BELIEFS OF SECONDARY ART TEACHERS IN RELATION TO EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, CURRICULAR ISSUES AND TEACHING PRACTICES

by

FIONA HUMBY BLAIKIE
B.A. (Art)., University of Cape Town, 1978

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty

of

Education

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]

Dr. William Zuk,

[redacted]

Dr. Margaret Travis

[redacted]

Dr. Paul Thomas

[redacted]

Dr. Ted Aoki

University of Victoria

Supervisor: Dr. William Zuk

ABSTRACT

This is an interpretive study of the beliefs of five secondary teachers of art, in Victoria, British Columbia. The subjects' beliefs are examined in relation to their educational background, current art teaching practice, and two art education curriculum models.

Beliefs are the focus of this study because they play a major role in what the individual teacher believes should be emphasised in practice, therefore determining the nature of teaching practice. It was the studio-centred teaching practice of local secondary art teachers, in contrast with curriculum theory dominating the art education literature, which initiated this study: in short, the chasm between theory and practice.

The research was conducted through conversations. A phenomenological approach was chosen, because this approach afforded an in-depth examination of beliefs, in the context of the particularities of the subjects' individual lived experiences as teachers of secondary school art.

The study focuses on five issues:

1. How educational background affects beliefs.
2. Which beliefs are held individually and in common.
3. How beliefs affect teaching practice.
4. The relationship between beliefs and two curriculum models, (the local British Columbia Secondary Art Curriculum Guides and discipline-based art education).
5. The implications of beliefs in relation to implementing change in art education curricula.

The findings indicate that educational background has an important influence on beliefs, and that teaching practice clearly relects long established personal beliefs. It is apparent that the current theoretical emphasis in art education, discipline-based art education, (which proposes

that art be composed of art history, aesthetics, art criticism and studiowork as equally weighted components), would have minimal impact on the subjects in relation to their roles as practising art teachers. This is because the discipline-based orientation seems to contradict the subjects' beliefs in a studio-based emphasis in art education. Other important beliefs identified are that the specialist art teacher should be an artist, independent of teaching practice, and that future teachers of art should make a long-term commitment to the profession in the form of a visual arts degree.

Implications for art education curriculum developers are that beliefs greatly influence teaching practice, and that teachers' beliefs should be considered in both the formative and implementation stages of curriculum change.

Examiners:

[redacted]

Dr. William Zuk

[redacted]

Dr. Margaret Travis

[redacted]

Dr. Paul Thomas

[redacted]

Dr. Ted Aoki

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER FIVE

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE
SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Beliefs are individually and or commonly held persuasions of the truth, pertinent to a particular idea, in this case, the teaching and learning of art. Beliefs are formed by experience. They are both affective and cognitive in nature. Beliefs vary in importance. On a continuum, beliefs of greater importance to the individual resist change more than beliefs of lesser importance. Beliefs are therefore hard to change, because changing one belief would affect others; the more central a belief the greater the impact on related beliefs.

Attentive to this concept of beliefs, the writer has conducted an interpretive study of the beliefs of five high school art teachers, in Victoria, British Columbia. The study focuses on the subjects' experiences in relation to their educational backgrounds in art, their teaching practices, and their perceptions of art education theory.

Most of the research employed tape-recorded conversations, with a phenomenological orientation. This emphasis on the conversational method enabled both researcher and subject, through informal nonjudgmental discourse, to come to a mutual and deepened understanding of ideas and issues related to beliefs.

Background to the Study

It was the apparent gulf between current scholarly theory and local teaching practice that prompted the researcher to examine the phenomenon of beliefs in a specific way.

Initial contact with art teaching in British Columbia revealed that both the curriculum guides and teaching

practice feature a strong studiowork component. This was very different from the researcher's own art education and art teaching background in South Africa, where art education is foundationally centred in both studiowork and art history.

A search of the current literature revealed that in North America a case has been made for a dominantly content-based approach, as opposed to the studiowork centred approach to art education, dominating much teaching practice. The gap between theory and practice in art education has a long history. Greer and Rush (1985), write that the movement towards including more structured theoretical content in art education is one hundred years old. In the movement towards a more content-based approach in art education, significant events include the Pennsylvania State Seminar in 1966, where Barkan, among others, proposed a more formalised approach to the teaching of art. More recently, discipline-based education, also known as DBAE, has emerged as a significant issue. Greer (1984) describes DBAE as comprising four components: art history, art criticism, aesthetics and studiowork.

While the DBAE model for art education dominates much of the current literature, it appears to be somewhat removed from local art teaching practice. In an attempt to bridge the gap between theory and practice, a study of teachers' beliefs has been done, in order to examine their beliefs about theoretical ideas, and their own teaching practices. In view of this, two hermeneutic questions were formulated at the beginning of the study. These have determined the overall structure of the study:

1. What does each subject believe is important in teaching art?
2. What is the relationship between these beliefs and curriculum theory in art education?

Organising Themes

This study focuses on the beliefs of five practising art teachers. The themes formulated to organise the scope and purpose of the study are:

1. The formative background to currently held beliefs about teaching art:

Beliefs have a strong experiential base. This view is shared by Dewey (1934), and Triandis, (1971). The first purpose of this study is to examine how the artistic and educational experiences which the subjects had as children and as students of art, shaped and determined their current beliefs about teaching art.

2. Individual and shared beliefs about teaching art:

"Teaching is an idiosyncratic activity" (MacGregor and Gray, 1987, p.24). The individual beliefs and personalities of art teachers determine the kind of teaching that takes place in the classroom. Individually and commonly held beliefs concerning the subjects' ideas about the theory and practice of teaching art are examined and compared.

3. Individual beliefs and their effect on teaching practice:

Teaching is an idiosyncratic activity, so that "to hire a teacher is to hire a curriculum" (MacGregor and Gray, 1987, p.24). In spite of and because of all previous education and experience, the teacher brings to the job of teaching art his or her own biases. These biases are the external manifestation of beliefs, which to a large extent determine teaching practice, and the support for and manner in which the theoretical curricular ideas of others are implemented.

4. The relationship between individual beliefs and theory in art education, focusing on two current curriculum models:

Two curricular orientations in art are examined in this study, the studiowork centred approach and the discipline-based approach.

The subjects' beliefs are addressed firstly in relation

to whether they are teaching a studio centred curriculum, and the relevance of the British Columbia Secondary Art Guides in this regard, and secondly, the manner in which the subjects might be incorporating aspects of DBAE into their teaching practice. An examination is made of the extent to which the personal beliefs of teachers support the philosophy of DBAE, as opposed to studio centred art education, and how open or constrained the beliefs of the subjects are in the context of curriculum change. This is particularly pertinent as far as DBAE is concerned, because DBAE reflects the orientation of change in art education today.

5. The relationship between the subjects' beliefs and curriculum implementation:

Teaching is an idiosyncratic activity, greatly influenced by individual beliefs. Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding and Cuthbert (1985), say "if people want teachers to change their practice, pertinent evidence, must in some way, be related to teachers' existing beliefs" (p.52). Teachers' beliefs should be taken into account in implementing new orientations in any curriculum, because these beliefs will determine the extent to which change is implemented. Personal beliefs can get in the way of curriculum change and implementation: yet these beliefs must be taken into account if teaching practice is to be improved, and if changes are to be made in the curriculum and effectively implemented. In this regard, the implications of how best to effect curriculum change are addressed by the researcher.

Definition of Terms

Beliefs

Beliefs are individually and or commonly held persuasions of the truth, pertinent to a particular idea, in this case, the teaching and learning of art.

Discipline-based art education (DBAE)

Discipline-based art education is a current model for organizing an art curriculum into four components, namely: art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and studiowork (Greer, 1984). DBAE is being actively promoted by art educators at the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in the United States.

Phenomenology

Phenomenology is the study of the nature of lived experience. In this study, conversation was used by the researcher as the method to investigate, analyze and understand the lived experiences of the individual subjects of the study, in relation to their beliefs about learning and teaching art.

Rationale

The phenomenon which sparked the pursuit of this study was the incongruous chasm between studio-centred teaching practice in art, and discipline-based art education (DBAE), which is currently dominating the literature.

The decision to study teachers' beliefs, was in order that the researcher might evaluate what teachers believe is important in teaching and learning about art, and why. This is based on the assumptions that teachers' beliefs to a large extent determine their teaching practice, and that long-established beliefs are hard to change, being founded in experience.

The idea of examining theoretical ideas in art education, in contrast with teaching practice, and the beliefs which determine teaching practice, seemed intriguing, particularly in view of the gap between theory and practice in art education. It was this concept that determined the structure of the study: the focus on beliefs in relation to formative educational background, curricular issues in art education, and teaching practice.

CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into three sections: first, beliefs are discussed in relation to theory and practice, and the implementation of educational change. This is followed by the second section--a discussion of the theoretical development of discipline-based art education (DBAE). The implementation into practice of such a curriculum, (and existing curriculum guides), is also discussed in the light of teachers' beliefs. The third section, a review of research in the field of art education to do with the beliefs of art teachers, concludes the review of the literature.

Beliefs, Theory and Practice: Implications for Change in Education

In reviewing the literature to do with beliefs, three major points emerged: first, beliefs are determined by past and present experience, that is, they are both cognitive and affective in nature. Second, on a continuum, beliefs vary in importance, some resisting change more than others. Third, beliefs are held both individually, and commonly. In the case of shared beliefs, change is resisted to a greater extent, because of the reinforcement of group support.

Rokeach (1968), defines beliefs as being incorporated into a much larger belief system. He says, "A belief system may be defined as having represented within it, in some organized psychological but not necessarily logical form, each and every one of a person's countless beliefs about physical and social reality" (p.2). Eisenhart, Harding, Shrum and Cuthbert (1985) define belief as "an attitude consistently applied to an activity" (p.54), and they say "a belief is a way to describe a relationship between a task,

an action, an event, or another person and an attitude of a person toward it" (p.53). While they say that no one definition of belief has been accepted by the research community in education (p.52), in the literature of educational philosophers "belief is consistently defined as a proposition, or statement of relation among things accepted as true. Philosophers of education, using this definition of belief, have directed attention to the impact of teacher beliefs on teaching practice" (p.54). Cognitive anthropologists use the same definition of belief, in that "to accept a propositon as true is to value it in some way for logical, empirical, social, or emotional reasons" (p.53).

How do we come to have beliefs? Dewey (1934) states that both the human environment and experience shape the formation of beliefs. He says of "mankind" that "The materials of his thought and belief come to him from others with whom he lives" (p.210). Triandis (1971), writing about attitudes and changing attitudes in the field of social psychology, states that "attitudes are learned" (p.101). Like Dewey, he acknowledges the role of experience in shaping attitudes, citing Allport's definition of attitude as a "'mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related'" (p.2).

