



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

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.

Art Education Made Respectable: Some Research Into
American and British Experience, 1969-1979

Peter Riches

A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Art Education and Art Therapy

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

May 1987

© Peter Riches, 1987

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-44235-2

ABSTRACT

Art Education made Respectable: Some Research into
American and British Experience, 1969-1979

Peter Riches

The author argues that over a ten year period (1969-79) there has been a gradual departure from the previously-accepted goals of art education. As a case in point, he has examined the effects of innovations in art education in both England and the U.S.A. The two areas which have been examined in depth are the concept of the artist-in-the-schools (U.S.A.) and the introduction of design education components into the art and craft curriculum (U.K.) He considers how these interventions are at a variance with the time-honored function of art education in meeting the needs of the individual. He makes the case that the introduction into art education of both programs has left the field compromised and art teachers vulnerable. Literature pertinent to these issues has been located and studied. Certain art educational goals associated with the published writings of D'Amico, Lowenfeld, and Read are presented to determine the extent to which the two curriculum approaches described deviate from the traditional values advocated by these two major figures. Whilst acknowledging differences of background and character in both schemes, the author argues that they are a response to increased societal pressure for accountability in education - with reforms focussing on the structure and functioning of art education, neglecting the individual. The respectability sought by proponents of both programs has, in the author's opinion, not been forthcoming.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Significance of the Study	3
Some Major Goals of Art Education	5
Personal growth through creative experience	7
Self-expression for social unity	12
Media exploration for experiential learning	16
Procedure	20
Parallel Concerns	21
PART 1. PROFESSIONALISM AND ART EDUCATION (U.S.A.)	
Introduction	26
CHAPTER 2	
Review of Literature	27
Art teachers as conflicted about their professional roles	27
History of professional art education associations	29
Position papers developed in relation to professionalism and art education	31
The artist-teacher as model	34
CHAPTER 3	
Artists-in-Schools (A.I.S.)	38
Background	38
Analysis	40
Conclusion	47

PART 2. INDUSTRIALIZATION AND ART EDUCATION (ENGLAND)

Introduction	51
CHAPTER 4	
Review of Literature	53
Manual training skills for an artisan class	53
Curriculum planning and integration	59
The politics of design in general education	66
CHAPTER 5	
Design Education	73
Background	73
Analysis	75
Conclusion	78
CHAPTER 6	
Conclusion	80
REFERENCES	85

20

Introduction

Background of the Study

A recent Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation report (1982), The Arts in Schools : Principles, Practice and Provision, presented evidence that the arts in education are being threatened by: "(a) the effects of falling rolls, (b) cuts in public expenditure, and (c) some of the demands of educational accountability" (p.3). This summation confirmed what many art educators know only too well: the increasing emphasis on teaching the basic skills has meant that once again the arts are being treated as a frill rather than as central to the learning process.

In earlier attempts to focus attention on the plight of the arts in education, writers on both sides of the Atlantic have sought to highlight the distorting and impoverishing effects of education programs which are neglectful of the arts: in England (Abbs, 1979; Goodman, 1975, 1976, 1980, 1981; Ross, 1975, 1978, 1980, 1981) and the U.S.A. (Broudy, 1978; 1979; Eddy, 1977; Eisner, 1976b, 1980; Goodlad, 1974, 1979; Williams, 1977). In seeking to describe the general pattern of art education neglect in our schools, Abbs (1979) touches on fundamental issues of precedence, relevance and values:

The expressive arts in this country [England], as in all modern technocracies, lie on the very fringe of the school curriculum. One can be certain that each child in our schools will be frequently and formally exposed to the symbolic systems of mathematics, physics, chemistry, geography, history and literature, but there is no certainty that in the course of his school life he will be exposed in any systematic way to the expressive disciplines. (p.27)

The widespread insistence on a core curriculum and the prevailing conservatism noted by Eisner (1976a, 1979a) and Hubbard (1978) has particularly concerned teachers operating within the important field of visual education. Against a background of strict cost-effectiveness and utilitarianism, art teachers have been "forced" to virtually abandon their primary task of initiating children into the individual and personal world of feeling. The greater emphasis upon teacher accountability in both England and the U.S.A. (Blackstone & Wood, 1981; Cox, Boyson, Pollard & Brittan, 1973; Holt, 1981; Qualley, 1976; Silliman & Silverstein, 1979; Steele & Victoria, 1975) has resulted in art teachers becoming confused about their specific contribution to a curriculum area for which they have responsibility. At a time when relevance in art education has given way to concerns of accountability, professional status is in jeopardy. It now appears that national needs have superseded personal values in the teaching of art, leaving the field compromised and subject specialists vulnerable.

Statement of the Problem

The author will make the argument that over a ten year period (1969-1979) there has been a gradual departure from the previously-accepted goals of art education as stated by D'Amico, Lowenfeld and Read. As a case in point, he will examine the effects of innovations in art education in both England and the U.S.A. The two innovations to be examined in depth are the concept of the artist-in-the-schools (U.S.A.) and the introduction of design education components into the art and craft curriculum (England). These interventions are at variance with the concept of art education as an educational approach which respects

the individuality of the student. The merits of these innovations will be questioned, taking into account the extent to which they are responses to economic limitations and societal pressure for accountability in education, along with the desire for a return to "basic learning".

Significance of the Study

Fundamental to the argument that art education has been professionally devalued by developments in the 70's, are questions focusing on the suitability and relevance of mechanistic techniques and the high emphasis placed on the production of artifacts (Design Education). Equally open to debate are elitist notions of artistic "standards" with the artist as exemplar (Artists-in-Schools). If art education's long standing goals (as stated by D'Amico, Lowenfeld and Read) have been to promote individual learning and self-discovery, then the introduction of these two innovatory programs suggest a marked shift in emphasis. The needs of the economy and the state appear to take precedence over the needs of the developing child. The threat to art education in this respect was identified for us thirty years ago by Piaget (1953) when he wrote:

Art education more than any other form of education must not be content with the external transmission or passive acceptance of a ready made truth or idea. It must train that aesthetic spontaneity and creative ability which already manifest themselves in the young child. Beauty, like truth, is of value only when recreated by those who discover it. (p.43)

The presentation of this study seems both timely (the artist-in-school program and design education components have been established for over a decade) and original (nothing in the available literature discusses both of these programs as exemplars of a similar trend). It

4.

is this author's contention that the introduction of these two innovations is at variance with the goals of art education as stated by D'Amico, Löwenfeld and Read, and the professional status of the art teacher is jeopardized still further. The respectability sought by proponents of both programs has, in this author's opinion, not been forthcoming. Rather, there has been an attempt at "taking on the trappings" of respectability by emphasizing skill acquisition and basic training techniques.

In raising questions of balance and relevance within the art curriculum, this study is of the utmost importance to theorists and practitioners alike. While schools try to give children an understanding of the world of objects, the development of personal feeling is seriously neglected. Gombrich (1979, pp. 205-207) and Guyatt (1977) add considerably to our understanding of the rational/emotional dichotomy in the visual arts when they both endorse the merit of combining intellect, emotion, and skill in works of art. It is vital, therefore, that the field of art education reassesses its content and direction with regard to the two curriculum strategies described in this study. Both strategies endorse a clear move away from the central and traditional role of art education: the emotional development of the child through creative self-expression.

In a remarkable book, Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance, Pirsig (1974) enquires into the concept of "quality" and the split between "traditional" (romantic) and "technological" (material) values. The "channel deepening" to which Pirsig refers in the following quotation is so appropriate to the position of art education today--diffuse, meandering and seemingly lacking its central purpose:

I would like not to cut any new channels of consciousness but

simply dig deeper into old ones that have become silted in with the debris of thoughts grown stale and platitudes too often repeated There are areas of human history in which channels of thought have been too deeply cut Now the stream of our common consciousness seems to be obliterating its own banks, losing its central direction and purpose disconnecting and isolating. Some channel deepening seems called for. (p.16)

In the period under consideration (1969-1979), art education went through dramatic changes in ideology and practice. Conceptions of curriculum and classroom management were modified to accommodate new beliefs and assumptions about the goals, content, and process of teaching art to children. The introduction of practicing artists into schools and the incorporation of design components into the art and craft curriculum exemplifies transformations in thinking and process which challenge or even discard goals established by D'Amico, Lowenfeld and Read. As a consequence, a radically different view of the art teacher's professional role is indicated, at variance with the self-expressive approach. To adequately assess the effects of these new practices on the teaching of art, a clear examination of some long-espoused art educational goals is necessary.

Some Major Goals of Art Education

The years after 1945 saw the emergence of certain important and familiar art education goals: art in the service of self-expression, personality development, and creativity. Publications by D'Amico, (1953), Lowenfeld (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970), and Read (1949), built upon the influential work of John Dewey and Gestalt psychology,

initiated and sustained the idea of meeting the needs of the individual. In emphasizing the individual nature of the art experience, all three authors saw "a distinctive, separate mission for art education in the educational context of the school" (Logan, 1965). Although the leading personalities in the field have changed, the ideas of D'Amico and Lowenfeld and Read are still operative to a degree.

Silverman (1976) defines the meaning of goals in art education as being: "verbal statements identifying anticipated outcomes that should accrue as a consequence of someone's being involved in learning experiences in art" (p.34). In a period of rapid change there is an understandable need to appraise the nature and bases of education. Recent developments in society and education have now challenged the once-dominant core of common goals in art education. Adult notions of perfection and depersonalized learning strategies--formerly associated with drawing schemes in industrial training programs--have replaced the desire to nurture the individual child's urge to experiment, explore, and express. There has been a marked shift in emphases away from some of the child centred goals of D'Amico, Lowenfeld, and Read. For the purposes of argument in this thesis, three major goals for art education have been identified from the published writings of these three influential art educators. Each goal has been matched to the particular art educator who best represents that conception of art education, although it would be clearly naive to suggest that these views were held exclusively by that one spokesman.

The major goals for art education, as personified by D'Amico, Lowenfeld, and Read, are accordingly:

1. Personal growth through creative experience. (Lowenfeld)
2. Self-expression for social unity. (Read)
3. Media exploration for experiential learning. (D'Amico)

Personal growth through creative experience: Dewey's ideas and philosophy have proved to be a major influence on art education in the 20th century, because they provided a powerful and respected voice for those art educators whose ideals were aimed at providing for the uniqueness of the child. For those who had moved away from such goals as imitative drawing and vocational training for industry, the concern was with the growth of the child through creative experience and aesthetic awareness. The methods of Cizek, Marion Richardson, and the "child art" movement (Peel, 1954, p.145) lead many to develop new concepts of how art education could help the child. Against this background Viktor Lowenfeld emerged as a dominant figure during the period of the Second World War and up to 1960.

Lowenfeld's most influential book, Creative and Mental Growth (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970), published in various editions since its original presentation in 1947, alerted professionals in the field of art education to the natural developmental stages in children's drawing. In his "stage theory" (Eisner, 1969, p.78), Lowenfeld drew attention to the way "the child develop[s] by stages into an emotionally mature and personally self-assured human being" (Dobbs, 1970/71, p.115). The art of the child, according to Lowenfeld, should be geared to overall personal development, both mental and creative. In meeting the needs of the individual child through art activities, art education should not concern itself with the artistic preconceptions of the adult:

Aesthetic awareness is part of the total growth pattern of

children. It is not the imposition of standards or rules from outside the child, but rather the development of his ability to discriminate and make choices. Beauty is something that changes with each culture, and the opportunity for youngsters to express their own feelings and 'emotions' about things around them is more important than the development of taste according to today's standards. (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970, p.341)

and

Art is not the same for a child as it is for an adult

Art for the adult . . . is usually concerned with the area of aesthetics or external beauty.

Art for the child is something quite different. For a child art is primarily a means of expression a language of thought.

A child sees the world differently from the way he represents it, and as he grows his expression changes. (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970, p.6)

The development of personality and the fostering of creative and mental growth through art, according to Lowenfeld; necessitated a change in the art teacher's role. Lowenfeld supported his theories of child growth by recommending a variety of art materials and experiences commensurate with children's aesthetic and cognitive development. A teaching methodology was now encouraged in which the art teacher was viewed as a guide and given specific tasks related to his role: stimulation, curricular development and evaluation at every stage of child development. The "unfolding" nature of children's artistic development was to be "unlocked" rather than "shaped" by the teacher (Eisner, 1977b). Lowenfeld viewed the art teacher's role in catalytic

terms: an active intermediary, who might even help accelerate children's creative development by anticipating and motivating:

The teacher of art becomes a crucial person in art production. It is only through a strongly supportive teacher who encourages and interacts with youngsters that an increased sensitivity to the environment can grow The creative spirit needs reinforcement, and the teacher is one who can provide the environmental conditions that will make the art experience an exciting and rewarding one. It is through identifying with the child, with his needs and interests, that the teacher can best understand the needs and desires of each child. (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970, p.345)

For Lowenfeld, art education was essential to the creative development of the individual child because it had the capacity to unite the various components of growth, whether emotional, intellectual, physical, perceptual, social, aesthetic, or creative (Lowenfeld, 1953, pp. 33-35). Lowenfeld's insistence that the emphasis in art education be on the creative behaviour of the individual, suited a post-war world thirsting for values of "freedom and individuality" rather than those of "rigid prescription and authoritarian control" (Eisner, 1977b). Humanistic trends in education provided a naturalistic orientation in the field of art instruction conducive to Lowenfeld's basic theory that the subject served the needs of the individual in society, both personally and psychologically. Lowenfeld was concerned with the art of the child--process rather than product--only in as much as it developed the individual's capacity to think, feel and perceive:

The art products of children tell us a great deal. The child

reveals himself directly and without fear. Art for him is more than a pastime; it is a meaningful communication with himself, it is the selection of those parts of his environment with which he identifies and the organization of those parts into a new meaningful whole. Art is important for the child. It is important for his thinking process, for his perceptual development, for his emotional development. (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970, pp.33-34)

The teacher's role in this development is crucial to its success; the teacher must stimulate and nurture personal expressiveness whilst providing a balance of emotional and technical support. A proper understanding of how a child develops must precede appropriate responses at every stage.

Lowenfeld's aims contrast sharply with the goals of the two curriculum programs under discussion in this study where adult expectations (Artists-in-Schools) and technical competencies (Design Education) feature prominently. These programs dictate quite a different style of teaching and thus the teacher's role.

Lowenfeld was not alone in his views; Herbert Read, his English contemporary believed in a similar teaching style which discouraged the influence of external standards; both required the teacher to refrain from imposing sophisticated ideas and imagery that constricted the child's self-expressive work in art. In Read's case, moreover, self-expression through art served a social as well as individual purpose.

Although both men shared a child-centered view of art education, there were differences in their conception of the term "aesthetic".

Lowenfeld (1953) believed that any form of creative activity involved

aesthetic growth. He considered aesthetic growth conducive to the development of an integrated personality, and one of the main components in a well-balanced education. For Lowenfeld (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970), aesthetic awareness required "a personal sensitivity toward perceptual, intellectual, and emotional experiences so that these are deepened and integrated into a harmoniously organized whole" (p.316). His discussion on stylistic differences in the work of children ("visual-haptic" theory) related to a definite philosophy of art history and aesthetics. The development of two creative types (intellectual and sensory) in Lowenfeld's theory provided a framework for the aesthetic appreciation of expressive periods and artistic styles.

