeper shift in experience or drawing conclusions from their experience were categorized as *recalling* experience. Student statements that implied aspects of Experiential Knowledge generated and utilized in the course included reflective observations and/or analysis of their creative process and/or performance that signified a shift in their experience or their perception of their experience. In other words, these statements implied steps towards both grasping experience and transforming experience (Kolb, 2015). See Table 7 for student data examples of this distinction.

Results indicated that the dance-making process enabled students to not only gain Experiential Knowledge as a choreographer and performer, but to also apply Experiential Knowledge acquired outside of the class to their learning experiences in our class. Jussara and Nicole, for example, drew upon Experiential Knowledge gained from specific life experiences as inspiration for their choreography. They used Experiential Knowledge to CREATE/plan a structure for their dances.

For Jussara, knowledge arose from her experiences with a previous relationship, and this contributed to the *planning* of her dance:

My theme is about someone being in an abusive relationship, about people accepting to be in that situation just because they think they can’t live with somebody that hurts them. This is a topic that I really wanted to share on my way, because I was in an abusive relationship with somebody, and even knowing that I was living an abusive relationship I
did not want to move on, because I was thinking that he would change, or get better. But I also wanted to share it, because I believe that there are many teenagers that are going through an abusive relationship, and don’t really know it.

I basically tried to do from the beginning of a relationship, which is when everything is beautiful and perfect, middle which is when someone does something bad but the other still forgives, and end which is when the one that always forgives puts an ending on it.

Nicole’s Experiential Knowledge came from her experiences stargazing with her family:

The theme of my final composition was stargazing. I have many memories involving my family and I stargazing on the beach during summer nights. These are memories that I cherish. What I want to communicate through my movement is the beauty and wonder of the night sky. I want the audience to understand that I am transfixed by something and it is my intention by looking up that they understand I am meant to look at the stars. I also want to communicate the relaxation I feel while stargazing, that all my stress and anxiety washes away while I look at the stars.

I sequenced my movements by following the order of events that would usually happen while stargazing. I began with the initial idea and physical travel to stargaze. I then demonstrated the stress I feel by moving quickly, and then it is diminishing. From then on, I am admiring the beauty of the sky and enjoying my time, using a more sustained time effort.

Affective Self-Knowledge

A distinction between an affective response and Affective Self-Knowledge was also revealed in student data. An affective response – as assessed in the subarea three – is a term used in this research to represent a feeling or emotional response to a learning experience. Statements
portraying such a response to performing or choreographing that do not go beyond recalling the singular feeling experience were classified as recalling an experience. Affective Self-Knowledge was a term that I used to code knowledge of students’ feelings and emotions that extended beyond a singular experience and/or connected to other aspects of their performance and was connected to their thinking. Such statements of feelings or emotions implied an understanding of a shift in experience and were classified as Affective Self-Knowledge. See Table 8 for student data examples of this distinction.

**Finding C2: Student learning was assessed as a linear, rather than cyclical, process.**

While students continually revised and experimented with their work throughout their creative process in class, their assessments were prompting their learning as a linear, rather than cyclical, process. Teacher data revealed that students were prompted in their online journals and Final Reflection assignment to share (a) the actions that they took (simply REMEMBERING/recalling their experience without association to a particular type of knowledge), (b) their observations made via reflection (Reflective Observation), and (c) the conclusions drawn from thinking about their experience (Abstract Conceptualization). Although students were prompted in their Final Reflection to share the steps that they took to improve their choreography and performance (Active Experimentation), students were not prompted to share their experiences of modifying and re-assessing their work after modifications were made.

Results indicated that students were provided with opportunities to demonstrate their ability to move beyond recalling experiences and towards higher levels of thinking by EVALUATING their experiences using self-imposed criteria, but they were not prompted to state how their experience of their work had shifted as a result of the evaluation and how the knowledge gained from their experience informed their creative process. Assessments supported
learning as a linear process and were out of alignment with the Revised Fall 2019 Student Learning Outcome 5: After successful completion of the course, students should be able to implement cycles of reflection – experience, reflect, analyze, modify, repeat – throughout their learning process.

Table 7

**Student Data Examples: Distinction Between Experience and Experiential Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>1.0 REMEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summarizing or explaining reflective observations and abstract conceptualization of their performance that signify a shift in their performance experience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As I performed my final composition, I wasn’t thinking about everyone else as I normally would have. I was focused on my movements and the feelings that were being put behind them. I was nervous before getting on stage but once I began dancing, the nerves went away and I was performing. I performed more during this performance than other performances that I had done during class, putting more emotion and strength behind the movements, because I felt more comfortable being in front of an audience. My choreography was stronger so my performance was also stronger. (Leanne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>recalling aspects of their choreographic and/or performance experience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a performer I was thinking about my movements and repeating them in my head. I felt confident and comfortable while performing. I noticed that my performance felt a lot more confident and I enjoyed it. My choreography could have been better and more advanced but I think I got my point across of the childish movement. (Grace)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8

**Student Data Examples: Distinction Between an Affective Response and Affective Self-Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. AFFECTIVE SELF-KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td><strong>1.0 REMEMBER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparing reflections and thoughts on their feelings or emotional responses to performances that signify a shift in their performance experience: Some things that stand out to me from my online journals are that in the beginning of the semester I wrote about how nervous I was to perform in front of the whole class and even some partners and small groups performing my own choreography. I feel as if I have now grown past that and would like to think I feel more comfortable and confident with people in the class to be able to perform in front of them. It is definitely a lot different from how I am used to performing because in cheerleading my dance and routine is choreographed for me and I have coaches to correct me every day, the judges are also farther away and not right on top of you like in class, so I feel as if that is more pressure. The more we perform in class with various people, the more comfortable I get with performing. I would say that this has definitely changed throughout time to the end of the semester. (Catherine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. EXPERIENCE (an affective response)</td>
<td>recalling aspects (feelings or emotions) of their choreographic and/or performance experience: I noticed my performance was fun and different than what I've done before. I noticed the confidence I had when I performed...I think what went well with my performance was that I wasn't as nervous, and I had fun and I remembered all my choreography. (Stacy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finding C3: Procedural Knowledge of choreographic tools and techniques was not evident in student writing, assignment prompts, or student learning outcomes.

Classification of cognitive processes and knowledge types found in student and teacher data into the Creative Dance Taxonomy Table revealed that Procedural Knowledge of choreographic tools and techniques was not evident. This conclusion was drawn by the empty Procedural Knowledge row in the Creative Dance Taxonomy Tables representing student data for Final Reflection Prompt 4 (Appendix I), the intended cognitive processes and knowledge types in teacher data for Prompt 4 (Appendix L), and the revised Fall 2019 student learning outcomes (Appendix K). The students’ abilities to APPLY specific Procedural Knowledge to the creation of a dance were not demonstrated in their Final Reflections, as this required the act of dancing. Their UNDERSTANDING of such Procedural Knowledge was not demonstrated in their writing either.

Data revealed that this lack of UNDERSTANDING of Procedural Knowledge was not the fault of the students. The absence of Procedural Knowledge was revealed to be a result of my teaching strategies. Procedural Knowledge was not prompted in students’ Final Reflections or implied in the revised Fall 2019 student learning outcomes. In addition, in-class instruction prioritized other aspects of choreography over learning specific choreographic tools and techniques for researching a theme, generating movement, structuring movement into a dance, and providing self-feedback.

Class plans revealed that class instruction focused primarily on the processes of improvising, performing set choreography, and manipulating set choreography rather than the processes of translating ideas into new movement and organizing movement into a larger structure for a dance (forming). Choreographic devices were used in class to modify already
created movement as a means for generating new movement and assisting students with working through choreographer’s block, the dance-making equivalent to writer’s block. Assignment prompts and class plan data did not include choreographic tools and/or techniques for researching, forming, or revising their work. Rather than requiring students to utilize specific procedures for researching, forming, and revising their dance, students had the freedom to do so as they wished.

The Procedural Knowledge that students were introduced to in class, as outlined in my class plan data, was not assessed in their Final Reflection. This was through experiences such as a step-by-step process of giving and receiving constructive peer feedback adapted from Liz Lerman & Borstel’s (2003) Critical Response ProcessSM, using choreographic devices to manipulate already created movement, and using structured improvisation as a process for manipulating movement and for encouraging students to exploring new ways of moving their bodies. Students did share statements about their peer feedback experiences and outcomes in their online journals, Midterm Reflections, and Final Reflections, but their actual APPLICATION/implementation or UNDERSTANDING of this process was not assessed.

When specific procedures were mentioned in the Final Reflection, students were not prompted to demonstrate their UNDERSTANDING of the procedure. For example, in their Final Reflection, students were asked “Which 2 manipulations did you incorporate into your choreography (other than change of staging, levels, tempo, lateral inversion)?” but they were not prompted to share their knowledge of the processes used to manipulate their movement. Catherine went beyond simply stating the two manipulations and demonstrated her UNDERSTANDING of specific Procedural Knowledge by interpreting (defining) instrumentation – a particular manipulation – and exemplifying the process that she used:
Instrumentation is when you are using another body part to show an action. An example of this in my choreography is when I am on my hands and knees using my head to roll a snowball to make a snowman. Usually you start with a snowball and walk and roll it at the same time to make an even bigger snowball to make a snowman, I took that movement and changed it to crawling as walking and moving my head as rolling the snowball instead of my hands.

The revised student learning outcomes (SLO) did not include terms reflective of discipline-specific procedural knowledge such as choreographic techniques and methods (Appendix K). The words “choreographic concepts” were utilized and intended to be all encompassing, but the term “concepts” is limiting; it does not represent choreographic techniques and methods. The only SLO to imply knowledge of a procedure is SLO5, stating that students should be able to apply cycles of reflection.

**Summary of Findings in Subarea One**

Three main findings were revealed in the analysis of student and teacher data within the cognitive domain of learning. First, Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge were found to be two additional types of knowledge integral to, and outcomes of, the students’ thinking throughout their choreographic and performance processes. In connection to this finding, student responses in their Final Reflections revealed a distinction between statements of an experience and statements of Experiential Knowledge and between statements of affective responses and statements of Affective Self-Knowledge. Second, student learning was found to be assessed as a linear, rather than cyclical, process. Assignment prompts did not encourage students to enter repeated cycles of learning where they could become aware of the
transformation of their learning experiences. Finally, Procedural Knowledge of specific choreographic tools and techniques was not evident in student or teacher data.

**Subarea Two: The Development of Physical Skills in Relationship to Choreography and Performance**

The purpose of data analysis in this second subarea was to gain a better understanding of the development of student’s choreographic and performance skills and the instructional strategies and practices that guided their physical skill development. This section presents key findings in the development of students’ physical skills obtained from videos of student choreography and performance, text-based student data (Midterm and Final Reflections, online journals), and text-based teacher data (Final Composition prompts, assignment prompts, class plans, syllabus, and observation notes recorded during analysis and on rubrics during the semester). Data analysis for the development of physical skills in relationship with performance and choreography revealed four main findings:

1. A narrow perspective on creativity served as the foundation for creating and assessing student choreography.

2. Choreographic and performance skills, learned and assessed, and their associated levels of proficiency were not made explicit.

3. A direct relationship was revealed between students’ earned deductions for the compositional element of Time and lack of class time devoted to this content area.

4. A student’s level of confidence demonstrated while performing could not be sufficiently measured from a third-person perspective using the set assessment parameters.

**Finding P1:** A narrow perspective on creativity served as the foundation for creating and assessing student choreography.
Student and teacher data revealed that a narrow perspective on creativity served as the foundation for student choreography and assessment of their choreography. Creativity was defined in Fall 2019 as producing something new, unique, and outside of the box, and students’ demonstrated level of creativity was assessed based on this limited definition. Steps were taken during the semester to guide students towards more creative outcomes, but greater teaching modifications are needed in future semesters. In addition, the focus of creativity was on the finished product – the dance – rather than a process of creative thinking and moving that contributed to the shaping of the product.

According to the rubrics used to assess students’ Midterm and Final Compositions, all 12 students earned credit for their demonstrated level of creativity on their Midterm and Final Composition assignments. All students met the definition of creativity used in class: producing something new, unique, outside of the box. This was true for the four students who created literal dances, six students took a more abstract approach to their choreography, one student who sequenced literal actions with recognizable dance technique, and one student who used a lot of repetition in her dance with minimal modifications.

Student and teacher data revealed a narrow definition of creativity was discussed in class, and this definition used to assess student creativity demonstrated in their assignments. Rather than impose a definition of creativity on the students, teacher data (class plans and online journal prompts) showed that I asked students to define it themselves by answering the following during our third class of the semester and again in their Week 3 Online Journals:

- What is creativity? Tell me your definition. What makes someone or something creative?
• Are you creative? How so? or why not? Tell me about a time when you were creative. (It doesn’t have to be dance related.)

• Was the choreography that you created last week and this week creative (your “Daily Action Sequence,” “Instrumentation Sequence,” and “Low-level Sequence”)? Why or why not?

Eleven out of the 12 students focused on creativity as new, unique, and/or original, including Angela:

Someone is creative if they come up with something that is out of the box, or never done before. Something is creative if it's different, if it's not like all the rest, and if people are actually surprised at what someone could come up with.

Teacher data (Midterm and Final Composition prompts and weekly movement assignment prompts) revealed that I summarized students’ perspectives of creativity by reducing them into a narrow definition that was used as the foundation for creativity in class: new, unique, imagination, and outside of the box. I then prompted the students to consider their peers’ definitions of creativity when completing their assignments:

Think about creativity as defined by your peers: imagination, outside of the box, new. (Movement Assignment 4, week five).

Effort and creativity should be applied to your work and shown through your choreography. Keep in mind “creative” as defined by your classmates: new, outside of the box, using imagination. (Midterm Reflection)

What in-class exercises and activities (e.g., specific movement activities, peer feedback), if any, have been most helpful for…encouraging you to be creative – for performing and
choreographing movement that is “outside of the box” (i.e., dancing and choreographing beyond your familiar ways of dancing and choreographing) (Midterm Reflection)

I added my perspective to this definition in in-class discussions and in assignment prompts by noting creative movements as those that required students to move beyond replicating known dance, sports, and pedestrian actions. Midterm and Final Composition prompts encouraged students to move beyond literal actions:

… Your movement will not be a literal representation of your theme. I encourage you to expand your creativity by manipulating your movement with choreographic devices that you have learned about. Your writing will serve to explain the clear connection between your movement and your theme.

Student data in this study, along with anecdotal evidence from teaching the course for 13 semesters, showed that the requirement to create a dance that communicated a specific theme often resulted in movement that was literal and easily interpreted by their classmates. This was reflected in Mary’s movement and writing. She stated the following in her Week 5 Online Journal in response to performing her in-progress Midterm for her classmates:

I felt a little bit nervous while my peers were observing/witnessing my movement as a responder/audience member because I didn’t know if they would understand what I was trying to portray or get across (Week 5 Online Journal)

Mary’s Midterm Composition was primarily a literal representation of the motions one would see at a Track and Field meet. She utilized mostly recognizable pre- and post-running actions such as warm up exercises, tying shoes, running, recovering with hands on her thighs, and drinking. If her focus was creating a dance with a theme that her peers would easily
understand, she was successful in doing so. She produced a choreographed dance that was
creative according to the definition used in class.

Teacher data showed that I took steps to encourage students to move beyond replicating
known actions in for their Final Compositions by listing the following as a requirement for
students’ demonstrated expansion of their artistry:

Codified dance vocabulary, sports movements, and large durations of literal movements
are to be used at a minimum. If used, challenge yourself to manipulate these known
movements and create something unique to you and your theme. Refer to your “16 Ways
to Manipulate a Motif” handout for ways to tweak your movement to make it more
unique.

Four students, including Mary, were observed to move from primarily literal Midterm
Compositions to more abstract Final Compositions. All four of these students acknowledged in
their Final Reflections that they created choreography with more abstract movements for their
Final Compositions, including Mary who wrote the following:

At the beginning of the semester I used to think that my movements had to be very literal
in order for people to understand what I was trying to portray. My movements wouldn’t
be very unique, and they would sometimes be too literal. I am now creative with the
movements that I use, and I make sure to try and stay away from literal movements. I try
to take movements that may seem literal and turn them into something completely
different than what it is. I make sure to try and think of new movements for each
assignment that was due and try to steer away from what my comfort zone is.
Finding P2: Choreographic and performance skills, learned and assessed, and their associated levels of proficiency were not made explicit.

Teacher data (Midterm and Final Composition prompts and observation notes recorded on rubrics during the semester) revealed that the specific choreographic and performance skills assessed in assignments, along with their associated levels of proficiency, were not clear. For example, the Final Composition assignment (Appendix T) did not state the specific choreographic and performance skills that were being assessed. The following was stated on the assignment handout:

…You will be graded on your ability to physically demonstrate and integrate the concepts explored over the course of the semester (body, space, time, shape, effort), your growth in your artistry over the course of the semester (and since your midterm composition), your integration of feedback from me and your classmates and aspects of your “opposite” assignment, and your ability to reflect upon and explain all of the aforementioned and more in writing. I have witnessed this growth in your smaller compositions, so now it is time to push yourself to explore and share your artistic potential in a longer work…

This statement was followed by a list of movement concepts as requirements to be demonstrated instead of the choreographic and performance skills to be demonstrated. The requirements were presented in checklist form to encourage students to be proactive about monitoring their work and checking off the boxes when they had met the choreographic requirements. For example, the requirements for the compositional element of Space was listed as follows:

- Space
  - Incorporate different facings
Maintain clarity of focus throughout your composition

Perform movement in all 3 levels

Perform axial and locomotor movements

While the checklist format was meant to assist students with ensuring that they had met the requirements – a tool to use to prevent omitting information – the assignment was viewed during analysis as a lengthy to-do list rather than an acknowledgement and revelation of the choreographic and performance skills that students have developed in class and would be demonstrating in their work.

Focusing on the observable physical skills alone omitted the choreographic and performance skills that require moving and thinking. Analysis of teacher data revealed that some choreographic skills being assessed as physical skills could not be assessed via observation alone; these skills required additional information written in students’ Final Reflections. For example, students were required to utilize dance concepts in their choreography in an intentional way that was reflective of their chosen theme. This was not always easily observed in choreography that was an abstract representation of a theme. The Final Reflections enabled me to assess whether students UNDERSTOOD how to translate thematic ideas into movement using choreographic concepts. However, this connection between thinking and moving with regards to their physical skill development as a choreographer was not made explicit to students.

How the students’ level of physical skill proficiency was assessed was also unclear. I used a rubric (Appendix E) with quantitative markers akin to a Likert Scale including numbers one through five to assess certain aspects of student choreography and performance. See Table 9 for an example of how a student’s ability to demonstrate various aspects of the compositional element Space was recorded in the Final Composition Rubric. Five represented that the student
clearly fulfilled aspects of the requirement, and zero reflected that the requirement was not met. Clear, written explanations for what each number represented was not included in the rubric. I wrote notes in the Comments column to explain why a deduction was earned to ensure consistency between student assessments (Appendix P). Instead of sharing these numbers with students when providing feedback on their work during our Midterm meetings, I shared verbal descriptions of their work for areas that they demonstrated fully and areas in which improvements could be made for their Final Composition. The numbers were ineffective measures of proficiency and were not utilized when providing feedback to students.

**Finding P3:** A direct relationship was revealed between students’ earned deductions for the compositional element of *Time* and lack of class time devoted to this content area.

There were minimal opportunities for students to explore and embody the compositional element of Time, and this resulted in the majority of students’ earning deductions on their Midterm Composition. When looking for patterns of earned deductions across the students in rubric for both their Midterm and Final Compositions, it was revealed that nine out of twelve students (75%) earned deductions for the compositional element of Time on their Midterm Composition.

