NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

A Husserlian Phenomenological Investigation of the Lived Experience of an Art Educator and Children

Alan George Wilson

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Art Education

and

Art Therapy

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

March 1988

ISBN 0-315-44882-2

ABSTRACT

A Husserlian Phenomenological Investigation of the Lived Experience of an Art Educator and Children

Alan George Wilson, Ph.D.
Concordia University, 1988

The purpose of this study was to inquire into the interactions which took place between a teacher and students in a secondary school art classroom during an experimental painting project. These classroom interactions were recognized as highly complex structures of experience involving a constantly changing interplay between teacher and students. Edmund Husserl's phenomenology was used to philosophically ground a qualitative investigation into this art classroom experience. Concomitant, usually unquestioned, assumptions inherent within the experience became the subject of a phenomenological inquiry.

The events which occurred in the art classroom during the painting project were first viewed from the commonly accepted everyday perspective, or "natural standpoint". This became an objective description of the events of the experience. A discussion and explication of Husserl's phenomenological concepts which had a bearing on this inquiry emphasized the simplicity of phenomenology rather than its complexity. Following this discussion, the experience was subjected to phenomenological analysis. In

this analysis the assumptions, values, beliefs and meanings which are intrinsic components of natural standpoint interactions came under scrutiny.

Rather than remain at a philosophic level and engage in a discussion of phenomenology, the researcher attempted to discover how these phenomenological concepts operated within the context of the experience. In this doing of phenomenology, dialogue was analyzed in an attempt to understand fully the inherent structures of experience.

Significant revelations of this analysis were that student intentions regarding the experimental project differed from those of their teacher. The analysis also revealed how beliefs, views and meanings were transferred from teacher to students. Inherent meaning was discovered to have a flexible nature. In the light of new experience, previously held meanings were superseded by ones bearing verifiable authenticity. The students displayed a growing ability to understand and to analyze their own paintings, as well as their classmates'. Their perceptions of value of art works altered perceptibly, objective monetary value was displaced by a more subjective value based upon personal feelings.

The study concludes with a recommendation that further research be conducted into art classroom environments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer of this study wishes to acknowledge the encouragement and guidance of his advisor and committee chair, Dr. Cathy Mullen. She displayed much patience and offered constructive recommendations during the course of this writing. Dr. Dallas Laskey, who in many ways helped shape and define the final outcome of this inquiry, extended unwavering support and sound advice in enabling the writer reach and communicate an understanding of Husserl's phenomenology. A special note of appreciation is given to Professor Stanley Horner who provided suggestions and criticism which helped to more fully develop this investigation. A further note of appreciation is owed to the Montreal Catholic School Commission, and the teacher and students who graciously and enthusiastically took part in this research.

The writer also extends a gesture of gratitude to his wife, Pam, for her perseverance and assistance in the completion of this inquiry.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

This study enters the world of an art teacher and students as they embark upon a new painting project. The primary thrust and purpose of this study is an attempt to provide general insights and degrees of understanding into the participants' experiences, from their viewpoint, as they operate and interact with one another in their world.

The participants under study meet in the classroom environment for the purpose of sharing an educational experience. To that environment they bring with them memories of past experiences which contribute to make them the individuals they are at the present time. The teacher views this shared experience and operates within its boundaries in a certain way. Her purpose during this painting project is different to that of her students. She is here to teach, to impart and share knowledge about the subject of this project with which she is already familiar, namely, painting in an experimental manner.

In comparison to their teacher, the students view and live through this shared experience in a very different way. Their purpose is to learn, to gain knowledge and understanding from the experience. They are about to be exposed to, to experience for themselves, a way of painting which is completely new to them. With only a general theme

of "sky" to guide them, the students are about to begin this experimental painting project.

Rationale of the Study

As a researcher, I am attempting to reach an understanding of the two experiential perspectives within the painting project: the teacher's and the students'. I aim to search for uniformities and regularities within the teaching/learning process, and to understand the meaning and value of individual experience within that process, from the point of view of the participants. If individual experience can be viewed as containing universal elements, then an inquiry into individual experience could yield universal insights. It is in this way I believe an understanding of the structures of the individual experiences of the participants could make a unique contribution to a general understanding of art classroom experiences.

A Provisional Definition of Husserl's Phenomenology

Edmund Husserl's phenomenology provides the philosophical grounding for this study. Rather than attempt a complicated definition of phenomenology at this stage of the study (the nature of Husserl's phenomenology and specific concepts which have a bearing on this study are discussed in detail in chapter 4), I offer a definition which clearly and effectively communicates Husserl's understanding of the function of phenomenology.

Phenomenology is a methodology by which experience may be subjectively viewed and investigated. The subjectivity of human experience is recognized by phenomenology as the essential core in any investigation of the relationship between human beings and the world. It is subjectivity, the cornerstone of lived experience, that phenomenology attempts to understand. The primary reason for studying subjective experience is to investigate how meanings emerge in the course of human activities. Empirical, or non-phenomenological investigations assume that meanings are given to us ready-made and that they are stable. Phenomenologists tend to see meanings as more dynamic and emerging from the context of human experiences.

A distinguishing feature which helps in an understanding of a phenomenological position is that of assumptions. From a phenomenological viewpoint, assumptions are seen as those sometimes hidden, unrecognized, or taken-for-granted factors which often operate below a conscious level, and which can influence how humans think, act and view the world. These assumptions are inherent within the "natural attitude", or everyday, unreflective, non-phenomenological view of the world. Phenomenology attempts to nullify factors which influence assumptions by setting assumptions aside. Freed from the subtle and pervasive influence of assumptions, phenomenology becomes a disciplined method by which the complexity of human experience can be explored and by which

meaningful features can be extracted and general, universal features described. Descriptions of these features can aid in an understanding of experience by laying bare underlying intentional structures and meanings.

Phenomenology views subjective features of experience as possessing viable, valuable and essential characteristics which, if understood, can contribute toward an understanding of human experience in general.

Method and Phenomenological Nature of the Study

To obtain detailed knowledge and understanding about the world of a teacher and 14 students as they live through the experience of an experimental painting project, I will systematically observe and record the interactions which take place during the event. Data will be gathered by means of written descriptions, photography and audio-tape recording. A transcription of the audio-tape will provide a dialogue of the participants' verbal interactions. During the course of the event I will question the teacher and students and record their responses to add a further dimension to the data.

The research will focus upon the experience of the participants as they live through the classroom project. Aspects of interactions within the classroom experience will be singled out and Edmund Husserl's phenomenology will be used as an invitation to the reader to co-meditate on the significance of these selected experiences. If the

reader could make an attempt to suspend, or leave aside "natural attitude" (i.e. every day) assumptions such as viewing the unfolding events in an objective manner and looking for causal connections within the interactions, then an appropriate co-meditating posture could be adopted. In this posture selected classroom experiences can be viewed in a novel and insightful way. The lived subjective and intersubjective structures of experience can be explored, how these structures arise within the interactions, and what meanings and values the participants ascribe to them can be disclosed. Entry will have been gained into the subjective experience of the participants, and the resulting phenomenological view of that experience can contribute to a wider understanding of subjective elements within experience in art education environments.

Organization of Chapters

This study is organized so that it is representative of an experientially bound, phenomenological investigation, its special characteristics being that the particulars of the event are documented before the focus moves to various levels of abstraction.

Chapter 1 constitutes an overview of the investigation in that it describes the rationale of the research, the method to be used, and provides a brief definition of the phenomenological methodology utilized in the study.

Chapter 2 comprises a review of relevant literature during which the Husserlian phenomenological nature of the proposed study is compared and contrasted against a tradition of phenomenological inquiries in the field of art education.

An objective description of the 12 lessons which make up the experimental painting project comprises chapter 3.

The particular Husserlian phenomenological nature of the study is discussed in chapter 4, with examples taken from a transcript of the event used to explain phenomenological concepts.

In chapter 5 events, stages and pivotal moments of the classroom experience are subjected to a distinctive type of analysis, namely, phenomenological.

In chapter 6 individual strands of meaning are extracted from the analysis of the previous chapter and formed to provide an understanding of the significant structures of the event.

In order to ensure privacy and confidentiality pseudonyms have been substituted for the names of the teacher and students who participated in this research.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

An examination of phenomenological studies in the field of art education is the primary concern of this review of literature. Discussion of all literature is structured around factors which determine a study's phenomenological designation. While the subject of this inquiry is art classroom experience, its methodology is phenomenological. It is this phenomenological methodology, rather than the subject of classrom experience, which provides the focal point for this review.

This chapter comprises three distinct parts. The first provides a general overview of phenomenological inquiries in the field of art education. The second presents a more detailed examination of those inquiries in the field which make use of Husserl's phenomenology. The third outlines inquiries that combine qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

First the term "qualitative" as it is used here needs clarification. The qualitative mode of inquiry which most generally categorizes phenomenological works cited in this chapter began to be established in art educational research during the early 1970's. It has been described in various ways such as naturalistic, alternate, contextualist, constructivist, and ecological (Alexander, 1981, p. 35). For the purpose of reviewing such research in this chapter,

however, I will remain with the more widely used and understood designation: Qualitative. It is not necessary to trace the epistemological roots of the qualitative back to idealism and then embark on a classic comparison with naturalism, as, for example, Pohland (1972) does with the qualitative technique of participant observation. Because Husserl's phenomenology can be described as a qualitative methodology it is necessary to outline the nature of the qualitative, to contrast it with the quantitative, to briefly discuss the qualitative-quantitative methodological dispute and indicate how important the qualitative research methodology has become for the field of art education.

To speak of qualitative inquiry is to indicate an immersion in a research setting, a direct observation of the interrelated realities discovered there, which results in an essentially descriptive reporting of uncovered situated truths. If truths and realities are sought by both methodologies, a qualitative researcher sees them as plural and situational-contextual, whereas a quantitative researcher sees them as singular, fragmentable and having direct applicability to other situations.

Qualitative researchers become immersed in the subjective aspect of human experience. The aim of a qualitative orientation is to seek out and explicate meaning or significance from this experience. Quantitative researchers, seeking objectified and quantified knowledge, aim for verifiable generalization and generate normative

statements concerning uniformities in the empirical process.

From the perspective of phenomenological sociology, George Psathas (1973) comments on the aspect of the subjective, and in so doing provides a clear view of the qualitative-quantitative positions:

> There has been a tendency to treat the subjective as "merely" subjective or as so idosyncractic that social science, concerned with patterns and generalities, cannot seriously study it. This overlooks the possibility of finding patterns in the sujective experiences of individuals and denies the social scientist access to human experiences unless he can, almost in advance of his study, be assured that order and structure will be found. There is a basic misunderstanding among those who adopt positivist and behaviorist approaches that human experience is too subjective, variable, and inaccessible to be studied. Yet at its core, phenomenology represents the effort to describe human experience. (p. 13)

A qualitative investigator then, seeks insight and knowledge through direct involvement in human experience, and through a comparison of uncovered phenomena. Participant observation, sometimes referred to as microethnography, is a particularly good vehicle by which to further characterize qualitative research because it embodies the essential elements which define this type

of inquiry. By becoming an observer who participates in a situation, and then writes a qualitative description of that situation, the researcher attempts to re-create what is observed. This re-creation effectively allows the observation to be experienced by others. Through written description, the qualitative researcher transmits the felt qualities of a situation so that the reader can get some indication of what "being there" was like. As it would be impossible to observe, let alone describe, everything in a given environment, the researcher selects events from the experience that he or she considers most significant. Being immersed within a given environment allows a researcher to seek significance from meanings that would ordinarily be hidden to a casual observer. George Willis, writing about the qualitative, explains that the uncovering and disclosure of meaning is the indication of ". . . qualities and characteristics described in ways that permit a variety of comparisons leading to inferences about meaning" (1978, p. 11.) In other words, the meaning observed and understood in one situation can be compared to meaning in another, to better understand the significance of the uncovered meaning.

Researchers in the field of art education became more aware of the possibilities of qualitative inquiries following the publication of Kenneth Beittel's Alternatives for Art Education Research in 1973. Through an existential-phenomenological and particularly a

hermeneutic mode of inquiry, Beittel looked for ways to understand the nature of art making. Hermeneutics claims all experience is interpreted. As Richard Palmer (1969) describes its primary purposes "It lays open what was hidden; it constitutes not an interpretation of an interpretation (which textual explication is) but the primary act of interpretation which first brings a thing from concealment" (p. 129). It sets aside the epistemological perspective of phenomenology for an ontological one. By way of contrast, phenomenology attempts descriptions of intentional experience as free as possible from interpretation, theoretical constructs or presuppositions. It searches, not for an interpretation of things concealed, but for the "thing itself". Since a function of hermeneutics is to help researchers gain an interpretive understanding, for Beittel and the studies spawned under his influence, especially at the Pennsylvania State University, hermeneutic inquiry became a methodology particularly suited to study the act of making art. Such studies began what has become a tradition of qualitative investigations within the field.

Overview of Phenomenological Inquiries in the Field of Art Education

The selection of inquiries that I have included in this section are here because they have been described by their authors, either in the titles or abstracts, as phenomenological. Within this generic heading there

exists a number of sub-headings which cover the various branches and offshoots of phenomenology. Regardless which type or form of phenomenology is followed, these works have a number of things in common. The researchers observed objects, environments and/or structures of the everyday or ordinary world. They then sought to recognize their own individual perceptions of this world and shifted from the surface level of understanding, toward an understanding of the more deeply imbedded structure of meanings that was initially hidden. Not only was an individual understanding sought, but also a deeper understanding of meaning which was put into a context from which others could formulate their own understanding.

The following three studies reflect Kenneth Beittel's interest as well as his influence in the application of qualitative research strategies. Martin Heidegger's existential phenomenology as well as Hans-Georg Gadamer's dialectic hermeneutic method of phenomenological inquiry provided the philosophical basis for investigations by Cathy Brooks (1980), Mary Lou Stokrocki (1981) and Susan Hood (1984).

Cathy Brooks (1980) explored the meaning of her own childhood art experience from the perspective of adult, and of art educator. The inquiry was divided into a presentation and interpretation of the text, which was followed by a theoretical explanation utilizing a dialectic hermeneutic. The inquiry was described by

Brooks as qualitative, phenomenological and hermeneutic. It was qualitative in both substance and methodology. The author's own art works that had been produced during childhood became the artifacts to be investigated. These artifacts brought childhood memories to surface consciousness, memories which had been partly forgotten during the years between childhood and adulthood. These resurfaced memories were translated into a text which was then interpreted following Gadamer's notions of hermenuetic understanding. The hermeneutic was dialectic in the way in which the text was interpreted, and the resulting understanding of that interpretation revealed the historical and linguistic nature of the author's "being".

That the inquiry was hermeneutic and dialectic I would agree. It was phenomenological in its descriptive aspects as the text describes the author's perception of a "world". But the phenomenological aspect of the work could be questioned on the grounds that there was no recognition, or use made, of an epoché, reduction or bracketing process. While existential-phenomenologists do not completely endorse the epoché, a relevant and practical use for the concept can be found in existential-phenomenological investigations, for examples see Ecker, Johnson, and Kaelin (1969), as well as Kaelin (1970a) and (1970b).

While I deal with the epoché in detail in chapter 4, I will point out some salient features of the concept at this point for I believe an understanding of the epoché aids in

an understanding of the phenomenological studies reviewed here. As part of the "natural standpoint" or the commonly accepted everyday world there are equally commonly accepted and even unquestioned assumptions and presuppositions. The performance of an epoché allows a phenomenological inquirer to suspend belief in the natural standpoint, and in so doing a first step is taken toward a phenomenological attitude. In this phenomenological attitude an inquirer has broken free of all the assumptions and presuppositions of the natural standpoint. A change in viewpoint has taken place, the inquirer is now in a position to describe subjective experience without the constraints which prior theories, hypotheses, assumptions and presuppositions, put upon that description. Freed from these constraints, the description in effect becomes phenomenological.

When I point out that a study in this chapter has ignored or overlooked the epoché, I am also questioning how a study has dealt with the assumptions and presuppositions implicit in the natural standpoint. For I believe a recognition of these assumptions and presuppositions help characterize an inquiry as phenomenological.

Mary Lou Stokrocki (1981) based her research on the art educational environment of a pottery class which featured Kenneth Beittel as the teacher. The description of the interactions which took place in the class became a text for subsequent interpretation. As well as hermeneutics, the author used a microethnographic and

phenomenological descriptive approach as a basis for the investigation. The phenomenological aspect of the investigation, which is of primary interest here, was characterized by Stokrocki as arising out of her personal experience with the environmental situation (p. 17). The inquiry was described by Stokrocki as being phenomenological "in some ways" (p. 17) because of its concern with the deep structure of experience, and not only apparent observations. The phenomenology utilized in the investigation was identified and positioned as not following Husserl's ". . . bracketing of reality, but an integration of personal tradition with the larger hermeneutic sense of tradition" (pp. 195-196). Gadamer's hermeneutics and Heidegger's existentialism provide the grounding of Stokrocki's "larger" view of phenomenology.

Husserl, however, never described his epoché as having the function of bracketing "reality". Apart from this misunderstanding of Husserl, Stokrocki did characterize the type of phenomenology the inquiry followed as a wider (than Husserlian) hermeneutic form of phenomenology, one which links personal descriptions of experience to the wider influence of knowledge and understanding in the hermeneutic tradition. Understood in this manner, I am able to retain its description as phenomenological.

Susan Hood (1984) utilized both Gadamer's and Heidegger's existential philosophy to ground her investigation. The author's own educational experiences

as art educator, art historian and artist, formed the basis of the inquiry. Hood embarked upon a dialectic which formed a multi-level text between the author's life-world position, (the view of the world following an epoché of the accepted world or natural standpoint) through the actual process of writing the inquiry, to the dissertation itself as it took form. A description which made use of both memory and past imagery was termed phenomenological description. Any description termed phenomenological, however, ought to enter into some discussion as to the nature of that phenomenology, especially in view of the fact that in Husserl's phenomenology, to move from the "natural standpoint", which is the commonly accepted everyday world, to the life-world from which Hood began her inquiry, involves an epoché of the natural standpoint. Hood does, however, characterize the phenomenology she follows as hermeneutic. But again, that crucial element of a phenomenology which involves a shift in attitude from the natural standpoint to the life-world, the epoché, was overlooked, which only serves to diminish that aspect of the work categorized as phenomenological.

While it should be remembered that none of these hermeneutic studies have the word phenomenology in the titles, the respective authors described them as phenomenological in their abstracts. The hermeneutic and dialectical character of these studies is not being

questioned. The phenomenological aspect, however, could have been more precisely defined and positioned, with the possible exception of Stokrocki's work. Two of the works essentially overlooked the concept of epoché and bracketing, a concept so important to a phenomenology of any type, which involves a movement away from the natural standpoint--Stokrocki's concern with the "deep structure of experience", Hood's life-world position--that this writer believes a work described as phenomenological should take the epoché into account.

There seems to be a division among existential phenomenologists; those who endorse the epoché as having a situational relevancy, Ecker, Johnson and Kaelin (1969), Kaelin (1970a, 1970b), and Stapleton (1983); and those who follow Hiedegger, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty and reject it; i.e., Ricoeur (1967), Ihde (1971), Vandenberg (1969, 1971), and Denton (1974). The important point is, however, that no matter which position in the debate on the epoché an existential phenomenologist takes, the epoché must be recognized and dealt with so that the assumptions and presuppositions of the natural standpoint can be either set aside, or made an object of scrutiny. Therefore, in this writer's opinion, these studies could have followed one of two strategies. They could have recognized (either accepted or rejected) the epoché and subsequently conducted the investigation from the sphere of the natural standpoint. Failing this they could have substituted the

description "qualitative" wherever there was any reference to the term phenomenological. Whichever choice would have been made, the hermeneutic nature of the studies would have remained intact, and the phenomenological aspect accounted for more thoroughly. I am aware, however, that phenomenology need not be thought of only in Husserlian terms. But by recognizing the concept of the epoché, an existential phenomenologist can still remain within Palmer's (1969, p. 127) interpretation of phenomenology as expanded by Heidegger: `To be a way of accepting the existentialist notion of disclosing "being" either in its immediacy or "historicality". The recognition of the epoché does not alter a crucial element which differentiates Husserlian phenomenology from all other practices of the methodology. Husserlian phenomenology starts from, and maintains an epistemological stance, while all other forms of phenomenology, including hermeneutics, are ontological in nature.

Inquiries Taking an Existential-Phenomenological Aesthetic Approach

Eugene Kaelin's existential-phenomenological aesthetic theories provided the grounding for the second cluster of studies. Before outlining these works I will first briefly describe phenomenological aesthetics and Kaelin's phenomenological position.

The essential purpose of phenomenological aesthetics, which is based on an existentialist philosophy, is to

establish ". . . relevance in statements of criticism" (Ecker, Johnson and Kaelin, 1969, p. 583). This is accomplished by making distinctions between the relevant and the irrelevant, that is, employing a phenomenological epoché in order to bracket all irrelevancies as the appreciator attends to the aesthetic object. In this way, after the bracketing process, the appearances are the aesthetic object (Ecker et al, 1969, p. 584).

Kaelin acknowledged an influence of existentialists Heidegger and Sartre, but attributed to Merleau-Ponty an influence overriding all others (Kaelin, 1970a, p. 313). For the practice of aesthetic criticism Kaelin endorsed Husserl and the concept of the epoché up to the point of transcendentalism, which for Kaelin (1970b, p. 162) is an "isolation" of the structures of consciousness. In other words, Kaelin held that this modified form of Husserl's epoché was more relevant to aesthetic analysis than a complete Husserlian transcendentalism. Moreover, Kaelin felt that the early Husserl of Ideas (first published in 1913) was more useful for aesthetic criticism than later works (Kaelin, 1970b, pp. 135-163). In his descriptive terminology as it pertains to art works Kaelin made use of "counters" which contribute to expressive content and pertain to both surface and depth qualities of art works. These counters are phenomenological in that they characterize anything that can be distinguished in an

art work after an epoché, that is, in the bracketed state (Ecker et al, 1969, pp. 584-585).

Surface counters are those elements in an art work such as color and the way it functions, as well as the interaction between colors, which create spatial tension. The significance of a surface is controlled by the viewer's perception of how surface counters relate to each other. The surface becomes organized in the viewer's conscious perception of the object. Depth counters are also related to each other as well as to surface counters. Depth counters become significant in the viewing of a surface of a work in the way in which they are perceived to create the appearance of depth.

Influenced by Kaelin's phenomenological-existential position are studies by Paull McCoy (1970), Hugh Stumbo (1970), Jimmy Wright (1973), Marianne Suggs (1976), Barry Lieberman (1980) and Anne Lindsey (1982).

Paull McCoy (1970) attempted an existential-phenomenological approach toward art education strategies. He designed an experimental treatment regarding aesthetic growth in which teachers became producing artists in company with students. Maurice Merleau-Ponty as well as Eugene Kaelin provided some of the existential-phenomenological basis for McCoy's inquiry into aesthetic experience. McCoy investigated qualitative aspects in an existential-phenomenological sense, as well as empirical aspects, in an experimental attempt to confirm hypotheses.

If the intent of McCoy's inquiry was to use a combined approach (qualitative-quantitative) then this intent should have been discussed more thoroughly by the author. Otherwise, in my opinion, McCoy should have remained with one approach, and, because the work was overwhelmingly empirical, more thought could have been given to the existential-phenomenological designation.

In a study by Hugh Stumbo (1970), the author first exposed students to selected art works. Following this exposure, the students were instructed in phenomenological-analytical techniques. Stumbo then had the students re-view the art works after which he searched for changes which may have occurred in the students' understanding of the meaning of the works. Within a framework of an existential phenomenological methodology based on Kaelin's existential-aesthetics, Stumbo explored ways in which a teacher can assist students expand their aesthetic knowledge.

Again, in a similar manner to the previous study Stumbo combined qualitative and quantitative approaches without recognizing or discussing the combination. One section of this work was strictly scientific in an objective manner, with its "categorical differential tables", which brings to mind Beittel's comment of his being "horrified" to find that tests of significance had been used like credos (Beittel, 1978, p. 95). It was to oppose such research strategies, which, for Beittel,

deadened the "disappearance of meaning" (1978, p. 95), that brought him to consider more appropriate methods for research in art education. Whether Stumbo was aware of this contradiction of methods is not clear. The inquiry was essentially empirical as it dealt with four major hypotheses and comfortably discussed pretest and postest standard deviations, mean differences, and levels of significance (Stumbo, 1970, p. 58). The existential-phenomenological aspect appeared to be overwhelmed by the scientific tone of the investigation.

Jimmy Wright (1973) addressed the issue of increased learner awareness of visual qualities and developed an instructional model which dealt with Kaelin's concept of surface and depth counters. This model was used to list numerically and assess surface and depth qualities perceived in art works. The investigation concluded that pre-school children's response capacities can indicate areas which have been mastered, which in turn could signify the areas where instruction is most needed.

Once more, this study was overwhelmingly devoted to a strictly empirical paradigm, with only a small fraction of the pages (pp. 11-14) given to an outline of Kaelin's existential-phenomenological aesthetic position. Notwithstanding the word phenomenological in the title, the thrust and nature of this work was empirical, in the quantitative scientific tradition.

Marianne Suggs (1976) based the phenomenological aspect of her work on Kaelin's phenomenological aesthetics. She maintained that Kaelin's theories can be applied to many problems in analytical aesthetics, and that the method may be an appropriate one to be used by the art teacher in the classroom. Suggs concentrated on student aesthetic attitude toward an awareness of art objects as the basis for the investigation. She explored the ways in which this attitude and awareness changed depending on whether the students, as a first task, performed phenomenological analysis or studio production. The author focussed on the viability of phenomenological analysis when used as a method for evaluating the qualities of art objects in the classroom. After completing a phenomenological analysis of data, major findings were reported on the task order of phenomenological analysis/studio production treatments, in areas of studio production, perception of paintings, and art attitude. Suggs concluded that phenomenological analysis can affect the qualities students notice in paintings, and pointed out that this finding was supported by other researchers in the field.

While a major portion of this work was of an empirical nature, the section which dealt with phenomenological analysis and its effects had an internal validity within the larger study. While not phenomenological in total, this work still merits its phenomenological designation. However, because use was made of Kaelin's theories,

the work could have been more precisely defined as existential-phenomenological.

Barry Lieberman (1980) investigated a high school painting class, and developed a model of self-reflective inquiry which concentrated upon the triadic relationship of art student, art work, and art teacher. Because the author was attempting to remain free of preconceived theory, even Kaelin's theoretical tenets, on which the inquiry was based, were not strictly adhered to. Lieberman adopted a participant-observer research strategy, which he perceived as being more in keeping with the qualitative nature of the study than any quantitative approach. The thoughts and feelings of the researcher, in both roles of teacher and observer of the secondary school painting class, were recorded. Reflecting the influence of David Ecker's (1963) use of photography as a strategy to understand the painting process, Lieberman's approach developed a method of teaching painting by making use of a series of photographs of paintings in progress. The interactions of students and teacher were audio-tape recorded which, when used as feedback, along with the photographic record of the evolving paintings, contributed to intensify and heighten the awareness of the experience. It was claimed that this led to a better understanding of both the painting process and the student-teacher relationship. In my opinion, this heightened awareness of the experience, coupled with the practice of not strictly adhering to theoretical

constructs, justified the studies' description as phenomenological.

In her study Anne Lindsey (1982) used the theories of Kaelin and the phenomenological learning processes developed by Carl Rogers. Both phenomenological aesthetics and classroom practice were focussed upon, and an attempt made to bridge the gap between the two. Unlike the other studies that have been reported in this section, Lindsey's position remained at the philosophic level; she made no attempt to put Kaelin's aesthetic theories into operation. The work took a wide range of theorists and philosophers into account, from Kant, through Husserl, to Langer, as it compared and positioned these thinkers in relation to Kaelin. Because Lindsey embarked upon such an overview, I am able to describe her study's status as phenomenological as it attempted to relate classroom practices with existential-phenomenological aesthetics.

Of the studies grouped in this section, (all of them influenced by Kaelin), only those by Suggs, Lieberman, and Lindsey can be described as existential-phenomenological. Even though her study is primarily empirical, Suggs maintained an existential-phenomenological designation because of the way she made use of phenomenological analysis within the larger confines of the work. Lieberman's particular use of the qualitative methodology he employed in his study in an attempt to come to an understanding of an aspect of the artistic process is

consistent with a phenomenological approach. The recognition of, but non-reliance upon, theoretical constructs, meshes well with the phenomenological intent of attending to the "things themselves". Because Lindsey's study remained at the philosophic level, it provided a sufficiently adequate overview of a wide range of phenomenologists, and attempted to draw existential-phenomenological aesthetics closer to classroom practices; I can describe her work as existential-phenomenological.

The works by McCoy, Stumbo, and Wright, however, retained phenomenology as a descriptive element in the titles, yet embarked upon essentially quantitative empirical research strategies. Not only was there little recognition of the combination of approaches, but there seemed to be little understanding of the resulting clash of opposing methodologies.

While researching phenomenological works in the field of art education, several studies were discovered that resist being put into a neat phenomenological classification, as they embodied discrete approaches to a variety of problems. These works are included here because the respective authors use the word phenomenology or phenomenological in either their titles or their abstracts. In my opinion, some of these works are justified in their claim to be phenomenological, while others would be more accurately described by some other designation. I will first outline those which, in my

opinion, merit the phenomenological designation, before concentrating on those which I think do not. In each case I will state my reasons for the position I take. The first group consists of works by Vitold Kobisz (1975), Milton Paleologos (1976), and Joseph Streb (1984).

I consider that the study by Vitold Kobisz (1975) was correctly designated as phenomenological. The inquiry used phenomenological description in an attempt to understand the art making experiences of three artists. The activity of making art was described as both complex and evasive, and phenomenology was held to be the method by which this process could be described. The roles of intentionality, consciousness, language, intersubjectivity, and evidence were described as important constructs of the phenomenological method. All were seen as contributing to the make-up of phenomenological reflection which allowed the author insights into the artists' experiences. Language was described as the mediating structure which made available to the author's reflecting consciousness the essence of the phenomena, this essence then became the means by which significant structures of meaning were identified and labeled. Access to the subjectivity of another person became possible through the phenomenological construct of intersubjectivity, through which Kobisz came to an understanding of the art making intentionalities of the three artists. The artists' internal experiences were described as their creative processes evolved over time.

This inquiry maintained its phenomenological status because of the appropriate and effective use of phenomenological concepts as well as the recognition and demonstration that these concepts contributed to phenomenological reflection. The use of the concepts of intentionality, consciousness, and intersubjectivity led to a situational evidence. The evidence in this instance manifested itself as an understanding of the intentionality of the studied artists as they engaged in the process of making art.

The inquiry by Milton Paleologos (1976) was also phenomenological in nature. Through the technique of participant-observation he inquired into the working processes of an artist/teacher. Over a period of time the evolution of a single painting by an artist was described in a phenomenological manner, which was characterized as the way in which events are experienced and described without references to prior hypotheses. Paleologos recognized that phenomenological methods cannot reveal the totality of a given event, but can offer a wider range of understanding and knowledge often overlooked in more empirically inclined inquiries. This work justified its phenomenological title as the immediacy of experience was acknowledged, and an attempt made to describe this experience without reference to previous theoretical results, hypotheses or suppositions. The work was phenomenological for three reasons. Firstly, no use

was made of prior hypotheses, which can be compared to a suppositionless stance. Secondly, the immediacy of experience was recognized, which can be compared to the Husserlian notion of the "thing itself". Thirdly, there was a realization that the knowledge and understanding generated by such a work tends to be qualitatively different to the results of empirical research methods.

Joseph Streb (1984) accurately documented Husserl's phenomenology up to a point. In this work, however, he moved beyond Husserl to take both Martin Buber's and Martin Heidegger's concepts of being into account. By so doing, Streb retained a phenomenological designation; it would, however, be more accurately described as existential-phenomenology. Some explanation is needed to justify this position.

In the study, the concepts of phenomenology from a Husserlian perspective, as well as concepts in education and art, were discussed and described separately. Following this discussion, the existential themes of "mode of being", as well as the notion of "becoming", play prominent roles. The nature of Husserlian phenomenology was inaccurately extended when the existential theme of being was introduced. Some confusion enters the reader's mind mainly because Husserlian phenomenology, with the concepts of consciousness, prejudices of everyday beliefs (suppositions), free fancy (free variation), and especially the phenomenological epoché were all accurately described

and positioned as Husserl explicated them. Streb based his understanding of Husserl on Husserl's own writings such as Ideas and Cartesian Meditations. Using such writings, Streb accurately documented the function of Husserl's epoché by describing it as not negating but rather suspending ordinary beliefs without destroying them, leading to an attitude of neutrality (p. 160).

Following this accurate portrayal of Husserl's phenomenology, the study then went beyond Husserl. The emphasis of the work became existentialist in nature, especially with regard to the references to Buber and Heidegger. Consequently being became the theme, and the mode of being of a teacher was discussed and seen as a useful area for study. The study concluded that understanding the many and various interconnections between student, teacher, and art experience, was a worthwhile area for research for which phenomenological methods are ideally suited.