Whilst Lowenfeld identified himself with the individual and his psychological needs, Read merged art education into a larger pattern of experience. For Read (1958), all education was intrinsically aesthetic in nature. Although both writers saw art as an instrument for personality integration, Read (1966) made wider claims for the place of art in society. Read's concept of integration involved obedience to the laws of aesthetic harmony and the natural order of life itself. He believed aesthetic education only contributed to personal growth when "the senses are brought into harmonious and habitual relationship with the external world" (1958, p.7). Read expanded upon Lowenfeld's theory of haptic and visual types and proposed the following main temperamental categories: thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. He then identified four distinct modes of aesthetic activity as expressed in works of art--realism,

romanticism (idealism), expressionism, and abstraction--to pair with each of the temperamental functions. As with Lowenfeld, Read believed that children should be shielded from forms of aesthetic activity alien to their nature.

Self-expression for social unity. Prior to the Second World War, new theories of child development provided an overdue opportunity to appraise both the theory and practice of education. This growth of understanding helped professionals and thinkers within the field to develop more adequate means for educating children through art. The recognition of child art (Macdonald, 1970), stimulated in Britain by the research and writing of Cyril Burt, Stanley Hall, and James Sully, was translated into devoted practice by committed teachers like Marion Richardson (Campbell, 1978). The impact of Richardson and other such pioneers helped popularize the concept of the "whole development" of the child (Wooff, 1976, p.37). For Herbert Read, philosopher and art critic, the insights of psychologists, physiologists, and art practitioners were central to the formulation of theories on the value of art in education.

Read (1949) wrote his extraordinarily perceptive book, Education through Art, when self-expression had become the avant-garde attitude in art teaching. He propounded the view that the teaching of art, which he divided into three categories: self-expression, observation, and appreciation, was an urgent necessity for a complex industrial world. Read continued to urge his views even as late as 1967 when he made a plea for art education as a counterbalance "to the intellectual excesses of our educational system" (Read, 1967, p.96). In the

publication Art and Society (1967), Read develops this point when he presents the educational dichotomy apparent between aesthetic values (in the service of the individual) and the values of good citizenship (in the service of the community):

The whole evidence of the history of art goes to show that the moment art is yoked to . . . intellectual and moralistic values, it tends to decay. For there is a fundamental opposition between instinctual values and . . . conventional values--between . . . the forces of the id and the forces of the super-ego. (p.100)

Writing in Education through Art (1949), Read saw in children's art the development of different forms of expression which reflected the personality of the child. This concept of self-expression integrates the thought, felt, and emotional modalities, and embraces the individual's orientation to society and the universe. Art, in Read's view, is a social process, because it is essentially a means of communication. The teacher of art is entrusted with the vital task of helping this process by interacting between the child and his environment; he initiates action, collaborates in the creative process, and encourages self-confidence. Art teaching, Read reminds us, must refrain from dictating standards which disturb the potentialities for natural growth and maturation:

Generally speaking, the activity of self-expression cannot be taught. Any application of an external standard, whether of technique or form, immediately induces inhibitions, and frustrates the whole aim. The role of the teacher is that of attendant, guide, inspirer, psychic midwife. (p.209)

In later published writings (1953, 1963, 1966, 1974), Read returned to his theory that education was a process of individuation and integration: "the reconciliation of individual uniqueness to social unity" (1949, p.5). Such a theory of education assumes art has a social as well as a personal function. When personal expressiveness is accepted and encouraged in education, balance is achieved in the child's personality; when balanced personalities are integrated into groups or communities, harmony nurtures social unity and universal tolerance. Read saw art education as a potential force working for the redemption of mankind. Suppression of the individual's spontaneous creative spirit--education in the traditional intellectual/academic mode--denies personal serenity for a healthy society (1966, p.266).

Read believed aesthetic education was inextricably bound-up with life. The internal creative needs of the developing child were always to be matched with the natural order of an external world. To bring up children by the natural laws of aesthetic perfection, created in them a "harmonious state of mind and feeling" (1953, p.27). A theory of aesthetic harmony, pervading the whole of life and education, Read felt was encapsulated in his phrase "education through art". For him, such a reform spelt out a radically-changed state for the individual and for society:

An education through art does not fit human beings for the mindless and mechanical actions of modern industry; it does not reconcile them to a leisure devoid of constructive purpose; it does not leave them satisfied with passive entertainment. It aims to creat 'stir and growth' everywhere, to substitute for

conformity and imitation in each citizen an endowment of imaginative power 'in a kind perfectly unborrowed and his own'. (1966, p.13)

Read believed that art should feature at the centre of any complete system of education. As a core area of the school curriculum, art would counteract the rational bias so evident in our school system. Building an educational framework around genuine creativity would, in Read's view, have positive implications for future patterns of work and social conditions. Balance within the curriculum, it was argued, would ultimately engender a spirit of tolerance and feelings of empathy in society generally. In developing self-expression through the natural order of art, the child's unique potential would be tapped to serve the goal of social unity.

The task of developing the relation between self-expression in art and the prospects for universal harmony, Read argued, should be entrusted to the teacher. It is the art teacher, not the professional artist, who can best nurture this process of integration. Both Read and Lowenfeld recognized the importance of the art teacher as catalyst and exemplar: someone who provides the inspiration, encouragement, and environment that supports the child's creative efforts. Read recognized that the encouragement of self-expression--often denied in the rigid rules of method prescribed by some design programs in the last decade--demands a creative approach to art teaching, where there is freedom and opportunity to experiment with a variety of materials. A recognition of the potential of art materials in fostering discovery and imagination links Read to a third major art educator: Victor D'Amico.

Media exploration for experiential learning. The art education goals of the 1940's and 1950's fostered creativity through direct art experiences. Perceptual and cognitive abilities would, it was felt, be developed by ready access to, and involvement with, a range of art materials. Media exploration offered a unique sensory experience for the child: a way of helping the individual to know and understand the world in which he/she lived. The manipulation of materials--feeling and forming--and the development of personality through self-expression--expressing and communicating--offered, so it was argued, a creative learning process which provided both meaning and understanding for the child. Victor D'Amico recognized the values inherent in such a process and emphasized the contribution new art media made to the creative experience.

D'Amico's Creative Teaching in Art (1953), originally published in 1942, continued the trend of freeing the child from adult notions of artistic worth, but rooted this new won freedom of expression in practical application. The book aimed to "interpret the fundamentals of creative education in terms of practical teaching situations" (D'Amico, p.vii). The building blocks of motivation, processes and tools, were to be offered to the developing child, providing vital sensory experiences and imaginative play needs:

The child is the potential creator. He is a free natural being. His creativeness is born of a real enthusiasm and joy of expression. He has no competition to fight, no market place to please, no price to set. He belongs to no cult and knows no 'isms'. He expends his energy on drawing and painting as

he does in play. Art with him is a form of play, the spirit and imagination at play, revealing the true, innocent, child-like self. (p.241)

D'Amico believed that children's first-hand experience with the materials of their environment, supported by enthusiastic and perceptive advice and discussion, engendered interest in the properties and qualities of materials and encouraged development of critical and perceptual capacities (Dobbs, 1970/71, p.115). In a later publication (D'Amico & Buchman, 1972), D'Amico observed that the "materials approach" had put more emphasis on "the addition of new materials and technical procedures, than on the contribution these can make to new concepts and ways of learning" (p.4). D'Amico believed an appreciation of the novelty value of materials alone, whilst enjoyable, diverted attention away from considered and sustained work or any sense of craftsmanship. He maintained that children should be given time and opportunity to return to the same material. For D'Amico, every material is seen to have two basic values: (a) its intrinsic aesthetic worth, and (b) its potential creative use. A deeper sense of craftsmanship is envisioned when both values are respected, particularly when the child grows to know and have empathy with a certain material. It is only "through creative insight and the inventive power of the individual . . . [that] materials can be given a new meaning" (p.5).

Whilst D'Amico reinforced the dominant goal of personal development through creative experience, he clearly believed in teacher support and guidance. The art teacher, according to D'Amico (1953), must assist the child in the initial motivation and the

subsequent working process. Any teaching of material technique should be based on "child values and development" rather than regimented by a rationalized curriculum" (p.19). D'Amico, like Lowenfeld, maintained that the teacher of art should be familiar with the stages of child development, adapting approaches and processes to suit the needs of the individual. The teacher's task is to respond to the varying needs and capacities of individuals at different age levels, without imposing any preconceived image or step-by-step procedure. In this respect, the attractive presentation of raw materials was regarded by D'Amico as a fundamental task for the sensitive and effective teacher (D'Amico & Buchman, 1972, p.5). Materials, for D'Amico, seemed to provide the inspirational key to individual creativeness; the opportunity to encourage individual identity and maturity; the link between the personal world of feeling and the world of objects.

For D'Amico, therefore, the creative process through direct media exploration and communication, enlightened, inspired, and enriched the individual. Learning by and through material experiences was the object of art in education:

The business of art education is to help to develop the artistic capacity of each child through creative experience. For this purpose the school should offer as wide a variety of activities in art as is possible, so that each child may find his particular type of expression and have as many experiences as he needs or desires. (D'Amico, 1953, p.25)

By broadening the scope of creative studio work, D'Amico encouraged the child to explore the qualities and possibilities of

a material or medium. The range of experiences which different materials offer, provides children with valuable learning insights into what these materials can do and the kinds of images they make. The child, according to D'Amico, will devise ways of ordering and controlling materials to serve personal meaning in the expression of ideas. For D'Amico, individual expression through direct experience was always of greater importance than the pursuit of pure skill or adroit craftsmanship.

Although under D'Amico's influence art teachers moved classroom practice nearer to the methods and approaches of the professional artist, he clearly viewed the creative art teacher as the vital factor in any art learning process. Whilst the artist can pursue highly selective and biased directions, the art teacher must maintain a breadth of understanding and a range of ideas, methods, and media. In exhorting art teachers to avoid imparting technical information in a 'how-to-do-it' manner, D'Amico was clearly concerned that the individual's response was in no way constrained by a process which appears to predetermine the end result. Such a step-by-step method, however, currently characterizes much integrated design work in British schools.

Whilst some recent studies (Best, 1979; Gardner, 1982, Chap. 18; Southworth, 1981) have argued that the D'Amico/Lowenfeld/Read tradition of self-expression denies a balanced approach to skill acquisition in the art curriculum, methods associated with this tradition are still widely espoused and practiced. Undoubtedly the art teacher's contribution is more dynamic than, say, Lowenfeld or Read would advise.

The emotional support and nurturing involved in teaching art to children in the 1940's and 50's is equally valid today. Questions of balance and a departure from acknowledged values and goals in art education are the focus of this study. The curriculum innovations cited above were researched from this standpoint.

Procedure

The two areas of investigation--Artists-in-School (AIS) and Design Education components in the art and craft curriculum of schools--were examined to determine the extent to which these two innovations are at variance with the above-stated goals of art education.

The three major objectives of this research were:

1. To describe the broad range of information available on the topic.
2. To analyse the nature and proposed aim(s) of the scheme.
3. To evaluate the effectiveness of the rationale and the implications this might have for art education.

Documentation from a 10-year period (1969-1979) was studied with these issues in mind. Multidisciplinary library research--manual and computer (ERIC) searches--has focused on the following types of data:

1. National and regional reports and policy papers--inclusive of various independent agencies funding research.
2. Official "position" papers--pronouncements of the professional associations.
3. Theoretical ideas of art educators--reports, lectures, and publications.

4. Frequency and nature of the literature on professional concerns--debate and discussion through the vehicle of art education journals.

Parallel Concerns

Trends in educational thought in the U.S.A. and England during the post-Sputnik period have, according to Curtis and Boulwood (1977), remained remarkably similar. Despite differences in the respective school systems, both countries have made slow, painful progress towards a "populist, classless egalitarian education" (p.634). From the standpoint of an American sociologist surveying the American educational scene, Tumin (1966) described the goal of comprehensive education for all in terms of "individuation" (p.107): a philosophy holding that every child is a unique individual, with attendant individual needs, interests, and capacities. In England, however, as the author has noted elsewhere (Riches, 1976), the move to schooling of an egalitarian ideology appears to have outstripped the reality of the situation in many comprehensive schools. Sociological research from a "phenomenological" viewpoint (Hargreaves & Keddie, 1974) reveals differentiation of a more insidious kind permeating the whole fabric of school society. More specifically, the field of art education has not escaped the debate and soul-searching which has ensued over these fundamental issues of educational equality and educational opportunity.

Any excursion into the history of art education during the past 30 years would illustrate that, according to Dobbs (1970/71), Eisner (1965, 1969, 1978), Lanier (1974, 1975), Michael (1978), Plummer (1976),

and Saunders (1971), school personnel readily respond to the needs and demands of pressure groups outside the school. Addressing himself in the main to the subject of American art education, Eisner's article, "Curriculum Ideas in a Time of Crisis" (1965) conjectured on shifting objectives as a result of changes in social order. The previously accepted goals, purposes, and practices of art education have moved to accommodate "the demands of the social order" (Eisner, 1969, p.77).

Michael (1978), particularly, has characterized the past development of art education in terms of submission. He argues that education--and art education--has a record of almost total subservience to society; that schools merely implement directives passed (down) to them by the community:

Educators, somewhat like the Helots of ancient Sparta, have generally been viewed as servants of society. . . . [accepting] the dictates of the community concerning what education shall be.
(p.43)

When community and education have the same conception of values and are in accord over methods to achieve them, then the role in which art education has been cast might be entirely appropriate. What, however, if societal demand conflicts with educational need? Lanier (1975) has reviewed the changing goals of art education, emphasizing the frequent discrepancy between theory and common classroom practice. Eisner (1965) and Michael (1978), whilst acknowledging "a time lag" in the pronouncements of literature in the field and any implementation in school curriculums, have both depicted art education refining and developing extrinsic and, often, incompatible needs.

The impact of Sputnik on art educational practice was identified by Clement (1974): Essentially, in order to make art education fall into line in the new technologically oriented educational enterprise, economic, bureaucratic and political pressures were brought to bear. Administrative accountability of art education in public schools (Steele & Victoria, 1975) on both sides of the Atlantic, sought to re-define goals, procedures, and institutional ethos in behaviorist terms. In America, this "assessment of performance" led art educators toward the appreciation of works of art governed by a tripartite system of instruction and evaluation: a system bearing upon the productive, the critical, and the historical (Barkan, 1963; Eisner, 1965). In England, the same pressures sent art teachers off in another direction entirely: towards what has come to be regarded as "design education" (Ross, 1975, p.49).

Steveni (1978), in an article "Issues in Art Education Research-- Transatlantic Comparisons", reinforced the view that there has been a similarity of approach in satisfying the principle of equality of education through comprehensivization in both countries, but noted differences in art educational research over the previous decade. Whilst acknowledging the clear differences that exist in both the scale and particular nature of research trends in the U.S.A. and England, it is the intention of this study to suggest that the introduction of artists into the schools (U.S.A.) and the integration of design components into the art and craft curriculum (England) are part of the same reactionary movement. In the specific period under consideration (1969-1979), much public and private investment in

American art education promoted "the artist" as the model for classrooms art activity, whilst in England "the artisan" appeared to hold sway with major curriculum development funding in the areas of design education and technology.