Much of the relevant literature to do with beliefs also deals with the attitudes of teachers as a focus of study. While attitudes, per se, are not the same as beliefs, (in that beliefs are ingrained, inculcated, more internalised, and attitudes often indicate a particular orientation, being more external to the quintessence of the individual), there are grey areas. Dewey, (1934) states:

> Attitudes and interests are built up which embody in themselves some deposit of the meaning of things done

> and undergone. These funded and retained meanings become a part of the self. They constitute the capital with which the self notes, cares for, attends and purposes. In this substantial sense, mind forms the background upon which every new contact with surroundings is projected, yet 'background' is too passive a word, unless we remember that it is active and that, in the projection of the new upon it, there is an assimilation and reconstruction of both background and of what is taken in and digested. (p.26)

Triandis (1971) refers to the importance of individual personality in shaping attitudes, and by extension, beliefs as well. If individual personality shapes beliefs and attitudes, beliefs and attitudes in turn shape individual personality, yet in spite of individual differences human beings who share similar experiences and beliefs band together, so that shared beliefs are fortified. This happens not only amongst families and individuals who form friendships, but amongst those working together. Triandis (1971), refers to four reasons why people have attitudes, and these reasons reinforce the sociological aspects of shared attitudes and beliefs: first, to help understand the world in which one exists; second, to protect self-esteem (also making it possible to avoid unpleasant truths); third, to help adjust to the world and maximise rewards from one's immediate environment, and finally to express one's fundamental values (p.4). Rokeach (1968) writes of three assumptions regarding beliefs:

> First, not all beliefs are equally important to the individual; beliefs vary along a central peripheral dimension. Second, the more central a belief, the more it will resist change. Third, the more central the belief changed, the more widespread the repercussions in the rest of the belief system. (p.3)

Because the life-experiences and formative environments of human beings are different, it follows that beliefs will be highly individual, yet at the same time, human beings

seek one another out in the sharing of beliefs, as this is so self-affirming. In addition, it is clear that beliefs resist change, because of the psychological impact that belief change has on the personality: changing a deeply engrained belief is difficult, because like the ever-widening ripples caused by a stone thrown into water, other beliefs will, in turn, be affected. Change is resisted even more when beliefs are shared, and supported within a wider socio-cultural context. In terms of shared beliefs and the implications for change, Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding and Cuthbert (1985), state:

> Work in anthropology suggests that beliefs are often consistent across individuals who share similar circumstances and that belief systems organize and guide the actions and preferences of those who hold them. Such belief systems, like languages, make it likely (although not inevitable) that those who share them will interpret their circumstances in certain ways and favor certain courses of action over others. Correspondingly, change programs, including professional socialization programs, are unlikely to accomplish their goals unless they are first made compatible with or translatable into existing belief systems. (p.51-52)

In the following statements, the concepts of belief, theory and practice, and their relationship to one another, are examined in the context of effecting curricular change both in theory and in teaching practice:

Theory, in Rune's Dictionary of Philosophy (1982), is perceived as "...The hypothetical universal aspect of anything. For Plato, a contemplated truth. For Aristotle, pure knowledge as opposed to the practical. An abstraction from practice. The principle from which practice proceeds. Opposite of: practice" (p.333).

Practice is defined in Rune (1982) as "...The deliberate application of a theory. Formerly, an

established custom; the pursuance of some traditional action. Now, the organisation of actuality according to some general principle. Sometimes, opposed to, sometimes correlative with theory" (p.261). However the practical is defined as "relating to praxis or conduct", (p.260), and praxis as an " activity that has its goal within itself" (p.263-264). In other words, in praxis theory is totally incorporated in practice, and is no longer a separate hypothetical idea. Ideally, in praxis can be found putative educational utopia: the self-actualization of both theory and practice.

Practice is derived from theory, and theory from practice, or rather it is "abstracted" from practice, as it is defined in Rune (1982, p.333). Ideally the relationship between theory and practice is mutually beneficial, (praxis). When the relationship between theory and practice is not supportive and "correlative" (p.261), but rather "opposed", (p.333), this implies that there is no perceived connection, dialogue, or relationship between theory and practice, and indeed in opposition to the concept of praxis, that epistemologically, theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge are quite different. Thus the practice of teaching art is not (necessarily) noticeably related to current theories of art education (in this case DBAE), yet it can be related very successfully, in the form of praxis--if the teachers' belief structure is receptive to that theory. Gadamer (1975) states:

> The old Aristotelian distinction between practical and theoretical knowledge is operative here--a distinction which cannot be reduced to that between the true and the probable. Practical knowledge, phronesis, is another kind of knowledge. Primarily it means that it is directed towards the concrete situation. Thus it must grasp the 'circumstances' in their infinite variety. (p.21)

The "concrete situation" (p.21) is metaphorically the

classroom. And in the classroom the teacher is the most important variable in implementing any curricular theory. His or her beliefs will determine if and how a curricular idea is implemented. It is what the teacher does in the classroom that really matters, and this daily encounter involving teachers and students needs to be the focus of change. In failing to deal with this, we deal only with theoretical and structural change to the curriculum, but not with internalised change. Internalised change means that a teacher has both reflected on and accepted the idea of a curriculum change. In relation to praxis, the teacher has gone beyond internalised change by implementing that change in daily teaching practice, in the classroom. In this way, praxis is a way of describing internalised change: theory and practice become correlative, and self-actualized.

The relationship between belief, theory and practice is therefore a problem concerning curriculum implementation. It follows that a teacher to whom any kind of planned change means little or nothing, is unlikely to be enthusiastic and supportive of that change. On the other hand, when the proposed change has meaning for the teacher, both intellectually and professionally, it is likely to be implemented: Fullan says "...Effective implementation involves the development of individual and organizational meaning viz a viz a particular change..." (1986, p.188).

The opportunity for reflective thinking is very important for the teacher, because it allows him or her to internalize theory, and to understand it intellectually. Zais (1976) states,

> ...each individual must examine his own values and behavior honestly and attempt to determine (1) where, theoretically speaking, he prefers to stand, and (2) what his theory means translated into practice. This is, perhaps, one of the most crucial aspects of decision-making behavior, for self-conscious internalization of theory is the only means by which a

> genuine correspondence between theory and practice can be achieved in curriculum development. (p.500)

Ultimately the choice as to whether a theory is going to be implemented in practice or not rests with the individual art teacher: it is here that the whole problem lies. Usually generated by art education academics and researchers, theories abound in the literature--but it seems that theories are generated away from the practice of teaching art in the classroom; away from the beliefs of those art teachers who will be responsible for their implementation. In implementing theory into practice, the individual art teacher and his or her beliefs are very important considerations in the context of curricular change. Eisner and Ecker (1966) say:

> ...our crucial educational problems are much like other ethical problems in that they arise whenever there are conflicts among alternative sets of values. Thus, the art teacher in his own classroom inescapably makes ethical choices: he will teach in a certain manner according to the criteria or standards he chooses. The choice may be to acquiesce to the choices of others or to propose new alternatives. (p.23)

Fullan's (1986) view that the teacher in the classroom is the most important agent of change, is shared by Chapman (1982), Barrow (1984), Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding and Cuthbert (1986), and Gray and MacGregor (1987). If the teacher in the classroom--on an individual or communal basis, holds a belief which is not supportive of change, then it is important that curriculum developers who seek to implement change address this problem. Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding and Cuthbert (1985) cite Fenstermacher, who "argues persuasively that if people want teachers to change their practice, pertinent evidence must, in some way be related to teachers' existing beliefs" (p.52). Acknowledging the power and importance of teachers' beliefs in relation to both the

theory and practice of education, is particularly important in implementing change. The same authors say "educational reform programs, whatever their source, should take teachers' existing beliefs into account" (p.52).

Triandis (1971), who identifies attitudes as having three components--cognitive, affective and behavioural, says that these components must be addressed in effecting change:

> Attitude change can occur by first changing the cognitive component (for example, with new information), the affective component (for example, by pleasant or unpleasant experiences in the presence of the attitude object) or the behavioural component, (for example, by norm change, or the legal imposition of behavioural changes). It can also change by forcing a person to act or by presenting him with a 'fait accompli'. (p.143)

Triandis (1971) acknowledges that individual personality does play a part and that it is important as far as wholehearted implementation is concerned, when he states, "In sum, it is the relationship between incoming information and personality characteristics that leads either to the assimilation or to the rejection of this information" (p.97). Triandis also isolates and discusses three constructs in terms of prejudice to change: conformity, cognitive dissonance and insecurity. Eisenhart Shrum, Harding and Cuthbert (1985), mention similar prejudices to change: ..."belief systems limit dissonance, contradiction, and chaos... individuals are reluctant to give up their beliefs because of the cognitive disorder that would seem to follow from disbelief" (p.54). This echoes Rokeach's (1968) assumption that the more important a belief is, (on a continuum of lesser and more important beliefs), the more it will resist change.

The implications for effecting curricular change by teachers whose beliefs are unsupportive of that change are

not positive or encouraging. It is not suggested that teachers' individual beliefs should necessarily dictate curriculum development and change, but that curriculum developers, first, should research into and consult teachers' beliefs before planning change. This is so that they know and understand the classroom situation which they plan to change in some way, and also the way in which the change(s) will be implemented. Second, it is important in the process of curriculum implementation, that teachers have the opportunity to reflect on, internalise and implement changes, so that both theory and practice are correlated in the form of praxis. These seem very logical things to do in the process of curriculum development and implementation, rather like surveying and preparing land before expecting to build a skyscraper on it.

DBAE: Development and Implementation

The practice of teaching art in North America is currently generally studio-based, with some references to art history and art criticism, which is left to the teacher's discretion. (Chapman, 1982). Greer's definition of discipline-based art education (DBAE) proposes a very different kind of curriculum, composed of four equally weighted components: art history, art criticism, aesthetics and studiowork. If DBAE, which is currently dominating the literature, were to be implemented, the result would be a very much more academic and theoretically based curriculum in art. Many art teachers, for one thing, are academically unprepared to teach this kind of curriculum, (Chapman, 1984, Greer, 1984). Bearing in mind the personal and collective beliefs of teachers of art, the implications for implementing DBAE at this time are onerous. Yet DBAE, while not implemented in the classrooms of North America--except for those serviced by the Getty Center in Los Angeles,

(Lattin Duke, 1988), is currently a topical issue in art education. The development of DBAE and its coming to fruition is an important aspect of understanding the status of art education at present, both in theory and practice, and in terms of implementing future change.

After World War two, uneasiness over the quality of education in the schools of North America increased, reaching a climax with Sputnik in 1957. (Efland, 1988, p.262). Jerome Bruner's Process of Education, and the idea of the disciplines--areas of study as structures of knowledge, was adopted by "a number of art educators" in the 1960's, (Efland, 1988). In 1962, Manuel Barkan wrote a paper aptly titled "Transitions in Art Education: Changing Conceptions of Curriculum Content and Teaching". In this paper Barkan proposed that three assumptions dominate the teaching of art: first, how the student of art is to be treated--as a "'whole'" person or as an artist; second, the criteria for "judging and understanding works of art", and finally the desire to "encourage individual expressiveness, so much admired and aspired to by members of the art education profession" (p.12). He cites historical developments in art education in coming to a cognizance of the existence of these assumptions: "About twenty-five or thirty years ago there was...(a)...reaction against the then prevailing academic strictures for the teaching of art" (p.13). Here, Barkan is talking about traditional academic training in art, where students pursued structured foundational studio courses, for example, "a series of tight exercises beginning with light and dark or rather shade and shadow drawings of cones and spheres on 8"x10" manilla paper using hard pencils" (p.13). Barkan states that this kind of teaching procedure was "recognized as leading to rigidity and the suppression of individuality" (p.13). This gave rise to the progressive approach to education: the idea that children are naturally highly creative visionaries. In

addition, with the progressive movement the idea grew that art should be expressed freely and spontaneously--and that everyone can make art in this way. Lastly, Barkan discusses the progressivist idea that "the educational job is to teach the whole child rather than to try to make an artist out of him" (p.13). This idea led to the formulation of the National Art Education Association policy statement in 1949, which Barkan quotes as stating ..."art is less a body of subject matter then a developmental activity" (p.13). In defense of his assertion that art is in fact not "too simple, all too easy, and all too much fun" (p.13), and really a serious subject of study, Barkan emphasises the structure of the disciplines approach to the curriculum, by saying "there is a subject matter of the field of art, and it is important to teach it" (p.13). He quotes Bruner as follows:

> 'The schoolboy learning physics is a physicist, and it is easier for him to learn physics behaving like a physicist than doing something else.' If Bruner would have been thinking about the teaching of art, I have no doubt that he would have written: The schoolboy learning art is an artist, and it is easier for him to learn art behaving like an artist than doing something else. (p.14)

Barkan states that the veneration of the child as spontaneous and naturally creative led to the breakdown of "academic criteria for the judgment of works of art" (p.15). He contends that "learning in art requires careful attention to qualitative criteria that pertain to works of art" (p.15), and, "sensitive judgment comes through having lived with great works" (p.15). Of art-making he says "Media are tools for teachers to use in teaching art, and for students to use in learning to behave like artists" (p.18).