In my opinion, the inquiry certainly retained its phenomenological designation, but I would have preferred to have the described phenomenologies more accurately positioned in their respective Husserlian or existentialist camps. My confusion in not being able to choose a category for this work is understandable in that Husserl's phenomenology was accurately described, as well as the Buber/Heidegger concept of being. Streb seems unaware of the conflict which developed between Husserl and Heidegger,

a conflict which hinges on the very notion of being. Heidegger, a former student of Husserl and editor of the latter's The Phenomenology of Internal Time-consciousness (1964), eventually thought that Husserl did not stress the concept of being strongly enough. Heidegger, in Being and Time (1962), came to the conclusion that being permeated man's thinking and actions. It is interesting to note that Heidegger thought enough of Husserl to dedicate this work to him in "friendship and admiration" (Heidegger, 1962). Husserl, for his part, claimed Heidegger misunderstood his phenomenology, especially the function of the epoché in neutralizing the concept of being for the reflecting consciousness (Husserl, 1958, p. 172). Using both Husserl and Heidegger in a phenomenological work, without recognizing this conflict between them, somewhat diminishes that work. References to Husserl notwithstanding, instead of using the generic term "phenomenology" in the title, Streb could have more precisely described the work as existential-phenomenological.

The next group of works which I feel are not justified in their phenomenological claim are by H. Dante Vena (1975), Hope Irvine (1981), and Laurence Montalto (1983). Following a description of each work, I state my reasons for this criticism.

H. Dante Vena (1975) studied aspects of school life in three alternate high schools. While Vena did not use

the word phenomenology in the title, he described the study as descriptive and phenomenological. The reason given for this description was that multiple methods were used, such as participant-observation, interviews, enumerations, samples, photography and documents. Elsewhere, this study has been described as belonging to the anthropological method and naturalistic paradigm (Alexander, 1979). I agree with Alexander. The study can accurately go under a number of related designations: Ethnography, microethnography, anthropology, qualitative, even naturalistic-investigative. All of these descriptions fit one or more of the research positions adopted by the inquiry. It should not, however, be described by its author as phenomenological simply because it was descriptive. While a phenomenological work is invariably descriptive, a descriptive work is not necessarily phenomenological.

Two methodologies were combined in Hope Irvine's (1981) inquiry; phenomenology, and that examination of sign systems called structuralism. The work attempted a systematical description and explanation of art as a visual language. Art was described as a syntax, and positioned as a theoretical base, from which sign systems were examined through a structural approach. While the term phenomenology was not used in the title of this work, Irvine used it to describe an aspect of discovery of the art object, called "phenomenological intuition".

As far as phenomenology or phenomenological intuition are concerned, I can see no reason why this methodology should be combined with a structural one. The latter method is adequately suited for the purpose of this inquiry, and deeper understanding of art as a visual language can arise from such research. The understanding which arises from a phenomenological work is necessarily and qualitatively different from the understanding which arises from a linguistically oriented structural inquiry.

Laurence Montalto (1983) used the word "phenomenological", where simply "descriptive", or even "qualitative", would more accurately describe his inquiry. The study concentrated on selected departments of art in art educational establishments, and investigated whether departments may be identified by a distinctive art style. Montalto claimed this art style was influenced by ideology. The research attempted to uncover whether these styles and ideologies were reflected in the works and beliefs of M.F.A. students. Montalto described the research as qualitative, aesthetic and descriptive. These are valid and precise terms which in my opinion do indeed accurately describe the work. However, empirical as well as phenomenological research methods were linked. It is at this point I must disagree with the choice of labels which describe methods. The qualitative can be used in conjunction with the quantitative, see Wieder (1975), Sevigny (1977) and Suggs (1976), but usually traditional

(empirical) research methods are the very antithesis of phenomenological methods. Instead of confusing methods, it would have been more accurate to clarify labels. As the work was a combination of methods, the nature of this combination could have been discussed in detail. When two such opposing methods are used, the researcher could have been more aware of the type of study which results from the combination.

A general question which has arisen from this overview of these studies can now be formulated and an attempt made at an answer. The question is: Can empirical methods be combined with a phenomenological approach without altering the phenomenological nature of the inquiry? Clearly, some of these researchers have successfully accomplished this very combination while others have not. The key to this successful combination seems to be that both approaches be recognized, explained, and positioned in the inquiry. If the purpose of the research is a combination of approaches, then this purpose should be clearly identified. If a section of the research is phenomenological in nature, then this section should be identified as to which branch of phenomenology it belongs, and the section should have an internal validity within the work as a whole. There should be a completeness to both approaches, which would validate each. The resulting combination of parts would then contribute to enhance the whole.

Husserlian Phenomenological Inquiries in the Field of Art Education

Studies which make extensive use of Husserl's phenomenology are those by Wellington Madenfort (1965), Stuart Thompson (1974), and Stanley Folsom (1976). These works are grouped here not only because they maintain a phenomenological status throughout the investigation, but also because they recognize and attempt to explain Husserl's contribution to phenomenology.

Wellington Madenfort (1965) concentrated upon the aesthetic aspects of art education and embarked upon a phenomenological analysis of aesthetic experience so that its essential nature may be understood. Husserl was identified as the founder of phenomenology, and called the most important name in the discipline. Key concepts of Husserl's phenomenology were explained: Intentionality, understanding of phenomena, life-world, phenomenological intuition, description and essences. The ideal of phenomenology was correctly understood as ". . . a purely descriptive essential science" (p. 51). The functions of the reduction were accurately detailed and explained (pp. 53-56).

After describing these important components of Husserl's phenomenology, Madenfort took an existentialist turn when Merleau-Ponty's conception of phenomenology was introduced. Merleau-Ponty's theory of embodiment was seen as having the function of interpreting all phenomenological

themes through the concept of "body-as-subject". It was described as bringing Husserl's transcendental consciousness "back down", (one presumes from idealistic heights), to the reality of experience as lived (pp. 60-61). The actual phenomenological analysis of aesthetic experience took on an existential character as Merleau-Ponty's "body-as-subject" served as its philosophic grounding. Subjective concepts of seeing, feeling, and bodily movements were positioned and characterized as having an effect on aesthetic understanding.

The study maintained its phenomenological character, especially in the section which dealt with an analysis of aesthetic experience (pp. 66-122). The only criticism I can bring to bear is the common one of precise labeling. It would have been more accurate to describe the method used as existential-phenomenology, rather than only phenomenology. The reason for this being that Merleau-Ponty's existential-phenomenological concepts provided the basis for the analysis of aesthetic experience.

Through a phenomenological method, Stuart Thompson (1974) sought to engage in meaningful dialogue about the art experience, beyond the "superficialities" of historical, cultural and compositional relationships. Two hypotheses were explored in relation to student art objects. The first held that historically imposed, as well as teacher imposed, criteria are incomplete; the second that other criteria are phenomenally self-given

and discernable to a perceiving individual. An overview of current attitudes toward criticism was embarked upon, as well as a re-investigation of aesthetic experience. Following this, a transcendental-phenomenological methodology was used to view the aesthetic experience as well as serve as the methodological model for criticism. Husserl's phenomenology was cited as providing support for such an investigation.

Thompson claimed a complete understanding of phenomenology would result if that understanding grew out of an exposure to a wide range of theorists. Such an exposure, Thompson held, would avoid the "confusion" (p. 76) which results from an attempt to interpret Husserl's own writings. Out of this collectivity, i.e., writers such as Kockelmans on both Husserl and phenomenology, Kwant on Merleau-Ponty as well as phenomenology, and Merleau-Ponty directly, an existential-phenomenological tone surfaced in the study. During an outline of Husserl's phenomenology (pp. 76-91), Thompson described reservations concerning Husserl, and saw the transcendental ego as lacking viability. This view was based on Thompson's existential interpretation of Husserl treating man's being-in-the-world too lightly (p. 86). Also, reflecting the influence of Merleau-Ponty, Thompson questioned the reduction and claimed a complete reduction "impossible" (p. 86). Beginning with Ideas and tracing Husserl's thinking through Cartesian Meditations, Thompson

claimed Husserl moved toward existentialism (p. 77). The fifth meditation of Cartesian Meditations was cited as proof of this claim, where Husserl's concept of intersubjectivity was seen as existential in nature. This view can be traced to Merleau-Ponty, especially in the Phenomenology of Perception (1962). Heidegger, Thompson stated, extended Husserl's conception of intentionality to include the concept of being, and understood this way being became the ". . . core of Husserl's phenomenology" (p. 78).

With the concept of being, Thompson has not changed Husserl's phenomenology, though he has interpreted Husserl from an existentialist perspective. By so doing Thompson underlines the difference between the transcendental phenomenology of Husserl, and the existential phenomenology of both Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty. The key to recognizing the latter is both the questioning (and eventual rejection) of the Husserlian epoché, and the interpretation of the concept of being, as it is understood by existential phenomenologists, as motivating existential thought.' Both Merleau-Ponty and Heidegger can be classified as existential phenomenologists, and as such both insist that being in the sense of being-in-the-world, the "I" in the world, the "I" of any starting point of thought, must be recognized and accounted for. The nature of this recognition motivates, permeates and influences all existential-phenomenological thought.

In Husserlian phenomenology, being is not forgotten, or "treated lightly" or even ignored; it is, however, treated differently to the way existential-phenomenologists treat it. For Husserlian phenomenology, the concept of being is best described as neutralized. Instead of motivating all thinking from a position which recognizes and takes the concept of being into account, Husserl takes a stance with which the existential phenomenologists clearly disagree. Husserl's phenomenology brackets being, it sets the concept aside, and as Quentin Lauer puts it ". . . it is concerned with what things are, not with whether they are" (1965, p.66, emphasis added).

Of course being is not the only concept or object of thought bracketed by Husserlian phenomenology, but it is the one existentialist phenomenologists have difficulty accepting. The criticism directed toward Husserl by the existential phenomenologists fails to recognize the uniqueness of the epoché and the neutrality which follows its performance. For Husserl, after an epoché, the concept of being, instead of motivating thought in an existentialist sense, is simply put aside. It is not lost, negated nor denied; it remains, but becomes a concept like all the others, held in abeyance while an investigation is carried out. After an epoché the concept of being becomes neutral. An inquiry retains its Husserlian phenomenological status by maintaining this neutrality.

It follows then, that if Husserl's unique position of bracketing or neutralizing being is not accepted, it is not difficult to realize that an existential phenomenologist must take one of two positions when confronting Husserl's phenomenology. The first is that Husserl's epoché must be rejected completely, as Merleau-Ponty does, for the reason that the epoché is seen as bracketing being in terms of negativity not neutrality. The second position was the one Thompson adopted when he read Husserl through the eyes of an existentialist, and saw the concept of being surfacing in Husserl's phenomenology. Therefore, while remaining phenomenological, Thompson's methodology, like Madenfort's could have been more accurately described as existential-phenomenological.

While researching works in art education that were phenomenological in nature, the only one discovered that made use of Husserl's phenomenology throughout, was by Stanley Folsom (1976). Folsom rigorously followed Husserl's phenomenology, and positioned the art educator in the pre-adolescent world. The resulting investigation was a phenomenological study of teacher and children. The roles of art teacher and researcher were fused into one as the author's own art classroom became the area of study. The resulting research attempted to understand the underlying intentionalities of the students' activities. Folsom maintained that Husserl's life-long efforts constitute the "purest" view of phenomenology, which is

characterized as opposing empirical methodologies (p. 23). Husserl's epoché and bracketing processes were described through a series of reductions, beginning at the level of the conceptual, through the perceptual, the other's intentionality, to the level of pure ego (pp. 23-29). The phenomenologist then, by going from the conceptual level of consciousness, through the flow of perception, meets the intended object in a field of consciousness which is presuppositionless. It is there that objects are constituted within intentionality, eventually resulting in an essence, or a pure knowledge, where the ego trancends itself. In this transcendental realm the effort is directed to uncover the ego's motivations as it reacts in its world.

By outlining Husserl's phenomenology in this manner, and putting it into practice in the investigation, Folsom took a distinctive stance in art education inquiries, even among those described as phenomenological. For Folsom's study is both phenomenological and Husserlian. In my opinion it retained this designation because it described, explained, and utilized key tenets of Husserl's phenomenology.

One area where Folsom could possibly be criticized for moving away from phenomenology in a Husserlian sense, was in the use of scientific measuring devices. Because of the empirical nature of such devices, they normally have no part of a purely phenomenological work. However, as both

researcher and teacher, Folsom expressed the need to have his teaching subjected to external observation. His justification in expressing this need was that he felt he was not the best judge of such a subjective area. Therefore, use was made of two devices. One was the Withall Social/Emotional Climate Index, which is concerned with the affective domain of learning, and the kinds of verbal behaviors that can enhance or restrict the learning climate for students (pp. 34-36). The other was the Ribble and Schultz Social Substantive Scale, which was used as an aid to evaluate classroom behaviors and performances (pp. 37-40).

Folsom justified these empirical devices by phenomenologically reducing his intention in making use of them. The author's teaching behavior, as viewed by others through the utilization of these external instruments, was compared to Husserl's reductions and likened to a deep probe which ascertained true revelation of phenomena (p. 89). Folsom was, in part, investigating his own teaching and wanted to establish the nature of his performance prior to, and during the implementation of the investigation. The devices used, and the phenomenological justification for their use, seem in harmony with the concept of intentionality. Because of the nature of the teacher/researcher dualism aspect of the study, Folsom was justified in going beyond his own opinions on the nature of his teaching. Not to have sought a fuller knowledge and

understanding of his teaching would have gone against his own intentionality, and therefore against the Husserlian nature of the investigation.

Finally, Folsom recognized and responded to a common criticism of phenomenological works, namely that the knowledge and understanding gained by the work may be idiosyncratic. He maintained that while the understanding of the individuals in this particular study may be unique, the very individuals investigated represent a universal type. Therefore, an essence of the universal was embodied within these individuals (pp. 254-261). This is completely in accord with Husserl, who holds that we reach an understanding of universals, by beginning with an investigation of particulars (Husserl, 1958, p. 181). Folsom's study then, is completely phenomenological as well as completely Husserlian, even to this final point of anticipating criticism of phenomenological works, then justifying such works in a Husserlian manner.

Research which Combines the Qualitative and Quantitative

Unlike some of the previously cited investigations which combine aspects of the qualitative and quantitative in a study, the research discussed below combines methodologies purposefully from the outset. Studies in the previous section on phenomenology, for example, McCoy (1970), Stumbo (1970), Wright (1973), Suggs (1976), Montalto (1983) and even to a degree Folsom (1976),

combined methodologies in a different manner to the studies about to be discussed. These previous studies made use of combined research strategies, in works the authors described as phenomenological. The researchers did not fully intend to combine approaches, but used quantitative methods in works designated primarily qualitative. The concept of combined methodologies was not the primary consideration for the research.

The investigations discussed here question a priori the use of a singular methodology, whether it be qualitative, or quantitative. This research position holds that a combination of approaches may be a methodological answer to arguments directed against both approaches. The combined approach may provide research solutions by offering alternatives to extremes of either qualitative or quantitative methods. This middle ground, these researchers argue, may provide a fertile basis which could instigate new directions in art education inquiries.

Maurice Sevigny (1977, 1978, 1981) acknowledged that qualitative approaches have much to offer inquiries within art education, but would temper such "subjective" approaches with "objective" elements. He labeled his inquiries "triangulated", his perspective "multiple", and attempted to take both the subjective and objective viewpoints into consideration when investigating art educational environments. A blend of the two approaches --qualitative and quantitative--Sevigny claimed, may

provide a solution to the problem of describing the art classroom from various viewpoints. Sevigny, therefore, while understanding and displaying empathy toward a subjective, qualitative viewpoint, held it is not enough, that it needs to be tempered with quantitative aspects, and this combination of approaches--a multiple perspective--may be the methodology which could provide valid descriptions of the complexity found in an art classroom environment.

Similarly, Charles Wieder (1975), described "hard" elements of research strategies as being limited to the directly perceivable, even where evidence suggests that other phenomena are involved in the learning situation. The qualitative or "soft" approaches are equally inappropriate, because it is asserted, while concerning themselves with the affective aspects of human behavior, they do not lend themselves to "precise, systematic inquiry" (p. 18). The inadequacies of both ends of the research spectrum led Wieder to suggest an alternative called a "tough" approach to art education problems, one that is integrative, taking both "hard" and "soft" i.e., objective and subjective aspects into account. What would emerge from such a strategy would be description that would embody both precise and sensitive elements, Wieder characterized the "tough" researcher as a

". . . systematic humanist or a rigorous softy" (p. 17).

In an investigation into the use of classroom space which is described as a form of non-verbal communication,

Lee Eckleberry (1983) also used both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Eckleberry felt that the quality of art teaching, interaction between student and teacher, as well as student production of art works are all influenced by the spatial layout of secondary school art classrooms. The nature of the investigative procedure suggested qualitative, as well as quantitative, data collection. Among other techniques the qualitative data collection tools included participant observation, ethnography, and interviews. Quantitative data were used to illuminate relationships between space in the classroom and art achievement, as represented by grade measurement. The study concluded that spatial qualities were significant in that they can influence the learning environment, and also that the similarities outweigh the differences between traditional straight row configurations in the classroom, and non-traditional informal art environments.

Eckleberry's use of a dual approach, like Sevigny's and Wieder's call for a combination of research strategies, is not unique. All echo Child (1973), who made an eloquent appeal for the cross fertilization of the qualitative and quantitative research methods in the field of psychology.

The integration of the two approaches can also be seen earlier in Giorgi (1965, 1966, 1967), who labeled himself a phenomenological psychologist, and contended that a phenomenological interpretation can be applied to an empirical study (1967, p. 117). Also, because most

phenomena contain elements of measurement and meaning, as well as quality and quantity, is reason enough for a combination of the two approaches. Giorgi indicated which camp he leans toward, however, when he cautions that much work needs to be done before the human sciences reach the level of maturity he sees in the natural sciences (1966, p. 49).

Multiple approach methodologies argue that because both objective and subjective studies have drawbacks, namely, the former being too "hard" or quantitative, the latter too "soft" or qualitative, a solution may be a combination of the two. The assumption inherent in this reasoning is the "better" qualities of both stances would be utilized, while qualities deemed too extreme could be avoided. Sevigny recognized that multiple approaches directed toward studying art education settings can be time consuming, emotionally and intellectually demanding, as well as tedious (Sevigny, 1981, p. 80), nevertheless he maintained that they are ultimately worthwhile. If the effort put into these combined methodologies avoids what Sevigny termed the "limitations" of any singular strategy, then the effort expended would not be in vain. As Sevigny (1978, p.15) pointed out, these strategies are not held to be the ultimate forms of inquiry or methodologies, but they do provide an alternative for investigations into the complexities of art education environments.

These combined studies are worthy of consideration at this point in this review of literature for a number of reasons. They are not phenomenological, but do make use of some aspects of phenomenology i.e., direct observation, an immersion into the environment, and allow elements and meaning inherent in the environment to surface over a period of time. They are not totally ethnographic, but do make use of ethnographic techniques, most notably participant observation. Neither are they ethnomethodological, but do follow the discipline in that they are not necessarily concerned with fact discovery, but do concern themselves with the question of how participants in a setting account to themselves both facts and aspects of meaning. They tend not to be entirely quantitative, but clearly do see a value in making use of empirical measuring devices which can lead toward a more comprehensive understanding of the complexity of art education classrooms. By combining these methodologies therefore, multiple approach strategies carve out a unique niche for their positions in the paradigmatic world of art education research.

This concludes the literature review from the point of view of this inquiry. I recognize that my comparison of Husserl's phenomenology to the cited studies, along with my brief explanations of key phenomenological concepts, may actually raise questions rather than provide answers. I am also aware that a full philosophical accounting of Husserl

within a phenomenological inquiry does not belong in a review of related literature. For these reasons, I deal exclusively and more extensively with Husserl and key components of his phenomenology in chapter 4.

Chapter 3

This chapter presents the details of the art project which serves as a basis for the experience described in this inquiry. Described below are the teacher and students, the participants in the experience, and the classroom where the event takes place. In order to contribute to an understanding of the event as it unfolded, the days of the experience are presented in chronological order, beginning with Day One and ending with Day Twelve. A general summary follows an accounting of each day's activities, this summary is then followed by summaries from both the teacher's and students' perspectives. The cumulation of descriptions and summaries is intended to provide detailed objective knowledge of the totality of the event.

The Participants, the Setting, the Event, Objectively Described

The Teacher

Miss Elizabeth Fowler, the teacher taking part in this research, is an art educator with a number of years of experience at various levels of art education. She has taught high school, has been an elementary school resource teacher and, as such, worked at the elementary level with both students and teachers before beginning her current position at the fine arts high school. The fact that Miss Fowler was chosen to be the first art teacher in

this school of the fine arts attests to her competence and professionalism. It is therefore recognized by me that the teacher could be described as a competent, knowledgeable, or even a "good" art teacher. I recognize that my view of the teacher has inevitably been shaped to a certain extent by external influences, but hold that by employing a phenomenological epoché (detailed in chapter 4) I can set aside this knowledge and purposely view the teacher as she is within the context of the present experience.

I begin to explore further and identify what I know about the teacher. Why do I believe she is a competent teacher? I hold this as a belief based on past experiences when I had occasion to observe her teaching. The belief is also based on conversations I have had about her with other teachers and school administrators. If I explore the belief further, I find it is also based on conversations I have had with her over a period of time. Out of these conversations I came away with the impression that she held strong opinions, had no hesitation expressing those opinions, and generally seemed sincere, genuine, and honest in her beliefs about art and art education. I admit to myself that during these conversations she and I disagreed many times, but my respect for her opinions, based on the soundness of her logic, was maintained. When she was appointed to teach in this school I remember intuitively feeling that the choice was a good one, and that she would

perform well in the position. This forms the basis of my belief in her competence.

In conversations I have had with her, she has always seemed genuinely positive about the teaching profession and art education in particular. She has long "fought" with school administrators in order that art in her school be taken "seriously". She perceives school administrators to be generally uninformed about art and its place in education, and makes a point of attempting to change or influence their views at any opportunity. She appears a strong determined person, one who seems used to fighting for what she believes to be worthwhile.

One of her strong beliefs is that students should have a good exposure to, and good experience of, art in elementary and secondary schools. While she worked as a resource teacher at the elementary level she had access to a number of administrators, teachers and students, and won over many converts to her way of thinking. She is actively involved with the local art teachers' professional association, of which she is a past president. A new arts program is being devised for this school of the fine and performing arts, and she is involved with the formulation of the fine art section. Her own art work is important to her and she believes that by doing her own work, and being personally and directly involved in the creative process, she understands her students more completely when they are involved with experimentation and creation in the art

class. She told me she feels that she understands and has more empathy toward her students because the creative processes are the "same" in both cases. Her own work is part of an M.A. degree upon which she is currently working. In my opinion the description "activist" fits Miss Fowler as an art educator.

I now think back over the period of time I have been in contact with her professionally. As teachers we, along with others, attended meetings, worked on committees, and collaborated on formulating art examinations for high school students over a number of years. What kind of knowledge about her came out of these encounters? On a personal level, I know she was born and raised in Manitoba. She often speaks about the West and visits her parents, who still live there. She learned and spoke both French and English as a child. There is no trace of a French accent when she speaks English and vice versa. Unlike some who enjoy similar language skills, she does not pepper her English conversation with French words, but when a French word comes up in her speech it is pronounced correctly and not anglicized.

On a professional level, in my contacts with her I always came away with the impression that she was a hard worker. She was always willing to stay longer at meetings to complete tasks which others may have postponed. It is my impression she frequently stayed after school to help students complete projects, fire pottery, or work at

mounting an exhibition. These thoughts, I realize, are sedimented in my memory. If I think of her, or look at her in the classroom very few of these thoughts are on the surface of my consciousness, as it were. It takes an effort of contemplation to probe my memory and to re-call and express these impression based on past encounters.

The Students

The students participating in this research are a grade eight co-educational art class. They have been previously interviewed and specifically chosen to attend this school because of their talent in one or more of the arts: art, music, drama or dance. They attend all of these arts courses as well as following a regular high school program in grade eight, after which they major or specialize in a chosen field within the arts from grade nine to graduation. The students in the participating class, therefore, may not necessarily be art students going on to specialize in visual arts, but could be music, drama, or dance students. They do, however, participate in all of the fine arts courses during their grade eight year, including the present course.

The particular art course under study takes place every afternoon between three and four o'clock throughout the school year. It was from this course that I chose this

particular project in which to participate, this project then formed the basis of the described shared experience.

I had not met the students before this lesson began. Because they have been interviewed and selected to attend this school I must assume they are at least average, and probably above average in ability in one or more of the fine arts. While this does not necessarily mean every student has above average ability in art, I assume that because they have chosen to attend this school, and undergo an accelerated high school program, as well as courses in all of the arts, they must have a certain amount of talent or overriding interest in the arts. Some of the students in this class will go on to major in art in their senior years; which ones will do so are as yet unknown to me.

I realize that there is only one boy in this class. I therefore recognize that there is a danger of my viewing the class as an all female activity, with all of the sexist implications that may imply, simply because I am a male and viewing the activity inevitably from a male perspective. I wonder just how much of an influence this may have on the description, then realize that just being aware, and making this awareness part of an epoché, I will perform before I begin a phenomenological analysis of the event, is an important first step in overcoming the danger of such a stereotypical element creeping in to my view of the experience.

The School and Classroom

I must explore and externalize my views of the school and classroom, where the experience between teacher and students is to take place, so that I may recognize when my views are influencing what ought to be an impartial description of the experience.

The physical school is a five storey brick structure in the inner city, built as a high school in 1932. Within the last two years the building has undergone extensive renovations and is now a fine arts school. Students from across the city may apply to attend the school, follow an accelerated high school program as well as be exposed to the fine arts, namely, art, music, drama, and dance. In their senior years the students would elect to major in a chosen fine art field. Students are interviewed by school board personnel, including arts specialists, to ensure they have a talent or interest in one or more of the fine arts. They agree to follow courses which expose them to all four fine arts during their first year in the school.

The art classroom where the researched lesson takes place is located on the lower level of the building. The room, one of three designated for art, is a curious mixture of old and new, or more precisely, original and renovated. The ceiling is high and old, the fluorescent lights suspended from it are new, the pipes running across the ceiling and down the walls are both old and new, yet all have a unified effect as they have been freshly painted

a beige color. The walls are both old and new and are painted light grey in color. The original wall facing the street outside is thick and solid looking, the surface of which is plaster, it also contains the only two windows in the room. The remaining three walls are part of the new renovations and are constructed out of plaster board which appears flimsy and temporary in comparison to the original plaster wall. There is one new stainless steel deep sink, five tables four feet square around which are a number of stools. Some stools are all wood; some have wooden seats and tubular metal legs; some have backrests; some do not. None of the furniture is new. There are both wooden and metal cupboards used for storing students' works and materials. Miss Fowler uses a long wooden bench-type table in place of a traditional teacher's desk. This table holds art materials, newspapers, water containers, partly completed student works, and other odds and ends commonly found in art classrooms. Another table holds boxes of wax crayons, chalk pastels, along with assorted objects that may help create unusual marks on paper such as, feathers, twigs, various textured pieces of cloth, straws, sponges, and a number of pieces of plastic and metal which could have originally been toys or ornaments.

Located beside the teacher's table is a grey metal set of drawers which look as though they do not quite belong here or rather should belong somewhere else, a storeroom perhaps. These drawers hold current works of the various

classes which use the art room. All the tables have marks, stains, bruises, and gouges which seem to indicate art activity dating back a number of years. It appears incongruous at first to see this older furniture in this newly renovated room, but after a short time one accepts the situation and even begins to feel a certain amount of warmth and sense of comfort emanating from the older, eclectic furniture, especially in contrast to the rather stark newness of the rest of the room.

The wall opposite the windows is covered by sheets of brown masonite pegboard which extend from the floor to a height of eight feet. The wall extends another six feet from where the top of the pegboard ends giving some indication of the height of the ceiling. There are 25 large reproductions of art works pinned to the pegboard and virtually covering it from one third the way up to the top. (See appendix for titles and artists.)

On a pinboard to the left of the door as one enters the room and therefore visible from almost anywhere in the room and especially as one is leaving, are four posters, one under another, made by Miss Fowler. The larger one reads: "Art is learning skills: to see our world and to express feelings with line/texture/color/shape". The four last words are highlighted by the effect they describe: "line" written in an uneven black line, the letters that make up the word texture drawn in various textures; "color" in various colors, and "shape" with various shapes. The

three other posters read: "Art goes beyond what the eye sees . . .", "Art is learning to discuss the works of other artists", and "Art is learning to see what was always there but had missed the eye".

One last feature ought to be noted concerning the art room, namely, its acoustics. Because of the height of the ceiling, large expanses of wall and subsequent volume of space, any noise, however slight, seems accentuated in the room. One of the first things the teacher does when talking about the room, or the school, is mention the noise problem in the room and her attempts to alleviate the situation by stressing the need, to anyone in a position of authority, for some form of acoustical barrier to be installed, especially on the ceiling. During a lesson the noise level, even from normal activity and conversation, is amplified and tends to be most distracting. This feature is important because when Miss Fowler communicates with the students, she tends to use a louder than normal voice to ensure she is clearly heard above the incidental noise students inevitably make.

Because the physical school is an older building it has both attractions and distractions for me. I admit to being attracted to many of its architectural features such as high ceilings, solid walls and doors, interesting woodwork and so on. I also admit there are drawbacks to an old draughty school building, especially during cold weather. I like the idea of renovating,

thereby preserving, and giving the school a new lease on life as a fine arts school. The positioning of the art rooms on the lower level could have been thought out more thoroughly, however. The new walls of this particular classroom border the cafeteria, a boys' washroom, a stairwell to the first floor, and an exit door, all of which contribute to the general high and distracting level of noise in the classroom itself. The acoustics in the room are very poor and must be described as detrimental to effective teaching and learning. A quiet distraction free atmosphere does not exist in this room because of the level of noise. Even when the noise generally subsides somewhat, the noise of the traffic from the busy street just about five feet from the windows begins to infiltrate and influence activities within the room. Even my conversations with the teacher, when only the two of us are present in the room, are noisy and full of echo, which is reinforced when I later play back the tape to transcribe the conversation.

Some Phenomenological Considerations

I have an overriding question in mind: How can I faithfully record this experience? I know I will be writing a description of events which happen before me, while my tape recorder is picking up speech and noise which I will later transcribe into a text of the experience. How will I know when I have enough data? Or, perhaps more

to the point, will I have too much? The answer seems to lie in an understanding of phenomenological methodology, specifically the concepts of the natural standpoint and epoché. The study takes place in the realm of the normally unquestioned natural standpoint. If, by way of contrast, the study were to be non-phenomenological and therefore more empirical and objective, there would be a methodological necessity to limit and focus the investigation. This would be accomplished by the establishment of a hypothesis, followed by limiting the subsequent study to investigate whether the experience verified the validity or non-validity of that hypothesis. This would constitute a valid form of educational research based upon a scientific model. Valuable knowledge has been gained in the past, and will continue to be gained in the future, from the utilization of this model. However, because of the nature of the investigation, the data generated in an empirical study would need to be limited, first in order to be manageable, and second in order to assess the viability of the hypothesis and subsequent conclusions. The control of the type and amount of data an empirical work generates is an important consideration for that form of research.

In a phenomenological investigation such as the present one, data in an empirical sense does not apply in the same way as in a non-phenomenological inquiry. This is not to say that "data" is not produced in phenomenological

investigations. It is of course, but I ought not to refer to it as data, or certainly not understand it in objective terms. It is after an epoché when the accepted natural standpoint has been bracketed that a phenomenological investigation comes into its own. What then can be inquired into are the taken-for-granted assumptions of the natural standpoint itself, and subsequently at a deeper level the layers of meaning operating within experience at the level of the natural standpoint. Only when the phenomenological investigation is under way, and especially after an epoché, can an understanding of the scope and range of the study, which is what data refers to, be understood in a qualitative manner; for a quantitative generation of data in an empirical or objective manner does not apply in a phenomenological investigation. What does apply, as well as guide, limit, and focus a phenomenological study is the experience that takes place in a given location, at a given time, with a certain number of individuals taking part.

From a temporal perspective, if I only visited once or twice the classroom where the study takes place, it could be argued that much of the contextual detail that lies embedded in an experience may be missed. From a physical perspective, if I positioned myself in one fixed location in the classroom, with a limited view of activities, then again much would be missed. Even from a more personal viewpoint, if, after the lesson began,

I only attended to those individual students with whom I established a rapport, then again much of what other students did during the course of the experience could not be attended to. Of course, I realize that physical limitations exist, that as one person watching, listening, and writing, even with the aid of a technological extension in the form of a tape recorder, the sheer totality of the experience could not be attended to constantly. This is why over time I will remain enmeshed in the experience with its ebbs and flows. Details overlooked on one occasion could be picked up on another. Naturally, an effort will be made to attend as much as possible to what would be happening in the environment, but it must be recognized from the outset that I cannot attend to everything at one time. Only over time, with repeated involvement and participation in the evolving experience, can I hope to develop a meaningful understanding of the event.

Day One - May 15, 1985

I am seated on a stool near the wall, I have writing paper in front of me, pen in hand, tape recorder running, I am writing. Elizabeth Fowler, the teacher, enters the room followed by 14 students, they noisily go to tables and sit on stools beside them. The planned lesson, the teacher previously informed me, has to do with manipulations of materials, experimentation with color, and will have "sky" as a theme.

Elizabeth Fowler begins talking to the class; she instructs the students to take some time to look at the 25 illustrations pinned to the wall (see appendix). She says that they have something in common and she asks what that is. A student replies that all the works are painted outside, another says that most of them have something moving, others that they have motion and action.

The lesson has begun. I reflect that in thinking about other lessons and different situations that there is no overt discipline coming from the teacher; there is no shouting, although her voice is louder than normal to compensate for the poor acoustics in this room; there is no waiting for the class to be attentive, or to listen to instructions. This could be for two reasons, I tell myself; one because of the relatively small size of the class (14 students) and the other because Miss Fowler is recognized by me and others as a competent teacher. I then realize I am doing what I should not be doing, that is, comparing the present situation to others including, if I admit it, my own teaching. If I am observing the things themselves as a phenomenological methodology would indicate, I really have no business comparing what is happening here and now to other situations of my past experience. If I am to discover the nature of this current experience I then should focus and attend only to this experience.