PART 1

Professionalism and Art Education (U.S.A.)

Introduction

The practice of using professional artists as teachers dates back to the Middle Ages. Even before the modern and specialized meanings of "art" and "artist" were established, the artist/craftsman trained apprentices in the skills of a particular trade or craft. In recent times, the employment of professional artists as participants within institutionalized education has become widespread in the U.S.A., particularly at university and college level.

The introduction of artists into American elementary and secondary schools since the late 1960's, has challenged the professional status of the art educator as the best trained person to deal with the art and science of teaching art to children. The influx of "pedagogically untrained artists . . . [to] take the place of trained art educators" (Smith, 1979) has raised fundamental questions of professional effectiveness and professional training. Art teachers, confused about their specific contribution to the education service, are suffering a crisis of professional identity and worth. The principles of pedagogic professionalism appear to have been compromised.

The professional artist as inexperienced teacher has also created another concern in the minds of many art teachers. With the increasing emphasis on the artist as classroom exemplar and all that this implies in aims, methods, and standards, the D'Amico/Lowenfeld/Read view of the child's creative and mental development through the subject of art cannot be maintained as a viable goal for art education in the curriculum of the 1980's. Issues relating to the theme of professionalism and art education (U.S.A.) are researched and debated below.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

According to Pearson (1981), within artistic circles the term "professional" is normally used in: (a) a practical sense, and/or (b) a state of mind sense (pp. 6-9). The first definition relates to economic considerations, whilst the second is far more concerned with the approach to work. These terms can comfortably embrace artists and art educators within the general "professional" framework, but they fail to distinguish between the intellectual and professional obligations that separate both groups.

The kind of personal autonomy and independence enjoyed by the professional artist is not at issue. It is, however, not at all clear that the teachers' professional status in the eyes of the public has much to do with the kind of autonomy artists enjoy. Professionalism for the teacher stresses the alternative meaning of "professional": an altruistic dimension. In the practice of artists working as teachers within educational settings, this central vocational feature appears to have been completely disregarded by those promoting the "artist-as-teacher" model in American schools.

Art teachers as conflicted about their professional roles. Corwin (cited in Foley & Templeton, 1970), an educational sociologist, develops definitions and concepts related to the roles of "professional", "employee", and "craftsman" (pp.8-13). In the confused issue of teacher professionalism, Corwin considers training in pedagogic knowledge--a body of theoretical knowledge which examines the historical, philosophical, psychological, and social foundations of

teaching--to be the major difference between the craftsman and the professional. Although the professional often encounters difficulty in reconciling the "competing requirements of [the] professional and employee roles" (p.8) within the bureaucratic organization of the school, many learn to successfully bridge their dual professional roles.

From the specific standpoint of art education, Foley and Templeton (1970) in a central article on status, considered collective decision-making and conflict components fundamental to art education professionalism. In fact, the authors believed that professionalism, whilst undoubtedly more conflict-making as schools become bureaucratized, was the only positive solution for art teachers confused about their role and in need of purpose, identity, and direction:

➤ If art eventually is to be understood and accepted by our society, it must be handled by the professional [but] if the contemporary art educator is going to hammer out change, pushing art closer to the core of American values, then he must be a professional who does not just create conflict, but one who utilizes it. (p.13)

In "The Dilemma of the Artist-Teacher", Orsini (1973) outlines the frustrations experienced by artist and teacher alike in articulating these two roles. He referred to it as "the merging of the irreconcilables" (p.299). The identity crisis perceived by Orsini has led to what Smith (1980) describes as the "deschooling" or "deprofessionalization" of art education (pp.8-10). Smith argues that the field has been professionally devalued by a number of developments in the past decade, the funding of a project sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts to employ

uncertified teachers (artists) in schools, being the central threat to the principle of professionalism. The present confusion concerning the artist-in-the-school (AIS) program bears directly upon what Foley and Templeton (1970) call the "employee-craftsman [artist] vs. professional [teacher]" conflict. To regain professional pride and a central purpose in their role of educating children in and through art, teachers should in Smith's opinion pursue pedagogic issues:

The matter of professional identity could be resolved if teachers thought of themselves first and foremost as pedagogues, as persons concerned with the art and science of teaching . . . the subject of art. That is to say that it should not be necessary to live vicariously the lives of artists and scholars in parent academic disciplines Now to be sure, the terms pedagogue, pedagogy, and pedagogical are not elegant terms, but they do draw attention to the first order of business--resolving the problem of professional identity. (p.10)

History of professional art education associations. The earliest American ideas concerning the value of art as an educational activity consisted of: (a) the acquisition of art skills directed towards industrial training, (b) those benefits which promoted the training of artists, and (c) the inculcation of standards of good taste for a consumer society (Lanier, 1974, p.70). Walter Smith's appointment as supervisor of drawing for Boston's Public Schools and the Massachusetts State Department of Education in 1871, although by no means the first attempt to organize "professional training" (see Saunders, 1964, for the part played by the Manns, Horace and Mary,

Elizabeth Peabody, and a Mrs Minot), gave impetus to a highly structured system of art instruction in the New England States and helped establish an early art teachers' association (Saunders, 1976, p.6). It was, therefore, the concern to improve the quality of instruction and the environment in which that instruction took place, that led to an awakening of interest in professionalism in American art education" (Logan, 1955).

The establishment of subject-based professional associations of teachers--apart from obtaining official recognition in representing membership interests with regard to economic status, security, and entrance qualifications--re-ordered priorities in relation to wider professional aims. Hanson (1971a, 1971b), particularly, has charted the plight of the 19th century art master (teacher), anxious to achieve professional recognition and wishing to increase separation between himself and the artist of the time, seeking the collective identity of an association. Moves in the direction of professionalization, whilst promoting the wider professional aims of art education and art teachers, succeeded in reinforcing the developing rift between "the teacher who sees himself as an artist before he is a teacher, and the other who is a teacher first and an artist afterwards" (Hanson, 1971a, p.49).

The gradual emergence and development of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) in America has been clearly documented by Saunders (1978). Founded in 1947, the NAEA was the culmination of several attempts to form a national art education association : the previous attempts being the Federated Council on Art Education (FCAE, 1925-1936) and the

National Association for Art Education (NAEA, 1935-1938). Plummer (1976), in a political survey of art education in the U.S.A., seemed somewhat critical of the NAEA's performance in representing public school art teachers. Plummer believes the NAEA's 1947 move away from the National Education Association (NEA) has contributed in no small way to the lack of political and financial power evident some 30 years later.

Position papers developed in relation to professionalism and art education. The lack of political strength, which Plummer points out in his (1976) assessment of American art education, has continued to bedevil the profession throughout the period under discussion (1969-1979). Prominent art educators pointed to division at the national level which allowed bureaucratic groups from the "cultural service field" (Smith, 1979) to impose programs of questionable merit on the profession. The introduction of artists into the nation's schools was just such a program. Identifying concerns expressed by leading art educators during the decade 1969-79 will convey a sense of the profession's vulnerability to external demands for relevance and cost-effectiveness.

Dorn (1972, 1976, 1977), in questioning the lack of cohesion and direction in the "silent 70's", characterized art education in terms of "ambiguity and ambivalence" (1976, p.5). He identified the isolation of the art teacher as the result of fragmented policies, where they existed at all. The kind of professional identity and political awareness advocated by Dorn was supported in the literature by a number of prominent art educators : Eisner, 1977a, 1978, 1979b; Hoffa, 1972, 1973, 1977, 1979; Lanier, 1969; Michael, 1978; Plummer, 1976; and Smith,

1979, 1980. Recent written debate in the literature has focused on the provocative recommendation made by the Rockefeller Commission report, Coming to our Senses (1977), which suggested waiving teacher certification requirements for artists employed for varying periods in elementary and secondary schools. Lanier (1978), advanced his "cabal" or conspiracy theory of art education in the wake of the report's publication. He stated that a cabal of influential bureaucrats in the arts policy-making field were conspiring "to subvert and control" (p.13) the teaching of art in American schools. Lanier considered the profession's values and interests would be further diminished by other Rockefeller recommendations to integrate art education into "the arts"; to introduce multidiscipline personnel into art education; to involve arts bureaucrats at national levels to guide and generate ideas in art education.

In a climate of "back to basics" accountability, the need for informed professional debate of the most rigorous kind is essential to the maintenance of quality programs in the arts.- Budgetary considerations forced some school administrators to recognize only courses which could be validated by competency testing. The threat to professional independence by a process which obscured and subverted the real values in the field of art education, was articulated by Eisner (1979b):

Many of us believe that competency standards and competency testing too often reflect a mechanistic, bureaucratic, simplistic view of education, one that is often inimical to the spirit of art. Standardization, routine, predictability, and control do not live well with a field interested in spontaneity, originality,

expressiveness, surprise, and idiosyncrasy. (p.11)

Smith (1980), on the other hand, believed that growing elitism in the "cultural service field" weakened professional purposes with the introduction of projects of questionable merit into school art rooms:

The policies of the new arts education complex may not strengthen but actually weaken public school art instruction. If this happens, the teaching of art is likely to be further deprofessionalized because many in the new cultural service field care less about the quality of aesthetic instruction and teacher preparation than they do about turnstile counts and grantsmanship.

(p.9)

In deploring the fragmentation of art education in the U.S.A., Dorn (1976) expressed concern at the lack of direction in formulating the profession's values and purposes with regard to the structure of both theory and practice. The pivotal concepts within the field need, according to Eisner (1977a), to provide "An Agenda for Today for a Field Tomorrow". He believes that serious debate concerning the current state of art education must go beyond the purely local level and must become politically conscious of the constraints and influences which condition art education nationally (Eisner, 1978). Whilst collaborative effort along the lines advocated by Biehl (1972), Dorn (1969, 1972, 1976), and Hoffa (1973), in bringing together co-workers in parallel disciplines and associations is to be encouraged, unquestioned assumptions and unqualified assertions by philanthropic agencies promoting artists in the classroom as some kind of panacea for improving art education, should be rigorously debated and the best available

evidence compiled (Eisner, 1978; Smith, 1980). For, in Smith's words, "Only as professionals and competent pedagogues so proud of our profession that we do not need to borrow on the prestige of others will we be able to assert our claims" (p.10).

During the period under consideration, leading figures in the profession have expressed doubts regarding art education's fitness to act decisively and judiciously in the face of mounting political, economic and curricular pressures. Art teachers have much to gain from a professional unity. Group action and involvement at the national level might well have prevented, or at least considerably modified, some of the professionally unpalatable proposals that were suggested by the Rockefeller Commission (1977). The need for political strength to withstand such alien bureaucratic forces is clear; only by re-assessing art education's central values and purposes, re-asserting the work of committed art teachers and making political allies within parallel arts disciplines, will professional pride and identity be restored.

The artist-teacher as model. The identity crisis which beset art educators in the 70's had a significant influence on classroom practice. With the employment of professional artists in schools, the model of the artist-teacher has posed particular problems. Art teachers have become confused about both their professional role and the whole focus of art education within the school curriculum. It is also clear that the professional concerns and attitudes of the independent artist are different from the teacher of art. Whilst many observers have welcomed the idea of the artist as classroom teacher and model, others question

the adequacy and appropriateness of such an arrangement.

Expressions of both opposition and support for the artist in the classroom can be traced back to the early post-Sputnik phase of the late 50's. In one of the first articles directly bearing upon this development, Lowe (1958) recognized parallel and divergent concerns in each vocation's "unique commitments, goals, visions, and relations to a cultural situation" (p.10), declaring a convergent model to be at best a compromised situation. Logan (1961), in the prophetic "Artist in the Schoolroom : a Modern Dilemma", warned of the possible "professional diminution" inherent in the wholesale adoption of artistic goals when he stated:

The end result of setting up the goals of the artist as applicable both to artist and teacher is to make less effectual the work of many teachers who have, through this process, come to lack pride in their teaching achievement. (p.68)

Other art educators sensitive to the problems as perceived by Logan and Lowe at this early stage included : D'Amico (1959), Hausman (1967), Lanier (1959, 1961), and McCracken (1959).

The move to rebuild a curriculum for art education along the lines of the productive, the critical, and the historical (Barkan, 1963; Eisner, 1965), led to pronouncements of doubt being expressed on the suitability of art teachers (educators) to fashion this new emphasis on aesthetic education. Conant (1965; 1973), Kuh (1973), and Manzella (1963, 1965, 1967a, 1967b) in advocating skill-based programs, questioned the competence and effectiveness of art teachers, indicating, instead, that the introduction of artists into schools would generate much

needed interest and an improvement in overall artistic standards.

Another more radical notion was advanced by Roman (1968) who suggested employing professional artists in social priority schools with the intention of encouraging social action and change:

I should like to see artists--not art teachers, but professional artists--put into the elementary schools and encouraged to stage happenings and events in the classrooms, hallways, and play areas to see whether we cannot change the image of the ghetto school, and then the institution itself. (p.27)

In the period since the "official" introduction of the AIS program (1969), art educators (Chapman, 1978; Day, 1978; Eisner, 1974, 1978, 1979; Greenberg, 1979; Lanier, 1971a, 1971b; Smith, 1977, 1978, 1980; Wright, 1975)--for-the-most-part, "viewing with alarm"--and arts administrators (Fenwick, 1978; Hanks, 1971; Kerr, 1972, 1976; Morison, 1970)--for-the-most-part, "pointing with pride"--have inundated art education's professional publications with an almost never-ending succession of rebuttals and counter-rebuttals on the program's validity.

The conflict engendered by the artist-teacher model (Foley & Templeton, 1970; Orsini, 1973) has been accommodated by some art educators but not others. Anderson (1981), Conn (1978), Eickhorst (1977), Raleigh (1965), Szekely (1978), and Tyrrell, Williams, and Blanchard (1974) believe an acceptable and workable balance can be maintained by uniting the separate roles of artist and teacher. Forrest (1983), in "Another Look at the Artist as the Model for Art Education", provides argument and counter-argument for accepting the

professional artist as the model for organizing and controlling art education. The writer concludes that within any conception of art there is a need to recognize "the distinct characteristics of the 'different' disciplines of the artist, the art critic, and the art historian" (p.28). Any conflation of these disciplines Forrest believes to be muddled and wrong-headed. For some researchers, Kelly (1969), Michael (1980), Rush and Conant (1979), excellence of studio practice and the example of the artist remain fundamental to any program of quality within the visual arts, and thus at the very core of art education.

The adoption of the "artist-as-teacher" model in American schools has manifestly altered the focus of classroom practice. Although some art teachers may work as artists in their own right, in a professional educational context they operate as teachers of the subject; their competence is not in the creation of art, it is the moulding of a learning environment. Whilst this distinction has been recognized in the research of some art educators others have diminished one role or the other depending on their professional allegiance. Clearly this distinction needs to be appreciated to fully assess the contribution the respective professionals make to the field of art education. It seems then, that the presence of professional artists in the classroom undermines the position of art teachers, by implicitly devaluing the didactic skills of the art teacher.

Chapter 3

Artists-in-Schools (A.I.S.)

