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Abstract

This thesis argues for a strong studio component, taught by an artist-teacher, as the basis for student art-making activities and visual art in the schools. Such an art program would stress the individual and creative aspects of art-making that lead to a fuller understanding of art and related aesthetic concerns.

The thesis begins by considering the workshops of early masters, the apprenticeship systems, and the academy systems. Next, current art education efforts and the Discipline-Based Art Education program are considered in view of the possibilities they offer. At the same time, concerns are raised about any approach that views art-making as a process, and about movements that suggest art education should focus on technical training, visual literacy, or social issues. Art education is then discussed in terms of the nature of aesthetic experience and how it relates to our concept of an aesthetic human nature; how we first acquire our capacity for aesthetic experience; how art-making is a unique learning experience; and how we relate these issues to art, studio, artist, and art education.
Continuity of culture in passage from one civilization to another as well as within the culture, is conditioned by art more than any other one thing.

(John Dewey, 1934, p. 327)
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Preface

The origins of this thesis must be found partly in the suggestions made by Tasos Kazepides when I first attended his course in Epistemology. He suggested that, rather than writing papers on safe and fairly mundane topics where we were already comfortable, we should try to write about topics representing personal interest, worth, and challenge without being daunted or intimidated by the fact that we might not find all the answers to the questions we raised.

I decided that there were two fundamental and obvious questions for someone interested in art education. First, why do we teach art; and, second, how should we go about doing it. While both the questions and the answers may seem obvious to some, there were so many ways of dealing with these questions that I found no easy or uncontroversial path to follow. Rather, this is an area where educators and philosophers have stated and restated a variety of opinions for several hundred years that, as often as not, bore little or no relation to what was actually happening in the classroom. However, as I continued to pursue these questions and wrote various papers, it became clear that there are, to my mind, some things that appear to stand fast as answers.

I concluded that, however we qualify our reasoning, there is an aspect of our humanity, something that is a significant part of the complexity that identifies us as humans within social groups and as individuals, a way in which we are different from all other animals, that justifies our efforts to teach art in the schools. This important part of our humanity is significant in various ways: it spans our history, it is shared to some extent by all Western societies and cultures, and it is an integral part of the individuals raised within these cultures. In our time and in the recent past, we have chosen to deal with this important aspect of existence in our educational institutions through subjects such as art, drama, and music. I have never doubted the value of these subjects in the curriculum but it has been satisfying to put my thoughts on paper
and articulate what had previously been an intuitive understanding of the importance of art-making and art education.

The answer to the second question, asking how we should teach art in our schools, is less easily summarized. It seemed appropriate to attempt an answer that was not only theoretical but also pragmatic and useful. The answer, that we provide qualified and dedicated artist-teachers and well equipped studio facilities so students can experience art-making as the basis for broader achievements, is, I hope, reasonably formulated and justified in the thesis.

Having made these brief statements, I fully acknowledge that each of the two questions begs a host of related questions and each of the answers should be qualified in countless ways. Because of these complexities, I often thought that I should have written the thesis on one of the many clear areas of concern within art education that lend themselves to concise propositions that could then be contrasted with and discussed relative to the learned opinions in the field. But, all things said and done, I have found the writing of this thesis to be a challenging and satisfying experience.

F. M. Larsen
Richmond, B.C.
Chapter 1

The studio in art education

What the apprenticeship model does is to put severe restrictions both on the educator and on the community. The educator must exhibit in his life all the virtues that he intends to impart to the young, instead of merely paying lip service to some abstract principles. And the society must be a genuine moral and intellectual community where the various human excellences are regulative of its form of life.

(Tasos Kázepides, 1986, p. 333)

This thesis argues that art-making activities in the educational studio are vital for art education. Therefore, it is important to clarify the role of the studio for a number of reasons. First, because of the limiting view, prominent in much current writing, equating art-making to process. Second, because of equally limiting calls for political or social bias in art education with ideas and suggestions that omit the studio or use it for extrinsic purposes. And, third, because of pressures on educational institutions to provide training for a technological world. I include a historical perspective because school art rooms, used mainly as studio/workshops, have been in use for several hundred years and the evolutionary nature of the studio role relates to current issues.

Throughout the paper there is a focus on the studio because art objects must somehow be made. Dewey (1934) tells us very clearly,

Art involves molding of clay, chipping of marble, casting of bronze, laying on of pigments, construction of buildings, singing of songs, playing of instruments, enacting rôles on the stage, going through rhythmic movements in the dance. Every art does something with some physical material, the body or something outside the body, with or without the use of intervening tools, and with a view to production of something visible, audible, or tangible. (p. 47)
Art must be object oriented, even conceptual art is filmed, documented, acted out, or discussed before we conceptualize it as art - it must be made, produced, or created somewhere by someone. I propose that the time and place where students first experience art-making will significantly influence their later interaction with art. Thus, while the roles of the teacher and student may change, the educational studio environment is a uniquely consistent basis from which to view the evolving concepts and practices related to art in schools. It seems obvious that discussion of many issues - such as the relative merit of art education, art training, individual needs - will remain contentious. However, educational institutions can concentrate on providing fully equipped, well staffed, and attractive studios. This will be a sound investment for our society regardless of how we deal with other concerns.

I refer to Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) throughout the thesis for pragmatic reasons related to current practices and trends: DBAE offers a promise for significant change because of the general awareness it has created in various art education groups and through the funding available to develop and implement programs. It is such a powerful idea in recent art education literature that many of those who do not support the program present their ideas as a contrast to DBAE. However, I will argue that DBAE, as it is presented, is not appropriate for schools, especially at lower grade levels, because it does not acknowledge the value of creative art-making or the importance of the artist-teacher in the educational studio.

In brief, this thesis argues for a recognition of the primacy of practice over theory in art education that makes art-making activities essential. Without creative art-making, we limit students' abilities to fully experience the visual arts. Also, I will argue that the best means of facilitating art education in the schools is through artist-teachers working in educational studios. I will stress that DBAE fails to support these two arguments by denigrating and limiting the importance of the studio component and the role of the artist-teacher.
Chapter 1 - The studio in art education

The next chapter comments briefly on the art training provided through the apprenticeship systems, the academy systems, and art in the public schools at the turn of the century. These early studio environments can be seen as models contributing to our concepts of art education and the associated art-making activities. I continue by discussing current art education. I suggest there is good reason to be wary of DBAE where art-making is equated to a sequential process that can readily be evaluated and also, cautious of movements suggesting art be used as a means for addressing technical training, visual literacy, or social issues.

In the third chapter, I consider why we need art education and I also examine such issues as the use of art in the educational studio and our view of the artist. I elaborate on the nature of aesthetic experience and discuss how we acquire our capacity for aesthetic experience.

In the fourth and fifth chapters, I present a proposal for a studio art program in the early grades that would include some art history, art criticism, and aesthetics - a comprehensive studio program stressing creative and individual art-making experience as the fundamental basis for all ensuing visual art in the schools. This program would be followed by a discipline-centered program in high schools where art-making would be available for those who choose to pursue mastery.

Before proceeding further, I shall briefly explain some of the key terms used and mark the limits of the ensuing discussions so there can be some common understanding while I discuss the historical perspective (most of these terms are discussed at length in chapter three).

Aesthetic nature

I propose that our "aesthetic nature" is the shared fundamental forms of agreement that allow further learning in the area of the arts. It is not intended as a programmatic definition but, as a recognition of the fact that, at least within Western cultures, we share certain beliefs about art and the way we experience it that are important for education. As such, our aesthetic nature is a synthesis of shared propensities, feelings,
values, and concepts common to all humans raised in a Western society. The term "aesthetic nature" does not imply behavior, urges, or feelings based on biological instincts or genetics. This can be a fine distinction to make because most human beings are raised in social contexts and not in the isolation of a desert island or within a wolf pack or other non-human group. For example, our common eye is instinctively attracted to a sudden movement in a still landscape or to a sparkling spot of color on a dull background but we interpret such phenomena based on prior experiences that are uniquely human. There are no indications that instinct or genetic characteristics cause us to seek aesthetic satisfaction in the same way we are driven to satisfy needs for food, warmth, or sex, but ability and propensity to experience aesthetically are related to the concept of being human in a society and as such constitutes one of the ways we are different from other animals. Hamlyn (1973) writes,

"... learning on the part of an individual is as much as anything his initiation into a framework over which there is wide agreement, even if there is also plenty of room for individual deviations from the norm. For this to be possible there has to be, and is, a background of common interests, attitudes, feelings, and, if I may put it in these terms, cognitive apparatus. There must be, to use Wittgenstein's phrase, agreement in forms of life. (p. 189)

In this manner we are physical, rational, and moral beings, but we are also aesthetic beings as part of the complexity that is human nature. This is an essential distinction for art education because a significant part of the "aesthetic nature" manifests itself in art. We deal with related pedagogical concerns through the enterprise we call "art education" and I will argue throughout the thesis that students cannot realize the full potential of their aesthetic nature as it relates to visual arts without art-making experience.

I realize my discussion here is, in the words of Kazepides (1979), "... a general, "old fashioned" and obviously ambitious talk about human nature." (p. 55). But, we share a propensity to make and attend to images, designs, and patterns. The meaning of these images and the reasons for making them changes from one culture to another but, in our society, the aesthetic nature is apparent in our interactions with art
objects and the propensity to experience aesthetically. I will attempt to justify my ambitious use of "aesthetic human nature" in chapter three.

**Aesthetic experience**

I will argue in chapter three that aesthetic experience is a synthesis of feeling and cognition like other experience involving sense perception that is, in part, conceptualized. I also argue that aesthetic experience transcends other similar types of experience because we invoke our imagination, knowledge, and prior aesthetic experiences in order to, not only recognize an object, but also to apprehend meaning—we make sense of our world through attention to both form and content. I will include reference to Beardsley (1969, pp. 711-712) who says first, the aesthetic experience is object oriented—that is, the experience has a central focus on an object prompting and appearing in the experience. Second, it is a concentration of experience involving some intensity. Third, the experience "... hangs together, or is coherent, to an unusually high degree." (p. 712). And, fourth, the experience detaches or isolates itself and thus is "... unusually complete in itself." (p. 712). I argue that we do not suspend other modes of perception but transcend them because of these considerations, because of the satisfaction provided, and because we invoke imagination without losing our grasp on reality.

**Art education**

I define a pedagogical activity as art *education* if the intentions are aimed at knowing and understanding art for its own sake or if the main objectives can be achieved only through art activities. I consider the activity as *socialization* if the intent is directly or indirectly aimed at conformity of behavior, willing social commitment, or development of emotional responses that are socially desirable. Also, I consider the activity to be art *training* if the art objects are limited to "practical" arts or if the intent is to provide job skills.

I do not intend to make value judgements about the relative merits of training or socialization; they are each appropriate in their own way and
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it may well be that art activities can be extremely useful in these areas. I merely attempt to distinguish art education as a separate enterprise in order to determine what we have done, are doing, and intend to do with the teaching haphazardly called "art" in our schools. Simply put, if we wish to have art education as a vital part of our institutions, let us not use this term when we engage in activities that are best considered as training, therapy, craft, and so forth.

Art-making

I use the term "art-making" throughout this paper while others prefer "producing" or "creating" when discussing the origins of art objects. The term "art production" is often related to Marxist views that consider all art as manufacture or work similar to other types of work. This is, in large part, an objection to a romantic notion of art conceived and made by a "creative" genius in a manner beyond our ability to define. Some proponents of DBAE use "art production" for the studio component. They freely interchange the term "production of art" for "creating art" but, at the same time, they usually acknowledge a creative factor that can never be defined fully.

It is my premise that the terms "creating" and "producing" are closely related to views of the artist in society. As Janson (1968) says, "Men of genius were thought to be set apart from ordinary mortals by the divine inspiration guiding their efforts, and were called 'divine,' 'immortal,' and 'creative' (before 1500, creating, as distinct from making, had been the privilege of God alone)" (p. 108). I use "art-making" without probing the underlying question of production versus creation until chapter three where I will argue that art-making includes the application of skill, knowledge, and creativity towards the making of the art object - therefore, in the educational studio, we must consider skill development, training, knowledge, and creating.
Art

In this thesis, I refer mostly to art objects that are widely accepted and recognized within our culture. These choices are not intended as a programmatic definition of art, rather, they are an attempt to use clear examples of art that give rise to aesthetic experience. I will elaborate on the choice of art in chapter three where I take a pragmatic approach and suggest a core of proven art, including folk art, crafts, decoration, ethnic art, commercial art, and avant-garde art, as the basic examples.

I will argue that we share an aesthetic "eye" that provides educational validity to the art that has achieved broad and lasting appeal. Also, we take prior experiences and knowledge to our aesthetic interaction with the art object - this provides validity to art that is evaluated and selected by art experts who have pertinent prior experiences and expert knowledge. I take such a pragmatic approach because the main intent in the educational studio is to provide art-making experiences and this cannot be done in any worthwhile way without some attention to the art objects made. However, the political or social implications of such objects are a secondary concern in the studio and they are dealt with primarily in other art disciplines or in other subject areas.

The use of art as a means for social change may be a valid educational concern, but it is a secondary concern for art education where students only need to be made aware of such contention - they do not need to pledge allegiance to any one camp while they are learning in the art room. I do not mean we can teach in a manner that slights these issues or ignores educational concern about what is worthwhile but, that students should be made aware of the ways art objects can be used without losing sight of the essential aesthetic value that makes art, art.

1 Scheffler (1965) notes, "... from the time of the Sophists (at least), it has been recognized that teaching might be geared not toward knowledge of propositions taken as true but rather toward the acquisition of skills in handling the outward manifestations of such knowledge. There are analogous cases, moreover, where the latter aim is quite respectable - for example, where teaching is geared toward the development of skills in handling and applying theories rather than toward acceptance of these theories as true." (p. 14).
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Artist

Wolff (1981) begins her book with: "It [the book] argues against the romantic and mystical notion of art as the creation of 'genius', transcending existence, society and time, and argues that it is rather the complex construction of a number of real, historical factors." (p. 1). This view, essentially denying the individual's contribution, fails to account for artists, such as Michelangelo or Dürer, who were special in their own era and remain so today - they show that, not only is individual creativity important to all Western art, but, in some rare cases it is so pronounced that it overshadows the cultural and historical factors we usually rely on to interpret cultural development. Wolff's view fails to account for the part of art, however minor, made by an individual that is unique to the maker. All art works exhibit some of characteristics of individual "genius" or creativity that makes them something more than an anonymous social product uniquely bound to a certain time and place. There can be little doubt that historical, social, and economics factors have a significant impact on artists but we must constantly bear in mind that individuality is equally significant. I will argue throughout the thesis that art education must seek to develop students' shared and individual aesthetic capacities as they relate to the visual arts.

Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE)

I will elaborate on DBAE in the following chapters, but the thesis argues against this program as it is defined and explained in the 1987 special issue of The Journal of Aesthetic Education (Volume 21, Number 2). This issue, subsequently published as a book, represents the clearest view of DBAE at the point where it was fully formulated. While there

---

1 The name, 'Discipline-Based Art Education, is credited to Greer (1984) who defined DBAE as, "Four parent disciplines - aesthetics, studio art, art history, and art criticism - are taught by means of a formal, continuous, sequential, written curriculum across grade levels in the same way as other academic subjects. Activities and skills presented in sequence produce an evolution from naive (untrained) to sophisticated (knowledgeable) understanding of art, taking into account children's level of maturation and tasks ordered from simple to complex." (p. 212).
have been several interesting developments in the writings and discussions over the last two years, this publication represents DBAE as it is envisioned by most students, teachers, and scholars.

The claim, by Clark, Day, and Greer (1987), for DBAE is,

Art is viewed as a subject with content that can be taught and learned in ways that resemble how other subjects are taught in schools. Teachers are expected to teach their students by using written, sequentially organized curricula, and students progress is verified through use of appropriate evaluation methods. (p. 131)

They continue to define the characteristics of the DBAE program where they note that "art production" is the, "... processes and techniques for creating art." (p. 135). They state, "... understanding of art is similar to understandings that educators expect from formal study of such subjects as science, mathematics, or political science." (p. 138). They consider discovery, intuition, and originality as "... processes that can be encouraged among art students in the classroom." (p. 162). In the following chapters, I will argue that discovery, intuition, and originality, important aspects of art-making, are not processes and they cannot be taught or understood in a rule-bound manner. It is difficult to see how creative art-making can be taught as a process or how it can be evaluated, "... based primarily on assessment of student learning of content specified in the art curriculum." (p. 179).

My second concern is the way the teacher's role is limited to following a written curriculum. Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) suggest the DBAE approach requires, "... written plans with objectives, motivation and learning activities, and methods of evaluation." (p. 165). And, "... teaching specific concepts, skills, information, and vocabulary at each grade level for cumulative learning requires carefully written plans .... the DBAE focus on learning a specific body of knowledge and skills suggests the use of educational objectives." (pp. 165-166). Finally, they note, "Implementation of DBAE requires that teachers follow a designated scope and sequence at all levels of a district art program." (p. 168). I will argue in chapter four that the best means of teaching art is
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the educational studio and an artist-teacher with significant autonomy in terms of content and teaching techniques.

A view of Western art education

It is important to acknowledge that much of my thinking and writing is limited to the context of the educational studio within our school system where we are dealing with issues related to a shared Western culture. I will not attempt any extended arguments beyond this context since this would involve additional discussion on virtually all issues - this is not essential to my proposal for an educational studio in our schools where the majority of students, including most immigrants and the native population, are steeped in Western culture. We have a broad mix of ethnic and cultural influences but, the basis for understanding art among students, parents, administrators, and teachers is Western Art and the related educational philosophies.

Thus, when I propose that we share a common aesthetic nature, or a view of aesthetic experience, it is in the context of Western society. Similarly, in this thesis, I am concerned with art education, including the consideration of both Western art and non-Western art, from the perspective of a Western society. I am assuming such an approach is appropriate and that multicultural or ethnic concerns, concerns that are considered and included in the studio to a limited extent, should be addressed mainly as separate subjects within the curriculum.

I suggest that, if we include a comprehensive studio component with an artist-teacher present, we can have worthwhile art programs in general education. We are fortunate to share a wealth of "excellent" art that provides clear examples for the educational studio through its ability to initiate and sustain the aesthetic interest of students. Also, we are part of a prominent culture that constantly pushes the frontiers of art in terms of subject matter, technique, and concepts. Finally, we have access to and a tolerance for a variety of art from other cultures. In short, we have all the ingredients for a comprehensive art education.
Chapter 2
The evolving role of the studio

... the intellectual, vocational, social, and individual purposes of education we emphasize throughout the report have provided the foundations for educational endeavour for more than 2,000 years; we believe those foundations remain as durable and useful today as they were at the beginning of the Classical Age.

(Royal Commission on Education, 1988, pp. 65-66)

I would take the above quotation to mean that we, as art teachers, will continue to be concerned with providing an appropriate art education that reflects our history for both the individual and for society. That is, we will be expected to address the scholarly interests of our students, meet the training needs of a technological world, socialize students, and address the individual needs of the students in our care. These concerns are common to all subject areas, so they will necessarily impact the art curriculum and the studio. I will highlight some intellectual, vocational, social, and individual reasons for teaching art from the past, as well as the current situation, since much that has gone before is pertinent for art education today. I propose to briefly examine our past history to show the origins of the current proposals to use art in the schools as a means of training a work force, as a means of supporting social concerns, and as a way of developing artistic understanding.