I return my attention to the events in the classroom. As the students give answers to the teacher's questions I see a pattern quickly establish itself, namely, the teacher is using a Socratic method where she asks a series of easily answered questions which eventually lead the students to the logical conclusion the teacher initially had in mind. She controls the kinds of responses coming from the class. Simply, questions are asked and rephrased until a student response seems to be the appropriate or logical one.

The sky is identified, by a student, as something common to all the displayed works, with one exception. It should be noted that students had suggested "painted outside", "motion", "commotion", "action", "trees", "water" and "nature" as a theme of the works before someone said "sky". The teacher quickly praised the suggestion of sky, indicated its correctness with one exception, which the students quickly identified as "Before the Start", by Lapicque, a painting of jockeys on horseback with no visible sky. In discussing this work the teacher refers to feelings and the elements of art. Students are asked how they feel when they look at this painting; a student offers that she feels "movement and excitement". The teacher quickly links this with art elements by asking what elements were used to create those feelings. Students offer "bright colors" and "original". By pointing out the colors red and green the teacher elicits the answers

"complementary" and "opposite colors" and describes these as elements of art. Miss Fowler points out that this "juxtaposing" (her word) of colors creates a "loud" (a student's suggested word) and "jumpy" effect which creates the feeling of action.

The pattern of question-answer is then rapidly established. The teacher asks, rephrases, and refines questions, until a favorable response surfaces from the students' suggestions. When this occurs, the teacher quickly agrees with the student response then moves on to the next series of questions.

During this verbal interaction, the teacher moves continously using the illustrations to point out an artist's style or a detail of a work. The students are seated on their stools in groups of threes and fours around the desks. When they respond to questions they do so unhesitantly without raising their hands, or waiting for the teacher to indicate permission to speak by nodding or pointing. It happens in a seemingly natural relaxed manner; when a question is asked someone comes up with a response. I get the distinct impression that this kind of activity has occurred frequently with this group. There is no hesitation between question and answer, and more frequently than not, more than one student at a time responds to a question.

The general pattern continues. The teacher raises questions about the elements of art, a term that seems

to be known and understood by the students. Line is identified as an element; it occurs in Chagall's work, and is endorsed by the teacher after being suggested by a student. By comparing the two she links line and shape in Chagall's work. She refers to feelings: "How do you feel . . .?" (about this Chagall), "How does the artist get the viewer to feel?", "How does the work make you feel?" A student picks up on the concept of feelings, and uses the term in response to a question about choosing work for her own room; stating that how the work makes her feel is an important criteria in making a choice.

An important point develops in the question-answer technique. In discussing Childe Hassan's work "World's Fair Chicago (1893)", the teacher asks how the viewer "gets into" the work; what devices are used to lead the eye. The work depicts a large curved brown pathway, groups of people walking or sitting on benches, the pathway flanked by trees and bushes, all dominated by a silvery white dome growing out of a horizontal building beyond the trees. The "pathway" is an answer suggested by a student, and accepted by the teacher as a device in this work which draws the viewer's eye. Miss Fowler asks whether there is anything else which draws the eye into the work. A student offers the answer "bushes". Instinctively it seemed to me to be a correct observation. The teacher, ignoring the suggestion, mentions the color of the people's clothing in the work. A student agrees with the suggestion of

clothing, because it stands in contrast to the green of the trees and bushes. The teacher then elaborates on this suggestion and points to a red dress worn by a lady centrally placed in the work. Miss Fowler points out that the figure in the red dress acts as a focal point for the eye of a viewer.

So it seems that when the teacher has something in mind, in this case an artistic device to lead the eye into a painting, she ignores a perfectly valid observation by a student. To me both devices seemed to be quite correct an effective "eye leading" devices. The bushes flanking the pathway would perhaps be a more accurate observation, as they did in fact "lead the eye", whereas the red dress only provided a focal point for the eye after entry had been gained to the work.

To balance and lend credibility to the last point of ignoring a student's valid suggestion, the following seems pertinent. In discussing H.W. Hansen's "Questionable Companions", a work depicting a North American Indian and a Cowboy, both on horseback riding side by side, with a glowing sky as a background, the teacher asked how the viewer knew it was a sunset as opposed to sunrise. The student who had made the sunset suggestion offered that colors and shadows gave the viewer this impression. The teacher remarked that shadow was a good observation and one that she herself had not thought of. So it seems the

teacher is open to new suggestions but only when she is not trying to make a point herself.

Toward the end of the lesson the students are given their first hint of what the following lessons are to be about. They are told that they are observing skies because they will start an exercise the next day, and that they would be painting, experimenting, and "trying everything".

During a discussion of Rousseau's "Jungle Scene with Sun", the teacher asks the students to use their imagination by thinking about how they would feel if they were actually in Rousseau's jungle. This is the first time such a question was made.

In the continuing discussion of Rousseau's work, the teacher returns to the elements of art and asks a question related to composition. A student admitted that she did not know, that she had forgotten the meaning of the term composition. The teacher explained it was placement of objects on the paper. The student then continued with her response and seemed to understand the term. So it seems the students, or at least this one named Paulina, can freely admit to not knowing, or forgetting a term. The teacher simply reminded her by explaining briefly what the term meant.

The students are asked to compare two works, both by Rousseau, "Jungle Scene with Sun", and "Father Junier's Cart", the latter work more recognizable as a primitive style than the jungle scene. After asking for the identity

of the style of the latter work, and reminding the students of slides they had recently viewed, the students offered the answer "untrained" and "amateur". The teacher reminded the class that the word was "primitive", and when attention was drawn to the horse and people in the work, there was general laughter. She explained that primitive artists are overtly interested in detail, which is the element linking the two works.

As the first lesson ends the teacher indicates something of what the class will do the next day. She informed them that they will "experiment with transparencies, and work with gouaches".

In summary, the teacher used a question-answer format during this first lesson, generally getting the students to supply the correct response by her asking and rephrasing of questions. She identified the sky as the theme of the reproductions, and told the students they would experiment during the next lessons. It was a busy lesson, with the teacher asking 204 questions; time seemed to pass quickly.

The teacher emphasized feelings, and explained they had a lot do to with art works, as well as the viewing of them. She ignored a valid suggestion by a student when it seemed she had an important point in mind she wanted to make. She praised a point she admitted that she herself had not thought of. The elements of art, line, shape, color, texture, and composition featured prominently and repeatedly in the teacher's speech and

examples. In the question-answer technique she adopted a flexible attitude, when one question did not bring forth an answer, she quickly formulated another one. If her re-formulated question was not appropriate, she used a different example or question. This established a pattern which she repeated throughout the lesson. Rarely did she repeat a question, the exception was with themes, for example, when the discussion of the elements of art returned under different conditions. She accepted all the students' answers (with the one noted exception), she did not overtly classify any as wrong.

The students' seemed to enjoy the question-answer format of this initial lesson. They responded well to the concept of feelings in art works, emphasized by the teacher. They also appeared to understand and responded well to the teacher's emphasis on the elements of art. Miss Fowler challenged their imaginations when she asked how it would feel to be in a certain work. They seemed to be at ease throughout the lesson, and laughed often when someone gave a humorous answer. They had some idea of what they were to do during the following lesson, namely, with sky as a theme, they would experiment with transparencies, and gouache paint.

Day Two - May 20, 1985

Miss Fowler begins the lesson in front of the reproductions again and points out foreground and

middleground, as well as colors used in a diluted way in Dufy's "Normandy Tree", and Kirchner's "Forest with Brook".

The students then gather around one of the larger wooden tables where materials are set. The teacher demonstrates what she calls a diluted water technique, which results in transparencies. (Following the first lesson Miss Fowler had pointed out in a conversation with me that she had forgotten to mention transparencies during the first lesson and that she would bring it up today. She had remembered to do so.)

The students are "to experiment", just to "mix paint", Miss Fowler informs the class as she demonstrates. They stand around the table watching and questioning as Miss Fowler tries one experiment after another, all with one technique, wet paper or diluted paint. As she paints, she instructs the class to be "delicate", to see "what happens and what effects can be created". After exemplifying the use of various materials in different ways, she encourages the students to do the same; she reminds them to refer to the reproductions on the wall, the ones they had been discussing. She vigorously demonstrates what the class is not to do, that is, scrub heavily with a paint brush so that the paper disintegrates. She describes the paper as "cheap" and capable of tearing easily.

The students then enthusiastically gather materials, return to their places, and begin their experiments.

After observing the activity for a few minutes, I begin to question students about what they are doing. I am particularly interested to find out if they are following the teacher's advice, and experimenting by wetting the paper and diluting the paint.

After about ten minutes it becomes clear that a number of students are trying to do a representational work, it seems they want their efforts to look like something recognizable. When Miss Fowler notices this development she reminds them that they are not to "draw" (her word) anything in particular, not to "cover the whole sheet of paper with a sky", and that they are to "experiment and try the wet technique".

The students' efforts result in a wide range of variations. Some follow the teacher's advice to the letter and use the demonstrated technique; others do not. When I question them, the students of the latter group explain that they want to try things, and that they view their work as experimental. The students' interpretations of the images which result from these efforts are: tornados, a storm, sea, space with planets, clouds, sun, reflections, earth from space, a cave, and an underwater scene.

In a demonstration for Norma, a student who seems to be having some difficulty, the teacher repeats her earlier discussion on feelings in art works. Norma is urged to "feel" how clouds are, and to observe them after school.

If she "thinks" while experimenting, the teacher advises, then "things will happen".

In a conversation with me, Miss Fowler explains that this way of mixing colors on paper is new to these students, that they have not painted much before, and that they were only used to mixing colors in trays.

To summarize, three main events occurred: a brief discussion of the reproductions, a demonstration, and student experimentation. Students fell into two groups: Those who followed advice and conducted their experimentation as the teacher had demonstrated, and those who tried other techniques notably of a non-wet variety.

For the teacher, when she saw half the group doing representational images, she reminded these students that the purpose of the lesson was to focus only on experimenting with materials. After this reminder, she saw some students amend the representationalism of their images and return to experimentation.

For the students, approximately half the group followed the instructions to experiment and half did not. When reminded of the purpose of the lesson by the teacher some of this latter group changed their images and eliminated representationalism. However, even those who began by experimenting recognized representational images in their work. It seemed as though as the experiment progressed, the students found it difficult to resist the suggestion of representationalism, and to follow

through with this suggestion. Among those who began by experimenting, no one's work remained purely experimental throughout the lesson. Even those who began this way, eventually succumbed to temptation and began to see clouds or sky in their works; then followed and expanded upon these visual hints. No one closely examined the reproductions on the wall. No one seemed interested in trying to duplicate what was there, even though they had been instructed to observe these works, and had spent the previous lesson discussing them.

Day Three - May 21, 1985

Miss Fowler begins by reminding the class of the transparent effects that can result from an exercise such as the one they are doing, and to use their colors in a diluted way. Today's sky outside is discussed and compared to some of the skies in the reproductions. During a discussion of Kirchener's "Forest with Brook", and Dufy's "Normandy Tree", one student thinks the latter work is not realistic. When the teacher asked the class if realism is an important consideration for artists, one student answers "yes", followed quickly and loudly by many "noes". The teacher explains that artists can convey feelings without the work "being real".

The class is then instructed to return to their works and look for "accidents" in their previous experimentations, accidents that may be worth exploring

again. Today, the instruction is to cover the whole page with a sky effect. When questioned about today's sky outside school, and when asked to compare it to one of the reproductions, one student suggests Monet's "Boats on Beach". The teacher then compares today's sky to three artists, Renoir, Hassan, and Chagall, different elements from each work represent parts of today's sky. Students are asked to consider the type of sky they are trying to create, the type of statement the sky makes, ranging from stormy, clear blue, transparent, cloudy, rainy, snowy, to a sunset.

The students gather their previous work, their paint materials and begin. After a short while Miss Fowler reminds the class that the whole paper is supposed to be a sky. She then approaches one table of three students, and asks them about the effects they want to create using brushstrokes and gestures to imitate clouds. As an example of a particular sky, she refers to approaching storms out West when the sky goes practically all black and "scary".

I begin to go around the class and talk to the students as they are working. I ask about their painting and what they are doing. Judy is not yet sure what she is doing. David begins to create what he calls a "California sky" on his paper, he depicted water at the bottom of the sheet. Sheila is trying to make a sunset based on one she saw in the mountains during the summer two years ago. Sabrina is making a sky which varies from blue

at the top, to pink at the bottom, to represent a sunset which she has based on one she remembers viewing from her baldony last summer. Maria also is painting a sunset, one she saw this year from the rear window of her parent's car as it crossed the Champlain Bridge. Mary is painting a blue sky with a few clouds, which she remembered seeing towards the end of winter when she was skiing. Kim is using cardboard to scrape colors across the paper in an effort to represent a cool, breezy summer day. The sky is being based on one she remembers last year, when she went on a picnic with her parents. Domenique is making a stormy sky, full of clouds, in the summertime. Paulina begins at the top of the sheet and is doing a sunset, not one in particular but a general one. Louise is also beginning a sunset in the mountains, and again not a particular one she remembers. Kathy is beginning a sunrise, one she remembers from when she was "young".

In a conversation after the lesson, Miss Fowler told me that she thought the students were reluctant to use their colors in a transparent way, and that they have a tendency towards realism. They had trouble, she thought, with the idea that today's efforts should be restricted only to skies. Some students were including the sun, and David in pa[illegible]cular included other things (water and beach) in his work. She said she wanted bransparencies in the work today and kept reminding them to look at the reproductions on the wall. I said that I had not seen

anyone doing that. She replied that a few did, Sabrina, for example, based her sky on the reproduction of Homer. Miss Fowler was critical of Paulina and Louise who worked at the same table. Paulina, she thought, paints like a windshield wiper, and Louise ought to have more feelings about her efforts. She thought they forgot to express something or make a statement, and instead just filled up the page. Miss Fowler was especially critical of Paulina and thought she did not listen and rebelled when instructions were given.

The teacher intends to begin the next lesson by displaying the students' works in progress, and have each student talk about their work to see if they can recognize things in them. She thinks they will probably realize that the bottom of their works are beginning to take on the appearance of land. She expressed surprise at the fact that students had paid attention, and noticed the sky outside today. When she had asked about today's sky, some students were able to give a good description.

To summarize, three main events took place today. One was the teacher's instructions at the beginning of the lesson, the second was the students' working on their paintings, and the third was the teacher's conversation with me at the conclusion of the lesson.

For the teacher, the quality of transparency in the produced skies was important, and she expressed disappointment when the students did not use their colors

in this way. She was especially critical of Paulina's inattentiveness and what she termed "rebellious" attitude. In a discussion with students at one table, the teacher, for the first time, referred to her personal memories when she talked of skies out West. She saw Sabrina's work today as being based on a reproduction of Homer: "Breezing Up". When she raised the question of realism and its importance for art, the majority of students loudly voiced the opinion that realism was not important for art. This response was apparently the one the teacher wanted. Projecting to the next lesson, she assumed the students would begin to see land forming at the bottom of their experimental works.

For the students, I did not see anyone referring to the reproductions, as the teacher thought Sabrina had. It is possible that I could have missed someone doing so, including Sabrina, although she had told me her sky was based on a sunset she had seen from her balcony last summer. However, overlooking the example of Sabrina, I found it significant that the reproductions which had featured so prominently in all three lessons, and especially the first, can be ignored so readily by the majority of students when they worked on their own skies. I also found it interesting that many students based their skies on personal memories, on a particular sky they had remembered seeing, and that some had linked the sky to the event, where they were, who they were with, and so on.

When the question of realism and its importance for artists was raised, one student agreed that realism was important, which was followed loudly by negative responses. The impression I and everyone present in the room would get from the majority of negative responses, was that the consensus, namely, the rest of the students as well as the teacher, thought realism was not important. This would seem to be one way in which views, opinions, and beliefs can be altered. The majority loudly agrees on a point and, even if an individual may not agree, doubt has been raised. More important, the doubting individual knows what response is expected if the point is raised again.

Day Four - May 22, 1985

The teacher displayed the works done by the students yesterday on the wall before the students enter the room. The class takes their places on stools in front of the display and Miss Fowler takes a place facing the students, leaving enough space so she can move up and down in front of the wall where the works are. The teacher begins by saying she does not know which student painted which work, as most of them do not have names on them. The students look at the displayed works. The teacher asks what the experiment, represented by the works, was about. "Mixing" and "colors" the students reply. The teacher instructs the students to view and discuss the works.

Gillian begins by saying she likes the clouds in Domenique's painting. Domenique then notices her work is hung upside down; she agrees she likes it better this way because "everything was going in one direction before, and now it has the appearance of the viewer looking directly on to it". Another one looks "real" if our eyes are squinted when looking. Another "looks like a sunset", and when the teacher draws attention to the bottom of this work, the students agree it looks like water. Kim had used cardboard to mix colors in all three paintings she had done. The teacher points out sections of Kim's works and elicits responses of rain, clouds, hills, and wind. All these responses come from students after the teacher indicates a section and waits for suggestions. Paulina points out a section of a work that reminds her of blurred speed, of the type which occurs when a bicycle race is photographed. The painting is Sabrina's and has been displayed upside down. Sabrina then agrees it looks better upside down and agrees with the interpretation of speed. She explains what she had planned to be a sea is now a sky. Miss Fowler suggests Sabrina elaborate on this, using Homer's "Breezing Up" as an example of a type of sky. David points out a sky painting which reminds him of playing ball in the park last weekend, as the types of clouds are the same.

Sabrina indicates a sky painting where she sees a face, then after she approaches the work and points out the eye, nose, hair, etc., other students also see it.

There is a general consensus, they all can now see a head of a man in a painting of a sky. Norma expresses surprise at seeing the head of the man, its perfection, and points out that if someone had started out and tried to "draw" (her word) it, they would not be able to. The teacher picks up on this point, and reminds them that these accidents suggest all kinds of images which they would not have been able to do, had she asked them to, prior to experimentation. She explains that artists are free to use these accidents. In Maria's work someone sees fire, then a growing forest fire, then a spaceship, then a rocket being launched, then a volcano.

Miss Fowler asks for suggestions on the future direction of the lesson. A student suggests that they add things to the paintings. The teacher explains she had intended to have them choose one work (most students have two or three) go outside, and let the accidents speak to them as they sketch something outside on top of their work. The teacher gives her personal recollection of last evening's sky as she went home, she asks if anyone else noticed the sky yesterday. No one had. She then points out Hobbema's "The Two Water Mills" and explains he was more interested in painting sky than people in this work. Hobbema is then compared to a reproduction of Turner (in a book) and she points out Turner's interest in the effects of nature, and that he went into storms to experience them so that he could paint them afterwards. She reads from

the book a description of Turner's work, and emphasizes he experimented with different techniques. She compares the experiments the students are working on during this project to Turner's experiments. She reads a description of Turner being bound to a ship's mast for four hours in a winter storm before he painted "Steamer in a Snow Storm". The reproduction is shown to the class. The students then get their materials and papers, and work for twenty minutes until the period ends.

After the students leave I ask Miss Fowler what her intention was behind today's lesson. She explains she wanted to give the class an experience similar to an artistic experience, making use of what she termed "accidents". Her interpretation of artistic experience is beginning with a definite idea, using accidents, and allowing various things to happen when the original idea is returned to in a creative way. She feels this process balances what would have been stereotypical images if the instructions were simply to paint a picture with sky as the theme. The students would have reverted back to their past experience in painting, she explains, and repeated images they had been expressing since elementary school. The process of them looking at their works from a distance, she believes, allows them to elaborate and expand the work, a process which would not happen without this distancing and discussion. Miss Fowler thinks she gets what she wants

from the students, but does not want to appear "too dogmatic".

In summary, three events happened today: The discussion of diplayed works, the short work period for the students, and the teacher's conversation with me following the lesson.

For the teacher, her whole intention and direction was based upon her interpretation of the artistic process. Deemed crucial in this process, were accidents which provided a creative point of departure, one where imagination could take over. She explained to me that the original idea in a work should be returned to, but her examples to the class indicated this was not important and that the accidents could suggest new directions. She emphasized this process by displaying the works of two students upside down. At least one of these works was intentionally displayed this way. She used Turner as an example of an artist who was one of the first to use experiments and experience as an impetus in his work. This method, she advocated, would eliminate the stereotypical imagery she thought better avoided. This experimentation and production of accidents, typified the artistic process as she understood it, along with thinking about, discussing, and viewing the works from a distance. Interestingly, although she saw herself as getting what she wanted, she hoped her teaching approach did not seem dogmatic.

For the students, their viewing, interpretation, and reading into their displayed works seemed to be the same artistic process the teacher had explained. Accidents were frequently found, and interpretations could easily be made. No one disagreed with any of the suggestions. The more a work suggested an interpretation, the better it seemed to be. Imaginative interpretation was "everything" in the artistic process.

Day Five - May 23, 1985

The students sit quietly while Miss Fowler begins with a reading of poetry. Poetic images are linked to the type of imagery with which Turner was concerned, she explains, and poetry develops images and ideas in one's mind. She reads the poem "It is Raining" by Lucy S. Mitchell, a descriptive poem of rain in the city, in the country, and at sea. Another by Rhoda W. Bacmeister offers a different view of rain along with appropriate descriptions of sounds. She reads seasonal poems entitled "May" and "June".

The teacher explains to them that it is not her intention that they do rainstorms, or a particular theme, and that the poems were read for the imagery they invoke. She tells them to take any one of their works and search for things that could be developed. The works need not be realistic, she instructs, because realism is not necessary to convey an emotion. She gives Turner as an example of an artist who conveyed emotion without realism. No particular

theme is suggested, as students are invited to come up with their own ideas based on the experience of the last few days.

The students collect their works and materials and begin painting. I move among them and ask about their works. Sabrina begins by painting a tall tree, because trees lead to heaven, peacefulness, and sky. She sees what she is now doing as growing out of her previous day's work. Gillian is painting a mountain, which was changed from a sky. The mountain suggested itself when she put some darker colors, yellow and green, into a shape in the sky. When it began to look like a mountain, she consciously made it into one. David's work depicts sky, water and land. He intends to add bluish green to the water to add interest, but he is not sure what the land will be at this stage. Susan is working on her painting from yesterday, which shows water, and is adding sailboats to it. Paulina is painting birds with sky as a background. Louise's work shows a sky, a sea, and a boat sailing, she is painting a shark approaching the boat. Norma's work shows a sky, on top of which she is painting water, a sandy beach, and will add waves to the water. Her viewpoint is from the water, looking over the sand toward the sky. Domenique's work depicts yesterday's transparent sky to which she is adding water at the bottom of the page. Maria had begun with a mountain; now she adds water, waves, or perhaps wind. She

is not sure how it will turn out; she is experimenting, she explains.

Having looked at the works Miss Fowler tells me she is disappointed as the students seem to have reverted back to their stereotypical images, tightened up, and superimposed these images on the experimental work. She looks at Sabrina's painting and asks her if the addition of the trees and volcano today was done in the same style as the previous experimental sky. Sabrina realizes the two are different, but explains this difference exists because she used different materials on separate days and, according to her, the two images fit together. To me, the trees and volcano do indeed seem to be somewhat stereotypical and stand in stark contrast to the lightly handled transparent sky of the previous day. Sabrina apparently does not realize this. The teacher tells me she should not have instructed them to stop experimenting, that the experiment should have continued on to end in a complete work. She sees the images produced today as stiff stereotypes imposed on the experimental background without much effort at integration. Even the materials available have not been fully utilized, she notes.

She tells me she is beginning to think they should start again with another experiment, and let it continue as such. She assumed there would have been a greater diversification from the themes of water and sky, although she concedes she did talk about skies, and the experiments

are suggestive of that. A similar lesson, with grade seven students a few years ago, she reflects, turned out more successful because she had them develop the theme from a point after they completed a sky. The students had elaborated with tree tops, buildings and storms. The younger students, she supposes, were less inhibited, which indicates to her that today's images, in this class, are the result of inhibitions. She saw their lack of ideas about how to develop their work a result of not asking themselves questions, and a lack of experience in art. She wonders why she can imagine all kinds of things in their works, while the students seem incapable of doing so. Is it because of experience, she asks, or had someone long ago drawn her attention to it? The students do not have the capacity to see things, she supposes, because of their comparable lack of experience. She assumes that having a background in art makes a person like herself more conscious and aware of what happens around them, of the environment. The students need more art, she concludes, more experiences in art similar to the current one to make them more aware of what's around them. She makes the point that these students live in a city, and yet are trying to portray experiences vastly removed from their daily experiences; ships on the ocean and remote mountaintops. They may have seen the ocean or mountains only once or twice in their lifetimes. She concludes that assignments should relate to the child's immediate

experience, then realizes the work was supposed to be imaginary, and recognizes the contradiction.

In summary, three main events took place today: the poetry reading, followed by the students continuing with their work based on the experience of the last lessons, as well as my conversation with the teacher during which she expressed her disappointment with the images produced today, as compared to a previous teaching experience.

For the teacher, the lesson today was unsuccessful. She interpreted the students' efforts as a return to stereotypical imagery, which they imposed upon experimental beginnings. She felt she was wrong, and gave wrong instructions, and that the experiment ought to have continued until an image was produced. Instead, images were superimposed on the experiment. She was also disappointed that a wider variety of materials had not been utilized, and viewed this as symptomatic in terms of both materials and imagery that the students had returned to what they had previously known: their past limited experience in art. That the images produced today were stiff, she thought, probably had to do with the students inhibitions. Other causes she reasoned, could be a lack of experience and inability to see and realize the potential of their environment. More experimentation is what seems to be needed, experimentation which should relate to the student's immediate experience, although a totally imaginary assignment had the advantage of allowing

more freedom. She realized that holding these two viewpoints was somewhat contradictory.

For the students, they followed instructions. They began to complete their experimental work by adding the final images. They did not see the same problems Miss Fowler saw, nor did they realize anything could be wrong. To their minds they were completing their oceans, skies, trees, boats, and mountains as they should have been doing. Even when a student (Sabrina) was questioned by the teacher about the difference in imagery between the experimental work and the newly added images, Sabrina saw them as being consistent. She could not understand the teacher's point. If there was a difference, Sabrina thought it had to do with the use of different materials on separate days.

Day Six - May 24, 1985

Miss Fowler begins with a demonstration and discussion of materials. She tells the students that they are not using enough variety of materials in their work. She gives a demonstration using a variety of different materials. The students, sitting and standing around the large wooden table, watch and listen. Using a sponge and brush the teacher paints smoke. The students are told to look for the material that will help them get their ideas across. She uses a dry brush technique to create the effect of smoke. She compares the results of this dry brush technique to one where the brush is used in a normal way

and saturated with paint. Using a sponge she demonstrates another way to create smoke-like effects. Using a crumpled piece of paper she produces the effect of rocks. She tells the students they are to experiment today. If a tree is needed in a work, then an appropriate tool should be found that will produce the necessary delicate lines. They are not to continue directly on their work of the previous lesson, the teacher instructs as she demonstrates, but to experiment on a new sheet of paper. She lets the students know she was disappointed with the results up to now because they have outlined people and sailboats the way they did in elementary school. This is said as she demonstrates how she would do a sailboat, drawing attention to the wind and details, such as, which direction the sails would go. A student voices concern about how the water of the ocean can be put on top of the paint that represents the boat. The teacher explains and demonstrates, painting the ocean color on the lower part of the boat, and mixing the colors together. A small piece of flexible cardboard is used to create both the boat and waves. The demonstration ends. The teacher instructs the students to return to their works from the last lesson, or begin a new experiment, and reminds them that the theme is still the sky.

The students gather a noticeably wider variety of materials before beginning their work. As the teacher observes this, she tells me she is insisting on the

artistic process of trial and error, and feels she must make decisions for the students. Last night she thought about the results of the last lesson and the reasons for her disappointment. She arrived at the conclusion that with students of this age, she must repeat things continuously, that satisfying results are hard to come by, and that the students revert back to what they feel safe doing. She believes the answer lies in experimentation. She feels that the students must go through the experience before they understand what she is trying to teach them.

After the students have begun to work, I move among them. Domenique is starting a new painting because she tells me she is dissatisfied with the sky in her previous one. Sheila works on a smaller paper, she explains, in order to experiment because she has been absent for two days. Susan begins a new one, her other work did not turn out to her satisfaction. She intends to do sailboats using cardboard, the way the teacher demonstrated. She tells me that the reason she did not use a greater variety of materials in her previous work, was because she was not thinking. David thought the teacher wanted them to experiment more with different materials today, which he did not do previously, because he did not see them.

Sabrina interpreted the teacher's instructions today to mean a brush did not necessarily have to be used to create various effects, that other materials could give a

wider variety and better results. She did not use a wider range of materials previously, because she did not want to experiment as she knew what she had in mind to do. She plans now to use a stick to make tree branches. Her images of the previous lesson, the volcano and trees, she feels, fit in well with the differently treated transparent sky.

Kim thought the demonstration today had to do with using materials other than a brush. She uses cardboard in addition to a brush. Maria starts a painting which depicts a stormy sky. She interprets the teacher's instructions as meaning they had to experiment and try a variety of materials to create a more realistic effect, an illusion of realism. The reason she did not use a wider variety of materials before was because she thought they were to just experiment. Mary is beginning a work which depicts an explosion and mixture of sea, flames, smoke, and sky. She uses both a wet and dry brush technique. She interprets the teacher's instructions and demonstration to mean the use of both wet and dry brush techniques should be used when doing smoke, also, that a variety of materials can change the mood of a work. Judy continues with the previous lesson's painting of trees, and uses a second sheet for experiments at the same time. In addition to cardboard and brush, she is using wet crumpled paper which she dips in paint to create the effect of mountains.

Miss Fowler reminds Kim that the trees in her painting need the effect of wind to give them movement. Domenique

tells me she is trying to create the atmosphere of an approaching storm. The teacher advises Domenique to use a twig to create the effect of branches on the trees in her work. Susan is using cardboard to create the effect of boats. She feels they look more realistic than her attempts at boats during the previous lesson, more like boats with the wind pushing their sails. She is also using a brush and a sponge, and tells me she is happier with today's results.

As I observe the students, the teacher tells me that when she describes the task as an experiment she feels that the students "unblock", and the results are more "free". She feels the results are totally different today. She uses Domenique's painting as an example. Domenique has something she likes and becomes afraid of spoiling it. Domenique's work shows a threatening sky, but she does not seem to know how to do trees in the same threatening way. What Miss Fowler means by threatening trees, she explains to me, are trees like the ones she saw in Savannah, Georgia, the type that have moss on them. She supposes, however, that Domenique has not seen that type of tree, so would not understand what is meant when she talks of trees appearing threatening.

After the lesson is over, Miss Fowler tells me she feels that they have been more successful with skies today. And now it seems to be other elements in the works that are creating problems. She feels that these problems

can be overcome by the use of a variety of materials, and by experimentation.

In summary, three main events took place today: The teacher's demonstration and instructions, the students' work period during which they began new experiments with a wider range of materials, and the teacher's comments to me regarding her thoughts and feelings about the lesson.

The teacher felt she recognized the problems of the previous lesson, and saw her instructions and demonstration as the necessary devices by which these problems could be overcome. Her message was experimentation, along with a greater use of a wider range of materials, would bring the desired result of interesting, original work. The results of the students' efforts this period reinforced her beliefs. She was happier with the results, saw more "freedom" in the works, and that this new "freedom" could bring a greater potential of imaginative possibilities during the remaining lessons.

From the student's viewpoint, their understanding of what they were supposed to do during this lesson seemed to vary from one individual to another. The teacher's instructions could have been the cause for this variation as she told them at different times during the demonstration not to continue on their previous lesson's work but to experiment on a new paper. Somewhat contradictory, she told them to return to the previous lesson's works or begin a new experiment. The constant was

that the theme remained "sky". Some students, therefore, began a new work, while others continued on the work of the previous lesson. One student, for example, Susan, carefully followed instructions and in fact repeated one of the teacher's demonstrations producing sailboats with cardboard. Others also used cardboard, as well as sticks, dry brush technique, crumpled paper, sponge, as well as the more traditional wet brush method. The students overall correctly interpreted the demonstration and instructions. They used a greater variety of materials, were more aware of the potential of these materials, and seemed to experiment more than they did during the previous lesson.

Day Seven - May 27, 1985

The works from the last lesson are taped to the wall as the students enter. They take seats facing their paintings. Miss Fowler invites comments by asking who began a new one. Maria indicates she did and points out both her recent and previous works. She began the second one because as she explains she wanted to do scenery and change the sky, and also because she was unsure what to do next. The new work began with smoke, then she accidently added an exploding boat. The students recognize it as a boat, and the teacher thinks it effective as it looks as though it is approaching the viewer.

Next to comment is Mary who talks about her recent paintings and compares them to works from earlier lessons. She had changed her sky from clear to stormy, and added darker colors which she interprets as water and boats, she explains to the class. She found it easier to work the paint with cardboard, than she did using a brush. The teacher picks up on the point and suggests good effects come about through a "manipulation of materials", a term she tends to repeat. Because of this manipulation Mary's recent painting has a greater potential than the first, she explains. She talks of storms and refers to the skies in both Hansen and Monet's reproductions, and points out how these skies were produced.

David speaks about his work which looks to me like a horizontal blue mass, applied solidly with a roller, which reminds me of the shape of a submarine. Underneath the blue mass is a lighter blue area, with a lighter green/blue color above the mass. The teacher invites David to turn his work upside down. He does so, and says it looks to him like a submarine. The teacher agrees it looks like a submarine, but points out that it is changing and now is starting to look like something else. David suggests a lake, the teacher offers reflections. I now see the lake with reflections, but wonder if I saw it before the suggestion was made, or afterwards. I am undecided. Someone sees Indian teepees in the edges of the roller marks. The teacher ends the discussion by instructing

David to look at it, then he could later decide what the work suggests to him, after he has had more time.