Background. The acceptance of the "artist as model" in American art education took on literal meaning with the introduction of artists into public schools under the joint sponsorship of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the U.S. Office of Education. The decision to launch the AIS project stemmed, according to its originators, from a disenchantment with traditional kinds of "indirect" teacher-arts agency link-ups. As Nancy Hanks (cited in Morison, 1970), chairman of the NEA, has put it:

When you have a problem, it makes sense to turn to the person who knows most about the subject. None of us were satisfied with our progress in making the arts more central in education, and so we decided to look to the professional artist for help. (p.53)

And the purpose of introducing artists into school arts programs, according to AIS literature (Gross, 1976) published by the NEA, can be summarised thus:

Artists-in-Schools encourages cooperative efforts of professional artists, students, and teachers, to enrich the creativity of all three. The purpose is not to train more professional artists, but to enhance children's powers of perception, expression, and communication. (p.3)

From small beginnings, in 1969-70, with visual artists placed in six secondary schools in California, Colorado, Florida, Minnesota, Missouri, and Pennsylvania, the AIS project had by 1978 expanded to every state of the Union as well as being involved in the special

locations of Guam, Samoa, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia (Aquino, 1978). By the fiscal year 1975-76, over a million students and staff had been in working contact with approximately 2,000 artists and craftsmen, employed in 7,500 elementary and secondary schools through the AIS program (Carter, 1977). Since the \$145,000 initial investment in 1969, the program attracted a staggering increase in contributions from central funds to the tune of \$4,400,000 in 1978: an increase of more than 300% of the original grant for every year of its existence (Day, 1978). Funded primarily through grants to state arts agencies, the AIS program places professional artists and craftsmen in elementary and secondary schools for residencies that ranged from a few days to a full school year.

The employment of artists as teachers through the National Endowment's AIS program was paralleled by other related or similar schemes: Project IMPACT (Interdisciplinary Model Program in the Arts for Children and Teachers)--funded under the Education Professions Development Act, U.S. Office of Education (1971-72)--encouraged artists to work within classrooms and emphasizes artist-teacher cooperation; The Artist-in-Residence Program in Philadelphia provided the opportunity for a local artist to have studio space within a public school, whilst being available for discussion with students; Artist-at-Work Program in Philadelphia provided an insight into the artistic process by requiring an artist to carry out a specific commission on school premises; Project TAP (Total Arts Program)--a community-school arts program begun in 1973-74 by the South Carolina Arts commission--integrated professional resident and visiting artists into local

educational and community programs (Aquino, 1978). In these schemes and others, the artists functioned as working artists within an educational setting. The extent to which artists were called upon to teach varied considerably from program to program and from state to state. Whatever the extent of teaching time and however an individual school or group of schools used artists, the most common practice was to employ them directly within the traditional curriculum.

In addition to the visual arts and crafts, the AIS program provided support for a variety of related activities : dance, music, poetry, theater, film and video, folk art, architecture and environmental arts. However, in the analytical comments and conclusions that follow, the author will confine himself exclusively to the contribution made by, and the effects of, visual artists in school situations.

Analysis. As the largest funded project directly bearing on art education, the AIS program attracted much interest, concern, and criticism. According to Carter (1977), Day (1978), Eisner (1974), and Smith (1977), the NEA stubbornly resisted requests for an objective assessment of the AIS program, despite numerous appeals. What was provided were a number of self-laudatory reports and publications undertaken by individuals or "external" agencies already in receipt of NEA financial support : CEMREL (Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc.), The Artist in the Schools (1970); Connecticut Commission on the Arts, Artists in the Classroom (1973); Schiff, Artists in Schools (1973); Arkansas State Arts and Humanities Council, Artists in the Schools 1975-1976 (1976); Gross;

Extending the Dream (1976); South Carolina Arts Commission, Sharing a Learning Space : Project TAP, 1975/76 (1976); Western States Arts Foundation, A Study of the Poetry and Visual Arts Components of the Artists-in-Schools Program (1976); and Spellman, The Arts Endowment and Education (1977).

In the opinion of Carter (1977), the NEA did not undertake a serious assessment of its AIS programs despite criticisms that it was "ineffective, inappropriate and inefficient" (p.44). In a similar vein, Day (1978) made the observation that "objective information about the program is extremely difficult to find" (pp. 63-64). He concluded that "the goals, implementation procedures, and effectiveness of AIS" (p.63) will remain unclear until responsible research is conducted. The disadvantages of the scheme, Day stressed, need to be as clearly identified as the benefits, and efforts should be made to measure how and what children learn from artists.

Eisner (1974), found that the continued absence of empirical evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the AIS program while it operated on such a scale, was irresponsible. He insisted that claims made by supporters of the program lacked a body of objective evidence and were not supported in the available literature (p.20). The substitution of slick publicity and sophisticated public relations exercises for sound evaluation and research, Eisner maintained, clouded the issue and devalued the project in academic terms (pp.20-21).

Smith (1977) focused attention upon the educational justification of the AIS program. In a systematic analysis and criticism of NEA policy, Smith concluded that the image of the AIS program was

"politically popular, which means that questions of validity and justification are secondary considerations" (p.19). In the same article he considered the NEA's ambivalent stance on the issue of educational criteria and its relevance to artist-oriented programs. In Smith's opinion, either the AIS program was educationally relevant or it was not. If the AIS program had no educational purpose beyond the employment of artists within school settings, this had to be universally acknowledged and a different set of assessment criteria developed:

Policymakers must be prepared to defend the worth of their policies and not only their effectiveness. And if the policy is an educational policy, then the justification must be on strictly educational grounds. Neither the popularity of a policy nor its widespread endorsement necessarily satisfies the justification criterion. (p.15)

Arts agencies financed by the NEA did not appear to share any such misgivings about the AIS program. The Connecticut Commission on the Arts (1973), in documenting experience of artists in Connecticut schools, believed that confidence in self and a commitment to the work process were central to the success of a residency:

The artists who have been successful working in public schools in Connecticut have been those who have a clear commitment to their own work and a sense of the direction in which they are moving as artists. They bring to the classroom their feeling of the importance of learning by doing, of experiential education. They can transmit their excitement about the

creative act because they believe in its validity. (p.88)

In another NEA publication (Schiff, 1973), the AIS program was viewed as a mechanism to bring about fundamental curricular change:

The program is concerned not only with human change but with structural change so that a participatory awareness of the arts becomes a standard part of the essential process of education, a pathway leading to a better comprehension of other subjects. (p.26)

And change was also perceived at a personal level in the recorded thoughts of administrators and teachers associated with AIS projects:

The children are having more fun, liking school better, being more successful in school studies. (an administrator, p.61)

The children's range of experience has been widened. They talk about the times when Larry Dogwin [the artist] was here and they'll be glad when the artists come back. (a teacher, p.60)

The program sponsored jointly by the NEA and Arkansas State Arts and Humanities Council encouraged the visiting artist to act as an important creative catalyst within the school community. A report (1976) describing the 1975-76 AIS program in Arkansas elementary and secondary schools clearly considered this to be a vital feature when it stated:

Children are creative but many times they need someone to inspire, someone to get them started, someone to encourage and then someone to help them follow through.... The artist is invited into a school where he/she spends half his[her] time working with or alongside teachers, students, and community

members. (p.25)

The hope was that schools, once stimulated by "indepth relationships with professional artists" (p.25), would find other sources of funding and talent to keep art alive for their students. It is interesting that in one case this had the effect of producing a demand for a full-time art appointment (p.12)

According to the Western States Arts Foundation (1976) in a NEA-funded study, the generation of interest and willingness to participate in school-related activities markedly increased in those schools and communities in which an artist residency occurred:

The artist in residence program has been one of the best public relations programs the school has ever had. Evening exhibits and workshops have brought many of the townspeople for the first time into the school building. (a teacher, p.15)

Such placements were often seen as a way of providing students with new and challenging experiences (p.8). Administrators and teachers noted positive developments in student self-concept as a result of involvement in the AIS program. The artists associated with the project reported substantial changes in student attitudes and creative approach. From their initial tentative and narrow response, students were encouraged to be more confident and adventurous in their artistic efforts. They described their sense of achievement here in terms of "pride", "satisfaction", and "enthusiasm" (p.9).

The AIS program for some groups of administrators, teachers and students was of considerable benefit. In the best cases, there were obvious gains in knowledge, commitment, and understanding.

There were however many assumptions underlying the acceptance of this total package. The idea that by replacing teachers with artists you would appreciably improve the quality of the learner's art experiences is a highly contentious one. Inexorably linked with this notion, the author feels, must be implications for the nature of future art teacher training, both in initial recruitment and course length and emphasis. Indeed, the waiving of teacher certification for all artists participating in educational programs, as advocated by Coming to our Senses (Rockerfeller Commission report, 1977), raises the important issue of whether the focus of art education should be education-or artist-oriented. Questions about the orientation, the intent, or the goal of using professional artists at pre-collegiate levels are of deep concern to the art educator.

Whilst there can be no denying that some art programs are stereotyped and some art teaching lacklustre and ill informed, there are sound programs staffed by highly committed and creatively able teachers operating in classrooms across the country. It was also conveniently overlooked by the protagonists of the AIS program that very many professional art educators are also practicing artists in their own right--continuing to function as such outside the classroom whenever possible. The "teacher-artist" model is surely not so uncommon. One way of improving art teaching might be to encourage art educators to become more heavily involved in their own studio-art activities.

And what of the contribution artists can genuinely make to schools? Few can doubt the value of the artist as a resource in

the community--in the same sense that the art gallery or museum provides a learning resource in the community. By offering insights into the nature of the artistic process--what Ecker (1963) calls the "qualitative problem solving approach" of the artist--the student can achieve a deeper understanding of the creative conflicts and alternative tactics open to the artist at work. In coming to understand something of the complexity and rigor of the artist's struggle, the observer can come to appreciate something of the deep personal commitment underpinning the artistic product. Since it is the product which is ultimately judged by the public, anything which educates the public about the relatively unknown and unobserved struggles to produce a work of art, has to be valuable.

But although art education inevitably must contain a great deal of making and doing, making art is not its prime objective. Teaching a child how to appreciate the works of artists is vastly different to teaching him/her to perform artistic skills. The ability to communicate with children is central to this whole endeavor: the artist may well possess the special talents appropriate to the confident demonstration of certain skills; the teacher usually possesses the pedagogic skills of communication. Whatever the level of artistic proficiency, the ability to communicate information to children is one of the most important qualifications of an art educator. The effectiveness of the "artist as teacher" should not be gauged solely on the basis of the ability to perform a certain artistic skill well, but must be gauged on how effectively the action is transmitted to others and how, through discussion, it can be

appreciated--eventually becoming part of the learner's bank of knowledge and repertoire of skills. Stressing the appreciative and critical components of art, rather than just the performative aspects, is a more realistic and appropriate model for art education than that of the artist alone.

Conclusion. In an article for Art Education, "In Search of a Model", Betty Tissinger (1971) stated the case for the art teacher rather than the artist, critic, or historian as a model for art education. In claiming pre-eminence for the art teacher within an interactive classroom model, Tissinger described certain "master teachers" accordingly:

They are highly skilled in human communication and understanding as well as in their subject matter. In addition to this, in much the manner of the child, they seem to have kept something of the wonder and magic of seeing things new and afresh day after day. (p.27)

In a recent interview (Elsgood, 1984), Henry Moore, the sculptor, spoke with respect and affection of the encouragement he received from a particular home town teacher in his early school days:

She was a tremendous help to me. She wasn't much of an artist--you don't have to be a great artist to teach--but she helped me a lot. Teachers are the key to a good art education. I was lucky to get good teachers. (p.10)

Both quotations illustrate the vital contribution teachers make within the curriculum, fostering learning in the visual arts through activity and appreciation. The capacity to nurture and illuminate

artistic experience requires words as well as actions. Teachers use the spoken word as the most important and expressive way of conveying ideas in the classroom. Drawing and painting are communicative, but the spoken word is one of the most valuable tools we have in extending and qualifying graphic expression.

In what sense, then, can the artist help in education? Each community has artists who by their training, talent, and inclination can help, but, in the author's opinion, only on the basis of supplementing on-going programs led by professional teachers. Anyway, it is anticipated that the supposed freedom and popularity enjoyed by visiting artists in schools, so valued by the NEA, would soon disappear when exposed to the daily pressures and demands of a full teaching program. Undoubtedly, it is necessary to improve and change rather sterile school art programs, but whether this can be achieved by a massive influx of professional artists is a very moot point.

In view of the length of time the AIS program has been operating, a reflection on its impact seems both necessary and honest. At a time when relevance in art education has given way to concerns of accountability, professional status seems in some jeopardy. It is the author's contention, therefore, that while art education historically has followed a meandering route in relation to professionalism--the dichotomy of artist vs. pedagogue being a constant problem--the record of the last decade (1969-79) has been one of accelerated erosion of identity and worth. Given that art teachers function within institutional settings and the art teacher may well have a confused view of his role in the institution, the continued use of AIS can

only further diminish the already low professional status of art teachers.

PART 2

Industrialization and Art Education (England)

Introduction

The emergence of State-controlled design schools in the 1830's created a second tier in the system of art education geared to the needs of industry and the British economy. This dual approach to art and design effectively separated the recruitment and preparation of fine artists from industrial designers. The freedom enjoyed by the fine artist as a member of an elite within traditional independent academy schools, was to be denied the 'artisan' being trained in a restricted, technical mode.

Art in the service of industry has been a recurrent slogan in the history of art education. Recent official enthusiasm for design education is motivated more by the realization that effective design may help our national economy than the concern that students arrive at a critical understanding of our man-made world. The values of the market place now dominate this area of the school curriculum: art is viewed as a means towards a specific utilitarian goal, its syllabuses arranged to give greater merit to the practical application of design. Such a narrow interpretation of the design process neglects the more idiosyncratic and spontaneous features of the creative approach.

The development of design education in the school curriculum has had a significant impact on art and craft programs. Many integrated activities ignore intuitive and expressive elements in the use of product-orientated exercises. As a consequence, teachers of art are professionally disadvantaged by efforts to rationalize structure and content according to the design ethos. Education inevitably has a nationally utilitarian slant, yet the importance of personal development,

self-expression and imagination cannot be underestimated. These issues, relating to the theme of industrialization and art education in England are researched and debated below. This study, as with the AIS research, focuses on developments spanning a 10-year period (1969-1979).

Chapter 4

Review of Literature

There can be little doubt that the re-organization of British secondary schools over the last 25 years has had a radical effect on art education. The establishment of design departments in the late 1960's, with shared facilities in art, craft and home economics, was a politically-inspired move to bring about a wider acceptance of design studies in general education. Such an arrangement reinforced industrial and commercial pressure to re-structure curriculum along technical and vocational lines.

Within the aesthetic/expressive domain, the creation of larger administrative units to direct and develop the curriculum within schools has profoundly effected departmental structure. The integration of a group of subjects previously considered distinct and separate, whether for logistic or philosophical reasons, can prejudice the overall role that a particular subject can play: the unique contribution that art makes has been diminished in situations where joint projects have been developed around common themes. Integrated courses are technologically biased; their goals more in keeping with industrial regeneration than with educational worth.