The next landmark event in the development of DBAE was the Pennsylvania State Seminar in 1966, where Manuel Barkan

(1966), presented an important seminar paper on a discipline oriented curriculum in art, focusing on art history, art criticism and studiowork. Eisner and Smith also advocated this kind of curriculum (Efland, 1988, Lattin Duke, 1988). The ideas of both Barkan and Bruner have been important in terms of the development of discipline-based art education, as it exists today (Smith, 1986, Efland, 1988, Lattin Duke, 1988).

In view of Greer's (1984) definition of DBAE, (in which he identifies four components: art history, art criticism, aesthetics and studiowork, to be implemented at the elementary and secondary levels), it seems that if implemented as such, the equal weighting of these four components would mean a great change in the current studio-based emphasis of teaching practice. This would be reduced to one quarter, while areas in which most art teachers are currently untrained--art history, aesthetics and art criticism--would form the bulk of the art curriculum. In addition, this would effectively emphasize highly academic components of art learning, (three quarters of the curriculum), at the expense of the process--the experience of making art, (one quarter of the curriculum).

One of Greer's first tasks in "establishing a concept of discipline-based art education" (1984, p.213), was to gain a clearer understanding of "the terms and ideas that the label identifies" (p.213). What strikes an interesting note is that Greer coined the term DBAE, and then set about defining his own terminology. Greer (1984) says, "discipline-based art education should produce educated adults who are knowledgable about art and its production and responsive to the aesthetic properties of works of art and other objects" (p.212). As MacGregor (1985) points out, Greer is not so much defining DBAE as describing "terminal behavior" (p.245). Having called the four components the "four pillars of wisdom" (p.242) (the mild irony is

appealing), MacGregor discusses the concept of the structure of a discipline: "a clearly demarcated body of content, not interchangeable with other bodies, which permits the exercise of specific techniques and which lends itself to specific methods of inquiry" (p.245). He concludes that given that definition, "Studio art is altogether an unlikely candidate for discipline status, since its content is not clearly demarcated, and its techniques often are not rule-governed" (p.245).

This view that studio art is not a discipline, no doubt accounts in part for its demotion to one quarter of the curriculum. MacGregor is right in saying that the reason for the term discipline-based is probably "more likely political than academic" (p.245). The lowering of status and emphasis on studio art is distinctive of DBAE, which, in its curricular emphasis, is more concerned with epistemology than ontology. The same could be said of Smith (1986), who shares many of Greer's convictions in Excellence in Art Education. Webb (1987), says of Smith, "Smith's account of art education is epistemologically weighted, and this epistemology is a conventional one" (p.9). Webb continues:

> I should like...to draw attention to what, for want of a better term, I shall call the ontological aspect of artistic experience. I refer here to what it feels like to 'be in art'--a consideration which, in my view, Smith fails to address...this almost ritualistic activity (has) a value as much to do with the nature of the experience as with the product. (p.10)

The emphasis on thinking and knowing, rather than doing and experiencing the making of art, means that a very different kind of art will be learned in the DBAE classroom. The possibility of enjoying the ontological aspect of artistic experience which Webb refers to above could only be realized to a lesser extent in the DBAE curriculum, than otherwise might be possible.

Greer (1984), says that critics of art education have

accused it of having little to do with art. Will DBAE improve matters, or is this an assumption on Greer's part? DBAE may have less to do with art, depending on one's personal definition of what it means to be art educated, (and ultimately it is one's personal definition which determines parameters). Greer himself points out that Lanier "advocates art without any studio practice" (1984, p.213). Smith (1986), also curtails the role of studio activity as being not absolutely necessary, but important chiefly in contributing to the "building of the sense of art that we bring to appreciative acts" (p.53). Webb says of Smith's book, "The downplaying of studio activity does seem to strike at the core of our profession...Perhaps both we and Smith could begin by being more specific about what we think constitutes studio activity" (p.9).

In Greer's definition of DBAE there is a curious use of terms: Greer refers to "educated adults" (p.212), as the subjects and "end-in-view" of art education (p.212). Perhaps the "end-in-view" (at the school level) should more appropriately be children, but nowhere in this paper on the principles of the DBAE curriculum does Greer refer directly to children as the "end-in-view" of education. Often, in reading the literature on DBAE there is a sense that the fact that those people at school are in fact immature children, is to a certain extent disavowed. Rather, children are treated as miniature adults. Bruner, as quoted by Barkan (1962), said that children studying science should be treated as scientists--hence Barkan's idea that children being taught art should be little artists, (Barkan, 1962), and then Smith's (1986) and Greer's (1984) proposals that children practice being little art historians, art critics and aestheticians. Although the two positions are not necessarily opposed, there is still a sense that the child's being a child is not as acceptable as it's role-modelling an adult. Greer (1984) says "While there is a recognition of

the charm and naive power of the work of children, distinctions are drawn between these beginning efforts and the works of mature artists" (p.217). In role playing "competent professionals" (Greer, 1984, p.214), there is a sense of corny artificial pretensiousness--even if, on a continuum, the focus was more on art content. With Greer's concept of DBAE, art is put on a pedestal, or rather, a throne. Read (1966) says of teaching art, "We are not attempting to create professional artists" (p.261), and he says that while children are all taught to speak, they are not expected to become orators. diBlasio (1985) also questions the idea of role-playing. She acknowledges that this is a very literal interpretation of the "Brunerian stereotype" (p.201), and indicates that in relation to Bruner, this "behavioral mimicry began to be questioned" (p.201). She states:

> ...only in a rather forced euphemistic sense can a pupil learning physics be regarded as a little physicist. Lanier (1983,1984) expresses even stronger misgivings about the realistic correspondence of classroom role playing to the activities of art professionals...The fundamental obstacle confronting the role playing approach is this difficulty in adequately specifying the role protype, i.e., in determining comprehensively characteristic sets of professional behaviors. (p.201)

Greer, (1984) says that the "major goal of discipline-based instruction is to provide conditions that can lead to aesthetic experience. In providing for aesthetic experience, discipline-based art education serves aesthetic education" (p.214). It is unlikely that any programme--even DBAE, could provide for aesthetic experience, such that all students would be affected, as it is a highly subjective phenomenon. Indeed, the claim to aesthetic experience cannot be made by art educators alone, for we all experience

the aesthetic nature of existence, whenever wholeness enters into that experience. Perhaps too, the level of sophistication needed in the area of philosophy, to do justice to a course of study in aesthetics, suggests that it would be better left alone to be studied at the tertiary level, rather than taught in a banal manner, just for the sake of including aesthetics in the curriculum. Weitz (1966), wonders whether a true definition of aesthetic theory is possible. He says "...theory in the requisite classical sense--is never forthcoming in aesthetics, and we would do much better as philosophers to supplant the question 'what is the nature of art?'" (p.85). The case for the role of aesthetics as a separate domain is clearly debatable. MacGregor (1985) states:

> Barkan's proposal mentioned three roles for the students: producer, historian, critic. The dimension added to the present Getty program, the role of aesthetician, is less easy to visualise as a separate domain. It has been defined (Greer & Rush, 1985), as 'contemplating the nature of art and its role in human experience' (p.24) while the critical dimension is defined as 'describing, interpreting, and assessing art.' (p.24). I am at a loss to see how one can carry out these latter operations without becoming involved in the former. One of the Institute's faculty members (Lanier, 1984) has presented eight guidelines for selecting art curriculum content, and specifically argues for the addition of an aesthetic dimension to production, history, and criticism in a manner that suggests it is more of an adverb than a noun. (p.243)

diBlasio (1985), also referring to Barkan's paper (1966), and to the role of aesthetics, has a different understanding of Barkan's proposal. She says "Although it is clear that Barkan (1966, p.253) envisioned four domains, even this number is questioned" (p.198). diBlasio then points out that amongst art educators some (Eisner and Day) "have subsumed aesthetics within art criticism," (p.198), while others (Broudy, Smith, Lanier and Greer) "argue that explicitly structured aesthetic inquiry is needed to keep

student art learning on course" (p.198). Greer and Rush (1985) point out that "aesthetic scanning" is one way of discussing art (p.33).

Greer (1984) says that sophisticated exemplars should be the models for art learning. The purpose is "an adult understanding of art", having started and worked "backward" from "appropriate adult examples" of artwork (p.214). diBlasio (1985), repeats this idea of the student continually approaching adult sophistication, as does Smith (1986), the idea of using sophisticated exemplars and masterpieces. Smith says that appreciating excellence can only be nurtured by "studying selected masterpieces, classics or exemplars in depth" (p.50). We, as appreciators of art, will become connoisseurs and experts--consumers on the outside looking in at art, rather than getting our hands dirty in the process of making it. In this sense, art history, aesthetics and art criticism are seen as ultimately more valuable than studiowork, in that western art history can provide so called masterpiece exemplars, as an "interpretive framework for experiencing art" (p.41). Webb (1987), says of Smith:

> Smith's intellectualizing of art may be offensive not only to those who reject the masterpiece syndrome. For some, the approach will be deemed to be misguided in that it does not adequately conceive of what is intellectual in art. Smith does not appear to recognize artmaking as a discrete form of inquiry, a process of mind. Nor is it clear that he understands the nature of genuine dialogue with material. He is concerned to emphasize that studio activities have not been omitted from his excellence curriculum (two units from 11) but argues that 'their principal justification lies in their contribution to the buiding of the sense of art that we bring to appreciative acts.' (p.9)

Greer's ideas (1984) about implementing DBAE in the classroom are very different from those of Fullan (1986),

and Barrow (1982). Greer says administrators and school board members are an important part of the implementation process, in that "they can establish such a program in the knowledge that it will provide evidence of the increasing sophistication of the students they are responsible for" (p.217). Greer assumes first that DBAE will provide evidence of increasing adult sophistication, and second, that this is necessarily the goal of school administrators and board members for their art students. Greer continues:

> In order for a discipline-based art program to succeed, such a view must also be accepted by teachers and principals. They must see the possibility of accomplishing the kind of sophisticated understanding that discipine-based art education endorses within the resources that they have available...The teachers and principals must undertake staff development sufficient to introduce and sustain their efforts to provide their charges with a solid education in art. (p.217)

What is interesting is the use of verbs in the quote above: "must...be accepted" and "must see": there is no room here for the teachers to negotiate with those wishing to implement DBAE; to hold opinions of their own as practising professionals, or indeed to differ philosophically from what DBAE stands for. And here is the focus of this thesis: that teachers' beliefs should be consulted in relation to implementing change. Teachers are expected to reflect the wishes of society, via the curriculum. In this sense, they serve society, yet at the same time they are professionals. It is perhaps this contradiction in status, which results in teachers being treated somewhat differently from other professionals. Teachers are as accountable to society as doctors, although they do not enjoy the same privileged status as doctors. Teachers lack both the status and independence from societal opinion which many other professional bodies enjoy, who are also in a better position

to negotiate change in an independent democratic manner.

The idea of accountability in art is a different matter. While teachers are expected to fulfill the expectations of the society they serve in teaching academic content in subject areas like science and history, for a long time art has been considered a frill, a subject in which there is no structured content to be taught. Chapman (1982) concurs with this view, saying that societal opinion reinforces assumptions that art is a subject which has no real content. Greer (1984) maintains that "there is content...that can be assessed, and for which teachers can be accountable" (p.217). There is indeed content to be taught in art, it is a question of what that content in art should be, that is debatable.

While the idea of accountability in art has some merit, perhaps the only way to make teachers accountable for theoretical content would be to conduct national examinations on curriculum content. This is done at the secondary level in many countries outside North America, but initiating this kind of accountability would be a mammoth task in the United States and Canada. It would involve convincing regional and national ministries of education; obtaining funding; getting teacher support, and in some cases re-training them; developing new curricula and so on. Yet if change is going to take place, as Webb (1987) says "We have, after all, to fall off the academic fence and do something in our classrooms" (p.11). The way in which Greer proposes approaching teachers--if indeed one takes his words literally, is not a sure way to success, based on findings in the literature. Smith (1986) points out that teacher training in art education will have to have a "stronger academic character" (p.99), in order to successfuly implement a DBAE curriculum. This would definitely be a start in initiating change.