Miss Fowler points out Domenique's work, which at this stage looks like a moody, mainly transparent sky, with blue and black clouds. The sky takes up most of the area of the painting, leaving space for the beginnings of trees and land near the bottom. Norma comments that to her, Domenique's painting looks "gorgeous". Because Domenique is absent today, the teacher moves on to point out Sheila's two displayed works, and asks Sheila to comment. Because she noticed other students doing boats and water, Sheila says she began to paint trees in her second work. She did not want to do what everyone else was doing, she explains. A student asks about Paulina's work. Paulina is invited to comment. Her work depicts a multicolored thin sky background, on top of which are superimposed five distinct, deliberate, stereotypical, mostly white, clouds. There are also stereotypical flying birds, the type with wings but no body. Miss Fowler asks Paulina if the birds and clouds are natural looking. Paulina thinks the birds are, but not the clouds. The rest of the class is particularly quiet while this exchange takes place. The teacher talks of depth and suggests there is some depth in Paulina's work. Because they had been talking, Miss Fowler has separated Paulina from her friends, Norma and Louise, for this lesson, and while the class is going on Paulina continuously communicates across the room in a silent way,

using hand signals and mouthing words. When she speaks to Miss Fowler, her voice seems tinged with antagonism.

The students are told to pick up their works and continue on them, or begin a new one. They are informed they can have something dominant in the foreground if they want. I move among the students. I ask David about his work. He tells me he did not see what the others said they saw in his work apart from the little tents. He thinks he will develop the tent idea and add water. Judy is trying to complete her previous work and add some houses and trees. Mary is adding more ships to her previous work. When it was displayed on the wall she did not see anything she had not previously seen. The teacher reminds the class that many materials are available, and that they are not using them as much as they did during the last lesson. Sabrina is starting a new work, and is using the shape of an airplane window which will frame the sky. Maria works on her previous painting which shows water and boats. With a twig dipped in paint she adds a mast to a boat. When the work was displayed on the wall, she saw a new boat in a dark section of the stormy water and works on it now to make it even more recognizable as a boat. Norma works on a new painting using a sponge and she tells me it suggests teepees and water to her.

As I observe the students, the teacher tells me she feels she will have to put an end to the activity as she

sees it going on too long. While they may end up with an experience, she thinks they may not end up with a painting.

I return to the students. Louise begins a new work which shows a small boat swamped on a storm tossed sea, an idea she imagined she tells me. David sees the roller technique being successful for him. He mixes colors, rolls them into the work, and waits for the marks to suggest something to him. He likes the accidental effects he is getting. Sheila is painting grass, a path with a forest or mountains, she tells me she lets the work suggest things to her as she paints.

After the class ends, Miss Fowler tells me she is giving them a good idea of what painting and creating a picture is all about. Ideas need help, she says, as they do not come easily. She puts down the students' difficulties to a lack of experience. She says she feels that they cannot depict things if they have not had a wide variety of experience. This process she is putting them through, she says, will help them start noticing things, and in the future may contribute to their producing more mature, complete works.

To summarize, three main events took place today: The display and discussion of works, the students' work period, and the teacher's comments to me during and following the lesson.

The teacher's concept of experimentation and the production of accidents which lend themselves to

interpretation was verified. The students openly viewed their own and others' works, and allowed things to suggest themselves. The strategy of displaying some works upside down helped this process. Paulina's stereotypical efforts proved the teacher's point: Paulina's inattentiveness, not being open to advice on experimentation, not allowing accidents to be suggestive, combined to result in stereotypical imagery. The experimentation methodology parallels the artistic process, Miss Fowler believes, and results in the students being more aware of their environment. She thinks experimentation must be a first phase, and one which should be experienced before completed art works should be attempted seriously.

The majority of the students read things into their works. Even those who could not read things into their own works joined in the discussion, and were able to read things into the displayed works, especially when those works were turned upside down. Paulina seemed to do other than the teacher suggested. While Louise and Norma supported Paulina, they followed the teacher's methods, and Louise especially did highly effective work. Interestingly, Sheila deliberately chose a subject other than what she saw people around her doing. In contrast, Norma chose exactly what she saw David doing.

Day Eight - May 28, 1985

The students collect their paintings and gather materials. Miss Fowler informs them that this will be the last day to experiment, and the next lesson will be spent sketching outside.

The teacher talks to Domenique about the sky in her painting. Domenique thinks it could be darker in places, but wants to lighten it near the horizon. The teacher explains to Domenique that while she thinks the sky is successful and threatening, she feels the trees and land at the bottom of the work should indicate the same thing. Miss Fowler points out both Kirchner's and Rousseau's reproductions and explains the trees are scary and close because they are in the foreground. The trees offer an invitation to enter the paintings she explains, and suggests that Domenique do something similar by adding larger trees to her work. Domenique agrees with the suggestion and indicates she also wants to change the sky.

Miss Fowler talks next to Susan whose work at this stage shows a pale blue sky, darker blue sea with a number of sailboats depicted in an upright rigid manner. Susan is asked about boats and wind. She has never been sailing, she replies. Boats like this need wind, and the sails follow the direction of the wind, the teacher explains, althcugh the painting itself suggests it may be a calm day without any wind. Susan agrees it is calm in her painting and sees it as being finished, with nothing else needing

to be added, after the teacher asks if anything should be. Susan then directly asks if the work is finished, and Miss Fowler replies that is up to Susan to decide, who again asks for the teacher's opinion. The teacher then elaborates and explains that she feels the water appears too uniform for an ocean. Susan explains she has never been to the ocean. The teacher then relates her impressions and memories of the ocean, pointing out the different colors and values in the water, and wonders if it had been better if Susan had chosen a subject she had experienced. Susan ends the exchange by replying that she had previously seen pictures of the ocean.

I talk to Maria about the black areas in the sky of her painting and ask how she did it. She explains that she first wet the paper, put on grey and black splotches of paint, then added some white and used a piece of cardboard to mix it all together to create the stormy effect she wanted. She used the same technique on the swirling stormy sea. I ask when she will know when it is finished. She replies it will never really be finished, never perfect, and although it can never be perfect she feels it can always be improved upon.

Kim had followed the teacher's suggestion of trying a different brush, and to change the painting from the way it was. It previously had shown a delicate rainlike effect resulting from the use of a flexible cardboard technique, which Kim had used to spread the paint. The teacher had

suggested the addition of trees in the foreground. Kim had put in these trees, she explained, to change the original effect. She will know it is finished when she is satisfied with it, she says.

Louise continues working on her painting which depicts a boat in a stormy sea. It looks to me very expressionistic and highly effective with its aggressively applied thick brush strokes. There are streaks running diagonally across the sky that Louise describes as lightning. She knows it will be finished soon, but does not know yet how she will know.

Sabrina has started another work and tells me she has changed her whole perspective on skies. At other times she always painted peaceful skies and now she tries a stormy, rainy one with dark clouds. She will add people with umbrellas near the bottom to complete her work, she explains.

Gillian has added a large tree in the foreground of her painting which effectively dominates the work. Previously she had only depicted small trees which effectively acted as background. This addition of the large tree was made because she interpreted the other background trees as being "boring". She is happier with this new direction. The teacher approaches and suggests to Gillian that the large tree adds the elements of depth and space to the work.

In summary, the main event that took place was that the students worked on their paintings after being informed that this was the last day for this experimental stage of the work.

The teacher saw this as the final lesson of the experimental stage. She gave similar advice to the three students painting trees (Domenique, Kim, and Gillian), namely, to add one or more large trees to the foreground so that a spatial element will be created in the works. Her opinion on the works reflecting the student's own experience was reinforced after her exchange with Susan. She seemed perplexed that Susan would even attempt a painting of an ocean if she had never before viewed and experienced an ocean for herself.

The students, however, continue to follow the teacher's advice using a variety of materials and adding suggested elements. There were three opinions on how one knows when the work is finished. One, when it is "perfect", although it can always be improved upon, two when the person painting it is satisfied, and three one "just knows" when it is finished.

Day Nine - May 29, 1985

After the students enter and settle down, Miss Fowler informs them they are to choose one of their works depicting only clouds or sky, and to take it outside and sketch buildings and other objects on top of it. She

holds up examples of works onto which buildings or a city could easily be incorporated. Oceans can become lakes with something on the other side, trees can become parks overlooking a city. Rainstorms could be set in the city. The students are given drawing boards, a choice of drawing materials, pencils or wax crayons; they choose one of their works and go outside in groups of two or three. Before they leave Miss Fowler indicates a few areas near the school that have promising subject matter. She tells them not to go too far.

Outside the day is warm and sunny, the trees are full with freshly opened leaves. Most students choose a drawing position on the street beside the school. On the street the students have a view of trees, older houses, parked cars, people walking, and large office and apartment buildings looming in the background. The teacher points out such details as tree branches and sky and tells students to frame an area and work within the frame.

I talk to the students. Kim is sketching the tops of buildings over one of her skies. Sabrina continues her rainstorm picture by adding two old buildings she sees across the street. Although it is a bright sunny day and her work shows a rainstorm, she feels the buildings fit in because they look "grey and drab". Gillian works on her picture which had a tree in the centre of the work, and has chosen a tree outside to represent the sketched one, and is now drawing the buildings she sees behind the tree. Maria

is adding the large office building she sees across the street to her painting of sky. She will make changes she tells me, move buildings around and pick the best ones to make her work more interesting. Kathy has blue and yellow areas in her sky painting on top of which she is drawing Mount Royal, which she can see in the distance. She will make the sky darker to be more representative of a scene at night. Mary has positioned herself on an overpass, across the street, and looks down on to a highway which is flanked by trees. On top of a sky painting she is drawing the highway and trees in pencil, and chose this view mainly because of the trees. David has retained his beach scene and is adding cars which he sees in the street. Sheila is adding a nearby 25 storey office building to her work of trees and sky; the building will provide a background, she tells me. Kim is adding the cars, trees, and buildings she sees on the street to her painting of a blue sky. She will have to change the blue at the bottom where the street is, she informs me. Judy is the only one working on a new white sheet of paper, as she did not have any suitable paintings. She has chosen to draw trees because she prefers trees to buildings.

After the class Miss Fowler tells me she thinks it was a good idea for the students to work on their paintings outside, and that it is helping their understanding of composition. She is not disappointed, but notices students had difficulty choosing subject matter, and have poorly

developed sense of composition. She is pleased that students who will major in fine art, such as Sabrina and Maria, are showing a lot of potential.

In summary, the main event that took place today was the beginning of the outside sketching segment of the lessons.

The teacher recognized the students' difficulty in choosing a subject, but was generally pleased with the results by the end of the period. She thought the students' sense of composition was poor, and viewed these types of exercises as a way to improve it. She was pleased by the fact that the students who had chosen fine arts as an option in which to major during their senior years were doing good work. What was overlooked, however, was equally good work by some other students.

The students adapted quite well from the classroom to the outdoor setting. I did not see the same problem of their having difficulty choosing a subject as did the teacher. I observed all the students, and all seemed to settle down quickly and choose a subject upon which to work. They understood the concept ~~of~~ adding an outside view on top of their previously painted sky background without any apparent difficulty. They also understood that they could change objects they viewed outside, by moving, adding, or deleting them to suit their works.

Day Ten - May 30, 1985

Miss Fowler informs the class they are to continue their works inside the classroom today, using the medium of dry pastels in a variety of ways. Norma and Domenique, both of whom were absent the previous lesson, are sent outside to catch up to the rest of the class, and sketch an outside subject on top of a previously painted sky. The teacher does not notice but Domenique takes a blank sheet of paper upon which to sketch, instead of one of the many sky backgrounds from which she had to choose.

I talk to the students working in class. David is using the pastels to add color to the car he sketched outside. Susan is using the pastels to darken the buildings she drew behind the tree in the centre of her work. Judy added written color notes to her outside drawing; she follows these notes and adds color to her tree. Judy informs me she discovered she could see through the tree to the background beyond it. Prior to this, she did not realize a tree could be seen through. Sabrina colors the buildings she sketched outside, she is pleased with the effect which results when a previously colored work is used as a basis for a sketch. Mary adds light color to one side of the trees in her work, and dark to the other side, because, she explains to me, the sun is shining in her picture. Kim is coloring the buildings she sketched outside and finds this method of working "interesting". Maria remarks that by adding colors to a previously painted

work she finds she likes the effect which results. Sheila is adding color to the large office building she sketched and likes the method because the windows take on the appearance of having sky reflected in them. Kathy works on a house on a mountain with many trees. She has changed all she sketched outside to better fit her work.

In summary, the students took the previous lesson's outside sketch and added color to it in the classroom, mostly in the medium of dry pastels.

The teacher saw the students busily carrying out her instructions, and seemed generally pleased with the results of today's lesson.

The students followed instructions and added pastel color to their outside sketches. They found the technique successful in that it suggested directions to them as they worked. As an indication of the effect of my presence in the class, Kim noticeably modified her behaviour. Because she works beside Sabrina, Kim had often remarked how easily Sabrina expressed herself when she talked to me. Kim, by contrast, felt she did not express herself well. This lesson I found Kim to be making a noticeable effort to sound more articulate when she expressed her views to me.

Day Eleven - June 3, 1985

Miss Fowler informs the students as they begin their work that today is the last day to work on this project, and they must work hard to complete it. Domenique and

Norma go outside to complete their drawings and are joined by Louise who had been absent the two previous days. After watching the students in the classroom settle down and begin working, I follow the three students outside.

Domenique tells me she is drawing one of the large office buildings on top of one of her sky backgrounds. The previous lesson she spent drawing on a blank sheet of paper and today Miss Fowler insisted Domenique take one of her many sky backgrounds on which to draw. During the sky painting stage Domenique had started a number of authentic looking skies, which had drawn the attention of both teacher and other students. Domenique's work today was one of these pale blue semi-transparent skies with white puffy clouds. She begins to sketch the top five or six floors of the office building from the baseline of her paper up, so that the building covers the bottom half of the sheet. She works in wax crayons. Other surrounding buildings will be included she tells me, but she will move them to add "variety" and will know when she is finished when the work looks "full enough".

Working beside Domenique today is Louise who has chosen to draw the mountain using wax crayons. Her work at this stage shows a previously painted sky in colors of blues and purples done with strong brush strokes. She has chosen the mountain because it looks more "alive" with its covering of trees, than the buildings offered by other views. She will move some buildings to include them in her

mountain view, and is not sure yet how she will know when the work will be finished.

Norma works beside Louise and is also drawing the mountain on one of her sky backgrounds. She chose the mountain because she thought it easier for her to draw than buildings that she describes as "full of windows". She does not plan to move anything, and will include everything she sees in her view of the mountain.

On my return to the classroom I tell Miss Fowler that while I was speaking to the students outside it occurred to me that some form of framing device may help the students in their efforts to choose and compose. Miss Fowler tells me she is very interested in the concept, and it is the students' ability to compose that provides the main topic of her M.A. thesis on which she is currently working. A video camera, she explains, may be an effective tool to encourage the students' sense of composition, and we discuss the possibilities for a few moments.

I talk to the students while they work. Maria's work now begins to look more than half complete, and I ask what she is thinking as she paints. She tells me she is trying to do buildings, but now they look "weird" because they are painted red and purple, but her intention is to keep them this way because of the effect the colors have on her work. I ask Sabrina what her thoughts are as she draws a swing in a park on one side of her picture. She tells me that because she is using pastels and they feel a little like

chalk, it suggests sand to her and consequently she is trying to create the effect of sand under the swings. Because it is raining in her picture, she intends to make the sand look "a little muddy". The idea for the picture came to her when she did the dark rainy sky, she then imagined the buildings outside of school on top of her sky. When the day came to sketch outside she chose the buildings like the ones she had imagined and superimposed them on to her sky. Gillian tells me she started her center tree thinking she was doing a picture in the country. When she sketched outside she added buildings behind the tree and felt she turned it into a city picture. Although she lives, and goes to school in the city, Gillian tells me she lived in the country until she was five years old and still spends part of every summer at her family's country place. It seems the surroundings outside the school building influenced her original intention to set the work in the country.

In summary, three main events took place this lesson. The teacher informed the class that this was the last day to work on this project; three students went outside to complete their sketches, while the remainder of the class completed their works inside.

The teacher viewed the idea of adding to a previously painted sky as being successful in this case. Every student produced a work, and all works reached a stage of completion. To her mind there was a significant difference

between works produced in this manner, to more traditional results where students would have begun with an outside sketch, and not ended with one.

The students saw advantages to working in this manner, and allowed the previously painted sky to suggest things to them when they were outside. They found it easier to sketch on top of their skies, than they would have if a blank sheet of paper had been used to start. They followed the teacher's understanding of the concept of the artistic process. They felt they could easily move, change, enlarge, reduce, or otherwise alter the buildings sketched outside to suit their works. When completing their works inside, they continued the process of suggestion and felt free to change objects and colors to suit what they felt their works needed.

Day Twelve - June 5, 1985

Miss Fowler had displayed 24 students' works on the wall prior to the class entering the room. The students enter and take their places on stools so that they have a good view of the displayed work. The only exceptions to this are Paulina, Norma, and Kathy, who take places on a table near the back of the room, the farthest position from the displayed works and the teacher. Paulina continuously whispers to Norma while the rest of the class look quietly at the works. The teacher takes her position in front of the works and begins talking to the class while she walks

up and down. She points out works as she talks about them. She begins by asking if there is anything about the works which strikes anyone, and invites comments.

Gillian begins by saying the buildings in Sabrina's work look transparent, but the overall effect is of rain. It looks to Maria like buildings that would be seen on a movie set such as "Singing in the Rain". The teacher elicits the term "two-dimension" from Maria to describe Sabrina's work. Miss Fowler compares this two-dimensional quality to the three-dimensional quality of Mary's work, which shows a road with cars going into the picture. Mary talks about her work and explains she was attempting to create the effect of a sun setting behind the trees which are seen beyond the road. Maria remarks that Mary's work reminds her of a park near her home. The teacher points out that very often paintings help us recall things we have seen or experienced. Miss Fowler invites Paulina to speak about her work which depicts a mountain, trees and sky all done in forceful brushstrokes, but Paulina responds by stating she has nothing to say about it. The teacher invites others to comment on Paulina's work. Maria says "gloomy", Gillian says "wild" because of what she describes as a "fire in the sky". The red in the sky reminds Mary of a volcano and David of a dragon. The teacher says there is a feeling of aggitation and uneasiness emanating from Paulina's painting which comes from both the color and the forceful way the paint is handled.

Miss Fowler points out Mary's work which shows a blue, turbulent sea with two red explosion-like objects taking up most of the foreground and middleground of the picture. Miss Fowler compares this work by Mary to a previous one where similar explosion-like shapes are featured in another seascape. Mary explains it "just happened" that way. The teacher elaborates and explains that artists do that, use the same type of imagery from one painting to the next. Mary agrees. The teacher asks if there are similar examples among students who have more than one work displayed. Maria indicates that Sabrina's works have similar skies. Miss Fowler again compares this to the ways in which artists work, sometimes exploring an idea until it is exhausted.

Judy is asked to comment on her work which shows fantasy trees resembling palm trees, painted in bright colors. The work had begun as an imaginary landscape, and had evolved to show a number of trees, colored with pastels, a green mountain in the background and some exotic looking plants and flowers in the foreground. Judy explains she began with the sky, which then suggested the remainder of the work. The trees in the foreground became more important than the background or sky. The teacher points out that the assignment had begun with the background and sky yet Judy had reversed that, which in this case is relevant and successful because the foreground needs to dominate.

Sabrina is asked to discuss her work and she describes the stormy sky in one work as contrasting with the peaceful skies of her other works. One work by Sabrina depicts a dog sled and winter landscape, which was inspired, she explains, by a book she had read in English class. The teacher points out a work by Mary who indicated her painting was also based on a story she had read. Gillian is asked to comment on her work showing a large tree with a background of buildings. She describes beginning with a sky and sun, the sun then became a mountain, a little tree turned into a big tree, then the mountain changed into buildings. The tree especially changed everything, she explains; buildings from outside were then added around the tree. She concedes it was not meant to look like anything outside of school, she only used what she found there to complete her idea. Domenique is asked to talk about her work which shows dark trees and a stormy dark sky. She does not like it, she says, because the trees to her look "fake", they look too straight and stick out of the ground instead of appearing to grow, she explains. The teacher directs the attention of the class to Louise's work which depicts a boat on the storm tossed sea. Louise is absent today so Miss Fowler, who wanted Louise's comments, describes the work as being very effective and the kind of work one can make up stories about to describe in words what is visually suggested.

The teacher asks the class to tell her what they experienced when they did these works. She wants to know if the experimental method was different to other ways of working, she also wants to know who in the class had painted before, and who had not. Mary says the last time she painted was last year, she had been given a topic by another teacher and did not have much freedom. This year she felt she was free to experiment which has resulted in a lot of feeling in her work. Kim describes this type of work as a challenge compared to the drawing and color mixing they did last year. She explains she finds it difficult as she must constantly think about what she is doing. Using the sky as a starting point as they did in this topic she found helpful. Gillian agrees with Kim and explains she was in the same class last year and they did drawings the way the teacher instructed. She felt they could not do them any other way, which resulted in most of last year's work looking the same. She compares last year's method to the one they are now doing and describes the latter as much better because they do everything themselves in their own way.

Miss Fowler points out that if they look at the results of this lesson they will find no two works are the same, because only technique was indicated with the remainder being left up to the students. Maria says she feels she has improved a lot this year, because in previous years they did not do any "serious" art. She would not

have been able to do her storm at sea if she had not experimented with materials and techniques first. In her opinion it was the experimentation which allowed her to do successful work. David remarks that even though the lesson is over he is still "seeing things" in his work he had not previously seen. The work is still suggesting things to him, and he describes wanting to add mountains beyond the water in his work. He recounts using crushed pastels to achieve a certain effect, and Sheila, who worked next to him, picked up the technique and used it in her work. The teacher equates this with the way artists work when they learn from one another and use each other's ideas. Gillian says that to begin with the sky was good for her because she normally would not have known where to start, and acknowledges it was the device that got her started. David says he felt challenged by Miss Fowler and that he now feels there are no mistakes in art. The teacher agrees and elaborates by saying that in art there are no solutions and many different ways of expressing something.

Now that they have had this experience, Miss Fowler asks, if they were going out to buy a painting, how would they go about choosing one? She reminds them that the last time she asked this question, at the beginning of these lessons, they had said things like they would choose one that "matched the bedroom" or "matched the walls". Sabrina states she is now more aware of feelings and she would be able to perceive them in a work. The teacher

elaborates by explaining how a work can grow with a person, and that the more you live with a work the more meaning can be seen in it. Maria says she would choose a work for the mood it projects to her. Mary would choose one that looks peaceful to her. The teacher asks if they see much difference between their displayed works on one wall, and the reproductions that have remained on the other wall, the ones they discussed at the beginning of the project. In David's opinion everything seems to be moving in their work, whereas in the reproductions everything appears still. It looks that way Miss Fowler explains, because the reproductions depict fairly quiet scenes, and in comparison their works contain brighter colors. Maria suggests the works done by the class are works of "young artists", and more original. Gillian observes that most of the artists whose work is shown in the reproductions knew what they were doing, while she and her classmates did not, as they were learning from the experience. Time runs out, the class is dismissed.

To summarize, the central event of this last lesson was a discussion of the completed students' works.

For the teacher seeing all the works displayed, and hearing the students speak positively about the experience, reinforced her belief in the success of the method and results. She thought it a successful lesson. The students had been open, had conducted their experimentation along the lines of the artistic process as she understood it, and

continuously allowed the work to suggest directions to them at all stages. When the students compared what they did with another teacher last year, to what they did in Miss Fowler's class, the comparison was another vindication of her methods. Even the reproductions, discussed originally during the first lesson, could be compared to the students' works and all agreed the artistic process was the same. The only difference between the two was that the students' works contained livelier and brighter colors, and that they had experimented more than the artists' works represented by the reproductions.

For the students the experience was a success. They indicated on many occasions that the results would not have been the same, nor would they have even known where to begin, had it not been for the sky background device. They allowed the works to suggest new directions to them throughout the process, even during the last discussion, and this was continuously referred to as the artistic process. They happily compared their work to the reproductions originally discussed, and no disagreement was voiced when a student described their own works as those of young artists. They knew what the artistic process was, namely, experimentation, being open and aware of feeling, mood, expression, and suggestion. Realism, as they understood it in the photographic sense, was not very important. No works could be described as realistic, nor were they intended to be. The subject matter in their

works was recognizable for what it was, a tree was a tree, a house a house and that seemed to be enough. Straight lines and "realistic" effects were not important when expression, emotion, and suggestion were present.

My purpose in this chapter has been to offer contextual details of the lessons in chronological order. In the description of the days of the event details were built upon details until comprehensive understanding and knowledge of the participants and their activities unfolded. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, these descriptions are of an objective nature. The turn away from objectivity to phenomenology commences with a discussion of Husserl's phenomenology in chapter 4, the next chapter, and continues when chapter 5 is devoted to a phenomenological analysis of the event. I hope that this current chapter contributes to a dynamic understanding of the described situation. This understanding can serve as a base which can stand until supplemented by the phenomenological knowledge contained in chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 4

Edmund Husserl's Phenomenology

I am always struck by the paradoxical nature of phenomenology. Here is a discipline, a philosophy, the essential nature of which is concrete simplicity. The paradox occurs when attempts are made to put this essentially simple philosophy to practical use. Instead of clear, simple application, writers on phenomenology become bogged down in the most complex abstract and excessively detailed explanations, during which it is all too easy to lose track of phenomenology's primary simplicity.

Phenomenology always seemed to me to be ideally suited to investigations of human interaction, especially of the type with which I am professionally familiar: that between students and teachers in classrooms. What could be more appropriate than to investigate this familiarity through the phenomenological method, which essentially comprises an attempt to understand fully what is given in experience?

It is not difficult to understand how the simplicity of Husserl's phenomenology can be overlooked. Many different concepts make up Husserl's phenomenology. In order to impart an understanding of some basic phenomenological terms, writers on phenomenology attempt to define and clarify the nature of these concepts. All too often, however, the initially inquisitive reader tires

trying to follow these tedious detailed attempts at concept definition and clarification. Instead of leading to an understanding of basic terminology which would allow a full grasp of phenomenology's simplicity, these attempts at concept clarification often bog the reader down. The reader can then be forgiven for losing sight of phenomenology's simplicity and for becoming mired in the complexity which results from attempts to communicate the fundamentals of Husserl's concepts.

The problems involved in coming to an understanding of Husserl's phenomenology are not limited to understanding writers on phenomenology, but can be traced back to the source: Husserl himself. As I see it there are three reasons why Husserl is "difficult" to understand. First there is the problem of Husserl's style of writing. This is the most commonly acknowledged reason for Husserl being difficult to understand, especially by those who read Husserl for the first time. Husserl's tendency to write in great detail, to veer away from and then to return again to points that he is attempting to explain, renders his works difficult to follow. This is complicated by the fact that Husserl's works published in English are translations from German. The translators themselves often acknowledge difficulties with Husserl's writing. J.N. Findlay, the translator of Logical Investigations reports Husserl's ". . . richly redundant serpentine style . . . agitated me immensely . . ." (1970, p. 3). When I read the results of

translators' works in English I can sympathize with them and the formidable tasks they face.

The second reason put forward to explain why a comprehensive understanding of Husserl is difficult lies in the actual body of his published works. These range from Logical Investigations, first published in 1900, to the last work published in his lifetime The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology, in 1936. If I were to read only early works where Husserl began to establish phenomenology, a certain understanding would be gained. If later works were subsequently studied, the understanding gained from earlier works would seem inadequate by comparison. It would seem as though the "later" Husserl contradicts claims that he made earlier. What may be overlooked is that Husserl's effort was continuous, and the "early" and "later" works should be viewed as a constant refinement and development of phenomenology.

Essentially in his continuing returns to "beginnings", or "introductions", Husserl sought to establish phenomenology on a solid philosophical foundation. He attempted to ensure a rigorous method which had an applicability towards an understanding of human experience.

The third reason why I believe a full understanding of Husserl is difficult is the fact that while Husserl's works published in English are fairly numerous, they represent only a portion of his total output. The English-speaking

world, where interest in Husserl's phenomenology has increased in recent years, has essentially only a small percentage of Husserl's published works upon which to base an understanding. As to the amount of unpublished material, Maurice Natanson informs us that Husserl left ". . . 45,000 pages of manuscript written in shorthand" (1973, p. 5). Fortunately scholars have access to this vast quantity of work, and further translations continue to be published in the works known as "Husserliana".

My purpose in this chapter is to present the essentials of Husserl's phenomenology in such a way that I avoid difficulty and complexity by concentrating on the simplicity. I will discuss those Husserlian phenomenological concepts which need explanation because of their applicability to this investigation, which is grounded in the lived experience of an art teacher and students in a classroom. By making use of examples, I will show in the following chapter how these concepts will be methodologically applied.

The main phenomenological concepts I will concentrate upon are as follows: the natural standpoint, the phenomenological standpoint, the epoché and reduction, intentionality, horizon, static and genetic aspects of phenomenological analysis and constitution. One familiar with phenomenology may legitimately raise an objection immediately that these represent only a small number out of a long list of phenomenological concepts. Yet, I

believe explication of these central concepts will be adequate to my aim in this chapter and the investigation in general, which is to avoid complexity and to communicate simplicity. I could easily fall into the "complexity trap" by launching an ambitious attempt to explain and clarify all the concepts which compose Husserl's phenomenology. Instead, I believe I can effectively reveal the simplicity of Husserl's phenomenology by concentrating upon these central concepts, by making brief references to related concepts when necessary, and by exemplifying how these concepts may be applied to the art classroom experience.

The Natural Standpoint

The concept of natural standpoint is known by various terminologies. It is referred to as the "natural attitude", the "unquestioned or accepted everyday world", or the "unreflective attitude". In Ideas (1958, pp. 105-106) Husserl describes the thésis of the natural standpoint as reality being "out there" in the "world". No amount of doubting, Cartesian or otherwise, can change this and no other possibility is permitted. This view of the natural standpoint can also be described as the accepted world of "common sense" (Kohák, 1978, p. 34).

It seems deceptively simple to say that the roots and inspiration of phenomenology are found in this natural standpoint. The natural standpoint sustains and nourishes whatever promise phenomenology holds,

Phenomenology as a methodology does not imply "abstract" investigations which have little to do with the ordinary world of everyday experience. On the contrary, phenomenology cannot be phenomenology without the ordinary, mundane world of common experience or the natural standpoint serving as its basis.

In order to shed some light on the nature of the natural standpoint, I turn to the art classroom for an example. When the teacher is interacting with students in the classroom, she and they become caught up in the continuously emerging immediacy of the moment. The demanding nature of the immediacy does not lend itself to a distanced, reflective attitude; nor am I suggesting that it ought to. The teacher goes about her business, the students go about theirs; neither aware of the assumptions that guide and shape their respective behaviours and attitudes. This is the world of education. This is the world which educational theorists write about, educational researchers investigate, and curriculum specialists manipulate. None of these groups recognize or even deem important the sedimented assumptions which lie rooted and unquestioned within this world of the natural standpoint, for they too belong to this world. In contrast to these groups, a Husserlian phenomenological investigator would go to great lengths to ensure that this natural standpoint, and the assumptions imbedded therein, become the primary focus of an investigation. To do this, two things must

occur: the natural standpoint must be recognized, and the attitude of the investigator must shift from this natural realm to one of a phenomenological nature.

The Phenomenological Standpoint

To overcome the pervasive familiarity of the natural stance, so pervasive one ordinarily is not even aware of it, a shift in attitude is necessary. This shift entails a change in attitude from the natural to the phenomenological. The phenomenological attitude should be thought of in terms of an awareness of experience, rather than the way experience is a straightforward affair in the natural world, where the experiencer is rarely aware of experience.

To return to the example of classroom interaction, can the students make a shift to the phenomenological attitude while engaged in the art experience? The immediate answer that comes to mind is "no". The reason being that there is so much going on in the classroom, the importance of the moment "now" is continuously replaced by another equally important "now". There seems to be no way to "escape" the all encompassing present experience, no way to make a "shift" to a phenomenological attitude. Yet, upon further reflection, I realize the classroom experience is not always an overwhelming frenzy of activity. Small oases of private, quiet, contemplative moments occur among students, especially in an art class when a painting exercise is

under way. Students paint, stop, consider, think, then paint again. I am not suggesting moments of contemplation do not occur in the natural attitude. But by analyzing the periods of contemplation which can occur during a painting activity, an investigating phenomenologist may discover a situation which lends itself to phenomenological inquiry. It is here that an investigating phenomenologist can observe when a student temporarily becomes unaware of the surrounding activity, considers the moment past, anticipates the moments to come, and briefly becomes aware of the experience of painting. This experience percolates with complexity, with almost overwhelming visual possibilities, and a host of other details which make the act of painting such a unique, human activity. During these acts of contemplation, a brief shift in attitude may take place during which all other interests and concerns become temporarily suspended. By observing, coupled with questioning after the event, the phenomenologist can discover if the student had become aware of the experience of painting and moved ephemerally from the natural to the phenomenological attitude.