Manual training skills for an artisan class. Fyfe's (1975) examination of the interaction between artist and artisan in Victorian England, focuses attention on the way "institutions of art confer a creative role on some men, whilst denying it to other men" (p.38). The distinction between "artist" and "artisan" was strengthened and popularized during the first industrial revolution and was, indeed,

part of it (Pearson, 1981, 1982). The artisan was specialized in manual skills, without any intellectual, creative, or imaginative purposes. The artist personified humane and non-utilitarian values, contrary to the concerns of market place, commerce, and industry. Pearson (1982) reminds us that the State's involvement in art education in the 1830's was an endeavor to bridge the technical proficiency gap which existed between artist and artisan:

The artisan in the state education system was not to be offered 'art'; rather he was to be offered the techniques already developed by artists. In this way 'taste' (morality, right thinking and commercially useful skills) could be propagated throughout the population. (p.14)

As Bell (1963), Carline (1968), Macdonald (1970), Pevsner (1973), and Sutton (1967) have described, art entered general education in the 19th century largely as a response to the demand for skilled industrial artisans. In Academies of Art Past and Present, Pevsner (1973) relates how Great Britain, the first nation to develop machine industry to its modern capacity, survived despite the sternest competition from foreign artisans. Government measures in England to stop the decline in industrial art included establishing a Parliamentary Select Committee on the arts and their connection with the manufactures of industry in 1835. The Committee was mandated by a motion of William Ewart, MP for Liverpool (cited in Pearson, 1982), to inquire into:

The best means of extending a knowledge of the arts and of the Principles of Design among the people, (especially the manufacturing population of the country); also to inquire into the constitution,

managements and effects of institutions connected with the arts.

(p.15)

Two of the Committee's recommendations required immediate action to improve the quality of design instruction: (a) the integration of design education in any national education system, and (b) the setting up of a Government School of Design. According to Sutton (1967) in Artist of Artist?, commercially useful skills and knowledge were to be imparted to an artisan class through a system of drawing which stressed regularity in linear design and the rigid reproduction of flat ornamental pattern. This was a system devised for artisans and mechanics with the declared intention of giving instruction relevant to the character and "the condition of workmen and servants" (p.46); a system of drawing which by contemporary standards is far removed from the developmental and emotional needs of children.

The recommendation of the Select Committee were partially implemented in 1837 with the establishment of the South Kensington School of Design and, soon afterwards, other similar schools in the provinces. Bell (1963) has charted the effect that this type of foundation had on art training in this country in his publication, The Schools of Design. The formation of schools "with a very strong vocational bias closely connected with the demands of industry" (p.254) was to lay a foundation for good judgement in the consumer and the producer of manufactured articles. The final emphasis was always on the improvement of British goods and taste:

The repeated copying of geometrical figures might in the end produce skilled workmen. It might develop accuracy of eye and

skill of hand, but it had nothing to do with invention or imagination. It turned its back upon nature and rejected fantasy. The fault was one of intention. The curriculum had nothing to do with aesthetic feeling . . . it was established not for the benefit of the pupils but for that of their prospective employers. The Schools of Design had been created in order to satisfy the demands of industry; they had been modified to pacify industrialists and a great uniform system based entirely upon the requirements of manufacturers was fastened upon every art class and every art school in the country. (pp.261-262)

Eggleston (1970/71) pinpoints the emergence of handicraft and housecraft in various types and levels of English school in a 20-year period (1880-1900); he notes how utilitarian and vocational concerns completely characterized this sector of education. A "utilitarian justification" permeated the 19th century art and craft curriculum, regarding these essentially practical activities as "a pre-vocational training for the rapidly growing ranks of semi-skilled and domestic workers" (p.174). This persistent justification of the existence of art and craft education within the school curriculum, in utilitarian terms, appears in the Hadow Report of 1926 (cited in Cross, 1977):

In no other subject has there been in the last century a greater advance in the methods of teaching than in those of Drawing and Art. The greater respect now given to the subject is . . . a realisation of its value in the teaching of other subjects . . . [and] a recognition of the importance to the whole community of

a finer taste In the formation of such taste drawing must be one of the chief means.

Some practical skill in drawing forms a valuable and indeed indispensable adjunct to the study of various branches of the curriculum such as woodwork and metalwork, elementary geometry, elementary science, particularly nature study, biology and mechanics, geography and history. (p.31)

Another Ministry of Education report (1946), Art Education, continued the policy of art in the service of industrial production and consumer discrimination when its prefatory note indicated two broad aims for the field of art education within the state system:

To raise the level of public taste and appreciation, both by cultivating discrimination and by encouraging art and craft activities such as leisure-time pursuits, and secondly to provide the training required for those who may take up artistic careers, more especially in industries which depend on good design and craftsmanship. (p:5)

Over 20 years later when the Minister of State at the Department of Education and Science, Mrs Shirley Williams MP, addressed a conference on "Design in Education" (National Union of Teachers, 1969), consumerism and automated production methods were again paramount issues. Williams stressed that "design and the approach to design should underline the whole consciousness of the consumer" and that art and craft activity should allow for "a true understanding of the methods of production" (p.6).

The major criticisms of the South Kensington model of design.

instruction came from individuals outside official circles. Sutton (1967) cites both Ruskin and Herbert Spencer as examples of influential figures in the field of art and philosophy who raised issues concerning the importance of art to individual development. Ruskin particularly condemned the constant practice of copying straight lines in drawing as merely a rapid method of producing cheap designs for manufacturers. The 1835 initiative had, in Ruskin's opinion, addressed itself solely to the guidance of an artisan class. Quick (cited in Sutton, 1967) portrayed the South Kensington system as an all pervading force controlling the art educational content of millions of children. A curriculum which was based solely on transmitting manual skills to adults, Quick believed, was of little educational value to the minds of children.

Current written debate--not just specific to the field of art education--has focused on the threat to the school curriculum posed by vocational and technical training initiatives. Holt (1983, 1984) and Gorbitt (1984) have both questioned recent vocationalized training programs which seek to deny the tradition of liberal education in British schooling. "Vocational pressures and employment-led skills" (Holt, 1983, p.85) have, according to Gorbitt (1984), undermined the principal aim of education for democracy. Goodman (1975), within the confines of art and craft education, warns against the education of the consumer becoming a dominant aim:

The danger is that if this [consumer education] is inflated into a major aim the role of art can be narrowed to limited objectives such as the promotion of Habitat or House and Garden cliches,--

a sort of middle-class 'dolce vita'. (p.10)

The influence of the design concept has once again become a major issue in the visual arts. Nineteenth century efforts to train an artisan workforce to improve industrial design and educate public taste have been re-echoed in recent curricular developments which favor a narrow conception of design education. Educational planners and administrators have, it seems, succumbed to political and commercial pressures in emphasizing utilitarian value in the art curriculum: training in vocational skills is seen as an adequate and appropriate education for all; art teachers are seen as producers of an effective workforce. In the organization and practice of many design-related programs and activities few safeguards have been evident that preserve the uniqueness of the art curriculum.

Curriculum planning and integration. Curriculum development activities as we know them today--with funded projects, news bulletins, broadsheets, working papers, and reports, as well as advanced courses devoted to the theory of the business--are all very recent as far as Britain is concerned. Much of the interest in curriculum planning derives directly from the pioneering work done in America by Bloom (1956), Taba (1962), and Tyler (1949). Their basic theorizing in the curriculum field was to have considerable impact on educational research in England. At that time, teachers learned that educational aims could be broken down into specific objectives and that these objectives could be used as criteria for evaluating the success or failure of their courses. So persuasive was this "rational curriculum planning" model that some 20 years later it had become official policy

in the Schools Council working paper (1975), "The Whole Curriculum 13-16". The paper assures us that "most teachers would agree that planning of curriculum at all levels in schools should be as rational as possible" (p.61)

Lawton (1969) and Whitfield (1971) suggest that the rationally planned and integrated curriculum model is far more appropriate to an industrialized egalitarian society. The curriculum has changed, according to Lawton (1969, pp. 5-6), as a result of three related social pressures:

1. An "economic" pressure for schools to produce scientists, mathematicians, and technologists.
2. An "ideological" pressure for schools to transmit a common culture to all children.
3. A "rationality" pressure for schools to provide relevance and explanation across the educational spectrum.

Whitfield (1971) maintains the curriculum of schools should be derived from theoretical considerations rather than ad hoc necessity. In a further study (Whitfield, 1973), he assesses the needs and interests of the child as being of secondary importance in curriculum planning:

If we are searching for a fundamental referent for curriculum planning, only (iii)--man's acquired knowledge and understanding stands as an irreducible element, for both our sense of community and our ideal of the person are contingent upon this aspect.

This is not to suggest that (i) [society] and (ii) [the individual pupil] . . . are not important in curriculum planning--but merely to assert that they are logically secondary. (p.40)

Contemporary zeal for synthesis and curriculum integration has revolved around contemporary theories of knowledge of Hirst (1975) and Phenix (1964). Whether it is six "realms of meaning" (Phenix) or seven "forms of knowledge" (Hirst), both analysts propose planned, system-based change in the whole curriculum of schools. They have shifted the discussion from a consideration of the merits of particular subjects, to a sharper focus on the purposes and aims of education and on the curriculum as a whole. Their concern is for a broad, coherent curriculum for all pupils. As a consequence, present curricula is perceived as being too narrow and its approaches too differentiated. In the interests of balance and coverage, unified experiences--inter-subject or supra-subject structure blocks of related subjects--provide an operational model for integrated curriculum planning based on the "forms" or "realms" of knowledge.

In "Power and the Integrated Curriculum", Musgrove (1973) believes schools should be "very loose confederations of diverse centres of academic power" (p.10). Arguing that social structure and culture in a post-industrial society are diversified, differentiated, fragmented, Musgrove contends that teachers can cooperate effectively from a subject base without having to lose their identity to centralized forms of organizational control. Musgrove considers any blurring of subject boundaries in the interests of unified or integrated curricula and corresponding organizational structures, to be retrogressive, dangerous, and inefficient. He maintains that the foundation of powerful monopolies within education threatens individual subject identity and teacher worth. The pluralist nature of modern

society requires diversity in the curriculum, not centralization:

Open-plan architecture and integrated curricula are part of the process of homogenization which social analysts see as the dominant trend of our times. I believe that the opposite is the case: that post-industrial societies are not characteristically homogenized and 'massified'; they are even more segmented, differentiated, diversified. Differences are not removed but accentuated. And the trend is not towards more bureaucracy, if by bureaucracy we mean highly centralized forms of organizational control. Contemporary curriculum development and its organization corollaries are a curious throwback: a retrogression which has no enduring place in post-industrial societies. (pp. 9-10)

Gregor (1973), in a philosophical paper "Integrated Art and Aesthetics", describes the word "integration" as the current educational "hurrah" word which has been used in a notoriously ambiguous fashion (see Pring, 1970; 1973, for a similar assessment of the terms "integrated" and "interdisciplinary"). She felt this devaluation of the concept was a pity since a great deal of valuable practical work had been achieved under the integration banner, even though, in her opinion, the rationale had not been articulated in any precise or satisfactory manner.

In the research studies of Stockl (1974, 1976), integration emerged as one of the central concerns in art and design education. Stockl indicated that the increased provision for art, with the reorganization of schools into a comprehensive system, was being offered in the form of design departments or creative arts faculties.

The disquiet felt by some art educators about integratory approaches and structures seems to have been given statistical weight with Stockl's (1974) "Art Integrated" research, where she found from the replies of art advisers and teachers "there was a certain wariness of organized integration" (p.19). Of some 7½% of all heads of art departments and all art advisers questioned in England and Wales, Stockl discovered the least popular form of integration was the one based upon design departments. Headteachers questioned on curriculum innovation in art indicated a strong preference for some form of integration, and, where interdisciplinary work was envisaged at all, most favored the design option.

Another researcher, Cameron (1974), concluded that out of a variety of applications of the integration concept two had a special impact on art education:

1. The integration of aims, curriculum and practical work of the art and crafts departments into the 'design' departments.
2. The integration of the physical facilities of the art and crafts departments. (pp.57-58)

Holt (1974, 1978) argues that any program which interrelates the arts and crafts within a scheme or rationale of whole curriculum planning, needs "the bureaucratic protection offered by a faculty structure" (1974, p.20). For this reason, Holt cautiously supports a "weak theory of integration" (1978, p.77) with regard to art, craft and, to some extent, housecraft. Clement (1975), in a position paper representing the views of the Association of Art Advisers (AAA), questioned the increasing tendency in comprehensive schools to group

arts subjects within a generalized faculty system. Faculty groupings have usually been based on "traditional and assumed working relationships between subjects" (p.1); some faculty combinations have been based on a somewhat limited network of relationships. Clement believes too many faculty groupings "tend to assume that the subjects involved are composite rather than complementary" (p.1). In an endeavor to secure political power and parity of esteem in the school curriculum, the arts may well be prevented from achieving full effectiveness in terms of content, relevance, and teaching style. The administratively convenient and economically attractive proposition of combining art with other subjects in the curriculum has led to a polarization of aims. In his special study undertaken on behalf of the Schools Council "Art and the Adolescent" project, Clement (1972) summarized the then current situation in art teaching accordingly:

At their two extremes the two main movements towards integration represent two very contrasting points of view as to their educational function. Many design departments are particularly concerned with analysis, research and the application of logic in problem solving situations--with the cognitive aspects of education. In the expressive arts departments much emphasis may be placed on the role of feeling, intuition and personal response--with the affective aspects of education. For administrative or political reasons within the school, one of these aspects may be implemented at the expense of the other and to the possible detriment of a properly balanced programme for the children. (p.23)

Macdonald (1974), in an article for the National Society for Art Education (NSAE) Journal entitled "Unity or Fragmentation", focused attention on the "dilution" or lowest common denominator aspect when art and art education are forced to submerge their identities within group working strategies along thematic lines. Sensing motivations more in keeping with economic and political expediency than educational worth, the author suggests art and art education are being compromised and devalued by such methods:

Integration involves dilution and fragmentation of our disciplines [art and art education]. Cooperation between areas based on sound disciplines produces the most valuable multi-media experiences.

(p.1)

Whilst integration has been viewed with distrust, suspicion, and alarm by many art educators, "collaboration" appears to be a softer, less contentious term with regard to closer working relationships between arts subjects, home economics, and craft design and technology (CDT). The Schools Council bulletin (1978), Art 7-11, explains how "the collaborative potential of art" (p.41) requires respect for the separate subject identities in any combined work. The publication acknowledges the importance of visual education in supporting, extending and complementing other subject areas in project work, but reinforces the need for art to fulfil its primary purpose within curriculum. Integration on these terms would be a marriage of true minds, where each subject would make equal and different demands upon the child. Langer (1970) has made similar observations with regard to the concept of expressiveness across the arts and crafts continuum,

when she concludes that it is untrue and dangerous to generalize from a single consideration. Basic principles should be sought rather than adherence to any simple and sweeping theory of sameness:

Such candid study is more rewarding than the usual passionate declaration that all the arts are alike, only their materials differ, their principles are all the same, their techniques all analogous, etc. That is not only unsafe, but untrue. It is in pursuing the differences among them that one arrives, finally at a point where no more differences appear; then one has found, not postulated, their unity. (p.169)

The politics of design in general education. Following the Ruskin College speech on the 18 October 1976 by the then Prime Minister, James Callaghan MP, the Secretary of State for Education and Science in England and Wales initiated national debates on education. These initiatives followed strong critical comment in the papers and elsewhere that standards of performance had declined and that the educational system was out of touch with the fundamental need for Britain to survive economically in a highly competitive world, through the efficiency of its industry and commerce. Following these discussions the Green Paper, Command Paper 6869, was published (Department of Education and Science, 1977).