It is clear that making images has been a human activity limited by diverse cultural factors yet strikingly similar across cultures and time. Images were made and perceived by people crossing generations and cultures while their meaning was often of a more esoteric nature. This chapter is included to show how studio environments, that include extensive art-making experience alongside artist-teachers who appear as masters of workshops and later as academicians, were significant in our culture and, as such, deserve mention in a proposal for studio art in
schools. More importantly, I will suggest that two movements appeared in the history of art education at the turn of the century and, that they are still important. One was a requirement by the society to train workers, the second was the desire to support social concerns — both appeared in the school art room where they were taught as "art".

The early studio workshops

As we consider the Classical Age and the art-making of the Greeks, we see similarities between their art-making and our own. From this time onward, we see workshops where students learned to perpetuate and enhance the work of their masters. We can consider Greek and Roman workshops with their masters, slaves, and apprentices as precursors of the European apprenticeship systems that, in turn, provided a model for art training in the schools. They represent a model of the student-artist as artisan. In these systems, students were trained in the established techniques and familiar subject matter of their society through work experience and progressive skill development until they were ready to begin working independently as journeymen or masters.

Individual contributions were significant in these early systems just as they were in later periods. While there was no concept of artistic genius prior to the Renaissance, the value of the contributions made by the individual as art-maker was established long before Giotto. For example, we know Lysippus was Alexander's court sculptor or that the famous Laocoon was sculpted in the workshop of Hagesandros, Athenodoros and Polydoros of Rhodes. As Janson (1968) notes, "... by about the middle of the sixth century B.C. vase painters were so highly esteemed that the best of them signed their works. Art lovers might collect Psiax .... the way people nowadays collect Picasso." (p. 21). This awareness of an individual's contribution continues to the present day and many artists, such as Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Dürer, Rembrandt, Van Gogh, and Picasso are household names in our culture. Other cultures show a similar acknowledgement of individual contribution. For example, early artists like the Chinese painter Ku K'ai-chi or the Japanese printmakers Hokusai and Utamaro are noted for the exquisite quality of their art.
that seemingly stands apart and above the paintings and prints of their contemporaries. Their work stands out as "excellent" art in their own time and culture as it does in Western thought today. Gombrich (1972, pp. 52-59) provides a vivid picture of the Greek sculptors and painters who, during the time of Pericles, emerged as significant members of their society. He relates how architects and sculptors, such as Iktinos, Pheidias, and Myron, planners and decorators of the temples that are the basis of much Western Art, emerged as individuals. The fact that we know the artists' names and the works that emerged from specific workshops illustrates how some individuals rose above the view of the artist as a mere artisan who provided menial work or disposable handicrafts. It is clear that individual, creative contributions to art-making was important from the earliest times just as it is important in the educational studio of today.

We can see the emerging philosophies of art and education that relate to our own time and we see how rote learning of crafts was joined by conscious expression of recorded philosophical theories by the time of the Renaissance. From the Classical Age to the Renaissance, artists and students were masters, journeymen, assistants, apprentices, or slaves who worked on well defined art objects for the aristocracy, church, state, or patron. They were united by their intimate knowledge, often shielded by secrecy, of materials and techniques which could only be acquired through progressive experience with art-making while doing productive work. With the exception of those outstanding artists and masters we know so well by name, they were firmly established in their society as artisans and craftsmen who made jewelry and furniture as well as painting and sculpture. The artistic practice was based more in rule and tradition than in freedom and creative inspiration.

It was with the Renaissance and such artists as Leonardo da Vinci and Dürer that we see our contemporary role model emerge and we see the artist as scholar and intellectual as well as art-maker. These intellectual and artistic pursuits were also joined with educational activities. Dürer's written works included a book on perspective and proportion, *Treatise on Human Proportions* (1528), and one on artistic theory, *Introduction*
in the Art of Measurement with Compass and Ruler, (1525). These works, with their many wonderful illustrations, influenced most areas of Europe and remain as powerful and pleasing today as when first published. (Russell, 1967). Later, the artist-teacher appeared with the academies. For example, Reynolds, the first president of the British Royal Academy and author of the Discourses, exemplified the shift from apprenticeship systems to the academies that began to assume responsibility for training artists. In his fourth address to students of the Royal Academy, 1771, Reynolds (1987) opens his discourse by saying, "The value and rank of every art is in proportion to the mental labour employed in it, or the mental pleasure produced by it. As this principle is observed or neglected, our profession becomes either a liberal art, or a mechanical trade." (p. 13).

While there may not be specific philosophies of "art education" from the Classical Age, the Middle Ages, or the Renaissance directly related to the present, the apprenticeship systems, that prevailed well into the 1800s, and the academies are pertinent to the educational studio. They provide a historical perspective when we teach art-making where we use some traditional techniques and art as examples or, discuss the role of art and the artist in society. They clearly indicate that the working relationship between a master and apprentice inherent in such learning systems contributed to the making of some of the most profound and valued art of the Western world. These studios formed the basis for training artists and shaped both the art and the art connoisseurs of the day just as they were shaped in turn by the broader needs of their society.

In the educational studio of today, we are not interested in producing art objects for patrons nor do we intend to train artists. We are teaching art to a general student population. However, as I will argue in chapters three and four, creative art-making is an experience that can help students attain a deeper understanding of art. I will also argue the artist-teacher in the educational studio is the best means of providing such experience for the students. Without a reasonable amount of guided experience with art-making, few students will be in a position to make significant art. As Constable (1987) says, "There has never been a
The evolving role of the studio

boy painter, nor can there be. The art requires a long apprenticeship, being mechanical, as well as intellectual." (p. 306).

As a final comment on these early studio systems, I would note that, while it is true art does not make advances in the same way as science or other disciplines, there is a progression in art that can be seen clearly in terms of the techniques and materials used. In the past, the introduction of the printing press and oil-based paints were the notable examples, and constantly improving techniques in graphics and casting were also significant for artist and art as well as for industry and commerce. Today we see changes in schools and studios through use of computers, photography, and video techniques. It is clear that the available art materials and their inherent limitations affect the art that is made and they affect art education. It is a rather tentative analogy to the earlier studios, but I would suggest the use of computers and other new media - when they are used as media and not just as tools - indicates a clear demand for artist-teachers with expert knowledge in both technology and art education. Otherwise, we are likely to be teaching commercial art techniques through rote learning of prescribed routines with little or no attention to individual creativity.

The changing role of the studio

It is only when we see art in the schools of the 1800s, after a time of industrial and political revolution in France, America, and other parts of

1 Farley and Neperud (1988b) note, "The multiplicity of artistic forms, the recognition and valuing of ethnic differences, widespread use of the computer, the expansion of contending values and aims in art education, and growing emphasis on recognizing and appreciating the cultural heritage have all interacted to change art education, and consequently teaching, from disseminating a singular unquestioned truth to more diverse and changing patterns ... The interactive relationship uniting creator, computer-mediated art, and audience will allow education to focus more on feeling and understanding than on concrete art production." (p. 222).

Pope (1988) discusses the use of computers in art on pages 321-323 and pages 326-333. He writes, "... the computer is the most appropriate instrument with which to facilitate the realization of substantial concerns with kinetic, participatory, and cybernetic art forms, which when mature cannot have other than a major impact on art theory and aesthetics." (p. 323).
the world, that we see a direct relationship between those educational concerns and current art education. The similarities can be seen through the academies, the French ateliers, and the British design schools where emphasis on theoretical knowledge bound to systems of rules and rigid practice provided the replacement for the mechanical training of the guilds. These institutions, along with other European influences, were significant for later art education.¹

There remained a need for young ladies of good social standing to have a little drawing or watercolor skill along with other social graces. Similarly, young men, especially those associated with the military or navy, would find drawing skills appropriate to field sketching or map-making. Such "art education" was provided by drawing masters for the wealthy elite but did not influence schools. The predominant view prior to the 1800s held that public training was a charity provided for the improvement of artisans or that the common aim was to improve the future working man and make him more efficient. However, during the 1800s art or craft training became necessary and mechanical arts for tradesmen or workmen who used their professional skills to produce useful products proved to be increasingly important.

The emergence of the academies as the means of teaching art to students was a major change. The shift was based not only on the gradual separation of craft from "fine art" or Art with a capital A that came about with the Industrial Revolution, but also on the new mass production of so called "art" for a new middle class. The result was a drastic redefinition of art, artists, art materials, techniques, studios, and art education while, at the same time, there was a gradual separation of the art establishment, comprised of museums, galleries, and art dealers, from the practical art taught in the schools. This separation still exists to the present where innovations appearing within the art establishment

¹ Many of the ideas in this section rely heavily on the book by MacDonald, The History and Philosophy of Art Education. This informative volume focuses on the period from 1800 to 1970 with an emphasis on British art education. See also Efland (1983) for a concise view of the same period.
usually have little or no impact on school art programs until they have been well established and often left behind by current art movements.

The most important considerations from this historical period were the two distinct views of art education that emerged by the turn of the century. One view considered art in schools as a means for practical training with emphasis on design and crafts while the other considered art as a means for social change. These two schools of thought are still with us in various forms and they are important for our understanding of art education especially in regard to the educational studio.

The initial concern of school art was to provide practical training that suited the needs of the machine age brought about by the Industrial Revolution and the new middle class that craved its products. It was a means of providing gainful employment and for providing products, many labelled as art rather than craft, that could not be produced by the cottage industry. Such art training occupied the most prominent place in the schools well into the 1900s. But, while art training was perpetuated such that objectives were extrinsic and the emphasis was on practical arts and crafts, the establishment of the Bauhaus by Walter Gropius and the work of architects such as Frank Lloyd Wright merged the aims of the art trainer and educator within a concept with an overt social emphasis. The Bauhaus, founded in 1919 by Walter Gropius, was instrumental in changing the concept of art education at that time. Gropius makes the spirited statement that he did not,

... wish to separate the artist from contemporary society, lest they produce an art proletariat lulled into a dream of genius and enmeshed in artistic conceit - destined to social misery - condemned to a life of fruitless artistic activity - social drones, useless, by virtue of their schooling, in the productive life of the nation. (Macdonald, 1970, p. 317. Original quotation is from Gropius' Idee und Aufbau des Staatlichen Bauhauses Weimar, 1923, translated in Bauhaus 1919-1928, published 1959)

The Bauhaus objective was industrial design that applied art to dress, home, and church; their concept of general education included the notion that there should be no barriers between architecture, art, craft,
industry, and society or between the arts in art education. (Richards, 1940).

Overt socialization through school art also appeared at the turn of the century and we see the beginning of views that look to art-making as a means of understanding the mind through the study of an artistic process. For example, socialization through art appeared in the guise of the "Picture Study" movement, a movement in America that first appeared during the 1890s due to the availability of postcard size reproductions and the growth of art museums. This program stressed elements of beauty in some of the masterpieces from the Renaissance genre school of French painters, and some Victorians, but the focus, and primary intent was not aesthetic education but rather, improvement of public morality through the lives of these artists and the story depicted in each painting. Similarly, the supposedly elitist "aesthetic movement" led by Whistler emerged and proposed that artistic sensibility was the only serious consideration. These movements were prominent at the turn of the century and, with some delay and evolution, made their influence felt in the schools. At the same time, art in the schools began to be seen as a way to mental health and as a therapy contributing to psychological comfort. Sigmund Freud's work became influential and the combination of psychology, art, philosophy combined, with a changing concepts of academic and industrial art led eventually to the non-directed creative art approach. It is an interesting era to consider if we extrapolate from our observations and propose that art in the schools will continue to be used for reasons that are largely extrinsic and intended to address the social concerns of the day.

Another major influence on art education was the 1920s progressive education movement where the teaching of art for creativity, a major organizing idea, and the concept of self-expression through art became prominent. At this time, requirement for formalized drawing began to disappear and art instruction became almost exclusively related to the development of creativity and craft; a fairly continuous movement from the study of art as a distinct human enterprise to a view of art training and art education as a part of the socialization process. For instance, a
prime example of art for socialization in America during this period was the 1933 Owatonna Project in Minnesota. The director, Melvin Haggarty, used "art as a way of life" for drapes, landscape, etc. from the school to the general community. This program, like many others was initiated by the Great Depression and ended by the war; it is the epitome of art in the school exclusively for the benefit of society based on the idea that the two were or should be inextricably linked. (Eisner, 1972, p. 54).

I would not wish to denigrate the sincere and creative efforts made between the two world wars but, in many classrooms there was an overt emphasis on socialization through art that excluded most of the traditional approaches. This led to some of the more inane ideas about negative adult influence and the use of art reproductions in the school. On a more positive note, the concept of artistic creativity was linked closely to the imagination and seen as a way to provide a nonverbal form of communication. Some of Dewey's ideas about using the child's interest and experience held great promise, but in practise, led to the situations where the art room was a place for doing anything desired without any teacher intervention in the natural unfolding of the child's expression. Similarly, the "whole child" concept led to art as a means of fostering general creative ability or personal growth. Here art was integrated with other fields of study and children were seen as natural artists who were not in need of guidance.

While there was still little art education per se taking place in the schools, significant strides were made in terms of understanding the art of the child. An example is Marion Richardson who toured Canada in 1934 at the invitation of the Carnegie Trust giving lectures illustrated by the work of English art teachers. As an inspector of London County Council, she helped to establish a method called the "New Art Teaching" - this included the premise that children did their best work when painting from mental images of ordinary contemporary subjects in a wide range of media. She stressed that the teaching was for the average child, not the especially artistic pupil, and children needed positive stimulation by the teacher before they could realize how to express their ideas. These ideas made a significant impact at the time and we
see many similar ideas in influential books on art education by writers such as Laura Chapman and June McFee.

An area worth noting, because of the extensive studio art programs that resulted, was the appreciation of primitive art and the comparisons to children's art, a comparison to be made with some note of caution. This led to a view that child art is not just immature adult art but the product of a distinct stage of mental growth. The child art classes started by Franz Cizek in Vienna were a prominent influence; these led to wide exposure of child art through exhibitions in Germany, France, U.S.A. and Britain during the early part of the 1900s. Cizek was influenced by Gustav Klimt, the Arts and Crafts Movement, and Art Nouveau. (Macdonald, 1970, pp. 340-347). Thus, while the link between current art movements and art in the schools is generally tenuous or delayed, the child art movement in its inception was related to the movements and the revolutionary developments in modern painting that took place at this interesting time in Austria.

It is also worthwhile to note the changing materials and teaching techniques. When art training was first introduced in public schools during the late 1800s, pencils, pens, and paper were expensive and used mainly to promote neatness; the norm was painted desks and walls, slates, and white chalk. The supply of materials was then expanded to include common use of colored chalk, crayons, water colors, and inks. As the materials changed, the scientific approach to instruction, the technique of painting and modelling from copies of classical subjects based on the assumption that the basis of all form is geometry, changed to drawing from nature and to sophisticated freehand drawing. It was an evolution, partly caused by the materials available, that moved to lively swift freehand drawing replacing cross-hatching and stippling enclosed by hard outlines. Most of these changes were a result of the French and German methods that included drawing and copying from contemporary ornaments and from nature rather than from antiquities; they also used point to point freehand drawing rather than stippling and crosshatching. Many of the changes in both materials and technique were caused by innovations in one country that
led to improved textile designs and thus had to be copied by others. By the time such training concerns were placed in the background, tempera paints, charcoal, paper, and clay were readily available and the only limitations for art materials were in terms of costs and quantity not quality or variety.

Again, there are some interesting, if tenuous, comparisons presented by computers in the studio. The computer allows us to experiment freely, we can reproduce images easily, and there are commercial qualities in the works - it offers possibilities for creativity but also links us closely to the commercial art world. When we consider the commercial and industrial uses of the new technology, or even the way it is used by the current art establishment, the introduction of computer graphics into the educational studio can be viewed with trepidation or optimism. It is difficult to predict the impact of new materials in the educational studio but history shows that an impact and influence is inevitable.

When art first appeared in schools, "Fine Arts" was the playground where the wealthy elite could participate in the enjoyment of visual arts, perceived to have no practical value, while the "Practical Arts" trained young men for the work force and women as homemakers through industrial or applied arts. The British Columbia Royal Commission Report on Education, 1988, brings both fine and practical arts into the classroom and imbue both with equal value through two of the categories of subject matter proposed for grades one to ten. The report states,

*Fine Arts*, which includes Music, Visual Arts, Theater, and Dance, should foster creativity and provide youngsters with alternative modes of thinking .... Visual Arts should integrate the study of art production, aesthetics, art in society, and art history .... *Practical Arts*, encompasses several of the more traditional program areas as well as the emerging lifeskills .... Industrial Education shifts in focus from developing student awareness and familiarity with the use of tools, materials and technological processes to providing opportunities for students to employ different technological applications and to engage in activities allowing them to create, design, and construct. Home Economics study should focus on the family and prepare students for family living by engaging them as active learners in inquiry and reflection. (pp. 29-30)
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The DBAE program seems to have influenced the definition of visual arts and we see some creative activity as part of the industrial art focus. However, it is not clear that "alternative modes of thinking" are aesthetic or that the "different technological applications" will mean different emphasis on rote learning.

Recent movements in art education

One of the most powerful influences on art education is Bruner's (1960) view that students be encouraged to discover the basic ideas and structures of subjects after the manner of scholars or practitioners in the disciplines. The ideas generated by Bruner, ideas developed in the context of discussions about art education during the Penn State Seminar at Pennsylvania State University in 1965, focus on the establishment of art education as a discipline in its own right with art history, aesthetics, and art criticism complementing studio art. The inclusion of art history and art criticism was proposed in the 1960s and is supported by many while the unresolved issues are the ways to include aesthetics, methods of training teachers, and inclusion of social concerns and popular art in a unified view of art education.

A variety of American art education projects during the 1960s and 1970s are worthy of note. For example, there was the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) Aesthetic Program, the National Center for School and College Television (NCSCT - later identified as NIT), the Kettering Project in Art Education, the Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory (SWREL) Elementary Art Program, and the Aesthetic Eye Project.1 These projects consisted of packaged materials or resource kits including printed texts, visuals, manipulable parts such as games and puzzles, transparencies, audio tapes, films, etc. They were modular units to be used by teachers who were untrained in the fields of art and art education. These programs reflect the need for trained instructors in art and the difficulties with

---

providing specialized instruction for a large number of pupils in widely distributed locations. Walter Smith (1966) in his book, *Frehand Drawing* (first published in 1875), writes that, "Drawing can, and should, be taught by the regular teacher. One who understands the general principles of teaching can teach drawing successfully, without any special artistic gifts." (p. 200). This sounds like a statement from the 1967 Kettering Project where it is suggested that regular teachers using support materials can teach all aspects of art. The basic premise for most of these programs is that only the visual arts can provide certain indigenous qualities such as perception of visual qualities or refined ideas for visual expression; that there is the possibility of evaluation in art education; that systematic and sequential instruction can be provided; and that adult role models such as artists, art critics, and art historians are appropriate. These programs show a clear indication that studio art programs were being expanded to include at least art history and art criticism and that art education was adopting a more comprehensive and academic approach. The major consolidation of these ideas is within DBAE and it is through criticism of DBAE that many contrasting ideas are expressed.