This heightened awareness, which Husserl refers to as a "vocational epoché" (1970, pp. 135-137), is essentially a type of epoché which can occur during engaging activities, and is not necessarily restricted to art activities. However, I feel that art and phenomenological activities can be compared, and especially during a vocational epoché

there is a striking similarity between the two. On this point Fritz Kaufmann states:

> As an exploration of the hidden depths of feeling in which life and the world are originally related, art bears comparison with phenomenology as converting the natural attitude toward the experienced world into the transcendental attitude toward one's experience of the world. (1968, p. 189)

Both in phenomenology and art, concerns which inhabit the natural attitude are temporarily suspended while engaged in the task at hand. In both cases attitudes are similar and comparable in that the activity is all encompassing, suspending for a time all other concerns and activities. They are also similar in that both the artist and phenomenologist focus more on an awareness of one's own experience, rather than in the natural attitude where the focus tends to be directed towards an experience of the world.

The teacher may experience a similar situation during moments of contemplation, especially when viewing the emerging paintings, and when considering what advice to offer a student. What the teacher and students have in common is that whenever a shift in attitude occurs it tends to occur spontaneously. I am not suggesting the teacher or students are phenomenologists, nor am I suggesting that they make use of phenomenological devices. I am suggesting that at certain moments during classroom

activity a shift in attitude may take place, during which the experiencer can become aware of the experience being lived through. However, I must emphasize that it is only the phenomenological inquirer who deliberately and self consciously shifts to the phenomenological attitude by suspending the natural one. For the inquirer is aware of both attitudes and realizes the phenomenological attitude is adopted in order that the natural attitude may be subjected to radical phenomenological scrutiny. In fact, it is only the phenomenological inquirer who can become aware of the natural attitude for what it is. For everyone else--that is non-phenomenologists--the natural attitude is the common sense world of everyday experience and, as such, rarely becomes the subject of doubt or inquiry for its own sake. Put another way, the phenomenological attitude allows the natural attitude to be recognized for what it is: The basis for all phenomenological knowledge and inquiry. The phenomenological investigator is also aware of what needs to occur if the phenomenological attitude is to be consciously adopted, namely, a deliberate suspension of the natural attitude brought about by a phenomenological epoché and reduction.

Phenomenological Epoché and Reduction

The epoché is a suspension of the belief that pervades the world of the natural attitude. It is the most important first step in the formation of the

phenomenological attitude, for it serves to bring the "natural" aspect of the natural attitude into clear focus. The reduction allows the shift in attitude to the phenomenological realm, after the epoché effectively suspends belief. It is in this suspension of belief where the well-known phenomenological term "bracketing" originates. Belief can be thought of as bracketed when a phenomenologist shifts from the natural to the phenomenological standpoint. This effort is accurately described by Eugene Fink (1981) as a "tension" between the "natural sense" understanding of the natural attitude and the "neutralization" of this domain which takes place following an epoché (p. 66). It would be a mistake to understand the epoché and reduction as a methodological device which allows the phenomenologist to "leave" the natural standpoint and enter another realm. The epoché and reduction, however, do allow the phenomenologist's view and attitude to change, which in turn enables the investigator to make the natural standpoint a subject for phenomenological inquiry.

If any phenomenological concept generates a high degree of misunderstanding it is the epoché and reduction. Even the terminology of the concept becomes problematic. On various occasions Husserl discusses the epoché and reduction separately (1970), or both together (1958), or bracketing in connection with one or the other (1958). For the most part, however, whenever Husserl discusses

the epoché or reduction, all the various features which belong, or are part of the concept, tend to be implicit within the discussion. A philosopher such as Herbert Spiegelberg (1973), identifies various reductions and distinguishes among them. Philip Bossert (1974) tends to see the epoché and reduction as part of the same methodological operation. Richard Zaner (1970) identifies controversies concerning the number of reductions, where six or more are seen as necessary. E.G. Ballard (1972) cautions that certain forms of epoché can be seen as abstractions rather than as suspensions.

The epoché is such a critical methodological device that it has engendered much discussion and interpretation in the literature. By my efforts here I hope I can avoid misinterpretation as I attempt to convey Husserl's intent with regard to the epoché as I understand it. I aim to show through examples, not only what the epoché and reduction are, but also some results of their application.

I will first clarify why I am using the terms epoché and reduction as opposed to either term alone. Like Bossert (1974), I see the two as separate yet linked components of one methodical operation. This interpretation seems to be in keeping with Husserl's use of epoché in both Cartesian Meditations and The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology, where "withholding of judgment" or "suspension of belief" is the main sense of the term epoché, and the reduction refers to

a "change of attitude" or a "shift in standpoint". Bossert links the two and his interpretation of Husserl is near to my own, where the epoché seems to be the method by which the reduction is carried out.

When an epoché is performed what is the result? What has Husserl said about this aspect of phenomenology? Indeed, what has Husserl indicated about the main thrust and purpose of his phenomenology? Husserl would admonish "Zurück zu den Sachen". Mohanty (1970) translates this as "Back to the facts" (p. 92). Spiegelberg (1975) interprets the slogan as "To the things" (p. 58). Both agree that the call is to explore the "Things themselves". A sharp distinction should be made from the Kantian concept of "things-in-themselves", which are inaccessible both to phenomenological as well as objective or scientific knowledge (Husserl, 1970, p. 95). To have access to these things themselves the phenomenologist faces a methodological paradox. He must first adopt an attitude of naivety, and secondly transcend it, to suspend belief in order to focus on the structures involved in believing. It is a paradox which, because it defies resolution, must be accepted, which then provides a key to understanding phenomenological methodology. The phenomenologist not only need not accept the inherent beliefs of the unreflective attitude, but at the same time he need not reject them. As Mohanty puts it, "His job is to tell the tale" (1970, p. 102). Here is the crux of understanding both "the

things themselves" and phenomenological methodology. A naivety, coupled with a suspension, can produce a description of the givenness of things. These things themselves become clarified through an adoption of a naive stance, or, viewing the situation as it is presented, as a thing itself without exterior references. Following the suspension of all previous knowledge an understanding and description of the confronted event can emerge. The things themselves, in this case the art educational experience, can then be described in a phenomenological manner. Any hinderances in any form whatsoever be they ontological or epistemological presuppositions in the form of prior knowledge, opinions, values or beliefs no longer apply. The phenomenological description, the "tale", is allowed to emerge.

Therefore the purpose of the phenomenological epoché, reduction, and the bracketing properties which result from their application is to break free from the natural attitude and all of the taken-for-granted assumptions associated therein. Husserl does not doubt the existence or reality of the world, nor does he seek to explain it. During the epoché and reduction the world exists as a correlate or experience. Husserl wants to understand, not necessarily explain, this relationship between the "world" and one's experience of that world. Husserl refers to "appearances" or "phenomena" as inherent in phenomenological understanding. If the word "experience"

is substituted for these terms a clearer comprehension of Husserl's intent would result. For phenomenology is an experientially grounded investigation of experience.

By returning to the classroom experience I offer the following example of an epoché, reduction, and some properties of bracketing. As a phenomenological inquirer I am in the classroom observing as the lesson gets under way. The teacher begins to introduce the topic of sky as an experimental form of painting exercise, the students listen. For future reference I am tape-recording what is said as well as writing descriptions of the unfolding activity. First of all I deliberately perform an epoché by suspending all prior knowledge of this teacher, these students and, as much as possible, my familiarity with other art classroom interactions. As detailed in the previous chapter, this prior knowledge consists of the cumulation of my various experiences, not only with the participants, but also with the setting, and other similar environments with which I am familiar. I have "known" the teacher in a professional capacity for a number of years and over time I have built up more knowledge of her, and shared more experiences with her, than I have of the students whom I had not met until the outset of this inquiry. I have experienced a number of art learning environments, both similar and dissimilar to the present one, and hold opinions about such environments, such as what measures are needed to improve them. I now set aside

these memories and this knowledge as I begin to concentrate only upon this interaction as I experience it. This constitutes the function of the epoché.

The reduction in this example is simply a device I invoke which may enable me to reach an understanding of the activity taking place before me. I have "reduced" the classroom activity to only my present experience of the interactions among these participants. The epoché suspends my previous knowledge of this and related classroom interactions. The reduction enables me to experience fully these interactions at this particular time, free from the constraints that prior knowledge places upon me. As I become caught up in the flow of the interactions, I make an attempt to understand this experience from the participants' viewpoint.

The bracketing that occurs here is connected to the epoché. Indeed, it is very difficult to even conceive of these terms separately and it becomes clear where overlapping occurs. The epoché has "suspended" a particular kind of objective knowledge. This knowledge is held in abeyance, in "brackets". I do not refer to this knowledge in order to experience the interactions before me. If I did refer to prior objective knowledge the resulting description would be diminished from a phenomenological perspective. I would not be able to attend to the experience itself fully and completely. Instead of trying to understand the experience, I would

be trying to explain it. This attempt at explanation may not even be a conscious one. However, prior objective knowledge embedded as it is in the natural standpoint, carries along with it a host of unexplored natural standpoint assumptions, which inevitably would have an influence upon my understanding of the classroom experience. Bracketing these assumptions and knowledge allows a phenomenological understanding of the experience to unfold.

By means of the epoché I gain access to the field of subjectivity. An investigation of this field from the phenomenological standpoint can reveal to me pheomenological understanding, which is how prior beliefs and values enter into the sense of what I immediately experience.

It is appropriate at this point for me to clarify natural standpoint subjectivity and contrast it to the type of subjectivity which follows an epoché, which is transcendental subjectivity. Certain features characterize subjectivity within the natural standpoint or naturalized subjectivity, i.e., naturalistic, relativistic, idiosyncratic, mental and private. In the reduced state these naturalistic terms do not apply. Following an epoché the standpoint becomes transcendental, where no gap exists beween transcendental subjectivity and intersubjectivity. Transcendental subjectivity is my subjectivity in the reduced state, devoid of naturalistic references, and

intersubjectivity can be understood as my understanding of another's subjectivity from this same state. Perhaps I can best explain this in the following example which is from the particular perspective of the phenomenological attitude.

As an inquirer in the art classroom, i.e., a human being who is capable of being aware, I am aware of the interactions between students and teacher. These are particular students and a particular teacher here at this moment in time sharing this experience. Yet, I can transcend my awareness, i.e., I can become aware that I am aware. In this attitude I am aware of my awareness. I have the capacity to grasp my lived experience. This is the transcendental attitude, and although it is part of my experience, its structure, (Husserl would say "necessary structure"), can be applied to someone other than I. I can use my knowledge of my own experience to interpret the experience of the participants in the classroom. When a student applies paint with a water saturated brush and achieves a wash-like effect, her experience is like my experience when I do the same thing. While our intentions in regard to what we are painting may be entirely different, the experience of applying a thin wash is structurally the "same". I am capable of understanding the student's experience because, in principle, that experience has the same necessary structure as my own. It is in this way that transcendental subjectivity can be

transcendental intersubjectivity. I do not have to "break away" from the former to reach the latter. The two belong in the same realm.

Assuming that the natural standpoint, the phenomenological attitude, transcendental intersubjectivity, and the pivotal concept of epoché and reduction have been clarified, an appropriate question might be: How is experience viewed, now that the epoché and reduction have been performed? The answer simply stated is that a new field now unfolds, namely, experience viewed as intentional.

Intentionality

Husserl conceived of consciousness as intentional. Intentionality, first outlined by Brentano--once Husserl's teacher--holds that all consciousness is consciousness of some intended object, phenomena or state of affairs. Brentano, however, did not have the same understanding of the possibilities of intentionality as Husserl. Brentano made a distinct division between phenomena of the mind (ideas) and phenomena outside the mind (physical objects). But, as Spiegelberg points out, Brentano's discovery of the concept of intentionality became the basis for all future phenomenological analysis (1971, p. 41).

As Husserl developed it, intentionality is inexorably linked to consciousness; to intend an object is to be conscious of that object and vice versa. "Every conscious

process is, in itself consciousness of such and such, regardless of what the rightful actuality-status of this objective such-and-such may be . . ." (Husserl, 1960, p. 33).

Brentano's narrow definition of intentionality, wherein objects of the mind are differentiated from objects of the world, was expanded by Husserl to include all actualities and potentialities of consciousness. Husserl (1960) uses external perception as one example. We are conscious of an object; the consciousness is intentional, indicating this object in consciousness is not something which comes to consciousness from the outside; rather the object in consciousness is a result of one's intentional activities. Furthermore, there are different levels to this perception ranging from the "genuinely perceived" to the "also meant" and "not yet perceived but only anticipated" (p. 44).

In English the term "intentionality" tends to mean "done on purpose". As Erazim Kohák (1978) notes, Husserl's meaning of the term is ". . . solely and precisely being necessarily related to an object" (p. 61). Intentionality then is a necessary rather than a purposeful relationship. (One is reminded again of some of the difficulties associated with reading Husserl in English. It requires some effort to replace the English meaning of intentional with Husserl's meaning of a necessary relationship.)

Before I embark on an example which positions and clarifies the concept of intentionality within the context of the classroom experience, I offer Don Ihde's characterization of the concept. Ihde sees intentionality as ". . . precisely that structure and precisely that feature of experience overall, which make possible the way phenomena can and do appear. . . . Intentionality is the directional shape of experience (1979, p. 41).

It is common to see the link between intentionality and consciousness, and it may be easy to overlook its connection with experience. What I hope is clear, thus far, is that there cannot be the phenomenological concept of intentionality without consciousness and without that consciousness being experientially bound. I should note, however, that much of consciousness is not manifest to me "right now" in my immediacy. Consciousness--that present ongoing stream of which I am "now" aware--is only the tip of the iceberg, and like an iceberg consciousness includes much more than the relatively narrow range of my awareness at any one particular moment. It is here, that the essence of phenomenology can be understood, where the focus is upon consciousness and experience and an attempt made to understand them fully. The following example is intended to clarify the concept of intentionality.

After a few days of experimental painting on the theme of sky, the teacher has collected the students' work (one from each student) all of which are now displayed on the

wall. After entering the room, the students see their displayed works and choose suitable positions in order that they have a clear view of the display. There is considerable interest in the works. Up to this point the students have not seen a display of their own work from these lessons. For the most part, the works show areas of color applied in such a way so that the results look like transparent cloud formations; some include lines which could be horizons and masses which could be land or water.

Now, with the concept of intentionality in mind from the students' perspective, they do not just sit and passively gaze at the display. The students are not mirror-like passive reflectors who somehow are affected by external objects, in this case, the paintings on the wall. This is not the way consciousness or intentionality functions. Rather, the students actively perceive the works and attempt to view them as meaningful. Some, if not most, of the paintings can quite honestly be described as daubs of paint on paper. The students in their active viewing of the works reconstruct these daubs as meaningful. The daubs have in fact no meaning, until the meaning is perceived and understood by the viewer. This can be described as "seeing" in phenomenological terminology. If there were no viewers, these paintings would be devoid of meaning.

One student sees a human head in a cloud formation. Excited by her discovery, she lets the teacher and the rest

of the class know what she has seen. From that point onward, the other students make an overwhelming and almost palpable effort to see the head in the work. When they do, they seem satisfied they are able to share another's discovery. In terms of intentionality they had taken an area of a painting to mean a cloud. When an unsuspected alternative had been suggested, they had gone back to the painting and reinterpreted their original meaning. This seems to indicate one example of the multiple aspects of meaning. (Paintings or art works in general seem to be particularly suited to these multiple interpretations.) These meanings arise in the context of the students' activity of viewing the paintings. The significance of intentionality is not only that the students understand the paintings as meaningful, but how this understanding comes about within the context of experience.

Husserl introduces the terms noesis and noema as components within the structure of intentionality. With the introduction of these terms and Husserl's highly complex and technical explanations of them, a first-time reader of Husserl may be forgiven for feeling somewhat perplexed, and being tempted to give up on Husserl. Yet I believe the terms can be readily explained and their function within the general concept easily grasped. Kohák (1978) uses the example of "act" and "fact". Simply stated, the noesis is the act of experiencing and the noema the fact of that experience.

In the art class a student is painting. This act of painting as experienced by the student is the noesis or the noetic phase of the painting experience. It is this experiential quality of painting with its richness, variety, and challenge to the student/artist that gives unique meaning to the painting experience. The resulting fact of the experience, the completed painting, acts as an ideal objectivity (Husserl would say "irreal"), which is the noema or the noematic phase of the painting experience. The noema here is the painting as external evidence of conscious intentionality represented by the fact that is actually present in experience. Only the person who conceived, lived through, i.e., experienced, the developing painting can view the completed work and recall the noetic aspects of the experience, while simultaneously being aware of the noematic aspect of the painting as an object. The painting represents the resulting and completed object of the intentional act, and as such is contingent upon the experience that constitutes it. The noesis and noema are correlated aspects, yet representative of two polarities, within the totality of experience.

Husserl indicates that while I can conceive of and discuss these two sides of consciousness separately, they form a synthesis within experience and belong together inseparably (Husserl, 1960, pp. 39-41). Just as there are separate elements of a painting to which I can direct my attention--this cloud-like formation here, that transparent

area there suggestive of great depth, these are details of a work--they are always part of the unity of the total painting. I can direct my attention to the details but I am always co-aware of the whole work. And vice versa, when I direct my attention to the totality of the work, I am co-aware of the details. Husserl characterizes this as the streaming or flowing nature of intentional consciousness.

Horizon

A component I would like to position within the structure of intentionality is that of the horizon or fringe as Husserl sometimes calls it. Husserl emphasizes the point that objects or experiences can only be viewed as situated within a horizon, and that this horizon has special properties:

> The process taking place in an original intuition is always already saturated with anticipation; there is always more cointended apperceptively than actually is given by intuition - precisely because every object is not a thing isolated in itself but is always already an object in its horizon of typical familiarity and precognizance. But this horizon is constantly in motion; with every new step of intuitive apprehension, new delineations of the object result, more precise determinations and corrections of what was anticipated. No apprehension is merely momentary and ephemeral. (Husserl, 1973, p. 122)

Before going on, I must point out Kohák's sensible warning about the English meaning of the word "intuition". To equate "intuition" as used by Husserl with "guessing" or "having a feeling" about something would be inappropriate and misleading (Kohák, 1978, p. 159). In his use of the word "intuition" Husserl means to convey more rather than less clarity. (Again, it is one of those difficulties which arise when attempting to understand Husserl's phenomenology through an English translation).

Let me now position the horizon within the context of the art classroom, or more precisely use the experience of the art classroom as a horizon. During these lessons the teacher's stated aim is to have the students experiment, use color in a transparent manner, and end up with paintings on the theme, "sky". Ostensibly the students would learn something about the nature of experimentation, about transparent color usage, and pay closer attention to skies. These could be called the main elements or goals of the lessons or the experience, and if looked at from a phenomenological perspective can constitute a horizon in which the experience unfolds. The horizon can be thought of as acting as a form of perimeter within which the experience evolves. In this case the teacher has decided on the horizon or perimeter of the lessons in terms of the chosen subject matter and method.

There are multiple aspects to the feature of the horizon, aspects which intertwine and overlap each other

within the context of the lessons. The classroom itself is a physical horizon of space, the time in which the lessons take place is a temporal horizon. Even the words spoken during the lessons constitute a horizon of language through which the experience is viewed. The important point to understand is that the experience in the classroom, when looked at from the phenomenological perspective, must be viewed with the concept of horizon in mind. So, from this viewpoint, it would be absurd to speak of the art experience itself without being aware of the multiple aspects of horizon into which this experience is set.

Static and Genetic Aspects of Phenomenological Analysis

Before explaining the final phenomenological concept in this chapter, I would like to clarify two aspects of phenomenological analysis which are sometimes misunderstood: "static" and "genetic". All investigations, including those into the art classroom experience, necessarily begin at the level of static (sometimes called "eidetic") analysis. This indicates an exploration and phenomenological description of the contents of consciousness and is a direct and faithful account of the noematic features of an experience. It is this preliminary stage, the level of static analysis, that is fairly easy to grasp and implement. Donn Welton describes this level as one which begins with our

descriptions of what is given directly in experience, before any form of epoché or reduction (1983, p. 167).

Phenomenological investigations that remain at the level of static analysis typically describe actions, events, and environments. Conclusions may be formed at this level based upon these descriptions. But these conclusions would not clarify nor account for problems which may be raised. Investigations at the level of static analysis are always incomplete on their own, for they are incapable of disclosing all the relevant horizons inherent within a particular experience, especially the sedimented horizons associated with the past. It is at the level of genetic analysis that inquiries can be made into the history, origins and developmental influences of present experience. Husserl characterizes this as genetic inquiry into noetic-noematic multiplicities (Husserl, 1960, pp. 76-77, 1969, pp. 246, 250, 314-319).

Inquiries at the level of genetic analysis, attempt to discover how the present contents of consciousness came about. In other words, the historical, cultural, and social combinations which contribute to the structure of present experience. Husserl maintains that what we consider to be idiosyncratic thinking and actions can be probed by the method of genetic analysis to reveal historical, cultural, social, and temporal influences.

While the static level of analysis investigates and describes individual features of experience, the genetic

level probes the layers concealed and stratified within the identity of that experience, their "history", the sense and meaning of how they came to be as they are. Husserl holds that, not only is all this available to consciousness, but that phenomenology is the appropriate method by which we can approach an understanding of events of experience.

Constitution

A discussion of meaning and how it comes about within the context of experience introduces the phenomenological concept of constitution. How does Husserl see experience constituted as meaningful? The answer to this was briefly exemplified when the students viewed their displayed paintings on the classroom wall. If there were no students to view the paintings, there would be no meaning constituted. The paintings in isolation have no meaning without an experiencing subject. In this example one could say that the paintings already "mean" a great deal to the students who, after all, created these works. But this "meaning" would tend to be of a "mundane" variety, one associated with the natural standpoint or natural attitude. In this attitude the paintings mean an eventual grade from the teacher, they mean certain instructions were followed or not followed, and so on. But this is not Husserl's understanding of constitution, or certainly not his complete understanding. For a painting to "mean" something to a student in terms of a grade is one thing,

for that student to constitute meaning while experiencing the painting is something else.

I objectively described these paintings in a certain way "daubs of color on paper"; that is objectively what they are, but not subjectively what they mean. To arrive at the condition in which a painting has meaning, an experiencing subject is required. That subject (or that group of students in this case), through the experience of viewing the paintings, generates meaning. The students see or understand the shapes and colors as clouds, sky, land, water, or even a human head complete with details. They are not just listing what is "there". Through their conscious experience they are constituting the works as intelligible, as meaning something to them. Indeed, when the students view the paintings, not only do the works take on meaning, but the whole experience of experimentation through which the works were created begins to make "sense" and begins to acquire meaning. As it functions within the experience, the constitution of meaning is not limited to the paintings which resulted from the experimental experience, but extends to the whole process of experimentation as well as to the wider experience of the lessons of which the experimental aspect was an integral component. The process that enables a constitution of meaning permeates the whole experience and is not limited only to certain sections. When the students view the paintings, perceive daubs of paint, and understand

them to be representative of clouds, for example, they not only see the shapes in the works as meaningful, they begin to understand the whole experience of experimentation as having a meaning and purpose. Through this experience of experimentation they have arrived at possibilities in their works which probably would have been difficult to arrive at through any other process. They begin to understand the "sense" of experimentation, the possibilities and promise of the method; they begin to understand its meaning. Essentially this is what Husserl means by the concept of constitution.

Evidence

The concept is essentially a flexible one, capable of being questioned and revised, utilized in phenomenological investigations which attempt to come to an understanding of experiential knowledge or truths. Husserl insisted that if phenomenology were to be a true scientific form of philosophy, it must have a principle of evidence as an indispensable component within a rigorous methodology. Having nothing to do with "feelings" or "intuitions" of truth which are somehow revealed to exceptionally insightful individuals, or knowledge based on unfounded opinion; rather, evidence should be conceived as an act of synthesis within experience whereby what is intended is fulfilled and coincides with what is meant. It is a distinctive mode of consciousness in which stages of

understanding and knowledge are brought to fulfillment through experience. Husserl conceived this performance of evidence as a fundamental law of intentionality (1969, p. 160).

All intentional acts can be appraised with respect to their evidence. Unfulfilled or deflected intentions result in a lack of evidence. The discussion on intentionality earlier in this chapter emphasized the necessary rather than the purposeful character of that concept. Given this understanding, evidence can be viewed as a "fundamental law" which operates intrinsically within a necessary (intentional) structure of consciousness. That an individual can come to "know" and "understand" objects or events of experience can be verified through evidence. As the certainty of knowing and clarity of understanding increases within an experience, so too does the probability of the establishment of evidence.

The performance of evidence in the phenomenological attitude is loosely analagous to verification on an empirical level, where evidence is necessarily objective, testable, repeatable and accepted by others. In the phenomenological attitude, Husserl wanted to emphasize the structure of what was intended within a particular kind of experiential situation. When there is a correlation between the act of consciousness and the intended object within a given experience, intentions are filled and

evidence results. Where there is no correlation, intentions remain empty and therefore devoid of evidence.

Elisabeth Ströker emphasizes that Husserl's phenomenology is concerned not only ". . . with the intentional correlation between the act of consciousness and the object, but essentially and above all with the objects in the manner of their givenness and with the relevant modes of consciousness" (1982, p. 116). Throughout this inquiry, and especially during the analysis stage (chapter 5), it is the "way things are given" within consciousness which is of primary concern. In other words, it is the way in which the students come to an understanding of the meaning of their participation in the experience, and not only with that understanding.

Husserl refers to "clarification" in this regard. He states: "Making clear is always a mode of making evident . . ." (1960, p. 59). Evidence is the process of bringing into clear focus the meaning bestowing elements of a particular experience. Making "clear" and "clarification" are particularly appropriate descriptions by which the performance of evidence may be understood. And especially if the clarifying characteristics are directed toward those elements present in all experience which are laden with meaning. Within a given experience, if there is clear understanding of those elements of experience which bestow meaning, then intentions become filled through that understanding and evidence results.

In the example to follow I make use of Robert Sokolowski's (1974, pp. 18-19) explanations of conditions in experience under which intentions remain empty or become filled. For a student in the art classroom trying new techniques and methods in an attempt to produce an image of a sky, the notion of experimentation moves from being a vague apprehension to become "clarified" through the experience of trying to produce the sky image. Intentions become filled as the students experience for themselves experimenting with paint, as they employ saturated techniques to achieve a sky-like effect, as they try one technique after another and begin to come to a realization about what the teacher had meant by experimentation during earlier discussions.

Their teacher's meaning becomes phenomenologically clarified, understood and confirmed against their own experience of experimental image production. If, however, intentions remain empty during the experience, if there is no synthesis between the striving for a sky image and the result of that striving--the image itself--then, there is no understanding of the meaning of experimentation, neither is there any phenomenological clarification, and consequently no evidence.

In the discussion above, the continuous and flexible character of the concept may not be apparent as the performance of evidence more closely qualifies, rather than fixes or determines an object or events of experience. It

could be deceptive to consider evidence determined or complete when unearthed. Husserl cautions about the possibility of the deception of evidence, and that even apodictic evidence (a form of evidence which excludes doubt) can be overruled by the evidence of experience (Husserl, 1969, p. 156). However, if apodictic evidence is overruled, it must be overruled by more evidence of an apodictic nature. All evidence, when unearthed is not complete in itself, but can always be returned to in further efforts directed towards completion and perfection. That phenomenology contains these "return again" features emphasizes something of its flexibility. An evidence previously regarded as completed can be modified or even discarded in light of new experiences and new evidences.

The example of evidence arising from the classroom experiences, should not be classified as complete at the stage at which it was unearthed, or when the students' empty intentions became filled. More precisely, it should be classified as "true for now", with a decision as to its final status reserved pending further experiences and further possible evidence. This type of evidence has not yet reached the stage of adequacy as it retains the possibility of containing additional unfulfilled intentions.

Differentiation of evidence

Adequate and apodictic are not synonymous terms which describe similar types of evidence. They can be compared, but should be distinguished from one another. Adequate refers to otherwise complete evidence, that which stands the test of time, negation and doubt. Apodictic, while referring to an exclusion of any doubt, and impossibility of being other than it is, occurs in evidence that is as yet inadequate, is seen as a stage on the way to perfection, and is always relative to a horizon (Husserl, 1960, pp. 14-16. Landgrebe, 1970, pp. 267-268). Ströker insightfully distinguishes between evidence which is ". . . apodictic, but inadequate . . ." (1982, p. 133, this writer's emphasis.)

Apodicity then, is a stage of evidence on the way to adequacy, the latter term corresponding with perfection (Husserl, 1960, p. 15). Adequate evidence and its correlate truth are held to be an idea lying at infinity (Husserl, 1960, p. 62 and 1969, pp. 277-279).

In order for the evidence in the discussed example to reach the stage of adequacy, all empty intentions must be filled. The example of a student's understanding moving from being a vague apprehension to become "clarified" through the actual doing of the experimental experience demonstrates the first stage of fulfillment, with the status of adequacy or truth being left open until (or in case) further evidence surfaces.

Adequate evidence is the result of an experiential process where what is intended (the noesis) becomes fully and completely confirmed in the intentional object (the noema). In other words, adequate evidence results when all the intentions become filled and all the meaning bestowing elements become understood within the context of a particular experience. Moreover, evidence is relative to a given context or horizon.

The temporal element is one aspect of horizon in which the students function. Their past experiences of art classrooms, of painting, of memories of skies, of producing skies, or even of attempting experiments, make up a genetic formulation of past relative experience. The aspect of future protentions of what they are about to do in the current project, vague or even distinct apprehensions of techniques they observed their teacher demonstrate, how they envision their skies evolving, all contribute to an aspect of horizon into which the current experience evolves.

In the example of students experiencing experimental procedures in the classroom, the evidence although rudimentary at that stage, is nonetheless limited and relative to the horizons of that experience. As the students continue with their experiments, and if, through experience, they achieve an understanding of the meaning of experimentation, then their noetic intentions become filled through their involvement with the noematic object (the

experimental procedure). Under these conditions, within the given horizon, the students understanding of experimentation and successful image production represents a preliminary stage of evidence. The ideal of adequacy is something towards which the students would aim in subsequent experimental experiences in the art classroom.

David Levin (1970) comments on the adequacy of evidence:

> The total perfection of evidence, designated "truth" or "true being", is conceived in a quite general way to be an absolute "agreement" (conformity) between an empty intention and its fulfilled meaning (the evidence); there is achieved a complete and perfect "adequatio rei et intellectus", an adequate experience (Erlebnis) (pp. 34-35)

The notion of absolute truth or "absolute evidence" is criticized by Husserl as belonging to the realm of the "exact" sciences. These sciences have "falsely absolutized" truth as they neglect to investigate the living truth from living experience (1969, p. 270). In other words, absolute truth which can be equated with absolute perfect evidence are ideals which guide an investigation, and the intermediate stages of evidence, while flexible, can stand until supplemented by a more complete stage.

Examples of Applied Phenomenology

I have discussed some of the main concepts of Husserl's phenomenology. The phenomenological method can be applied to investigations in a variety of fields. Some of these were discussed in more detail in chapter 2. I will give brief examples from four fields where phenomenology has been effectively utilized: art education, aesthetics, phenomenological sociology and general education. For now, these examples serve to indicate possible applications of the concepts outlined in the foregoing discussion.

Stanley Folsom (1976) is an art teacher who chose to investigate his own class of students using Husserlian phenomenology. Folsom's research sought to uncover and understand the intentional structures underlying student activities. While the author admitted the understanding generated by a phenomenological work may be idiosyncratic, he held that the investigated individuals belonged to universal types. Therefore, through a study of individuals, an understanding was claimed as being universal. In other words, the study claimed validity beyond the studied subjects.

Donald Kuspit (1974) directed his phenomenological inquiry in aesthetics toward an understanding of artistic intention. He concluded that there is more to artistic intention than previously thought, when intention is explored in a phenomenological manner. Being consciously

aware of artistic intention implies a greater awareness of the concepts of fundamentality and freedom. These concepts take on a new meaning when viewed through artistic intention.

Phenomenological sociology seeks to understand the features of the life-world in social settings. Alfred Schutz (1964, 1966, 1973) adapted Husserl's phenomenology and applied it to a life-world level of sociological investigation. Schutz's main efforts were directed toward the recognition of the mundane world of ordinary experience (the natural stance) and to describe, analyze, and understand the features of this sphere. Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966) applied phenomenological concepts to the social world in order to understand how shared reality is socially constructed. George Psathas (1973) also addressed his inquiries toward a phenomenological understanding of the social world.

Clinton Collins (1974) is an educator who attempted a synthesis between sociology and phenomenology. He directed his inquiries toward an understanding of the multiple realities (seen from the multiple perspective of the participants) of the life-world of education.

These cited investigations provide a practical answer to common criticism that phenomenologists <u>discuss</u> phenomenology but do not <u>do</u> it. The criticism is often valid, as phenomenological literature abounds with esoteric arguments and discussions regarding phenomenological

concepts, or various forms of phenomenology. I have argued here, that although a discussion of phenomenological concepts is necessary for the sake of a clear understanding, phenomenology itself has been, and is capable of being, applied in a variety of fields. The results of these inquiries can be both viable and valuable as alternatives to more traditional modes of inquiry into human interaction.

I assume this chapter has clarified key concepts of Husserl's phenomenology. By positioning these concepts within examples extracted from the classroom experience it was my intention not only to impart an understanding of the concepts, but also to demonstrate how they operate in situations involving human interaction. In chapter 5, the following chapter, I intend to analyze the events of the classroom in accordance with Husserl's phenomenology. It was these classroom events which formed the objective description in chapter 3. Throughout the phenomenological analysis in the next chapter I will apply those phenomenological concepts which formed the bulk of the discussion in this current chapter, and upon which I believe an understanding of Husserl's phenomenology in operation is based. The foregoing has been, for the most part, a <u>discussion</u> of Husserl's phenomenology; in what follows I cease <u>discussing</u> phenomenology and <u>do</u> it.