As a statement of future government policy in the field of education, the document was critical of schools where the curriculum had not kept pace with modern industrial life. It emphasized the part played by education in revitalizing British manufacturing industry, thereby increasing national wealth. The idea that "design

for all may bring practical benefits to British industry" (Doe, 1980, p.5) perfectly fitted the Green Paper's priorities for more practical education to aid industrial regeneration. Design studies, with its problem-solving approach and rather intellectualized incremental process, appeared to offer just the right kind of broad and flexible education appropriate for transfer to future technologies.

The education and industry lobby had rapidly grown in the 1970's. A preoccupation with the issue of standards in education at the beginning of the decade developed by the late 70's into increasing concern that schools should become more related to the world of work. Connections had been drawn between schooling, the attitudes of teachers, and the declining national economic performance (Weinstock, 1976, p.2). The present Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher MP, since taking office in 1979, has been active in promoting connections between design education and industry. A seminar (1982) on "Product design and market success" held at 10 Downing Street, stressed the importance of problem-solving approaches and design utility:

At present, design is too often taught in secondary schools as an art subject. It is rarely taught as it should be--as a practical, problem-solving discipline that is ideal for preparing young people for work within the constraints of user needs and the market Syllabuses are arranged to give greater merit to 'pure' art than to the practical application of design.

(Thatcher, 1982, p.2)

It is clear from the general tone of this pronouncement that the Prime Minister is referring to a functional design suited to the needs

of engineering and industrial production; it has little to do with aesthetic considerations relating to design appearance.

Design has been a recognisable secondary school subject since the late 60's. Sometimes design education sprang from the individual efforts of art and craft teachers who wanted to add an extra dimension to the teaching of manual skills; sometimes it was used as an appropriate label when, for the sake of rationalization, art and craft and home economics facilities were grouped together in a design faculty building ("Design in Schools", 1977). A series of Government-sponsored Schools Council curriculum development projects sought to overlay the traditional craft activities of wood and metalwork with the notion of "total" design (Harrison, 1969). Design, as a subject, featured in courses for teacher preparation in London (Goldsmith's College and Hornsey) and provincial outposts in the Midlands (Loughborough) and Wales (Cardiff). Apart from these ad hoc activities, the Government commissioned two major reports on design education in schools : Design in General Education (Royal College of Art, 1979) and Design Education at Secondary Level (Design Council, 1980).

The semantic ambiguity associated with the term "design" has contributed to confusion in the literature. Herbert Read (1965/66), the British philosopher and art educator, in an essay on the complexities of design in general education, conjectured on the true meaning of design-- in a general sense of "design for living"--in contrast to related terms like form, pattern, and composition:

We design everything we make for a purpose, tools, furniture, houses, towns and regions. We also talk about design in the things.

we make for our pleasure--paintings, music, ballet, costumes, etc. Is it the same quality which we bring into such apparently diverse activities? Is design the connecting link between the useful and the beautiful? What, in fact, do we mean by the word design? (p.6)

Professor L.B. Archer, leader of the Design Education Project unit at the Royal College of Art, reported (cited in Egglestone, 1976) that the design "confluence" could in his opinion be described thus:

Design is that area of human experience, skill and knowledge which is concerned with man's ability to mould his environment, to suit his material and spiritual needs There is a sufficient body of knowledge for this area called 'design' to be developed to a level which will merit scholarly regard for the future. (p.15)

Archer (1975), in taking "a closer look at the relations between the broad concept of design in general education and its component parts" (p.1), locates the meaning of the term "design" somewhere at the intersection between attitude (design awareness), process (problem solving), and product (artifact or design solution). From a myriad of meanings and interpretations, Archer has indicated how the term has been variously employed in schools to mean:

1. Design activity, alongside art, craft and other subjects.
2. Design activity, as a substitute for art, craft etc.
3. Design activity, representing a special sort of problem-solving approach.
4. Design activity, as a vehicle for general educational experience.
5. Design appreciation, as a synonym for visual education.

6. Design appreciation, as a liberal arts study.
7. Design education, as a collective term for the activities of a loosely federated group of 'practical' subjects. (p.2).

A host of conflicting opinions have emerged about the meaning, nature, content and structure of design in general education. More particularly, the issue of how design education should be introduced into schools still remains unresolved. The pivotal concern, to drastically condense Archer's seven applications of design in schools, is still whether design should be structured within the school organization "as a separate department; as a loose combination of art, craft, technology, and home economics; or as a theme across the curriculum" (Rogers, 1983, p.22)

In his book Art and Industry, Read (1934) warned of the dangers to society, to personal freedom and to education, inherent in the development of a technologically-based civilization. In particular, he equated functionalism in industry with vocationalism in education. There has been increasing evidence of the latter in practical education for at least a decade now (1969-79). The rapid growth in design education has, according to Clement (1974), been the consequence of policies formulated in the light of utilitarian goals for an industrial mass-society. Motivations associated with this particular type of integration, i.e. faculty groups linking art, craft (woodwork, metalwork, and technical subjects), and home economics, have been enumerated by Clement in the form of "pressures":

Pressure from the D.E.S. [Department of Education and Science] to up-date the image of Craft education with consequent pressure upon

the Colleges of Education to re-structure their courses.

Publicity pressure from two very successful Schools Council Projects ["A School Approach to Technology" (1967) and "Education Through the use of Materials" (1969)].

Theoretical pressure from these projects and from a number of articulate lecturers in Colleges of Art and Education.

The pressure of Comprehensive reorganization and an attendant building programme with a strong emphasis upon providing related and shared facilities for Art, Craft and Home Economics.

Political pressure within the schools to form larger empires to match the other large faculties being formed. (p.12)

The past two decades have seen the re-emergence of vocationalism as a central issue in British education. Vocationalism is the belief that the purpose of education is to prepare pupils for employment, and to give these pupils transferable skills appropriate to a technological age. With the establishment of design courses in secondary schools, the focus of art teaching has changed to accommodate integrated programs of study. This new approach to art and design is, in the opinion of many art educators, a restrictive practice directed towards prescribed outcomes.

The development of design education has obviously had an impact upon the content and organization of art in schools. With the introduction of a design "rationale", problem-solving has become a

central activity extending to the related areas of art, craft, and home economics. The adoption of a common model in this section of the curriculum fails to respect individual subject differences. For many art teachers, traditional values have been forfeited in the interests of an integrated system.

Chapter 5

Design Education

Background. From the mid 1960's to the present (1986), the accelerating change in the political/social/economic climate has resulted in a "rationalization" policy being adopted in schools to deal with the results of falling rolls, dwindling resources, and increased demand for technologists. Recent progress in English art education has, in consequence, focused upon the question of integration within the context of curriculum development with the establishment of design education courses in middle and secondary schools. Rearrangement of timetables and the assimilation of art and craft education within design faculties or departments has changed and/or limited the role for art education in some schools. The usual result has been a reduction in quantity and quality of art teaching.

In England, the pressure for educational accountability caused central-and-local government to review priorities and generally tighten up the art and craft curriculum. The emergence of design education seemed to serve two purposes: (1) an economical use of building areas, and (2) the desire to break down subject barriers. Apart from highlighting the need to rationalize and justify the educational function of craft teaching, design education succeeded in securing funded study. Money from central government has financed research by the Schools Council, Design Council, and certain universities and colleges on an unprecedented scale.

Against this background of concern, design education first developed as a serious aspect of general education in the late 1960's.

The British stereotype drew sustenance from William Morris and the early 20th century Art and Craft Movement, from the Bauhaus and its industrial art school tradition of the 1920's; from the development of "basic design" courses for students entering art schools and colleges in the late 1950's-and-60's (especially at Newcastle, Leeds, Cardiff, and Hornsey (London)). Projects were initiated preparing teaching and learning packages for new courses which would improve the teaching of design. The funding for this research was distributed through three agencies: the Schools Council (Loughborough College of Education "Project Technology", 1967-72; University of Exeter "Arts and the Adolescent" project, 1968-72; University of Keele "Design and Craft Education Project", 1968-73; Goldsmith's College, University of London "Art and Craft Education 8-13" project, 1969-72; Education Unit, Town and County Planning Association "Art and the Built Environment" project, 1976-80), Royal College of Art ("Design in General Education" study, 1974-76), and the Design Council ("Design Education at Secondary Level" study, 1978-80). Whilst reports from these major projects have influenced the development of design education in the period under discussion (1969-79), other published research has been of importance (e.g. Aylward, 1973; Baynes, 1969; Eggleston, 1976; Green, 1974; Zanker, 1972). Alongside this there has also been the introduction of a journal, Studies in Design Education and Craft, and the establishment of a professional association, the National Association for Design Education.

That design education has brought much needed impetus to current craft teaching in schools is to be applauded; that it has provided

administrators, and many headmasters, with a system that at the same time both fragments and integrates art education is something not quite so praiseworthy. At "grass roots" level, therefore, art teachers have continued to be particularly apprehensive about their role in relation to design departments. Many sincere art teachers are very uneasy about a curriculum for children which seeks to concentrate only upon a common core of basic elements. Antagonists of the "art-in-design education" model (e.g. Association of Art Advisers, 1973; Barrett, 1979; Cameron, 1977; Clement, 1973, 1974; Goddman, 1976; Stockl, 1974) maintain that, whilst design studies have given academic respectability to a traditionally low status area within school curricula, the design method largely denies the individual and intuitive nature of activity in the visual arts.

Analysis. The departure from what Meeson (1974) calls the "fine art/craft" rationale, with its emphasis on the art object requiring particular skills or techniques, was spearheaded for-the-most-part through the authoritative writings of Dewey (1934), Lowenfeld (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970), and Read (1949). Their view of art education as a "general education concept which does not posit any particular outcome for artistic activity in the form of a particular artifact" (Meeson, 1974, p.293) took up a diametrically opposed position in relation to the then dominant artifact-orientated courses. Something of the flavor of this "either/or" syndrome (Allison, 1978)-- "either a reaction against or . . . remedy for the felt deficiencies in the prevailing mode of thought or action" (p.85)--appears to characterize current thinking with regard to the design education/expressive

art polemic. The pressure to tighten up and defend the arts curriculum has, in many observers' view, permitted the pendulum to swing back and rediscover the "supposed" benefits to be derived from instruction and training for the development of public taste (Brown, 1921, p.120).

In this respect, the educational pendulum has heralded the return of the well-meaning, but radical, design education rationale.

The development of design education studies in English schools has given much needed professional identity and direction to craft teaching. In the promotion of problem solving and decision making processes, design education has shifted the base of craft teaching appreciably away from the menial and the manual. Objectives have been clearly defined and appear to relate to socially beneficial outcomes whilst affording the individual the opportunity of confronting practical and functional problems. Design education has presented a logical, objective, and largely intellectual program of problem recognition and solution; it involves children in problem solving experiences in both two-and-three-dimensional media; it requires the use of a whole process of reasoning which has as its goal the efficient production of a functional product; and it is seen as offering multidisciplinary design solutions to human needs. Design is viewed as the element which draws together the social, technical, economic, and aesthetic factors inherent in the understanding of contemporary technological and cultural problems.

Whilst acknowledging the considerable progress which has been made in moving craft education away from the traditionally separate subjects of woodwork, metalwork, and technical drawing, with its

practical blend of limited inflexible exercises and outdated vocational skills, critics of design education point to an imbalance in its overall approach. They argue that a systematic program which follows a rigid step by step process towards a known goal is alien to the divergent, "problem finding" nature of art education. How can such an approach cater to the emotional, imaginative, and intuitive development of the individual? The potential of expressive artwork is dangerously undervalued in some secondary schools (Goodman, 1980), its approach considered too romantic, spontaneous and lacking in objectivity. Personal expression fails to feature in the general procedures of design education.

The answer to the problem of how to achieve a more balanced diet in the aesthetic/creative mode is not necessarily to be found in total subject integration. In the areas of art, craft design and technology, and home economics such an arrangement, limits working practices. Competence is encouraged in the use of tools to certain prescribed ends: those of uniformity, acceptance, and dependence; rather than diversity, questioning, and independence. Where design departments have been operational for some time, the art specialist has experienced a sense of vulnerability far more acute than the "apparent" isolationism protagonists of design education sought to combat within art departments. The art teacher, inadequately trained and creatively unsuited to the role which now confronts him in his new situation; has suffered a loss of identity and erosion of professional status unparalleled since the introduction of art education into state schools in Britain.

Conclusion. In Herbert Read's (1968) last published writing looking forward to the 1970's, he took up the theme of design. Recognizing the tendency to integrate schools of art with polytechnics and colleges of technology as yet another example of State rationalization limiting artistic function, Read concluded that the practical, social and commercial values of the new design concept support mechanization, not imagination. Read went on to elucidate why, in his opinion, this new concept of design augurs badly for art education:

Perhaps I should say it tends to deny the imagination; that I fear that in another ten years it will have betrayed the imagination. To express the same thought in other words: it deprives the work of art of its symbolic value, its original function of creating forms expressive of human feeling. (p.16).

Alarmingly, Read's words went unheeded, and, in the years that have elapsed since this prophetic warning, design education is distinctly "suffering from a severe case of accelerated growth" (Clement, 1973, p. 2).

The creation of design departments/faculties, the adoption of a common model for the design process, and the extension of design-related activities across the art and crafts curriculum, has imposed structures on art education that have been both harmful and retrograde. This damage has been compounded by the introduction of integrated programs encouraging a uniformity of working procedure with an emphasis on the operational aspect. Art teachers, anxious to re-establish the unique contribution of their subject area, are unsympathetic to an approach which emphasizes a functional attitude to design. Such a paradigm

prevents adequate response to the balanced needs of children: their sensory needs, their intellectual needs, and their emotional needs. The design education rationale offers a program of problem-solving experiences in a variety of media. Art education goes far beyond this level of understanding; it is a more diverse activity in which expressive forces interrelate with rational considerations. Any collaborative schemes in the art and design field must recognize and respect these essential differences.