Recently, art in the form of design has emerged in a different form as computer graphics or audio-visual media where there is a tendency to stress utilitarian ends or commercial potential as the aim of art education. Sometimes this is appears as news photography, desktop publishing, jewelry design, video productions, or other technologically

---

1 Morris (1987) considers that, "Under the influence of the basic design movement, the prior concept of art education as aesthetic and expressive, as essentially a matter of doing and enjoying has been seriously eroded. The dominant conception now sees the subject as constituting a clear body of knowledge, made up of conceptual, material and technical skills, which can be taught to pupils of all abilities and which are 'relevant' to a much wider social context that that *sic* of the child's subjective experience. This view, as we have seen, dismisses the classification between high and popular culture and dissolves the classification of separate functions implicit in the terms 'art', 'craft' and 'design'. Art education thus becomes visual education and, while it is seen as a way of knowing, the particular kind of knowledge is often seen as being more transactional than aesthetic in nature. Learning about design has more to do with the outer objective world than the inner and personal one. Such an approach, in the end, must stress the utilitarian rather than the symbolic, the functional rather than the aesthetic, the objective rather than the personal." (p. 199).
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oriented art forms that emphasize techniques and skills at the expense of aesthetic value. Emphasis on socialization through art has also eased somewhat, in part due to the excesses of the 1960s, but multicultural education is now an issue of increasing importance. The teaching of non-Western art is presented as a means of establishing cultural identity and thus felt to have social relevance in the art room. A similar line of thinking proposes that "popular art" is necessary to bring social relevance and meaning to art education. Teachers who, in the past, were able to ignore "art education" in favor of crafts or art therapy are, in some cases, still tempted to justify art in the school for reasons that should be incidental to art education and it is necessary to question the influence and use of such ideas. Blandy and Congdon (1987) present a varied and interesting series of articles related to the "democratic" use of art in the schools.

The influence of DBAE

As I indicated in chapter one, DBAE rests on the assumption that the four disciplines of art history, art production, art criticism, and aesthetics, adequately encompass all necessary aspects of art education and, at the same time, make sense as separate but related disciplines. It also assumes a discipline-based approach is preferable to a child-centered approach. The basis for the proposal is the idea that art is a subject like political science, physics, or mathematics with content that can be documented, presented, and evaluated through a sequential curriculum. Although the underlying concepts have been with us for the last twenty years, DBAE is significant because of funding, available through the Getty Institute, that has resulted in extensive discussions and writings related to the program. As such, it is a program that can

1 Abbs (1979) writes, "Through the process of mimesis, powerfully manipulated by commercial élites, the young are growing up with a prefabricated culture which is making them stupid." (p. 67). He adds, "The Greeks called all those who could not master the beauty and symmetry of their own language, barbarians. The barbarians were those who before the beauty of the world and the privilege of existence would only say 'ba-ba'. Today's barbarians are those who, fed on the cheap symbolism of commercial culture, are unable to locate their true identities, and who, in resorting to strategies of violence, destroy their community from within." (p. 71).
have significant impact on art education and it must be closely examined.

The significant recent theoretical and practical antecedents to DBAE are the writings and projects of a variety of art educators such as Brody, Chapman, Eisner, and Greer. Their ideas were influenced by Bruner's *The Process of Education* (1960), and the ensuing idea that the student should be using the art expert as a model for learning. It is significant to note the momentum and the amount of effort that have been expended on DBAE is related, to some extent, to the funding provided by The J. Paul Getty Trust for publications such as the report *Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools* (1985) and the special DBAE issue of the *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (1987). These publications were widely distributed, and other major art publications, such as *School Arts* and *Studies in Art Education*, have devoted numerous articles and whole issues to DBAE. However, we should also remember that it is essentially an American proposal that has no direct relation to art programs in Canada and few similarities to the art programs in British Columbia.

As I indicated in the first chapter, my main concerns about DBAE relate to first, the view that art-making - including discovery, intuition, and originality - can be taught and understood in the same way as mathematics or political science and, second, to the role of the teacher in the studio component of DBAE. I will elaborate on these concerns in the following chapters, but there are other ways that the DBAE program influences the art curriculum in terms of how we view the student and the teacher. Similarly, DBAE will influence our choice of art disciplines and the way we incorporate training or social concerns in the art room.

---

1 *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* (1987, volume 21, number 2) provides the most concise overview of DBAE and the underlying aims. The gist of the concept is presented by Clark, Day, and Greer in the chapter, Discipline-based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art. Here, as representatives for DBAE, they present the defining characteristics of the program in great detail. The issue also includes a number of articles about the history of DBAE. See also Smith (1987a), Rush, Greer, & Feinstein (1986), Clark (1984), Madeja (1986), Efland (1988), and Greer & Rush (1985).
Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) provide some interesting insights when they discuss DBAE. They confirm that DBAE has the focus on art as a subject for study as opposed to a focus on the child. I suggest that a clearer view of the learner would help to clarify the contention that is bound to arise between those who view the student as an artist—however this is qualified as child artist or novice artist—and those who view the student as a whole person with a need for some limited art knowledge. As it stands now, DBAE describes the learning in terms of adult models where learners progress from naive to knowledgeable and the degree to which an individual is naive or knowledgeable can be measured against predetermined adult standards. Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) simply write, "Students should be assigned learning activities and tasks that acknowledge and accommodate their respective levels of cognitive, social, and physical maturity." (p. 169). It is doubtful whether such measurements against adult standards will be of much use in a studio program for children where evaluation must surely be in terms of individual progress and where individuality and creativity are important.

Similarly, a clearer concept of the teacher's role would be helpful. There is a sense that teacher involvement and decision making is included in the DBAE proposal largely due to the failure of earlier projects that attempted to implement teacher-proof packages and not due to any real inclination to delegate responsibility or initiative to qualified teachers. I propose that a successful art program must stress teacher training and acknowledge the teacher as a vital contributor who needs support, training, and resources. As I will propose in chapter four, fully realizing the difficulties involved in defining a set of comprehensive professional qualities, there is a need for role models and qualified artist-teachers in the educational studio.

---

Teacher training remains as a prime consideration for art education. This has been true since art was first introduced into the public schools in the 1800s and there seems little reason to expect the problems or the concerns to change in the future. In many respects this is a problem shared with other subjects and one that can be addressed through additional resources and funding to help untrained teachers in the short term and to provide trained teachers for the longer term. It should be apparent from past experiences, especially the American programs with their packages and multi-media resource materials, that teacher-proof programs are a poor substitute for real teaching. The focus must be on improving teacher training and then on placing these qualified teachers in the art rooms. The true challenge may reside as much with teacher colleges as with teachers.

DBAE, a timely proposal in terms of current calls for structure and evaluation, is very much concerned with an emphasis on accountability. There are firm acknowledgements of a need for continuity over the grades and for an instructional sequence that ranges from the simple to the complex. The emphasis seems to be on the ability to accommodate mobile, transitive student populations; the need to follow other subjects in the core curriculum; and the need to evaluate programs. There are repeated calls for an ability to evaluate and thus justify DBAE in the same way as other subjects in the curriculum but there are few clues in the writing about DBAE as to how we actually go about evaluating or what should be evaluated. Best (1986a) offers the apt thought that there is, "... the tendency to give priority in education not to what is humanly of greatest importance, but to what can be relatively easily assessed - i.e., quantified." (p. 16). It is certainly necessary to evaluate as a part of teaching, both to enhance the learning process for the student and to allow the teacher to teach, but this can be done without reducing art-making to a set of curriculum guidelines that are to be interpreted in exactly the same way by every teacher. The obvious concern centers on the way and means of evaluation and the pressure applied to programs if this becomes a disproportionate part of the justification for art. This is especially so for the studio component.
One of the most obvious issues to be addressed, and of particular concern for the studio, is the integration and relationship of art disciplines. For example, in British Columbia, the *Elementary Fine Arts Curriculum Guide/Resources Book* (1985) and the *Secondary Art Guide 8-12* (1983), include art history, art criticism, and aesthetics within the curriculum. For secondary education, the guide says, "... the program stresses the development of reasoned criticism and sees the history and heritage of art as integral to all art courses" (p. 4), while the elementary guide includes attention to both: "... creation and appreciation" (p. ix). I suggest that such guidelines must ultimately rely on the discretion of the individual teacher who will have to decide how to incorporate the disciplines and the proportion of time for each. It is only where we have failed to properly prepare artist-teachers that we have problems with integration of disciplines.

DBAE proposes art as part of a general education. Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) clearly state that; "Art is taught as an essential component of general education and as a foundation for specialized art study." (p. 138). But, again, there is little guidance for those who will be asked to make this integration work in a way that addresses both the understanding of wider concerns within general education and those concerns that are unique to art. The above quotation appears as a rather simple answer to what is a complex and controversial issue where it is not clear that, the early skill development and extended art-making

---

1 The inclusion of disciplines and the exact balance or time to be allocated to individual disciplines are among the more contentious issues for DBAE. Suggestions about the disciplines to be taught include Gray (1987), who would see aesthetics eliminated at the elementary level leaving the other three disciplines in place and Lanier (1987), who would exclude all disciplines but aesthetics - he would view the student as a consumer of art rather than an artist or art expert. Chalmers (1987), would expand the number of disciplines to include the concerns of other areas such as psychology, anthropology, and sociology to account for the cultural perspective and to ensure a contemporary approach to art education. See also Dorn (1984), Bersson (1986), Hausman (1987), and Eisner (1972, 1984) for other views. Regarding the balance of instruction, Greer (1984) suggests, "... a natural balance in the instruction that does not rely upon prescription or formula." (p. 216). Eisner (1987) states, "... there is no ideal arithmetical ratio to prescribe how much emphasis should be devoted to each discipline at any particular grade level. Such decisions are best left to the teacher, as long as it is understood that all four are important." (p. 24).
experience required for those who wish to pursue mastery in art is appropriate for art in general education. I do not intend to pursue this issue in the thesis, but there is some indication from art history that the best artists were exposed to extensive and specific early art-making experiences, often at the expense of other educational concerns - this would not be appropriate in our schools now where we must acknowledge that few students go on to pursue professional art careers.

There is promise in DBAE's four disciplines with the opportunity to focus on art and to emphasize learning that can only be accomplished through art. This has to be tempered with an awareness of the past emphasis on vocational training and practical crafts, and the progressively more overt emphasis on the school's role as a socializing agent. We must recognize that art may be seen as a means for addressing such varied concerns as job training, physical and mental therapy, or right-brain development - ideas often supported by art teachers who are required to justify the time and resources that are allocated to the art programs.

The greatest danger presented by DBAE is the idea that art-making can be taught in a rule-bound manner. But, I would also add that, if we implement DBAE with a "watering down" of the content through a major emphasis on ethnic art, popular art, design, visual literacy, or technology to please the administrators, politicians, and the lay community, we will have gained little. Similarly, if there is only token attention to some of the disciplines by untrained teachers who rely on rote learning from the written curriculum, we will be child-minders.

---

Morris (1987) writes, "The question of 'breadth' versus 'depth' appears to be one that dogs art education continually .... A common solution seems to lie in an approach that sees the early years of art education as being 'foundational'. The foundational years are then seen as offering a breadth of experience, a range of materials and an introduction to the formal elements of visual language .... In some instances, this has led to a 'circus' strategy in the early years, a system whereby pupils rotate through a whole range of different art, craft and design disciplines and, very often, a whole range of different teachers." (p. 198).
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We should also ensure training does not replace art education in a DBAE program. We see the concerns for practical results through a statement from Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) when they say DBAE: "... can serve as a solid foundation for many careers and avocations in the visual arts, such as museum work, commercial design, illustration, art administration, connoisseurship, collecting, gallery sales, scholarship, and art writing and publishing, to name a few." (p. 146). They indicate a wish to continue the relationship between art education and practical careers, a concern about the practical requirements of the individual and society.

I also suggest the inclusion of additional disciplines to address increased concern for ethnic, racial, and sexual issues, in a program such as DBAE, must be viewed as a further erosion of the necessary attention to art education. However, if we accept that our aesthetic conventions or "language" are part of the socialization process and that we share these conventions as creators and viewers of art, we could be faced with an increasingly rich mixture of art that synthesize into meaningful new movements or, alternatively, be, faced with a confusing and diffusing conglomeration of popular art forms that become a superficial veneer hiding a lack of real progress. In British Columbia, this could be seen in terms of the contrast between the new vitality that we see in and through Native Indian art, much of it through the influence of technology and the overt interaction with Western culture, as opposed to the static production of traditional Native Indian art objects for the sake of "cultural identity" or for commercial purposes.

Using art in practical ways, beyond the strictly pecuniary or commercial objectives, or the integration of school curricula with social concerns is a recurring theme in American education and, to some extent, in Canadian education. Such concerns could be addressed as well by other means and do not depend on art concepts. For the art teacher, such concerns will remain as potent forces in the foreseeable future because there seems to be a clear and continued recognition that academic success alone does not ensure success in society and that the schools are obliged to teach fundamental social skills. For example, the Royal Commission
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Report starts with the premise that education is a lifelong process embracing many facets of life, including personal development, career preparation, enhanced creativity, mature judgement, self-discipline, and a wide variety of life skills. Similarly, in Access to Advanced Education and Job Training in British Columbia (1988), there is a call for Emily Carr College of Art and Design, the major art school in the province, to address the need for graduate degree-level artists in design areas because such art degrees have economic significance as the prerequisites for a variety of artistic professions. (p. 27). The Royal Commission Report (1988) says, "... we look to schools to preserve diverse cultural heritages through language instruction and through other studies in history, geography, art, music, or drama." (p. 11). It is clear that the continuing requirement to address "career skills" and "life skills" as well as "cultural heritages" will mean that we must be clear about what such terms mean and how they relate to art education in order to ensure that we do not usurp the educationally unique aspects of art in the general educational sense.

This section has attempted to indicate some of the influence from the DBAE project while keeping a "weather eye" to art education history. I have tried to indicate some of the promising aspects of DBAE where art is valued for its own sake and given a place in the curriculum, but I also suggested there are many aspects of this proposal that we must question. The primary problem is the failure to recognize the necessity for creative art-making experience under the guidance of an artist-teacher. We must consider that art education deals with the unique aspects of art in the general educational sense and that any worthwhile DBAE program must help to develop artistic understanding, it must be a means of interpreting reality and appreciating art.
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A view of art education

In ethics and aesthetics our starting point must always be the values and perceptions we inherit and learn from within our particular culture ... the underlying weakness of rationalism in any field of human activity stems from the failure of rationalists to recognize the primacy of practice over theory in human affairs, and the way in which our explicit knowledge and theory is based in pre-theoretical dispositions, reactions and forms of life.

(Anthony O'Hear, 1988, p. 5)

It would be presumptuous of me to attempt a comprehensive view of art education in one chapter when it is doubtful that I could accomplish it in a lengthy tome. However, I will discuss specific areas critical to my proposal in chapter four where I suggest the studio component and the associated art-making activities are essential for art education, provide unique learning experiences, are required for a full understanding of art, and provide a basis for other art disciplines.

A shared aesthetic human nature

We, as humans raised in a Western society, may be physical beings in space and time first and foremost, then rational and moral beings, but we are also aesthetic beings. By this I mean that we share a propensity to appreciate beautiful objects for their own sake. At the lowest level, this is a human propensity to make patterns and decoration, a lowest common denominator that is of little use for my purposes, but, in our Western society, we see this propensity as a complex set of shared, culturally bound values, feelings, and concepts. This does not imply our way of expressing and perceiving is superior to other cultures, it only means we are considering a basic capacity for and propensity to experience aesthetically that manifests itself most particularly in the
visual and performing arts. I do not argue at length for a universal aesthetic nature transcending Western Civilization but, within our world the "aesthetic nature" is a shared and fundamental aspect of our humanity that is expressed through both propositional language and feelings. As Kazepides (1979) says,

Human beings are born into a world of beliefs and meaningful, understood relationships. It is this fact, that gives their experience a special, human character and enables them to live in communities. To say that man is a rational and a social animal comes to the same thing. Individual animals in a herd do not form a community; they coexist. (p. 60)

And, Kazepides also writes, "The importance of recognizing the universal truths about human beings lies in the fact that they set the boundaries of human possibilities; and, consequently, the boundaries of our moral code and our social and educational policies." (p. 61). While the boundaries are not quite as clear-cut for our cultural possibilities, the fundamental ability to interpret our world aesthetically is important for educational policies concerning art.

We can see a significant part of our existence involves choices, activities, and thinking that has little or nothing to do with physical needs, rational decisions, or moral choices. Often, we like people, events, ideas, or objects because of the way they look, feel, or sound, and there need not be rational reasons for our subsequent actions or thoughts. We can see many of our choices, such as the politicians we elect, the companions we choose, the clothes we wear, and the restaurants we frequent, are made, in part, for aesthetic reasons. We often choose more through the feelings that originate from or through the way our options appear to us as images and less for rational or moral purposes. A cynic would suggest we are avid consumers of images existing at the mercy of those who select and organize the many images that permeate every nuance of our lives - a serious consideration for art teachers.

I suggest it is important for our teaching to consider an "aesthetic nature" that makes aesthetic experience a natural and pervasive part of our lives. It is not an instinct, a metaphysical belief in human nature,
a theory of human development but, it is a concept based on those shared experiences of our world, including our involvement with music, visual art, drama, and dance where we apply "aesthetic" values. In short, we can consider this as one of the several ways we make sense of our existence, a way of interpreting the world, and a "way of being" just as we consider ourselves to be rational and moral beings.

Aesthetic human nature is not an instinct or a genetic characteristic. "Instinct" implies subconscious, predictable reaction to stimuli but, in the case of human beings, such inherited tendencies seldom appear in any clear way except in our reactions to unexpected pain or in other simplistic examples. Yet, human beings raised in a cultural group have a seemingly inevitable propensity to such activity as the decoration of objects with patterns or images. This is part of a tendency to gather in groups and, after satisfying basic needs for food and shelter, to enjoy the pleasures of the senses and emotions in a manner that is not directed purely by instinctive activity or physical drives. Humans satisfy these needs institutionally and socially through forms of cultural activity that are observed and accepted by the individuals if they participate as members of the culture. However, aesthetic concerns are quite different from our ideological concerns for political, economic, social, racial, or sexual issues even though all may ultimately be rooted in both human biology and the accidents of history. The difference is in the way we experience aesthetically; the way we respond to or appreciate something for its own sake.

I do not suggest we are born with an "aesthetic nature" imprinted on our genes but rather that it is common to humans who experience the primary socialization of a Western society where it is acquired with other shared human traits and river-bed propositions. Our "aesthetic nature" results from the synthesis of those shared propensities, interests, feelings, values, and concepts that provide our fundamental forms of agreement - importantly, the earliest acquired ability and interest constitutes the prior experiences that allow further learning in
the visual arts. Based on an "aesthetic human nature" that is acquired as we are raised in a society and culture, art education can make us better off by increasing both our knowledge and understanding of the world and ourselves in relation to the visual arts.