Table 9

*Final Composition Rubric Example: Assessing the Compositional Element of Space*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Strong No</th>
<th>Strong Yes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facings: Incorporated different facings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus: Maintained clear, purposeful focus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels: Demonstrated clear use of 3 levels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stationary/Traveling: Incorporated axial and locomotor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the Time element on their Midterm, students were required to perform for a duration of 45-60 seconds (0.75-1 minute), demonstrate slow and fast movements with a clear distinction between the two extremes of tempo, and demonstrate at least one moment of stillness other than their starting and ending positions. Six students (50%) earned deductions on this assignment by performing dances that were shorter or longer than the required duration. Eight students (67%) earned deductions on their Midterm Composition for not demonstrating fast or slow tempo or a distinction between the two tempos. Nine students (75%) did not include a moment of stillness.

Teacher data (class plans) revealed that only two classes were devoted specifically to movement explorations focusing on Time. (Time was incorporated into previous classes, but the focus was on other aspects of moving such as observing and mirroring the slow movements of a partner rather than sensing aspects of Time while performing.) This took place during week six. Week seven was devoted to peer feedback, and week eight was devoted to Midterm performances. Movement exercises for Time on Tuesday of week six included performing (a) a set warm up where students experienced performing the same movement at varying tempos, (b) structured improvisations where students – both individually and with a partner – improvised movement and spontaneously made choices according to aspects of Time (e.g., performing at a slow tempo, accelerating the tempo of the movements as they danced from one side of the studio to the other), and (c) set choreography of their in-progress Midterm Compositions to slow and fast tempos.

On Thursday of week six, instead of devoting the class period to exploring Time as a large group, I opted to prioritize peer feedback with a focus on Time. Responders offered feedback on the following questions: “What are movements that stand out to the responders as possibly being more effective at a faster tempo? slower tempo? as accelerating? decelerating?”
My teacher memo written after the Thursday class acknowledged the lack of time and repetition on these experiences: “Didn’t spend a lot of time on acceleration and deceleration – just tried each once and then once having them decide when to accelerate and decelerate within their set choreography. Next sem: take a section and make it accelerate, decelerate???” I noted changes for the following semester, because I was not satisfied with my teaching choices.

Class plans showed that I guided students to focus on the element of Time within their duet/trio assignments after Midterms by encouraging them to incorporate stillness and aspects of tempo in their performance. Improvements in the demonstration of Time were seen in the Final Composition performances, as fewer students earned deductions compared to their Midterm; only four students (33%) earned deductions due to omitting fast or slow tempo and/or not demonstrating a distinct difference between fast and slow tempos. The Final Composition had the same Time requirements as the Midterm but with one difference; students were required to perform for a longer duration of 75-90 seconds (1.25-1.5 minutes).

**Finding P4: A student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing could not be sufficiently measured from a third-person perspective using the set assessment parameters.**

Analysis revealed that confidence could not be sufficiently assessed from a third-person professor perspective. Variations in choreographic and performance abilities across the students made it challenging to see universal observable parameters for assessing confidence. In addition, the Midterm and Final Compositions were separate pieces of choreography with entirely different movements. The only constant was the performer. Even when a positive shift in performance was observed, as it was between Nicole’s two performances, it could not be assumed that an increase in confidence and/or a decrease in nerves was responsible for the change.
Nicole, who has over 10 years of dance training and some experience choreographing for younger students at a dance studio, stated in her Final Reflection: “For my midterm, I was the most nervous I have ever been performing a solo, but it was ten times better this time around.” She also commented in her Final Reflection how she was more comfortable dancing to her full ability at the end of the semester compared to the beginning:

At the beginning of the semester, I was very nervous to let loose and just dance. Now, I feel very comfortable with dancing to my full ability. I have always had an issue with my confidence, and I can see a clear improvement within myself over the course of this semester.

Nicole was observed to perform confidently in both her Midterm and Final Composition. The only sign of nervousness was her exit after she performed her Midterm Composition; she quickly skitted as she exited the performance space.

There was, however, a subtle difference between Nicole’s two performances that could have been a representation of her feeling more comfortable and less nervous during her Final. Nicole’s movement in her Final Composition clearly extended beyond the boundaries of her kinesphere\(^7\), whereas her movement in her Midterm Composition appeared to remain within her kinesphere. This extension outward into space for her Final could be seen an indicator of her increased comfort, feeling more open to extend her movement into her environment rather than staying within the comfort zone of her personal space, and dancing, as she stated, to her “full ability” (Final Reflection).

\(^7\) A kinesphere is the spherical space that surrounds one’s body to create a “bubble of personal movement space” (Moore, 2014, p. 91). It includes all areas of space around one’s body that can be accessed with the limbs while remaining stationary.
Analysis revealed that this observable shift in Nicole’s movement, alone, could not be used as an indicator of her decrease in nerves and increase in comfort. The theme of her Final Composition was stargazing, an act that could have certainly inspired movement and a focus that penetrated far beyond the boundaries of her kinesphere. Was the shift in her performance a result of her decrease in nerves, her thematic intention, or a combination of both? By comparing my observations of student compositions on video with student comments about their levels of confidence, comfort, or nerves while performing stated in their Reflections and online journals, it was revealed that a student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing could not be sufficiently assessed through third-person observation with the set parameters.

**Summary of Findings in Subarea Two**

Four main findings were revealed in the analysis of the development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance. First, clarification is needed for how creativity is defined, applies to, and is assessed in our choreography course both as a process and product. Second, the choreographic and performance skills that are assessed in assignments and their associated levels of proficiency need to be clarified and communicated to the students. Third, teaching strategies for exploring the compositional element of Time needed to be modified to improve facilitation of student learning. Fourth, a student’s level of confidence demonstrated in their performance may be best assessed from a first-person student perspective rather than a third-person professor perspective.

**Subarea Three: Affective Responses to Learning Experiences**

The purpose of data analysis in this third subarea was to gain a better understanding of students’ affective responses to learning experiences in Creative Dance and the teaching practices that influenced their responses. I believed that this newfound understanding would
enable me to guide students to become more aware of their inner state and the impact it has on their outer expression more effectively. This section presents key findings about students’ affective responses revealed in text-based student data (Midterm and Final Reflections, online journals) along with supporting data from teacher documents (online journals prompts, class plans). Analysis in this subarea revealed three main findings for their affective responses to their learning experiences in Creative Dance:

A1. The majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]) experienced shifting feelings and/or emotions over the period of a singular performance.

A2. The majority of students (10 out of 12 [83%]) reported feeling more comfortable, more self-confident, and/or less nervous performing in class as a result of repeating learning experiences.

A3. For the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]), peer influence extended beyond providing beneficial critical feedback for the development of their peers’ choreography to inspiring feelings of satisfaction and/or positive shifts in students’ affective responses to learning activities through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions.

Each of these three findings are presented separately with supporting data. Findings in this subarea spoke more to student learning experiences rather than teaching strategies. Although connecting steps such as magnitude coding were used to bridge teacher data to student data findings, the connection between my teaching and students’ affective responses to learning required a deeper level of interpretation and consideration of teaching strategies, practices, and values that lied outside of the text-based teacher documentation analyzed in this study.

Therefore, interpretations of these findings and their application to teaching Creative Dance in Fall 2020 are explained in Chapter Five.
Finding A1: The majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]) experienced shifting feelings and/or emotions over the period of a singular performance.

In their Week 9 Online Journal, students were asked what they were feeling before, during, and after their Midterm Composition performances. Eleven out of the 12 student participants completed this assignment, and all eleven expressed experiencing a shift in their feelings and/or emotions over the short period of time before, during, and after their performance. All 11 of these students expressed feeling nervous or anxious prior to performing. After their performances, these students experienced feeling good, relieved, happy, satisfied, and/or confident. Although shared feelings and/or emotions existed across the 11 students within the same Midterm performance context, looking more closely at student writing revealed the individual nature of the students’ feelings and/or emotions, particularly those experienced after their live performance.

According to the Affective Domain Taxonomy (Krathwohl et al., 1964), students experience level 2.3 Satisfaction in Response “where the behavior is accompanied by a feeling of satisfaction, an emotional response, generally of pleasure, zest, or enjoyment” (p. 130). Looking at the data across these 11 students revealed a distinct difference between feeling satisfied and/or happy with their performance and feeling relieved or happy that their performance was over. Two students, Angela and Leanne, only expressed feeling relieved or happy that their performances were over:

After my performance, all i thought about was how relieved i was that it was over, not because i didn’t enjoy it, but because my anxiety could finally chill out. (Angela)
“… as we continued watching other dances, I became relieved that I had already performed and wasn’t still waiting for my turn… I was happy that I had had my turn to perform. (Leanne)

Two students, Stacy and Jussara, expressed feelings of satisfaction with their performance rather than relief of it being over:

I am happy with my choreography and performance. I feel as a performer, it went smoothly. (Stacy)

…after the performance I felt so good and alleviated, because I finally showered and did what I had to do, and I was feeling more confident about everything: my movements, dancing in front of my colleagues, etc… I was also happy about it. (Jussara)

Six students expressed both relief or happiness to have finished the performance and a level of satisfaction with their performance. The terms “glad,” “happy,” and “felt a lot better about myself” were used as descriptors to denote their satisfaction. Toni used the word “satisfied” to express how he felt after his performance:

After the performance, I felt straight relief – I felt accomplished and satisfied with myself, and this feeling was only amplified once I read my affirmations from my classmates… I thought to myself “thank God! I did it! I finished it!” . All I thought about was how I was able to finally do it and do a good job with my piece.

For six students, their relief or nervousness was sensed within their bodies both on a physiological level and emotional level. Sensations in the body can precede cognition, and reflecting upon these bodily sensations enable understanding of the learning experience (Lawrence, 2008). Four students noticed the physiological stress responses within their bodies either before or during their performance as a result of their nervousness:
Before my performance I was feeling extremely nervous, anxious, and my palms were very sweaty. (Catherine)

Before my performance I was feeling extremely nervous...I was very scared, my body was shaking and I was sweating. (Demi)

During my performance, the first time, I was still really nervous-and i was shaking. (Angela)

Usually when I would perform, I wouldn't be nervous, but today my heart was POUNDING before walking out... (Stacy)

While the experience of nervousness can often be perceived as detrimental to a performance, Toni shared his experience of nervousness as a possible enhancement to his performance:

Over the course of performing several times, I got used to the feeling of nervousness that it almost downplayed itself over time. It may have enhanced my actual performance, however, because I felt that when I performed, I put more emotion into my piece – for example, in the beginning when I cover my face and rub it when I am on low-level, I felt the slight urge to cry. I think this was more beneficial than a setback because I felt more in-tune with my piece, and I was able to envelop myself more over the course of my theme.

**Finding A2:** The majority of students (nine out of 12 [83%]) reported feeling more comfortable, more self-confident, and/or less nervous performing in class as a result of repeating learning experiences.

Nine out of 12 students (75%) expressed feeling more comfortable, more confident, and/or less nervous as a result of their repetition of performance experiences over time. These
positive shifts in students’ responses occurred as a result of (a) performing frequently throughout the semester (7 students, 58%), (b) performing multiple times in one class (7 students, 58%), and (c) performing with or for the same partner or group that they worked with previously (2 students, 17%). In this case, the term “performing” refers to any activity in which students danced live in class and includes both choreographed assignments (in-class assignments, Movement Assignments completed as homework, and Midterm and Final Compositions) and improvisational exercises (structured improvisations and improvised manipulations of set choreography). The duration of their performances spanned from a singular movement or short sequence of movements to a completed dance with a duration of up to one-and-one-half minutes.

For this finding, numerical outcomes of magnitude coding of teacher data are first shared to provide the reader with a better understanding of the types and frequencies of performance contexts in Creative Dance. This is followed by student data that spoke to the benefits of repeating performance experiences and teacher memo data that commented on repetition of learning experiences or lack there-of. Finally, the outcomes of connecting steps used to bridge student data findings to teacher memos are summarized. My interpretations of what was revealed about the teaching strategies and practices that facilitated or hindered learning through repetition or lack there-of, and their application to future semesters of Creative Dance, are explained in Chapter Five.

**Frequency of Performance Contexts**

Students met for a total of 25 class periods over the Fall 2019 semester. Twenty-two classes were devoted to instruction and learning as working class periods. Three classes were devoted to performing: two classes were allocated for Midterm Compositions and one for Final Compositions. Magnitude coding of class plan data focused on the frequency of performance
activities over the 22 working class periods. Data revealed that Creative Dance students performed in all 22 of these classes and experienced four categories of performance activities: warm up exercises made up primarily of set choreography, structured improvisations, set choreography created either in class outside of class for homework (Movement Assignments), and improvised modifications of set choreography.

Students performed warm up exercises in all 22 classes (100%). The warm up included primarily axial (stationary) movements with students standing in a circular formation facing the center of the circle and/or facing downstage (toward the audience as if standing on a proscenium stage). The circular formation was used in 14 classes (64%) to allow students to see one another as they warmed up and to promote a sense of connection while moving. Students warmed up facing downstage in the four classes leading up to both their Midterm and Final performance, for a total of 8 classes (36%), to prepare them for performing in a proscenium stage setting with the audience seated on one side of the room. These movements consisted mostly of set choreography that I created and led for the students with some opportunities for improvisation. All students performed the warm up simultaneously and in unison.

Structured improvisation exercises were experiences in 14 classes (64%). Students spontaneously created and performed their own movement while using specific dance concepts as guidelines. They performed these movements while traveling across and/or throughout the dance studio, either individually, with a partner, or with a small group of three to four students. Set choreography was either created individually at home as Movement Assignments and performed in class (16 classes, 73%) or created and performed in class (13 classes, 59%), either individually or in pairs. Students also experienced improvising modifications of set choreography using specific dance concepts as guidelines (five classes, 23%). For example,
students performed their choreographed movement sequences but made spontaneous choices about when to move at a slow tempo and when to move at a fast tempo.

Although students performed in all 22 working class periods, the performance context varied in terms of the number of performers and the degree of connection between the performers. Students experienced dancing alone as a soloist; dancing simultaneously alongside, yet independent from, their peers; and dancing with their peers. Students performed alone in front of the entire class (13 classes, 59%), half of the class (1 class, 5%), and for small groups of two to four of their peers (6 classes, 27%). These performances spanned from singular actions and shorter movement sequences to longer, in-progress performances of their Midterm and Final compositions.

In 16 classes, (73%) students performed their own choreographed or improvised movements alongside, yet independent from, their peers’ movements; in these cases, students were independent dancers occupying the same dance space. In seven of these 16 classes (32%), each student performed with an assigned partner watching. While dancing alongside their peers, the number of performers varied. Students performed alongside the entire class (3 classes, 14%), half of the class (7 classes, 32%), one-third of the class (2 classes, 9%), and four to five classmates (8 classes, 36%).

In addition to performing independently alongside their peers, students also performed with their peers and experienced connecting with one another by intentionally moving together. Students performed set choreography created with a partner in 10 classes (45%). These instances of set choreography also included performing improvised modifications of their set choreography in unison according to the same guiding dance concept. For example, students performed a set sequence of movement together with a specific quality, such as floating.
Students also improvised movements with their peers in 9 classes (41%) by leading or simultaneously influencing and responding non-verbally to their peer’s movements.

Repetition Throughout the Semester

Seven students (58%) communicated that their repetition of performance experiences over time had a positive impact on their confidence level and/or comfort level in class. This was true for Demi and Toni:

My comfort level with the class increases when I perform in front of everyone. It helps me get used to being the main focus and I become more comfortable with everyone’s eyes on me when I do it repeatedly. (Demi, Midterm Reflection)

Having regular performances in front of peers like we have done several times in preparation for our midterm. Doing that repetitively, especially in groups, becomes so second nature that it decreases anxiety levels (at least for me) every single time we do. (Toni, Midterm Reflection)

The students quoted above appeared to speak to their repeated experiences performing set choreography. In 14 classes (64%), students also experienced performing structured improvisations. They performed these movements while traveling across and/or throughout the dance studio, either individually (11 classes, 50%), with a partner (8 classes, 36%), or with a small group of three to four students (1 class, 5%). Both Jussara and Leanne spoke about the benefits of their repeated experiences with structured improvisations:

…when you put us to walk through the classroom improvising the movements, and do what comes through our mind, I think it helps, because we get used to improvise more, and feel more confident when we really have to perform… (Jussara, Midterm Composition)
One thing that stands out to me about my in class experiences is how much he across the floor [structured improvisation] sequences had helped me to become more comfortable with performing in front of the class. During my dance classes at my studio, we did across the floor work every week in the different styles. But the across the floor in this class was different because we were improving [improvising] the entire way across. This is what caused me to become more comfortable – because we were beginning to perform our own choreography across the floor instead of doing the same thing as everyone else like we would in a regular dance class. (Leanne, Final Reflection)

**Repetition Within One Class**

In addition to performing repeatedly over the course of the semester, performing their set choreography repeatedly within one class period also had a positive impact on seven (58%) students’ confidence and comfort levels. Repetition occurred in class by providing time for students to rehearse their movement before performing it for an audience and by having students perform multiple times consecutively. When students performed their set choreography in class, they always had time to rehearse their choreography beforehand. For Mary, this rehearsal time helped to reduce her feeling of nervousness: “Getting some time to rehearse and run through our choreography before performing helped to get rid of some of those nerves” (Week 9 Online Journal).

In all but three movement assignments performed over the course of the semester, students performed at least two consecutive runs of their dance for an audience. For seven students (58%), including Becca and Angela, performing consecutively in one class period inspired them to feel more confident, more comfortable, and/or less nervous:
I was a little nervous to perform in front of new people that had not seen my routine yet. However, I did become comfortable after the first time I went through the sequence. (Becca, Week 6 Online Journal)

During my performance, the first time, I was still really nervous-and i was shaking. But, the second time after everyone had applauded and i in fact had survived performing my solo, my nerves went away and I wasn’t as scared. (Angela, Week 9 Online Journal)

Repetition of Peer Groups

Finally, data revealed that working repeatedly with the same peers enabled two students (17%) to experience positive shifts in their comfort level. Emily and Catherine’s comments, for example, spoke to the value of repeating learning experiences with the same partner or small group of peers:

On Thursday during the warmup from stage right to stage left with my partner I thought it was a lot better than what it was on Tuesday because we had the whole class to talk and get to know each other so it wasn’t as awkward or embarrassing dancing with him. (Catherine, Week 5 Online Journal)

I think it may have been because it was my second time in the group but i felt slightly more comfortable with my performance and overall being watched and critiqued on the tenth. (Emily, Week 7 Online Journal)

Teacher Memos: Statements Implying Repetition

Statements implying repetition of learning experiences or lack there-of were found in my teacher memos. I questioned whether I was attempting to do too much or devote too little time on an experience; I was aware of the minimization of opportunities to repeat experiences and facilitate deeper embodiment of concepts. Teacher memos revealed questions about whether I
was trying to incorporate too much content into one class and comments about the amount of time devoted to content:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Am I trying to do too much in one class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>I realized that I am in charge of the flow, speed – so why am I rushing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably because I have the topics on the semester overview – will remind students tomorrow that the topics may change from what is listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>I am trying to cram too much into the class – not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Didn’t spend a lot of time on acceleration and deceleration – just tried each once and then once having them decide when to accelerate and decelerate within their set choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It takes time to truly experience/embody the terms that we are exploring in class. I planned too much for today, and it was totally fine to let go of much of the class plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>For next semester – if I am focusing on process and experience of moving rather than final product, would it be beneficial to have more opportunities/repetitions of performances? For example: they performed their connection duets/trios with sustained time effort today while maintaining their connection points. We then talked about their experiences simultaneously performing with sustained intention while also focusing on their partners (inner and outer), and how with group work this develops over time. I mentioned that if this was a full year course, I would add elements of this – and include individual and group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>As mentioned in Tuesday’s memo, experiencing and sensing from the inside takes more time. One can’t embody efforts as quickly or easily as one can embody a low-level movement, for example. This is something to consider for next semester. Maybe efforts come in right away with the connection duets after midterms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finding A3:** For the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]), peer influence extended beyond providing beneficial critical feedback for the development of their peers’ choreography to inspiring feelings of satisfaction and/or positive shifts in students’ affective responses to learning activities through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions.
Peer influence on student learning consisted not only of assisting in the development of their peers’ choreography by providing critical feedback, but also by contributing to feelings of satisfaction with the feedback experience and to positive shifts in affective responses to learning activities through shared experiences. Data analysis revealed three main subfindings related to peer influence on student learning. First, the majority of students (10 out of 12 [83%]) appeared to be satisfied with the outcomes of their peer feedback experiences on the development of their choreography. The majority of students (10 out of 12 [83%]) also enjoyed participating in the feedback process. Second, the act of performing in front of their peers during class activities inspired a range of affective responses that shifted in a positive direction over the course of the semester for the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]). Their interactions with their peers, along with their shared experiences and affective responses to those experiences, contributed to this positive affective shift. Finally, being a witness of, and active contributor to, their peers’ learning throughout the semester resulted in positive affective responses in the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]) and, for some (3 out of 12 [25%]), inspiration for their own learning.