Chapter 5

Phenomenological Analysis: Preliminary Observations

Included in phenomenological analysis is an element of observation which includes an act of focussing. Before entering into the analysis proper, I shall discuss aspects of this focussing which can have an influence upon my perception of objects and events. When I view a student's painting I first of all widen my focus to "take in" the whole work. I determine for myself the "type" of work, its subject matter, etc. I will call this a wide or background focus. When I have established the nature of the painting, I then visually explore its details. If the painting depicts a boat being hurled about on a stormy ocean I focus upon the boat, the sailors, the huge storm-tossed waves and the angry sky. I call this a narrow or detailed focus. When I am focussing on the details I am not attending to the whole painting or the background, and conversely when I use a wide focus to view the whole painting, I am not fully aware of the richness and variety of the detail or the core of the work. This seems to be the nature of vision and perception; that certain items are selected, and that these items are seen in relation to a background.

This act of focussing is an aspect of my flexible visual horizon, and has direct parallels with the phenomenological feature of horizon, as well as a

phenomenological viewing of the objects resulting from the experience, namely the students' paintings. When I observe Miss Fowler speaking to the students, my focus has widened to take in all the class i.e., the students and Miss Fowler. When a student asks a question my focus narrows, seemingly automatically, to that student while I attend to the question being asked. My focus then widens again to gauge a reaction from other students, then narrows for Miss Fowler's reply, and so on. Yet, while I am engaged in narrow focus and concentrating on a detail I am co-aware of general "background" activity, although I am not directly attending to that activity. Then, if I widen my focus to concentrate on the general activity I am co-aware of details, yet not specifically attending to them. An example of a camera comes to mind with its focussing capabilities. Yet unlike a camera, especially those of the "automatic focus" variety, my focussing is not as automatic as I initially believed. When observing classroom interactions I react to visual and auditory stimuli. When viewing a painting I allow the visual array to "lead" my eye and consequently my interest. This I do in order to appreciate the creator's skill, and understand the meaning of the painting. Throughout the whole of the experience this wide and narrow focussing continues in one or another form, for I cannot do the two things simultaneously. When I concentrate or focus on one aspect of the lesson's activity, my interpretation of the meaning

of that aspect of the activity is determined by my focus. Of course my interpretation of any aspect of the activity can change as quickly as my focus. It is the cumulation of wide and narrow focussing upon the activity which builds up over time to result in my interpretation of the meaning of the event.

Don Ihde (1979) has defined this aspect of vision phenomenologically as "core-field-horizon". The core is what I term detail or narrow focus. The field is the background against which the core item is always positioned, or wide focus. The horizon is the outer limit or border or shape of the visual field, the point at which vision actually ceases. This description of the visual field Ihde classes as a move towards eidectic phenomenology, towards structures or invarients (1979, pp. 60-61). The possibilities of vision are shaped by this structure of the visual-field. This structure has direct parallels to experience. When I am observing the lesson, my observation--even experience--is structured along the lines described. I concentrate on a detail or core, which is set into a field or background, having a limit or horizon.

One of the difficulties in phenomenological inquiry is that the "horizon", both in the phenomenological and ordinary meaning of the term, can appear to recede infinitely. It comes down to a question of significance, and a common difficulty which seems to be inherent in

phenomenological inquiries becomes: After an experience has been described in detail, how can I, as a phenomenological inquirer, determine which details can be designated "significant"? Then, compounding the difficulty, how can I make any choices upon which to concentrate without falling into the trap of prior knowledge influencing the outcome, or in phenomenological language: presuppositions? Put another way, how can I remain true to Husserlian intent and avoid problems at both ends of the spectrum when I inquire into human experience? On the one hand I could end up awash in unmanageable voluminous data, on the other hand I could end up verifying my prior knowledge which would be akin to the presuppositions I hold at the beginning of the inquiry being verified at the end.

To answer these questions, first I must recognize that throughout a phenomenological analysis I am constantly dealing with levels of significance, and not designating certain elements significant and others insignificant. Second, I can overcome the difficulty these questions pose, yet still remain true to Husserlian intent, by raising a number of issues which the analysis can address. My purpose in raising these issues is two-fold, it will serve to shape the inquiry and, at the same time, avoid the needless complications which could result from being bogged down in an inordinate amount of detail. Further, because I am aware that I have selected these items to aid the

direction of the inquiry, I can continue to be vigilant, perform an epoché, and not allow these concerns to take on the nature of presuppositions.

The following issues I view as guidelines or signposts to be addressed in the analysis when and if they surface. The teacher is perhaps the most important individual within the context of this experience. Her words and actions, both to the class generally as well as to individuals, ought to come under close scrutiny. Is she expressing herself clearly? Is what she says to the class as a whole consistent with what she says to students individually? Are her visual and verbal examples clearly understood by the students? Do I understand everything she says? Is there a pattern or relationship in her interventions, explanations and examples? Do her conversations with me after the lesson shed any light on her actions and intentions during the lessons? Can I, as observer, adequately understand her viewpoint? These and other related questions can be kept in mind as the analysis progresses.

The analysis begins by following the days of the experience, i.e., beginning with Day One and ending with Day Twelve. However, as certain facets of the experience surface, I will deviate from the chronological order, and trace significant phenomenological features as they recur throughout the experience. An actual transcript of the

words spoken by the participants will be used to clarify certain features.

Noesis-Noema

This analysis could effectively begin with the application of any of the previously discussed concepts. However, I feel it pertinent to begin with the concepts of noesis and noema, because as early as the initial, introductory lesson I began to suspect the teacher's intentions in terms of noesis-noema were different from those of the students.

It seemed to me that Miss Fowler with her continuing emphasis on the process and variety of artistic experimentation, was primarily concerned with the noetic aspects of the lessons to follow. The process of experimentation seemed to be more important to her as an educational aim than the results of that experimentation, the students' paintings.

After a number of lessons during which I observed the students' experiments, and especially after the first display and discussion of the results, I began to suspect the students were primarily interested in the noematic aspects of the experience. They seemed to go along with the experimental procedures, but were primarily interested in the results, and interpreting the results of the experiments.

I begin by concentrating upon the noetic-noematic aspects of the introductory lesson. During this lesson Miss Fowler refers to the "artistic process" when discussing the reproductions. Her comments during the course of this lesson range from feelings, elements of art, works evoking memories and experiences, symbolism, to the use of imagination, the overall theme she returns to is that of the process of art. She emphasized that the experience the artist went through in creating the paintings shown in the reproductions was crucial to this artistic process. The actual reproductions are used by Miss Fowler as devices which allow the students to come to an understanding of the creative process experienced by the artists.

The following extract from the transcript of the first day's interactions indicate the teacher's emphasis on the artistic or creative process. The reproduction under discussion is "Questionable Companions" by W. H. Hansen. The work depicts an Amerindian and a cowboy on horseback riding from left to right against a background of a sunset.

Teacher: Is there a painting that gives you a warm feeling here? (Gesturing to the display).

Student: Yes.

Teacher: Which one?

Student: That one.

Teacher: What did he do to give you that warm feeling?

Student: Miss, the sunshine.

Teacher: How does he show you the sun is shining?

Student: Reflections, the water, sky, trees.

Teacher: Yes, but you said a warm feeling. What does he do to give you that warm feeling?

Student: Colors, sunset.

Teacher: Just before the sun is setting? How do you know that?

Student: The horses look tired (general laughter).

Teacher: How do you notice the sunset or sunrise?

Student: Colors, shadows.

Teacher: That's a good observation.

In terms of the phenomenological concepts of the noetic-noematic aspects of experience, I think it significant that the teacher refers to what the artist does to achieve a certain effect. "What did he do . . . ?", "How does he show you . . . ?" and so on, rather than "What does the painting show?". Because references of this type are so frequent throughout both this discussion and the lesson in general, I believe it goes beyond idiosyncratic phraseology. Her references tend to be weighted toward the doing, the process of doing art. In phenomenological language the teacher's emphasis is on noetic rather than noematic elements.

I must point out that this emphasis on the noetic, on the part of the teacher, becomes apparent only at this stage of the analysis. While I, as phenomenological observer, was living through the actual experience, this

emphasis was not detected. Of course, as I write this account, I have the advantage of being "outside" the time of the experience. I am able to look over the data and "advance" a few lessons to determine if the experience bears out my noetic-noematic suspicions.

While the transcribed interactions bear out Miss Fowler's leanings toward the noetic, the students seem to show primary interest in the noematic aspects of the experience. I believe the following excerpt corroborates this. During the discussion of student works on Day Four, following two lessons of experimental painting, my suspicions seem verified. In this instance there have been questions raised about David's work, which while incomplete, shows sky, horizon as well as beach or land with some objects in the foreground. A student asks David about the objects. David laughs. Miss Fowler continues the question.

Teacher: Yes, could you talk about that?

David: At first it was supposed to be a person under an umbrella, and then it turned into a raft under an umbrella and now its a table under an umbrella (laughter).

The objects in question in David's work are still incomplete, but his intentions in creating the objects are clear. He uses the phrase "... . it was supposed to be . . ." to begin his explanation, that is, he intended the object to be a certain thing. He was not "just

experimenting", he was trying to depict an object from the outset. What concerned David was the noematic rather than the noetic aspect of the process.

Leaving aside the strict chronological aspects of the lessons, and jumping ahead in time to the lengthy discussion which took place during the last lesson on Day Twelve, further evidence can be found for the noetic-noematic division between teacher and students. The whole of this last lesson consisted of Miss Fowler leading a discussion on the newly completed student works. I believe the following extracts from this lesson are consistent with the noetic-noematic division. In this instance the teacher asks a question of Gillian.

Teacher: Did you find it painful, Gillian, while you were doing this?

Gillian: Painful?

Teacher: Did you enjoy doing that?

Gillian: Yeah.

Teacher: Why?

Gillian: Miss, you will never guess what I started off with. Just the sky and the sun. Then the sun turned into a mountain, then a little tree turned into a big tree, then the rest of the mountain into buildings, then everything just changed, the whole scenery.

While Gillian's response could be interpreted as concerned with both noetic-noematic aspects, process and

product, the teacher's questions are clearly related to the noetic or process aspects of the experience. In an other example in which a student's emphasis is on noematic aspects, the teacher asks Kathy about some trees in her work.

Teacher: Could you talk a little bit about it? How did you choose to express the trees here? I saw you doing it, you were twirling around (the brush). Why did you choose to use that gesture?

Kathy: I don't know because . . . I wanted the house to be hidden by the trees and the grass. I didn't know how to do it so I was just playing around with the brush.

Again the student clearly was aiming for a certain thing, in this case she wanted a house to be viewed through trees and grass. Her intentions tended toward the noematic, while the teacher's questions are concerned with noetic aspects.

Miss Fowler's noetic intentions are again clear in this next extract:

Teacher: Alright, now I would like to hear from you people, I would like you to talk about the experience you had when you had to do these paintings, as opposed, let's say, to your experience with past paintings. Experiments you have had. . . . how different was this?

After a response Miss Fowler asks a further question:

Teacher: And did you find that the freedom of experimentation helped the ideas to come along?

And again after a student's response:

Teacher: So they (the ideas) came out as you were doing them? Is that it?

Student: Yeah!

In the same context, Miss Fowler discusses the lack of a definitive topic, and the impact that had upon the students and their work:

Teacher: So you really had to concentrate, you really had to put a lot of thought into what you were doing. That thinking, was it forced upon you because you were just given materials, or was it because you didn't have a topic?

Student: Well, because I really didn't know what I wanted, I had to find out.

Teacher: But did the fact that I gave you a sky to start with help? Was it a start?

Student: Yes it was.

During this discussion with the class Miss Fowler acknowledged that the experimental nature of the lessons and the limited "sky" topic, was her way of guiding the class through the "process" of discovery. Her primary interest was in the process. The theme "sky" served as an effective starting point for the students' imagination, yet

did not provide a topic with strong imagery. By beginning with the sky, and going through the process of experimentation, the students experienced noetic aspects before they could concern themselves with noematic ones. Ultimately, however, it was the noematic elements in their works which eventually intrigued the students. Once their experiments generated images, the students essentially ceased experimentation, and concentrated upon completion of the imagery. Phenomenologically, they were immersed in noetic aspects because of the teacher's emphasis on experimentation or the process aspect of the project. Noematic aspects overwhelmed the noetic as soon as images and their suggestive power appeared in the student works. The noematic aspects of completed images eventually proved more powerful than the noetic aspects of experimentation.

Intentionality and Constitution

I now return to the discussion which took place on Day Four and will view the experience through the phenomenological concepts of intentionality and constitution. At this point in time, following the introductory lesson, the students had had two lessons of experimental painting. The results of these lessons, two paintings per student, Miss Fowler had displayed on one wall. At the lesson's conclusion on Day Three, Miss Fowler had indicated to me that she was dissatisfied with the students' works and the direction they were taking. The

way the paintings were evolving at this stage in the experimental exercise was not what she had anticipated. She thought the students were reluctant to use colors transparently, and that their works were tending toward realism rather than remaining purely experimental. She expected the works to be limited only to skies, and instead the students were tending to add realistically rendered images of objects to their experimental sky beginnings.

These observations by Miss Fowler parallel my noetic-noematic phenomenological observations. Both our interpretations of the unfolding event seemed to be consistent despite our divergent stances and views of the experience; hers from a mundane or natural standpoint position and mine from a phenomenological one.

Miss Fowler informed me as to why she displayed their works and devoted a lesson to a discussion of the results thus far. Her intention was to communicate an understanding of experimental painting. The actual students' experimentations, she reasoned, may suggest to them possible directions, not only for these, but for future works.

I will use extracts from this discussion on Day Four and view the events through Husserl's understanding of the concept of intentionality. In the previous chapter I discussed intentionality and concluded that Husserl saw it as a necessary rather than a purposeful relationship with experience. That is, rather than intentionality

meaning something which is done on purpose and therefore voluntarily within the context of experience, it is something which is necessarily related to the nature of experience. I have previously described the students entering the room and seeing their works displayed together as a group for the first time. I described how intentionality was functioning as the students viewed these works. From the first moments the works were seen, the function of intentionality as a necessity was apparent. The students did not simply view the display and then were somehow affected by the paintings. Although the works were far from complete, or even fully thought out, the students necessarily made an effort to understand these emerging works as meaningful. I realize that understanding the paintings as meaningful introduces the phenomenological concept of constitution, which I shall discuss below, for I see it being closely linked to intentionality.

This attempt to view the works as meaningful took place among the students to varying degrees and at differing levels. It would have taken great effort on the students' part to attempt to view these paintings at this stage without the phenomenological concept of intentionality being a necessary component of that viewing. This I have described as if the students passively observe the display, and somehow let the paintings affect them. Imagine for a moment a student looking at an emerging experimental sky painting and something happens whereby the

painting affects her. It is as though the painting itself does the communicating, and all that can be communicated is the information or message which the work already contains. No, this would be impossible, because intentionality would be denied and the qualities which allow for human experience would be negated. In fact the structure of intentionality cannot be suppressed because it is not a feature of consciousness which one decides to engage or disengage. It is rather an inherent and necessary structure of consciousness. In the discussion of the following extracts from Day Four I will apply the concept of intentionality and in so doing provide an analysis of the event from the perspective of this concept:

Teacher: Domenique, did you notice something about that, something I did?

Domenique: Oh! It's upside down.

Teacher: Yes, it's upside down. Do you like it that way, better than right side up?

Domenique: Yes.

Teacher: Why? Is it different now? Does it look different?

Domenique: Yes, Miss.

Teacher: It looks different, eh? I put it upside down. This is the way you painted it (turning the work the other way) and by accident I put the tapes the other way. What's the difference?

Domenique: I like it better that way.

Teacher: Why do you like it better?

Domenique: Because everything was going upwards, the other way.

Teacher: And now you feel more like it's . . . ?

Domenique: Like you are looking into it.

Domenique's white clouds on a blue background was one of the few works to remain true to the format of an experimental sky painting. Miss Fowler had displayed the work upside down. Domenique was therefore forced to re-interpret her own work from another perspective. If the work had been displayed as it had been painted, Domenique could just as easily have overlooked her work and concentrated upon others in the display. The new configuration, coupled with the teacher's questions, made Domenique look anew at her own work. It was as though she had to put as much effort into re-interpreting her own work as she had in the other works on display. When I view Domenique's action through the concept of intentionality her search for new meaning in her already familiar work was a necessary rather than a voluntary action. Had Domenique noticed that her work was different from the way she had painted it, even without the teacher's questions, she would have had to interpret and understand the work anew. With intentionality being a necessary component of experience Domenique had no choice in the matter. The painting on its own could suggest nothing to her. Intentionality cannot be discussed in terms of either an object in isolation, or an

isolated subject. Rather, it is the relationship between the subject and the object of attention. In this case, Domenique, the experiencing subject, had to search for new meaning in the new viewing of the object, her own painting.

From the same discussion on Day Four, I will use an example I have used before, one where a student sees a head in a cloud. In this instance the new interpretation forces everyone, teacher as well as students, to return to their initial interpretation and re-interpret it:

Sabrina: Miss, I see a person in that one.

Teacher: In here? (indicating the painting) Where? Point out the person.

Sabrina: Miss, come here, you can see it. (Sabrina called Miss Fowler to a point further back in the room. When the teacher had reached Sabrina's vantage point, Sabrina approached the painting in question and pointed out the features of the face, the eyes, nose, hair etc.)

Students: (in general) Oh yeah! (They all now begin to recognize the features of the face as Sabrina pointed them out.)

Teacher: So those things are all accidental, but the fact that we can all stand back and look at them . . . . We look at them from a different perspective.

Sabrina: I'm freaking out. It's so perfect. (the head and features of the face) If you tried to draw it, you couldn't draw it.

Teacher: No? A lot of these things, if I had asked you to draw them, you probably would have been very stuck in how to do it. You would have said, "Oh I can't do this". Sometimes it's by accident, and we pick up on these accidents, you know artists are free to do that.

These "accidents" to which Miss Fowler refers are unexpected and perhaps surprizing combinations of elements within a painting. The "accidents" are the type of result she had hoped for when the students began experimenting. The whole experimental sky theme was a device she used to get the students involved in the act of experimentation, out of which she hoped unexpected and surprizing combinations would result. The operation of the concept of intentionality becomes apparent when the students attempt to view these "accidents" as having a meaning or suggesting a direction for continued experimentation.

Not only is intentionality evident in this extract but also the concept of constitution. When the human head was pointed out by Sabrina to the teacher and the class, it took a few seconds for anyone (including myself) to re-interpret the cloud as a head. For those few seconds the class was very quiet. Then, as I recognized the features of the head, others in the class did also. There

was sudden agreement among the class that there was a head and face in the cloud formation.

Without being aware of it at the time, I realize as I write this account, I made use of the core-field-horizon elements of vision and focussing. The cloud was the core upon which I focussed. The painting was the field into which the core was set. The horizon was my co-awareness of those other paintings in the display which bordered the painting in question. Yet this act of writing about the experience allows me to view my initial experience reflexively. I am reflecting back upon my viewing of the painting at the moment before I could see the cloud as a head. This reflexive viewing makes me realize that not only was I viewing the painting as an observer, I was also viewing it as an artist. When I am involved in the process of creating a painting, at every stage in that process I "read into" the developing work and the visual array can suggest a new stage of development or direction to me. This is a tactic I, or anyone who attemps to create an art work, habitually use especially when involved with works of a non-figurative nature.

If I take this realization, that I viewed the painting as an artist, and extend the realization toward the students and their reaction, I suspect they must have done something similar in order to see the cloud as a head. They must have "read" the work, initially as a cloud, then later as a head similar to the way in which an artist, or

any creator of an art work, would have "read" the work. When Sabrina pointed out her new understanding to the class, the concept of constitution was apparent as she allowed others to share not only her understanding but her vision-as-an-artist. Some students understood her new meaning quickly, others took a longer period of time to achieve the same understanding. All who understood the new meaning and configuration, at the moment of realization, visually experienced the painting in a manner similar to an artist.

This suspicion comes about through the use of inter-subjective empathy. I, as phenomenological observer, viewed the paintings at the same time the students and teacher viewed them. When the new configuration was indicated, we all shared in the realization that what was previously accepted as having one meaning, contained the possibility of another. Further, the two meanings were equally valid: the cloud could be either a head or a cloud. Once visually understood and experienced, either configuration could be summoned at will. Phenomenologically, what I as well as the teacher and students did was to search for a new configuration and meaning in what we all had previously accepted as clouds.

As we all viewed the work and took a configuration in the painting to "mean" a cloud, the concept of intentionality was a necessary component within the structure of our experience. We as subjects, viewed an

object, of which a particular part "meant" a cloud to us. I have previously noted that the object or painting could, at this stage, be described as daubs of color on paper. How do we, the students and myself, ascribe the meaning "cloud" to these daubs of color? The answer lies in our experience of clouds under a variety of conditions. From my experience, a certain visual array in the sky means a cloud. If there are many clouds it can mean something else, for example "overcast". If the sky is blue, as is the case in the painting, and objects of varying degrees of whiteness and translucency are observed superimposing some of the blueness of the sky, then I conclude the objects are clouds. I may check for verification of this conclusion. If the objects are near the horizon, or near buildings, I may want to observe them for a few moments to see if they behave as smoke, steam, or as escaping condensation may behave under various weather conditions. If the objects do not behave as any of the above, I assign a "cloud meaning" to them.

I will describe how I view a cloud from a phenomenological viewpoint. When I look at a cloud, only one side appears to me. Without being consciously aware of it at the time of viewing I appresent the other side of the cloud appearance. I do not for a moment think that the cloud I see in the sky is a flat two-dimensional object. It has depth and a back side, although both are not visible as I simply look at the cloud at any given moment. But as

I look I do not debate with myself whether the cloud is flat or contains three-dimensional qualities. Through the process of retention, a stored memory of past experience, I know clouds have dimensional qualities. These memories of clouds are many and varied. I have viewed clouds from above when traveling by air. The dimensional qualities of an object occupying space are apparent from such a vantage point. I have also viewed clouds at different times of the day, at sunrise and sunset, when they have degrees of both translucency and opacity, and when their edges and dimensionality are more apparent. All this is stored in the memory of past experience.

I also anticipate how the cloud will appear in a few moments, through protention. I protend that its shape will not only change, but is ever changing. Even as I look at it to determine its shape and edges, it has an ephemeral character and its shape continues to be amorphous as it either expands or contracts. As I continue to observe the cloud I begin to realize that in order to investigate its edges I must somehow "freeze" it. I can accomplish this by looking intently at it, then closing my eyes and concentrating upon the image which is retained on my retina, then by continuing to concentrate upon the after-image into which the primary image dissolves. I find this after-image appearance still retains distinct edges. With continued concentration, I find I can observe the shape, size, and edges of the cloud - even keeping my eyes

closed. Of course, I realize there are other ways to hold onto the image of a cloud, through photography, or drawing or painting, as was done by the students. With my eyes now open, and again through protention, I can anticipate how the cloud will appear in a few moments as I and the cloud move in space. I can also anticipate how it will appear if the light were to change, if the sun was obscured by it or another cloud.

By making use of the phenomenological term "free variation in phantasy", otherwise known as imagination, I can search for familiar objects in the clouds. Clouds offer a fertile suggestive canvas to the lively imagination, which is why the students were able to see non-cloud features in the discussed painting. Whatever I imagine will be related to my experience, as in the "head-in-the-cloud" example. I cannot project into the cloud something beyond my experience. Of course, experience includes imaginative experience, or phantasy appearances which exist only in my imagination. For these as well as what I consider "real" experiences, i.e., experiences of the "mundane" world, are all accessible through phenomenological investigation.

I should indicate that this is a phenomenological description of cloud recognition from within my experience. In ordinary "mundane" experience, this described recognition takes place almost instantly, and it occurs within a "flow" of other experiences. By using

phenomenological methods. I can explore something as taken-for-granted as a cloud, and how it takes on meaning within my experience.

Something similar happened when I viewed the painting in question. Through a variety of checks and verifications, few of which I was consciously aware at the time, I concluded the object in question in the painting meant "cloud" to me. When the new configuration was suggested, I had to return to the object to which I had previously ascribed the "cloud" meaning, and search for the newly suggested one.

While the re-interpretive aspect of this viewing was of a voluntary nature, the structure of the viewing was one of necessity. The participants, as subjects confronted with the paintings, necessarily engaged in a search leading toward an understanding. The paintings in the display could be described as meaningless daubs of color, but they could not be understood this way. Through the experience of viewing the works, the experiencing subjects necessarily attempted a search for meaning. Everyone viewing the display, had initially understood the white brush strokes on a blue background in the painting under discussion as clouds. When the new interpretation was indicated, everyone was forced to return to the work and re-interpret their original understanding. They were confronted with their original understanding, then, taking the new suggestion as a cue, searched for the new one. Once the

head and facial features were recognized, the original meaning was supplemented by the new one.

Within the context of experience this example shows quite clearly how the concept of constitution functions in a specific situation. It also demonstrates something of the fluid nature of constitution, where one meaning can give way to another. Nothing had changed in the painting, the daubs of color and brushstrokes were the same during both interpretations. What had changed was the meaning as interpreted by the viewing subjects. With a little concentration the viewer could "change" the section of the painting from clouds to head, and back again to clouds. Once both meanings were accepted it became difficult to hold only one of them in mind, as neither the head nor the clouds dominated. Both were plausible and both became part of the meaning of the painting, although the student who painted the work clearly intended the subject matter to be clouds and sky.

Although I have concentrated upon individual works and details up to this point, a more general aspect of the experience, the lessons themselves, can be viewed through the concepts of intentionality and constitution. By adopting a perspective whereby the lessons are seen through these concepts, light may be shed upon the meaning the lessons have to both teacher and students. I assume the lessons begin with the teacher having a certain understanding and purpose regarding the direction and

nature of subsequent lessons. Throughout the experience she attempts to communicate her understanding of the lessons to the students, both collectively and individually. Questions raised earlier regarding consistency and clarity may be addressed within this context.

Within the general experience, certain aspects of the lessons were answered in terms of process and product, or noetic-noematic concepts. It became clear that the teacher and students were viewing the lessons and the resulting paintings from different perspectives. As observer, I implicitly understood that the teacher's intentions and understanding regarding the lessons were set from the beginning. As phenomenological observer I should have known better, and should have probed the nature of this implicit understanding, or described this presupposition in phenomenological terms. I rather naively assumed she had fully thought out the nature of the project and had some idea of the direction the lessons would take and what may result in terms of student works. She saw the lessons as primarily experimental and on the theme of skies, that much seemed certain to me. What I also assumed was that she had a clear idea as to the types of images which could result from the lessons; skies eventually turning into snowstorms, rainstorms, sunsets, becoming windblown and so on. It was only during the fourth lesson that she shared her larger understanding with the class as well as myself. This

became the first clue as to how she envisioned the student works in their final form, or her goal concerning these works. In this extract Miss Fowler is speaking to the class on Day Four, after discussing the displayed student paintings:

Teacher: What do you think we could do next with these pictures? What do you suggest?

Student: Add things.

Teacher: Add something to them? Something quite unexpected? Or should we continue with the ideas that are coming through here? What I had intended to do was to take one . . . most of you have two . . . and we could sketch outside, and use one for imaginary types of things. Let accidents sort of speak to us. Last night when I was going home I was on top of a hill and I was looking at the sky directly and what you can see are the top of things which is quite interesting . . . you can pick up houses . . . .

In this explanation Miss Fowler indicates two possible directions for the lessons to follow. One, the imaginary possibility, she had shared with the class before during her introductory talk on Day One; the second direction, where the students would sketch outside on top of one or more of their skies, was a new direction for the students as well as myself. In terms of the phenomenological

concept of constitution, the building up of meaning within the general experience, Miss Fowler may have simultaneously considered these two possible directions, the imaginary and the outside sketching, during the first day. However, it was only at this point in time, near the end of the fourth day, that she shared this understanding with the students and myself. It is here the students and I are offered another layer of meaning, another direction of the experience. What still remained unclear, however, was which direction out of the two possibilities, the subsequent lessons would take.

Part of the answer came about during the next lesson, Miss Fowler renewed her imaginary direction. The students were instructed to develop, from imagination, their experimental beginnings. Up to and including Day Five, from the students' perspective, the lessons continued to mean an experimental imaginary work which began with a sky.

The Turning Point of the Lessons:
The Redirection of the Constitution of Meaning

At the conclusion of the lesson on Day Five, Miss Fowler shares her thoughts with me regarding all the lessons up to this point in time.

Teacher: (to myself as researcher) I am very disappointed. They have gone back to stereotypical images. They seem to have superimposed those images on the experiment.

They have tightened up and gone back to what they knew before.

From the teacher's perspective, this constitutes the turning point in the meaning and direction of the lessons. To her, the future direction of the experience was becoming clarified. In terms of phenomenological constitution, the meaning of the experience thus far would be redirected. After five lessons she realized the students lacked what she termed "experience in art". She saw this "lack of experience" as hindering their ability to complete the works to her satisfaction. As to why the works disappointed her, she offers this explanation:

Teacher: (to me) Well, it probably has a lot to do with their experience in art before . . . they have very little experience in art. Maybe if we did more of this sort of assignment, eventually they will be able to create an image . . . . I can imagine all sorts of things in these pictures (indicating the students' works). Why can I see wind blowing and a mist, rain, people pushing, trees being bent? Is it because of my experience? Is it because someone has made me pay attention to these things when I started to take art, or when I was younger? . . . I think our (the teacher's and researcher's) background in art has made us more conscious of what's happening

around us. We are more conscious of our environment.

Here, as Miss Fowler gains insight into the students' perspective, by sharing her growing insight with me, I attain a deeper understanding of her position. Her discussions with the class, her discussions with individual students, as well as her reflective observations of their developing images, contribute to her awareness of the differences between her and them. She views their emerging images from the perspective of one who has had a wealth of experience over a number of years. By tapping into this experience she is able to see enormous possibilities in their works. She can see the possibilities easily; the students cannot.

Any experience Miss Fowler has had (for example of trees which play an important role in the images of this project) has been built up over time. When she is outside with the students looking at the same tree some of them are depicting, the meaning the tree has for her is quite different to the meaning it has for the students.

Meaning becomes formed and developed through experience. She has observed, drawn, painted and otherwise depicted many trees during past experiences. When she was a young child, or herself a student in High School, the trees she observed and depicted then had a necessarily different meaning for her than the trees she observes her students depicting during this project. Her understanding

of the meaning of trees was developing through new experiences when she was a student, and was limited to the relatively few trees (in comparison to her knowledge of them now) she had observed and depicted as a child and student. Artists and students of art often talk about gaining an insight and understanding of objects after spending time observing and sketching them. When observing, drawing and consequently thinking about a tree, a person begins to develop a growing awareness and understanding of trees as organic things. That person rarely views a tree casually again. Whether the tree was sketched in summer or winter, with leaves or without, its structure, growth patterns, reaching-to-the-sky- quality, texture, flexibility, symmetrical or asymmetrical characteristics; in short its meaning has been internalized, better understood and better appreciated than it was before.

When Miss Fowler traveled she was keenly aware of her surroundings. She told me of trees she had seen in Georgia, during her travels in the South, the type with hanging moss on them, and how she thought they had the right "frightening mood" to fit a painting Domenique was doing. Not being familiar with that type of tree Domenique did not understand what Miss Fowler meant by trees being able to convey a frightening mood.

In documenting something of Miss Fowler's range of experience concerning trees my intention here is to show

how this experience enables her to see and understand objects of experience in a more meaningful manner compared to the manner in which the students understand them. Because of this constituted meaning she necessarily and qualitatively views and understands things differently from the students. It is for this reason she is able to visualize a wealth of possible directions in students' work and becomes disappointed when they cannot visualize the same possibilities, or fully understand her meanings and suggestions.

While she is astute enough to realize her wider experience enables her to have a more comprehensive understanding of the possibilities and meaning in student works, it nontheless does not stop her from being disappointed with the students' level of visual awareness. She has not come to terms with their lack of experience in comparison to hers. The constituted meaning which arises from her accumulated experience necessarily enables her to ascertain a works contents, determine its limitations and potentialities, and clearly project into it a variety of possible future directions.

From their perspective, the students are at the leading edge of their experience. This very exercise, the experimental painting, is a new experience for them. As their works develop and images become clarified, the meanings they attribute to the images in their works are in the process of being formulated. While they draw upon past

experiences during this project, the lived-experience of the project itself constitutes an important part of their experience of viewing and depicting objects. What they are beginning to realize is that non-imaginative objects are more accurately and authentically represented after they are experienced. All the students have met with a degree of success in their representations of skies, for they all have sedimented memories and experiences of skies, although skies probably have not previously been made the objects of attention that they have become in this project.

The aim of accurate representation of objects in student works other than skies depends upon past experiences of those objects. When the students' experience of oceans, boats, mountains, etc., are still in the evolutionary stage--in phenomenological language still being constituted within experience--their representations of these objects will always fall short of the expectations of others like Miss Fowler who have had previous experience of similar objects. She inevitably views their efforts from her experienced point of view, and unless she can make an effort to understand their emerging awareness, she will always be disappointed with images which do not measure up to those she has internalized through past experience.

Because the students have no experience of an experimental method of generating images, it ought not to be surprising to Miss Fowler that they are unable to complete the works as she thinks they can be completed.

Their understanding of the elements depicted in their works; rain, wind, storms, oceans, trees, even skies, have been experienced at a level of awareness and understanding different from that of their teacher. A student from this class or an adolescent the same age, outside on a windy, rainy day tends not to observe what occurs during such occasions in the same detached, contemplative manner in which Miss Fowler clearly does. It also helps that she has attempted to externalize these observations in her own art, for this gives her an insight into the process the students are going through.