I do not propose that "aesthetic nature" is a predominant or exclusive trait. It is always viewed as a part of the complex totality of our human social nature that is based in part on aesthetic propensities but also on a variety of other physiological and psychological needs. For example, we never interpret our world in purely aesthetic, rational, or moral ways. Rather, we make judgements that are predominantly aesthetic, rational, or moral, but include some consideration, however limited, for all three ways of making sense of the world. I realize this is a rather tentative analysis of human behavior, but if we include physiological factors along with human rationality, morality, and aesthetic sensibility, we can begin to discuss the ways that humans interact with each other and their world. As Cassirer (1944) writes,

Sense perception, memory, experience, imagination, and reason are all linked together by a common bond; they are merely different stages and different expressions of one and the same fundamental activity, which attains its highest perfection in man, but which in a way is shared by the animals and all the forms of organic life. (p. 17)

It is difficult to deny that my argument for an aesthetic nature is, as Kazepides (1979, p. 59) says, a value judgement or a call for changing outlooks, customs and beliefs. Yet, there are, among our universal beliefs, shared ways of making sense of images. A human being "... must

1 Fiedler (1987) writes, "The origin and existence of art is based upon an immediate mastering of the visible world by a peculiar power of the human mind. Its significance consists solely in a particular form of activity by which man not only tries to bring the visible world into his consciousness, but even is forced to the attempt by his very nature." (p. 522). And, "The phantasy of the artist is at bottom nothing else than the imaginative power which to a certain degree all of us need in order to get any grasp at all upon the world as a world of visible appearance." (p. 524). Further, Fiedler concludes that there is the basis for an artistic consciousness in everyone who is raised in a visible and tangible world. He writes, "To some degree, everyone acquires that consciousness which, when developed to a higher level, becomes the artistic consciousness of the world." (p. 525).
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have, to some extent, the capacities of perceiving the world according to some categories, remembering his various impressions, and appraising and judging them according to relevant criteria." (p. 62).

The nature of aesthetic experience

I stated earlier that aesthetic experience is a synthesis of feeling and cognition similar to other experience involving sense perception that is, in part, conceptualized but, that it transcends other such experiences. We invoke imagination, knowledge, and prior aesthetic experiences in order to make sense of the object that has captured our attention and, we attend to both form and content.

Beardsley (1969, pp. 711-712) argues we can, in part, define the aesthetic experience by points on which there is general agreement. He suggests the aesthetic experience is object oriented, it is a concentration of experience that involves some intensity, it is coherent to an unusually high degree, and it is unusually complete in itself. Using these points as a basis, I will argue the aesthetic experience can be defined as follows: (1) it has an object of attention that prompts and is a part of the experience, (2) it transcends (it does not suspend) other similar experiences of sense perception by involving the imagination and by being more intense, coherent, and detached, (3) it involves the imagination without losing grasp of reality, and (4) it provides some amount of satisfaction. I realize we may look at someone we find sexually attractive in this way so I will restate that "aesthetic" experience implies the experience is a response or an appreciation for its own sake.

First, the aesthetic experience has an object of attention that prompts and is a part of the experience. Beardsley writes, "... attention is firmly fixed upon heterogeneous but interrelated components of a phenomenally objective field - visual or auditory pattern, or the characters and events in literature." (p. 711). For example, in the visual arts we experience specific paintings, prints, sculpture, and so forth - this is the case even if we are "experiencing" the art object without
actually being with it. Aesthetic experience is also object oriented even if the object or idea is present only in the imagination. As we do for other experiences, we establish a framework of time and place for the aesthetic experience such that we can make sense of it and this includes an identification of the object of the experience. We may have an experience with a sculpture and, later, another experience with a painting while touring a museum. We can also consider our visit to the museum as a distinct aesthetic experience. Thus, we have an object of each experience - the sculpture, painting, or tour. We do not say the experience with the painting combined with the experience of the sculpture equals the experience of the tour - each experience has an object and the tour of the museum consists of many parts, including other individual aesthetic experiences, that together provide a unity and coherence such that we say the tour of the museum was a separate and complete aesthetic experience that will be remembered as a distinct entity apart from the components that made the whole.

Because aesthetic experience is object oriented, we must consider the qualities that reside in the object of attention when we teach art - here we relate the individual student's ability and propensity to experience an art object aesthetically to the qualities that reside, or are perceived to reside, in the object. We can say all qualities of art images must be related to the knowledge and values of the person perceiving the object, since there is no value without a viewer, but, as we share an aesthetic human nature and extensive cultural values, it is appropriate to discuss shared values that are seen as residing in the art object itself. Thus, as a culture and as individuals, we will react differently to different objects depending on their real or perceived aesthetic and non-aesthetic qualities. Some, like the David, can be viewed by a great variety of very different individuals, viewed repeatedly, and viewed within limits as a copy or through another media without significantly changing their stature or aesthetic worth. Others will appeal to a narrower audience, will require more learning to be appreciated, or will lose their appeal if copied or viewed in another medium. Our shared aesthetic human nature makes some works of art more significant than others and we
can suggest such art has aesthetic values that are important for art education.

The second point of the definition proposes that aesthetic experience transcends - it does not suspend - other experiences of sense perception by involving the imagination and by being more intense, coherent, and detached. Beardsley writes, "Aesthetic objects give us a concentration of experience ... summon up our energies for an unusually narrow field of concern." (p. 711). He says we can interrupt an aesthetic experience with a piece of music or a book and re-establish the connection to the same experience again. He adds, "... some degree of equilibrium or finality is achieved and enjoyed. The experience detaches itself, and even insulates itself, from the intrusions of alien elements." (p. 712).

I have stated there is always cognition as well as feeling when we experience aesthetically but the experience is never totally one or the other. This means we cannot view other sense experience, where interest is also stimulated by sight, hearing, and touch, as completely separated from aesthetic experience because the cognitive component allows us to make sense of the art object in the first place as an object in time and space. Aesthetic experience transcends other experiences, it is not a suspension of other modes of perception, because we intensify, concentrate, and isolate to a degree that is not usually done in our other experience with sense perception - we do this without losing sight of the reality of the art object as an object just as we bring the imagination to the experience without losing our grip on reality. Therefore, we need to consider how both cognition and feeling are involved in an aesthetic experience that transcends other experience.

For example, if we first perceived the famous David by Michelangelo falling towards us from a tall platform, we would perceive it and react as we would if any large object descends on us unexpectedly. Here there is no consideration of aesthetic value or aesthetic interest involved in our conception of a massive object related to us in time and space even though it is a coherent, intense, and isolated experience - our feelings and thinking are totally non-aesthetic. If we were citizens of Florence in
Michelangelo's time and we first encountered the statue in the original setting on the left of the entrance to the Palazzo Vecchio without any prior knowledge that it was there, we would cognitively assess its mass, composition, and relative position in space, as we would the other art and non-art objects that entered our range of view, before we were able to focus on the David as an art object. Only after we established our relationship in the setting would we intensify our attention to the statue, focus on the aesthetic value, and omit the distractions of the Palazzo from our consciousness. Even today, knowing all we know about the David, we would place it cognitively in time and space as we first view it in the museum before we perceive it in a way that relates to aesthetic experience - we may be intensely involved but we are aware that it is not a live being and we are aware that we must walk around it to see it just as we do with any other three-dimensional object we view. As we bring our imagination and perception to an unusual intense, coherent, and isolated viewing of the object we rarely lose sight of the environment completely. In all these instances, with varying intensity, we view the sculpture in time and space as an object of particular color, shape, texture, size, and so on.

We make aesthetic judgements that cause us to react aesthetically based on our prior aesthetic experiences just as our non-aesthetic reactions are based on other non-aesthetic experiences. We would not understand or appreciate the David aesthetically with only conceptual knowledge and rules. Our prior aesthetic experiences help us to learn how to focus on and isolate the event. Also, the degree of aesthetic involvement will vary with individual physical or mental states just as it varies depending on prior knowledge and experience. These states relate to how we perceive the environment during our other sense experiences and thus will necessarily affect our ability to transcend them and experience aesthetically. As Carus (1987) observes, "It is self-evident that the shipwrecked would not be able to take interest in the beauty of the waves' dashing; the fire victim, in the beauty of the illumination."

(p. 273).
I would also note that the feelings of the moment, feelings other than those induced by the object of our attention, may influence the nature of the aesthetic experiences during specific circumstances. While we must separate contingent empirical circumstances from the concept, there can be important considerations related to the influence of those feelings that may be unrelated to the object of attention that will influence teaching techniques. For example, the degree to which we feel happy, sad, comfortable, or threatened will influence our ability and inclination to become aesthetically involved with an image. If we are very unhappy or uncomfortable, it is difficult to appreciate music, art or drama. In short, aesthetic experiences require circumstances that allow a more detailed attention to be paid to the experience.

Because the incidental physical and mental factors significantly affect an aesthetic experience, it is unlikely that we can directly teach someone to have such an experience. The problem is simply that, on the one hand, aesthetic experience cannot readily be reduced to facts or rules and, on the other, the experience is uniquely individual in a way that does not necessarily give rise to a similar experience at a given time or place for two or more people. Therefore, the experience is so intensely personal that the time and place of the experience as well as the physiological and psychological state of the individual will play a major role in shaping particular experiences. For example, if we approach Michelangelo's David in the Museum after a frustrating cab drive from the railway station where we lost part of our luggage, we will perceive and react to the statue differently than if we reached the same point in time and space after a leisurely drive that included the stunningly beautiful view of Florence as we descended from the hills. And, even if two of us arrived in the same manner we may still have very different experiences in the museum because of our many individual differences. It is only because we share enough common ground as human beings and as a culture and because we have ample teaching experience to assist us, that we can indirectly teach others to
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have an aesthetic experience. It may be that developing the ability to experience aesthetically is always an assimilation of other learning and, while we teach for the achievement, perhaps it is best considered as acquired at all times. We can only make an effort to reduce the effect of circumstances and we can teach that aesthetic appreciation requires a certain outlook and temper of mind that excludes pragmatic affairs of the moment and allows us to experience art for its own sake.

It is necessary to stress the various aspects of the aesthetic experience if we are to consider learning and teaching that pertain to the nature and quality of the experience. There is conceptualization or cognition but there is also feeling and intuition. Here, feeling is the consciousness that is not based solely on reason while intuition is the more immediate apprehension or insight by the mind that relies on an apprehension of the particulars without reasoning. Feeling is never fully defined or articulated but it allows us to account for the individual and shared appreciation of aesthetic and artistic values that defy rational justification. Reid (1981) distinguishes "affective feeling" that "... does possess affect positive or negative" (p. 46) from the wider feeling that is "... the inner side of conscious experience of everything that happens over the whole extent and range of conscious life." (p. 47). Reid also writes,

There is on the one hand a clear and sharp difference between the relatively impersonal knowledge expressible in propositional statements, "that-p", and the special kind of intuitive knowing of very particular and individual works of art. On the other hand there are very important relationships, and there is interplay, between general conceptual thinking and these very particular intuitions in which feeling plays an essential part ... feeling plays a quite essential part in the aesthetic knowing of any art. Though feeling is, on one side of it, certainly subjective in the sense of belonging to a private experience, aware immediately of its own states, feeling is, because of its organic relationship with the rest of what goes on in the psychophysical organism, also involved conatively and cognitively, (pp. 43-45)

Langford (1978) notes, "I have characterised learning, then, as the second-order ability to acquire abilities and have pointed out that the ability to learn must, as a matter of logic, be innate; and have also pointed out that innate abilities are not necessarily present at birth but may be acquired at various times during the animal's life. And this, as a matter of fact, is the position so far as the ability of human children to learn is concerned." (p. 48).
I would emphasize I do not subscribe to the ideas of those, such as Carroll (1986), who would have us believe there is interaction with art that may be totally non-aesthetic. If we consider an object or activity to be art, no matter how controversial, we are, however minutely, expressing a degree of aesthetic interest, involving feeling, and making aesthetic judgments. Meaning in art objects or the search for meaning is always significant for the aesthetic experience but never to the point where the "message" is the only stimulus for the viewer or artist. Similarly, if we are experiencing pure feeling without reason, we are in a state of ecstasy or in a trance, we are not having an aesthetic experience.

The third point states that aesthetic experience involves the imagination without losing grasp of reality. In this regard, Beardsley writes, "... aesthetic objects are make-believe objects; and upon this depends their capacity to call forth from us the kind of admiring contemplation, without any necessary commitment to practical action, that is characteristic of aesthetic experience." (p. 712).

It is the inclusion of the imagination - our store of personal experiences and intuitive ideas that incorporates physical reality into the creation of the mind, without losing sight of the fact that we are also reading a book, watching a play, or listening to music - that allows us to respond to, appreciate, and relate to objects we find beautiful or satisfying for their own sake and without any need for practical action. Also, it is this separation from practical concerns that, together with the synthesis of cognition and feeling, allows us to attend to the unarticulated.

---

1 The area of research and thinking that proposes to analyze the nature of aesthetic experience in terms of cognitive psychology and the "computer model" of the mind is not examined here since it would lead to extended discussions beyond the scope of the thesis. Neperud (1988) is one of many who attempt to use the information processing model to analyze human experience. He notes, "Aesthetic experiencing embraces the complex interconnected processes of attending to, discriminating among stimulus properties, interacting with referents drawn from the study of art, and colored and directed by affect; this range of stimulus and cognitive interactions parallels contemporary views of information processing." (p. 277).
"rightness" or "form" as well as the content of the object we are
experiencing. We can distinguish aesthetic experience and sensibility as
a way of perceiving and interpreting; a way of making sense of a world
that is filled, from the beginning of our consciousness, with the
perception and interpretation of visual object.

The fourth point states that aesthetic experience provides some amount
of satisfaction. That is, we get satisfaction from the experience and this
satisfaction is derived from the totality of the experience over and
above the individual parts. For example, a picture is more than color,
line, medium, or subject matter. As we experience aesthetically, our
interest is prompted and maintained primarily but not exclusively by
the "form" expressed through the total arrangement. Our satisfaction is
derived from an intuitive knowing and understanding where feeling is
an essential part and where we attend to both the form and the
meaning we attach to the form. It is the interrelationship of the parts'
formal rightness, the "fit" of form and content or the "appropriateness"
of the form for the given content, that provides the satisfaction.

For example, if we look at Goya's etchings from the Napoleonic Wars, we
are fully aware of the horror depicted yet, if we are aesthetically
involved, we are satisfied by the design of each etching. We are
conscious of and satisfied with a totality that resides in the etching as a
piece of art even though the subject matter has the potential to cause
great discomfort if it is viewed as anything other than art. If we are not
satisfied to some degree with the content matter or the meaning, we
quickly focus on a discursive analysis of the art object in order to
determine the political, sexual, ethnic, or other such subject-related
considerations that caused our lack of satisfaction. Similarly, if we are
not satisfied to some extent by the form, we will quickly divert our
attention and resent the need to attend to the object. Here we may focus
on formal considerations, such as a lack of unity or an area of discord,
that caused our lack of satisfaction.

The traditional view of aesthetics, based in large part on Kant's writing
about aesthetic judgement, relies on a "disinterested" interest or pure
feelings of pleasure or displeasure that are ultimate and irreducible components aroused in a viewer of the beautiful. I do not intend to explore this theory in any depth but I would suggest the word "disinterested" is misleading and it would be better to consider "aesthetic" interest. I would suggest there can be no "disinterested" interest when the focus on an object provides satisfaction to the viewer and when satisfaction is critical to defining the experience. This is especially clear as we engage in the activity of art-making where "interestedness" may be seen in the intensive cognitive involvement and the sensitivity to skill that is often required to facilitate the very personal expression of the artist. There is a necessary interest in all estimating, judging, and making of art. Wolff (1983, p. 73) writes that the aesthetic attitude offers us an explanation for considering sunsets or Duchamp's ready-mades as art objects because we can look at anything this way. This is certainly true but we need not suspend other modes of perception or to experience a "wholly disinterested pleasure" in order to assume an aesthetic attitude.

So, as part of our primary socialization we acquire an ability to experience aesthetically that allows further development of interest and capacity. We acquire such an ability through sense perception; by doing things that involve the use of our limbs, eyes, and ears; and, very likely, in some part, by art-making. We do not likely acquire such early ability through theory or conceptual learning because the results, seen in the activities of young children, manifest themselves before such theory can be taught. We see children drawing, coloring, and shaping at very early ages. Similarly, we see song and dance as a part of children's lives early on in their development. These aesthetic involvements are learned by practice alone or through an emphasis on practice over theory and the earliest manifestations of the child's ability and propensity to engage in such aesthetic activities are also through practice.

1 Kant (1928, Meredith translation) writes, "Taste is the faculty of estimating an object or a mode of representation by means of a delight or aversion apart from any interest." (p. 50). This is perhaps clearer in the Cerf translation (1963) where the translation reads, "Taste is the faculty of judging an object or a mode of representing it by a wholly disinterested pleasure or displeasure." (p. 12).
This leads to the very problematic question of what is learned and what is acquired. Kazepides (1986) tells us, "The distinction between 'acquisition' and 'learning' is a very important one. Unlike the learning of other propositions, the acquisition of these rock-bottom beliefs does not allow the use of the intellectual acts of explaining, demonstrating, doubting, justifying, etc. - such acts are irrelevant and impotent." (pp. 328-329). Kazepides (1987) also writes, "... river-bed propositions are acquired or inherited without thinking, investigation or justification. These ordinary certainties are not matters of knowledge and must be taught as a foundation, substratum or background without evidence and without reasons." (p. 238). And, he also notes they are a vast core of propositions that stand fast for us but not independently of one another (Kazepides, 1986, pp. 327-328). These river-bed propositions include the many acquisitions that pertain to our ability to experience aesthetically - they are acquired first through practice and not through theory or learning of conceptual knowledge.

I am proposing that the initial aesthetic capacity is not a separate entity that can be viewed in isolation. Furthermore, I would argue there are no specific river-bed propositions pertaining only to the aesthetic experience that can be readily identified as those needed for later acquisition or learning. There may be concepts common to this domain, but it seems reasonable to assume we acquire our concepts, such as our concept of color, form, space, or time, for many reasons and in many ways - they are vital for aesthetic experience but they are also necessary in non-aesthetic ways. Atkinson (1982) says,

... human creatures are born with the capacity for strong, complex emotions, which are naturally elicited by the adults who care for the child and so naturally provide the conditions of interest in and attention to the adults attempts to initiate the child into his own world. These natural capacities for emotion, along with the similar perceptual systems, similar needs for food, warmth and care, similar vulnerability to suffering, similar physical capabilities and so on, constitute that shared form of life which Wittgenstein argues is at the base of our capacity to communicate with one another and consequently learn from one another. (p. 75)
This seems logical but does not answer the questions about what is initially acquired, what is learned later, or how they differ. There is a need for substantial clarification before we can determine how humans raised in a society acquire the dispositions that allow learning of knowledge related to the aesthetic experience and, how that knowledge, in turn, allows acquisition of further capacity. We can see children acquire an "aesthetic human nature" but this is an integral part of acquiring the wider human nature where much "shared form of life" is physiological. If we agree that learning involves prior knowledge yet avoid a circular argument we must account for the initial learning. The search for a solution to this difficult problem is beyond the scope of this paper but may relate to how knowledge is formulated through cognition yet derived from experience. For now, I consider this matter of such a primary nature that only Wittgenstein's concept of acquisition can adequately explain the initial entrance into a social world with some aesthetic sensibility. I proceed to use the distinction between acquisition and learning without any attempt to resolve or justify the notion that there may be more than one type of understanding. The distinction allows us to account for the fact that we need prior knowledge to learn and thus we must account for the knowledge which undoubtedly is acquired at some stage and in some manner to form the basis of future learning.