**Satisfaction with Peer Feedback Experience**

In the artist role for peer feedback, students performed their choreography for small groups of two to four of their peers, received feedback on their work from their peers, and collaborated with their peers to refine aspects of their work based on the feedback received. Ten students (83%) made statements that reflected satisfaction with the outcomes of their peer feedback experience in their role as artists, while one student (8%) was not satisfied with the peer feedback received as an artist on her Final Composition. Two students (17%) made positive
statements about peer feedback, but their comments were not interpreted as an expression of satisfaction. Toni found that peer feedback was helpful to the development of his work:

I already know this, but having peer feedback for the midterm and final only reinforced the fact (for me) that having another’s perspective is so useful because we can so often become trapped and blocked by only thinking and doing it ourselves. Having a second eye especially helps with making things more creative and spontaneous, but also more effective. For example, having Grace and Carl tell me that my theme may be more effective if I start my piece having my back face the audience was something that I never really thought of. Initially, I thought of having my facing just directly to the audience. But, this makes so much sense with my theme, and having my facing to the back of the stage introduces a “new chapter” into my piece really felt creative and effective, and I really appreciated this idea. (Toni, Final Reflection)

Emily was not satisfied with her peer feedback experience as an artist due to lack of constructive criticism received:

I am being honest, I did not ever receive much feedback from my peers, I always tried to be helpful and give ideas and opinions, but rarely got that in return. I know it is important to work in groups and especially with our peers, I would’ve just liked to have gotten outside criticism instead of criticizing myself and my own performances. (Final Reflection)

**Feelings of Satisfaction.** Ten students (83%) expressed a feeling of satisfaction with their peer feedback experience with statements that reflected happiness, enjoyment, fun, and/or excitement in response to their feedback roles of artist, facilitator, and/or responders. Facilitators were in charge of leading their group members through the steps of the feedback process
outlined on a handout and also provided verbal feedback on the artist’s work. Responders provided verbal feedback on the artist’s work. All group members worked together to refine the artists’ choreography based on the feedback. Five of these 10 students made positive statements about their facilitator and/or responder roles and included words such as enjoy, fun, cool, liked, and proud. Becca stated the following:

As a responder, I really enjoyed helping the performer in my group figure out the right tempos for their routines. Once you change a movement and make it slower or faster, it really makes the routine come together even more. It was really enjoyable for me to watch them change the tempo in one small movement and have it change the entire routine and make it even better. (Week 7 Online Journal)

During the first round of peer feedback, facilitators were not only in charge of leading their group members through the steps of the feedback process; they were also responsible for recording notes on the feedback that was provided to the performer/artist. Two students, including Toni, expressed a lack of enjoyment as facilitators during this first round:

The process as a whole was a bit awkward… As a facilitator, it was a bit hard to engage with everyone on the individual’s choreography because I was so focused on writing everything down onto paper. Due to this, I did not have enough say as I wanted to. It was a bit confusing putting myself onto the role of the responder as well, especially in the beginning where we had to make neutral statements to the artist. Most of us, especially on this part of the form, had to stop and really think about statements that could be represented as neutral to the artist. Due to this, most of our time spent was more in silence rather than in conversation. (Week 6 Online Journal)
Peer Influence on Affective Responses

Additional affective responses beyond feelings of satisfaction arose in the majority of students as a result of learning alongside their peers. The act of performing in front of their peers inspired a range of feelings and emotional responses that shifted in a positive direction over the course of the semester. Data revealed that their interactions with their peers, along with their shared experiences and affective responses to those experiences, contributed to this positive shift.

Positive Shifts in Affective Responses to Performing. For 11 students (92%), the act of performing in front of their peers inspired a range of feelings and emotional responses that shifted in a positive direction over the course of the semester. Performing in our studio environment inspired feelings such as nervousness, discomfort, awkwardness, a lack of self-confidence, and worry about the being judged for the majority of students. In their Midterm Reflections, 10 students (83%) recognized these affective responses as challenges that they would like to work through and/or goals that they would like to work toward for the second half of the semester. Eight students (67%) stated lacking self-confidence, nervousness while performing, and/or concern about peer judgment as a challenge that they faced in Creative Dance. Ten students (83%) listed feeling more self-confident, feeling more comfortable, feeling less nervous, and/or feeling less worried about peer judgment as goals for the second half of the semester. Figure 3 displays the challenges and goals that each student faced.

Over the course of the semester, these feelings shifted in a positive direction, with 11 (92%) students feeling more self-confident, more comfortable, less nervous, and/or less worried about peer judgment. For example, Mary expressed feeling more confident at the end of the semester, which was one of her goals mentioned in their Midterm Reflection:
At the beginning of the semester, I was nervous even just performing in a big group. I would think that performing alone would be something that I wouldn’t be able to do in front of the class. I used to think that my classmates would judge me and would think that my choreography isn’t good. Now I am a lot more confident with performing in front of the class. I felt very natural while performing my midterm performance which gave me a lot more confidence for the rest of the semester. I am now able to perform to my fullest potential and without as many nerves as I used to have. (Final Reflection)

Figure 3

*Student Challenges and Goals in Creative Dance Fall 2019 as Stated in Midterm Reflections*
Jussara’s comments in her Midterm and Final Reflections expressed her challenges of feeling shy and feeling concerned about peers’ judgments and her recognition of a shift at the end of the semester:

My greatest challenge in this class, It’s for me to perform in front of the whole class, especially something that I created on my own, because I feel like it’s not enough, and that I could be better than that, so I think that makes me shy to do what I want, and go ahead and show what I can do, and be the best version of me… My personal goals in this class, are to…stop thinking about what people might think when I am doing my performance. (Midterm Reflection)

Two things that stand out to me about my class experience are how I improved a lot in terms of being less shy, and stop caring about what my classmates were thinking, because on the 4 first journals I was always saying how nervous I was, but by the end I was more comfortable…(Final Reflection)

Emily, a student with over 10 years of formal dance training and some choreographic experience for “gym finals” and her senior solo, felt comfortable performing in class since the start of the semester, even when she was challenged: “I knew my choreography and even though aspects of it were challenging to me, I was comfortable onstage” (Final Reflection). She recognized early on in the semester during her Week 3 Online Journal that her comfort with performing could possibly play a role in helping her classmates to feel more comfortable: “It was exciting to me to watch some students come out of their stage shell slightly. I am once again very comfortable in front of a class of either my peers or strangers so I try to be as soft and non judge-y looking to hopefully help them relax and feel more comfortable.” Whether students were
conscious of their influence on their peers’ affective responses or not, data revealed that peer interactions did play a role in students’ comfort and confidence levels.

**Positive Affective Shifts Due to Peer Interactions and Shared Experiences.** For 11 students (92%), their interactions with their peers, along with their shared experiences and/or affective responses to the experiences, contributed to this positive shift. Students acknowledged their connection to their classmates not only by participating in the same required learning activities but also by experiencing similar feelings and emotional responses to the activities. This connection enabled the majority of students to experience positive affective responses such as feeling less nervous, less awkward, more comfortable, and more self-confident. Students acknowledged their shared experiences with their peers as early as the Week 3 Online Journal and throughout the semester up to the Final Reflection:

I was less comfortable with the sequences as I was not confident in my movements but there were others that felt the same way so I wasn't as nervous. (Nicole, Week 3 Online Journal)

I enjoyed performing my opposite composition. I thought it made it easier to perform because it was so awkward to me but it was also awkward for everyone else too. (Grace, Week 11 Online Journal)

I also was afraid to do more abstract choreography because I knew there were more experienced dancers in the class and I thought they would’ve made fun of me. I know that they wouldn’t, but being fairly new to the dance choreography world, I was quite nervous to try new things. I am now much more comfortable, and I don’t care now since I know many of the other students are in the same boat as myself…I think we all have a
mutual respect and understanding for each other because we’re all going through the same thing. (Demi, Final Reflection)

Jussara recognized that she and her peers were not simply experiencing something together; they were learning and improving together:

I don't think that my classmates watching me now, bothers me anymore, at least not like it used to be before, because I feel more familiar with them now, and I can see that we are all learning together, and improve together, it does not matter, how good one of them might be, but every single of us there are learning with each other…One thing that I putted in my head is that we are all proud of each other, and most of us there had never danced professionally, which means we are learning everyday with each other there…

(Week 13 Online Journal)

For 10 students (83%), dancing with their peers inspired affective responses that were more positive compared to dancing alone. Students performed alongside or with their peers in 19 out of 22 instructional classes (86%). They improvised together in groups of two, three, or four in nine classes (41%), created and/or performed set choreography or improvised modifications of set choreography in pairs/trios in 10 classes (45%), and performed unison choreography created by all students together as an entire class in two classes (9%). shared her experiences performing with her peers:

During class when we learned about efforts, I thought it was a fun way pf learning became we did it with our trio’s and duo’s which was less intimidating. Coming up with different ideas with our partners was cool because we got to incorporate all of our creativity into one. (Stacy, Week 13 Online Journal)
Positive Affective Responses via Observing and Contributing. Observing and actively contributing to their peers’ learning over time resulted in positive affective responses in 11 students (92%). For a few students, their roles as observer or responder resulted in inspiration for their own learning. These responses were noted as early as their first online journal during week three. Students used words such as proud, fun, enjoyed, inspired, lucky, and happy to describe their responses to observing and/or contributing to their peers learning:

I enjoyed being able to see people who have never danced before use their style and imagination to make a dance, and I really enjoyed how people with some dance background brought that experience into their dance and choreography and made it enjoying to watch. I feel as if everyone did a really good job and they all made me want to keep watching and see more. It was like a really good movie top me and they director leaves you with a cliff hanger to make a sequel, because I just wanted to see more of a lot of their dances. (Catherine, Week 9 Online Journal)

Watching my classmates perform was really inspiring. I loved every single one of them. I could tell who really put in effort and who didn’t. Some of their performances had me very emotional while others gave me positive energy! It is a crazy feeling to watch performances and have it touch your emotions in a way you didn’t think watching someone could give you. It was a really cool experience and I was lucky enough to share it with everyone. (Demi, Week 9 Online Journal)

Students like Angela also experienced positive affective responses to their experience observing their peers’ midterms, knowing that they contributed to their peers learning by providing peer feedback:
It was interesting to see the dances that I had seen periodically over the semester and to see the final product. One of the dances I had actually helped with and gave one of the dancers an idea—and to see them incorporate it made me happy. I enjoyed seeing the process and it made me feel like I knew the dance more. (Angela, Week 9 Online Journal)

For three students, their roles as observer or responder contributed to their own learning. This was true for Becca and Leanne, who made the connection between their observations and applications to their own learning processes when prompted in their online journals to share their experiences watching their peers perform. Becca’s observations resulted in inspiration for her own movement and enabled her to see concepts in her peers’ movements that she was not able to as a performer:

Some people were very creative with their movements, and it was very fun to watch. I enjoyed watching them create movements because it gave me a little inspiration on movements of my own. (Week 3 Online Journal)

I really enjoyed watching my classmates perform the different efforts. It was so fun and it seemed like they were having a lot of fun with it as well. It also helped me notice how much it [efforts] adds to the choreography. I felt like it added to my performance, but I also could not see myself, so watching them do it really helps me see how much it really helps the performance. (Week 13 Online Journal)

Leanne’s observations of her classmates inspired her to feel more comfortable and more confident:

Watching both the structured improvisation and the movement sequences allowed me to see how everyone took a different perspective on what was being asked of them. Some
people got really into their movements which I think made me more comfortable when performing my action sequences. (Week 3 Online Journal)

I liked watching my classmates perform the efforts. It allowed me to see how everyone looked different but they were all going with the idea of focusing on the movements rather than anything else that was going on around them. Watching them made me more confident in focusing on my inner attitudes and intentions. (Week 13 Online Journal)

Summary of Findings in Subarea Three

Three main findings were revealed from student data in the area of students’ affective responses to learning. First, the majority of students experienced feelings and/or emotions that changed over the period of a singular performance. Secondly, repetition of learning experiences had a positive impact on students’ affective responses; the majority of students reported feeling more comfortable, more self-confident, and/or less nervous performing in class as a result of this repetition. Finally, for the majority of students, peer influence extended beyond peer feedback to inspiring feelings of satisfaction and/or positive shifts in affective responses through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions.

Chapter Four Summary

This chapter presented key findings revealed within three subareas of focus in this study: the cognitive domain of learning, the development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance, and affective responses to student learning. Findings were discussed separately for each subarea and were outcomes of the analysis of student data (Midterm and Final Reflections, online journals, videos of their Midterm and Final Composition performances) and teacher data (syllabus, Midterm and Final Reflection prompts, Midterm Composition prompts, online journal prompts, teacher memos, class plans, and observation notes)
recorded during analysis and on rubrics while watching videos of students’ Midterm and Final Compositions during the semester). Examples of data in support of these findings were included and were used to represent aspects of the students’ learning experiences in their own words.

A total of ten findings were revealed across the three subareas. Four findings were found with regards to teaching and learning in the cognitive domain. First, two additional types of knowledge that lied outside of the knowledge types acknowledge in The Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al., 2001): Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge. In connection to this finding, student data revealed a distinction between simply stating an experience or feeling and demonstrating Experiential Knowledge or Affective Self-Knowledge. Second, student learning was found to be assessed as a linear, rather than cyclical, process. Third, Procedural Knowledge of choreographic tools and techniques was absent from student writing, assignment prompts, and student learning outcomes.

Four findings were also revealed in subarea two: the development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance. These findings focused primarily on teaching strategies that were in need of modification. First, it was found that how creativity is defined, applies to, and is assessed in Creative Dance needs to be clarified and communicated to students. Second, clarification and communication are also needed with regards to the specific choreographic and performance skills assessed in assignments and their associated levels of proficiency. Third, teaching strategies for exploring the compositional element of Time need to be modified to improve facilitation of student learning in this area. Finally, a student’s level of confidence demonstrated in their performance may be best monitored and assessed from a first-person performer perspective rather than from the professor’s perspective.
Three main findings were revealed in subarea three: affective responses to student learning experiences. These findings focused on the student learning experiences rather than the teaching strategies. First, the majority of students experienced shifting feelings and/or emotions over the period of a singular performance. Second, the majority of students felt more comfortable, more self-confident, and/or less nervous performing in class as a result of repeating learning experiences. Third, for the majority of students, peer influence extended beyond providing beneficial critical feedback for the development of their peers’ choreography; peers inspired feelings of satisfaction and/or positive shifts in students’ affective responses to learning activities through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions.

Findings from all three subareas provided me with a better understanding of the cognitive, affective, and physical aspects of student learning in Creative Dance in Fall 2019 and my teaching strategies that guided their learning. These findings served as foundation for affirming certain instructional strategies and for modifying others in order to promote emerging adult learning in a general education choreography course more effectively. My interpretations of these findings, including the connections between findings in the three subareas, and applications of these findings to my teaching in future semesters of Creative Dance are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this action research study was to gain a better understanding of student learning in Creative Dance, a general education choreography course, and of the teaching strategies that guided their learning. It was anticipated that outcomes of this study would lead to planning modifications of instructional materials, strategies, and practices to be used for teaching Creative Dance in Fall 2020. Qualitative research approaches enabled the utilization of standard teaching documents created for, and used in, the course and work created by the students as data. Teacher documents included the syllabus, assignment prompts, class plans, observation notes, and teacher memos. Student data from 12 undergraduate participants included written work in response to open-ended assignment prompts and videos of their choreography performed in class. Data was coded, analyzed, and interpreted within three subareas of learning – the cognitive domain of learning, the development of physical skills in relationship with choreography and performance, and affective responses to student learning – in response to following research questions:

1. What does student work reveal about student learning and the teaching strategies that guided their learning?
   a. What teaching strategies strengthen the quality of student learning experiences and outcomes?
   b. What teaching strategies hinder student learning experiences and outcomes?

2. What curricula and teaching changes will more effectively facilitate student learning experiences and stronger outcomes?

This chapter discusses my interpretations, conclusions, and applications of these findings in connection with the research questions, available literature, and my original assumptions.
First, I briefly discuss the reflection that guided the interpretation, meaning-making, and application of my findings. This is followed by a discussion of the interpretation of findings organized according to three areas: (a) supporting the interrelationships between thinking, moving, and feeling; (b) supporting learning as a cyclical process; (c) supporting learning as a social process. My original assumptions about this research and whether or not findings aligned with assumptions are discussed. The chapter concludes with reflecting on what I found to be most surprising in this study, looking ahead to teaching Creative Dance fully online in Fall 2020, and thinking about future research.

**Reflecting Through Interpretation**

Ten key findings were revealed across the three subareas. Bloomberg’s (2016) If/Then/Therefore/Thus Matrix was used to analyze my findings and ensure their alignment with my interpretations, conclusions, and general recommendations for teaching modifications (Appendix U). The information in the matrix was then used to uncover areas of overlap across findings, to draw meaning from these connections, and to plan changes to my teaching for Fall 2020.

When interpreting the findings, I kept in mind that the outcome of this study was to deepen my understanding of teaching and learning in Creative Dance so that I can take informed action to improve my teaching; this action includes planning for the modification of teaching materials, strategies, and practices for Fall 2020 based not only on the findings revealed in data, but also my reflections on my teaching and research. Risner (2002) brought up the foundational questions that reflective practitioners ask themselves: “What do/did I do? Why do/did I do that?” (p.?). Findings in this study addressed *What did I do?* and *What did I not do?* in Fall 2019. As I
interpreted my findings in order to plan for teaching modifications, I reflected upon the question, *Why am I doing that?*

The conclusions drawn from this study and the resulting teaching modifications are not simply a matter of refining the student learning outcomes and working backwards to align these outcomes with my assessments and class activities as originally anticipated. This investigation required taking a deeper look at my teaching values and the theoretical foundations guiding my teaching – the *whys* of my teaching – and assessing whether or not these are in alignment with my teaching strategies and practices that guide students towards the anticipated learning outcomes – the *whats* and *hows* of my teaching. Stinson (2001) summarizes this teacher reflection:

> Reflective thinking in the curriculum planning process takes us beyond these boundaries and leads us to different kinds of questions. Instead of asking what students should know and be able to do or whether they are learning, we pose much more difficult queries such as What do I believe in – and why? Am I living what I believe? Are these values embodied in the curriculum I teach? What kind of world am I creating/supporting in the decision I have made? Whose interests are being served in this world – who gains and who loses? (p. 27)

Reflecting upon the data findings alongside my teaching values resulted in three interconnected areas of focus that serve as the framework for my teaching modifications for Fall 2020: (a) supporting the interrelationships between thinking, moving, and feeling by clarifying the mind-body connection in choreographic and performance skills and encouraging student self-monitoring and self-assessment of these interrelationships; (b) supporting learning as an ongoing spiraling process in which creativity and choreographic procedures are applied; and (c)
supporting learning as a social process through peer interactions and collaborations. Appropriate modifications in these areas will strengthen student learning experiences and outcomes and will be more supportive of emerging adult learning and development.