The fact that DBAE dominates the literature, as a

theory of art education, but that it is not currently implemented in general practice, is acknowledged by Leilani Lattin Duke (1988), director of the Getty Center in Los Angeles. She also acknowledges that many teachers are unprepared to teach this kind of curriculum. But she does not acknowledge that art teachers, even if adequately trained, may not believe that DBAE is the kind of art curriculum that would most benefit students of art, and perhaps would not support its implementation. She says "If DBAE is to become a reality in the classroom, then professional development and training of teachers is essential" (1988, p.10).

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts opened in Los Angeles in 1982, funded by the J.Paul Getty Trust. Lattin Duke, says "The Center's stated mission is to improve the quality and status of arts education in America's schools" (1988, p.7). She further states:

> The gap between theory and practice means that the Center, in committing its efforts to DBAE, is devoting its resources to a broad range of activities. That is, we are doing more than just building support for DBAE among educational professionals and the public, the Center is nurturing its evolution in all areas--strengthening of theoretical underpinnings, the work of developing sound curricula, the training of teachers, and the demonstration of DBAE in classroom practice. (p.8)

The Center is currently providing inservice workshops for teachers in 21 school districts in Los Angeles, and "proving itself as an effective model for initiating and sustaining a DBAE program for grades K-6" (Lattin Duke, 1988, p.10). Lattin Duke says that regional institutes will be opening in 1988, catering to elementary and secondary art specialists.

While Silverman (1988), Associate Director for curriculum at the Getty Center, writes that DBAE is

essentially democratic, he states that the "great promise of DBAE" is that all children, rich and poor, may learn to "appreciate great and important works of art" (p.18). This may be problematic both culturally and socially: how would children from poorer families feel going home to an environment where "Great Works" (p.18), are associated bitterly with all that is not available to the family, and where what is, would be called "Lesser Works of Art" (p.18). Silverman says "too often students are exposed only to art works that are reflective of folkart or commercially oriented traditions" (p.18). It seems possible that this kind of attitude and use of terminology, could result in a serious socio-cultural and psychological schism for those children confronted with "Great Works" at school, and "Lesser Works" at home.

The concept that folk art and commercial art would be considered inferior is noted by Webb (1987), who says of Smith (1986) "Would Smith discount folk art for lack of seriousness and depth?" (p.7). Silverman's diagrammatic representation of "Objects and events which involve us in aesthetic experience", sub-headed with "Lesser Works of Art" and "Great Works of Art" (p.18), smacks of elitism. This opinion that DBAE is elitist and overemphasises the academic, is shared by Helen Muth, who says "What the Getty...has done is to make a conceptual product out of DBAE" (1988, p.20), which is "motivated by the desire to promote the appearance of academic rigor" (p.21). In addition, Muth (1988), asks why four curricular divisions have been made:

> Why has such care been given to building boundary edges to clarify which concepts distinguish the four designated categories? How can excerpts from single representatives of the disciplines in question do more than give a highly abstracted definition of what one field is when compared to another? What are we as art teachers to do with such meager information? Even a

> cursory reading of material not bound up in the concept of DBAE will show that what goes on on the art world is really much messier than the four designated categories would suggest. (p.20)

In citing other writers on DBAE Muth says, "We are made subjects of DBAE, for it tells us who we are and all we can ever be. DBAE has been described as elitist (Lanier, 1987), narrow (Chalmers, 1987), possibly reactionary (Feldman, 1987), and suspiciously pretentious (Jackson, 1987)" (p.22). Muth believes that DBAE is a language of practitioners: the art historian, the art critic, the aesthetician and the artist. Art learning is no longer one thing, but four things which are divided up and neatly packaged for the teacher to disseminate.

Jerome Hausman (1988), writing about the development of DBAE from World War two, expresses concerns about the likely effect DBAE might have on art education. In this context he cites the prophetic words of Herbert Read in Education for Peace (1949), where Read took exception to the educational objectives of UNESCO, (formed in 1946). At the time Hausman had felt that these objectives were innocuous--for example: education for all; the pursuit of truth; the exchange of ideas and knowledge, and increased communication. But Read, whom Hausman cites, highlighted some worrying assumptions:

> ...that culture is a concrete material which can be disposed of, handed round, bartered like butter or steel; and secondly, that this material culture is already stored up in universities, libraries and museums, waiting, like corn in Egypt, to be distributed to the hungry masses. (p.38)

Hausman expresses concern that art education is increasingly "seeking to stabilize and fix knowledge and information...(and)...there's a press to reenforce (sic) and measure outcomes" (p.38). As regards the justification for DBAE, Hausman continues as follows:

> No wonder there's a reassuring ring to the promises implied by such terms as foundational, basic, fundamental, and disciplined. No wonder there's an attraction to the idea of great art and masterpieces, exemplars of our highest achievements. It follows that the press to establish the teaching of fundamentals and basics would also result in the measurement and testing of students so that higher authorities and the community-at-large can be assured that learning has taken place. (p.38)

Hausman expresses concern that at other times in history, and in other places, art has been combined into the very fabric of daily life--whereas now "we're being confronted with the creation of art as a separate category of human behavior to be conspicuously consumed" (p.39). Hausman sees methods of evaluation being developed which are "antithetical to the values of art" (p.41), with words replacing images. Hausman believes that the development of portfolios, diaries, sketchbooks and so on, would be more appropriate to art learning. He states,

> I, too, would urge a return to a more disciplined approach to the teaching of art--but, the discipline I seek would not have its manifestations in the force feeding of information about 'masterpieces' that can then be tested. Rather, it would be in the focused attention, passion, and play that comes of making and responding to art. (p.41)

Dewey (1929), says, "....Through thought, however, it has seemed that men might escape from the perils of uncertainty" (p.6). It seems that a desire for certainty and accountability in art education has inspired the move to discipline-based art education, with it's emphasis on thinking, over and above the doing and making of art. But it is in the making and doing of art that we are able to articulate the experience of living, both cognitively and affectively.

Langer (1970) declares:

> A work of art expresses a conception of life, emotion, inward reality. But it is neither a confessional nor a frozen tantrum; it is a developed metaphor, a non-discursive symbol that articulates what is verbally ineffable--the logic of consciousness itself. (p.175)

Both thinking about and making art should be part of the art learning experience: a balanced perspective on this is essential, so that neither supersedes the other.

Art Education Research into Beliefs

In spite of the gap between theory and practice, and the implications for the implementation of DBAE in view of teachers' beliefs, since 1972 few research studies to do with the beliefs of art teachers per se have been made in the field of art education.

Asch (1976) writes about teaching beliefs and evaluation: in her paper she expresses the need for teachers to "critically evaluate ideas and directions" (p.18), because there are many fallacious practices in art education which are based on unexamined and unevaluated beliefs. She identifies three main belief areas: accepting all student art regardless of quality; encouraging creativity, and reinforcing students' self confidence. She contends that the belief in accepting student art regardless of quality, is being supported mainly by those concerned with the "therapeutic value of art...(and)...positive reinforcement" (p.18). Secondly, the belief in always approving of student art means that a teacher, in the strictest sense, would not give criticism and guidance. Finally she maintains that the belief that the art teacher should provide a positive encouraging atmosphere prevents the student from learning from mistakes. She says "Too often compromise replaces excellence" (p.19). She suggests that these beliefs should

be critically evaluated in order to improve the quality of art education.

Blackman et al (1977), did a quantitative study of one hundred and thirty four public school teachers in Louisana, who responded to a questionnaire. This study focuses on teacher opinions, general teacher profiles, and teacher training preparation, rather than being an in-depth study of the beliefs of individual teachers. Statistical data generated has to do with the average age, sex, marital status, salary and teacher training of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire. The most interesting data generated has to do with the teaching of art history: most art teachers in the study do not teach art history because they believe students lack interest in this area.

Morris and Stuckhardt's (1977) study, "Art Attitude: Conceptualization and Implication", focuses on defining attitudes; the development of attitudes, and then dealing with the implications of attitude development, so that desired attitudes can be fostered in art education through particular (learning) experiences. While they address art teachers, the researchers' main aim is to help art teachers understand attitudes in their students. Their rationale is, "To continue vague references and misplaced use of the term attitude...is actually detrimental to the growth and progress of art education theory and practice. Art educators need a clear and well founded coneptual basis for contributing and working with attitudes" (p.26). They define attitude as "A learned and relatively enduring evaluative system of affective predispositions held toward art referents" (p.21-22). They cite six major characteristics of attitudes which have been defined by "authorities" (p.22). These characteristics are: (a) attitudes are affective in nature and result in evaluative concepts which give rise to motivational behaviour; (b) attitudes are learned; (c) attitudes have specific social

referents, and are resistent to change; (d) attitudes are relatively stable and enduring; (e) attitudes vary in quality and intensity; (f) attitudes are interrelated. (p.24). Citing Shaw and Wright, the authors say that attitudes are resistent to change because of three factors: "...(a) individuals actively resist changes to held attitudes; (b) individuals tend to reinforce held attitudes through selective learning; and, (c) individuals hold many interrelated attitudes; therefore, the alteration of one attitude implies a readjustment of others" (p.24). Although this paper focuses on the attitudes of students, it has implications for changing the beliefs of art teachers themselves, through knowledge of attitude development.

diBlasio's study, (1978), like Asch's, (1976), focuses on the need for a critical examination of often fallacious beliefs held by art educators. She says that many of the basic concepts in art education are value laden and "articulated with different degrees of evidential support" (p.1). In addition, beliefs, (which are entirely affective), are often "employed as a justification", and are often "confused with knowledge" (p.1). Calling unsupported belief claims "assumptions" (p.7), diBlasio identifies various "claims" to belief: beliefs as a purely verbal disposition; beliefs which are nonevidential; beliefs which are evidentially based and verified; and finally beliefs which are evidentially based but not critically verified. DiBlasio contends that it is important for art educators to recognize these differences in supporting beliefs, as it is important for all beliefs--including one's own, to be critically examined.

Chapman's (1982) book, Instant Art Instant Culture: The Unspoken Policy for American Schools, is a mammoth study of the status of art education in the United States. Through a quantitative survey, Chapman makes a powerful case for the demise of art education. This is partly because pre-

conceived and negative attitudes are held toward art education--by society, teachers, educators and administrators, and even by the elite. Chapman states:

> The biggest problem in developing art programs in our schools comes from the unexamined beliefs and opinions held by the public, by the arts establishment, and by professionals in education, including arts education. Within each of these groups--and all are potential supporters of art programs in school--there exists a deeply engrained belief that the arts, with few exceptions, can be experienced, comprehended, and created with little or no formal education. Overcoming this fundamental misconception is the first and biggest step we must take. (p.4)

Chapman quotes authoritative statistics in order to make her case: for example, "...80% of our nation's youth graduate from high school with little or no instruction in the arts" (p.1). She says that out of 12,000 hours of instruction in school, less than 1% of this time is spent in studying the arts, (excluding literature), with a qualified teacher.

Chapman discusses the studio-based training of most art teachers, and points out that "until recently, few teachers were trained to teach children about art history and issues in judging the visual arts. There is still some resistance to such instruction, both in schools and in teacher education" (p.11).

Chapman asserts that society as a whole does not support art education. These collective beliefs are upheld by many cliches: "...we have seen many people in our society who seem to believe that the study of art is unnecessary. A number of these beliefs are embedded in cliches that surface in discussions of art" (p.29). Chapman cites the following cliches, which conceal societal beliefs about art education:

> Children are naturally imaginative, creative and artistic. (Don't teach children art, you'll destroy

what nature has given them.)
I don't need to know anything about art to know what I like. (A knowledge of art doesn't aid judgment.)
Art is a gift, a talent you are born with. (Train the talented, but don't waste time trying to teach the untalented.)
If you have to explain it, it isn't art. (Art is self-evident, it can't be illuminated by explanation.)
People who try to explain art are barking up the wrong tree. (Teachers who try to explain art are misguided.)
Art is a universal language everyone can understand. (Understanding of art is not influenced by education.)
Art is caught, not taught. (Exposure to art is infectious.)
I can't draw a straight line with a ruler. (Art is skill in drawing; the clumsy can't learn about art.)
Art is fun, enjoyable. (Art is a form of entertainment.)
Art is play. (Art is never work, doesn't require disciplined study.)
Art is therapy. (Art is for people who are abnormally troubled.)
Art is anything you can get away with. (There are no criteria for judging art.)
Art is life, life is art--that's all there is to it. (Anything can be called art.)
Art speaks for itself. (Teachers aren't needed.) (p.29)

It is not surprising, Chapman says, that art is commonly regarded as a non-academic subject--a soft subject, suitable for students who are unruly, and unenthusiastic about academic work.