I have mentioned the term "better aesthetic experiences" and this may need some clarification. When I discuss learning or teaching related to art-making and art appreciation, I do not mean merely the acquisition of some facts about art or the intellectual engagement with art. I consider that we can actually improve aesthetic capacity and aesthetic interest in a way that facilitates, even if it does not directly provide, better aesthetic experiences. While the better aesthetic experiences may be the achievement, there is obviously also better capacity and interest

---

1 Osborne (1984) notes, "Nowadays 'sensibility' has become a key term in connection with art appreciation and is sometimes used almost in the sense of a natural endowment. This is a mistake. There is no natural or genetically determined talent for aesthetic appreciation but at most a pretty widely distributed capacity which, fortified by interest, can be cultivated and developed." (p. 33).
where we assume the propensity and disposition to appreciate art is valuable. We are striving for a state of being where the individual has the necessary facts, skills, and concepts along with the interest or propensity for engaging art that lead to first, the possibility for a wide range of aesthetic experiences, secondly, the ability to experience a wide yet sophisticated and discriminating selection of art forms, and thirdly, the ability to fully experience the complexity of art forms. In this way it is possible to consider or speak of the ability of an individual to experience art in an appropriate manner or to have better aesthetic experiences in the same way as we speak of people leading a better life in other respects. Also, the educational worthwhileness of the aesthetic experience may reside in the acquisition of what will be prior learning—that is, we may use experience with one type of art to facilitate later achievements; a repertoire of prior experiences are necessary for further acquisition of ability and interest.

Our ability to experience aesthetically and our art-making abilities are closely linked because practice provides the basis of all our ensuing experiences with art and provides a foundation for further learning. Thus, art-making is necessary for a full understanding of art and it is necessary for a comprehensive art education. If we are to understand and appreciate the David in the fullest sense, it is helpful to have done some sculpting in order to experience how skill, individual imagination, and knowledge combine to make a work of art emerge from raw materials into an object with aesthetic qualities. We cannot fully understand the magnitude of the David as art unless we have worked with marble or something similar—of course, such levels of esoteric experience in general education is not always necessary or possible. However, it is only our earlier experiences of practice where we manipulate materials, touch three dimensional objects, and transform mental images into concrete objects—including both aesthetic and non-aesthetic objects—that allow us to make sense of the David both as an object in time and space and as an object in artistic terms. It is our earliest aesthetic experiences with art, obtained through practice, that allow us eventually to make sense of the David in aesthetic terms.
The choice of "Art" in educational studios

Choosing art for the educational studio involves understanding what we deem to be art and an awareness of the varied functions fulfilled by art. I include such a discussion in the thesis because art-making is not a set of random activities without content value. We cannot teach techniques and skills without attending to the objects made. If we teach etching, we cannot ignore the fact that students come to the class with a massive set of images from television, magazines, and so forth. As they produce etchings or look at examples, they involve examples of art and, just as we cannot separate form from content, we cannot separate art from art-making - therefore, we make choices about the art we use as examples.

Before I continue this discussion, I offer a practical observation. In my teaching, I have often started with examples from the graphic works of Dürer, Rembrandt, Toulouse-Lautrec, and Käthe Kollwitz to present clear examples of art objects and techniques. These images are as pertinent to students as a Michael Jackson poster, they present powerful examples of graphic techniques, and they promote discussions of contemporary works. So, while I recognize the difficulties associated with selecting art for the schools amid the many options available, I feel there can be a selection - including folk art, crafts, decoration, ethnic art, commercial art, feminist art, and avant-garde art - that provides a comprehensive but manageable set of examples. These basic examples should be supplemented with the topical art representing the interests of students based on their age, cultural background, and local environment. If we pursue an approach based on using established art and techniques, not as a narrow dogmatic means of limiting choices by individual teachers but as a useful suggestion for establishing a core of art objects and techniques for the studio, it will allow a broad range of individual responses to art without becoming lost in the ethnic, sexual, and political biases so often incorporated into the art selection.

I would suggest we are a society that uses and relies on images more than ever before and that some images are perceived by students as providing an almost sacred meaning to their lives. As art teachers, we
cannot afford to rely on the "fine art" of the museums that may be alien to large segments of the student population nor can we focus solely on commercial aspects of art that rely on the slogan that truth is what sells. There may be some truth and value in both the mundane art forms and the masterpieces. Also, part of the educational value resides in the capacity to interest students and to expand their horizons - there is some "excellence" in most art if "excellence" means a potential to prompt and sustain aesthetic interest for a wide segment of students.

The main concerns for art education, in terms of choosing art, is to determine what qualifies as art objects, what the limits are for artistic expression, and how we rate the relative merits of art objects. Starting with a core of established art objects and techniques, we can expand our repertoire with examples of current art objects and new techniques. The additions should be largely determined by the materials and expertise available in individual educational institutions. When we select the art and techniques that cater to local demands and popular taste, we must rely on the judgement of the individual teachers who are best qualified to make these choices. They are necessary choices that must consider the community and the students but, they are made by the teacher to address pedagogical concerns. I recognize this is easy to say as a statement of intent while the actual choices are difficult. Teachers must deal with the limitations of their own background; the bias of students and community; and the evolutionary nature and diversity of art objects - obviously, we need qualified teachers.

As we make the necessary choice of art for the studio, we must remember we are relating our teaching to the aesthetic, rational, and moral values of our students. The art objects we choose must contain the properties, or be perceived to contain the properties, that prompt the aesthetic experience even though we sometimes have great difficulty in distinguishing the aesthetic and non-aesthetic value. Wolff (1983) notes, "The point is that evaluation is inseparable from empirical and factual aspects of its object. Values cannot be 'fact-free' .... all evaluations involve a certain factual defence; and facts are always value-laden. Aesthetic values, then, necessarily involve other, extra-
aesthetic values." (p. 59). This may be true but, the facts alone are not constitutive of aesthetic value nor are they necessary prerequisites to aesthetic value. However, value-laden facts are important means of establishing and defending aesthetic value in art criticism, art history and aesthetics. Similarly, they are important factors in the cognitive aspect of the aesthetic experience. In short, they are important when we select examples for the studio. While a popular poster may give rise to the same feelings in a student as a Rembrandt etching, we must consider other factors in the art work that relate to the achievements we strive for in the studio.

Providing opportunity for aesthetic experience, or even the relative worth of experiences, may not by itself be grounds for using an art object as an example or for making an art object in the educational studio. Western art has been used for practical uses (instrumental) and for appreciation (aesthetic) but, the utility of art seems to be the main point of contention when we discuss the selection of art objects. This is followed by a concern about how art is defined. We need to consider the distinctions that are made between "fine art" and other art to determine if such distinctions are useful in the studio. In other words, determine how the art object must satisfy certain criteria that make them valid for

---

1 One of the common concerns is the separation of useful art from fine art. I agree with Dewey (1969) who states that the only valid separation should be between good art and bad art. However, it is still crucial to distinguish between rote learning of craft techniques or craft-making and creative art-making. Dewey writes, "Disunion of production and consumption is a common enough occurrence. But emphasis upon this separation in order to exalt the consummatory does not define or interpret either art or experience. It obscures their meaning, resulting in a division of art into useful and fine, adjectives which, when they are prefixed to 'art,' corrupt and destroy its intrinsic significance .... Anyone who reflects upon the commonplace that a measure of artistic products is their capacity to attract and retain observation with satisfaction under whatever conditions they are approached, while things of less quality soon lose capacity to hold attention becoming indifferent or repellent upon subsequent approach, has a sure demonstration that a genuinely esthetic object is not exclusively consummatory but is casually productive as well .... The 'eternal' quality of great art is its renewed instrumentality for further consummatory experiences .... The only basic distinction is that between bad art and good art, and this distinction, between things that meet the requirements of art and those that do not, applies equally to things of use and of beauty." (pp. 333-343).
educational concerns. Also, we should consider how we wish art to be used and establish the relationship between art, individual, and society. We must balance the use of art for aesthetic contemplation with the use of art to support such human social concerns as political change, cultural or ethnic needs, sexual equality, personal development, and so on. The concern should be education that moves the student towards the fullest understanding of art - allows students the fullest access to art that is practical within the constraints of curriculum and resources.

Regarding the social value of art there are many opinions. For example, Richmond (1989a) notes, "... it is an idea of longstanding in Western criticism and scholarship that interest in art takes in but goes beyond content per se, even if that content is politically significant." (p. 4). Blandy and Congdon (1987) present another view where, "Aesthetic attitudes and values are subject to an everfluctuating array of ethnic, racial, religious, occupational, sexual, generational, recreational, political, and philosophical influences." (p. 121). They suggest all value residing in art is culture bound and learned through economic, ethnic, religious, regional, occupational, generational, and recreational value systems. This can lead to situations where the basic aesthetic reasons for our commerce with art are underemphasized or totally ignored. For example, those who suggest art education should be an inherent part of the agitation for political change are taking a very limiting and instrumental view of art. Here, I agree with Smith (1987b) who says,

Instead of taking the measure of a work of art in terms of its artistic virtuosity, capacity to afford aesthetic experience, and stature, which may involve taking into account a work's political or ideological import as part of an overall assessment, those who commit the fallacy of misplaced emphasis stress political significance at the expense of art's inherent values. They thereby slight those qualities that constitute the capacity of a work to afford high levels of aesthetic experience. (pp. 38-39)

---

Richmond (1989a) writes, "... as history shows, opinions may vary, within a critical dialogue about which qualities are the aesthetically valuable ones. Nevertheless, without some reference to an artwork's aesthetic qualities it becomes difficult to know in what way an object is to be understood and appreciated as art .... In other times when art was practised as handicraft (and still is in some cultures) serving a variety of state, religious, social and aristocratic purposes, aesthetic motivations appear to have been at work even if they were not explicitly recognized in matters of purpose and appraisal." (p. 122).
When we consider art for the studio, we must consider the educational value. Richmond (1988) writes, "Under the aesthetic view, as it is commonly understood, it is the potential of art to sustain rewarding aesthetic experience, to be looked at, understood, appreciated, and enjoyed simply for the insights, meanings, truths, and well-ordered qualities of form individually revealed that is the basis of its value." (p. 53). This is true but, we always include non-aesthetic values and factual defense in aesthetic judgement. I suggest that our experience with a painting such as the Mona Lisa is influenced by its use in commercial areas, the way it is exhibited in museums, and the astronomical price associated with it. We do not view such paintings in the same way we do with lesser known works and we cannot ignore this reality in the studio. We can never totally ignore the values imbued to art by the art establishment, by popular culture, or by commercial interests - they are brought to the aesthetic experience and such values may have the potential of creating interest in students. As Osborne (1986) says,

Aesthetic value is assessed in terms of percipience within the mode of direct cognitive apprehension. Stature looks to the importance ascribed to subject matter and its implications. Unless we remain alert to the difference between these criteria, and hold them apart, the confusion may make nonsense of our critical assessments and theoretical formulations. But we cannot hold them in complete isolation. For the unity which is a condition of aesthetic perception is a unity imposed upon the subject matter itself, including the nonaesthetic values in virtue of which we assess greatness or stature. (p. 336)

Before leaving this section, it is worth noting the idea that we should select "good art" by relying on the taste of the populus and avoid the dangers of elitism.¹ The difficulty here is that most people come to works of art with a variety of theories even though these are not

¹ The elitist view may be seen in Whistler’s (1987) statement where he writes, "Vulgarify - under whose fascinating influence 'the many' have elbowed, 'the few' and the gentle circle of Art swarms with the intoxicated mob of mediocrity, whose leaders prate and counsel, and call aloud, where the Gods once spoke in whisper! And now from their midst, the Dilettante stalks abroad. The amateur is loosed. The voice of the aesthete is heard in the land, and catastrophe is upon us. The meddler beckons the vengeance of the Gods, and ridicule threatens the fair daughters of the land." (p. 510).
always well articulated or even consciously applied. Popular taste in art relies on social and psychological factors that are too volatile and susceptible to irrelevant influences to be used as indicators of "good art" for the studio. However, we cannot ignore popular taste and we must consider our students' interests if we want them to get involved with art. We need not be as pessimistic as Milizia (1987) who, in 1781, offered this comment,

The public in our society has been "called a flock of sheep, and what one does the others do; a magnificent force of inertia keeps sheepishness perennial. And to perpetuate it even further, some so-called amateurs, and even experts, arise who know and love only terminologies, tales, anecdotes of the lives of the painters, the stories of their works, prices, rarity, celebrity. The celebrity of names makes them raise their eyebrows and praise and blame without any understanding of the cause. All this excitement for thunder and air! With much less efforts one might obtain more: that is, to learn to see. (p. 39)

It seems that only a historical perspective, albeit a complex perspective where future generations may return to rediscover past art, will truly sort out the important art trends from the trivial. For example, it may be years before we can definitively state that the masochistic body art that is now presented in reputable art journals is repulsive nonsense and not art. However, what cannot be denied is that all art, even the silliest, is derived in some way from tradition even if only as a revolt against established factions or theories. O'Hear (1988) notes that a public educated through practice is the ultimate test. He writes,

... in the end, the test of a work of art is the way it engages the untheoretical response of the public; a public with an education in feeling and taste, yes, but not necessarily in theoretical issues. Where there are theories underlying artistic forms and styles, as with the theory of music a music student learns, the usefulness of the theory must ultimately lie in its potential for producing works that are found perceptually, that is untheoretically, satisfying. What I am claiming here is that the type of knowledge embodied in both art and morality is a practical knowledge, neither reducible to nor subordinate to theory. (p. 122)

Education, training and socialization

I include this section because "training" and "socialization through art" continue to be significant forces in school art and often confuse our view
of art education. If we wish to have "art education" as a formal part of our society and a vital part of our institutions, and I strongly suggest that we do, each term should be clarified to determine what is included and, equally important, what is not.

I define art training by these criteria: (i) the achievement is essentially intended to provide job skills or, (ii) the art objects are limited to the "popular" or "practical" arts. I use this term for activities where the activities are used to develop a skilled work force or where the utility of the skills and concepts are to be applied in a predominantly practical way - the way art was first introduced into the schools. This includes activities such as art therapy where individual and creative art may be achieved as an incidental part of the activity but where the ability to provide therapeutic value is the main intent. I would add that skill development is not necessarily useful for contrasting art training with art education. Rote learning or repetitive exercises can be used quite appropriately in education where trained physical dexterity and manual skills are significant for the larger achievements.

I define socialization through art as follows: (i) the main intentions of the activities are aimed at conformity of behavior, willing social commitment, or development of emotional responses that are socially desirable or, (ii) the main objectives can be equally achieved by means other than art with consideration of situations where, (iii) the explicit or implicit role model is not that of the art specialist.

Morgan (1975) provides this definition, "Socialization: The processes whereby a person (especially a child) acquires sensitivity to social stimuli (especially the pressures and obligations of group life) and

---

1 Peters (1966) writes, "... we do not naturally talk of educating men as rulers, soldiers, or economists; we talk of training them ... We do not call a person "educated" who has simply mastered a skill, even though the skill may be very highly prized, such as pottery. For a man to be educated it is insufficient that he should possess a mere know-how of knack. He must have also some body of knowledge and some kind of a conceptual scheme to raise this above the level of a collection of disjointed facts. This implies some understanding of principles for the organization of facts ... implies that a man's outlook is transformed by what he knows." (p. 7-9).
learns to get along with, and to behave like, others in his group or culture; the process of becoming a social being." (pp. 118-119). I am suggesting here that much of the self-expression and self-development taught in the art rooms during the recent past was actually overt socialization. It was neither attention to the individual per se nor art education but a way to socialize children according to the norms of the society. Art-making activity in such programs was the secondary concern and the main objectives could just as well have been realized through other areas or subjects such as sports, politics, or religion.

I also include those art activities intended to achieve or explore social concerns, such as sexual and racial equality, to be socialization through art. These concerns involve role models and learning that are primarily social in nature while artistic or aesthetic considerations are secondary. This is an area that is difficult to define without extended discussion of aestheticism, feminist art, and so on. There must be room for some attention to these matters in the educational studio but they must be secondary to the artistic concerns. Many pertinent issues related to art and society are raised by McFee and Degge (1977). For example, they note, "Although art starts with individuals, it takes forms that have meaning for many people. Thus, art becomes a communication system. A people's values and beliefs are expressed through their art." (p. 7). And, "The key purpose of education is the growth and development of individuals from wherever they may be to wherever their aptitudes for creating and comprehending may lead. This is countered with the second assumption that individuals can only survive in viable humane societies." (p. 323).

I define art education thus: (i) the intentions and activities are aimed at providing an understanding of art - including learning of conceptual art knowledge and acquisition of art experiences involving aesthetic perception of form - that is or could be independent of utilitarian or moral purposes or, (ii) the main objectives can be achieved only through the visual arts with consideration of situations where, (iii) the explicit or implicit role model is that of the art specialist. This definition is intended to distinguish art education from art training and socialization.
as a unique, important educational enterprise that provides worthwhile knowledge and understanding about visual art.¹

The points in the definitions concerning the role model relate to my view of the artist-teacher as the most significant influence on students in the studio. I am suggesting we would likely provide better learning experiences in the arts for students with teachers who are, in part, artists, than with teachers who are not. For example, a teacher without artistic ability or experience presents a role model indicating that art-making is: for select groups, not achievable for all, not of major significance in the school, etc. I do not want to pursue these ideas to unreasonable lengths so I acknowledge that appropriate techniques and attitudes will make some of these concerns seem trivial yet they cannot be ignored. Without stressing the art expert as the role model, we are likely to see art as a minor part of larger concerns that emphasize other subjects in general education at the expense of the visual arts. Further, the art specialist, connoisseur, historian, critic, and artist as we know them today, maintain and enhance our artistic heritage - they provide the examples and models necessary for the educational studio where they help to validate the value judgements and generate the interest in art-making that is so essential to art within general education.