**Supporting the Interrelationships Between Thinking, Moving, and Feeling**

According to Finding C1, two additional types of knowledge were revealed to be integral to, and outcomes of, the students’ thinking throughout their choreographic and performance processes: Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge. The experience of the moving body and the feelings and emotions that arose from such experiences were components of students’ thought processes in this course. Students gained knowledge about the art of choreography and about themselves through their direct experiences with dance-making and performing. Knowledge arose from these experiences of the moving body, and the development of this Experiential Knowledge reflected in student writing required both thinking and moving, mind and body, cognitive and physical. Affective Self-Knowledge arose from the resulting feelings/emotions of their learning experiences, revealing the potential for uncovering connections between thinking, doing, and feeling.

Although investigated as separate subareas in this study, there are inherent connections between the thinking, moving, and feeling aspects of learning. Even the authors of the cognitive and affective taxonomies acknowledged connections between the cognitive and affective aspects of learning (Anderson et al., 1964; Bloom et al., 1956; Darling, 1965). Bertucio (2017) pointed out that although the learning domains were separated in order to state objectives more clearly, this was not reflective of a separation within the student’s learning processes. According to Immordino-Yang and Damasio (2007), aspects of cognition are affected by emotional processes, and feelings and emotions impact student learning and performance. Larimer (2016) pointed out
that changes that flow in the opposite direction: physical patterns can result in changes in thought and emotional patterns.

These interrelationships have not been fully supported by my teaching strategies. I prompted students to notice their thoughts and feelings while dancing and to write about their experiences after the experience – reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983) and reflection on action, respectively – but I did not encourage them to explore how their thoughts and feelings impacted their movement. Also, I did not ask students to sense if/how their movement impacted their thoughts and feelings.

As a result of this study, I realized that I have perpetuated the mind-body split with some of my teaching choices. For example, the seemingly simple and habitual act of creating and grading two separate assignments for both midterms and finals – a written reflection and a movement composition – divided the thinking process from the physical act of dancing. While assessing each of these assignments, however, I was repeatedly drawn to connecting the two; I have had to continually refer to the other assignment to see how the students writing/thinking connected to their choreography and performance. I was habitually separating thinking and moving even though, come time to grade, I had to bring them together to assess student learning. In addition, the feeling aspect of learning was prompted separately in online journals, not in students’ Final Reflections. I believe this disconnect between thinking, feeling, and moving to be a hindrance to student learning.

Teaching strategies and practices should be modified to support the mind-body-feeling connection inherent to the learning experiences in Creative Dance more strongly and to share these connections with the students. As Davenport (2017) stated, “The more we perceive our own work in dance to represent a synthesis of the cognitive, physical, emotional, cultural, and
political (and whatever else), the more others will do so” (p. 36). These connections can be highlighted through the clarification, teaching, and assessment of choreographic and performance skills and by providing opportunities for students to discover the interrelationships between thinking, moving, and feeling from their personal experiences in class.

**Clarifying the Mind-Body Connection in Choreographic and Performance Skills**

The mind-body connection in Creative Dance can be supported through the clarification of the choreographic and performance skills developed in the course. According to Finding P2, choreographic and performance skills, learned and assessed, and their associated levels of proficiency were not made explicit. Assignments did not include the specific choreographic and performance skills that students were to develop and demonstrate. The associated levels of skill proficiency were also omitted from these assignments.

As mentioned previously, the thinking and moving components of choreographic skill development and demonstration were assessed separately via a written reflection and a movement composition. This lack of clarity was a potential hindrance to the development of students’ Metacognitive Self-Knowledge – awareness of what they know along with their strengths and areas in need of improvement – and Experiential Knowledge. This was also perpetuating mind-body split; students wrote about their process as separate from the act of making and performing their choreography.

Clarification of these physical skills and their associated levels of proficiency are needed for more effective assessment and scaffolding of learning experiences and for developing students’ Metacognitive Self-Knowledge and Experiential Knowledge. Such modifications begin with revising student learning outcomes. Once clarified, the language and format of the student assignments need to be adjusted to include the choreographic skills students will be
demonstrating both in their performance and in their writing, thus linking the cognitive and physical aspects of learning. Also, revising rubrics to include clear language for each level of skill proficiency would be helpful for me as I assess student work and for the students as they create and self-assess their work and the work of their peers. Leijan, et al. (2009a) recommended providing clear criteria for students to use when they evaluate their written reflections. Such criteria would also assist with guiding my feedback.

**Student Self-Monitoring and Self-Assessment of Interrelationships**

In addition to informing students of the mind-body connections within their learning experiences, it is also important to encourage students to discover, monitor, and regulate their own interrelationships between their thoughts, movements, and feelings. This includes how a students’ level of confidence, comfort, and/or nervousness impacts their thinking and dancing. Based on Findings P4 and A1 in this study, I concluded that students’ affective responses to learning and their subsequent impact on their thoughts and actions are best assessed from a first-person student perspective.

Finding P4 revealed that a student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing could not be sufficiently measured using the set assessment parameters from a third-person professor perspective. A third-person professor perspective was not the most effective way to assess a student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing in this choreography course. The parameters used for assessing confidence were also not sufficient, as overarching parameters for assessing a confident performance was not applicable in our general education choreography course where students of various performance experiences performed completely different pieces of choreography.
In addition, confidence, comfort level, and nervousness are inner states, and this inner state was not always expressed in a students’ performance; some students expressed being nervous for their performances, but they appeared to be comfortable and/or confident while performing. I realized that I was assessing confidence solely based on observation, thus aligning with the behaviorist views on learning that omit subjective experience as integral to learning. I concluded that confidence is best monitored and assessed in our course from a first-person student perspective.

Finding A1 revealed that the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]) experienced shifting feelings and/or emotions over the period of a singular performance. Performing in this classroom context can be uncomfortable for students regardless of their level of dance experience. Nerves seemed to be natural in this context, and such “negative” feelings and emotions can be a hindrance to a student’s performance. Strategies for monitoring and managing the feelings and emotions that arise and shift when performing in front of an audience were not explored in class. Such strategies may assist some students with managing performance-induced nerves so that they can perform to their best ability. Learning and applying such strategies develops Metacognitive Strategic Knowledge which could be beneficial for in-class performances and public speaking in any context.

Feelings and emotions, including feelings of confidence, and their impact on performance are best monitored and assessed from a first-person student perspective. Rather than being an assessor of confidence, I can modify my teaching to become a facilitator of learning experiences that encourage students to monitor, assess, and influence their own affective responses to learning experiences and to be aware of how their inner state impacts their performance and how their environment impacts their inner state. Movement-based somatic practices have not yet been
emphasized in this choreography course, but they could serve as the students’ bridge to inner awareness and its impact on their outer expressivity. Hanna (1995) described the self-sensing and self-regulating aspects of somatics:

The human is not merely a self-aware soma, passively observing itself (as well as observing its scientific observer), but it is doing something else simultaneously: it is acting upon itself; i.e., it is always engaged in the process of self-regulation…the soma that is being observed is not only aware of itself through self-observation but it is also simultaneously in the process of modifying itself before the observer’s eyes. (p. 344)

Bartenieff Fundamentals may also serve as a valuable resource for such explorations, particularly the principle of inner-outer which states that there is a connection between one’s inner experience and outer expressivity and environment (Hackney, 2002). In a choreography course and within a wider culture that tends to view the body from the third-person perspective, focusing on inner awareness and sensations can help bring students away from solely looking at the body as an object from the perspective of an outside observer.

This first-person observation requires that students to take on more responsibility in their learning and lays the foundation for intrapersonal connection and the development of greater self-knowledge, including Affective Self-Knowledge and Metacognitive Strategic Knowledge. This would also enable students to track the development of the interconnectedness of their mind, body, and feelings and to sense the movement of their body over time. Somatic practices are about self-learning, where students are provided with cues to explore, sense, reflect, and apply (Lester, 2015). Since emerging adulthood is a time where an individual relies less on others for direction and moves towards greater self-direction and regulation (Tanner, 2006), incorporating movement-based somatic principles into Creative Dance could encourage the
student to rely less on me, their teacher, for guidance and for the student to play a greater role in their learning process.

I realize that in order to effectively guide students to self-monitor and self-regulate the interrelationships between their mind, body, and feelings, I must continue to experience this inner sensing within my own movement practice. By doing so, I will gain a greater understanding of the interrelationships within myself and of ways that I can effectively guide students – most of whom I assume would be new to sensing their bodies from the first-person perspective – in a general education choreography course. Due to the current pandemic and need for social distancing, there are numerous somatics resources available online including movement classes taught by skilled practitioners. The Feldenkrais Guild® of North America (2019) and Association for Hanna Somatic Education®, Inc. (2020), for example, will be valuable resources for online movement classes as I build upon my own practice.

**Supporting Learning as a Cyclical Process**

Data revealed that student learning was assessed as a linear, rather than cyclical, process (Finding C2). Learning was measured more so as an outcome of a process. Student engaged with the four learning modes of The Learning Cycle (Kolb, 2015) – concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, active experimentation – but were not prompted to state how their experience of their work had shifted as a result of the this reflective process or how the knowledge gained from this process informed their creative process. This was deemed to be a hindrance to student learning, as students were not prompted to engage in repeated cycles of reflection to continuously link new information about their experience to prior information.

Teaching strategies and practices are in need of modification to promote learning as a cyclical, rather than linear, process. The Learning Cycle and its reflective components can serve
as the foundation for scaffolding assignments that enable dance students to move from the act of experiencing to a place of learning. Students can be guided to repeatedly engage with all four learning modes of The Learning Cycle by progressing from observing their direct experiences to critically reflecting upon their assumptions, perspectives, and movement and later using this new knowledge to inform and modify their actions and interactions with others. This reflects the transformation of experience, true learning according to Kolb (2015). Incorporating student-centered approaches for assessment throughout the cycle, such as formative assessments – assessments within the learning process rather than solely at the end – can be helpful for guiding students throughout their learning process. Fink’s (2013) “FIDeLity” feedback model would be a useful framework for feedback and formative assessments: “if we want our feedback to be educative, rather than just tell student what grades they got, the feedback needs to be frequent, immediate, discriminating [based on clear criteria and standards], and delivered lovingly” (p. 94).

Opportunities to repeatedly immerse themselves within The Learning Cycle over time through in-class activities and assignments that welcome subjective experience into the learning process can encourage college dance students to move beyond recalling and imitating movement and towards higher levels of thinking, moving and self-knowing. William James, possibly the first person to describe the cycle of experiential learning, believed that bringing conscious, intentional attention to one’s learning process could improve one’s learning (Kolb, 2015). Encouraging students to monitor, assess, and influence their own affective responses to learning experiences, as discussed previously, by cycling through the four learning modes enables students to bridge dance content with the self, rather than keep knowledge of content and knowledge of oneself as separate domains of study. This model of student-centered learning can
be beneficial for emerging adults in higher education who are evolving into a position of greater independence and self-direction.

Since accepting responsibility for oneself and making independent decisions are stronger markers of adulthood than traditional role transitions (Arnett, 1998; Sharon, 2016), I can begin to incorporate the Learning Cycle to encourage such growth and development in the classroom context. On way of doing so is through a combination of written reflections and movement activities that guide students through The Learning Cycle. Providing clear evaluative criteria for written reflections can help students shift towards greater self-direction and less reliance on me, their teacher, as the sole provider of direction and feedback. In addition, including written reflections throughout their cyclical learning process would enable me to learn about students as holistic, multidimensional individuals and to support the growth and development of students through my teaching practices. As Cooper (2013) stated:

From a teaching perspective, reflective writing operates as an effective means to learn more about how students approach learning—not just what they understand, but perhaps more importantly, what they are confused about, and what fallacies or misunderstandings exist that could be having a negative impact on their learning and their self-image. Reflective writing can be used to chart student progress over time, helping connect a student’s cognitive processes to what occurs during studio practice, thus creating a more comprehensive picture of the student’s learning and growth. (p. 6)

Stevens and Cooper’s (2009) *Journal Keeping: How to Use Reflective Writing for Learning, Teaching, Professional Insight, and Positive Change* will be a beneficial resource in this area.
Repeating the Cycle: The Learning Spiral

Repetition of learning experiences was revealed to be an effective teaching strategy. Findings A2 and P3 spoke to this repetition, or lack there-of, in class. Finding A2 stated that the majority of students (10 out of 12 [83%]) reported feeling more comfortable, more self-confident, and/or less nervous performing in class as a result of repeating learning experiences. Students’ affective responses to performance experiences shifted in a positive direction due to the frequency of performances in a singular class and over the course of the semester. Finding P3 spoke to the outcome of lack of opportunities to repeat learning experiences: a direct relationship was revealed between students’ earned deductions for the compositional element of Time and lack of class time devoted to this content area. When class time devoted to experiencing content was limited, as it was for the compositional element of Time in Fall 2019, it was more difficult for students to demonstrate their understanding via embodiment of the concept.

Repetition of learning experiences over time enabled students to experience positive shifts in their affective responses and would have enabled student to understand dance concepts such as Time more clearly via embodiment, thus leading to stronger learning experiences and outcomes. Therefore, repetition is one theme used to inspire teaching modifications for Fall 2020 by reviewing class activities and assignment prompts that supported repetition and those that lacked repetition. The repetition must be intentional, however, so that students are encouraged to think, move and/or feel in new ways rather than habitually going through the motions. The systematic, cyclical nature of The Learning Cycle can support the intentional repetition of learning experiences.

The Learning Cycle can be best envisioned as a learning spiral, rather than a circle (Kolb, 2015); a student does not begin and end the process with the same knowledge. (See Figure 4 for
the learning spiral.) The process of experiencing, reflecting, thinking, and acting results in modifications of ideas and behaviors that lead to new experiences. When a student begins to repeat the cycle again, they do so from a position of newly accumulated experiences and knowledge. The learning spiral ensures that repetition is purposeful and leads to learning.

Figure 4

*The Learning Spiral*

![Learning Spiral Diagram](image)

CE = Concrete Experience  RO = Reflective Observation  
AC = Abstract Conceptualization  AE = Active Experimentation

*Note.* This image was adapted from Kolb’s (2015) conceptualization of Dewey’s Model of Experiential Learning (p. 34).

The learning spiral could be applied in Fall 2020, for example, to repeating performance experiences as a means for strengthening their embodiment of the compositional element of Time. Students could *experience* their inner sense of Time while dancing, *reflect* on how it felt doing so, *observe* their embodiment of Time by watching a video of their performance from the third-person perspective, *evaluate* whether there was a clear connection or a disconnect between their inner sensing and outer expressivity of Time (e.g., students felt that they were moving very slowly but the video of their performance revealed otherwise), *think* about action steps that they could take to align their inner experience and outer expression of Time and deepen their
understanding of the concept, experiment with these steps, and start over with experiencing their movement from a newly informed position. This would require purposeful prompting on my end to encourage students to engage with all four learning modes through the learning spiral.

By incorporating regular video feedback assignments into The Learning Cycle, students may begin to trust and value their own perspectives. I was reminded of Cooper’s (2013) comments about dance environments as “hierarchical settings where the teacher as expert is the authority figure, and the student as novice is often the passive recipient of information” (p. 5). Although Cooper (2013) was referring to ballet technique environments, this instructor-centered assumption with the teacher as the sole vessel of knowledge is found in many dance classes and educational contexts. Video is one way for students to self-assess from the perspective of an audience member and from the first-person perspective, evaluating the relationship between their inner sensing of movement and outer expressivity. In addition, the repetition of using video as a feedback tool can provide documentation for students use to assess their growth as performers over the course of the semester.

**Putting Creativity into the Creative Process**

Data revealed that a narrow perspective on creativity served as the foundation for creating and assessing student choreography (Finding P1). Viewing creativity as we did in class producing something new, unique, outside of the box, and an abstract representation of a theme – was outcome focused and omitted creative thinking and moving as inherent components of the dance-making process. Improvisation was used as a tool for exploring creative movement possibilities throughout the semester, but specific procedures for shaping these creative discoveries made via improvisation into set choreography for their dances were not explored.
This narrow perspective of creativity and lack of acknowledging and implementing creativity as integral to the process of dance-making was a hindrance to student learning because it placed limitations on the students’ creative capabilities. Therefore, how creativity is defined, applies to, and is assessed in our general education choreography course needs to be clarified and set as a stronger foundation for creating and assessing choreography. It is important to enter the semester with a clear standpoint on what is meant by “creativity” and “creative dance” while also remaining flexible to hearing and incorporating students’ perspectives. While doing so, I need to ask myself some of the questions that Shupp and McCarthy-Brown (2018) posed for shifting one’s teaching to better represent the cultural diversity in our country:

How can I bring more specificity to naming the exercises and devices I am teaching in my improvisation and choreography class to better situate the cultural contexts of the practice?

What assumptions are built into my language and how can I, and my students, question those assumptions? (p. 17)

Am I selecting content that both honors what my students bring to class and moves them forward? (p. 18)

MacBean (2001) posed an important distinction to consider as creativity is clarified: “what are the differences between the act of movement and the art of movement?” (p. 48). This reminded me of a struggle I faced during Fall 2019: I repeatedly questioned whether or not a dance made of primarily literal, imitative actions reflected the same degree of creativity and artistry as a dance that included abstract movements that were open to wider interpretation. Imitation is the basic, foundational level of physical skill development in Dave’s (1970) psychomotor taxonomy where an individual observes, copies, and imitates someone else’s
movement. Dances that imitate literal, sports-based, and/or pedestrian movements can certainly reflect creativity, but I know that I can encourage creative thinking and moving more effectively and guide students to move beyond replicating known actions and towards higher levels of thinking and moving.

Teaching can be modified to include activities for students to explore and expand upon their creativity as choreographers and performers. Divergent moving and thinking can be highlighted as integral components of dance-making, placing emphasis on the process and the variety of creative possibilities that arise. One way of doing is by expanding upon the improvisational tools already used in class and introducing students to procedures that can translate improvisation into set choreography. More techniques can be explored for generating a variety of movements inspired by a particular idea, concept, or object and experimenting with various movements and ideas within the learning spiral. By experiencing, reflecting, thinking, and experimenting with various creative possibilities, students can then make more informed, intentional choices for the set movement that is added and shaped into a dance.

**Applying Procedural Knowledge to the Creative Process**

Data revealed that Procedural Knowledge (Anderson et al., 2001) of choreographic tools and techniques was not evident in student writing, prompted in assignments, or stated in student learning outcomes (Finding C3). Teaching strategies and practices prioritized choreographic devices – tools for manipulating already created movement. Students were not required to utilize specific choreographic tools, techniques, and structures in their creative process. They had the freedom to create and structure their dances as they wished and were then required to explain their process in writing.
The lack of Procedural Knowledge (Anderson et al., 2001) was a potential hindrance to student learning because these new choreographers were left to navigate their own processes for creating movement and structuring dances. Having foundational tools, techniques, and structures available to choose from and to utilize in their process might be helpful to the development of their choreography. Learning activities and assessments should be modified to include more choreographic tools, techniques, and structures for new choreographers to use at different stages in their choreographic process. This would provide more foundational theory to support the students’ practice. These procedures could include processes for transitioning improvisation to set choreography, an example discussed earlier.

