In teaching and learning the subject of history, multiperspectivity is, as the name implies, a strategy of understanding people, objects and events from multiple points and perspectives. As a method of teaching, it has gained a lot of attention and positive response and is regarded as beneficial because it enriches a student's understanding of historical events, helps create diversity and inclusivity, promotes the development of analytical and critical thinking skills, and allows the student to interpret meaning from real world issues and controversies.

This view on learning is shared by the National Council for the Social Studies in the United States; in its most recent position statement that body advocated students learn to “think critically, and make personal and civic decisions based on information from multiple perspectives.” They go on to state that students need to learn how to engage with ideas that encourage “them to connect what they are learning to their prior knowledge and to current issues, to think critically and creatively about what they are learning, and to apply that learning to authentic situations.”

In an analysis done by Robert W. Maloy and Irene LaRoche on social studies research and practice, it was deemed that multiperspective teaching created a student-centered method of learning that allowed higher retention and engagement and that critical thinking skills were enhanced as a result of its use.

Yet in the field of graphic design, the tools given to teach its history are limited to those using a singular perspective approach that focuses solely on the innovation, its creator, and the immediate reaction that innovation had. This follows a knowledge-transmission approach (or a teacher-centered approach) in which the creation of design objects and/or styles is considered from the viewpoint of traditional learning, namely one in which the predominance of fact, date, and significance of the innovation are stressed. This is not the same approach as multiperspectivity where the social and cultural effects of the time are given equal import to the reasoning of the subject’s development. In essence, multiperspectivity offers a more diverse way of learning the subject matter.
Simultaneously, as teaching methods expand so too do the mediums for delivering knowledge. The use of digital readers as a tool in the classroom, specifically iPads and tablet devices, is growing rapidly, replacing common textbooks. Forbes magazine reported in an online article that close to half a million of these devices were distributed through schools, universities, corporations, and government agencies within the U.S. in 2012 alone as a means of keeping up with information delivery systems. 70% of the organizations they reported were in the education sector. In another survey it was found that 1.5 million iPads are in use by students and that schools bought some 47,000 in the first month-and-a-half after its release. Other studies are also showing improvements in learning as a result.

Further, publishers are noting significant volume increases in trade sales for e-books, with revenues more than doubling between 2010 and 2011. The reason for this trend is widely reported to be centered around the ease of accessibility digital readers possess: vast libraries can be compressed into these simple-to-use portable devices and updates and links to more information are almost instantly available. From a pedagogical perspective, hyperlinks to sources, interactivity within pages, multimedia and Javascript commands, ability to control font features, color and sound, as well as production affordability add benefit to this medium, and in many respects, what digital devices offer mirrors multiperspectivist educational practices.

Therefore, it is proposed that, for the task of presenting multiperspectivity as an approach for teaching design history, a model be presented using current digital reader technology. Selecting a module of historic importance, the research of this proposal will center on facilitating an overarching view not just on the significance of innovations from that historical time but also on the cultural and social influences that helped bring them about. It is anticipated that through this exercise, and by using digital reader software, the tools to build a more comprehensive learning experience can be gained, and that this in turn will aid in the effort to better the field of design by meeting the competencies required of future practitioners.

Secondary research will focus on building content and finessing the skills necessary to build the prototype. Primary research will center on testing the usability and qualitative benefits gained in the learning experience of the prototype model, thus proving the benefits of multiperspectivity to the student user.

2 From a presentation entitled, “The Use of Multiperspectivity When Teaching and Learning History: Advantages and Challenges,” given by John Hamer to the Council of Europe in Tallin, October 2011.
3 http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/powerful
7 Stradling, Multiperspectivity in history teaching, p. 25
8 Maloy and LaRoche, “Student-Centered Teaching Methods,” pp. 46-47
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**RESEARCH PLAN FOR STUDY**

**Using Multiperspectivity as a Method for Teaching Graphic Design History**

*Principal Investigator: Sheila Hart Fowler*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step in Process</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>People Involved</th>
<th>Required IRB Forms</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Develop research plan | Create a 12-month plan of action for completion of thesis | • Create Thesis Committee  
• Write and submit IRB forms  
• Get sign-off from Thesis Advisor  
• Send off IRB forms for approval | Committee formed: Ken Visocky Ogrady (Thesis Advisor); Sanda Katila; Angela Berlingeri  
IRB number assigned | Principle investigator, thesis committee | • Application for approval to use human research subjects  
• Research study consent forms  
• Recruitment scripts  
• Questionnaires  
• CITI certificate | February - April 2013 (allow six weeks from submission of forms to IRB until approval received) |
<p>| 2. Literature review | Build content for the learning module focusing on one segment of design history | Library research; decide which areas the selected learning module will center on and isolate sources for data and images; get permissions if needed; keep diligent notes about resources | Gather enough information to begin writing and to cite resources | Principle investigator | None | March - September 2013 |
| 3. Outline | Formulate writing plan for presenting information | Narrow in on historical aspects that have an affect on design directions | Clarify which areas are most important to the study | Principle investigator | None | April - May 2013 |
| 4. Assessment of technical limitations | Review software capabilities for prototype | Learn add'l skills if needed | Become proficient at software used in prototyping or, if necessary, establish a programmer who will aid in building the prototype | Principle investigator, possible outside programmer | None | May - December 2013 |
| 5. Write first draft | Create content | Begin drafting the written content and conceiving visuals that support the written document | First pass of material can be presented to the thesis committee for comments and revisions | Principle investigator, thesis committee | None | May - July 2013 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step in Process</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>People Involved</th>
<th>Required IRB Forms</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Write second draft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edit, revise, rewrite; begin building and compiling interactive components as needed</td>
<td>Fine tune data and information presented in previous draft</td>
<td>Copyedit and proof text for a second review with the thesis committee to gain for comments and revisions</td>
<td>Principle investigator, thesis committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Begin design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Devise options for layout and revisions to components for prototype</td>
<td>Develop page layouts, icons, illustrations</td>
<td>Review all with thesis committee for comments and revisions</td>
<td>Principle investigator, thesis committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Finalize manuscript</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare manuscript for layout</td>
<td>Edit, revise and compile final changes to manuscript before layout</td>
<td>Receive comments toward final text in anticipation of building prototype</td>
<td>Principle investigator, thesis committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Build prototype testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Build prototype using info gained in previous steps</td>
<td>Build prototype</td>
<td>Prototype built and tested internally for functionality</td>
<td>Principle investigator</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Finalize questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize scripts and questionnaires that will be used in prototype testing (both usability and learning experience)</td>
<td>Edit, revise and compile final changes to scripts and questionnaires as prototype is being built</td>
<td>Review all with thesis committee for comments and revisions; begin recruitment</td>
<td>Principle investigator, thesis committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prototype testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test prototype to assure it can be navigated</td>
<td>Test usability using scripts and questionnaire as developed in step 10</td>
<td>Assure usability of prototype module, modify if needed</td>
<td>Principle investigator, volunteers for usability study</td>
<td>Informed consent forms, list of survey questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Survey qualitative benefits gained in learning experience testing off the module prototype</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gather student volunteers to review the module and to answer questionnaire</td>
<td>Get student impressions about comparative learning experiences</td>
<td>Gather reviews about the learning materials; determine successes and failures</td>
<td>Principle investigator, student volunteers</td>
<td>Informed consent forms, list of survey questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Thesis summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generate and share a summary that explains the process and findings from the study</td>
<td>Showcase the efforts and prepare to defend various outcomes gained in this study</td>
<td>Present and gain approval of final outcome of thesis project</td>
<td>Principle investigator, thesis committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>