Chapman did a survey of the attitudes of art teachers, admitting that "in a brief survey, it is impossible to ascertain a teacher's philosophy" (p.62). Nevertheless, some interesting data was generated: only one fourth teach art history formally--the rest treat it as part of the studio activities. Over 80% of the 600 art teachers surveyed thought it was "essential" or "valuable" for the art teacher to be a practising artist (p.89). Fine Arts faculty, who are also art educators, prefer to be identified as artists rather than as teachers of art. Yet the Fine Arts faculty who train art education majors often have lower

expectations of these students, because they perceive the job of teaching art to children as "relatively undemanding" (p.91). Chapman also points out that teacher training programmes are weighted heavily in favour of studiowork, and are not "balanced with in-depth studies in the history of art or art theory..." (p.90).

Chapman cites the Western tendency to separate reason from feeling as a factor to do with the reason why there is a split in art education--between the practice of making art, and art as an intellectual discipline.

Chapman states that while many studies have been done focusing on children and students, few have been done on art teachers, and their beliefs and opinions. She states:

> Our research offers little insight into the way the art teacher's beliefs and preferences may influence what students study, or the character of interactions in the classroom, or what students learn. Research on the teacher's own artistic and educational philosophy is of special importance in the visual arts precisely because the art teacher is relatively free to invent the art curriculum--to determine the objectives, content, and activities made available to children. (p.107)

Like Lattin Duke (1988), she stresses the need for the lessening of the gap between research and practice, saying "some people think research should be more relevant to the 'real' needs of teachers, thereby bringing about educational reform where it counts--in the classroom" (p.107). This view is shared by Barrow (1982), Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding and Cuthbert (1985), and Fullan (1986).

Lahr (1984), focuses on three recent surveys into those who teach art, identifying who we are, what we teach, how we teach, and what we value.

In discussing a study by Davis, Lahr states:

> ...the art education profession faces tasks of

> redefinition of purpose, setting of priorities and goals, and increasing the current knowledge base. To take this one step further, we must also be aware of the needs of those who teach art, their professional attitudes and behaviors, the content of their programs, and their understanding of the purposes of art in education. (p.115).

The three profile surveys on which Lahr focuses are Chapman's, and the Missouri and Nebraska surveys. In all cases data were collected through survey questionnaires, and the quantifiable results are treated as conventional statistical research findings. The Chapman study formed the basis of the book Instant Art Instant Culture, just discussed. This study reflected a national concern, while the studies in Nebraska and Missouri were restricted to those states, and to particular institutions. But the findings were, however, "related in surprising ways" (p.116). Of particular interest is that each study addressed the concept of the teacher as an artist. In all three studies the concept of the teacher-artist was supported. In the Nebraska survey "over half the art educators had formally exhibited their personal work during the past year" (p.118), while in Chapman's survey 45% had created but not exhibited work over the preceeding three years. Lahr says in the implications of his review and study, that while prominent art educators (for example Eisner, Chapman, Davis), have established a certain groundwork for understanding the values and practices of art educators, "knowledge of the field at any given time is subject to change, since the conditions under which the schools operate are in a constant state of flux. The only constant in this milieu is change itself" (p.119).

In concluding, Lahr says that while this sort of study relects national concerns, the concerns of art teachers at "grassroots levels" should also be addressed by the appropriate state associations. (p.120).

Gray and MacGregor (1987), are currently working on a study called "Proacta", which stands for "Personally Relevant Observations about Art Concepts and Teaching Activities".

In the "Proacta" study, two connected educational phenomena are examined: the first covers theory, content, goals and implementation, while the second covers "teacher personality characteristics, value structures, social skills and interactions, and professional preparation activies" (p.23).

The stated aims of the "Proacta" study focus on the relationship between classroom teaching dynamics, curriculum content and interpretation; the use of curriculum documents, and finally, process and production as a reflection of teaching quality. Data have been collected for the "Proacta" study from the three western provinces: British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Some initial findings of the "Proacta" study (data are still being examined) are that "Formal, written lesson plans were absent; instead concise and situation-specific lesson aids were developed or adapted by the teacher" (p.27). Art teachers appeared to be "responsive, adaptive, and transformative" (p.27). Three propositons formulated by Gray and MacGregor, namely "to hire a teacher is to hire a curriculum"; "teaching is an idiosyncratic activity" and "the visual arts are complex phenomena" (p. 27), were supported and confirmed by the findings.

Findings regarding the research questions were as follows: first, dominant art teaching dynamics which emerged were persistence, engagement and alertness. Second, as far as pre-service is concerned, "Mastery of art content and knowledge through studio course work was cited by 80% of the respondents as essential" (p.30). Subjects indicated that studio study should be combined "in association with some limited school-life experiences until

such time as pedagogical study is combined with an extended three-month practicum or internship" (p.31). Third, the characteristics of students' artifacts is determined by the students' reason for taking art; the teacher's expectations of the student, and finally the social context in which the work is produced. Fourth, curriculum goals most valued by the subjects in the three provinces "are difficult to determine" (p.31). Most subjects agreed that the aims of the guide in British Columbia are worthwhile. In Alberta and Saskatchewan no guides were "brought forward" (p.32), although some of the goals of the British Columbia guide "are implicit in the preliminary drafts of Alberta's new curriculum guides" (p.32). Fifth, goals which are promoted are art-making activities appropriate to the objectives of the teachers themselves.

In conclusion, few studies have been made in the field of art education, which specifically address teachers' beliefs. In addition, in the field of art education few interpretive studies have been conducted, particularly studies employing interviews of a phenomenological nature, such as this one. In searching the recent literature, no studies were found in the field of art education which focused on teachers' beliefs about the practice of teaching art, with a specific connection to beliefs about DBAE.

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

This study is interpretive, but the researcher wanted to go beyond the limitations of the traditional research interview, where the roles of interviewer and interviewee are more clearly defined, and thus, more separate. The purpose in seeking to break through this barrier, was so that the conversations could approach the honesty and truth of shared consciousness and subjectivity. In this context, the idea of phenomenology was found to be fascinating and intriguing. Reading phenomenological literature provided a more certain perspective to this approach: in support of this, a short review of the recent literature follows.

Mishler (1986) describes conversation as a speech event, in which meaning is jointly constructed, and contextually grounded. Analysis and interpretation of the transcribed texts is in turn based on a subjective understanding of that discourse, and its meaning to the researcher, and in turn, paraphrased to the reader of the text. Mishler says that a conversation affords two people the opportunity to express their subjective "understandings of themselves, their experiences, and their worlds" (p.viii-ix). The focus in a conversation is on coming to a mutual understanding of what is being discussed, thus meaning emerges through interactive subjectivity. In this sense, conversation is related to ontology rather than epistemology, which Ricouer (1973b) calls a "sense of greater radicality", in the context of phenomenological research (p.116). Heidegger, quoted by Ricouer (1973b) contends that "'Discourse is the way we articulate significantly the intelligibility of being-in-the-world'" (p.124). In this study, beliefs are examined in relation to the nature of the lived experiences of teaching art. In the sense that our experiences of being in the world determine

our perception and understanding of lived experiences, beliefs play a major ontological role. Thus discourse, or conversation, is an appropriate way in which to examine beliefs, because both beliefs and discourse are ontological in nature. The orientation in this study is phenomenological, in that the researcher is interested in the relationship between beliefs and experience, that is the nature of individual and shared beliefs, and how these relate to the past and current (everyday) experiences of teaching art.

In support of doing phenomenologically oriented research through conversations, Carson (1986) says:

> ...establishing a conversational relation is a hermeneutic endeavor. Such a view is rooted in Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics which considers interpretive acts in their widest possible sense as the ontological task of understanding the nature of human being-in-the-world. (p.75)

Bruner (1986) says "language is our most powerful tool for organizing (and describing) experience, and indeed, for constituting 'realities'..." (p.8). Bruner believes that it is chiefly through language that we can come to an understanding of how experience is endowed with meaning.

While it is possible to understand the concept of phenomenology intellectually, van Manen (1984) says that there is a difference when phenomenology is understood from the inside. In this sense he quotes Merleau Ponty, who remarks that we can only understand phenomenology doing it. It is suggested, however, that as human beings, we are, in a way, always doing phenomenology, in that our subjective senses force us to be aware of the nature of lived experience. Often limited to subjective understanding, it is only when someone wishes to do a phenomenologically oriented study of others--of human subjects, that a kind of reflective heightened consciousness develops about what it

is like to experience life for another person. Thus doing a phenomenological study is highly educative for the researcher, because an accepting yet objective understanding develops for one's subjects. A truly ontological and nonjudgmental empathetic knowing evolves, both in the experience of the conversation, and in reading and re-reading the text. Phenomenology is, as van Manen (1984) remarks, the attentive practice of thoughtfulness, which he describes as a "caring attunement--a heedful, mindful wondering about the project of life, of what it means to live a life" (p.26).

Phenomenolgy deals with the essence of things: for example, one would not ask, how does this art teacher teach art criticism? Rather, what does art criticism mean to this art teacher so that it is taught in this particular way?

van Manen (1984), suggests a methodical approach for conducting research of a phenomenological nature, in four stages, as follows:

> a. turning to a phenomenon which seriously interests us and commits us to the world;
> b. investigating experience as we live it rather than as we conceptualize it;
> c. reflecting on the essential themes which characterise the phenomenon;
> d. describing the phenomenon through the art of writing and rewriting. (p.27)

In turning to the phenomenon which seriously interests the writer, two essential questions emerged. These questions determine the overall structure of this study, including the formulating of the interview questions, and the themes identified in the transcripts.

> 1. What does each subject believe is important in teaching art?
> 2. What is the relationship between these beliefs and curriculum theory in art education?

The Subjects

The researcher conducted a pilot study of five art teachers. This was followed by the main study of five more art teachers. University of Victoria personnel in the Department of Art Education recommended the subjects (including those in the pilot study), to the researcher, as experienced art teachers. In addition, the following criteria were borne in mind:

1. The subjects had to be practising art teachers at the secondary level, in Victoria, British Columbia.
2. The subjects are therefore part of British Columbia's educational and cultural milieu.
3. The subjects were also considered to be dedicated, articulate and well established art educators.

While the number of subjects represents a small sample (suitable for a study of this nature), they were thought to be active professionals, and leading spokespeople. The subjects' beliefs therefore may not be representative of all art teachers, as they may be more competent than the norm.

Permission was given to the researcher to use human subjects, by the Human Subjects Committee of the University of Victoria.

Conducting the Study

After the pilot study was completed, questions were added, developed and refined. This was for two reasons: the research methodology--conversation, while remaining interpretive, became more standardised, and less phenomenological, (this was because research questions became structured and standardised). Second, the study became focused more specifically on beliefs, (and also on the relationship between beliefs, educational background, the two curricular models, and teaching practice), therefore

questions were developed and refined in order to address these issues directly.

In all the conversations--pilot and main study, the chronological format for questioning worked well: questions started with early childhood experiences in art, and moved through tertiary education, to present art teaching practice. The subjects felt relaxed and unthreatened by the innocuous questions asked at the beginning of the conversation, giving the researcher important information about how beliefs may have been formulated early on.