**Supporting Learning as a Social Process**

Dewey, often noted as the father of experiential education, argued that reflection does not occur in isolation; it needs to occur via interactions with others (Rodgers, 2002). Learning is not limited to an internal, individual process; it is a social process that is grounded by experience and interactions between an individual and the environment (Kolb, 2015). Teaching strategies in Creative Dance supported the notion of learning as a social process by incorporating peer activities throughout the semester. Such peer activities included verbally and physically reviewing dance concepts, collaborating on movement assignments, performing movement alongside or with their peers, and engaging in peer feedback. Having experienced the benefits of working collaboratively in the professional dance world, I believed that students could also benefit from the exposure to multiple perspectives in their learning process. Additionally, I worked to create a safe, supportive learning environment for these interpersonal interactions. I could not do this alone, however; the students played a large role in the creation of our dance studio community.
Finding A3 spoke to the impact that peers had students’ learning experiences, particularly their feelings and/or emotions: for the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]), peer influence extended beyond providing beneficial critical feedback for the development of their peers’ choreography to inspiring feelings of satisfaction and/or positive shifts in students’ affective responses to learning activities through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions. I concluded that peer interactions were beneficial components of student learning experiences with regards to learning outcomes – peer contributions to the creation of Midterm and Final Compositions – and the inner, subjective state of students representing the affective aspects of their learning.

As mentioned for Finding A2, data revealed that working repeatedly with the same peers enabled two students (17%) to experience positive shifts in their comfort level. While students were not asked explicitly if/how repetition of peer groups impacted their affective responses to learning, this mention by two students connects to my teaching considerations. I frequently questioned the potential advantages and disadvantages of having students work with the same groups compared to working with a new peer group. These thoughts were not recorded on paper and, therefore, were not included as data in the study. I will continue to consider the repetition of peer groups in future semesters and will ask students about their preferences for peer group repetition.

The social aspect of learning is significant in the college context for emerging adults, as emerging adults are still in the process of forming their identities (Arnett, 2000) and college provides the social environment for intellectual development and both personal and social identity formation (Kaufman, 2014). Illeris (2013) stated that “The concept of identity is about a person being in the world, who one experiences being, and how one relates to and wants to be
experienced by others” (p. 1). I connect this notion with students’ feelings of nervousness, worry about peers’ judgments, and or fear of messing up when performing in class. Over time and with repeated interactions with their classmates, however, students felt less nervous, less worried, more comfortable, and/or more confident. Data revealed that they began to view themselves in connection with their peers through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions. As Kaufman (2014) argued, the social interactions that students have with others shapes who they are and impacts the students’ perceptions of self and others.

Although Creative Dance will be taught online during the Fall 2020 semester, peer interactions will be included as a strategy to assist students with feeling more comfortable and confident with who they are and what they do in class and to build connections between classmates. These interactions can also inspire students to acknowledge and embrace similarities and differences within the class. According to Stinson (2001), “Dance can be a way to teach students to recognize and value individual differences and to recognize their connectedness with others.” Teaching strategies can be modified to include thoughtful guidance of peer interactions and collaborations within the learning spiral where students can learn about one another, learn from one another, and learn about oneself in relationship to others.

In addition, I will continue to do my part in creating a safe, supportive, and trusting learning community for these peer interactions. My teaching aligns with some of Leijen et al.’s (2009a) suggestions for effectively teaching reflection, including their suggestion to create a safe and trusting environment. This is one of my top priorities as an educator. This is the first step not only in supporting student-centered learning practices, but also for creating a safe space for students to grow, to move beyond their comfort zone, and to take creative risks. Since Creative Dance tends to include students’ varying levels of dance experience, I strive to encourage
students – regardless of their experience – to feel as though they are a valuable contributor to the class community and that they can teach and learn from one another. I believe that my desire to create such a community contributed positively to the peer interactions in the classroom. These teaching practices and interpersonal interactions lied outside of the data in this study, however.

**Revisiting My Assumptions**

1. *Creative Dance offered non-dance majors learning outcomes and experiences beyond, and more useful than, what was stated in the current student learning outcomes.*

   This assumption is both supported and unsupported by my research. First, Creative Dance did offer students learning outcomes beyond what was stated in the student learning outcomes. Learning outcomes reflected in students’ Final Reflections – a summative assignment – revealed two additional knowledge types that were not considered when creating the original student learning outcomes listed on the syllabus. According to Finding C1, Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge were revealed to be integral to, and outcomes of, the students’ thinking throughout their choreographic and performance processes. The revised student learning outcomes for Fall 2019 (Appendix K) stated that students should be able to demonstrate their UNDERSTANDING of Experiential Knowledge and their ability to CREATE based on Experiential Knowledge, but they did not include affective aspects of learning. In addition, student data for Final Reflections Prompt 4 (Appendix I) revealed a wider degree of cognitive processes that utilized Experiential Knowledge - REMEMBERING, UNDERSTANDING, ANALYZING, and EVALUATING – along with the students’ ability to RECALL Affective Self-Knowledge. The Final Composition added CREATING – the highest cognitive level – based on Experiential Knowledge.
Second, Creative Dance did offer students experiences beyond what was implied in the student learning outcomes, as affective aspects of learning were not included in the student learning outcomes. The inner shifts that took place within students – positive shifts in students’ level of confidence, comfort, nervousness, and/or worry as revealed in Findings A2 and A3 – were not stated learning outcomes, yet they appeared to be significant to their learning.

Finally, it is impossible to assess whether Creative Dance offered non-dance majors learning outcomes and experiences that were more useful than what was stated in the student learning outcomes. While the dance content of this course was not directly applicable to their lives outside of the dance studio or future careers, I believe students have the opportunity to carry the self-knowledge that arose from their experiences of speaking and moving in front of an audience and collaborating with peers into the future. This could be useful, but it is really the students who would have to say what was useful to them or not. Some students did see aspects of the course as applicable to their future careers but follow up interviews would provide insight into the usefulness of their experiences and outcomes.

2. Using common cognitive, affective, and psychomotor taxonomies of educational objectives would enable me to speak more effectively about the similarities and differences in learning and teaching of dance with colleagues across disciplines.

This assumption is not fully supported by my research. An outcome of this study was to be able to speak more clearly about the teaching and learning in Creative Dance with colleagues. This clarity, however, was not due to being exposed to a wider pedagogical vocabulary within the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor taxonomies. As mentioned in Chapters Three and Four, the affective and psychomotor taxonomies were deemed to be inapplicable lenses of analysis for data in this study. While I do anticipate the language of the cognitive domain to
somewhat useful for communicating cognitive processes and knowledge types utilized and
gained through experiences of the moving body, the language speaks solely to outcomes, not the
process of learning.

What these taxonomies did provide is inspiration to be intentional, specific, and clear
with the language that I choose to use in my instruction. For example, although I will not be
using psychomotor taxonomy language when speaking about choreographic and performance
skills in Creative Dance, I can speak with greater clarity and specificity about the specific skills
to be developed and assessed in the course and their associated levels of proficiency. This can
certainly be helpful when communicating about teaching and learning across disciplines and,
most importantly, when speaking to students in class.

During data analysis for subareas two and three, I learned that it was best to set aside the
pre-selected taxonomies and let the data guide the path of my analysis. Similarly, when speaking
about teaching and learning, I learned to let my discipline speak for itself rather than force it into
taxonomical language. While the taxonomies can provide a shared language to be used to
communicate learning outcomes across discipline – provided colleagues are familiar with the
language – I am most interested in speaking about the hows and whys of teaching that guide
students’ learning processes towards the intended outcomes.

3. Using the three learning domains acknowledged in Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) as
the foundation for data analysis and course redesign would enable me to create more holistic
learning experiences and outcomes that take into account the thinking, feeling, sensing, and
moving capacities of students.

This assumption was both supported and unsupported by my research. Two of the three
learning domains and their associated taxonomies were deemed inappropriate for data analysis in
this study. These two subareas of focus for data analysis were changed, and only one learning domain remained consistent: the cognitive domain. Therefore, the three learning domains and their associated taxonomies did not collectively contribute to the creation of more holistic learning experiences as originally expected.

Once my three subareas were solidified, data analysis required me to look first look at the cognitive, affective, and physical aspects of learning separately. Findings were compartmentalized within each subarea. Deeper analysis of my findings as a means for interpreting and drawing meaning from the study resulted in the strong desire to connect the thinking, feeling, and moving aspects of learning. An outcome of the interpretation was the desire to support the interconnectedness of these learning aspects in my teaching, to make these connections explicit to students, and to have students discover their own connections based on their in-class experiences. This was a step in the right direction for creating more holistic learning experiences.

This research spoke to some of the thinking, feeling, and moving aspects of students’ learning experience. What findings did not speak to was the inner sensing of the body while moving. Creative Dance has promoted viewing choreography and performance primarily from the third-person perspective by focusing on what is being communicated to the audience through movement. We spend two classes exploring the four effort factors of Laban Movement Analysis – Flow, Weight, Time, and Space (Hackney, 2002) – where students were encouraged to focus on how they were moving rather than what they looked like. While some students’ written work included positive comments about their inner sensing and first-person perspective of their movement, this information was not highlighted in the findings. Spending more time on these activities and integrating additional movement-based somatic practices would encourage
students to shift their focus from what their bodies look like towards sensing how their bodies feel. This could potentially assist students with managing performance nerves by moving their attention away from the worry and fear in their heads to their internal physical sensations in the present moment and with reducing the tendency towards body-objectification.

Self-objectification occurs when one places greater value on how one’s body appears to other people rather than how one’s body feels or what it can do (Murnen, 2012). Modifying teaching strategies to include somatic practices may help to reduce body objectification in a course that relies heavily on self-, peer- and professor feedback from a third-person perspective. Since the body plays a role in one’s self-identity (Shilling, 1993), and emerging adults are immersed in the developmental process of shaping their identities (Arnett, 2000), I am interested in exploring ways for students to utilize both first- and third-person perspectives while choreographing, performing, and evaluating their work. Rato and Alvez (2020) connect the inner-outer experience to body image by stating “Balance between internal and external body experience is crucial for the construction of body image, and is associated with the way the student acquires knowledge about his own movement” (p. 319). By incorporating somatic practices in class, my teaching could move beyond the thinking, feeling, and moving capacities of students to include the inner sensing aspects in their learning process. This, I believe, would create a more holistic learning experiences for the students and would more strongly support emerging adult development.

4. Due to the social nature of the learning environment and our focus on dance as a vehicle for individual expression, interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of learning will be revealed in the data.
This assumption is supported by the research. Interpersonal aspects of learning were revealed in Finding A3: For the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]), peer influence extended beyond providing beneficial critical feedback for the development of their peers’ choreography to inspiring feelings of satisfaction and/or positive shifts in students’ affective responses to learning activities through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions. Intrapersonal aspects of learning were revealed in all three findings for the subarea three: affective responses to learning experiences. Finding A3 also revealed the connection between intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of learning.

5. Assumption #4 above led me to further assume that there could be important aspects of student learning that might not easily fit into the organizational categories of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor taxonomies.

This assumption is supported by this study. Since deductive analysis using the learning domain taxonomies proved to be limiting, I widened my view beyond the organizational categories and priori codes of these pre-selected taxonomies. This wider view revealed aspects of student learning that lied outside of these taxonomies.

6. This study will enable me to look critically into many aspects of my teaching, particularly my assessment practices. My habitual tendencies towards viewing and assessing student learning will be revealed, along with the need to clarify how I view and assess learning within the three domains.

This assumption is mostly supported by this study. This action research study required me to look critically at how I was viewing and assessing student learning. It opened my eyes to areas of assessment that have been overlooked and/or were in need of clarification. The clearest example of this was in subarea three when I quickly realized that my assessment practices for the
students’ Final Composition needed clarification. This choreographic and performance skills to be developed and assessed were not made explicit, nor were the levels of skill proficiency clear on my rubric. This is also when I realized that I was viewing creativity from a very narrow perspective and that a student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing could not be sufficiently assessed from my third-person perspective.

The assumption “the need to clarify how I view and assess learning within the three domains” is incorrect, however. Rather than clarify within the three domains, I saw the need to clarify how I view and assess learning across the cognitive, affective, and physical areas of learning. I move on from this research with the strong desire and intentional plans for connecting the thinking, moving, and feeling aspects of learning in Creative Dance.

**Reflecting and Looking Ahead**

In Fall 2020, I will implement and experience my modified teaching strategies and practices, observe and reflect upon these experiences and modified instructional strategies, and continue to move through the learning spiral and various learning modes. Widening the reach of this research beyond this singular course, I view the modifications of my teaching to serve as an example for a general education choreography course with materials and practices that value and support the interrelationships between thinking, moving, feeling, and sensing and between students. As an artist and educator, I have taken these interrelationships for granted; the interrelationships existed in practice without question, or so I thought. When I looked more closely at my teaching via a formal action research process, I learned that my practices were not fully supporting this connection that I consider to be integral to holistic learning. This was one of the biggest surprises to come from this study, and one that I am grateful for. What I have focused
on and supported through my teaching was cultivating connection on the interpersonal level via peer interactions in the studio.

As this dissertation came to completion, it was announced that Creative Dance would be taught online in Fall 2020. My greatest challenge in adapting this course for online learning will be facilitating learning as a social process. Peer interactions played a large role in student learning in Fall 2019, and these interactions will be entirely different online. Students will no longer be dancing alongside or with one another live in the studio or sharing the feelings and emotions that arise from performing live in front of peers. Yet I am inspired by the many professional dance artists and dance students who have moved through the social isolation necessitated by the pandemic and have come up with creative solutions for connecting with one another through dance. The silver lining to being forced to teach Creative Dance online is that I will discover new, creative ways of teaching and learning choreography and promoting connection via dance that I would have never otherwise considered. That excites me.

In Fall 2020, student and teacher responsibilities in the course will shift. I will no longer have a macro view of multiple peer groups working simultaneously in the studio. Instead, I will move from one Zoom breakout room to the next and will have to adapt my usual facilitation of peer collaborations and delivery of feedback. Online learning will increase the opportunity for students to take responsibility for their learning as it will be more self-directed. Shifting more of the learning responsibility to the students aligns most strongly with student-centered practices and emerging adult development.

The lack of in-person interactions and the blend of synchronous and asynchronous learning will enable me to work diligently on the modifications needed – as indicated by my findings – to support student learning more effectively, specifically with regards to clarification.
This includes modifications to support the interrelationships between thinking, moving, and feeling and support learning as a cyclical process. I strongly believe that my experience teaching online in Fall 2020 with the modifications made from this study will further strengthen my teaching when the course is able to return to the studio.

Looking further down the road into future research endeavors, I am interested in continuing the investigation into emerging adult learning experiences in higher education dance courses. I will continue to build upon this action research study by immersing myself in the continual learning spiral and investigating the outcomes of changes made to my teaching of Creative Dance as a result of the findings of this study. Doing so through a formal, empirical research process will require a new group of student participants. This brings up the concern, as it did for this study, about whether or not students will volunteer to participate. In this study, it was not known why students chose to participate or not to participate. It would be helpful to know the rationale for participation and non-participation, so that I can better understand student motivation and concerns when conducting research in the future. Perhaps an anonymous questionnaire could provide an opportunity for students to share their concerns with participating in teacher research and for me to address their concerns. Having the opportunity to express and address student concerns might assist with drawing more student participants and a more diverse representation of college students.

**Chapter Five Summary**

This chapter covered my interpretations, conclusions, and meanings drawn from the findings in this action research study. Teacher-researcher reflections that guided the process from data findings to research outcomes – plans for teaching modifications for Fall 2020 – were introduced. This was followed by a discussion of the findings as connected to available literature
and my plans for teaching modifications within three thematic areas: (a) supporting the interrelationships between thinking, moving, and feeling; (b) supporting learning as a cyclical process; (c) supporting learning as a social process. The chapter concluded with revisiting my original assumptions about this research, explaining whether or not findings aligned with these assumptions, and looking ahead to the Fall 2020 semester and beyond.
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Appendix A

Creative Dance Syllabus Fall 2019

DANC 255-001 Creative Dance
Fall 2019  T/Th 9:30 – 10:45am  Burnell Hall 138B
Professor Kuhn Donnelly  Office Hours:
kkuhn@bridgew.edu  T/Th by appointment
Office: Burnell 130A

Course Description (BSU Catalog)
This course investigates the theory of dance through participation, composition, lecture, discussion, and film. Students learn about the elements of space, time, force, movement, and style.

About Our Course
In Creative Dance, you are a choreographer and performer. You will learn the basic elements of dance composition – including body, energy, space, shape, and time – and additional aspects of Laban/Bartenieff Movement Analysis. Through movement exercises, choreographic projects, improvisations, discussions, video viewings, and live performances, you will explore these elements as individual choreographers, artistic collaborators, performers, and informed audience members. You will reflect upon your work through journal entries and experience giving and receiving constructive feedback throughout your learning process.

Required Materials & Resources
• A Choreographer’s Notebook to be used for activities inside and outside of class
• Appropriate dance/exercise attire (p. 5)
• Internet Access for research, Blackboard access and email communication. Blackboard will be utilized to access and submit course assignments. By submitting work in this manner, you are consenting to receiving grades and/or feedback from me via Blackboard.
• A device to record videos of your choreography (If you do not have one, you may borrow one to use for in-class assignments.)
• A ticket to Winterdance, the Dance Department’s annual Fall dance concert (pp. 8-9)
### Student Learning Outcomes

*After successfully completing this course, you should be able to:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Category</th>
<th>The following will be used to assess the degree by which you have met the learning outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>understand and apply the basic elements of dance composition to the creation and performance of unique individual and collaborative dance studies</td>
<td>Attendance, Participation &amp; Professionalism; HW Assignments; Midterm &amp; Final Compositions &amp; Reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyze and evaluate pieces of choreography and explain your point of view using appropriate dance terminology</td>
<td>Attendance, Participation &amp; Professionalism; HW Assignments; Reflections; Performance Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflect upon your experiences throughout your creative process and apply your findings to your work</td>
<td>Attendance, Participation &amp; Professionalism; HW Assignments; Reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate growth in your artistry – your ability to create and communicate through movement – since the start of the semester and explain how your artistry has evolved</td>
<td>Attendance, Participation &amp; Professionalism; HW Assignments; Final Composition &amp; Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply knowledge gained from class to movement experiences outside of the dance studio (and vice versa)</td>
<td>HW Assignments; Performance Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Categories (% of Final Grade)

1. Attendance, Participation & Professionalism  45%
2. HW Assignments 15%
3. Midterm Composition & Reflection 10%
4. Winterdance Attendance & Response 10%
5. Final Composition & Reflection 20%

**Total:** 100%

### Grading Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94 – 100</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>74 – 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90 – 93</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70 – 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87 – 89</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>67 – 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84 – 86</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>64 – 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80 – 83</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>60 – 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77 – 79</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0 – 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Attendance, Participation & Professionalism (45%)

A maximum of 45 points are earned in this category based on your attendance, participation and professionalism. Some policies in this category are dictated by the Dance Department, while others are specific to our course.

✧ Attendance Policy

In this class, you learn by *doing*; you learn primarily through your movement experiences in the studio. **Therefore, attendance is essential in this course.** Only through consistent practice can you integrate new conceptual and physical material into a learning process that leads to the development of new choreographic and performance skills. Neither you nor I can assess your progress or your understanding of course material if you are not present to physically and verbally demonstrate your knowledge. Absences in our movement course based extensively on experiential learning in the studio cannot be made up with assignments outside of the studio. **It is your responsibility to get notes and assignments from classmates for any classes that you miss and to complete all missed assignments ASAP.** Work in our class is cumulative. We will be building upon concepts from class to class in a purposeful sequence, and you will miss out on important learning experiences if you do not complete assignments.

- **Absences:** Missing class due to being sick (with or without a doctor’s note), a job interview, sleeping late, a transportation issue, or out of town travel, for example, will count as an absence and will result in a reduction in your participation grade. I encourage you to bring in a doctor’s note for absences. Meetings with your advisor, coach, or other professors should not be scheduled during our class time.

  - Each absence earns a deduction of 1 point.
  - Your final grade will be lowered 1/3 letter grade for each absence beyond 2. (e.g., If you have earned an A and are absent 3 times, your final grade drops to a A-.)
  - If you miss 4 classes, you must withdraw from the course. Otherwise, you will earn an F. Exceptions may be made in the cases of well-documented emergencies.

If you anticipate class conflicts or expect to arrive late or leave early, please let me know in advance.