The nature of studio art-making

I consider the term "art-making" to include the application of skill, knowledge, and creativity. This is quite different from the term "art production" as it is used by those who see art activity as another form of manufacture of work. It is also different from "art production" in DBAE where the studio discipline is viewed as a process, a sequential set

¹ Richmond (1989b) says, "Whatever else may be said about education, it certainly implies change for the better, and central in this idea of change for many educators is the idea of developing desirable qualities of mind and feeling. Here I am thinking of capacities involving what it is to know, understand, appreciate, imagine, create, judge, respond affectively, by means of concepts, intuition, norms and procedures, that will withstand public scrutiny vis a vis the various important disciplines of thought. It is by means of such capacities, and in ways of our own making that we are able to interpret and evaluate experience, and bring meaning and order to our lives." (pp. 18-19).
of activities; that can be defined and analyzed. I agree that art-making and achievements unique to this activity include some aspects of skill development and creativity that can be analyzed just as it includes activity related to other types of work. However, there are also individual and cultural influences that make the activity more than work and more than a specific process. Art-making is a synthesis of cognition, feeling, and imagination combined within work activities that often rely on skill. All art is made through an artist's individual physical and mental efforts and, therefore, there is always individual creative effort through the direct control that resides with the artist in all but the most mechanical copying. I do not ignore those instances where crafts or non-art objects gain a status as "Art" through passage from one culture to another or through manipulation of the art establishment but these instances are the exceptions and they are of dubious value in terms of teaching art-making. Similarly, art made by purely mechanical means is not pertinent to art-making in education although it may be of interest in other art disciplines.

I emphasize that art-making should not be considered as a process that can be defined fully because of the necessary involvement of creative imagination combined with individual prior experiences that defies any attempt to apply consistent rules, apply standard evaluation criteria, or predict results beyond a superficial level. Individuality - the way we pose and resolve problems, the way we plan our activities, and the way we invoke our imagination - will affect the way art is made even where the end result of art-making activities by different individuals looks very similar. Art-making includes skills that are learned from past experience (often, but not necessarily, based on rote learning or physical dexterity that can be acquired only through practice) and creative effort or unarticulated individuality that can logically be acquired only through practice - in other words, there is creativity, work, knowledge, and skill involved in art-making.

I have said earlier that art-making in the educational studio often includes some art criticism, art history, and aesthetics because the art object is not made from a set of random activities or unknowing
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The manipulation of materials and, therefore, it is not made without content value. It is true that techniques and skills can be taught without any bias towards sex, race, or other such differences if we limit the lesson to abstract or non-figurative art. However, in an educational studio there should always be a role for criticism, history, and aesthetics. We would not expect the student to re-discover the technique of wood-block printing through random manipulation of wood, ink, and paper. Instead, we would expect students to learn some technique in order to explore the limits and possibilities within the medium. Similarly, we would not want students' work limited to non-objective images with pre-defined standards but, rather, we would encourage individual images showing a variety of aesthetic qualities. Also, we would include discussion about the images in terms of their meaning and importance. In other words, we would invoke past and present art that pertain to the student's work in the studio and we would evaluate the images students make in terms of both form and content - in this way we would include other art disciplines.

The creative artistic genius

There is a range of values related to an art object based on factors that include social, political, and other considerations but not reducible to these same considerations. Similarly, there are levels of skill, interest, and creativity in artists such that their stature is related to these factors but not reducible to one or more factors. We tend to rate art mainly on aesthetic value and artists on their aesthetic sensibility or their insights into life. It is undeniable that certain individuals, as individuals and not merely as a product of their society, have greater artistic abilities or "talent" than others and that such individuals emerge as the elite. By focusing on the very best examples we perceive the "artistic genius" as a designation often applied in retrospect - not as a unique, transcendent entity destined to a predetermined fate by birth, but as the example of exceptional developed excellence. In this sense it is useless to argue for or against the genetic origins of "genius" for the fact remains that there are few beings who have no aesthetic sensibilities or propensity for artistic creativity and equally few with as much as Leonardo da Vinci.
where would we draw the line between genius and non-genius? Most of us fall somewhere between these two extremes yet our "human aesthetic nature" provides most of us with some amount of "talent" or with some amount of "genius" if we use such terms.1

Kant (1928, Meredith translation) considers that genius is first, "... a talent for producing that for which no definite rule can be given .... and that consequently originality must be its primary property." (p. 168). Second, "... its products must at the same time be models, i.e. be exemplary." (ibid). And third, "... It cannot indicate scientifically how it brings about its product, but rather gives the rule as nature." (p. 169). We can use Kant's rules to help define the term - assuming of course that "genius" is a desirable state of being representing the best possible model of the artist and that we wish such qualities to reside in our students.

Kant considers originality as the primary property of genius but it must always be tested or proved by a public or specialist confirmation of excellence and by the fact that it cannot, like scientific discovery, be reduced to a formula or process that others can follow at will after the initial insight is documented or explained. This is close to the rule I have tried to establish for art-making. With these rules we can account for those aspects of art that make some artists and their work better than others through originality and sense of beauty - they provide the models. We can also indicate what we mean by creative art-making in the studio or, at least, say that the criteria includes acknowledgement by the artist-teacher of the personal expression that is bound to the personality and individual characteristics of the student. I do not

---

1 While it may not be very instructive, I would like to include this quotation from Schopenhauer (1969) who writes, "The man in whom genius lives and works is easily distinguished by his glance, which is both keen and steady, and bears the stamp of perception, of contemplation. This is easily seen from the likenesses of the few men of genius whom Nature has produced here and there among countless millions. On the other hand, in the case of the ordinary man, the true object of his contemplation, what he is prying into, can be easily seen from his glance, if, indeed it is not quite stupid and vacant, as is generally the case .... Finally, they [men of genius] are given to soliloquising, and in general may exhibit certain weaknesses which are actually akin to madness." (pp. 258-260).
propose to explore the notion of artistic genius further in this thesis but I would expect that the reasons for a difference in individual "talent" or "creativity" are exceedingly complex, are deeply buried in our earliest acquisitions, and they involve multiple genetic and environmental factors.

The final point to be made here is that we do not focus on art education for the artistic genius but rather, strive to teach for a broad range of students who represent a wide range of abilities and interests. The art objects they make represent, to some extent, what they think, see, feel, and what they are - the artistic genius is as rare as the aesthetic moron and these represent two ends of a wide spectrum where most of us fall somewhere in the middle. Gombrich (1972) puts it so nicely when he refers to Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, Titian, Coreggio, Giorgione, Dürer, and Holbein: "One cannot explain the existence of genius. It is better to enjoy it." (p. 218).

The artist-teacher and student-artist

Important artists come from varied backgrounds but all developed their talents through actual practice and through association with masters, contemporaries, society, and culture. The repeated surfacing of the "artistic genius" overshadows a multitude of other achievements over the course of history but this should not hide the important lessons of the past. These lessons show us that, while a multitude of factors are involved in artistic development, both art-making and masters in studio environments have been important factors for individual achievements. I propose that art-making in the studio where the artist-teacher and student met so productively in the past is still important if we remember the ultimate achievement is learning by student-artists, not art-making by artists.

It is clear that no artist of any time worked in isolation but rather as a product of an environment where the studio was often a significant factor and we can suggest students, regardless of their initial ability, can learn from artist-teachers. This would indicate the primary concerns for
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Art educators relates to appropriate training for art teachers and the optimum studio configuration while teaching techniques and curricula are secondary considerations that will depend more on the ability of individual artist-teachers and the available studio facilities than on formulas or packaged learning aids.

It is not my intention to discuss teaching techniques in this paper but I do not mean to ignore the difficulties or the importance of techniques in the studio. Without a thorough understanding of how technique relate to theory, art teachers can easily lose sight of art education. Art-making is a serious and complex variety of activities that vary with students, teachers, time, place, and so on. It is a sophisticated activity that requires subtle and flexible teaching techniques. Teaching art in the studio is a shared search for aesthetic meaning through art-making where artist-teacher and student-artist are dealing with the timeless problems of understanding aesthetic values, judgment of art objects, and the nature of aesthetic experience. If we summarize teaching in the studio, there should be, at least in the early stages, an emphasis on teaching to or an attempt to develop skills and on teaching to be with the art expert as role model. As Kazepides (1986) writes, "... there is that very important mode of teaching to, which seems to be neither totally the result of initiation, nor yet the exclusive outcome of furious ratiocination. This mode includes propensities, tendencies, habits of conduct, and various human attainments." (p. 331). While teaching art-making we would use the full range of teaching acts and incorporate progressively more knowledge or teaching that as the ability of the student develops to a point where the learning activities in each discipline include the search for mastery.

It may be a digression but we could compare art education and moral education - assuming first that art education is somewhat like moral education with more freedom of choice - because of the limited and unique ways of validating aesthetic judgment that involve considerable
pedagogical trust and place great responsibility on the artist-teacher. Moral education poses many similar problems in terms of making sound judgments in areas of conflicting values, in evaluating what constitutes knowledge and prior knowledge, and in determining how to teach without incorporating mis-educational activities. Moral education has more restrictive options in several of these areas but both aesthetics and ethics are uniquely human concerns that elevate man's engagement with his world above the basic survival instinct. In these areas we teach personal values in relation to social values and we deal with areas of human behavior that often defy logic and reason.

In the burning museum we may be faced with the logical choice of exiting as quickly as possible or staying to help others, the choice between saving the *Mona Lisa* or a child, or the choice between saving the *Mona Lisa* or Bacon's *Screaming Pope*. If our choices are moral or aesthetic choices, we are reflecting our position in the world relative to other people and we are incorporating individual and social values in the way we choose—we are making practical choices that may defy theory or logic. When teaching art, there are tremendous moral, cultural, ethnic, and political influences on the choice of art objects and their use in the teaching activities. It can be difficult to distinguish art that has intrinsic value from non-art with extrinsic purpose. We see this clearly when we compare erotic art to pornography, poster art to propaganda, or commercial art to advertisement. It takes a good understanding of what art education is and good character to avoid the obvious pitfalls that could lead to the incorporation of a biased set of values—this is where the comparison to moral education is valuable. We need to validate aesthetic judgement in teaching and, while the

1 Egan (1983) writes, "A value-free educational theory would be useless. What we want to know is how to produce a particular preferred kind of person; that is we want to know what value decisions we should make at every step of the way. We want to know what we should teach in order to produce a person capable of enjoying and improving Western democratic social life and its culture (or that of some other culture); how we should teach those things to encourage the development of such a person; and when it it best to teach those things in those ways. Designing a curriculum to produce a particular kind of educated person requires answering these questions, and is a value-saturated and culture-bound task." (p. 9).
penalties or results of mis-educational activity in aesthetics are not as severe for the individual or for society as mis-educational activities in ethics, they should not be taken lightly. We must trust individual art teachers and other art experts who exercise a great deal of autonomy and, if this trust is misplaced we limit the student's humanity in a significant way and we impoverish the culture as well as the individual.

I suggest there is a unique relationship between teaching and art. That is not meant to imply that teaching art is more or less difficult to teach than other subjects only that, if we wish to understand and improve our teaching, we must understand our subject through experience and we must know what we mean by art education. Teaching art history, art criticism, and aesthetics is much like teaching other subjects. And, if we have even a grain of common sense, we make teaching pertinent and interesting for students by relating the aesthetic to the rational, moral, social, and physical aspects of their world. However, the primacy of practice that is so important in art-making suggests the artist-teacher is vital for the educational studio where there is a need for knowledge, role models, experienced hands to demonstrate and help with techniques or skills, and value judgements that are based on experience. The artist-teacher must choose among art objects and art disciplines, justify the way we engage art, determine the relationship of art and aesthetics to society, consider the relationship between learning and acquisition, sort out biases, and so on. Finally, because we are involved in an area where there is constant learning and acquisition, we must recognize that art education can involve both institutional and general teaching. As Kazepides (1986) notes, teaching, "... is not a technical concept but one that has a long history in ordinary language and refers to ordinary activities of ordinary people. It is a parasitic and chameleonic concept that cannot be divorced from its content. More generally it depends on the aims and the moral integrity of the teacher, the teaching institution and, above all, the character of the particular culture." (p. 325).
Chapter 4
A proposal for educational studios

production must remain central in arts education and particularly so among precollege students. The heart of any arts-educational process must be the capacity to handle, to use, to transform different artistic symbol systems - to think with and in the materials of an artistic medium. Such processes can occur only if artistic creation remains the cornerstone of all pedagogical efforts.

(Howard Gardner, 1988, pp. 163-164)

In this chapter I propose that the studio component is essential for art education because it provides unique learning through art-making. However, I stress that the art-making must be more than a process such as the operations in manufacture - it should not be merely a series of connected actions and changes that can be evaluated and taught without considering the many different ways individuality and imagination affect the art-making experience. I emphasize a need for the creative and imaginative aspects of art-making because there is an obvious danger that without this emphasis we may see an inappropriate bias for teaching art as a process that omits concern for individual differences - a "process" of art-making, such as envisioned in DBAE, would lend itself most readily to packaged learning activities and written guides for teachers who have little expertise in art.

I present my proposal as a contrast to DBAE where the demand for structure and accountability leads to a diminished studio component where creative art-making and the artist-teacher are largely ignored. However, I also acknowledge the value of a discipline-based approach and some of the ideas in DBAE. For example, the emphasis on art as a subject in its own right within the schools is very important. Similarly, the use of four distinct disciplines is appropriate at the higher grades to support a wider cognitive involvement with art and the integration of
aesthetic concerns within the wider concerns of general education. I consider the following issues that are relevant to teaching art-making: the educational studio as a foundation for art education; the role of the artist-teacher; and the importance and uniqueness of the students' art-making achievements.

**Studio art-making experience**

DBAE is, in part, a reaction to the pre-1960s movements that perceived art in the school as an instrumental means for individual expression and development. This has resulted in a view of art-making by some of the influential writers on art education, such as Eisner or Gardner, that stresses art-making as process. Eisner (1984), in his discussion about alternative curriculum structure, writes, "... activities are not used as instruments for the psychological development of students or for catharsis. Put simply, studio activities are used to develop the skills that will enhance the student's understanding of art as a process." (p. 261). He goes on to say the reason for teaching studio art includes the belief that studio activities can develop critical skills; provide the best means of understanding art; and can elicit and refine modes of thinking and feeling that are singularly important in education. Gardner (1989) plainly states, "I am a committed cognitive psychologist who views art as a matter of the mind." (p. 145). Gardner (1988) considers art education to be a teaching of "literacy skills", and implies that students can learn to read and write in a language that is somehow unique to art.

---

1. Cognitive science and cognitive psychology are areas of study that should be mentioned as important even though I have not included further discussion in the thesis - they are an influence in various subject areas including art. Farley and Neperud (1988a) say, "The foundations of aesthetics, the arts, and art education have been re-examined in recent years in light of the resurgence of scientific aesthetics as a research discipline; "the development of contemporary cognitive science encompassing aspects of computer science, psychology, philosophy, linguistics, and so on; and the advances of neuroscience." (p. vii). Pope (1988) states, "The possibility thus exists that one's education in the arts can focus more on the transactional experience than on concrete production ..., a student's education must focus more on the critical investigation of feeling and understanding during the process of art making, and art viewing, and less on the production of material art objects." (p. 332).
assessing we all create and perceive in a manner that lends itself to a precise interpretation. He states,

... one might think of the arts as involving the use of certain sets of symbols in certain ways - for example, attending to fine details in a symbolic pattern or apprehending the expressive potential of a particular symbolic configuration. On this view, an individual who would participate actively in the artistic process must learn to 'read' and 'write' in these different symbolic systems. And so arts education can be usefully viewed as the imparting of literacy skills in the area of artistic symbolization." (p. 158)

While there may be some promise in DBAE, if it is considered with due attention to imaginative and creative art-making, I also see potential problems with the persistent emphasis on structure, knowledge, and process. As I have argued, there is both cognitive and non-cognitive involvement during artistic experiences and neither should be ignored in an educational context yet this is precisely the case in the studio as it is most often presented in DBAE. When art-making is viewed as part of the "understanding of art as a process" we are assuming there are cognitive approaches to art-making that guarantee art objects as the end result of following a prescribed set of activities. This seems a highly inadequate approach to understanding or teaching art-making and, further, it lends itself to the type of prescribed learning that is just as nonsensical and limiting as those programs that were supposed to teach "self-expression" or "self-development" through crafts or unstructured manipulation of art materials.

Hamblen (1988) gives an indication of concerns about art-making viewed primarily as process when she says that, "DBAE emphasis is on learning art content, not on students' artistic development or the conveying of original qualities in their art products. Hence, similarities among students' products are not viewed with alarm, but rather as a sign of success." (p. 23). The learning of "basic art-making processes"

---

1 Hamblen's concerns are in reference to an article by Rush (1987) who states that DBAE, "... teaches children to understand a language of visual imagery in order to expand their expressive options when they use art materials. Putting image literacy at the center of studio art instruction departs from traditional practice, which encourages media manipulation but which discourages systematic image manipulation." (p. 206).
could approach craft making or technical training and this would clearly
be the case if we disregard individual contributions through personally
creative and imaginative efforts. No matter how "processes" are defined
or partitioned into a series of connected actions or experiences, there
would be an assumption that all individuals think alike when they
make art. This is not true for creative art-making that depends on the
individual imagination - it may not even be true in craft making where
the "craft-making" process, the prescribed series of steps, will often be
clearly defined but where the mental activity may be quite different
among the craft makers. It is a process that we most often envision
when we are training or teaching crafts - here we place the imaginative
and creative aspects as the secondary considerations to the production
process - we emphasize a sequence of prescribed activities intended to
achieve a predetermined end result.

The view of art as process, without due attention to imagination and
creativity, can be shown to be inadequate or unduly limiting and, as
such, can be readily identified as a unique problem that needs further
discussion and resolution. It is unlikely that any of the proponents of
DBAE would want to omit this important and fundamental aspect of art-
making completely and teachers could readily include activities that are
less structured and aimed at an inclusion of the student's imagination
and creativity. Greer (1987), discussing DBAE, indicates students should
participate in a studio program and, "... an important goal for teaching
production is to develop an understanding of originality .... Students
should reach the artists' high levels of concentration and interest as
they set about making their own works." (p. 232). This tempers the
view of art as process in so far as it acknowledges the value of
originality and the need to generate interest if learning is to proceed.
Hopefully, the stress on originality and interest will provide ways for
students to do creative and imaginative work because, if this is not part
of the achievements, we seriously limit art education.

In Brandt's article (1988b), Gardner indicates his work deals with
assessing aesthetic growth in terms of production, perception, and
reflection. He says the, "... approach grows out of the child's actual
experience with the arts. We don't talk about perception or reflection apart from artistic activity." (p. 32). Similarly, in another of Brandt's (1988a) articles, Eisner states, "Learning in the arts is cognitively a very sophisticated operation. It requires the exercise of imagination .... It is the farthest thing from an algorithm." (p. 7). Eisner's statement places great emphasis on imagination but he also states, in the same article, that making art is a process parallel to the discipline of art production. He concludes, "We need both structure and magic in art education." (p. 9). Perhaps there is a recognition by these authors that moderation is needed so we can incorporate the teaching of creativity in the studio component of the DBAE program.