While having experience with her own art helps in one way, it can hinder her understanding of her students in another. Her own artistic endeavors are experienced from the point of view of a visual sophisticate; a person who is highly attuned to her surroundings. Her disappointment with the students' works up to this point in the experience reveals that she expects to see similar visual experiences echoed in the students' efforts. When, in her view, they display gross inadequacies, she is perceiving their efforts from her perspective. It is only after five hour-long lessons that she says she begins to realize that the visual experience and abilities of the students are vastly different from her own. On Day Six, she returns to pure experimentation which, she feels, may be the solution to enable the students to become more aware of possibilities within their work.

This lesson begins with Miss Fowler giving demonstrations of a variety of tools and techniques which may be used to achieve desired effects. She emphasizes different tools, such as crumpled paper for rock effects, a flexible piece of cardboard for a sailboat effect, a twig to produce the effect of a tree, and so on. The students respond by being attentive and interested during the demonstration.

The following conversation Miss Fowler and I had after the lesson on Day Six provides further insight as to how she perceives the experience up to this point:

Teacher: (to researcher) I'm really insisting on the artistic process. You just can't take a piece of paper and you create instantly, there's a lot of trial and error, there's a lot of going back to your work and saying I have to reconsider this, and this, you have to make decisions about this. I have to chuck it out, it's no good er . . . you know?

Researcher: So would you say you are trying to make these decisions for the students?

Teacher: I almost have to for them. So they realize.

Researcher: You said you were disappointed by the students' works yesterday, can you elaborate on that?

Teacher: (laughs) I thought about it all night. I thought because I had given them that

experience earlier in the year that they would remember and pick it up really quickly and I realized that with young students you have to repeat it and repeat it. It just doesn't come instantly. They revert back to what's the safest. In order to make it a habit with them when they are working, it has to be done more than once. I did it with inks and now I'm doing it with paints.

Researcher: How long did they spend the previous time on this kind of thing?

Teacher: About a week and a half.

Researcher: How long ago was that?

Teacher: A month and a half, two months ago. So it's a matter of repeating it. So if we did collage then we would have to experiment the same way using different collage materials. Everything has to be ... . at that stage I believe it all has to be experimentation.

Researcher: Do you think they understood when you made that point about the experimentation for the background, the sky etc.? Do you think when they started to change it into a picture they reverted back?

Teacher: I didn't elaborate on that.

Researcher: Do you think they understood your point? Do you think they are going to understand what you are getting at here?

Teacher: Maybe after they are finished, not now. Perhaps once they are finished.

Researcher: So they have to go through the experience first?

Teacher: Yes.

It seems for Miss Fowler, experimentation and repetition are the twin key elements the students must experience in order to understand what she is attempting to teach. Experimentation for her is having and keeping an open mind and being willing to follow visual "accidents" and clues. It is beginning without a fixed idea, and allowing the developing painting itself provide a direction and even suggest a subject matter. Repetition for her is the determination and persistence to continue along the same lines so that the desired, the experimental, the unexpected may result. By adopting this attitude she believes the students may understand her conception of the project. Or, put another way, that they may share in her understanding of what experimentation means.

The Students Understanding of and Reaction to the New Direction

The next question needing an answer now becomes: Are the students able to understand the experience in a similar manner to Miss Fowler? The aspect of trial and error

within an experience seems to be an element fairly easily grasped by the students. However, as I have noted previously, when images appear in their works trial and error are put aside as effort is directed toward completing the imagery. Trial and error, or experimentation, seems to take the students only up to the development of an image, at which point they accept their effort and attempt to consolidate their images.

Up to this point the teacher has communicated conflicting messages concerning the direction of the project. The direction being followed so far is the experimental one, the other, mentioned once by Miss Fowler, is the outside observation sketching direction. For the moment she has renewed the experimental direction.

Concerning the students' understanding of the experience, the question could be formulated this way: While much time is devoted to discussing the students' works, what is the students' understanding of these discussions? Generally, one would assume the students understand what is discussed and to a certain extent how others see and understand their work. This is based upon my observation that after each discussion the students eagerly resume their paintings with seeming renewed energy and vigor. It seems the verbal discussion of the images in their works motivates them to continue exploring and refining these images. In this example I will concentrate

upon one student, David, and his response to a class discussion concerning his work.

Along with other students' work, two paintings by David were discussed on Day Seven. One of David's paintings depicted a traditional sky and birds. The other, more experimental and upon which the discussion centers, has a horizontal blue mass in the middle of the work and green-blue masses above and below. The color was applied with a roller. After the work was turned upside down, a number of students began to "see" a variety of things in the painting: a submarine, a lake, reflections in water even an Indian reservation and teepees. The teepees were Sabrina's observation.

Following this display and discussion, I talked to David in order to better understand his reaction to the discussion of his painting. The following conversation seems to run counter to my stated assumption that the students understand discussions of the images in their works:

Researcher: (To David) When you viewed your work from a distance, after the class had talked about it, can you tell me what you saw?

David: I'm sorry to say no.

Researcher: No? When other people were talking about your work couldn't you see what they said they saw, when they said the lake looked like something else?

David: Well, all I saw was maybe little tents.

Researcher: Little tents, teepees?

David: Yes, that was all I could see.

Researcher: What are you going to do with it now?

David: I'm probably going to form tents, and like, make water here, kinda.

Researcher: Anything else?

David: Then probably make clouds or something.

Researcher: O.K. We will see how it turns out.

David seemed hesitant during this conversation, as though he was not sure how to respond to my questions. He had picked up on the teepee or tent suggestion and told me he did not "see" any of the other visual suggestions: submarine, lake and reflections in water. Out of the four suggestions for projection concerning his painting David was able to "see" only one. David's response must affect my assumptions regarding the students' understanding of these discussions about their work. When visual suggestions were made concerning projected variations and alternatives in certain paintings, I assumed because I "saw" these variations, the students did also. I had simply assumed that the communicated meanings were understood by all. What my conversation with David reveals is that I continue to hold assumptions regarding various levels of student understanding, despite my efforts to the contrary. A deceptively simple piece of phenomenological evidence surfaces here, specifically: Despite seemingly

unanimous agreement among students when a visual suggestion for projection is made regarding a work, not all students "see" or understand the suggestion in the same way. This is just one way the students' perception and understanding of the event differs from mine as well as the teacher's.

The Teacher's Interactions with Individual Students

Thus far I have concentrated upon the teacher's interaction with the class. What of her interactions with individuals? While I would expect some differences, perhaps a more personal tone when talking to an individual than when addressing the class, I can be on the lookout for consistency. During these exchanges during which the students have more opportunity to respond to the teacher on an individual level, can these responses reveal significances regarding their views and understanding of the experience?

In the following example the teacher is talking to Domenique at the beginning of the lesson on Day Eight. Domenique's painting at this stage shows an effective moody, grey, cloudy sky, with a few small trees shown on an area of land at the bottom. The sky domihates the work. Miss Fowler points out to Domenique one of the reproductions on the wall, Kirchener's "Forest with Brook", which shows a brook, large trees in the foreground behind which is a dark forbidding looking forest. The teacher

talks about mood and how the trees looming large in the foreground create a feeling of closeness:

Teacher: If you wanted to give a scary, eerie feeling in your painting, how could you do it using basically the same idea as Kirchener did? What would you do, what's missing in your picture?

Domenique: More trees.

Teacher: Same size of trees?

Domenique: No, smaller trees.

Teacher: Smaller trees?

Domenique: No, bigger trees.

There is certainly more scope for individual response during these conversations. In this case Domenique reveals something which is not obvious during more general class discussions: a willingness to accommodate the teacher's suggestions. In phenomenological terms Domenique is not attempting to share in a communication of meaning about her work. Neither is she simply being open to the teacher's suggestions. Domenique is either unable to articulate a response, genuinely does not know how her work could be changed, or she seems overly willing to acquiesce to any suggestion the teacher may make. All of these possibilities remain plausible.

From the teacher's viewpoint, she is being quite consistent with her general discussions with the class as a whole. In this case her suggestions are tailor-made for

the individual and possible direction of the work. It is similar to the kind of suggested direction she uses in group discussions. During these individual exchanges, however, there is more opportunity to judge the student's response, more scope whereby suggestions may be modified to fit the student's work. In this conversation with Domenique, Miss Fowler expands her recommendation of foreground trees, yet leaves it up to Domenique whether or not she makes use of the advice.

In phenomenological terms Miss Fowler offers her interpretation of constituted meaning, based upon her visual and personal experience. She has seen a variety of trees and forests, as well as many artists' interpretations through a myriad of artistic mediums, of how these trees and forests may be depicted. She is attuned to how an artist may do this, what kind of thinking, vision and skill this requires, and in this conversation attempts to share this experience and knowledge with Domenique. This is a small example of what Miss Fowler endeavors to accomplish throughout these lessons; namely, to share her knowledge and experience of art, artists and artistic methods with the students so they may begin to experience this knowledge expansion for themselves. Generally, during these individual conversations, Miss Fowler is being quite consistent in her discussions and instructions as she is in her discussions with the class as a whole.

In another conversation with an individual student on Day Eight, Susan, in this case, the teacher's views regarding the students' lack of experience hindering their development of images is reinforced. Susan's painting at this stage depicts a pale blue sky, a darker blue sea with a number of sailboats which Miss Fowler says look rigid and too upright.

Teacher: Is it calm here, or is it windy? These are sailboats I assume.

Susan: Yes.

Teacher: In order to sail do you need wind? Can you sail without wind?

Susan: I've never been sailing.

Teacher: Have you been to the ocean?

Susan: No.

Teacher: You've never seen the ocean in your life? (Laughs) You can't relate to this if you have never been to the ocean. Is this how you imagine it is?

Susan: Yes. (Laughs) Well, I've seen pictures of it.

Teacher: You've seen pictures? O.K.

This conversation with Susan supports Miss Fowler's view that it is the students' lack of experience which hinders their visual and artistic development. It is this view, more than any other Miss Fowler repeats to me following the students' departure at the end of the class. As she views their efforts, or in this case talks to Susan,

she becomes convinced that this lack of experience is the most important factor to overcome if the students are to experience visual development. She sees this experimental exercise as one of the necessary steps the students need to go through in order to overcome this lack of experience and awareness. Thus, in her view, this experimental experience becomes an important and necessary component needed to broaden the students' general awareness and artistic development.

The Outside Sketching Segment of the Lessons

On Day Seven Miss Fowler shares a thought with me regarding the final direction of the experience.

Teacher: (To researcher) This could go on forever and ever. I will have to put an end to it because it seems like it's an ongoing experience and we may never end up with a painting. They (the students) may end up with an experience, however.

In this I recognize echoes of the earlier process-product discussion. Miss Fowler remains quite consistent. The solution to the problem becomes apparent on Day Nine when the students are instructed to go outside and sketch buildings on top of one of their sky experiments. In the frenzy of activity which follows the directions to go outside and sketch, I see a new element encroaching upon the experience, one of a kinetic nature.

Thus far, the students have been restricted to the physical classroom for eight lessons. They are now free to move outside into the brightness and warmth of the spring sunshine. The act of gathering a suitable background, a drawing board and variety of materials adds a new level of bodily movement unseen up to this point. Of course students moved around during previous lessons, but it was a movement restricted to the classroom, and often confined to a particular stool and desk within the room. Now something new is happening. Movements are quicker and there is an air of urgency and excitement about them. Leaving the relatively dark school and entering the bright, breezy, noisy outdoors adds new spatial elements to the experience.

Outside the school building the students not only move around, they must move around in order to find a suitable subject to superimpose on to one of their skies. There are no stools or desks outside, the students continue to move around in order to find something upon which to lean or sit while they sketch.

This outside environment is, of course, familiar to the students, but not as part of an art class and not in this particular way where it provides subject matter for their work. They enter this familiar outside school environment and bring with them equally familiar aims, but aims usually associated with the inside of school. They have probably not considered these two environments together in quite the same way before. The interior

of school is usually reserved for school concerns, and the school door is usually where these inside concerns end. Being outside of school in the morning, at recess, lunchtime, or at the end of the school day means different things to the students at different times. The two environments tend to be separate, each imbued with its own meaning. The outside of school is visually searched and inspected in order that part of it may become integrated with a pressing inside school concern: the completion of an art assignment.

Described phenomenologically, the kinetic nature of the students' activity might take the following format. (I shall use first person singular, present tense, in order to convey something of the immediacy of the event-as-lived.)

The students and I are outside. All the experiences of the recent lessons are fresh in my mind. The working and re-working of the experiment, the students being and remaining open to visual suggestions and the accumulation of a number of experimental beginnings. Now, here outside the school building everything looks and feels different. Somehow, the students sound brighter and fresher in the sunlight. Movements are different to classroom movements. As we all leave the classroom and come outside, movements seem energetic and enthusiastic as the students begin to search for something suitable to sketch. Yet upon closer observation, I realize this initial bustle of activity is linked to the act of leaving the school building. Once the

immediacy of the bright, breezy outside world becomes apparent, the initial frenzy of movement gives way to what seems like serious visual examination. Each student looks from houses, to trees, to large buildings, to the street itself in an effort to select appropriate imagery for their sky background.

With squeals and shrieks two students sit on steps which lead to a front door of a house and begin to sketch the view across the street. Others cross over the street and walk up and down the sidewalk while looking back at the side they had just left.

One student, Gillian, settles down on the grass in front of a tree which resembles one in her painting, and begins to sketch what she sees beyond the street tree. I watch her as she sketches. She tells me that this tree matches the one she began inside. She sketches the buildings she sees beyond this tree. As I continue to watch her work develop I see changes occurring. Gillian tells me she is "changing" the buildings and is not representing them exactly as they look to her from her position behind the tree. As more buildings are added, her work changes from the country scene she began in the classroom to a city scene which I begin to recognize behind this centrally placed large tree. She agrees with me that her country scene with tree has begun to take on the appearance of a city scene. The immediacy of this stimulating outside world seemed to change the direction of

Gillian's initial thought. The change was readily made. There seemed to be no hesitation on her part, excepting the time it took her to actually find a suitable tree here outside. Once the appropriate tree was discovered, the background of buildings immediately behind the tree turned out to be suitable suggestive material which enabled her to complete the work. That the work changed from a country scene to a city scene seemed not to matter, as though she were not committed to the initial direction of the work.

Considering the students' act of leaving the inside of school to sketch outside, I am reminded of artists moving from one environment to another with the resulting work undergoing profound change. After Vincent Van Gogh left the relatively dull surroundings of Paris and began painting in and around Arles in the south of France, he began to use considerably brighter colors in his works. Or, when Paul Gauguin left Paris and began painting the simple yet exotic life the natives led on the South Sea island of Tahiti. In both of these examples one environment was exchanged for another. And, in both cases, the new environment with brighter light, different surroundings, propelled the artists to produce bright, provocative yet innovative work.

Considering this example of artists changing environments, and the change having a profound impact on their work, it becomes appropriate to compare the students response to the change in their surroundings.

Can the students make the transition from one phase to the other, and how might this change affect their work? In the following I talk to Sabrina as she sketches:

Researcher: (To Sabrina) Tell me what you are doing here?

Sabrina: O.K. I have . . . er, it's a very sunny day but my picture is totally different. I have a rainstorm, and I'm sitting across the street from these two buildings that I am drawing, these old houses.

Researcher: Yes.

Sabrina: And I think it fits in with my picture because they look grey and drab.

Researcher: Where are you going to put these houses in your picture?

Sabrina: I am putting my houses just a little bit higher than the sidewalk, just like in the front of my picture.

Researcher: So that's about one-third from the bottom edge?

Sabrina: Less than that, a little less than that.

Researcher: So you have no problem understanding what you are supposed to be doing?

Sabrina: No.

While Sabrina's efforts do not mesh exactly with the Van Gogh/Gauguin example, she appears to have little difficulty adjusting from the inside to the outside environment. It seems a little incongruous that she

chooses to depict a rainstorm on a sunny day. Yet, she makes use of the outside environment, and selects elements which fit her initial conception begun in the classroom.

By way of contrast to Sabrina, Gillian also displays an ease in adjusting, although in a different manner, as she searched for a tree which matched the one she had begun previously in the classroom. Unlike Sabrina, Gillian accepts what she finds outside, and the discovered tree becomes the focal point for the outside portion of her work. Kathy also adjusts easily to the outside and turns a sunny view of the mountain into a night scene to match the color of her sky beginning. David remains with his initial beach scene, and to it adds cars he sees on the street before him.

While the experience of working outside seems at first totally different to the inside experience, the students seem to make the adjustment easily. I did not observe anyone having obvious difficulty making the transition from a "studio" artist to one of a "plein air" nature. In terms of the constitution of meaning within the experience, from the students' viewpoint, this phase presented little in the way of difficulty. The students took the two seemingly disparate experiences and dovetailed them harmoniously to suit the individual needs of their works.

Up to this point the experimental sky phase had meant a certain type of thinking and working along the lines of trial and error and repeating experimental beginnings in a

variety of ways. Being outside presented an opportunity to cease experimenting and to finalize the effort by adding something concrete on top of an experimental sky. The students' inclination toward the noematic or product aspect of the project was able to be realized. Everyone eagerly sought out elements from the surrounding outside environment which would allow them to complement as well as complete their earlier beginnings. It also seemed to matter little whether this environment they discovered outside matched their previous starts. They displayed great malleability and adapted seemingly incongruous beginnings to this sunny outside world very easily. This sunny day became rainy, night, foggy or overcast; this urban street was transformed into country, beach, forest, mountain or city. For the students the meaning of one situation merged effectively or ineffectively into the meaning of another.

While there was no overt difficulty adjusting to the outdoors, were there advantages? The following conversation with Sheila on Day Ten provides an answer:

Researcher: What do you think of the technique of doing a drawing on top of a painting?

Sheila: I like it. It comes out like . . . it's better to draw a building over a painted paper because the window sort of look like it's reflected from the sky and if you draw it on a blank sheet it won't come out the same.

Researcher: Did you notice that while you were drawing outside yesterday?

Sheila: Yes, I noticed that yesterday.

Researcher: Are you happy with it so far?

Sheila: Yes.

Sheila's work at this stage depicted a green shape which could be a hill or mountain on a pale blue background. Using wax crayons she had sketched buildings which looked as though they were behind the green shape. None of her lines were straight, neither vertical nor horizontal. Clearly, Sheila had no difficulty adapting her classroom-produced sky to the outside-sketching segment of the lesson. The two different environments, inside and outside of the school building, presented no problems for Sheila. The outside sketching portion of the lesson becomes completely incorporated when the sky color is purposely left for a reflected glass effect in the sketched building.

Back in the Classroom: The Final Segment

After watching the students work outside I had assumed that the outside environment acted as a powerful suggestive force enabling the students to easily choose elements from this environment to add to their skies. This was true for all the students I had talked with up to this point. On Day Eleven, however, one day after being outside, I spoke with Sabrina in the classroom as she was completing her

work. At the time of the conversation Sabrina was adding a swing to a park which she had positioned beside older houses which she had sketched after seeing them outside. She had added rain as well as people with umbrellas to suit the mood of her cloudy sky beginning.

Researcher: Can you tell me something about the overall effect of your work, are you happy with it?

Sabrina: Yes, I'm happy. I did a lot of skies but I didn't expect to pick this one to do my picture out of because it was the one I did the quickest.

Researcher: Then why did you pick this sky?

Sabrina: Because as soon as I saw it I had the idea in mind what scenery to put on it because I pictured the buildings in front of the school.

Researcher: Did you picture the buildings before you did the sky, or as you were doing it?

Sabrina: After I did the sky when the teacher said "Pick one of your skies and go outside", I knew which one I was going to pick because I pictured my sky and the buildings together and it looked good.

Researcher: So you had this particular scene in mind?

Sabrina: Yes, and it turned out the way I wanted it to.

Researcher: When you went outside sketching, did the buildings suggest something to you?

Sabrina: Well, they suggested the gloomy and dark mood because they are very old and very dark and that's what I needed for my picture.

Researcher: So did you look for buildings that fit the idea you had?

Sabrina: Yes, I did.

Researcher: O.K. Thanks.

Sabrina's image development runs counter to all the other students. With everyone else, the outside environment with its powerful immediacy provided or suggested the images which enabled the students to complete their works. In Sabrina's case, the initial sky dictated the mood of the work. Once this mood was established Sabrina remembered buildings outside near the school which suited this gloomy overcast mood suggested by her sky. She related to me that it was the teacher's instruction to "pick one of your skies" which triggered her imagination and enabled her to put the sky and remembered buildings together. The constituted meaning of the painting was clarified in an instant for Sabrina. She integrated two separate elements in her mind, then once outside, set about completing the imagined image, using the old buildings she remembered being on the street.

The last lesson on Day Twelve consisted of a wide-ranging discussion centering upon the experimental exercise and the students' paintings which were displayed on the wall. The display and discussion represents the final

segment of the experience from both the teacher's and students' perspective. The students had ended the experience with at least one completed work, a number of students had more than one work in the display. They had gone through various stages of pure experimentation, including at least one outside sketching experience and one lesson which followed that experience, enabling them to integrate and complete the sketch and finalize the work.

Seen in phenomenological terms the paintings were utilized in the discussion in order to remember and focus upon the experience which produced them. The discussion can be understood as a concentrated focussing upon experience. The paintings, or objects of attention, function as resulting artistic evidence of sedimented memories of various layered experiences which have evolved over time. Phenomenologically, for the students the paintings act as a direct and accessible link to the stored memories which constitute the lived experience. The completed works serve to evoke memories of the experience of the experimental beginning, the false starts, and the thoughts and discussions about skies. Superimposed upon the memories of these earlier experiences are the forceful images produced by the outside sketch and the memories associated with that experience.

These memories become accessible to me as phenomenological researcher when I examine the participants' verbal interactions as they viewed the

display. These verbal interactions, available via the transcribed dialogue, act as an "evidence" which can reveal the participants' present and past consciousness. What the participants say during a viewing of the display reveals more than their present perception and understanding of objects or events of experience. Because Miss Fowler has had more past experiences upon which to draw and compare to the present, her comments can be especially revealing. What she says is only a part of what she means. When she gives her opinion about a painting, an analysis of this present opinion can uncover sedimented past opinions, upon which her current educational beliefs and values are based. I believe the following extract from the transcribed dialogue supports this assertion.

The discussion has centered upon last year's art class which did not have Miss Fowler as a teacher. The students state that they felt they had to "conform", and that there was a "right" way to draw and represent objects. Gillian recounts how last year's teacher showed the class how a tree should be drawn. Miss Fowler replies:

> I showed you how to do the technique itself, make colors transparent, mix colors directly on the paper and I left it there. The rest was up to you . . . your own ideas. I cannot tell you how to do it. I can only explain a technique to you. . . . There are no mistakes in art, you can't go wrong in art.

> There are as many kinds of trees as there are different kinds of artists. Its not like mathemetics where, if you don't get the right answer, you've got it wrong.

While Miss Fowler's observations are directed to the students and refer to the current project, I believe they represent a surface layer of meaning, which, when analyzed, can contribute to a more profound understanding having implications beyond this particular situation. These observations reveal what she believes to be her purpose as an art teacher i.e., someone who acts, not as a prototypical model for imitation, but rather as a catalyst disseminating technique and image information. This type of art teacher can show the students techniques, but the individuality of student images is paramount and is to be respected and encouraged. If the project culminates in a wide variety of images (such as the present situtation) the more successful this type of teacher has been. Conformist or stereotypical images, on the other hand, would indicate a lack of success.

From the students' viewpoint while they were working on their paintings, either in the classroom or outside, they were primarily aware of their own work. As an added, although peripheral awareness, they worked near each other and were therefore aware of other works to varying degrees. Part of the experience of their own work is the memory of others working alongside them.

The display itself presents a new dimension to this thought. Not only were the students confronted with their own work or works, but also with the works of everyone else in the class. Some students were aware of some of these other works, especially those produced by students with whom they worked in close proximity during the lesson. Other works were new to them. A new element was added to the experience of viewing the display: one of comparison.

The paintings displayed on the wall tended to formalize the students' viewing of the work. There is also a matter of scale. When a painting is developing, the student is usually an arm's length or less away from the work's surface. There are times during the development of any work when a student purposely views his/her work from a distance. This is usually done to judge the effect of a particular part of the work, for example, "How does this cloud or tree look from a little further back?" But for the most part, a student is familiar with his/her work from an intimate distance, one where practically the entire visual field is filled by the work. Don Ihde's (1979) core-field-horizon description of vision comes to mind here. When the visual field is filled with an object, especially an object upon which one is concentrating, it is difficult to think of much else as thoughts tend to also be filled with the object. The painting acts as a vehicle for the imagination, or more precisely, the student through the act of painting, makes the painting act as a vehicle for

the imagination. What can be imagined can be integrated into the evolving painting, with varying degrees of success. In this way, the paintings served as sedimented evidence of imagining, which was bound up in the context of the experience.

When the total display was viewed, a student saw his/her own familiar work alongside all the others. For the first time during the whole experience, a formal comparison was made. The field of vision was filled with many paintings, not only one. Owing to the distance from which they were viewed, the visual impact an individual painting had tended to be lessened. Also, no matter which work was focussed upon, there was always a co-awareness of other works. None could be seen in isolation in the display. The display itself filled the visual field, and once this field was established, the act of comparison began.

It was this act of comparing the paintings which shaped the discussion during the final lesson. Not only were student works compared to other student works, but they were also compared to the reproductions of artists' works, which had still remained in position on another wall since the first lesson. Throughout the comparison discussion, there was agreement that students worked as artists worked, and that there were legitimate areas for comparison.

This sense of comparison can be understood phenomenologically as arising from the students' understanding of type. The works they produced belonged to the same type as the reproductions on the other wall of the room. They can all be designated paintings. Before the students began this painting, or even the first one they produced in a school, they knew what a painting was. It was easily understood as a specific type of object. When they began producing their own paintings, it was understood as belonging to a type of object already known to them. In phenomenological terms, before this painting exercise began, the students apperceived their future actions as belonging to those types of actions which produce paintings. This was not a conscious thought, but part of an apprehension of an object understood beforehand. The students need not have known individual paintings or artists, but they did understand the genus. When they painted, they felt they were doing what artists did. Because Miss Fowler had emphasised that experimentation was part of the artistic process, the students felt that they had taken part in an artistic experience, and as a consequence they had a legitimate right to compare their works to those of artists.

The experience of producing these works was fresh in the minds of the students. The trials and tribulations which contributed to the totality of the experience were represented in their works. When the reproductions were

viewed, and comparisons made between students' and artists' work, the students, correctly or incorrectly assumed that the experience they had lived through in producing their work was similar to the experience an artist has when producing work. From the standpoint of this study, it remains unimportant whether or not students and artists have similar experiences when producing their work. What is important here is that the students felt they could genuinely compare their work to that of professional artists. This act of comparison gives an indication of how deeply the students understood and felt about the experience they had lived through.

If the students felt as though they could compare their works to those of artists, it would follow that they felt they made use of artistic devices while working. The following extract from Day Twelve is revealing in that regard:

David: Miss, when I used a piece of pastel on my paper and started to brush it, it gave me the idea to crush pastel dust and use it just like that. Then Sheila was just, she extended it more, she used it on top of her paper and it comes out fresh like.

Teacher: So, you were learning from each other in a way?

David: Yes.

Teacher: O.K. You are picking things up from each other. All artists do that. It happened to you and it's a good healthy habit too. You know, you feed off each other and each other's ideas and you look at what another person is doing.

While David reported what happened when he and Sheila were working, it was Miss Fowler who made the point about artistic exchange. This tends to be representative of the times in the discussion when the subject of artists arises. Miss Fowler was inclined to initiate the student-artist comparison, a comparison the students began to include in the discussion independent of their teacher's observations. In other words, the idea the students came to have during this day's discussion, that their work was similar to artists' work, and that both works could be compared, can be traced back to Miss Fowler. Her belief became the students' belief.

Although the discussion during this last lesson was wide ranging, comparisons between students' works tended to dominate. In the comparison discussion a number of issues arose. Miss Fowler returned to the theme of feelings and directed the students' attention to how certain works evoked certain feelings. Everyone taking part in the discussion agreed that feelings were aroused by these works, and that even the "mood" of a work can be altered by such things as materials and colors. The act of

experimentation, it was agreed, not only challenged the class, but instilled in the students elements of freedom. They did not feel restricted by subject-matter, as they often did during projects which remained on a strict topic. The sky theme was seen as an effective starting point and as such allowed the students leeway to complete their works according to their interests or imagination. It was observed that all the works in the display looked different, and this difference only emphasized the individuality of each student. The teacher pointed out that people discover their own way of expressing themselves, and that this project offered an effective vehicle for this expression. The final outcome of the artist-student comparison was summed up by Maria who observed that student works were the works of "young artists".

An issue raised during this discussion provided some insights into the students' perception of value in art. David initiates this discussion when he asks the following question:

David: Miss are you going to sell them?

Teacher: Sell them? Remember I asked you if you were going to go out and buy a painting, how would you choose? And remember, "match the bedroom", "match the walls", there were answers like that. Money. Now if you were going to go out and buy a painting after this

last experience, how would you choose your painting? What difference does it make now since you have experienced painting? Yes?

Sabrina: I wouldn't look at the picture itself, I would look deeper into the picture and see what kind of feelings I get from it and if I would want that in my house.

Teacher: Because you have to live with it eh? Because if you choose a painting just because it goes with your walls, what happens when you repaint your walls? (laughter) Then it won't be right for your room anymore. But if you really like a picture when you first buy it, I have had that experience, you like a picture, you can't really know why but you buy it. Sometimes two or three years later you start seeing things in it that you have never seen before, then it starts to grow with you and grow and grow deeper and deeper, and you start seeing more meaning in it. I don't know if it's because you are changing or whatever is happening, but you are living with this painting and you are starting to enjoy it, you see things into it, read more into it. Anybody else have a reason for choosing a painting which is different to what they thought before? You still would go out and buy it because it matches the room?

Maria: For the mood.

Teacher: Yes. What kind of mood painting would you buy today?

Maria: Like you would have like a cheery painting, of, you know, a toddler. (laughs)

Teacher: (laughs) Yes.

David's question unearths perceptions he and the students hold regarding value and art works. Whenever these perceptions are externalized, art works are invariably seen as value laden. This value seems to apply to their own art works and especially those of established artists. David's question reveals perceptions which equate a monetary value with the displayed works. These perceptions evolve from a social context. The genetic aspect of phenomenology is apparent within this social context, as the social context is inevitably a historical context. David's question reveals a social and historical view of art works which antecedes his emerging understanding. The ready-made world into which David was born contained art works and commonly held opinions of them. These works were perceived as incorporating tangible representative manifestations of societal and monetary value by those members of society who came into contact with art works. By contact, I refer not only to artists and those associated with the "art world", dealers, collectors, etc., but those in society who actively visit galleries and museums where art works are exhibited. I

also refer to those who choose art objects to display in their homes, and those who non-purposefully come into contact with art works i.e., a reproduction displayed in a social or business environment which registers only on the periphery of awareness. When viewed from a genetic phenomenological perspective this all contributes to a collective awareness of the social and historical context which informs present individual opinion.

In this discussion, however, Miss Fowler deflects the monetary value usually associated with the sale of a work, to other values associated with a work's acquisition. She recounts an earlier discussion during which the students related they would buy an art work to match their color scheme at home. She then asks if the experience of this experimental painting and the discussions of the works changed these thoughts. The students' answers reveal a change in attitude: no longer would they choose a work for its compatibility with their domestic color preferences. Sabrina would look beyond the picture surface, to a "deeper" level, to discover what "feelings" the work may arouse in her. Maria states she would acquire a work for its "mood". With these subjective qualities of "feelings" and "mood", these two students are expressing that they have moved away from acquiring a painting-as-object, to somehow blend in with their surroundings. Following this experience, they now would seek to discover more subjective qualities in a work, qualities which lend themselves to

long-term association, and which have a deep personal meaning for them. I believe the foregoing serves to indicate that the meaning a work has for them and their reasons for acquiring it have perceptibly altered.

Perceived from a phenomenological viewpoint, the paintings displayed during the final lesson were meaningful in that they served as sedimented layered evidence of the whole experience. The works aided in shaping the last discussion and concentrating it upon the events of the project as lived and understood, prior to the discussion, by the participants. These paintings, according to the students who verbally participated in the discussion, were comparable to works of professional artists. The students understood the experimentation process they had experienced as being an "artistic process", the same one the teacher had emphasized throughout the project. Having undergone this "artistic process", the results of which were the produced paintings, the students felt they had a legitimate right to compare their efforts to the display of artists' reproductions. The display of their work also functioned to draw the students' attention to the efforts of their peers. Most students had little opportunity to be aware of anything but their own endeavors while immersed in work on their own paintings. They also had a value, not necessarily of a monetary nature, but a more subjective value, one which involved deeply felt emotions. Furthermore, the value associated with these student works

also helped shape their awareness of value in other art works.

Evidence

Any understanding of the participants' experience at which I, as a phenomenological inquirer, can arrive must be verified through the concept of evidence. As indicated during the discussion on evidence in chapter 4, when empty intentions achieve a degree of fulfilled meaning, the resulting conformity between the two represents evidence. When the students listen to their teacher's explanation of the experimental process, without understanding the process, their intentions remain empty; therefore there is no evidence. It is only when they experience experimentation for themselves that they come to an understanding of their teacher's meaning regarding the process. Their intentions become filled through their own efforts to resolve problems posed by initial visual suggestions, and they begin to reach an understanding of the nature and meaning of experimentation.

What is interesting about the activities in an art class when considered with the concept of evidence in mind, is that the emerging works can be viewed as a visual metaphor for evidence. Put another way, the emerging works not only depict images and potential images, but evidence and the possibility of more evidence.