If you are absent on a day when you are scheduled to perform a movement assignment, you are expected to perform your movement the next time that you are in class. Otherwise, your assignment will be late and you will earn an incomplete (equaling a 0). Exceptions will be made in cases of well-documented emergencies or if you make arrangements with me at least 48hrs in advance.

- **Late Enrollment:** If you miss 1 or more of our first few classes due to late enrollment, you are required to complete make up assignments for your absences. Contact me as soon as you register for the course.

- **Athletes & Students Participating in BSU Supported Events and/or Travel:** If you are a student athlete and anticipate class conflicts, you are expected to 1) provide me with
both a printed letter from the athletic department and a printed game schedule
highlighting class conflicts and 2) meet with me outside of class to discuss ways in which
you can make up what you have missed. Documentation from an appropriate BSU
contact is needed from students who have to miss class due to BSU supported events
and/or travel (e.g., dance club competitions, conference presentations). If you expect
excessive absences, let me know ASAP in order to discuss the advisability of continuing
in our class.

- **Class Cancellations:** If I have to cancel class, I will notify BSU and will email you all in
  advance. Please make a habit of checking your BSU email prior to leaving for our class.

◊ **Participation**

Refer to the table on p. 7 to see how your participation and professionalism will be assessed.
Additional information regarding your participations is as follows:

- **Punctuality:** Tardiness is arriving after 9:30am. Each late arrival will earn a deduction
  of 0.25 to 0.5 points. If you are late, it is your responsibility to check with me at the end
  of class to ensure that your attendance is recorded. **The 3rd time that you arrive late equals 1 absence.**
  Attendance policies apply.

- **Leaving Class Early:** Leaving early earns a reduction in your participation grade by 0.25
  points. If you leave more than 15 minutes before the class is over, you will be considered
  absent from the class. Attendance policies apply.

- **Observations:** Your 2nd observation will count as 1 absence. If you sit out during
class, you must be an active observer, take notes in your Choreographer’s Notebook (not
electronically) and contribute to class discussions. **No more than 4 observations are allowed within a single semester.**

- **Injuries:** If you cannot participate in 3 consecutive classes because of injury or illness,
  let me know ASAP in order to discuss the advisability of continuing in our class. **Any student with a physical limitation should meet with me to discuss appropriate movement modifications for assignments.**

- **Choreographer’s Notebook:** You are required to bring a notebook to every class that
  will serve as a tool for you to reflect upon your work, to record and complete assignments
  and to serve as a reference for your reflection papers and online journal entries. It can
  include discoveries made during movement exercises, feedback on your work, questions
  that arise, thoughts to keep in mind for future assignments, etc. It is helpful to record
  information during and after class when the ideas and experiences are fresh in your body
  and mind. **Put the class date on the top of each page,** because you may be asked to
  refer to specific dates when completing your online and Reflection assignments.

- **Quizzes:** Quizzes may be completed in-person or online to demonstrate your
  understanding of information learned in this course.
• **Practice the Law of Adaptation.** When I provide feedback to your classmates, it is beneficial for you to listen and think of ways that you can apply the feedback to your choreography and performance. Although I may not be speaking to you directly, being proactive about discovering ways to apply the information to your work can greatly improve your work.

◇ **Professionalism**

Proper dance class and performance etiquette is expected in this course. Whether you are new to dance, new to my teaching and classroom environment, or have previously taken dance classes at BSU or elsewhere, the following information ensures that we are all on the same page moving forward with regards to the policies and expectations for this course. Refer to the table on p. 7 to see how your participation and professionalism will be assessed.

• **Adherence to Dress and Studio Policies**

  • Arrive dressed appropriately for a dance class. Wear comfortable, form fitting dance/exercise clothing that allows freedom of movement and is not distracting. (e.g., If you have to fix your shirt every time that you roll up to stand, you should not wear that shirt to class.) Jeans, khakis, extra long pants, extra baggy clothes, and hats with brims are not acceptable. Exceptions must be approved by me in advance. Dressing in layers is encouraged, especially as the weather gets cooler. Wear pants (or shorts) that cover your thighs and knees, as we will be performing movement on the floor.

  • Shoes are not required in this course. You may dance with bare feet or wear socks or appropriate dance shoes. If I observe that your socks or shoes inhibit your movement in any way (i.e., prevent you from fully performing) or are unsafe/slippery, I will require you to dance with bare feet. Footwear should not be distracting or unsafe.

  • Hair should be tied back and secured away from your face. Your *focus* – the action of your eyes along with your face – is an important component of your performance that we need to see.

  • Bulky, dangling and expensive jewelry should be removed for safety reasons and to prevent any damage to your accessories.

  • Gum, food and drinks (with the exception of water) are not permitted in the studio.

  • Street shoes must be removed *before* entering the studio and placed in the cubbies along with your other belongings. Let’s work together to keep our studio clean!

  • **Use of electronic devices:** For some in-class exercises, I will invite you to use cell phones or other devices to record your choreography. Please be respectful of our class time and use your devices for class purposes only.
Otherwise, cell phones, iPads, laptops, or any other electronic devices are not permitted in class. Cell phones should be silenced and placed in your bags to minimize distractions and to demonstrate your focus and readiness learn.

- **Respectful Communication & Behavior (in Person & Online)**
  - **Verbal and non-verbal:** In such a highly collaborative creative and performance environment, lack of respect and a negative attitude towards yourself and others through words or actions greatly affect all members of the class. Let’s all work together to make this a positive, supportive learning environment where respect for oneself and others is demonstrated through our words, body language, and overall behavior. This is incredibly important, as most of the in-class assignments require giving and receiving peer feedback. In addition, positive body language and non-verbal communication is expected whether you are performing choreography, listening while others are speaking, and watching others perform. Continually speaking to a classmate during our warm up exercises or while someone else is talking or performing, for example, demonstrates lack of professionalism.

- **Email:** Thank you in advance for adhering to the following email guidelines. Doing so is helpful for me as I learn which students are in which class and will ensure a prompt, purposeful response from my end. In addition, these guidelines serve to cultivate professional, respectful email etiquette, as **one-line emails and blank emails with a file attached are not acceptable forms of communication in this course.**
  - Include a meaningful subject line (e.g., Question about Video Assignment 2)
  - Use an appropriate greeting (e.g., Dear Professor Kuhn) and salutation. Sign your name to your email, followed by “Creative Dance” so that I know you are in this class.
  - State the purpose of your email.

The table on the next page displays the ways in which your participation and professionalism will be assessed as part of your final grade.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism &amp; Participation Rubric (45pts)</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>You demonstrate your readiness to learn by:</strong></td>
<td>6pts</td>
<td>4-5pts</td>
<td>3pts</td>
<td>1-2pts</td>
<td>0pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- arriving with journal/notebook and course handouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adhering to dress and studio policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- maintaining focus for the duration of class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You contribute to the creation of a positive learning community by:</strong></td>
<td>13pts</td>
<td>9-12pts</td>
<td>5-8pts</td>
<td>1-4pts</td>
<td>0pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- showing respect for others in class through words, attitude, and actions (e.g., body language)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- demonstrating effort and the willingness to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- demonstrating professional online communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You participate in small and large group discussions and collaborative movement activities by:</strong></td>
<td>13pts</td>
<td>9-12pts</td>
<td>5-8pts</td>
<td>1-4pts</td>
<td>0pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- contributing your ideas to choreographic assignments and performing your work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- answering questions posed in class and offering your point of view as an informed audience member with appropriate dance terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- providing constructive feedback to classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You actively contribute to your learning process in class by:</strong></td>
<td>13pts</td>
<td>9-12pts</td>
<td>5-8pts</td>
<td>1-4pts</td>
<td>0pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- demonstrating your understanding of the basic elements of dance composition in movement activities and on quizzes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- being open to receiving and integrating feedback from your classmates and professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- utilizing class time to work on class assignments (even without being prompted to do so)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- demonstrating an openness to explore and choreograph new ways of moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- asking questions if clarification is needed on assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. HW Assignments (15%)

Points in this assessment category are based on your completion of online journal entries, movement assignments and video viewing assignments. Assignments are bundled into weekly folders that can be found by clicking on the “Weekly Assignments” link in Blackboard. Due dates can also be found on the Semester Overview document but be sure to check Blackboard for any schedule changes. Work in our class is cumulative. Therefore, it is important to complete all assignments fully and on time.

These assignments are assessed on a Pass/Fail basis (i.e, credit or no credit). If you meet all of the requirements, you will earn full credit (noted as 1 on Blackboard). If you miss any of the requirements, you will not earn credit (noted as 0 on Blackboard). Partial credit will not be given. You will have the opportunity to revise 1 of these assignments over the course of the semester if you do not fully complete an assignment OR to earn credit for 1 assignment that is submitted late. I will discuss with individual students as needed.

✧ Online Journal Entries (due Tuesdays, by 9:30am, via Blackboard)

These assignments will allow you to summarize and reflect upon course content, your creative process and in-class experiences, and to address prompts related to your views on dance and choreography. Your Choreographer’s Notebook will be helpful for completing these online journal assignments.

✧ Movement Assignments (due Tuesdays, by 9:30am, in class or online)

These choreographic assignments will allow you to physicalize course content and demonstrate your embodied knowledge and understanding of movement concepts. Most of these assignments will be performed live in class. Some will be recorded so that I can view and assess them after class. (These recording are for my eyes only and will not be shared with anyone else.) For some of these assignments, you may be asked to upload a video of your choreography and to share it with me online.

✧ Video Viewing Assignments (due Thursdays, by 9:30am, via Blackboard)

These assignments will enable you to apply course content to online dance videos and a variety of dance genres. You will also be asked to watch and assess your own choreography.

3. Midterm Composition & Reflection (10%)

You will create a solo composition and perform it live in class on either Tues. Oct. 22 or Thurs. Oct. 24. You will also write and submit a Midterm Reflection paper on Thurs. Oct. 24. Assignment details will be provided in early October. Individual student meetings may be scheduled for the weeks of Oct. 28 and Nov. 4 to discuss your Midterm Composition and Reflection.
4. Performance Attendance & Written Response (10%)

You are required to attend Winterdance, the Dance Department’s annual Fall dance concert at BSU, and write a response paper. Place the dates in your calendar now. (You only have to attend 1 of the 3 performances.) Assignment details will be provided closer to the performance.

Winterdance
Fri. Dec. 6 & Sat. Dec. 7 at 7:30pm, Sun. Dec. 8 at 2pm
Location: Rondileau Campus Center Theater
Tickets: check online for current prices, as they might have changed
   Online www.bsutix.com $8 for BSU students w/ ID, seniors, military
   $10 for general public
   Plus a service fee
   At the door Tickets are more expensive. Only cash and checks accepted.

Performance Response due: Thurs. Dec. 12 (Blackboard)

If you are unable to attend this performance, it is your responsibility to search for a live dance performance in the area and find a substitute. You must email me a link to information about the substitute performance, and I will let you know whether or not the performance is suitable for this assignment.

5. Final Composition & Reflection (20%)

You will create a solo composition and perform it live during our final exam time slot on Thurs. Dec. 19, 8-10am. You will also submit a Final Reflection paper due Thurs. Dec. 19 (Blackboard). Assignment details will be provided in November.

Additional Course Information

- **Writing Assignments**: Reflections and Performance Responses should follow the writing guidelines for this course unless otherwise noted. See your “Writing Guidelines” handout.

- **Late Writing Assignments**: I will accept late Reflections and Performance Responses up to 48 hours after the due date. Your grade for a late assignment will be reduced 15% for each day that it is late. Assignments submitted after 48 hours will earn a zero. Exceptions will be made in cases of well-documented emergencies or if you make arrangements with me in advance (at least 48 hours before the due date).
Fall 2019 Semester Overview

Students are expected to complete all assignments on time and before coming to class. Assignment details are posted on Blackboard. Click on the “Weekly Assignments” link and the folder for the specific week (e.g., Week 2) to see the details of the assignments that are due.

Weekly assignments are due on the following days:

**Tuesdays, 9:30am:**  
Journal assignments  
submitted and assessed via Blackboard

Movement assignments  
performed and assessed in class  
Some may be submitted and assessed online.

**Thursdays, by 9:30am:**  
Video assignments  
submitted and assessed via Blackboard

Our schedule will most likely change to facilitate your learning. Updates to our schedule will be mentioned in class and posted on Blackboard. See Blackboard for the current topics and assignments.

**Week 1: WELCOME!**

Thurs. 9/5  
Introduction to course and one another

**Week 2: BODY**

Tues. 9/10  
Week 2 Reflection due (Blackboard), Movement Assignment 1 due  
No Journal

Thurs. 9/12  
No Video Assignment

**Week 3: SPACE**

Tues. 9/17  
Journal 1 due, Movement Assignment 2 due

Thurs. 9/19  
Video Assignment 1 due

**Week 4: SPACE**

Tues. 9/24  
Journal 2 due, Movement Assignment 3 due

Thurs. 9/26  
Video Assignment 2 due  
Guest Artist Event: Joy Davis, 7pm
Week 5: CRITICAL RESPONSE PROCESS

Tues. 10/1  Journal 3 due, Movement Assignment 4 due
            Class cancelled today

Thurs. 10/3  No Video Assignment

Week 6: TIME

Tues. 10/8  Journal 4 due, Movement Assignment 5 due

Thurs. 10/10  Video Assignment 3 due

Week 7: CHOREOGRAPH MIDTERM COMPOSITIONS

Tues. 10/15  Journal 5 due, Movement Assignment 6 due

Thurs. 10/17  No Video Assignment due

Week 8: PERFORM MIDTERM COMPOSITIONS

Tues. 10/22  Midterm Performances
            No Journal due

Thurs. 10/24  Midterm Performances; Midterm Reflection due (Blackboard)
            No Video Assignment due

Week 9: SMALL GROUP CHOREOGRAPHY, MIDTERM MEETINGS

Tues. 10/29  Journal 6 due,
            No Movement Assignment due. Review your midterm choreography.

Thurs. 10/31  No Video Assignment due

Week 10: SMALL GROUP CHOREOGRAPHY, STYLE & OPPOSITE, MIDTERM MEETINGS

Tues. 11/5  Journal 7 due

Thurs. 11/7  Movement Assignment 7 due, No Video Assignment due
Week 11: ALL ABOUT ME, MOVEMENT MANIPULATIONS

- Tues. 11/12  Journal 8 due, Movement Assignment 8 due
- Thurs. 11/14  Class will not meet today in exchange for your time at Winterdance

Week 12: GROUP WORK, EFFORTS

- Tues. 11/19  No Journal due
- No Movement Assignment due. Review your duet/trio choreography
- Thurs. 11/21  Video Assignment 4 due

Week 13: TBD

- Tues. 11/26  Journal 9 due, Movement Assignment 9 due
  Read over your Final Composition & Reflection assignment. Come to class with any questions.
- Thurs. 11/28  No class – Happy Thanksgiving

Week 14: CHOREOGRAPH FINAL COMPOSITION; PEER FEEDBACK

- Tues. 12/3  Journal 10 due, Movement Assignment 10 due
- Thurs. 12/5  Video Assignment 5 due
- Fri. 12/6  Winterdance Performance, 7:30pm
- Sat. 12/7  Winterdance Performance, 7:30pm
- Sun. 12/8  Winterdance Performance, 2:00pm

Week 15: CHOREOGRAPH FINAL COMPOSITION; PEER FEEDBACK

- Mon. 12/9  Breanna Holmes Honors Thesis Concert, 6pm
- Tues. 12/10  Our last class: Journal 11 due, Movement Assignment 11 due
- Thurs. 12/12  Winterdance response due (Blackboard)

Finals Week: PERFORM FINAL COMPOSITIONS

- Thurs. 12/19  Performance of Final Composition
  8-10am  Final Reflection due (Blackboard)
## Appendix B

The Taxonomy Table (Anderson et al., 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. REMEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. META-COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Information about My Research
Understanding the Impact of Teaching Strategies on the Learning Experiences of Undergraduates Enrolled in a General Education Choreography Course: An Action Research Study

As part of my doctoral work at Lesley University, I am completing an action research study to investigate how my teaching influences your learning experiences and work created in our class. The main goal of this study is to improve my teaching effectiveness and the learning experiences of future Creative Dance students. In order to do so, I am asking you to voluntarily participate by allowing me to use your Reflections and Journal entries as part of my research, in addition to the notes that I make while observing your performances (live and on video). These would be part of my data along with my class plans and assignment prompts and our syllabus. I would look at what you wrote in your Reflections and Journals to investigate questions such as: How does student writing and choreography inform my teaching? How do they affirm my teaching practices? How do they demonstrate the need for changes in my teaching practices? What can I do next semester to better guide student learning throughout the dance-making process?

I will compare my notes (e.g., class plans, assignment prompts, observations of your performances) with what you write about in your Reflections and Journals. When I write up my findings, I may use some direct quotes from your writing but use another name so that your identity is confidential. You can choose the name that you’d like me to use!

To participate, you do not have to submit additional work beyond what is already required in this course. The only addition is to read, check, and sign the consent form on the next page. Your participation is not a requirement for our course, and your decision will have no bearing on any grades that you earn in Creative Dance. I will not know who volunteers to participate until after final grades are in, and a colleague of mine will collect and hold all consent forms until after final grades for our class have been submitted. If you initially decide to participate and then change your mind, you can email me at any point after December 20, 2019 to let me know that you no longer want to participate. I will remove your writing and my notes about your work from my research materials/data.

While this research has no direct benefit to you, you might appreciate that your words and experiences are of great value to me, your professor, and will make a positive contribution to dance education research, my teaching and research, and the learning experiences of future Creative Dance students.

My doctoral committee, composed of 3 professors, will initially read and provide feedback on this study. Findings from this study will be used for my dissertation, which will be presented publicly at Lesley University, and may be incorporated in presentations at conferences for educational purposes in the field of dance in higher education. I will gladly send you the final document, if you’d like!

Please read and sign your name on the next page to let me know if you’d like to participate.

Thank you for considering!

There is a Standing Committee for Human Subjects in Research at both Lesley University and Bridgewater State University (BSU) to which complaints or problems concerning any research project may, and should, be reported if they arise. Contact Lesley University’s Committee Chairpersons at irb@lesley.edu or BSU’s IRB Administrator at (508) 531-1242.
I hereby give, as specified below, my consent to use my writing submitted as Reflections and Journal assignments and Professor Kuhn Donnelly’s observations of my live and recorded work in DANC 255 Creative Dance for Professor Kuhn Donnelly’s research. I understand that my participation will assist with the refinement of Professor Kuhn Donnelly’s teaching of this course in future semesters and will be used as findings for her dissertation, which may be included in a paper or presentation at conferences for educational purposes in the field of dance in higher education. I understand that my information will be kept private and confidential and that I may withdraw my participation by emailing Professor Kuhn Donnelly any time after December 20, 2019. I understand that my choice to voluntarily participate will have no bearing whatsoever on any of my grades earned in DANC 255, and Professor Kuhn Donnelly will not know who is participating until after final grades have been submitted.

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOXE(S) AND SIGN BELOW

☐ I agree to have the writing in my Reflection and Journal assignments and Professor Kuhn Donnelly’s observations of my live and recorded work available for Professor Kuhn Donnelly’s study.

☐ I do not want the writing in my Reflection and Journal assignments or Professor Kuhn Donnelly’s observations of my live and recorded work used in Professor Kuhn Donnelly’s study.

☐ I am interested, but I would like more information before I commit to participate.

☐ I would like to read the study when completed. Please contact me with the information via the email below.

Name of Student (please print) ___________________________ Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Email ___________________________

If participating, is there a first name that you’d like me to use since your information will be confidential?