The idea of a conversation rather than a more formal interview also worked well, for several reasons. First, as Mishler (1986) says, conversation is a commonplace occurrence, as people ask and answer questions all the time. The atmosphere was conversational and relaxed, with a nonjudgmental attitude on the part of the researcher. In this way, both researcher and subject were able to gain a deeper mutual understanding of the research focus, in that the asking and answering of questions was contextually grounded, enabling particular points to be explored. Second, the relaxed atmosphere afforded the subjects the opportunity to give information which they otherwise might have withheld. Third, the researcher was not a passive listener, but took part, so that the event was not so much an interview as a conversation. Mishler quotes Piaget who says that "'the answers given continually inform the evolving conversation'" (p.97), and that the researcher's stance is neither neutral nor objective, but "reveals her personal interest in her subjects...as well as in her own research project'" (p.97).

The conversations were tape-recorded. This allowed the researcher to really listen to the subjects, rather than having to take notes as well. Mishler (1986), writes that at one time is was feasible "not to tape-record interviews in the field...(and)...it is clear that an adequate

understanding of what each respondent's answer means...must begin with the question actually asked as the context for interpreting the response" (p.44). In this sense, when it came to reading and re-reading transcripts of the conversations and choosing what should be quoted in this study, it was often better, in endeavouring to retain contextual meaning, to cite both the answer and the question asked.

Interview Questions

The subjects' early involvements and experiences with art were sought and examined through these questions:

1. How did you first become involved with art as a young child--at school, or in other ways?
2. What were some of your most memorable experiences with art?

The questions then moved to how, why, and under what circumstances the subject made a commitment to art, and how that commitment relates to the decision to teach art:

3. Can you remember when you first felt a real interest or commitment to art?
4. What were the circumstances that made you decide to become an art teacher?

Questions following these focus on personal beliefs about teaching art: beliefs held individually and commonly, and the way these are implemented in teaching practice: the first question in this section deals with how the subjects experienced their education and training in art education:

5. Where did you receive your training? What was that like?

This question was asked because it was felt that training and education would have an influence and an impact on the

subjects' currently held beliefs about the practice of teaching art. The questions then moved to a direct examination of the current experience of teaching art: the positives and negatives of teaching art, and the kinds of experiences and ideas that the subjects believe are valuable in art learning, and should be taught.

6. What appeals to you about teaching art?
7. What doesn't appeal to you about teaching art?
8. What important ideas and experiences do you believe should be emphasised in teaching and learning about art? Which ideas seem important to you, and which are not as important?

The last question dealt directly with the subjects' beliefs about teaching art and how these are implemented in practice. The former two questions dealt with beliefs indirectly: they are more innocuous than the last question, which may have been more overwhelming, threatening and unnerving to some subjects, if asked without introduction.

Finally, questions focused on the subjects' beliefs in relation to the British Columbia Secondary Art Curriculum Guide and DBAE: implications for theory, practice, implementing change and teacher education.

9. Do you believe it is important to deal with art history, art criticism and aesthetics in your programme?
10. What is your opinion of the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guide? Which aspects of the guide do you find useful or important?
11. What are your personal needs regarding improving your practice, perhaps in the form of in-servicing and so on?
12. (a). Are you familiar with the idea of DBAE? What is your opinion of this as a new curriculum in art education?
(b). If DBAE were to be implemented, what do you believe your needs might be in terms of upgrading to teach this kind of curriculum?
(c). How would you feel about this, that is, upgrading and teaching a more content-based curriculum?
13. What kind of educational background and training do

you believe teachers of art should have?

The conversations were rich both anecdotally and idiosyncratically: for this reason quotes from the transcripts are of varying lengths in order to preserve the essential character of that point in the conversation, and to keep them as contextually grounded as possible.

In a number of cases the subjects answered questions before they were asked--largely due to the chronological nature of the questioning.

In reading the text which follows in the main part of this study, the reader becomes, in turn, a writer of the text, in that he or she is able to interpret both the meaning of what is said in the conversations, and what is said by the writer. Ricouer (1973) says the "hermeneutic circle proceeds not from the subject and object, but from a connection between these two discourses. The discourse of the text and the discourse of the interpretation" (p.93). The final act of appropriation "occurs when the world of the reader and when the world of the text merge into one another" (p.93). Gadamer, Ricouer says, calls this the "'fusion of horizons'" (p.93). Bruner (1986) says that all meaning is a form of translation, so that he too sees the reader of the text as a writer: "...in Barthe's sense...to become a writer, a composer of a virtual text in response to the actual. In the end it is the reader who must write for himself what he intends to do with the actual text" (p.35). In this sense it is important to remember that the experience of a conversation is, as Mishler (1986) says, a linguistic rather a behavioural event--the latter having been the traditional approach to research interviewing.

This is an interpretive study, then, in a broader sense than it is a description of methodology, for it is interpretive for both writer and reader: it lays claim entirely to one major aim--the search for understanding of

the beliefs of teachers of art in relation to educational background, teaching practice, curriculum theory and implementating change. As Bruner (1986) says:

> ...the medium of exchange in which education is constructed--language--can never be neutral, that it imposes a point of view not only about the world to which it refers, but towards the use of mind in respect of this world. (p.121)

Having conducted this research study, it is felt that its greatest strength lies in the conversations, and in the reading of them.

Isolating Themes

On reflection, and in examining and re-examining the transcripts of the conversations, three dominant themes emerged. Identifying these themes was influenced but not determined by the original (two) research questions, nor by the specific scope and purpose of the study. However, the themes which suggested themselves include a re-examination of the original research questions, the scope and purpose of the study, and examination of the transcripts.

The themes are:

(a) The Background to Currently Held Beliefs about Teaching Art;
(b) Personal Beliefs about Teaching Art: Beliefs Held Individually and Commonly, and the Way These are Implemented in Teaching Practice;
(c) The Subjects' Beliefs in Relation to the British Columbia Secondary Art Curriculum Guide and DBAE--Implications for Change and Teacher Education.

CHAPTER FOUR
DESCRIPTION OF THE CONVERSATIONS

Introduction

The subjects of this study are "Patrick", "Tim", "Catherine", "Andrew", and "Harvey". They are all secondary teachers in the Greater Victoria metropolitan area. Their answers to the questions are discussed individually, and then interpreted and commented on as a group.

Theme One: The Background to Currently Held Beliefs

Early involvement with art

Tim became involved with art before he started attending school, through play. He developed what he calls a "facility", which he does not care to acknowledge as talent. However, his ability was encouraged, and so early on art became established as an important part of his life:

> F: How did you first become involved with art as a young child at school--was it at school or in other ways?
> T: Before school.
> F: And how did that happen?
> T: Through play, and I developed some facility--and at school that facility was encouraged.
> F: You had a talent...
> T: I discovered early that it was possible to represent what one wanted to represent--some people call it talent, I think it's lucky. Just a lucky discovery.

Patrick became involved with art at elementary school. He loved it, he was good at it, and he was encouraged. Like Tim as a young child, Patrick's experiences with art were confirmed as enjoyable and very positive, almost

guaranteeing at least a modicum level of interest in later life:

> F: How did you first become involved with art as a young child, whether at school or in other ways?
> P: I guess it was at school, in elementary school. It was the one thing I really loved, and I was good at it, therefore it was reinforced.
> F: You loved to draw and paint as a young child?
> P: Oh yeah. I loved it.

Catherine says she has always been interested in art: the fact that her father and older brother were both "artistic" has influenced her love for art. Her brother seems to have served as a mentor. But Catherine shows that as a young child she was independently very inventive and imaginative: she describes her exploration with collecting dog hair, which she artfully made into wigs for her dolls. This exhibits metaphorical thinking, self-motivation and resourcefulness. Through Catherine's own initiative, her interest in art continued, supported by the involvement of her immediate family. She says this overruled the effect of poor quality art instruction at school, as she was always encouraged:

> F: How did you become involved with art as a young child--was it at school or in other ways?
> C: I was always interested in art, just as far back as I can remember. As a child I was constantly exploring various materials. My hands were always dirty, I was always painting. Often I would do things that nobody else thought of or even that I was shown to do. I was pulling hairs out of the dogs' backs to make wigs for my dolls, so my interest in art was not just with pencil and paper or conventional materials. In fact I tended to go for the more unusual. As long as I can remember I've been very involved in art--my father was quite artistic--my brother was extremely artistic, and went on to become an architect, an artist-architect. So there was a lot of interest in the arts in my family. I was always encouraged. When I went to school I really don't remember any really valuable experiences. My first school was a public school. I remember the quality of the art teaching being very

very poor. Then I went to a convent school and again the art instruction was non-existent, but it didn't stop me from continuing to be interested in art. And so really in terms of actual school instruction I can't really say I received anything very valuable, but it was something that I did constantly.

Andrew, like Catherine, enjoyed the benefit and encouragement of family involvement and support for art: his grandfather was an artist. He developed a close and rewarding friendship with his Welsh art teacher, with whom he says he is still in contact. This early mentor and role-model afforded him the kind of encouragement important to his eventual commitment to art:

F: How did you first become involved with art as a young child, was it at school or was it in other ways?
A: No, I guess my grandfather...yes, family...
F: Your grandfather was an artist?
A: Ya.
F: So were you encouraged as a young child before going to school?
A: I suppose I must have been!
F: And what was the teaching like at school?
A: Fairly good I think. I always remember my high school teacher--he was a Welsh painter and he had a great influence on me, and I'm still in contact with him. He's well into his eighties now.

Harvey always had "an interest" in art. At elementary school he enjoyed good teaching in art and encouragement: at this point a continuing interest in art (if not a commitment to it), is almost certain. Harvey says his own interest in art "carried" him through high school, where he continued doing his own art work independently:

F: How did you first become involved with art as a young child--was it at school, or was it in other ways?
H: Well I first became involved at school--we had a number of itinerant teachers that came into our elementary school who I found were quite good. I always had an interest--they seemed to help develop that interest. From there I continued doing my own art

work, for my own interest's sake, throughout high school.

Memorable experiences with art

It is clear that as a young child, Tim enjoyed his artistic ability in two ways: first in being able to make art, he could translate mental images visually--into succesfully rendered pictures, and he liked being able to do that. Second, he enjoyed the praise and encouragement that his ability afforded him, which made him stand out "from the herd". The latter factor helped reaffirm Tim's own self-concept, that is, that he was artistically talented, so that a commitment to art as a career would not be unusual:

> F: What were some of your most memorable experiences with art?
> T: As a child?
> F: Yes, as a child, and growing up at school.
> T: I think being able to put ideas into pictures, and being praised for being good at something.
> F: Was it one thing that you were really good at, or were there other things?
> T: I was a reasonably bright student at school, but I stood out in art from the herd--and that gives one tremendous encouragement.

Although at elementary school Patrick loved art and was good at it, in junior high school he decided to take industrial arts: there was a lenghty hiatus before his next contact with art, when he realised in his early twenties that something "wasn't quite right", and he decided to go to art college. This effectively prevented him from having memorable art experiences during that period:

> P:...When I got to junior high school, I did art in grade seven, but then they offered industrial arts, and that was much more fascinating to me. So I took industrial arts instead of art up until grade twelve, when I just had a spare period and I decided I'd take

> art again. And then I didn't take art all through university, because I started writing in grade twelve. I took creative writing at university so I was obviously interested in something artistic, but that wasn't really the right field. I didn't go to art school until I was twenty four, so I already had a B.A. in English and Anthropology, but I knew something wasn't quite right. And then I went to the Victoria College of Art for four years.

Catherine, as a young girl, took herself to the local museum with a sketch-pad: this early enterprise confirmed her independent and unfeigned love of art. She talks about her brother with great admiration and pride: his ability and interest in art influenced and encouraged her's. She says that at a young age, she developed an artistic sensibility, both aesthetically and critically:

> F: What were some of your memorable experiences at that stage--can you remember anything in particular?
> C: I think the most memorable experiences were regularly--like on a Saturday afternoon, as a child, I would head for the public museum, and the museum in Edinburgh (where I was born), is a very large one and has wonderful collections of everything from fiction art to animal displays and so on. And I used to take in a sketching pad and go on a Saturday afternoon and while away the hours just sitting and sketching. And that I would say was a very memorable experience for me. And I think too, also being around my older brother, who was six years older than myself, and seeing the quality of art that he was producing. And I think that very early I started to be quite critical and to know what constituted a good piece of work and what didn't, even though I wasn't able to sort of analyse it in a critical sense. I was very--my sense of aesthetics I think was developed very early.