Art education's involvement in design education has been, in the author's opinion, a misguided attempt by those in authority to confer a respectable status label on an area of activity hitherto considered "different" in curricular terms. That teachers have been diverted away from a consensus of previously-accepted art educational goals is, according to Read, a betrayal of the imagination. The results of art education's acquiescence to external pressure groups has finally brought about the rise of design education faculties. The respectability sought by early defendants of the integration policy has proved to be nothing but an organizational veneer: an insubstantial wrapping, promising much but achieving little. Art education "forcibly" made respectable conforming to the pattern of technological advance has paid a high price indeed for that respect.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Art . . . never presents us with a blueprint of what to think or what knowledge we should have or attempt to influence us as to the conclusions we should come to, but rather presents us with raw material--essential abstractions in imagery and symbolic form which have to be worked on, refined and made the basis of original action or thought by individuals The Arts, through their imagery, afford the possibility for independent thinking, as alternatives to the exactitude of standardisation, of uniformity, of predictability and of single-valued thinking enjoyed by analytical philosophy, scientific calculations and their technological application. (Marshak, 1976, p.5)

In this study the author has described the background, implementation, and major shortcomings associated with the use of artists within educational settings and the introduction of design education components into the art and craft curriculum. He has argued that both innovations are expressions of communities which have lost faith in the traditional values of art education, as expressed by D'Amico, Lowenfeld, and Read. Both are responses to the fickleness of time and mood, that have demoralized those whose concern it is to develop the creativity of children. The artist-in-the-school program embodies an approach which seeks to either radically change the art teacher's role within the curriculum or, more drastically, to make the art teacher's contribution subordinate to that proffered by the peripatetic employee-craftsmen. In the case of design education, an attempt has been made to impose

highly prescriptive and technical skill-based programs on the visual arts, with the consequent departure from previously-accepted educational goals which emphasized self-fulfilment.

Whilst it is suggested that the practice of putting professional artists in education raises serious issues about the nature and relevance of the visual arts in American schools, it has never-the-less provided a valuable opportunity to narrow the gap which exists between artists and art educators. Clearly the artist as practising amateur has a rich and inspiring contribution to make to education at all levels but not necessarily in terms of commitment to the classroom. As a resource person in the community, the artist can be used most effectively when supplementing on-going programs designed by teachers; as a "teacher" in the classroom, the artist often lacks the communication skills necessary to successfully impart his or her ideas to children. Recent research by Hargreaves (1983) and Tickle (1983) reinforce the value of good teacher-pupil dialogue in those areas of the curriculum particularly concerned with creativity and personal growth. The art of teaching is a crucial factor in effective learning in the visual arts. To ask artists to act as teachers is to invite a lowering of standards and create disharmony generally.

In a similar vein, the author has questioned the manner in which art is employed in integrated art and design education programs. A belief in integration as an educational ideal is disastrous if, in the implementation of this approach, little regard is taken of the different objectives, processes, and the basic character of the constituent subject areas. If we habitually approach art and design education from

a solely functional, quantitative, and scientific standpoint we do not encourage aesthetic enquiry in the child and little suspect "what spontaneous activities, what fertile curiosity, may have been stifled in him" (Piaget, 1953, p.23). The submergence and misapplication of art within integrated design programs need not become the blueprint. Adams and Ward (1982) provide a considerable measure of sensitivity and understanding in their proposals for ways in which the creative arts might develop an awareness of the sensory and feeling significances inherent in the child's personal relationship with his (built) environment. The urban complex can provide a focus for some genuine sharing of ideas and approaches, without compromising either art or design education in the process. Providing the different needs and experiences are respected, the emphasis must always be on the extent to which the child can explore and learn in a personal way.

In his 1982 Reith Lectures, Denis Donoghue (1983) challenges the view that the arts can and should be explained in purely rational terms. The "resentment against mystery" (p.33), Donoghue argues, takes the form of a domestication of the arts. Living in an age when adult sophistication demands total explanation, perfection and utility, the threat to our children's innocence and unfettered absorption in the creative arts is a very real one. Indeed, it has been the task of this author to suggest that the two curriculum innovations described inhibit personal introspection and exploratory experience in art. Both issues have raised fundamental questions concerning the meaning and control of art and design education in our society. Art education does not aim to teach children to say or do the right things; it is

concerned with fostering individual growth in problem-finding processes and posing new problems of creative freedom, with all the risks of crudity and error. Utility alone is clearly no substitute for the unique nature of the aesthetic experience. Morris (1972), whilst not confining himself exclusively to art education, describes quite beautifully what for him true engagement in creative education means to the individual child, when he writes:

Creative education is concerned with joyful discovery by children of their powers of construction and expression, of imagination and reason, freely exercised and uncoerced by neurotic adult pressures for premature results which can be defined beforehand. It is concerned with personal development, with the discovery by every child of what he has within him to become. It is thus concerned with being and becoming, with the right to enjoy every stage of our development for, and in, itself, as well as a preparation for further stages. (Morris, p.249)

The expressive tradition had its greatest impact upon the pattern of art education in the period between the Second World War and the late 1950's. It was a tradition sustained by the ideas and potent influence of D'Amico, Lowenfeld and Read. The methods advocated by these major figures of 20th century art education were adopted by generations of teachers committed to a child-centered view. Such an orientation appealed to a post-war world eager to value individual freedom and social harmony.

Whilst D'Amico, Lowenfeld and Read indicated the way forward 30 or 40 years ago, their achievements have been undermined by a view of

art education geared to the present age of efficiency and technological change. In a post-modern world the ideas of these men--ideas whose roots stem from humanistic rather than technological concerns--are once again relevant and urgently needed. Otherwise, there is a real danger that some of art education's most cherished values from the D'Amico/Lowenfeld/Read era will be eroded beyond recognition.

REFERENCES

- Abbs, P. (1979). Reclamations : Essays on culture, mass-culture and the curriculum. London : Heinemann Educational.
- Adams, E., & Ward, C. (1982). Art and the built environment : A teacher's approach. Harlow, Essex, England : Longman/Schools Council.
- Allison, B. (1978). The 'either/or' and its effects on education. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 12(2), 85-91.
- Anderson, C.H. (1981). The identity crisis of the art educator : artist? teacher? both? Art Education, 34(4), 45-46.
- Aquino, J.T. (1978). Artists as teachers (Fastback 113). Bloomington, Indiana : Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Archer, L.B. (1975, May). A closer look at the relations between the broad concept of design in general education and its component parts. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midland Art Advisers, Leicester, England.
- Arkansas State Arts and Humanities Council. (1976). Artists in the schools, 1975-76. Washington, D.C. : National Endowment for the Arts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 504)
- Association of Art Advisers. (1973; June). The establishment of design departments in schools. (Available from AAA, Woolley Hall, Wakefield, Yorks, England)
- Aylward, B.(Ed.). (1973). Design education in schools. London : Evans
- Barkan, M. (1963). Transition in art education. Art Education, 15(17), 12-18.
- Barrett, M. (1979). Art education : a strategy for course design. London : Heinemann Educational.

- Baynes, K.(Ed.). (1969). Attitudes in design education. London : Lund Humphries.
- Bell; Q. (1963). The schools of design. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Best, D. (1979). Free expression, or the teaching of techniques. British Journal of Educational Studies, 27(3), 210-220.
- Biehl, J. (1972). Let's put it all together : compromise and care. Art Education, 25(9), 14-15.
- Blackstone, T., & Wood, R. (1981). Making schools more accountable. New Society, 58, 531-532.
- Bloom, B.S.(Ed.). (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives : the classification of educational goals (Handbook 1 : Cognitive domain). New York : David Mckay.
- Broudy, H.S. (1978). The arts as basic education.. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 12(4), 21-29.
- Broudy, H.S. (1979). Arts education : necessary or just nice? Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 347-350.
- Brown, F. (1921). The training of public taste. In National Society of Art Masters, Some aspects of art education (pp. 120-130). London : Allen & Unwin.
- Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. (1982). The arts in schools : principles, practice and provision. London : Author.
- Cameron, H.R. (1974). An examination of the concepts of design education, in relation to its influence on the organization and practice in some design/creative studies departments in secondary and comprehensive schools. Unpublished dissertation, University of Leeds, England.
- Cameron, H.R. (1977). Design and creative studies departments--Have we

gone too far? Studies in Design Education and Craft, 9(2),
247-251.

Campbell, A.D. (1978). Marion Richardson and the crab's claw.

Studies in Design Education Craft and Technology, 11(1), 15-21.

Carline, R. (1968). Draw they must. Leeds : Arnold.

Carter, M.N. (1977). NEA's low marks in self-assessment. Art News,
76(5), 44-45.

Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory. (1970). The artist
in the schools : A report on the artist-in-residence project.

St. Louis, Missouri : Author.

Chapman, L.H. (1978). Coming to our senses : beyond the rhetoric.

Art Education, 31(1), 4-9.

Clement, R. (1972). Art for whose sake? (Themes in Education No. 30).

Exeter, England : University of Exeter Institute of Education.

Clement, R. (1973, June). Design education : The inflatable object.

Paper presented at a conference of the Association of Art Advisers,
Woolley Hall, Wakefield, Yorks, England.

Clement, R. (1974). Design education the other side of the coin.

Studies in Design Education and Craft, 6(2), 12-16.

Clement, R. (1975, January). Creative arts faculties. NSAE Journal,
pp. 1-4.

Conant, H. (1965). The role of professional artists in art education.

Seminar on Elementary and Secondary School in the Visual Arts.

(Co:op Research Project No. V-003, pp. 198-209) New York : New York
University.

Conant, H. (1973). Season of decline. In G. Battcock (Ed.), New ideas
in art education (pp. 149-169). New York : Dutton.

- Conn, C. (1978). The artist and the teacher. Art Teacher, 8(3), 18-19.
- Connecticut Commission on the Arts Education Programs. (1973). Artists in the classroom. Hartford : Author.
- Cox, C.B., Boyson, R., Pollard, A., & Brittan, L. (1973). The accountability of schools (National Council for Educational Standards : Conference 1973). Enfield, Middlesex, England : Churchill Press.
- Cross, J. (1977). For art's sake? A strategic approach to teaching art in schools (Classroom Close-ups 6). London : George Allen & Unwin.
- Curtis, S.J., & Boulwood, M.E.A. (1977). A short history of educational ideas (5th ed.). Slough, Bucks, England : University Tutorial Press.
- D'Amico, V.E. (1953). Creative teaching in art (Rev.ed.). Scranton, Penn.: International Textbook.
- D'Amico, V.E. (1959). The artist-teacher--The role of the professional artist in colleges and universities. The Art in Art Education (17th Annual Conference of the National Committee on Art Education). Madison : University of Wisconsin.
- D'Amico, V.E., & Buchman, A. (1972). Assemblage : A new dimension in creative teaching in action. New York : Thames & Hudson.
- Day, M.D. (1978). Point with pride or view with alarm? Notes on the evaluation of the NEA's artists-in-school program. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 12(1), 63-70.
- Department of Education and Science. (1977). Education in schools : A consultative document (Command Paper 6869). London : Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Design Council. (1980). Design education at secondary level. London : Author.
- Design in schools. (1977). The politics of scholarly regard. Practical Education and School Crafts, 74(2), 22-24.

- Dewey, J. (1934). Art as experience. London : Allen & Unwin.
- Dobbs, S.M. (1970/71). The visual arts in American education. The Journal of General Education, 22, 105-121.
- Doe, R. (1980, September 12). Design for all may bring practical benefits to British industry. Times Educational Supplement, p.5.
- Donoghue, D. (1983). The arts without mystery (1982 Reith Lectures). London : The British Broadcasting Corporation.
- Dorn, C.M. (1969). Art education without walls. Art Education, 22(2), 16-19.
- Dorn, C.M. (1972). Silent Seventies? Art Education, 25(1), 22-28.
- Dorn, C.M. (1976). Professional values ambiguity and ambivalence. Art Education, 29(2), 5-7.
- Dorn, C.M. (1977). NAEA : A status report 1977. Art Education, 30(5), 7-11.
- Ecker, D.W. (1963). The artistic process as qualitative problem solving. The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 21(3), 283-290.
- Eddy, J. (1977). Art education : The basics and beyond. Art Education, 30(7), 6-12).
- Eggleston, S.J. Developments in the use of three dimensional materials Paedagogica Europaea, 6, 172-179.
- Eggleston, S.J. (1976). Developments in design education. London : Open Books.
- Eickhorst, W.S. (1977). Expression/Art education and the 17 years war. Art Education, 30(3), 26-27.
- Eisner, E.W. (1965). Curriculum ideas in a time of crisis. Art Education, 18(7), 7-12.
- Eisner, E.W. (1969). Art education. In R. Ebel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (4th ed., pp. 76-86). New York : Collier-Macmillan.
- Eisner, E.W. (1974). Is the artist in the school program effective?

- Art Education, 27(2), 19-23.
- Eisner, E.W. (1976a). Implications of the new educational conservatism for the future of the arts in education. In E.W. Eisner (Ed.), The arts, human development, and education (pp. 213-226). Berkeley, Calif. : McCutchan.
- Eisner, E.W. (1976b). Making the arts a reality in the schools of tomorrow--An agenda for today. Art Education, 29(3), 20-24.
- Eisner, E.W. (1977a). An agenda for today for a field tomorrow. Art Education, 30(5), 4-6.
- Eisner, E.W. (1977b, October). Training art teachers. Paper presented at a national conference on the training of art teachers; Bournemouth, Hants, England.
- Eisner, E.W. (1978). The state of art education today and some political remedies : A report to the National Endowment for the Arts. Art Education, 31(8), 14-23.
- Eisner, E.W. (1979a). Conservative influences on the arts in education. In S.M. Dobbs (Ed.), Arts education and back to basics (pp. 67-82). Reston, Virginia : National Art Education Association.
- Eisner, E.W. (1979b). Convention address : Art education--1975-1981. Art Education, 32(6), 11-18.
- Eisner, E.W. (1980, Autumn). The impoverished mind. Curriculum, pp. 11-17.
- Elsgood, R. (1984, September). Teachers are the key. Arts Express, p.10.
- Fenwick, J. (1978). Arts education : A new place in the sun? Phi Delta Kappan, 59(7), 467-470.
- Foley, R.R., & Templeton, D.E. (1970). Conflict, craftsmen, and professionals : A sociological view of the art teacher. Art Education, 23(2), 8-13.

- Forrest, E. (1983). Another look at the artist as the model for art education. Art Education Monographs (School of Art Education, City of Birmingham Polytechnic, England), 5, 17-28.
- Fyfe, G. (1975). Labourers in art. Studies in Design Education and Craft, 7(2), 38-48.
- Gardner, H. (1982). Art, mind, and brain. New York : Basic Books.
- Gombrich, E. (1979). Ideals and idols : Essays in values in history and in art. Oxford : Phaidon.
- Goodlad, J. (1974). Advancing art in U.S. public schools. In G.W. Hardiman & T. Zernich (Eds.), Curricular considerations for visual arts education : rationale, development, and evaluation (pp. 113-118). Champaign, Ill. : Stripes.
- Goodlad, J. (1979). Education in what is basic. In S.M. Dobbs (Ed.), Art education and back to basics (pp. 12-26). Reston, Virginia : National Art Education Association.
- Goodman, E. (1975). Curriculum justification (Art Education No. 2). In Association of Art Advisers, The Function of Art Education in Secondary Schools (pp. 5-12). Llandudno, N. Wales : Author.
- Goodman, E. (1976). Art and the secondary curriculum. Artscribe (Art Education issue), 5, 3-4.
- Goodman, E. (1980, April 4). Talkback/Neglecting the arts. Times Educational Supplement, p. 35.
- Goodman, E. (1981). The assessment of aesthetic development in the visual mode. In M. Ross (Ed.), The aesthetic imperative--relevance and responsibility in arts education (Curriculum issues in arts education, Vol.2, pp. 53-75), Oxford : Pergamon.
- Gorbutt, D. (1984). The new vocationalism : A critical note.