______________________________

Name of Teacher/Researcher: (please print) ___________________________ Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Kristy Kuhn Donnelly
Part-time Faculty, Dance Department, Bridgewater State University
k5donnelly@bridgew.edu
Advisor: Dr. Vivien Marcow Speiser

There is a Standing Committee for Human Subjects in Research at both Lesley University and Bridgewater State University (BSU) to which complaints or problems concerning any research project may, and should, be reported if they arise. Contact Lesley University’s Committee Chairpersons at irb@lesley.edu or BSU’s IRB Administrator at (508) 531-1242.
# Midterm Composition Rubric Fall 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Strong No</th>
<th>Strong Yes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Theme
- Thematic intention was clear (Written reflection supports this.) | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
## Space
- Levels: Demonstrated a clear use of all 3 levels | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Facings: Incorporated different facings | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Focus: Maintained clear, purposeful focus | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Stationary/Traveling: Incorporated axial and locomotor | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Reach: Utilized near, mid and far reach as it applies to theme | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
## Time
- Duration: 45-60 seconds of movement material | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Tempo: Demonstrated a distinct difference between fast and slow | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Stillness: Incorporated stillness | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
## Effort & Creativity
- Effort: Demonstrated effort put into assignment | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Creativity: Demonstrated creative movement | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Codified/sports movements manipulated | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
## Confident Non-Verbal Communication
- Demonstrated confident body language during entrance and exit | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- performed choreography with confidence | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- bow: completely, confidently, without rushing | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
## Consistency
- Demonstrated set choreography that was consistent for the 2 performances | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
## Music

## Clothing/Costume
- Appropriate for theme | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
- Appropriate for movement | 0 1 2 3 4 5 | |
### Appendix E

**Final Composition Rubric Fall 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Strong No</th>
<th>Strong Yes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thematic intention was clear (Written reflection supports this.)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facings: Incorporated different facings</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus: Maintained clear, purposeful focus</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels: Demonstrated clear use of 3 levels</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stationary/Traveling: Incorporated axial and locomotor</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Duration: 75-90 seconds of movement</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tempo: Demonstrated a distinct difference between fast and slow</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stillness: Incorporated stillness</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort &amp; Qualities</strong></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporated efforts and/or qualities appropriate for theme (Written reflection supports this.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manipulations</strong></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least 2 (other than staging, levels, tempo, lateral inversion) (Written reflection supports this.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production Elements</strong></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instrumental music/score appropriate for theme (Written reflection supports this.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clothing relates to theme (Written reflection supports this.)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expansion of Artistry</strong></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exhibit growth beyond previous comps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effort and creativity demonstrated in choreography</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal use of codified, sports, literal movements</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confident Non-Verbal Communication</strong></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated confident body language during entrance and exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• performed choreography confidently</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• bow completely, confidently, without rushing</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Effort here refers to the four motion factors categorized by Rudolf Laban and used to describe how humans move: space, time, weight, and flow (Moore, 2014).*
Appendix F

Subarea One: Organizational Categories and Priori Codes for Student and Teacher Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Categories</th>
<th>Associated Priori Codes (Anderson et al., 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Anderson et al., 2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
<td>Knowledge of: terminology, specific details and elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Knowledge of: classifications and categories; principles and generalizations; theories, models, and structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Knowledge of: subject-specific skills and algorithms; subject-specific techniques and methods; criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>Strategic knowledge; Knowledge about cognitive tasks, including appropriate contextual and conditional knowledge; Self-knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Knowledge Types</td>
<td>(revealed in student data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Self-Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(revealed in student data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Categories</td>
<td>Associated Cognitive Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Anderson et al., 2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 REMEMBER</td>
<td>recognizing, recalling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 UNDERSTAND</td>
<td>interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 APPLY</td>
<td>executing, implementing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 ANALYZE</td>
<td>differentiating, organizing, attributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 EVALUATE</td>
<td>checking, critiquing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 CREATE</td>
<td>generating, planning, producing, choreographing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G

**Subarea One: Creative Dance Taxonomy Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 REMEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. META-COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. AFFECTIVE SELF-KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This table is a revision of Anderson et al.'s (2001) Taxonomy Table specifically adapted for Creative Dance.
### Appendix H

**Subarea One: Example of Per Prompt Analysis of Students’ Final Reflections Using Organizational Categories and Priori Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Student Data: Prompt 4</th>
<th>Organizational Categories and Priori Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Becca| I think what went well with my performance was my confidence level, and different motif’s I used for my choreography. I really focused in on that, and I think it made my performance go well. I think what could’ve been better with my performance was the speed. Although I felt comfortable, I still am nervous in the back of my head so I tend to do my movements faster than I would if I was doing the routine on my own. My performance could have been improved by me taking my time and not rushing the performance. My choreography could have been improved by using change in tempo. I really struggle with that, and I did not incorporate it like I could have. Constructive feedback I gave myself was, again, that I should not have rushed it so much. Also, that I could incorporated more things into my dance. Even though I met the requirements, I still felt like I could have added a little bit more. My classmates gave me some feedback when we performed last week, and Demi and Angela told me I should incorporate more abstract movements. Therefore, I fixed my dance after that class to make it better. Based on what I learned in class from experience, observing, and analyzing, action I took to improve my performance was focusing on how I was dancing, and practicing more and more to make my performance stronger. I also, performed in front of my roommates and some friends to help with my confidence. I integrated their feedback by taking what they said and changing my routine a little bit. I knew what they were saying was going to help improve my dance, so I made sure I added more abstract movements. They also told me to add more to the teenage stage in my routine, so I did that as well. My themes/ideas evolved over the time spent in class. In the beginning, I stuck with basic easy themes that can generate easy dance moves. However, | REM/recalling experience throughout  
UND/explaining  
Affective self-knowledge,  
(Experiential Knowledge)  
REM/recalling  
Metacog Self-knowledge  
Implies REM/recalling  
Metacognitive strategic knowledge  
UND/summarizing  
Metacognitive Self-Knowledge  
(UND/comparing experiences) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Student Data: Prompt 4</th>
<th>Organizational Categories and Priori Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stacy| as time went on, I pushed myself and stepped out of my comfort zone. I had more abstract ideas and themes. This was all extremely helpful to my learning and growth because I came up with ideas and movements that I never thought I would be able to do before. I felt my creativity expand greatly I think what went well with my performance was that I wasn’t as nervous, and I had fun and I remembered all my choreography. The timing of my dance could have been better and improved by spending more time practicing. I would give myself feedback along the lines of don’t look down, look forward and/or at the audience as well as hit my cheer motions sharper to show I am a cheerleader and messier at the football player parts. My peers told me to help show the difference… | REM/recalling experience  
Implies REM/recalling Metacognitive strategic knowledge |
### Appendix I

**Subarea One: Creative Dance Taxonomy Table - Cognitive Processes and Knowledge Types Found in Student Data**
*(Final Reflection Prompt 4)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 REMEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 UNDERSTAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0 APPLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 ANALYZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0 EVALUATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0 CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td><strong>Recalling</strong> dance terminology used in choreography (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exemplifying</strong> dance terminology in choreography (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td><strong>Translating</strong> thematic ideas and resources into movement (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exemplifying</strong> choreographic concepts in choreography (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizing</strong> movement into an overall structure for the dance (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Critiquing</strong> choreography and performance based on self-imposed and external criteria (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning</strong> an overall structure for the dance (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. META-COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td><strong>Recalling Self-Knowledge:</strong> movement tendencies, movements to expand creative potential, thought processes, goal motivation, value beliefs, and/or learning challenges (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</td>
<td>1.0 REMEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. META-COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE, cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recalling Strategic Knowledge:</strong> acknowledging clear steps they could take to improve their performance and/or choreography (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recalling</strong> reflective observations of their creative process and/or performance that signify a shift in their experience and/or their perception of their experience (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. AFFECTIVE SELF-KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recalling</strong> feelings and emotions that connect to other aspects of their performance and/or beyond this singular experience (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recalling</strong> aspects of their choreographic and/or performance experience (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. This table is a revision of Anderson et al.’s (2001) Taxonomy Table specifically adapted for Creative Dance.*
Appendix J

Subarea One: Student Data Examples – Cognitive Processes and Knowledge Types Revealed in Final Reflection Prompt 4

Table I1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 REMEMBER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE**

**Recalling** dance terminology used in choreography

The efforts that I focused on were time effort and flow effort. I tried to make my movements include both sustained and quick time effort. For flow effort I wanted my movements to be free and not bound to represent a happy feeling on new year’s. (Mary)

**D. META-COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE**

**Recalling Self-Knowledge:** movement tendencies, movements to expand creative potential, thought processes, goal motivation, value beliefs, and/or learning challenges

In my opposite composition I wanted to incorporate more high level movements with jumps and kicks but with a unique twist, I am also more comfortable with my slow movement sequences so speeding up parts of my choreography and playing with the tempos was another way to incorporate something opposite to my usual choreography. Some things were also jazz-like and stiff when I prefer to be more fluid. (Emily)

**Recalling Strategic Knowledge:** acknowledging clear steps they took/could take to improve their performance and/or choreography

To try and improve my choreography I looked at the vocabulary handout sheets and looked at the definitions and thought of a way that I could change a movement by using the definition. I also tried improving my movements by doing them out when I thought of it and recorded myself doing it, so I didn’t forget it, once I practiced it I changed it in my dance to see if I liked it. I added feedback into my dances that were given to me if I thought they worked well in my sequence, I would try it out with the music and a few movements before and after to see if it flowed, if it did, I added it to improve my sequence. (Catherine)

**E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE**

**Recalling** reflective observations of their creative process and/or performance that signify a shift in their experience and/or their perception of their experience

The more I worked with the choreography, the more confident I got in it and the better my performance quality became. (Leanne)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. AFFECTIVE SELF-KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 REMEMBER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recalling</strong> feelings and emotions that connect to other aspects of their performance and/or beyond this singular experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although I felt comfortable, I still am nervous in the back of my head so I tend to do my movements faster than I would if I was doing the routine on my own. My performance could have been improved by me taking my time and not rushing the performance. (Becca)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recalling</strong> aspects of their choreographic and/or performance experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(This recollection is the foundation for all of the students’ written statements but does not reflect higher levels of thinking.) As I was performing for my classmates, I felt confident in the material I created because it was and the Pats are amazing and no gender or race or anything is needed to understand the dynasty the NE Patriots has created. I noticed my performance was fun and different than what I've done before. I noticed the confidence I had when I performed. I noticed my choreography had an equal amount of literal and abstract movements. (Stacy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I2

Student Data Examples: Cognitive Process 2.0 Understand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0 UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplifying</strong> dance terminology in choreography</td>
<td>From the time handout, I used slow, moderate and fast tempo, as well as stillness in my composition…I did the movement really fast, and then in slow motion to show the difference in tempo. The fast movement represented the stress of daily life and when it slowed down, it is meant to represent the stress draining from my body. Towards the end, I used a moment of stillness while laying on my back and looking up. This was meant to represent the action of laying on the beach and stargazing. (Nicole)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translating</strong> thematic ideas and resources into movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplifying</strong> choreographic concepts in choreography</td>
<td>For the concept of Body, I used more curvilinear movements than angular ones to go along with the feeling that Lacie feels more free, not only in the way she moves, but in the way she expresses herself, which goes along with the theme of breaking away from society’s abstracted chains…For the concept of Shape, I used the element of advancing to clearly show the protagonist’s motivation towards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I3

Student Data Examples: Cognitive Process 4.0 Analyze

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE, cont.</td>
<td>2.0 UNDERSTAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>Summarizing/Explaining reflective observations of their performance that signify a shift in their performance experience. As I performed, I was thinking about how I was dancing, which I never did before. I was thinking about each effort and the motif’s I was using throughout my dance. I was thinking less about what movements I was doing, and more about how I was doing them. I noticed that I was much more confident in my performance. I always get a little nervous right before I perform, but once I started, I felt completely comfortable. I also noticed that my choreography was so different than what I am used to, but I really enjoyed it. I had more fun with the abstract movements, then when I was doing literal movements before. (Becca) I noticed that my choreography felt a lot different than what I normally do because I changed a lot to show that I can do other types of movements and not just my go to movements that I feel comfortable doing. I noticed that it felt like it was a short dance, but it is actually a minute and a half and I think it feels like this because I actually enjoy doing it. (Catherine)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>4.0 ANALYZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing movement into an overall structure for the dance</td>
<td>My movements were sequenced in chunks rather than one movement after another. The chunks of movements alternated between low level and middle level, signifying the challenges and overcoming them. I choreographed the dance in chunks and decided to put them in the order that I did due to the way it fit with the music that I chose and the intensity that the movements showed. I had the more intense movements come in as the dance continued, showing that after each challenge that is overcome, it becomes easier to overcome them because I had become stronger… In order to improve my choreography, I moved a few of the chunks of movements to different points in the dance, allowing for more impact to relate to my theme… (Leanne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>Organizing movement into an overall structure for the dance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I4

*Student Data Examples: Cognitive Process 5.0 Evaluate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.0 EVALUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td>Critiquing choreography and performance based on self-imposed and external criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What went well is that I remembered all of my choreography, which I was worried about. I also feel really good about my performance. What went well about my choreography is that I feel I represented my theme well in my movements. I feel that my solo was easier to understand than my midterm performance. What could have been better is my acting or the emotions that show on my face. Usually, it takes me a few weeks to be able to do so. Although this was a performance, it does not feel the same as an on-stage performance. I feel that I could have been more committed to my emotions. The constructive feedback I gave myself is that I felt that I could have done a better job at moving at a fast tempo. It is something I struggle with, but I will continue to work on it on my own as I choreograph pieces for myself and for my students. (Nicole)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td>Critiquing choreography and performance by knowledge gained via doing, reflecting, analyzing, and modifying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I5

*Student Data Examples: Cognitive Process 6.0 Create*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.0 CREATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td>Planning an overall structure for the dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I basically tried to do from the beginning of a relationship, which is when everything is beautiful and perfect, middle which is when someone does something bad but the other still forgives, and end which is when the one that always forgives puts an ending on it (Jussara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I formulated my sequence of movements by knowing how much time from each song I was going to use. Once I settled on 1:10 for “Breathe In Air” and 20 seconds for “Eclipse” I knew I wanted three behaviors throughout my piece: the beginning which had much more focus on the ground which helped develop my opening movements and where my arms...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</td>
<td>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 CREATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE, cont.</td>
<td>went; the middle where I had slightly more movements where my focus shifted up but not completely, this helped me to develop movements that every as I’d move, could show more focus to the ‘light; and the end comprised of all focus up and an overall happy more fluid set of movements that still had speed but allowed for more repetition in welcoming the light in with my arms and smile. (Emily)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Subarea One: Classification of Revised Student Learning Outcomes Fall 2019

Below are the original and revised Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for Fall 2019. The next page displays the classification of revised SLOs in the Creative Dance Taxonomy Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Revised Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After successfully completing this course, students should be able to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. understand and apply the basic elements of dance composition to the creation and performance of unique individual and collaborative dance studies</td>
<td>1. demonstrate your understanding of choreographic concepts through words and movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. analyze and evaluate pieces of choreography and explain your point of view using appropriate dance terminology</td>
<td>2. use choreographic concepts to create and perform unique individual and collaborative dance studies with a clear thematic intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. reflect upon your experiences throughout your creative process and apply your findings to your work</td>
<td>3. analyze pieces of choreography to find interrelationships between the movement, choreographic concepts, and thematic intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. demonstrate growth in your artistry – your ability to create and communicate through movement – since the start of the semester and explain how your artistry has evolved</td>
<td>4. evaluate pieces of choreography as a means of refining the work based on externally imposed and self-imposed movement criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. apply knowledge gained from class to movement experiences outside of the dance studio (and vice versa)</td>
<td>5. implement cycles of reflection – experience, reflect, analyze, modify, repeat – throughout your learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. demonstrate growth in your performance and choreographic abilities and an understanding of how your abilities have evolved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table J1

Creative Dance Taxonomy Table - Revised Student Learning Outcomes Fall 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>1. REMEMBER</th>
<th>2. UNDERSTAND</th>
<th>3. APPLY</th>
<th>4. ANALYZE</th>
<th>5. EVALUATE</th>
<th>6. CREATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recalling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dance terminology (SLO1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exemplifying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choreographic concepts (SLO1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Translating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thematic ideas and choreographic concepts into movement (SLO2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Differentiating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant aspects of the dance and Finding Coherence between thematic ideas, movement, and choreographic concepts (SLO3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Critiquing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choreography and performance based on externally imposed and self-imposed criteria (SLO4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Producing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a dance based on conceptual knowledge (SLO2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Implementing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycles of reflection in learning process (SLO5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. META-COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE (self-knowledge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Comparing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one’s choreographic and performance abilities over the course of the semester (SLO6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Comparing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one’s choreographic and performance abilities over the course of the semester (SLO6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. AFFECTIVE SELF-KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Producing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a dance based on experiential knowledge (SLO5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table is a revision of Anderson et al.’s (2001) Taxonomy Table specifically adapted for Creative Dance
Appendix L

Subarea One: Creative Dance Taxonomy Table - Cognitive Processes and Knowledge Types
Intended in Final Reflection Prompt 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE KNOWLEDGE DIMENSION</th>
<th>THE COGNITIVE PROCESS DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 REMEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalling</td>
<td>Exemplifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dance terminology used in choreography</td>
<td>dance terminology in choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thematic ideas and resources into movement</td>
<td>movement into an overall structure for the dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplifying</td>
<td>Selecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choreographic concepts in choreography</td>
<td>aspects of their choreographic and/or performance experience that stand out as relevant for critiquing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. META-COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE (Self-Knowledge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalling Self-Knowledge:</td>
<td>Explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movement tendencies, movements to expand creative potential</td>
<td>choreographic choices based on movement tendencies and moving beyond these tendencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table is a revision of Anderson et al.’s (2001) Taxonomy Table specifically adapted for Creative Dance.
## Subarea One: Example of Data Table Used for Recording Learning Modes Implied in Online Journal Prompts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Recalling Experience</th>
<th>Teacher Intention: Learning Modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal 5-1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>Reflective observation = REFLECTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>Abstract conceptualization = drawing conclusions = evaluating fb experience based on self-imposed criteria - THINKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>Abstract conceptualization = drawing conclusions = evaluating fb experience based on self-imposed criteria - THINKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>Abstract conceptualization = drawing conclusions = Evaluating CP experience based on self-imposed criteria - THINKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Observing a video</td>
<td>Reflective Observation + Abstract conceptualization = drawing conclusions = evaluating choreography and performance based on self-imposed criteria and externally imposed (confidence) = OBSERVING + THINKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6-1-4</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>Reflective Observation + Abstract conceptualization = drawing conclusions = evaluating experience based on self-imposed criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>reflective observation - REFLECTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>reflective observation - REFLECTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7-1-5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8-1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>UND/summarizing perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>Abstract conceptualization = THINKING = analyzing their movement, Recalling metacog self-knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recalling perspective</td>
<td>Recalling metagoc self-knowledge – value, interest beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recalling experience</td>
<td>Reflective observation + abstract conceptualization = REFLECTING + THINKING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subarea One: Examples of Learning Modes Implied in Online Journal and Final Reflection Prompts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Modes (Kolb, 2015)</th>
<th>Online Journal Prompts</th>
<th>Final Reflection Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Recalling experience:** stating actions with additional reflection or thinking | Week 4 Journal 2  
2. Share your process for researching your theme. Include the following:  
• How did you research your theme? Where did you look? What did you find? | 4a) How did you research and develop your theme/ideas? |
| **Recalling experiences via Reflective Observation (Reflecting)** | Week 9 Journal 6  
5. Tell me about your experience watching your classmates perform their midterm solos. | 6. Read through your Online Journal entries and notes in your Choreographer’s Notebook. What stands out to you about your class experiences that you wrote about in your journals and notebook? Explain 1-2 things that stand out to you. |
| **Recalling Experience via Reflective Observation and Abstract Conceptualization, moving towards higher levels of thinking** | Week 11 Journal 8  
4. Describe your experience with improving movement that is opposite to how you normally move. How did it feel to improvise movement that was not organic/natural to you? Discuss the challenges you faced and the discoveries that you made during your improvisations. | |

| | Week 13 Journal 9  
1. Efforts: When exploring efforts in class on 11/19 and 11/21, you were directed to focus on how you were performing your movement instead of what your movement looked like.  
• Tell me about your experience performing according to the various efforts.  
• To what degree were you able to focus on your inner attitude and intention?  
• Did the fact that your classmates were watching you impact your performance at all? Explain.  
• Tell me about your experience watching your classmates perform with various efforts. | |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Modes (Kolb, 2015)</th>
<th>Online Journal Prompts</th>
<th>Final Reflection Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recalling</strong>&lt;br&gt;Experience via Reflective Observation and Abstract Conceptualization, moving towards higher levels of thinking</td>
<td><strong>EVALUATE/critique based on self-imposed criteria</strong>&lt;br&gt;Week 7 Journal 5&lt;br&gt;5. Critical Response Process - TIME: Tell me about your experience as an artist during the Critical Response Process on Thurs. 10/10. Was the Critical Response Process helpful to the development of your choreography? If so, how was it helpful? If not, how could it be improved to make it more effective for the peer feedback process and for improving your work?&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;7. Midterm Composition Feedback: Take a look at the video of your choreography performed in class on Thurs. 10/10 and write about the following:&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;a) What do you think about your choreography at this point? Include the following:&lt;br&gt;- What stands out to you about your choreography?&lt;br&gt;- Affirmation: What do you find to be interesting about your movement? Why?&lt;br&gt;- What would you like to change in your choreography, if anything? Why?&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;b) Pretend, for a moment, that the choreography in the video was created by someone else. Focus your attention on your performance. What do you think about your performance at this point? Include the following:&lt;br&gt;- What stands out to you about your performance?&lt;br&gt;- Affirmation: What did you do well as a performer?&lt;br&gt;- What would you like to change about your performance, if anything? Why?&lt;br&gt;- Are you performing confidently? How does your movement in the video demonstrate confidence or lack of confidence (or a combination)?</td>
<td><strong>EVALUATE/critique based on self-imposed criteria</strong>&lt;br&gt;7. Have your choreographic skills grown over the course of this semester? How so, or why not? Read what you wrote for #2 on your Week 2 Reflection, and explain how your choreographic skills and knowledge have grown, if at all, since the start of the semester.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;8. Have your performance skills grown over the course of this semester? How so, or why not? Read what you wrote for #3 on your Week 2 Reflection, and explain how your performance skills have grown, if at all, since the start of the semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix O