Andrew was exposed to good and bad teachers. The bad ones couldn't put him off art, because his own love of art, interest and ability were already established. The combination of the Welsh painting instructor in the role of mentor, and family support for art, were clearly important influences on Andrew:

F: So some of your most memorable experiences would have been with the Welsh painting instructor?
A: The positive ones about art, ya.
F: Did you have negative ones as well?
A: Yeah there were some art teachers that I think didn't do what I wanted then to do for me. I couldn't be put off art because I was really interested, but I remember not liking them particularly.

Like Tim, and Patrick, Harvey was both very successful in art, and he enjoyed the positive feedback and reinforcement that his artistic ability afforded him. At an early age, Harvey enjoyed the physical experience of painting, through having read about Jackson Pollock. He decided to try this kind of action painting on his own, undoubtedly demonstrating creative initiative in art:

F: So what were some of the most memorable experiences with art that you can remember now--from that time. Was it making art, or perhaps being exposed to it?
H: I remember at the elementary level being very successful at it. What I mean by that is having other people say very positive things--generally knowing that it was okay because people were telling me it was, and it was very positive for me. Another memorable experience was--I remember reading something about Jackson Pollock when I was very young. I don't know why I even read it. I really liked it--the experiences of painting--like I thought he did. As a matter of fact I think my mother still has the paintings that I did from that period. Very large pieces of plywood.

A commitment made to art

By the age of ten, Tim had made a commitment to art; he knew then that art would always be an integral part of life:

F: Can you remember when you first felt a real interest or a real commitment to art, that this was something you really wanted to follow through on--even if it was very early?
T: I think it was very early--I think it was before secondary school, which would be by the age of ten.

At twenty four, realising something "wasn't quite right", and having done a B.A., Patrick decided to go to art college. It was at this relatively late stage that he made a commitment to art:

> F: Now when did you first feel a real commitment to art?
> P: When I was twenty four.
> F: When you went to the Victoria College of Art?
> P: Yeah, yeah. I took some evening classes there and...

Catherine, on the other hand, says she has always been commited to art: this answer may indicate again the influence of her family, in that an interest in art--at least, would have been a 'fait accompli' in her particular family environment:

> F: Now when did you first feel a real interest--a commitment to art?
> C: I think I've always had it.

When he finished high school, Andrew was uncertain about what he should do. His aunt advised him to consider attending an art college: like Catherine's situation, this shows clearly that art, per se, was appreciated by the family, so that a career in art was acceptable and indeed encouraged, and also that Andrew's ability and interest were clearly recognised:

> F: When did you first feel a real commitment to art--that this was going to be an important part of uour life?
> A: Well I finished high school--or I was just about to, and I didn't know what I was going to do, so one of my aunts said, "Well you know there are art schools?" So I thought, Oh! Didn't know that. So I applied to an art school--Hornsey, and got in. And I suppose that was the point.

Like Andrew, Harvey made a commitment to art when he

started university: art was his first choice as a career.

F: Can you remember when you first felt a real interet--a commitment to art?
H: When I was at university.

The decision to teach art

In the conversation, Tim said that as a little boy he wanted to experience four things; being an artist, a sailor, a farmer and a train-driver. He attended art college when he left high school, not thinking of the possibility of a career as a teacher of art, but like most people at art college, hoping to work and survive as a practising artist. At the end of Tim's art college studies, teaching art "loomed" as a possibility--clearly a decision doominated by financial considerations:

F: And what were the circumstances that made you decide to become an art teacher?
T: Financial.
F: Otherwise you would have become a sailor?
T: No I would have become an artist...
F: So teaching art was the financial alternative?
T: The financial alternative after art school.
F: When you went to art school did you know that you were going to teach art, or did you go there purely to explore you studio-work?
T: Purely to explore studio-work. It loomed at the end as one way to make a living.

Patrick had gone to university and completed a bachelor's degree. He started attending evening classes at a local art college, while working as a construction worker during the day. He became very involved in painting at the college, and taught some classes there. When his mother-in-law suggested that he teach art in a formal school situation, Patrick was horrified: like Tim he saw himself as a professional artist, and teaching school did not have

quite the same status. He realized though that teaching might not be a bad idea, as he loved art, and enjoyed teaching it at the college:

> P: Yeah, I was a construction worker. (laughter)
> F: Having done a degree in English and Anthropology!
> P: At the time I was still writing poetry, but it was really hard work, and I realised I wasn't in quite the right field.
> F: But you didn't want to teach English?
> P: No, in fact teaching never occured to me--teaching in a school didn't occur to me until--how many years after I finished art college--at least five. And it was my mother-in-law suggested it to my wife. I was horrified when she said "maybe 'Patrick' should look at teaching." And I thought, "my God, is that what you think of me!" Because I was all set for being an artist, not a teacher!
> F: So the circumstances were financial--it was expedient?
> P: Ya. I had been teaching adults, and I realised that I really liked teaching, so let's just put the two together and see what happens. The whole professional year thing went so well, that by the time I was finished I was pretty sure that I wanted to do teaching.

At sixteen years of age, Catherine wanted to attend art college. Her brother, a great influence on her artistic and educational background, was already attending art college. He successfully dissuaded his parents from allowing Catherine to attend art college on the grounds that the experience would be unsuitable for a young girl. Instead, Catherine attended a religious teachers' training college, where she specialised in art education. She has always regretted this particular educational route:

> C:...my brother was going to art school at the time, and it was very bohemian. So at sixteen when I wanted to go to art college, he worked on my parents and dissuaded then from allowing me to attend the art college--he felt it was an inappropriate place for an innocent young girl. So I went into teaching, but I've always thought that if I had another chance I would have insisted and gone to art college like I had

planned to.
F: So it was your brother who strongly influenced the circumstances that made you become an art teacher?
C: My brother had an influence. I've always enjoyed teaching, and I think when I was growing up I used to babysit a great deal--I used to love working with kids. When I was younger obviously it was little kids. But I've always enjoyed that interaction, so to parents who were trying to suggest careers it seemed like a very obvious choice to make, because it seemed to sort of go with the kinds of things I enjoyed, and was good at.

Like Tim and Patrick, Andrew attended art college. Teaching art didn't occur to him until he found himself working, unhappily, as a display designer. At this point teaching art seemed like a better financial alternative, and he felt he would still be very involved with art:

A: The next thing I did was I finished there (at art college) and did a year of freelance display work for shops and things. That was quite well paid, but the display managers and things I didn't get on well with. So I didn't know what to do. So then I thought well if I can't earn a living just doing art, then I might as well teach it! So then I went to Brighton College of Education for two years, and got a teaching certificate. And when I left there I decided we wouldn't live on the money I made in England. We were going to go to Australia but we decided we'd try Canada first. So then we came over here, and then I started teaching. And I wasn't earning particularly good money because of the training--they wouldn't recognise the Hornsey part of it, so I then went back to U. Vic to upgrade.

Harvey started a B.A., but realising he wasn't enjoying this, he switched to a B.Ed., electing to major in art education. it was at this point that he decided to teach art, his love for art having been established years previously:

H:...I took an education degree at university. I went through one year at university in a general B.A. programme. I didn't enjoy it and I didn't do well. And I knew it was the wrong decision. So I decided to

switch into art education the following year, after I'd travelled. And so I did that.
F: So you had already decided to teach art, going into art education?
H: Oh yeah, oh yeah.

Having spoken to the subjects and read and re-read the transcripts of the conversations, it is no surprise that they are all currently teaching art. Their positive experiences in art, which eventually led to their teaching it, began when they were all young children. Thus their continued involvement is no career accident--indeed, involvement in art in some form or another was almost destined.

As young children, all the subjects had ability in art making: the ability to do something well would alone assure a certain level of attachment to experiencing that activity, because doing something successfully is usually reaffirming and pleasurable.

In all five cases, the subjects as young children were shown encouragement in art making, through important role models: Tim, Patrick and Harvey enjoyed support and encouragement in art from teachers at school; in Catherine's case her father and particularly her brother were influential mentors; in Andrew's case family support--his aunt and his grandfather are mentioned particularly, and his Welsh art teacher with whom he formed an important and continuing friendship, through a mutual love of art. The teachers and family members who encouraged these young people in art, exerted a considerable influence on their charges.

Catherine exhibited independence and a deep passion for art in her solo visits to the local museum to draw. Harvey's independent reading of Jackson Pollock's abstract action paintings, and his subsequent experiments were valuable experiences in the act of painting--in enjoying the physicality of paint and painting. Tim Patrick and Andrew

loved art at school, the experience of making successful art and being praised for it were very memorable.

For Patrick, commitment to a career in art came at a later age--twenty four. On leaving high school Tim, Catherine, Andrew and Harvey were already committed to careers in art. At this stage, Catherine and Harvey elected to teach art. Choosing the art education route, they saw themselves primarily as teachers of art, rather than as artists. Tim, Andrew and Patrick would have preferred to be practising artists, choosing the visual arts route: teaching art was the most attractive financial alternative on completing art college.

Summary statements from this section can be seen in Table 1.

TABLE I

SUMMARY STATEMENTS ABOUT FORMATIVE BACKGROUNDS IN ART

Subject	Statement
Tim	Through play, and I developed some facility--and at school that facility was encouraged. In art I stood out from the herd, and that gives one tremendous encouragement.
Patrick	I guess it was at school, in elementary school. It was the one thing I really loved, and I was good at it, therefore it was reinforced.
Catherine	I was always interested in art, just as far back as I can remember...there was a lot of interest in the arts in my family.
Andrew	My grandfather...(was an artist). I always remember my high school teacher--he was a Welsh painter and he had a great influence on me.
Harvey	I first became involved at school. I always had an interest--they (teachers) seemed to help develop that interest. I remember at the elementary level being very successful at it.

Theme Two: Personal Beliefs and Teaching Practice

Art teacher training

Tim attended a college of fine arts, where he had a rigorous and comprehensive education, covering formal art history and foundational studies in studiowork: drawing, painting, sculpture, printmaking and so on. His drawing course included anatomy--as a basis for life drawing, and to develop basic draughting ability to do with proportion, the use of line, tone and form, and so on. This rigorous kind of foundational training in the visual arts is typical of the highly structured formal art courses taught at art schools in Europe, in the academic fine arts tradition of the nineteenth century.

Tim acknowledges that this visual arts education helped him to understand "what makes art tick"--that is to say an intuitive and a rational understanding of art. The latter his training would certainly have given him; intuitive understanding would be increased by reflecting on art works, his and others'. And here art history and art criticism would assist the art student in comprehending this intuitive understanding of art. Tim says that art history was a complete parallel to studio practice, in that one could see similar problems and their solutions in other works. This parallel, and the emphasis on critical awareness, aided Tim's intuitive understanding of why a particular painting works, or why it doesn't, the critical and aesthetic awareness emerging through searching for honesty and truth in all art work, including his own.

Tim believes it is essential that the artist makes an honest commitment to art--and this commitment adds to the (truthful) integrity of the artist's intentions, as an artist:

F: Now where did you receive your training--what sort of an institution was it, and what was your training like? What were the memorable experiences about that?
T: I had some training in London, part-time study, and enjoyed that--at St. Martin's College of Art. I went to one of the central institutions in Scotland where I had a vast varied comprehensive almost Renaissance academic type training...
F: Where you had to do very structured drawing...
T: Very structured drawing, painting...
F: Academy style?
T: Very much academic. It also entailed a lot of history.
F: Art history?
T: Art history, history of architecture, history of ornaments. I probably did as much structural anatomy as a G.P. does. It was pretty rigorous.

F: Do you think that that kind of very structured training is a good foundation--has it been a good foundation for you in terms of draughting--just basic drawing ability?
T: I think in terms of knowledge, background, understanding, critical awareness, aesthetics, history, and practice--it was an excellent training.