It is also important to consider the more sophisticated implications of curriculum structure. As Hamblen (1988) says, "The DBAE curriculum teaches, therefore, in at least two senses - first, what is taught through the explicit curriculum, and, second, what is taught through the characteristics of DBAE itself, i.e., what is emphasized and de-emphasized, how information is presented, and so on." (p. 24). The way studio activities are presented and structured will emphasize and de-emphasize those attitudes and interests that are the most significant aspect of the studio component and it is in this way that the atmosphere and setting of the overall studio environment becomes important. The studio environment would need to be considered with as much attention and emphasis as the science laboratories, woodworking shops, or automotive areas where hands-on-experience is equally necessary. There would have to be consideration for both students and teachers in terms of work space, storage space, materials, equipment, and so on. For example, there may be a need for locking drawers, storage rooms, or individual lockers to allow a wide use of facilities with only a monitor present yet still preserving a measure of order and safety for individual and class projects. If we emphasize the importance of the studio, the artist-teacher, and the student-artist, we teach more than the explicit curriculum and place art education as one of the important components of general education.
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It is necessary to note the sometimes subtle distinctions made in regards to the studio component in DBAE. For example, Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) state,

... comparable concern for each art discipline and comparable respect for the contribution of each toward a well-rounded understanding of art do not translate necessarily into equal school time spent on each discipline at each grade level. Art production activities often take more time to accomplish, and, therefore, art production might require a larger share of class time. (pp. 171-172)

This is not the same as an approach that sees the studio and art-making as the basis of and the focal point for art education. The time spent on the activity is no guarantee that valid achievements take place in the art room and, if we are still stressing process, technique, and skill at the expense of creativity and imagination, we continue limiting our view of all art activities including those in the other three disciplines. Therefore, it is necessary to emphasize the need for appropriate time, space, materials, and teacher training relative to those disciplines we consider necessary for art education — all as considerations within a strong studio-art program that considers all aspects of art-making.

We need to emphasize the importance of those imaginative and creative aspects that are clearly not process oriented and it is necessary to recognize that art-making, like the aesthetic experience, will always include aesthetic and non-aesthetic involvement just as it will always include cognitive and non-cognitive involvement.¹ The important thing to understand if we teach art-making is that there are always several components involved in the activity of making and, while we may teach skills, techniques, facts, and so on, as part of the lessons, art-making will always be more than any one of these. Art-making is always a synthesis

¹ Spratt (1987) writes, "The ability to synthesize — the meaningful drawing together of experience, observation, and thought — is a truly creative endeavor and one of education's highest goals.... It is in synthesis that we grasp the accretion of complex experiences and motives intrinsic to creating art: the drive to set down one's observations and feelings, the incorporation of reason and critical judgement, the honing of perception, the cultivation of skill, and the creative response to the ambiguity that resides in endeavors guided by subjectivity." (p. 202).
of the "know-how" - the skills, techniques, and knowledge we have acquired and learned - with individual imagination and prior aesthetic experiences. It is this synthesis that makes art-making more than manufacture or production.

In this thesis, I do not elaborate on the nature of art-making activities or give specific examples of art lessons. However, I would offer my own way of teaching graphics as an example of how both "know-how" and individual imagination is considered in the educational studio. I teach four components in an order that is determined by the nature of the students and the circumstances of the lessons. These components are not taught in isolation from each other but rather, each component is the focus in one of a series of related teaching activities. One component is instruction and practice related to the facts, skills, and techniques used in etching, engraving, aquatint, or other graphic media being taught. Another is an overt exploration of the possibilities and the limits that are related to the materials and the techniques. The third and fourth components relate to the aspect of art-making that requires an individual creative contribution. One of these components will involve an exercise, such as "continuous-line drawing" or "action drawing", that results in art images defined primarily by students' imagination and creativity yet restricted to some extent by the medium. This is an overt attempt to use intuition and the "accidents" of the drawing exercise to advantage. The last component is a similar attempt to use the individual imagination. Here I use a pre-determined image, perhaps an abstracted self-image or an "aged" self-portrait. The essence of this exercise is to "picture" an image made in a specific medium and then proceed to make this same image knowing there will be a constant interaction between the actual making or doing, the changing mental image, and the possibilities and limitations of the materials used. Again, I would note that all four components are seen as parts of an integrated lesson in art-making where there is constant attention to both "know-how" and individuality.

In art-making, prior experience consists of a progressive development of images that rely on some influence from the work of peers, other
artists, and the students' own art-making experiences. To satisfy a need for pertinent art-making experiences that are based, in part, on interactions with other student-artists and the artist-teacher, we need to define our educational studio as the consistent environment in the school that provides a platform across the grades for art-making. This includes learning of some processes related to skills and techniques but also those further abilities - much more difficult to teach but equally necessary - needed to create individual art works that are recognized in a public forum and also satisfy the unique needs of the art maker. As Richmond (1989b) notes, "Feeling for form, the capacity to grasp in the particular and in part, unique case what approach to take, what needs to be done to various parts to strengthen the whole, is an intuitive knowing that eludes complete analysis and conceptualization." (p. 22)

It can also be said that art-making is necessary for pertinent learning in the other three disciplines and thus provides the basis from which to teach art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. I suggest that, since we value art experiences and wish to experience art fully, we should strive to explore all aspects of art to the fullest extent possible. Thus, while we may be able to learn or even teach some aspects of art through art history, art criticism, and aesthetics without actual art-making experience, both are definitely better done with prior art-making experience and there can be no denying we learn some things by doing that simply cannot be learned in any other way. For example, all other things being equal, the student who has touched, handled, filed, or cut marble will have a fuller understanding of the *David* than a student who has no such experience. However, the necessity or desirability for such esoteric learning is another argument and the necessary decisions about how much to teach is the real problem that faces the teacher in the art room every day.

Before I leave this section, it may be necessary to restate my reason for proposing that creative art-making is so important and why it must be acknowledged as such before we can begin to consider a DBAE program that separated art-making from aesthetics, art criticism, and art history. I suggest art-making is the primary means of understanding art
because it includes those irreplaceable experiences where knowledge, skills, and materials are combined with individual imagination to make an art object and this, in turn, leads to an understanding and knowing of the importance of individual creative efforts in art, a necessity for art education. Art-making provides the first experiences that are needed for further learning and it is the unifying aspect of art education that allows other disciplines to focus on art as a subject for critical value judgement, historical analysis, or philosophical concern.

The stress on art-making does not mean we omit aesthetics, art criticism, or art history since all are part of the studio where conceptual knowledge and value judgements are necessary. Art criticism and art history are the areas where we develop visual literacy and we use the fact of historical perspective or the use of judicial comments to separate the two areas. Both these disciplines should be included in art-making activities - here the students manipulate materials to make art objects based on prior experiences that are a reflection of their culture. If the teacher is an artist-teacher who respects and values Western culture, teaching art becomes an involvement in activities that will include both making and discussion of art objects. Such lessons would obviously involve the philosophical discussion related to the meaning of art objects and their place in broader human concerns - there is always a role for aesthetics in the studio.

In DBAE, aesthetics remains the most difficult discipline for the educational theorists to come to grips with. It is viewed as the most nebulous and the most difficult of the four parent disciplines in terms of defining the scope of content, teacher training, application over the grades levels, integration with other disciplines, and related issues.¹ Art

¹ Aesthetics is a branch of philosophy that deals with the clarification of such concepts as art, aesthetic experience, aesthetic value, and so on. It is the means for a cognitive understanding of art concepts - the philosophy of art. Aesthetics, as well as being an exceedingly difficult subject for many teachers, is often used for a variety of reasons that could be questioned. In the same way that art education should not be equated with attempts to develop creativity, so aesthetics should not be considered primarily as a means of teaching students to broaden their perspectives or to develop their critical skills.
criticism and art history are relatively easy to place in the standard curriculum and their inclusion seems to find little opposition, rather, the concerns about these two disciplines seems to center on the exact nature of the art objects to be considered. Art-making remains the mainstay of most art programs and with a few exceptions there is no thought of eliminating this aspect of the art curriculum completely.

Areas that appear to be very problematic to the DBAE program are the quality or consistency of the teaching and the amount of time or content allocated to a varying number of disciplines - these concerns are often reflected in the various attempts by writers on art education to define the required disciplines in an expanded or contracted format relative to the four proposed in DBAE. It is reasonable to have concerns about teachers in terms of DBAE where we face difficult choices in terms of the techniques and skills required, the nature and method of evaluation, the nature of the supporting resources, and so on. But, this is the case with most programs and thus, should not necessarily demean the value or the promise of the DBAE concept. A far more problematic concern is to determine the scope of the disciplines - here there will be continued pressure to include emphasis on ethnic and popular art content and this is a pressure that could easily drain valuable curriculum time and resources away from our attention to traditional Western Art. There is nothing inherently wrong with the inclusion of ethnic or popular art, they should provide some of the content in all four disciplines, but there could be a tendency to focus on an understanding of ethnic concerns where the art is only incidental and a similar tendency to use popular art in a context that trivializes the art-making experience. These are the type of initiatives that previously resulted in teaching and learning

1 Smith (1987b) comes close to the mark when he tells us, "... the general goal of art education is the development of a disposition to appreciate the excellence of art, where the excellence of art implies two things: the capacity of works of art at their best to intensify and enlarge the scope of human awareness and experience and the peculiar qualities of artworks where such a capacity derives." (p. 16). And he adds, "The primary purpose of teaching students to manipulate the material of art is to help them acquire a feel for artistic design and to grasp ideas that will serve them well in their future commerce with art - in short, to cultivate in students an educated capacity for the appreciation of artistic excellence." (p. 19).
activities that have little to do with art education and more to do with ethics, morality, crafts, and art training. In a similar way, it is obvious that the inclusion of such ideas as the use of studio art to develop imagination, using art history as a basis for decision making, or seeing art criticism as a social function of art would open the door to a host of thorny issues. Such ideas abound and here we see the ease with which we can approach issues through art and, if we are not careful, leave art education behind – they point out the very complexity inherent in both the discussion and reality of art education in the schools.

If we continue trying to understand why DBAE offers some possibility for art education, and ask the fundamental question - why a discipline-based approach? - it may be possible to answer pragmatically that this approach provides a viable, and perhaps the best, alternative for art education in the context of the current educational environment. We could improve the funding and the time for art in the schools. If we pursue the question - why these four disciplines? - we could suggest that they provide a comprehensive coverage of the fundamental aspects of art education in such a way that each discipline is uniquely defined. Together they cover all the basics, they all focus on art as the object of interest, and they readily accommodate other secondary interests such as the sociology of art.

We could use the example of a classic print such as the Dürer woodcut known as Rhinoceros of 1515. We could learn more about the printing process and deepen our understanding of the image by producing our own woodcuts. The history of the print will tell us something about the object, the artist, and the social conditions of the time that is necessary and important for our full understanding and appreciation. The critical analysis, a view of the print as a unique art object using current terminology and perhaps including a comparison to current graphics, will help to put the print into perspective in terms of how it elicits the reactions it does now and has done over the centuries. Finally, there is an aspect of the Dürer print that prompts us to respond to it, an aspect of our involvement that relates the print to our lives, and the analysis of this phenomenon allows us to expand our understanding of the
experience and the concepts involved. This example could represent the means of teaching and learning through a discipline based approach - yet always keeping in mind the focus on art-making as the fundamental means of providing the prior experiences necessary for learning in all four disciplines where, as Davies (1985) writes, "... the hand speaks to the brain as surely as the brain speaks to the hand." (p. 404).

We should also acknowledge the fact that some art objects are more complex than the Dürer print and engage our interest in different ways. For example, the woodcuts or etchings of Käthe Kollwitz can be strong social statements and at the same time engage our aesthetic interest with or without a social context. Their strength or value is not isolated to one or the other way of approaching them but I would suggest there is educational value in understanding the distinction and in analyzing the relationship. We may approach art education through the four disciplines in this way and, with such a basis, we can begin to analyze the relationship between art and the wider human experience.

There will have to be some consideration for the early need to focus on studio art-making and the gradual progression towards an even balance between the four disciplines. We are teaching to develop a capacity for aesthetic experience which is only partly cognitive and may be rooted, to some extent, in physical responses and feelings. Yet, we may be able to best facilitate increased capacity to experience aesthetically by teaching first art-making with all its attending skill development and hands-on activities to develop a necessary interest and to provide a basic knowledge about art. Then we progressively emphasize other disciplines including aesthetics where we involve those exceedingly cognitive discussions related to art as knowledge, communication, and language to increase the ability to experience aesthetically. At this point the educational worthwhileness of the aesthetic experience may reside almost entirely in the cognitive aspects of the experience.

Gardner (1989) suggests three stages of teaching art starting with an emphasis on creative expression, followed by skill development, and,
last, a return to an emphasis on creativity. Both creativity and skill is taught to some extent throughout. He writes,

Even though the focus should ideally shift from creativity to basic skills and then back again, it is crucial that the other alternative be kept in mind during each developmental phase. The early years of life ought to feature at least some areas of skill acquisition, some development of useful working habits. By the same token, the years of middle childhood should incorporate some open-ended exercises, some free productions, as well as constant reminders that there is never a single best way to do something. So long as these alternative options - the accent on skills and the flair for creativity - are kept in mind at all times, the growing child is likely to be able to capture the best of both orientations. (p. 157)

The artist-teacher

I have discussed the importance of the artist as a role model in the educational studio and we may note Spratt's (1987) observation, made while talking about art students, where he states that, in art production, "... we find avenues leading to a fuller understanding of all art - access to which may be foreclosed when learning is exclusively through the study of the works of others." (p. 198). This observation is no less true for the teacher of art than for students - to fully understand not only the art of other artists but also of our students it is necessary to have some ongoing direct experience with art-making, not only to keep current in terms of technique and skill, but to act as a role model. In this respect, I speak from personal experience and I also offer Thompson's (1986) clear statement where she writes,

If we neglect to exercise our abilities as artists, we are in danger of forgetting what is involved in the processes of conceiving and expressing ideas for use in art works we expect our students to undertake. Conversely, when as teachers we continue to produce our own art, we link ourselves to our students in ways that mere knowledge of theories of creativity cannot produce. (p. 48)

It also follows logically that if such direct experience is missing, we are reducing the teaching component of the studio experience to where we can seriously consider teaching art through the use of teacher-proof packages or by using computer-assisted learning. The idea of packaged material that is essentially teacher-proof has been tried in the past
without any significant success and there is no reason to believe that there is anything to be gained in pursuing such an approach with or without DBAE—obviously, it makes even less sense in the studio than in the other disciplines.\(^1\)

While the ideal scenario would be a rich studio environment, including a qualified teacher-artist with broad knowledge of the four disciplines, it may be necessary to consider practical alternatives in some situations. We must seriously evaluate the implications of the material and human resources used in the teaching of art and consider alternatives to fully trained artist-teachers, being available at all times. This may include alternatives such as art specialists who cover more than one school or artists-in-residence who could be available on a part-time basis to fulfill an artist-teacher function. Similarly, a judicious and discretionary use of art specialists, learning packages, and technology would allow us to supplement those teachers who have little experience with history, criticism, or aesthetics.

---

\(^1\) Abbs (1989) says, "The art-teacher's task is to promote that reciprocal play between the repertoire of artistic conventions inherited through the culture and that innate proclivity in the individual and group for symbolic expression. The formal aesthetics we have proposed, then, would have the arts taught as aesthetic activity where the conventions of art and the meanings of art are grasped through the medium of art and through sustained practical experience of art-making. At times, close conceptual analysis, historical knowledge, ideological knowledge, biographical knowledge, will be necessary for understanding; at times, careful interpretive essays may be called for; but, essentially, aesthetic disciplines should be rooted in the sensuous, analogical, poetic non-discursive mode of knowing .... The practice of good art college teaching, where the teacher paints alongside the students, establishes a model for what I have in mind. According to this model, the teacher of an arts discipline becomes, in some measure, a practitioner: the music teacher composes, the teacher of literature writes and edits, the teacher of dance dances, and all should be ready, at times, to act as creative exemplars." (p. 39).

Like most ideas presented in this paper, there is little said that has not been said before. For example, Aristotle (1969) writes, "Clearly there is a considerable difference made in the character by the actual practice of the art. It is difficult, if not impossible, for those who do not perform to be good judges of the performance of others .... they, who are to be judges must also be performers, and that they should begin to practise early, although when they are older they may be spared the execution; they must learn to appreciate what is good and to delight in it; thanks to the knowledge which they acquired in their youth." (p. 85).
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The idea of using outside expertise to assist teachers is quite valuable if we do not ignore the fact that a combination of teachers, monitors, and art experts are necessary for such things as introducing materials, acting as role model, demonstrating techniques, providing instruction to students who have special needs, arranging working groups, providing criticism, and monitoring the student's participation. These functions should involve personal contact but could be supplemented by various learning packages or computer programs. In this way, it would be possible and practical to provide assistance for teachers by presenting some techniques and facts as packaged learning units, testing students' knowledge, and keeping track of students' progress. With these various resources, it would be necessary to define the limitations of each and to allow a great deal of flexibility in the way they are used but this should be viewed as a bonus for those teachers who wish to create dynamic and interesting environments for their students. In terms of these approaches, it is necessary to consider that we first and foremost teach for interest and the propensity to experience art because this will, in turn, facilitate the learning of the skills, facts, and concepts that result in a capacity for better aesthetic experiences.

With an approach based solidly on a good studio environment staffed and equipped as required, it is possible to envision a sound position from which art education can start. DiBlasio (1985) states, "The DBAE approach cannot be realized through simple 'enrichment' of studio-dominated programs, i.e., through the insertion of token units of history, criticism, or aesthetic perception, or even through substantial addition of such units." (p. 203). This is a reasonable observation and, as I have noted, we need to explore further how the other disciplines must be related to the basic studio component. We also need to consider where new technology, learning packages, specialists, assistants, artists-in-residence, and so on are appropriate at the various grade levels and in terms of the four proposed disciplines; we need to come to terms with the limitations imposed by time and expertise that may not allow time for all types of media or for the media or topical biases and expertise of all teachers; and, when we also consider the question of integrating the components of DBAE, there are additional considerations in terms of our
chosen methods or methodologies. As Sevigny (1987) notes, "Teacher educators will need additional skills for integrating the components of DBAE. They will need to become more knowledgeable about the optimum conditions for integrating learning, and they will need a broad range of exemplary models to assist them in this task." (p. 117).

The student-artist

The desired result of our teaching, in terms of how we view the student, is a clear indicator of what and how we should teach. In DBAE, the students are viewed as budding art experts in the four disciplines and, as such, they are, in part, artists. Rush, Greer, and Feinstein (1986) note that in art-making, as well in the other disciplines, students are exposed to sequential instruction based on the same literature, practices, and body of knowledge as adults and they are distinguished from adults only by the nature of the instruction. In all cases the emphasis is on a sequential movement from naive to sophisticated understanding of art concepts and skills with a consistent view of the student as an art expert. However, the student as artist is significantly different from the student as historian, critic, or philosopher. In these three disciplines the student and art expert are consumers of art without necessarily becoming involved in making art. Therefore, we need to recognize the uniqueness of art-making in the studio component of a DBAE program.

I propose that if we are to more fully appreciate the wonders of a Dürer etching, we need, among other things, experience with the intaglio process. This follows logically but, as I have said before, such esoteric experience is not mandatory in art education where it is replaced by broader art-making experience that is synthesized with our conceptual knowledge to allow us to appreciate works such as the Dürer print.