I will use empty-filled intentions as an example once more, and reflect back upon the beginning of the experimental process on Day 2. The students at this stage had begun to experiment with transparent painting techniques as their teacher had instructed the previous lesson. The experimenting quickly resulted in stereotypical images. The students had not understood their teacher's meaning, and, because of this lack of understanding, they reverted to previous knowledge and previous experiences which had resulted in stereotypical imagery. Their intentions remained empty, there was no evidence of filled intentions in the works or in their understanding of experimentation. Through the experimental procedure of trial and error of subsequent lessons, and through the emerging images, intentions became filled and a visual indication of evidence began to emerge. The students, verbally and visually, displayed an understanding of experimentation and the resulting images reflected this understanding.

Questioning students and listening to their verbal accounts is one way of verifying that the experimental process had been understood. In the art class, however, especially when images develop during the lesson, the depicted results provide a visual evidence of an unfolding understanding of the meaning of experimentation. During the lesson images are in a state of flux as they are modified through a process of trial and error. The

reliance on stereotypes of past imagery dissipates as intentions regarding the meaning of experimentation become filled, and, as students begin to realize the variety and possibility of images produced by "accident", through the experimental process. For some students the process was a revelation which was externalized (evidenced) in their "surprising", "accidental" experimental images.

The following extract from the dialogue on Day 7 provides an insight into David's view of the experimental process. His painting at this stage depicts a central mass of color which seems to recede and take on the appearance of mountains set against a blue and white sky.

Researcher: (To David) Can you tell me about your painting?

David: Well, by mistake I put a red dot in the middle of the page, then I took the roller and made a half circle with it. I didn't really like it so I put some white around it. By mistake the white mixed up with the red and turned pink, so I tried adding more color to it. I put blue on top of it. Then I gazed at it for a couple of minutes and I saw some mountains kind of. So then I added some black and here I am.

Researcher: Do you like that effect?

David: Yes.

Researcher: The effect is interesting when you have accidents like that, do you agree?

David: Yes, yes I do.

David's account emphasizes the accidental nature of the experimental process from his viewpoint. Whatever his intention when he began was interrupted by the red paint he added, which set him off into an experimental process. His verbal account indicates the "accidental" or "suprising" nature of an experimental work where he allowed the unfolding image to dictate the work's direction. The work itself provides a visual testimony which conforms with his verbal account. Mountains can be detected in the colored mass and they do seem to recede toward the distance. The painting represents a visual form of evidence which agrees with his verbal account, which in turn externalizes his fulfilled intentions.

In the following extract taken from the dialogue on Day 4, a work by Sabrina forms part of the display being discussed by Miss Fowler and the class. At this stage the incomplete work shows cloud-like objects in various white and grey colors set against a blue background.

David: Miss, look at that one.

Teacher: This one?

David: Yes. It looks like you are in the park and playing ball like on Saturday. We had fun. When we looked at the sky we could see dark clouds like that and a blue sky behind them,

and then you saw like the white clouds behind that, and then like it's all mixed up.

Teacher: It reminds you of that particular sky when you went to play baseball. Was there a storm coming up that day?

David: Yes, it was supposed to rain that day.

Teacher: Who painted it?

Sabrina: Right here!

Teacher: You did! What did you have in mind when you painted it? You just heard David say it reminded him of an experience he had. What were you trying to do?

Sabrina: I was trying to make it look like it is going to rain.

Teacher: It's going to rain? So you must have been very successful then eh? Because David was able to see what you were trying to do. O.K.!

In this case, not only was the experiment successful for Sabrina in the sense that her intention was to create a sky which held the promise of rain, but also it was successful in that the work communicates her intention to others. Sabrina's painting reminds David of a threatening sky he had recently experienced. The painting represents a form of evidence which successfully attests to Sabrina's fulfilled intentions. Through the process of experimentation she intended to create an image of a threatening sky. From the image, others (David in the

example) share in an understanding of Sabrina's meaning and effort. The evidence in this case is both verbal and visual. In addition, the flexibility of the concept of evidence can readily be understood when viewing such a painting, as the work remains incomplete and can be returned to in an effort to finalize the image. Similarly with the concept of evidence, if I may continue with the metaphor, it too can be returned to in efforts directed toward completion and perfection.

A Chapter Recapitulation

This discussion on evidence, the final and arguably the most important of Husserl's phenomenological concepts in the sense that all other concepts directly or indirectly point toward it, brings the sequence of the lessons to a close. Because of the length of the analysis, a summary of significant events is warranted at this stage. In this summary I will review lived events of the experience that lead into the conclusions in the following chapter. In particular, I want to highlight the phenomenological character of this analysis, and reiterate significant revelations.

Changes in the perceived meaning of an art work or an event is significant during any account of experience. It is nonetheless significant from a phenomenological perspective. Inquiries such as the present one are immersed in the search for significance, understanding,

and meaning, and how this arises and becomes constituted within the context of experience.

The students have displayed a change in their perception of art works. This change can be directly attributed to the lived experience of these experimental lessons, as well as to the transfer of belief from the teacher to the students. This change can readily be seen when dialogue extracts are examined, and early dialogue i.e., that which occurs during the first lessons, is compared to later dialogue, especially that which occurs during the last lesson. The students' beliefs, evidenced by their expressed opinions, were more forthright and articulate during the final lessons. These beliefs echo some of their teacher's beliefs concerning the value of art works, reasons for acquiring works and the "process" students or artists undergo when creating a work.

The students were required to make decisions throughout the duration of the experience, from the earliest sky experiments; through material manipulation; continued experiments; the outdoor sketching session; as well as during all the discussions and the lesson devoted to completion. These decisions, influenced in part by the teacher's urgings, helped shape and develop the students' attitudes toward their work and art works in general.

During this analysis, I have attempted to concentrate upon how items, objects, and opinions appear within the context of experience, the relationship among them, while,

at the same time, trying to avoid what seemed to be there. In other words, I made an attempt to focus upon what appeared within the experience, rather than focus upon what in non-phenomenological terms can be described as being undoubtedly there. Throughout the analysis I have strived to retain the experience-oriented nature required by Husserlian phenomenology, one which places lived human experience at the forefront of the inquiry.

I have made a concerted effort to focus upon the experience presented by these lessons, as I held this experience in retention. By holding the experience in retention, aided by transcribed audio tapes, written descriptions and photographs, I was able to describe the experience for the most part in an unfolding present, or a present-just-past. By so doing, I was able to avoid present perception of the experience i.e., what I perceive "now" at this moment of writing. If the experience were not held in retention, inevitably present perception would have infiltrated my concentration upon the lived classroom experience, and influenced my perception of the event. Were this to have occurred, the analysis would have become non-phenomenological in nature.

In my opinion, the outline of the methodological aspects of the analysis about to be reiterated below, not only emphasizes the phenomenological character of this investigation, but also demonstrates the distinctive contribution to understanding afforded by this form of

inquiry. From the students' perspective insight was provided into the concepts of noesis-noema, with noematic elements preferred; meaning of the event, how these meanings are constituted, evolve, and are sometimes misunderstood; and how experimentation leads to an increased awareness and understanding of the artistic process. From the teacher's perspective insight revealed her bias toward noetic aspects of experience; her views and beliefs concerning experimentation; the artistic process; her role as a teacher; her students environmental and artistic awareness, and the meaning the project had for her as an educator.

An important goal was realized by the students during the experience--one of more developed imagery, one they worked towards even during the purely experimental stages. Their noematic or product aspirations were realized, but only after experiencing the noetic or experimental process their teacher insisted upon. The outside sketching segment of the experience propelled the works toward a conclusion, the adjustment from inside to outside the classroom being easily made. From the students' viewpoint there were many advantages to sketching outside in terms of visual stimulation and opportunities to complete imagery. Certain students, finding themselves outside, were heavily influenced by the immediacy of the outside environment, while others selected outside items from memory, before they began their sketch.

The meanings the students attributed to the images in their works were in the process of being formulated during this project. The project itself composed a lived-experience which formed an important part of the way in which they viewed and depicted objects during the event and will exert an influence on future experiences. During their art class last year the students were instructed that there was a "right" way to represent objects, consequently they faithfully copied their teacher's prototypes in order to achieve success. With Miss Fowler, they saw the reverse as being true. Individuality was stressed throughout the project. Techniques were suggested by Miss Fowler, but the type and variety of images produced by the students was left up to them, with variety being encouraged.

The meaning of an art project for the students has changed because of their experience during this project. Because the meaning extracted from this year's art class with Miss Fowler stands in stark contrast to the meaning from last year's class, the students have probably categorized this new meaning as being "true-for-now". I have arrived at this conclusion through the use of intersubjectivity which is using my subjectivity to understand the subjectivity of another, as all subjectivity has the same structure. Judging from my own experience, when meanings change I take a wait-and-see attitude with meanings which eclipse previous ones. I want to see if a meaning remains true over time. While a meaning is in

force it is for me "authentic". It remains unquestioned until future experience, which may contain further possible evidence, provides a new meaning which makes me doubt the authenticity of the previous one.

From the students' point of view, last year's meaning--success being achieved by copying the teacher's examples as accurately as possible--was supplemented by the new meaning carried by Miss Fowler's class this year. When one meaning is turned around so dramatically, the new one has to be internalized to see if it stands up over time and continues to be true when measured against new events of experience. It is this new meaning these students will take with them into future art projects and will be the one they measure the inherent meanings of future experiences against. This is one way meanings are formulated, with their potency and longevity depending upon how they perform against as yet undiscovered meanings concealed within future experience.

My discussions with individual students revealed that not everyone understood everything that was suggested with regard to their displayed work. It would have been an error for me to have assumed that students understood all that was said about their works; yet, it would have been easy to make such an error. During these discussions with individuals, students seemed to understand what had been discussed, then seemed to proceed to integrate verbal suggestions into the work in progress. Further discussion

and questioning, however, revealed to me that the students had not fully understood the original discussion about the work. In terms of the constitution of meaning--how meaning comes about within the context of experience--my further questioning revealed inadequate understanding and misunderstood meaning. It became clear that more of the experience needed to be lived through, or more experiences like this were necessary, before a more comprehensive understanding emerged.

In many ways the experience was an example of the constitution of meaning in progress, coupled with an expansion of horizons. Some students, by their words and actions, displayed a growing artistic understanding. From my point of view as participant in the event, the experience was akin to living through degrees and levels of a dawning of understanding. Sometimes, and in some cases, the emerging understanding was readily apparent, in other cases it became focussed only after much exposure to the transcribed dialogue.

The teacher also realized a goal, namely, that experimentation adds to a student's experience. This experimentation, she discovered, leads toward an increased awareness and understanding on the part of the students, not only of their own experiences, but also works of other students as well as those of professional artists. The experimentation the students experienced, she understood as the necessary trial and error aspect embodied in the

artistic process. Because the students had lived through this process she felt they achieved a greater understanding of the artistic experience. To her, the experimental series of lessons were a step in the necessary broadening of their experiential horizon. She felt they began to display a growing understanding of the process of experimentation, a grasp of why they should remain open to visual and verbal suggestions, and a realization that the first or the easiest solution may not necessarily be the best solution.

The analysis revealed Miss Fowler's beliefs regarding her obligation as an art teacher, namely, to act as a guide for the students, stressing their individuality in image production, encouraging variety and, at the same time, helping them avoid stereotypical images. Based upon her past experiences, her view of objects and events was qualitatively different from that of her students. It was her belief that the students' life-experiences, environmental awareness, artistic awareness and understanding were limited. Because of this belief, she viewed these lessons as necessary yet tentative steps in redressing these perceived limitations. She expressed disappointment when the students seemed unable to share in her depth of understanding regarding visual possibilities in their works. Yet, for her, the project entailed a modification of her understanding of meaning in that she went through a process of attempting to come to terms with

her disappointment. Miss Fowler endeavored to put her wealth of experience in perspective whereby she could come to an understanding of the students emerging awareness of visual qualities in their environment and their art works.

Her noetic interest, or interest in the process of experimentation, was realized. The tenor of the discussion during the last lesson underlined for Miss Fowler the students' blossoming awareness of their surroundings, their own work, as well as the work of professional artists.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

Phenomenological inquiries begin and end with human beings, their experience and view of the world. With humans centrally placed the task of phenomenology is to make their ordinary, common place, interactions a subject for scrutiny. It is precisely this task which has been the primary concern of this research. I believe the following summarizes the unique contribution afforded by a phenomenological methodology to investigations into human interaction:

> It is an important paradox that our normal lives, what we do most often, what we take for granted, are what we examine least . . . the ordinary is full of the extraordinary which we never see until we look. Phenomenology expresses its commitment to understanding by taking experience itself seriously, in the ordinary life world. (Barritt, Beekman, Bleeker, and Mulderij 1983, p. 60)

This study has centered upon that act of "looking" at "ordinary" experience to which Barritt et al., refer. As the investigation into the classroom experience progressed, my taken-for-granted attitude receded and was replaced by one which allowed for a growing understanding of the event.

One aspect of this investigation has been an endeavor to elucidate those features of experience functional in the

production of sense. Rather than discussing phenomenological concepts in isolation, or even as a component within a philosophical position, this research was conducted from the outset with the idea of these concepts being intertwined with the participants' interactions. The raison d'être of this investigation was not only to inquire into human interactions within an art education experience in a phenomenological manner, but to communicate the scope and characteristics of phenomenological concepts as they are bound up within this experience.

It is my conclusion that it is these concepts, their fluid nature and flexible characteristics, which allow for the unique insights into the events of the experience documented throughout this inquiry.

An examination of the teacher's role in this project revealed her thinking concerning student abilities as well her effect on the students. Her insistence on the process of experimentation, which she equated with the artistic process, revealed her noetic or process oriented partiality. In her view, experimentation was a necessary step students needed to undergo in order to overcome a general lack of visual experience and awareness. She believed that if the students went through an experimental process they would come to an understanding of the artistic process, which for her is developing images through trial, error and repetition. When the students' tendency toward

noematic or product elements surfaced, she displayed disappointment. Her disappointment centered in her perception of the students' images as being stereotypical, which she felt displayed their inability to share her depth of understanding with regard to visual possibilities in both their environment and their work. In her view, the students' life experiences were limited, which was the reason they displayed difficulty externalizing ideas, memories, and past experiences.

In phenomenological terms these stereotypical images were the visual evidence of empty intentions. In order to direct these empty intentions toward more fruitful ones, the teacher renewed her commitment to experimentation. When the students began to understand the nature of experimentation, her previously held views of students having limited life-experiences gave way to a new understanding on her part regarding student abilities.

To reach this new understanding and to redirect the students' empty intentions, the teacher went through a process whereby she placed her range of memories and experiences into a perspective from which she viewed the students' memories and emerging experiences. From this perspective the teacher was able to reach an understanding of the students' initially limited awareness of their surroundings and their inability to realize the visual possibilities in their works. Following her renewed

commitment to experimentation she saw fulfilled intentions replace empty ones in the students' visual successes.

Her belief that experimentation adds to students' experience of image development and leads to increased awareness and understanding of their own and peers' works as well as their environment, was confirmed by the students' final works and during the display and discussion which took place during the final lesson. She saw the wide variety of student images as a justification of her insistence on the process of experimentation. Until her encouragement toward completion during the last lessons, the teacher had felt a tension between her insistence on the process of art and the students' seemingly natural predilection toward a product. From her point of view, if she had not emphasized experimentation and insisted on the process, the students would have completed their imagery early and thereby missed out on much of the growth in visual awareness she associated with the process of experimentation.

Her views as to the purpose of an art teacher were revealed during this last discussion. She believes an art teacher should not be the type of educator who hands her students prototypical image models for imitation, but act rather like a catalyst in providing students with technique and image information. She believes an art teacher should act as a guide, one who stresses the individuality of

student images, and one who discourages the students from producing inauthentic or stereotypical images.

The viewpoint of the students matches that of their teacher in many respects. The lessons resulted in their becoming more observant and aware of their environment. They began to notice the sky, its changeability, variety and even its moods. They certainly began to be more aware of clouds, the almost endless variety that clouds can display and, equally important, how to represent skies and clouds with diverse materials.

While their natural tendency leaned toward early completion of a product, or noematic aspects, they began to understand why their teacher insisted upon continued experimentation. For it was only in this way that they would come to experience a range of possibilities within their works, and an understanding of the very nature of experimentation. A curtailing of these many possibilities would have resulted from early completion or a product-oriented exercise.

During the displays and discussions of student work throughout the project, an understanding of the concepts of intentionality and constitution and how they function within experience, allowed for insights into the students' understanding of their works. Even incomplete paintings were imbued with meaning, and the fluid nature of the concepts was exemplified when the students substituted one meaning for another in the same painting. Each meaning had

validity, and each could be replaced by the other, then reversed again.

From the outset of the lessons whenever there were class discussions of the students' paintings or the artists' reproductions, the teacher made comparisons. When the exercise was underway she used comparisons to emphasize or illustrate a point she was making. Taking their cue from the teacher the students began to do the same thing. They made comparisons among the reproductions, among their own works, and eventually between their works and the reproductions. Among the students there was agreement that they had worked as artists work, that their experimentation was an artistic experience. This view was summed up best by Maria during the final discussion when, after comparing their paintings to the artists' reproductions, she remarked that their paintings were the works of "young artists".

While their teacher had usually initiated the student/artist comparison during the lessons, the students began comparing their works to the artists' reproductions independently during the final lesson. The teacher's understanding and meaning of the artistic process came to be shared by the students; her belief became their belief. Their increased awareness and understanding of the artistic process, from their viewpoint within the experience, displays how meaning became constituted, evolved and how it was transferred to them from their teacher.

The changeable nature of meaning, and how one meaning can supersede another became clear during the class discussion of the final lesson. In their art class the previous year the students had been shown prototypes, by another teacher, of the "right" way to depict objects. They had come to believe that successful representation of their previous teacher's examples was the correct way to depict objects. With Miss Fowler's strong emphasis on individuality, experimentation, being open to surprising or accidental directions, and her equally strong emphasis on the avoidance of stereotypical images, the students first doubted, then changed their initial understanding of the meaning of images. Throughout the discussion during the last lesson the students articulated the view that their experience of experimentation enabled them to become aware of variety, individuality and even of future possibilities in their images. They realized that there was not one "right" way to depict an image. Meaning carried from a past experience became reversed due to their involvement with experimental procedures during the current project.

The experimental painting project as a totality constituted the leading edge of experience from the students' viewpoint. Their experiments, image production and discussions, formed an important part of their experience to which they referred when they viewed and depicted objects. The outside sketching portion of the project, with its powerful immediacy, aided the students to

come to a realization that non-imaginative objects were more accurately and authentically represented after they were experienced.

While these conclusions emerge from this particular experience, they need not necessarily be limited to it, because the structure of individual experience contains elements of the universal. While other individuals may operate under different circumstances in other educational settings, the structure of experience with its universal elements is a part of these circumstances and settings. Given this understanding of the nature of universal experience, the conclusions of this research can be of benefit to other educators operating under widely different conditions in a variety of other situations.

Implications for Art Education

The special contribution of this Husserlian phenomenological investigation is that it provides insights into intentional structures and meanings which contribute to form the subjective elements of experience. It is my hope that these insights can have implications for teachers of art. It is also my hope that this study will trigger in art teachers reflections about their own experience in the classroom. Others can join me in questioning and probing the meaning of art education activities through the act of co-meditating upon the significance of their own classroom experience. For I believe a more thorough understanding

of subjective elements of experience can aid art teachers gain insights into intentional structures and meanings operational in their own classrooms.

Another example of the way in which meaning can change within the context of experience, and which can have implications for art teachers, was in the students' understanding of value in art works. Their earlier conceptions of value were of an objective nature, which equated the value of an art work with one of a monetary nature. Following their involvement in this project, the value they attribute to art works now involve deeply felt emotions of a subjective nature, such as "feelings" and "mood". Here again one meaning is superseded by another. The implications for teachers of art in this context is that the students' understanding of the meaning of value, which emerged during this project, can shape their awareness of value in other art works.

The manner in which students reached a deeper understanding of their own and peers' works, revealed through class discussions, provides another insight into students' conception of meanings in art works. Understanding the nature, quality and durability of meanings, as these meanings travel with the students from one art experience to another, has further implications for art teachers. The students described here took these constituted meanings from a past experience, and measured them against the meanings inherent within the experience of

the described project. How well these meanings endure will depend upon their performance in comparison to as yet uncovered meaning in future experience. The necessary, and virtually incessant search for meaning in art works, on the part of the students, can aid art teachers in reaching an understanding of the process of meaning and knowledge acquisition. The manner in which meanings surfaced during discussions underscores, for teachers, the importance of discussions of art works in classrooms.

Areas for Further Study

Phenomenological research which concentrates upon the inherent meanings in art classroom experiences, the nature, flexibility and durability of these meanings, from the viewpoints of both teacher and students, could significantly add to the body of knowledge of art classroom activities. Longitudinal studies could attempt to track identified meaning as students move through educational levels, to determine which meanings, if any, endure in the light of new experience.

The aspect of students considering themselves young artists, a realization they had arrived at through their teachers' influence, raises questions about the purpose of the classroom art experience. Further research could probe beyond teachers' stated aims as to the purpose and direction of particular art lessons. The range of classroom interactions extended beyond the teacher's stated

aims and purposes. Opinions and beliefs the teacher initially may not have set out to share, were transmitted during the course of the studied experience. Future research could remain open to teachers' unstated opinions or beliefs and attempt to tease them out of the accumulated data which emerged from the classroom interactions. A more comprehensive understanding of some underlying influences which affect classroom interactions may result from such investigations. Research could also be directed toward an examination of students' understanding of their role in an art class. A more thorough understanding of students' perception of their roles and behaviors could aid teachers and researchers better gauge the effect of various teaching methods and strategies.

Continued phenomenological research involving the concepts of intentionality, constitution, horizon and evidence, into classroom discussions about art works, has the potential to yield a comprehensive understanding of students' attitudes and beliefs concerning such works. Further research into different perceptions of the same event, from the viewpoint of the teacher, and from that of the students, could aid in identifying where learning may be deflected by misunderstood meaning.

An observation by Max Van Manen concerning a phenomenological form of knowledge helps bring this study to a closure:

> Some argue that phenomenology has no practical value because "you cannot do anything with phenomenological knowledge." From the point of view of instrumental reason it may be quite true to say that we cannot do anything with this knowledge. But to paraphrase Heidegger, the more important question is not: Can we do something with phenomenology? Rather, we should wonder: Can phenomenology, if we concern ourselves with it, do something with us? (1982, p. 297)

Assuming Van Manen's question was not intended to be entirely rhetorical, I believe that phenomenological knowledge can indeed do something with us.

For phenomenological knowledge can provide us with profound insights into human experience, insights which can aid those of us who participate in art education to reach an understanding of ourselves and our educational efforts.

References

Alexander, R.R. (1979). Review of Vena's "A Study of art programs in alternate high schools through participant observation". Review of Research in Visual Arts Education, 11, 38-44.

Alexander, R.R. (1981). The evaluation of naturalistic, contextualist, constructivist, qualitative inquiry in art education. Review of Research in Visual Arts Education, 13, 34-43.

Ballard, E.G. (1972). On the method of phenomenological reduction, its presuppositions, and its future. In L.E. Embree (Ed.), Life world and consciousness: Essays for Aron Gurwitsch (pp. 101-123). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Barritt, L.S., Beekman, T., Bleeker, H. & Mulderij, K. (1983). A handbook for phenomenological research in education. Ann Arbor: School of Education, The University of Michigan.

Beittel, K.R. (1973). Alternatives for art education: Inquiry into the making of art. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Beittel, K.R. (1978). Qualitative description of the qualitative. In J.J. Victoria & E.J. Sacca (Eds.), Presentations on art education research (pp. 91-113). Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Concordia University.

Berger, P.L., & Luckman, T. (1966). The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday.

Bossert, P. (1974). The sense of 'epoché' and reduction in Husserl's philosophy. Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology, 5, 243-255.

Brooks, C.A. (1980). The meaning of childhood art experience: A dialectic hermeneutic (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3843A.

Child, I.L. (1973). Humanistic psychology and the research tradition: Their several virtues. New York: Wiley.

Collins, C. (1974). The multiple realities of schooling. In D.E. Denton (Ed.), Existentialism and phenomenology in education (pp. 139-155). New York: Teachers College Press.

Denton, D.E. (1974). That mode of being called teaching. In D.E. Denton (Ed.), Existentialism and phenomenology in education (pp. 99-115). New York: Teachers College Press.

Ecker, D.W. (1963). The artistic process as qualitative problem solving. Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 21, 283-290.

Ecker, D.W., Johnson, T.J., & Kaelin, E.F. (1969). Aesthetic inquiry. Review of Educational Research, 39, 577-592.

Eckleberry, L.E. (1983). A descriptive study of spatial resources as nonverbal dimensions in a secondary

art education setting. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 47A-48A. (University Microfilms No. 83-11,743)

Findlay, J.N. (1970). Translator's introduction. In E. Husserl, Logical investigations (Vol. 1). (pp. 1-40). (J.N. Findlay, Trans.). New York: Humanities Press. (Original work published 1900)

Fink, E. (1981). Operative concepts in Husserl's phenomenology. In W. McKenna, R.M. Harlan, & L.E. Winters (Eds. and Trans.), Apriori and world (pp. 56-70). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Folsom, S.N. (1976). The art educator in the preadolescent world: A phenomenological descriptive study of teacher and children (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 6903A.

Giorgi, A. (1965). Phenomenology and experimental psychology: I. Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry, 5, 228-238.

Giorgi, A. (1966). Phenomenology and experimental psychology: II. Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry, 6, 37-50.

Giorgi, A. (1967). A phenomenological approach to the problem of meaning and serial learning. Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry, 7, 106-118.

Heidegger, M. (1962). Being and time (J. Macquarrie, & E. Robinson, Trans.). London: SCM Press. (Original work published 1927)

Hood, S.B. (1984). Patterns: An interpretation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 3267A. (University Microfilms No. 85-00,582)

Husserl, E. (1958). Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology (W.R. Boyce Gibson, Trans.). London: George Allen & Unwin. (Original work published 1913)

Husserl, E. (1960). Cartesian meditations: An introduction to phenomenology (D. Cairns, Trans.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. (Original work published 1931)

Husserl, E. (1964). The phenomenology of internal time - consciousness (M. Heidegger, Ed., J.S. Churchill, Trans.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Original work published 1928)

Husserl, E. (1969). Formal and transcendental logic (D. Cairns, Trans.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Husserl, E. (1970). The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1954)

Husserl, E. (1973). Experience and judgment (L. Landgrebe, Ed., K. Ameriks, & J.A. Churchill, Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1948)

Ihde, D. (1971). Hermeneutic phenomenology: The philosophy of Paul Ricoeur. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Ihde, D. (1979). Experimental phenomenology: An introduction. New York: Paragon.

Irvine, H.B. (1981). The syntax of art: The logical form of visual language. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 508A. (University Microfilms No. 81-15,495)

Kaelin, E.F. (1970a). Art and existence: A phenomenological aesthetics. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

Kaelin, E.F. (1970b). Epoché and relevance in aesthetic discourse. In R.A. Smith (Ed.), Aesthetic concepts and education (pp. 135-163). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kaufmann, F. (1968). Art and phenomenology. In M. Farber (Ed.), Philosophical essays in memory of Edmund Husserl (pp. 187-202). New York: Greenwood Press.

Kobisz, V. (1975). The referential and operational grounding of phenomenology as a method of describing inner art experiencing. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 769A. (University Microfilms No. 76-17,180)

Kohák, E. (1978). Idea and experience: Edmund Husserl's project of phenomenology in Ideas I. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Kuspit, D.B. (1974). A phenomenological approach to artistic intention. Art Forum, 12(5), 46-53.

Landgrebe, L. (1970). Husserl's departure from Cartesianism. In R.O. Elveton (Ed. & Trans.), The phenomenology of Husserl (pp. 259-306). Chicago: Quadrangle.

Lauer, Q. (1965). Introduction. In E. Husserl, Phenomenology and the crisis of philosophy (pp. 1-68). (Q. Lauer, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.

Levin, D.M. (1970). Reason and evidence in Husserl's phenomenology. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Lieberman, B.P. (1980). A phenomenological approach to aesthetic education in the secondary school painting class. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 504A. (University Microfilms No. 80-17,539)

Lindsey, A. (1982). A phenomenologically based aesthetic theory with application to teacher preparation in accordance with adult education principles. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 633A. (University Microfilms No. 82-18,647)

Madenfort, W.J. (1965). A phenomenology of the esthetic and art education (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1965). Dissertation Abstracts, 26, 6556.

McCoy, P. (1980). A philosophical and experimental study of an existential phenomenological approach to art education strategies. Dissertation Abstracts

International, 31, 6494A. (University Microfilms No. 71-13,978)

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). Phenomenology of perception (C. Smith, Trans.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mohanty, J.N. (1970). Phenomenology and ontology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Montalto, L.J. (1983). A phenomenological examination of dominant painting styles and the effect of ideology on M.F.A. candidates in selected departments of art. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 3579A-3580A. (University Microfilms No. 84-06,305)

Natanson, M. (1973). Edmund Husserl: Philosopher of infinite tasks. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Paleologos, M. (1976). A phenomenological and contextual inquiry into the working processes of a mature artist/teacher. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 6906A. (University microfilms No. 77-97,17)

Palmer, R.E. (1969). Hermeneutics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Pohland, P.A. (1972). Participant observation as a research methodology. Studies in Art Education, 13 (3), 4-15.

Psathas, G. (Ed.). (1973). Phenomenological sociology: Issues and applications. New York: Wiley.

Ricoeur P. (1967). Husserl: An analysis of his phenomenology. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Schutz, A. (1964). In A. Brodersen (Ed.), Collected papers II: Studies in social theory. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Schutz, A. (1966). In I. Schutz (Ed.). Studies in phenomenological philosophy. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Schutz, A. (1973). In M. Natanson (Ed.). Collected papers I: The problem of social reality (4th ed.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Sevigny, M.J. (1977). A descriptive study of instructional interaction and performance appraisal in a university studio art setting: A multiple perspective. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 6477A. (University Microfilms No. 78-06,199)

Sevigny, M.J. (1978). Triangulated inquiry: An alternative methodology for the study of classroom life. Review of Research in Visual Arts Education, 8, 1-16.

Sevigny, M.J. (1981). The premise, promise and future of the multiple perspective study of teaching. Review of Research in Visual Arts Education, 13, 77-80.

Sokolowski, R. (1974). Husserlian meditations: How words present things. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Spiegelberg. H. (1971). The phenomenological movement. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Spiegelberg, H. (1973). Is the reduction necessary for phenomenology? Husserl's and Phänder's replies.

Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology, 4, 3-15.

Spiegelberg, H. (1975). Doing phenomenology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Stokrocki, M.L. (1981). A qualitative description and interpretation of an art learning environment (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvannia State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3394A.

Streb, J.H. (1984). Thoughts on phenomenology, education and art. Studies in Art Education, 25, 159-166.

Ströker, E. (1982). Husserl's principle of evidence: The significance and limitations of a methodological norm of phenomology as a science. (R. Pettit, Trans.) In D.E. Christensen, M. Riedel, R. Spaemann, R. Wiehl, & W. Wieland (Eds.), Contemporary German philosophy (Vol. 1, pp. 111-138). University Park & London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Stumbo, H.W. (1970). Changes in meaning that follow phenomenological analysis. Studies in Art Education, 12(1), 50-60.

Suggs, M.S. (1976). Phenomenological analysis, art studio production and task order effects on student aesthetic attitude, art studio production, and aspective perception of paintings. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 3353A. (University Microfilms No. 76-29,014)

Thompson, S.R. (1974). Criticism and the transcendental and dialogal-phenomenological as method: Phenomenological criteria and their implications for art education (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 1361A-1362A.

Vandenberg, D. (Ed.). (1969). Teaching and learning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Vandenberg, D. (1971). Being and education: An essay in existential phenomenology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Van Manen, M. (1982). Phenomenological pedagogy. Curriculum Inquiry, 12, 283-299.

Vena, H.D. (1975). A study of art programs in alternative high schools through participant observation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 7481A-7482A. (University Microfilms No. 77-13,145)

Welton, D. (1983). The origins of meaning: A critical study of the thresholds of Husserlian phenomenology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Wieder, C.G. (1975). Alternative approaches to problems in art education. Studies in Art Education, 17(1), 17-24.

Willis, G. (Ed.). (1978). Qualitative evaluation: Concepts and cases in curriculum criticism. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Wright, J.R. (1973). A systems approach curriculum model for pre-school art education based on phenomenological

aesthetics (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 181A.

Zaner, R.M. (1970). The way of phenomenology: Criticism as a philosophical discipline. New York: Pegasus.

Appendix

List of reproductions

Artist	Painting
Anonymous (American)	Leaving The Manor House
Marc Chagall	Chambou Sur Lac
Currier & Ives	Home To Thanksgiving
Currier & Ives	The Road, Winter
Raoul Dufy	Normandy Tree
Raoul Dufy	The Bay Of Angels
Raoul Dufy	Mediterranean Scene
Elshemius	Village Near Delaware Water Gap
Vincent Van Gogh	Three Trees And A House
H.W. Hansen	Questionable Companions
Childe Hassan	Word's Fair Chicago (1893)
Meindert Hobbema	The Two Water Mills
Winslow Homer	Breezing Up
Ernst Ludwig Kirchner	Forest With Brook
Lapicque	Before The Start
Claude Monet	Boats At Argenteuil
Claude Monet	Boats On Beach
Camille Pissarro	Le Point De Pierre, Rouen 1896
Camille Pissarro	In The Garden
Pierre Auguste Renoir	Chalands Sur Le Seine
Georges Rouault	Biblical Landscape

Georges Rouault	Noœturne Cretien
Henri Rousseau	Jungle Scene With Sun
Henri Rousseau	Father Junier's Cart
Alfred Sisley	Port Marly