Subarea Two: Clarification of Physical Skills that Could Be Assessed via Observation Alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Observable</th>
<th>Requires Written Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication &amp; Performance Skills: Clear, Effective Non-verbal Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use movement to communicate a particular theme to your audience. Your piece will be an abstract – rather than literal – representation of your theme.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES - Reflection supports this UNDERSTANDING/translating theme into movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated confident body language while entering the stage</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performed choreography confidently</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated confident body language while bowing</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated confident body language while exiting the stage</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choreographic Skills: Understand and Apply Choreographic Concepts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity &amp; Originality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effort and creativity demonstrated in choreography</td>
<td>??????? Unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimally used literal, pedestrian actions and recognizable/codified dance and sports movements</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manipulations: Demonstrated 2 (other than staging, levels, tempo, lateral inversion)</td>
<td>NO - Not easily observed.</td>
<td>YES – Reflection demonstrates REM/recalling chosen terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels: Demonstrated a clear use of all 3 levels</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facings: Incorporated different facings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus: Maintained clear, purposeful focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stationary/Traveling: Incorporated axial and locomotor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Duration: 75-90 seconds of movement material (1.25-1.5 min)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tempo: Demonstrated a distinct difference between fast and slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stillness: Incorporated stillness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efforts &amp; Qualities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporated efforts and/or qualities appropriate for theme</td>
<td>YES – but often not easily observed</td>
<td>YES – Reflection demonstrates REM/recalling chosen terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Observable</td>
<td>Requires Written Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choreographic Skills: Demonstrate Effective, Purposeful Integration of Production Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supported chosen theme</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES - Reflection supports UND/representing Conceptual Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instrumental</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clothing/ Costume</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supported chosen theme</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES - Reflection supports UND/representing Conceptual Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriate for movement</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choreographic Skills: Expansion of Your Artistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate growth in your choreography and performance</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO – Reflection asks students to comment on the growth of their performance and choreographic skills in general, not with regards to Final Composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opposites: demonstrated movement of body parts not habitually moved (Mentioned as a requirement, but not included in original rubric)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES – Reflection supports UND/recalling Metacognitive Self-Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P

Subarea Two: Example of Completed Rubric Used to Assess Midterm Compositions
Fall 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea Two: Example of Completed Rubric Used to Assess Midterm Compositions Fall 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANC 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric for Midterm Composition  Fa19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic intention was clear (Written reflection supports this.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels: Demonstrated a clear use of all 3 levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facings: Incorporated different facings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus: Maintained clear, purposeful focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary/Traveling: Incorporated axial and locomotor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach: Utilized near, mid and far reach as it applies to theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration: 45-60 seconds of movement material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo: Demonstrated a distinct difference between fast and slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillness: Incorporated stillness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort &amp; Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort: Demonstrated effort put into assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity: Demonstrated creative movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codified/sports movements manipulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident Non-Verbal Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated confident body language during entrance and exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performed choreography with confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bow: completely, confidently, without rushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated set choreography that was consistent for the 2 performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing/Costume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate for theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate for movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Q

#### Subarea Three: List of Emotion Codes and Feelings Revealed in Student Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion Code/Feeling</th>
<th>Opposite Emotion Code/Feeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation/Gratitude</td>
<td>Lacking Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>Lacking self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenged</td>
<td>Less afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>Less nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected</td>
<td>Less shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Less stressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatively restricted</td>
<td>Less worried/concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>More comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td>More confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>More connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
<td>More creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>More engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>More enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funny</td>
<td>More excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>More natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td>More nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking enjoyment</td>
<td>More self-confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R

Subarea Three: Examples of Primary Codes and Subcodes for All of Students’ Written Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- perf. for peer fb compared to simply observing (Wk5) (E – different way of watching dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perf. mov’t sequence cuz wasn’t confident in her mov’t (Wk2) (N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as a result of peer/group work (S- Midterm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Creative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compared to earlier in the semester (B, M, N - Final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- While perf. flocking (A – teaching strat #7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Due to moving beyond comfort zone (B - Final |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creatively Restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Due to assignment requirements (below): (E - Midterm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o mov’t expressing a theme rather than abstract (E - Midterm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Finding music w/o lyrics, when her initial song was a capella) (E – CHALLENGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Choreographing to music w/o lyrics (A - Midterm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Enjoyment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perf final choreography compared to midterm (B - Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Final was more abstract, midterm was more literal (B - Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perf. alongside peers compared to start of semester (D - Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perf. when focusing on how/efforts (Wk12) (B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perf for fb now that more comfortable, connection to peers (Wk6) (D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perf improv w/ partner compared to solo (Wk4) (E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perf with a partner compared to alone (Wk4) (M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perf midterm comp as became less nervous (Wk7) (L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perf fast improv across the floor (compared to slow) (Wk6) (M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt Change in Expression/Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “There was a lot of more emotion than usual when I performed my piece. This was definitely an enhancement to my theme, and it was definitely reflected in my affirmations (where my classmates said as well that they thought how emotional my performance made them). I was glad that they felt the same way I did.” (Wk7) (T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “I performed more during this performance than other performances that I had done during class, putting more emotion and strength behind the movements, because I felt more comfortable being in front of an audience. My choreography was stronger so my performance was also stronger.” (L - Final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S

Subarea Three: Example of Table Used for Magnitude Coding of Performance Contexts in Class Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>Week 13</th>
<th>Week 14</th>
<th>Week 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured improv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform individually</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a small group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform FOR partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform FOR 1/2 the class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform FOR 3/5 of the class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform FOR entire class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform ALONGSIDE entire class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform alongside peers in 2 groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform alongside peers in a group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform alongside peers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform FOR entire group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform individually w/partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform individually w/group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform Set Most crowded in class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform individually</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITH a partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITH a small group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a large group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform FOR entire class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform ALONGSIDE entire class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform alongside half the class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform alongside entire class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Magnitude Coding of Performance Contexts in Class Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>Week 13</th>
<th>Week 14</th>
<th>Week 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured improv</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform individually</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62.84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform individually w/partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform Set Most crowded in class</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform individually</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform individually w/partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a large group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform FOR entire class</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform ALONGSIDE entire class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform alongside half the class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform alongside entire class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix T
Final Composition Assignment Fall 2019

Performance date: Thurs. Dec. 19, 2019, 8-10am (100 points)

A written reflection assignment will be available soon as a separate document. It will be due on Thurs. Dec. 19, 2019, 11:59pm (via Blackboard, 100 points)

Total for Final: 200 points / 20% of your final grade

Description
I am so excited to see you embody and express what you have learned this semester in a piece of solo choreography! For your last assignment of the semester, you will choreograph a 75-90 second (1.25-1.5 minutes) solo composition for the proscenium stage. You will be graded on your ability to physically demonstrate and integrate the concepts explored over the course of the semester (body, space, time, shape, effort), your growth in your artistry over the course of the semester (and since your midterm composition), your integration of feedback from me and your classmates and aspects of your “opposite” assignment, and your ability to reflect upon and explain all of the aforementioned and more in writing. I have witnessed this growth in your smaller compositions, so now it is time to push yourself to explore and share your artistic potential in a longer work. I can’t wait to be a part of your creative process and see your work!

Score/Music
You may choose to choreograph and perform to music. If so, your music must relate to your theme and must be instrumental (i.e., no lyrics/words). Please do not get so swept away by the music that you lose your focus on the requirements of this assignment!

Costumes & Props
Wear clothing that would be appropriate for your theme and movement. Please do not go out and purchase any items. Go through your clothes and/or ask friends to find specific colors, materials, designs, etc. that would be appropriate to wear. A simple blue t-shirt and blue or black pants could be an effective costume for a theme about water, for example. We must be able to see your face/focus, so hair must be pulled back. Hoods, hats, or any items that cover your face and/or prevent us from seeing your eyes are not allowed. Rehearse in your costume so that you
know how it feels while performing. If you have to pull up your pants or pull down your shirt in the middle of your dance, choose other clothes to wear. Props are not allowed for this dance.

## Movement Composition Requirements

Use this sheet to self-assess your work and check off the boxes when you have met the choreographic requirements. You will perform your composition once, and I will record your performance. You will be assessed on your ability to integrate the following into your choreography:

### Theme
- Choose a theme for your composition. Your piece will be an abstract – rather than literal – representation of your theme. You will explain in your Reflection how your movement reflects your theme.

### Body
- Incorporate movement of body parts that you do not habitually move. Although this is not another “opposite” composition, I would like you to continue pushing yourself to move in new ways. Refer to the body parts and other body concepts that you listed in your “opposite” column of your “Style and Opposite” assignment and think about your experiences with movement initiation during our structured improvisations.

### Space
- Incorporate different facings
- Maintain clarity of focus throughout your composition
- Perform movement in all 3 levels
- Perform axial and locomotor movements

### Time
- Duration: Perform for a duration of 75-90 seconds (1.25-1.5 minutes)
- Tempo: Demonstrate slow and fast movements, with a clear distinction between the two extremes of tempo. Allow enough time in each tempo for these moments to register with your audience.
- Stillness. You must have at least one moment of stillness (other than your starting and ending positions). Allow enough time in stillness (4 “Mississippis!”) for it to register with your audience.

### Efforts
- Incorporate appropriate efforts based on your theme. (I encourage you to continue exploring ways to perform while sensing how you are performing rather than focusing solely on what your movement looks like.)
Manipulations
- Incorporate at least 2 manipulations (other than change of staging, levels, tempo, lateral inversion)

Production Elements
- Utilize instrumental music or a score that relates to your theme (Silence is fine.)
- Wear clothing that relates to your theme

Expansion of Your Artistry
- Exhibit growth beyond what you have physically demonstrated in your previous compositions. This includes integrating feedback on your midterm and aspects of your “opposite” assignment.
- Effort and creativity should be applied to your work and shown through your choreography.
- Codified dance vocabulary, sports movements, and large durations of literal movements are to be used at a minimum. If used, challenge yourself to manipulate these known movements and create something unique to you and your theme. Refer to your “16 Ways to Manipulate a Motif” handout for ways to tweak your movement to make it more unique.

Confident Communication (Non-Verbal) On-Stage
- Enter and exit the performance space with confident body language and without rushing
- Perform your choreography confidently
- Bow completely and confidently and without rushing
Appendix U

From Findings to Recommendations: Using If/Then/Therefore/Thus Matrix (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“If I find this...”</td>
<td>“Then I think this means...”</td>
<td>“Therefore I conclude that...”</td>
<td>“Thus I recommend...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C1. Two additional types of knowledge were revealed to be integral to, and outcomes of, the students’ thinking throughout their choreographic and performance processes: Experiential Knowledge and Affective Self-Knowledge. | - Knowledge can arise from the experience of the moving body  
- Knowledge of feelings/emotions can arise from learning experiences  
- Knowledge generated from the experience of the moving body and the feelings and emotions that arose from such experiences were integral components of / contributed to students’ thought processes. | - There are inherent connections between thinking, moving, and feeling that have not been supported by teaching strategies. | Teaching strategies and practices should be modified to support the mind-body-feeling connection inherent to the learning experiences in Creative Dance more strongly and share these connections with students. |
| C2. Student Learning was assessed as a linear, rather than cyclical, process. | - Student learning was measured as an outcome rather than a process.  
- Students were not prompted to engage in repeated cycles of reflection. | - Linear assessment of student learning was a hindrance to their learning, as it prevented students from… | Teaching strategies and practices should be modified to promote learning as a cyclical, rather than linear, process. This includes guiding students to repeatedly engage with all four learning modes of The Learning Cycle (Kolb, 2015) in a cyclical fashion throughout their dance-making process. Assessment of choreography can include process and product: aspects of creative process, including procedural knowledge and choreographic skills that cannot be observed in the performed product. |
## Findings Through Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **C3. Procedural Knowledge of choreographic tools and techniques**      | - Students were provided with minimal choreographic tools, techniques, and structures to use throughout their creative process.  
- Teaching strategies and practices prioritize choreographic devices.  
- Although improvisation was explored in class, how to transition from improvisation to set choreography was not explored.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | - The lack of procedural knowledge was a potential hindrance to student learning because these new choreographers were left to navigate their own processes for creating movement and structuring dances. Having foundational tools, techniques, and structures available to choose from and to utilize in their process might be helpful to the development of their choreography.               | Learning activities and assessments should be modified to include choreographic tools, techniques, and structures for new choreographers to use at different stages in their choreographic process.  
More theory to support practice.                                                                                     |
| **P2. Choreographic and performance skills**                            | - Students were not informed of the specific choreographic and performance skills that they were developing and demonstrating in writing and via their performance.  
- Students were not aware of how their demonstrated levels of skill proficiency were being assessed.  
- Skills demonstrated via movement, skills demonstrated via writing, and those that required both modes of communication were not clear.  
- The thinking and moving components of choreographic skill development and demonstration were assessed separately.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | - This lack of clarity was a potential hindrance to the development of students’ metacognitive self-knowledge, as students were not aware of the specific skills they were developing / had developed. It was also perpetuating mind/body split, with writing about their process as separate from the performance of their choreography. | Clarification of these physical skills and their associated levels of proficiency are needed for more effective assessment and scaffolding practices and for developing students’ metacognitive self-knowledge and experiential knowledge.  
The language and format of the Composition assignments are in need of modification to reflect the choreographic skills students will be demonstrating in their performance and throughout their creative process more clearly.  
Having clear language for each level would be more efficient for me as I assess student work and for the students as they create and self-assess their work and the work of their peers. |
<p>| <strong>P1. A narrow perspective on creativity served as the foundation for composing and assessing student choreography.</strong> | - Creativity was viewed as an outcome rather than part of the dance-making process.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | - This narrow perspective was a hindrance to student learning because it placed limitations on how creativity is defined, applies to, and is assessed in our choreography course needs to be clarified. Movement exploration and divergent                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1., cont.</td>
<td>Specific procedures for inspiring creative thinking and moving and shaping these discoveries into set choreography were not explored.</td>
<td>the students’ creative capabilities.</td>
<td>thinking can be highlighted as integral components of the dance-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4. A student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing could not be sufficiently measured using the set assessment parameters from a third-person professor perspective.</td>
<td>A third-person professor perspective was not the most effective way to assess a student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing in this choreography course. The parameters used for assessing confidence were not sufficient. Confidence is also an inner state, and this inner state does not always translate to / match outward behavior/expression. Universal parameters for assessing a confident performance is not applicable in our general education choreography course where students of various performance experiences perform completely different pieces of choreography.</td>
<td>Not necessarily a strength or hindrance to student learning, but an ineffective assessment strategy. A more effective process of monitoring and assessing a student’s demonstrated level of confidence while performing is needed.</td>
<td>Confidence is best monitored and assessed from a first-person student perspective. This can be for singular performance experiences and over time. Allows students to take on more responsibility in their learning. Gain Affective Self-Knowledge. Rather than being an assessor of confidence, I can modify my teaching to become a facilitator of learning experiences that encourage students to monitor, assess, and influence their own levels of confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. The majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]) experienced shifting feelings and/or emotions over the period of a singular performance.</td>
<td>Performing in this classroom context can be uncomfortable for students regardless of their level of dance experience. Students can get caught up in their feelings and emotions, preventing them from being fully engaged with, and present within, their bodies while performing.</td>
<td>Nerves are natural in this classroom context. “Negative” feelings and emotions can be a hindrance to a student’s performance. Implementing strategies to monitor and work through performance anxiety may assist</td>
<td>Introducing strategies for acknowledging and managing the feelings and emotions that arise and shift when performing in front of an audience could be beneficial to our course and beyond our course (e.g., public speaking in any context).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Findings Through Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1., cont.</td>
<td>- Feeling satisfaction after performing is different from feeling relief.</td>
<td>- some students with managing pre-performance nerves.</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction with their performance, pride, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Guiding students away from their thoughts and towards connecting with the sensations of their body while performing might assist with managing nerves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. The majority of students (10 out of 12 [83%]) reported feeling more comfortable, more self-confident, and/or less nervous performing in class as a result of repeating learning experiences.</td>
<td>- Repetition of performance experiences had a positive impact on students’ affective responses.</td>
<td>- Repetition of performance experiences supports student learning. Repetition strengthens students’ learning experiences and outcomes.</td>
<td>Review teaching strategies and practices that provided opportunities for repetition and those that lacked repetition. Teaching needs to be modified to facilitate deeper learning of Time with regards to choreography and performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3. A direct relationship was revealed between students’ earned deductions for the compositional element of Time and lack of class time devoted to this content area. (lack of repetition = hindrance)</td>
<td>- Lack of repeated opportunities to explore a dance concept prevented students from embodying this concept.</td>
<td>- Lack of repetition can be a hindrance to student learning. Repetition of learning experiences over time enables students to understand dance concepts more clearly via embodiment, thus leading to stronger learning experiences and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. For the majority of students (11 out of 12 [92%]), peer influence extended beyond providing beneficial critical feedback for the development of their peers’ choreography to inspiring feelings of satisfaction and/or positive shifts in students’ affective responses to learning activities through their shared experiences, feelings, and emotions.</td>
<td>- Learning does not occur solely within an individual; it is a social process. Peer interactions are beneficial to student learning.</td>
<td>- Providing opportunities for students to interact with their peers is beneficial to student learning experiences and outcomes.</td>
<td>Review peer activities to see where guidance can be more effective (e.g., peer feedback process).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>