1 As an aside, I would note that while personal art-making is important for the art teacher, we must also be wary of personal bias that may limit the experiences of the student. In a similar vein, "would-be" philosophers, such as myself, may well remember Davies' (1985) somewhat ironic comment when he writes that his memorable character, Saraceni, "... talked untiringly about what he believed to be the philosophy of art. It was a philosophy deformed by that disease so fatal to philosophers - personal experience." (p. 393).
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However, it would be interesting to explore this statement and relate it to the use of the sophisticated techniques that present the current generation of students with an abundance of attractive art images, including copies of Dürer prints, without any indication of the individual efforts that were required to produce the original images or objects. One could speculate about the lack of interest and appreciation by students for art objects that may seem trivial in terms of the effort and cost required to produce them - the Dürer print may seem like the logos on plastic grocery bags to the child who has no concept of creativity or the sometimes extensive creative and imaginative efforts required to conceive the images they are experiencing.

We might look to other areas where the need for actual experience is quite clear and compare this to art education. If we consider learning to drive a car, this will involve both driving and talking about driving. In this situation it is unlikely that we would have any great interest in the instructions or experiences of those who have never seen behind the wheel. Similarly, if we consider learning games, we recognize there is a great deal of literature and computer simulation for chess or golf but we do not seriously believe these can adequately provide the experiences of the real games where the pressures of time, competition, and physical conditions become critical to the achievements. We do not believe that playing a computer game or reading a book can adequately replace the real experience of doing - similarly, it is not likely that any amount of discussion can adequately replace art-making experiences.

We should also consider the reasonable limitations of a view that sees both student and teacher as artists. Using our example, we would note it is preferable to learn golf from a professional golfer or driving from an expert driver-mechanic and perhaps reach these levels of expertise ourselves but this is not always necessary or possible. Similarly, all that is required from the art teacher and the student is the amount of experience, knowledge, and interest necessary to achieve the intended learning. All that is necessary is experience that allows a reasonable amount of exposure relative to the need. If we pursue these analogies, we may note that the students' need to pass driving exams by
demonstrating expertise in order to satisfy social concerns but need only to play games to the level of expertise that they personally desire. It should be obvious that art-making is similar to games in this respect. However, because the ability to experience art is important in our society, we can justify art-making experience in the school curriculum since this is our primary, if not only, means of aesthetic understanding and experience in the area of visual art.

Such concerns will necessarily affect our choices of art for the studio. The art of today is a reflection of our past art experiences and, as such, it would be impossible to have anything other than a superficial understanding or appreciation for today's art - I include the art of the commercial market place, the subway graffiti, the craft shop, and the art gallery - without an understanding of our past heritage. Also, if we are interested in teaching students about etching or woodcuts, it would seem to demand an inclusion, in some manner or other, of the graphic works of past masters - such as Rembrandt, Hokusai, and Dürer - who simply represent the best possible examples available regardless of historical context. I would stress that this would not, indeed should not, preclude the use of contemporary printmakers' art in the classroom nor should it preclude an emphasis on the students' own work - the final choice is made by the teacher for pedagogical reasons.1

If we accept that the aesthetic aspect of our humanity is important and that art is one of our primary ways of experiencing aesthetically, we can make a strong case for art in the schools and we can insist that students have the opportunity to make creative art objects. On the other hand, if we are able to develop and explore our aesthetic nature without art-making - perhaps without art - then we could simply teach aesthetics or art appreciation. I find a limited view of students as passive consumers

1 Davies (1985), through his character Ruth, offers a non-scholarly comment on this concern that seems quite appropriate, "People are so stupid, you know, in the way they discount the influence of music that isn't right out of the top drawer; if it isn't Salzburg or Bayreuth quality it can't be influential. But a sentimental song can sometimes open doors where Hugo Wolf knocks in vain. I suppose it's the same with pictures. Good taste and strong effect aren't always closely linked." (pp. 371-372).
of art rather unattractive, but there are others, like Lanier (1987), who ignore the value of art-making and state that aesthetics should be the only required discipline through which art history and art criticism are taught while studio-art is seen as an almost unnecessary activity. This view holds that the primary and perhaps the sole purpose of art education is to teach the learners to enhance their appreciation of the visual arts in order to function as knowledgeable consumers of art. It is necessary, in view of such proposals as Lanier’s, to stop and consider the implications of omitting the studio component. If we omit art-making from the ten or twelve years of schooling that society demands and rely on the family, other institutions, or the community to provide opportunities for art-making experience, we are severely limiting the potential development of artistic talent as well as limiting the general student population’s ability to experience visual arts fully. Even worse, if we ignore or slight the value of such experience, we are seriously limiting our cultural development and our potential as human beings.

As I have stated, our view of the student must include consideration for age and maturity. I do not intend to discuss child development theories as they pertain to art but, there must be some recognition of the fact that we cannot simply measure students’ art against adult standards the

---

1 Gardner (1989) presents a view of sequence in his article on Chinese art education. He writes, "... there is a preferable or optimum sequence, I find it preferable to devote the early years of life - roughly speaking, up to the age of seven - to a relatively unstructured or 'creative orientation' where students have ample opportunity to proceed as they wish and to explore media on their own. Thereafter, given the child's increasing inclination toward the learning of rules, it is both appropriate and advisable to inculcate basic skills ... With the advent of adolescence, particularly in our society, youngsters want to be able to put their skills to a public and possibly as well a personal use. It is therefore important that by this time they have acquired sufficient skills so that they will not be disappointed or embarrassed by their own efforts." (pp. 156-157).

Feldman (1987) has a view of developmental theory and art education where he separates universal and nonuniversal development. He has written extensively on this topic and in this article he proposes that we should make, "... distinct attempts to separate those aspects of human change and transformation that are essentially inevitable and will occur in all children, regardless of background and experience, from those aspects that require the systematic application of cultural resources and effort by those who seek to facilitate developmental change." (p. 247). Feldman discusses his theories at length and outlines the five principles for nonuniversal development on pages 253-256.
way it is proposed in DBAE. We cannot assume a linear progression from
naive to sophisticated that can be started at any time and followed
step-by-step. This is an area that calls for a great deal of work before
we can determine the optimum combinations of "free creative
exploration" and structured skill development that is appropriate to
various age groups or to those we test and place on a scale that ranges
from naive to sophisticated. I suggest we need to continue to clarify our
view of the student-artist as an artist, an individual, and as a member
of a broader society and culture but, under any circumstance, we can
assume that art-making under the guidance of an artist-teacher who
teaches and evaluates individuals is a fundamental and valuable part of
art education.

Rosenblatt and Winner (1988) observe, "In the intensity of involvement
in drawing, in the willingness to play and experiment, in the lack of
concern for 'how it should be done,' the preschooler resembles the adult
master in nontrivial respects." (p. 5). And, they add,

The finding that preschoolers actually 'prefer pictures that are more
stereotyped, realistic, and conventional' is antithetical to a romantic view of
the very young child as 'natural, avant-garde artist' ... we are forced to
accept an antiromantic view of early art and conclude that its aesthetic
appeal is more accidental than intentional. (p. 7)

These observations could well be a further indication that the role of
the student as artist, using professional artists and the artist-teacher as
role models, is significant in terms of stimulating the interest that seems
crucial to further development. Such observations seem to support the
view that interest in and propensity to engage art, with the better
aesthetic experiences that are then possible, are best learned through
art-making in the manner of an artist in his studio and that interest and
learning in the other three disciplines rely on some exposure to and
experience with art-making. I should add that if the aesthetic appeal of
young children's drawings is accidental, it should not detract from the
value of the aesthetic quality, rather, it should be used as an example of
how the individual and unique quality of imaginative art is valued for
its own sake.
I continue to emphasize that the unique contribution of individual creative art-making is important in its own right as well as providing the basis for learning in the other art disciplines. We, have, as a part of our human experience, in addition to our rational, moral, and physical being, an acquired ability to experience aesthetically. The arts, such as visual art, music, or literature, constitute a primary area where students learn about these experiences as they pertain to a significant part of our heritage. If we ignore or demean this aspect of art education, we lower the quality of education in general and we become a less cultured, less civilized society. It is important to recognize our aesthetic human nature and the propensity to experience aesthetically because we will find the means to express and experience this aspect of our nature in one way or another. This is true for individuals and for society. Like other areas of human development—physical, rational, or moral—we, as educators, wish to take an active and conscious role in how these primary capacities and abilities develop. Thus it is appropriate to call for art in the schools and, further, to call for the best possible art experiences we can provide for each individual student.

Conclusions

If we rely on teaching the "process" of art-making, with or without considering DBAE or the quality of the studio setting, we are condoning and supporting a view of art that sees all art-making and all artists as process bound; art education reduced to rule-governed and structured teaching activities; and art experience available in equal measure and quality to all students who are exposed to the process. In view of what we know of individual artistic expression, such a view is fraught with difficulty and could easily result in more wasteful, perhaps harmful, pedagogical efforts in the name of art education. Taken to extremes, art as process offers trivial art and craft experiences as an easy alternative to art education. Instead of a process, we must provide experiences that synthesize cognitive involvement—skills, techniques, and conceptual knowledge that can often be viewed as sequential steps or as a process— with the imaginative, feelingful, unique contribution made by the
individual. Discovery, intuition, and originality, important aspects of art-making, are not processes and they cannot be taught or understood in the same way as rule-bound subjects.

This paper has not attempted any extensive consideration of the wider concerns about DBAE that revolve around such issues as the number and nature of the specific disciplines or the fundamental reasons for adopting a discipline-based approach to art education. Nor do I attempt to distinguish between aesthetic education and art education although this may need to be clarified in the context of implementing a DBAE curriculum in general education. I simply suggest we define the studio in terms of the possibilities and constraints of our current school system and use it as a consistent basis for art across the grades. I feel the studio component is, as Richmond (1989b) notes, "... crucial in understanding what the enterprise is about, what it demands from participants, the value of achievement, and the satisfactions and frustrations it involves. Many of these things must be directly experienced to be appreciated." (p. '23). In practical terms, this means we would need to consider and define our view of the room, the teacher, and the student so we can ensure the optimum conditions for "art-making" in the fullest sense of the word.

While art history, art criticism, and aesthetics may well be taught in a regular classrooms, the studio component should be taught within an environment that allows full use of the limited time available to the students and teachers. It is essential to have adequate easels, chairs, and materials; space to display and work on current projects without endless clearing-up and putting away; display facilities for pertinent examples of art works; and general storage facilities that are easily accessible for the various media and projects not in current use. The instructors must, in some manner, fulfill the needs of the students for a role model, art expert, and teacher. This can be accomplished through the employment of well educated teachers who have artistic abilities and interests or it can be through the intelligent and responsible use of other human and material resources combined with teachers who have some limitations in terms of artistic skills, knowledge, or experience. In
any case, the studio is needed - it should not be construed that a good teacher, although essential, can teach effectively without the studio or that a DBAE curriculum can be viable without such facilities.

I also suggest that we cannot assume a fixed format that provides the ideal studio environment for all time. Quite the contrary, we will likely be faced with regular change because of new technology, much of it related to microcomputers and other graphic equipment from the world of industry and commerce, that is making its way into all aspects of the curriculum. Similarly, the rich sources of images available to students bring contemporary art into the schools as never before - we are now in a position where the art of the galleries, museums, and streets is readily accessible. Just as the studio may need to change to accommodate new technology, the students' interests in new media may necessitate acceptance of new art forms and a need for new teaching skills. For example, as DiBlasio (1983) points out, it is possible to motivate some students through the close link between the computers and graphic presentations because now the computer will, "... constitute an attraction and a bridge to many students who presently may find little of interest or value in the realm of art." (p. 46). Both computers and video technology may allow greater experimentation in art-making or they may facilitate innovative ideas such as participation by viewers in the making of the art object. Needless to say, this brings all the current controversy and ambiguity of the art gallery and art establishment into the heart of the educational studio with all the attending difficulties.

There is no doubt that we will be faced with difficult questions related to the type of art-making that will be required in the studio. We may need to determine if there is a minimum or a core set of media that

---

1 As Phelan (1984) notes, "When (and if) the dominant aspects of post-modernism, the new technologies, and a structural shift in the art world produce such art forms as 'performance art' or 'environmental art,' video art or computer art, as major aesthetic forces in the coming years, then the teaching of art will drastically change .... While it is not certain what the future needs of artists will be, studio art education will be asked to meet those needs. Alternative spaces may indeed be the place in which the future of studio art education makes itself first visible." (p. 36).
must be explored and experienced by students and similarly, we may need to consider the minimum amount of art-making required, in terms of the time involved or the number of objects made, in order to provide the necessary experience. For example, we must determine if we can identify those areas, such as sculpture, drawing, and painting, that constitute the minimum set of media to be explored by students and to what extent they must prove capable of producing some meaningful art work in each area. We may have to consider the need to teach various graphic media, the various methods of creating three dimensional art, etc. We may need to clarify the need for skill development and to determine how and when this type of teaching is appropriate. We will also be faced with the intricacies of relating the art-making to the other three disciplines and to other subject areas in the curriculum. Finally, we will need to address the perceived need for art training and the relation to art education. There is also a growing awareness of visual literacy in the language arts that must be related to design, commercial art, and illustration so we can distinguish these concerns from art education per se and do justice to all or, at the very least, determine what we will teach and what is to be left for other subject areas.

Finally, I would note that my proposal with the studio as the basis for the other three disciplines may be departing from the DBAE concept to an extent where it might be practical to discuss DBAE, as it is now defined, only in terms of the senior grades. It may be more appropriate to consider the program proposed as an enhanced studio program in the lower grades, a program that would quite naturally include the other disciplines in the teaching. Such a program would lead to a discipline based approach with four distinct modules by grade seven or eight.

As a summary of this discussion, I note that when Rosenblatt and Winner (1988) discuss the use of students' portfolios they emphasize the attention to skills and abilities that can be reduced to a process.

Our focus has been on an examination of children's drawings as a means of understanding the child's artistic knowledge, rather than as a window on some other form of knowledge. In addition, we have treated the drawings that children produce as only part of the picture. Also essential, in our
view, are two other features: (1) an examination of the perceptual skills that children bring to the task of drawing; (2) a consideration of children's abilities to reflect about the kinds of processes and decisions involved in either the making or the understanding of an art object. (p. 4)

This clearly indicates a major concern for or interest in those areas of the art-making experience that are cognitive and this type of approach may suggest to students and teachers that the richness, complexity, and individuality of art-making holds relatively little value in comparison to the process. It is critical that we do not lose sight of the wonder of the art-making experience for the individual even if there are obvious difficulties in teaching and evaluating this aspect of art. Here we may look to the studio with its artist-teacher who acts as the role model and the important achievements of the individual student-artist - here, both are able to demonstrate individual imagination and creativity. As Gardner (1988) writes, "Whatever the role of inspiration, mystery, or emotional catharsis in the arts, these are much less readily dealt with in education than the regular and systematic (if somewhat less provocative) processes of symbolic cognition." (p. 159). Gardner could have added that, while it may be less readily dealt with, it is essential to the enterprise that we attempt to do so.
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Very often, the demand for a simple answer is a demand for a dangerously false answer. Such oversimplicity blinds us to the bewildering but exciting reality of the complexity of life. In relation to arts education, those who assume that there are neat, definitive answers seriously belittle and trivialize their own subject.

(David Best, 1986b, p. 16)

I think that Best's quotation above is very poignant for all those who make proposals for art education, including myself. However, with this in mind, the thesis proposed to show that a comprehensive studio component is vital for art education today. I argued that the educational studio, with an artist-teacher and students who actively engage in art-making activities, defined relative to a discipline based program, should provide the basis for all art education. Here, an emphasis on creative art-making would be clearly articulated to balance suggestions that we incorporate not only the multicultural and political concerns of the day, but also the somewhat limited DBAE approach that stresses talking, writing, and thinking about art while art-making is viewed mainly as a process that can be considered as a series of sequential steps and taught in large part through discussion, analysis, and evaluation.

I began the thesis with Dewey's (1934) comment where he told us that, "Continuity of culture in passage from one civilization to another as well as within the culture, is conditioned by art more than any other one thing." (p. 327). Dewey's comment indicates the importance of art and why we should teach art - it is an important part of our culture. This leaves the question of how to teach art or how best to teach art. I proposed that we would, in the early stages of an individual's initiation into the culture, teach to (art-making) and teach to be (an artist) among other ways of teaching and this is best done within a well equipped...
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studio that includes a knowledgeable artist-teacher. Here we would begin with studio art-making as the basis from which we teach artistic skills as needed, let the students experience a variety of art-making techniques, evaluate selected art objects, and demonstrate the ways that artists made and continue to make art. This would allow students to acquire basic concepts, skills, and knowledge related to visual arts and develop interest in and capacity for related experiences.

As students increase interest, capacity, and skill, I proposed a gradual separation of art disciplines to the point where "art" in the schools at the senior levels could be taught through individual disciplines. At this point, students begin to seek mastery through their pursuits in the arts and, in many cases, begin preparing for a transition to the work world or higher education. With pertinent prior experiences in art, including art-making, students can deal with art through cognitive pursuits that stress conceptual knowledge, aesthetic experiences through perception, and philosophical discussion. For some, hopefully for many, art-making will continue to provide satisfying experiences that are meaningful for achieving a fuller knowledge and understanding of art and the broader aesthetic human nature.

I propose this hierarchy in order to provide essential prior experiences of practice and to encourage the natural talent and interest of young children in our culture to participate in and enjoy art-making activities. As learners seek meaning there would be a progressive emphasis on art disciplines where we think, talk, and write about the art objects that we find interesting. We should still continue to teach art-making but for many people who develop interest in other areas there are conflicts between their abilities, interests, and skills in the art-making world and thus limits to their satisfaction in this area over time. This is not the case with a discipline like aesthetics which can be taught at many levels and in many ways throughout life without becoming repetitive or trivial. In this context only, as a program of study for students who have had art-making experience and continue to have the option for such experience, I would agree with DBAE proponents who state that
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experiencing works of art aesthetically - in the sense of understanding and appreciating them - is as important as making them.

While I have made a conscious effort to limit my discussions to the visual arts in our schools, I did consider the "aesthetic human nature" that transcends both individual and cultural differences of persons in the Western world. In art education, we must be aware of this "nature" and recognize the need for knowledge and experience with visual art that can provide the basis for further learning and acquisition in many ways. As Egan (1989) says, "The ever-active human memory requires knowledge to generate understanding .... Although we forget much of the detailed knowledge that we learn, the effect of that knowledge on our understanding should not be underestimated." (p. 457).

I also stated that experience is based on our cultural or intellectual background. This need not be a limitation once we acknowledge that art education is significant for all our students because of the many shared aesthetic concepts - such as selective ordering of color, form, line, and so forth - that form a basis for our common understanding of the world in both aesthetic and non-aesthetic ways. We can assume that the students we meet in our studios share enough cultural background to benefit from our teaching. With our indigenous population or ethnic minorities, it would be appropriate to include some aspect of their native art and art-making techniques - for the benefit of all students. The cultural differences need not daunt us if we consider that we may teach for cultural biases when needed and that both art and artists have the ability to transcend age, sex, race, culture, and ideology to some degree.

The thesis concludes that art-making activities are essential for art education in our schools; without art-making experience, we limit the general student population's ability to experience the visual arts fully. Also, the best means of teaching art in the schools is through artist-teachers working in educational studios. Such experience provides a worthwhile understanding of ourselves and our world in respect to an important aspects of our culture and our humanity.
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