- Perspectives (Occasional publication, School of Education, University of Exeter, England), 14, 49-60.
- Green, P. (1974). Design education : Problem-solving and visual experience. London : Batsford.
- Greenberg, P. (1979). Coming to whose senses. Art Education, 32(6), 8-10.
- Gregor, S. (1973). Integrated art work and aesthetics. Studies in Design Education and Craft, 6(1), 38-43; 53.
- Gross, R. (1976). Extending the dream : A report of the 1975 artists-in-schools national conference. Washington, D.C. : National Endowment for the Arts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 160 483)
- Guyatt, R. (1977). Head, heart and hand. Two Lectures (Royal College of Art Papers), 2, pp.2-5.
- Hanks, N. (1971). Education through art : A gateway. Art Education, 24(7), 10-17.
- Hanson, D. (1971a). The art teachers. British Journal of Educational Studies, 19(1), 40-50.
- Hanson, D. (1971b). The development of a professional association of art teachers. The struggle to achieve professional identity and status. Studies in Design Education and Craft, 3(2), 30-40.
- Hargreaves, D.H. (1983). The teaching of art and the art of teaching : Towards an alternative view of aesthetic learning. In M. Hammersley & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Curriculum practice: some sociological case studies (pp. 127-147). Basingstoke, Hants, England : Falmer Press.
- Hargreaves, D.H., & Keddie, N. (1974). Sorting them out : Two essays on social differentiation (E282 Education Studies : A Second Level

- Course on School and Society, Units 9 and 10). Milton Keynes, Bucks, England : Open University Press.
- Harrison, G.B. (1969). A 'total design' approach in the secondary school curriculum. Studies in Education and Craft, 1(2), 9-11.
- Hausman, J.J. (1967). Teacher as artist and artist as teacher. Art Education, 20(4), 13-17.
- Hirst, P.H. (1975). Knowledge and the curriculum. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hoffa, H. (1972). The 'whats in it for me?' syndrome. Art Education, 25(8), 4-9.
- Hoffa, H. (1973, April). Allegiances, alliances and ambivalence. Paper presented at the National Art Education Association Conference, San Diego, Calif.
- Hoffa, H. (1977). The presidents. Art Education, 30(3), 13-14.
- Hoffa, H. (1979). Art education in [perpetual] crisis. Art Education, 32(1), 7-12.
- Holt, M. (1974). Art, craft and rational curriculum planning. Cambridge Journal of Education, 4(1), 14-22.
- Holt, M. (1978). The common curriculum. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Holt, M. (1981). Evaluating the evaluators. London : Hodder & Stoughton.
- Holt, M. (1983). Vocationalism : the new threat to universal education. Forum, 25(3), 84-86.
- Holt, M. (1984). The dream and the reality. Forum, 26(3), 68-69.
- Hubbard, G. (1978). Dare we agree? CSEA Annual Journal, 9, pp.39-48.
- Kelly, H. (1969). The artist and arts education. Art Education, 22(4), 2-5.

- Kerr, J.H. (1972). Arts projects as a vehicle for educational change--
21 Theses--A guideline for federal funders. Art Education, 25(9),
2-9.
- Kerr, J.H. (1976). Artists in educational settings : A report from
the National Endowment for the Arts. The National Elementary
Principal, 55(3), 47-51.
- Kuh, K. (1973). The art education myth. Texas Quarterly (U.S.A.),
16(1), 147-151.
- Langer, S.K. (1970). Expressiveness. In G. Pappas (Ed.), Concepts in
art and education (pp. 168-175). New York : Macmillan.
- Lanier, V. (1959). Affectation and art education. Art Education, 12(7),
10;21.
- Lanier, V. (1961). Hyphenization takes command. Art Education, 14(6),
5-8; 20-22.
- Lanier, V. (1969). The teaching of art as a social revolution.
Phi Delta Kappan, 50(6), 314-319.
- Lanier, V. (1971a). The artist-teacher re-visited. Art and Activities,
69(3), 10-12.
- Lanier, V. (1971b). Instructional media. Art and Activities, 69(4),
10;41; 45-46.
- Lanier, V. (1974). Objectives of art teaching. Journal of the Ontario
Society for Education through Art, 3(2), 69-80.
- Lanier, V. (1975). Objectives of art education : The impact of time.
Peabody Journal of Education, 52(3), 180-186.
- Lanier, V. (1978). The Trojan horse of glass : A cabalistic theory of
recent development in art education. Art Education, 31(6), 12-15.
- Lawton, D. (1969). The idea of an integrated curriculum. London

- Institute of Education Bulletin, 19, pp. 5-11.
- Logan, F.M. (1955). The growth of art in American schools. New York: Harper Bros.
- Logan, F.M. (1961). Artist in the schoolroom : A modern dilemma. Studies in Art Education, 2(2), 66-84.
- Logan, F.M. (1965). Development of art education in the twentieth century U.S.A. In J.J. Hausman (Ed.), Report of the commission on art education (pp. 49-67). Washington, D.C. : National Art Education Association.
- Lowe, R. (1958). The artist-as-teacher. Art Education, 11(6), 10-11; 19.
- Lowenfeld, V. (1953). Experiences in growth and development. In E. Ziegfeld (Ed.), Education and art (pp. 33-35), Paris : UNESCO.
- Lowenfeld, V., & Brittain, W.L. (1970). Creative and mental growth (5th Ed.). New York : Macmillan.
- McCracken, W. (1959). Artist-teacher. Art Education, 12(9), 4-5.
- Macdonald, S. (1970). The history and philosophy of art education. London : University of London Press.
- Macdonald, S. (1974). Unity or fragmentation. NSAE Journal, 1(2), 1-3.
- Manzella, D.B. (1963). Educationists and the evisceration of the visual arts. Scranton, Penn. : International Textbooks.
- Manzella, D.B. (1965). Strike him sharply. Athene, 11(3), 14.
- Manzella, D.B. (1967a). A depressing unanimity of opinion. Art Education, 20(4), 18-20.
- Manzella, D.B. (1967b). Too good to teach? School Arts, 66(7), 12-13.
- Marshak, M. (1976, January 17). Symbol, myth and art. New Destinations, (The Cockpit Lectures, Greater London Arts Association), pp. 1-8.
- Meeson, F. (1974). Art or nature : A problem of art in education and

teacher training. British Journal of Educational Studies, 22(3), 292-302.

Michael, J.A. (1978). The helotism of education : Art Education. Texas Trends in Art Education, 2(3), 43-47.

Michael, J.A. (1980). Studio art experience : The heart of art education. Art Education, 33(2), 15-19.

Ministry of Education. (1946). Art education (Pamphlet No. 6). London : Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Morison, B.G. (1970, December 19). The artist as teacher. Saturday Review, pp. 51-53; 63-64.

Morris, B. (1972). Objectives and perspectives in education. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Musgrove, F. (1973). Power and the integrated curriculum. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 5(1), 3-12.

National Union of Teachers. (1969, September). Design in education. A report of a conference held at NUT headquarters, Hamilton House, London, WC1.

Orsini, N. (1973). The dilemma of the artist-teacher. Art Journal, 32(3), 299-300.

Pearson, N.M. (1981). Art schools and the un-publicness of art. In W. Davies (Ed.), The teaching of art : The roots of self deception? (pp. 1-27). Aberystwyth, N. Wales : University College of Wales, Aberystwyth in conjunction with the Welsh Arts council.

Pearson, N.M. (1982). The State and the visual arts. Milton Keynes, Bucks., England : Open University Press.

Peel, E.A. (1954, November). Psychology and the teaching of art. British Journal of Psychology, pp. 143-153.

- Pevsner, N. (1973). Academies of art, past and present. New York : Da Capo Press.
- Phenix, P.H. (1964). Realms of meaning. New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Piaget, J. (1953). Art education and child psychology. In E. Ziegfeld (Ed.), Education and art (pp. 22-23). Paris : UNESCO.
- Pirsig, R.M. (1974). Zen and the art of motorcycle maintenance. London : Bodley Head.
- Plummer, G.S. (1976). Where were we in '76 and where are we now? A political survey of the past one hundred years in art education in the United States. Viewpoints (Bloomington, Indiana), 52, n.p.
- Pring, R. (1970). Curriculum integration. London Institute of Education Bulletin, 20, pp. 4-8.
- Pring, R. (1973). Curriculum integration : the need for clarification. The New Era, 54(3), 59-64.
- Qualley, C.A. (1976). Addressing some problems in art education accountability. Art Education, 29(4), 4-6.
- Raleigh, H.P. (1965). The image of the art teacher. Art Education, 18(7), 13-15.
- Read, H. (1934). Art and industry. London : Faber.
- Read, H. (1949). Education through art (2nd ed.). London : Faber.
- Read, H. (1953). Education through art. In E. Ziegfeld (Ed.); Education and art (pp. 25-27). Paris : UNESCO.
- Read, H. (1963). Forward. In S.M. Robertson, Rosegarden and labyrinth--A study of art education (pp. xiii-xiv). London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Read, H. (1965/66). Design. Athene, 12(1/2), 6-7.
- Read, H. (1966). The aesthetic method of education. In E.W. Eisner

- & D.W. Ecker, Readings in art education (pp. 259-269). Lexington, Mass. : Blaisdell.
- Read, H. (1967). Art and society (3rd ed.). London : Faber.
- Read, H. (1968/69). Art education. Athene, 14(1), 15-16.
- Read, H. (1974). The necessity of art. In G.W. Hardiman & T. Zernich, Curricular considerations for visual arts education : rationale, development, and evaluation (pp. 7-13). Champaign, Ill. : Stripes.
- Riches, P.E. (1976). Raising of the school leaving age--a sociological perspective. Unpublished dissertation, University of Exeter, England.
- Rockefeller, D., Jr. (Chairman). (1977). Coming to our senses : The significance of the arts for American education. New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Rogers, R. (1983, April 29). The design and fall of Britain. Times Educational Supplement, p. 22.
- Roman, M. (1968). The arts as agents for social change : The psychologist's viewpoint. Art Education, 21(9), 23-27.
- Ross, M. (1975). Arts and the adolescent (Schools-Council Working Paper 54). London : Evans/Methuen.
- Ross, M. (1978). The creative arts. London : Heinemann.
- Ross, M. (1980). Hardcore : The predicament of the arts. Perspectives (Occasional publication, School of Education, University of Exeter, England), 2, 42-48.
- Ross, M. (1981, March 6). Talkback/Defending the arts. Times Educational Supplement, p. 18.
- Royal College of Art. (1979). Design in general education. London : Author.
- Rush, J.C., & Conant, H. (1979). Excellence : The key to educating visual artists. Art Education, 32(8), 8-13.

- Saunders, R.J. (1964). The search for Mrs. Minot : An essay on the caprices of historical research. Studies in Art Education, 6(1), 1-7.
- Saunders, R.J. (1971). Art education. In L.C. Deighton (Ed.), Encyclopedia of education (Vol. 1, pp. 282-289). New York : McMillan & Free Press.
- Saunders, R.J. (1976).. Art, industrial art, and the 200 years war. Art Education, 29(1), 5-8.
- Saunders, R.J. (1978). First steps : The FCAE and the NAAE : A brief history. Art Education, 31(7), 18-22.
- Schiff; B. (1973). Artists in schools. Washington, D.C. : National Endowment for the Arts.
- Schools Council. (1967). A school approach to technology (Curriculum Bulletin No. 2). London : Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Schools Council. (1969). Education through the use of materials (Working Paper No. 26). London : Evans/Methuen.
- Schools Council. (1975). The whole curriculum 13-16 (Working Paper 53). London : Evans/Methuen.
- Schools Council. (1978). Art 7-11 (Report from a Curriculum Development Working Group of the Schools Council Art committee). London : Author.
- Silliman, B., & Silverstein, L. (1979). Accountability through evaluation : A model for improvement and survival. Art Education, 32(3), 14-16.
- Silverman, R.H. (1976). Goals and roles in the art education of children. In E.W. Eisner, The arts, human development, and education (pp. 31-63). Berkeley, Calif. : McCutchan.
- Smith, R.A. (1977). A policy analysis and criticism of the artist-in-school program of the National Endowment for the Arts. Art Education, 30(5), 12-19.

- Smith, R.A. (1978). The naked piano player : Or what the Rockefeller report, 'Coming to our senses' really is. Art Education, 31(1), 10-16.
- Smith, R.A. (1979). Editorial/On the third realm - pedagogue pride : notes on professionalism. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 13(2), 5-10.
- Smith, R.A. (1980). The 'deschooling' of art education : How it's happening and what to do about it. Art Education, 33(3), 8-10.
- South Carolina Arts Commission. (1976). Sharing a learning space : Project TAP 1975-76 report. Columbia, S.C. : Author.
- Southworth, G. (1981). The process of teaching art in primary schools. Education 3-13, 9(2), 25-29.
- Spellman, A.B. (Ed.). (1977). The arts endowment and education. Unpublished position paper of the National Endowment for the Arts.
- Steele, C. & Victoria, J. (1975). Accountability and assessment of art education in public schools. Art Education 28(5), 14-19.
- Steveni, M. (1978). Issues in art educational research--transatlantic comparisons. Athene (Research issue), 66, pp. 4-8.
- Stockl, M. (1974). Art integrated? The place of art in the curriculum. Athene, 16(2), 19-20.
- Stockl, M. (1976). Aspects of change in secondary schools: Art education. Unpublished manuscript, Oxford University, Department of Educational Studies.
- Sutton, G. (1967). Artisan or artist? Oxford : Pergamon.
- Szekely, G. (1978). Uniting the roles of artist and teacher. Art Education, 31(1), 17-20.
- Taba, H. (1962). Curriculum development : theory and practice.

London : Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich.

- Thatcher, M. (1982, May). Take it from the top. Design, p.2.
- Tickle, L. (1983). One spell of ten minutes or five spells of two...?
Teacher-Pupil encounters in art and design education. In M. Hammersley & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Curriculum practice : some sociological case studies (pp. 107-125). Basingstoke, Hants, England : Falmer-Press.
- Tissinger, B. (1971). In search of a model. Art Education, 24(4), 24-27.
- Tumin, M. (1966). Social changes for education. In E.L. Mattil (Ed.), A seminar in art education for research and curriculum development (pp. 104-115). University Park : The Pennsylvania State University.
- Tyler, R.W. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction.
Chicago : University of Chicago.
- Tyrrell, R., Williams, D., & Blanchard, D. (1974). Artists-in-schools :
Why bother? Art Education, 27(8), 21-23.
- Weinstock, A. (1976, January 23). I blame the teachers. Times Educational Supplement, p.2.
- Western States Arts Foundation. (1976). A study of the poetry and visual arts components of the artists-in-schools program. Washington, D.C. : National Endowment for the Arts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 507).
- Whitfield, R.C. (Ed.). (1971). Disciplines of the curriculum.
Maidenhead, Berks, England : McGraw-Hill.
- Whitfield, R.C. (1973). Curriculum planning. Trends in Education, 30,
pp. 39-42.
- Williams, R. (1977, September 3). Why children should draw : The
surprising link between art and learning. Saturday Review, pp. 11-16.
- Wooff, T. (1976). Developments in art education. London : Open Books.

- Wright, J. (1975). Who should teach art? Art Education, 28(2), 13.
- Zanker, F. (1972). Design and craft in education. Leicester : Dryad.