T: ...from the point of view of one's own art, one became very self-critical, perhaps over critical, in that kind of environment, but also I became very aware of what made art tick, through the years, through the centuries--and where the real strengths in art lie.
F: Where would you say the strengths lie?
T: I think that's something we change our emphasis on as we gain more experience. But I would say a very honest commitment by the artist--an intuitive and a rational understanding.
F: Intuitive and rational...
T: Either or--separately or together. I think that that makes it extremely important to understand the formal qualities, the abstract qualities, of all art and architecture--when I say art I should keep it very broad.
F: Yes, because you could talk about applied design in the same way.
T: Ya--you could talk about applied design, you could talk about some of the great craftsmanship of stained glass or silver, or jewellery...
F: What do you think increases your aesthetic awareness in the kind of training you got--because you mentioned aesthetic (earlier)?
T: I think in searching for understanding and honesty in one's own art, one is forced to look at what's gone

on in the past and what is happening currently. And it made me critical--I think one begins to understand critically what it is that makes good art.
F: Would you say that it doesn't have so much to do with the idea of beauty as with truth?
T: Truth more than beauty certainly. Isn't beauty truth, and truth beauty? (laughter)
F: We're talking about Keats now!

F:...Now you were talking about the very traditional training that you got, and I was wondering about the art history and how you enjoyed that?
T: Oh it was an essential part of working in the studio.
F: How was it essential--what was the relationship between studio and art history?
T: Although art history was taught as a separate series of lectures, one would come across problems dealing with drawing, painting, graphic design, sculpture--and automatically go and search out how the greats had dealt with similar problems. It was a complete parallel to the studio practice.

At twenty four, Patrick realised that he was not on the appropriate career track. Something wasn't "right". Not having done studio art since his decision to take industrial arts in grade seven, he started attending studio art classes at a local art college.

Although Patrick and Tim both attended tertiary level fine arts institutions, their education and training was very different. The art college Patrick attended was non-accredited--when asked what he majored in, Patrick said the college was not run that way, one simply concentrated on certain areas: in Patrick's case, painting, drawing and sculpture. He attended the art college in the 'sixties, so it was very "reactionary": there were no marks, no formal studio courses, and no academic courses in art history--"you didn't write papers or anything". However Patrick says he did take some art history at university when he was doing his B.A. in English and anthropology. Visiting artists came in to give talks at the art college.

On completing his studio courses, Patrick taught for

the college for five years. It was at this point, at his mother-in-law's suggestion, that he got into the professional education year at a local university, having got B.F.A. equivalents for his non-accredited studies at the art college.

This kind of background in the visual arts--the emphasis on non-structured studiowork experiences, rather than formal structured course content, would have an influence on Patrick's concept of what it means to be art educated, as Tim's more rigorous training would have on him:

> P:...I didn't go to art school until I was twenty four, so I already had a B.A. in English and Anthropology, but I knew something wasn't quite right. And then I went to the Victoria College of Art for four years. So it wasn't until my mid-twenties that I got into the visual arts seriously.
> F: What were your areas of...
> P: Drawing, painting, sculpture.
> F: That was with Jim Gordaneer and...
> P: Bill Porteous--oh there were a lot of people there, over the years that I was there: Glen Howarth and Greg Snyder and Fleming Jorgensen, Jack Wise. So I actually ended up studying with a lot of people.
> F: What did you major in?
> P: It wasn't and still isn't run like that at all. It's not accredited--there are no marks, there's no marking system. You didn't major in anything, although there were areas that were concentrated on.
> F: And what about art history--did you do anytbing like that?
> P: Yeah, they had art history, but once again that wasn't formal. You didn't write papers or anything like that. A lot of it at that time consisted of visiting artists coming in and giving lectures. And they now have a particular sort of art history course, which I've sat in on at various times. You know this was in the late sixties, so it was all very much reactionary in the sense of no marks and that sort of thing. Although even at the very beginning when I was there they were teaching English at one point--they really went through a lot of changes. So I mean it wasn't totally informal, there was an English course offered. But I had done some art history at university.
> F: At U. Vic?
> P: Ya.

P: ...So out of curiosity I went to see what it would entail to do the professional year, and one thing lead to another, and really I had to go through hoops. (laughter). Hoops had to be gone through to get me into the programme, because the art college was not accredited.
F: What sort of hoops were they? Courses in art education?
P: No. I got into the basic professional year--but the work I'd done at the Victoria College of Art had to be verified by U. Vic's visual arts department.
F: Oh I see.
P: So they granted me B.F.A. equivalents. Because I didn't actually have a B.F.A., so on paper I had nothing that said I could teach art, even though at that point I'd been teaching at the Art College for five years. (laughter).

Catherine wanted to go to art college, but her brother "worked" on her parents, so that instead she attended what was considered a more appropriate institution for a young girl: a religious teachers' training college.

Catherine says the courses were mainly centred around teaching methods, and were aimed at elementary school teachers; Catherine chose to specialise in art. Unlike Tim and Patrick, she was being educated in pedagogery, rather than in art. Catherine feels her training was inadequate--she learnt "a smattering of skills" in studio courses, which it seems were not of the kind of intensity to afford the pithy involvment which she wanted. Art history was not offered. Catherine feels these courses are typical of art education courses, (as opposed to study in the visual arts).

Catherine has always regretted this route, because she says she's had to "work very hard at picking things up on my own":

F: What was your training like?
C: Well my education was mainly to do with the broad spectrum of teaching methods and so on.
F: This was all overseas?
C: Yes, yes. And it was a convent run--it was

recognized by the government, but it was a Roman Catholic convent college, and its non-denominational counterpart was in the city also. And the programmes were exactly the same, except there was a religious content in the one I was at. But the art education side of things was quite interesting, but again it was geared mostly to the elementary, because most people who were at the college were there for that reason.

F: What kind of courses did they offer at the teacher training college--in art?
C: Yes. Uhmm, now it has a been a long time ago, and they were--actually they were very similar to the ones that I see the art students taking here. They gave you sort of a smattering of skills, and a smattering of possible assignments, and some exploration, but everything was of a rather general nature. There was printmaking and there was a lot of design--there was more focus on design rather than actual drawing and painting.
F: So all the courses were basically studio-work oriented courses?
C: They were studio-work with a methods component.
F: A teaching methods component?
C: Yeah. But if I remember correctly all the classes were taught, you know, not so much to develop your skills, as to come up with effective ways of getting a point across to the students. So it was approached from a different kind of...
F: So you weren't being treated as aspirant artists as much as aspirant teachers?
C: Yes.

F: So you were able to go through the art education route, rather than through the visual arts route---the college of art?
C: Yes, yes. And I think I have always regretted it, and periodically I find if I had been allowed to go through the visual arts route I would have a better technical knowledge. I mean I've had to work very hard at picking things up on my own, and I feel that a lot of valuable time has been spent doing that, whereas if I had had that with my training I could concentrate on other things.

Andrew, like Tim and Patrick, attended art college. He spent two years doing foundational studies in a wide variety of media, including drawing, painting, sculpture, ceramics, and mosaics and printmaking. He is now teaching many of

these areas, so that this basic foundational training, similar to Tim's, has been very valuable to him. He specialised in etching and painting. At a later stage, when he realised, like Tim and Patrick, that he couldn't afford to live as an artist, teaching seemed a feasible alternative, so he went back to study for a two year certificate in education.

> F: Tell me what the course was like--what you did in each year and what you specialised in.
> A: Well it was--really the first year I think, or two years, you did a lot of things--you could specialise even then. I really liked etching and painting, so I naturally went there. But I remember doing mosaic and we did lettering and calligraphy and cermaics--everything.
> F: So you had a foundational first year where you had to do everything?
> A: It was two years I think.
>
> A: ...then I went to Brighton College of Education for two years, and got a teaching certificate.

After a false start in a B.A. programme, Harvey elected to study for a bachelor's degree in education, majoring in art education. Harvey concentrated on sculpture and film. Like Patrick, he is proud to mention the names of his artist-teachers, as are many ex-art students. This suggests that the faculty in which he studied was visual arts, rather than education. Like Catherine, he did not study art history formally, and he also says that he feels it was a mistake to study art education--he would do "straight visual arts" if he had another chance.

> F: So you were studying under the umbrella of education, and taking art education courses?
> H: Yes, that was my major.
> F: And you were training for secondary school teaching?
> H: Yes.
> F: What sort of courses did you take?
> H: Oh I took all sorts of courses, my main areas of concentration were sculpture and film. In film I studied with a man namd Jean Oser, who was a French

film editor. And then Terry Frank at that time. We had a film department at the University of Regina. And they were both very good--very influential. I wanted to become involved with some form of teaching art and making my own art...
F: And because at that time you felt you wanted to teach art, it was more appropriate to be in art education than in visual arts?
H: No I think it was a mistake back then, being in art education.
F: If you were to do it again would you do it differently?
H: Yes I would, I'd do straight visual arts.
F: Would you?
H: Yes.

The positive aspects of teaching art

The positive aspects of teaching art for Tim are threefold: first, he's dealing in an area "of passion" that he loves; second, he likes communicating "the message" to the students--in other words he likes the communicative act of teaching, and finally, he can deal in a "whole" way with an area which involves both "understanding" and "intelligence". The last point seems to refer directly to what he himself learnt at art college, that is, that understanding art involves both rationality and intuition. He sees studio practice as the most appropriate way to teach art in this "whole way":

F: Okay what appeals to you about teaching art?
T: At this time of year, very little! (laughter).
F: Then think of September!
T: Well I'm dealing in an area of passion and an area I love, and I do get the message through to masses of young people who are unaware that this aspect of life exists. And that's good. It's beautiful to find people discovering themselves. I think one of the other appeals is that in our school system which is very much a progressive rational type of system, we have an area where we can deal in a whole way with understanding and intelligence.
F: How do you inspire that intuitive intelligence in your students?

T: Through studio practice.

Patrick enjoys art because he too is dealing in an area which he loves, and like Tim, he is motivated to communicate this to his students. He feels teaching art is very important--it means a lot to him, therefore teaching it is personally satisfying:

> F: What appeals to you about teaching art, what do you like about it?
> P: Hoo boy! I guess the fact that it's something that I know and love. And I think it's incredibly important. And hopefully that gets across to people. (long pause)

Catherine enjoys making things clear and intelligible to her students: this means presenting ideas in unusual creative ways, sometimes through brainstroming. Catherine likes to see her students succeeding at art. She finds art a flexible subject to teach. It is not as structured as other subjects in the school curriculum, and she appreciates this:

> F: Now you're teaching art, and what appeals to you about teaching--what do you enjoy about it? Do you want me to turn this off so you can think about it?
> C: No, actually it's okay. One of the neatest things about teaching art, I think, is being able to be creative about how you present an idea...And so when I'm teaching art one of the most interesting things is to take a concept and try to brainstorm how many ways it can be taught, so that it becomes clear to the students, without using the jargon that we read in books but don't understand. How can I make this intelligible to them? Because there are many different learning styles, and I was made very conscious of that when I was teaching enrichment, that kids do learn in different ways...I also really get off on having kids be successful. It really gives me a thrill to see them doing something that they really like and are proud of, and possibly something that they felt that they couldn't achieve or do, but they have done. And I really enjoy looking at the work that they produce, it's almost like having your own personal art gallery, you know?...But mostly I think I enjoy the fact that it

> allows you to be far more flexible than in other subjects, and it allows me to have a rapport with the students. And an atmosphere in the classroom which is not as formal as in an academic class, although I do expect--they do recognise that it is a discipline. But nevertheless the atmosphere is a lot more informal than it would be in a normal class.

Andrew likes teaching art because although he is not able to paint all day, he is still "highly involved" in art: it is clearly an area he loves, in which he is concerned about being highly involved. He enjoys being able to teach as a facilitator, rather than as a traditional teacher. It seems that what Andrew likes about being a facilitator is that the atmosphere is less formal, and the students take more personal responsibility for their work. But perhaps he is also endeavouring to retain his own self-image as an artist, when he says that he doesn't look upon himself as a teacher as such:

> F: Now that you're actually teaching what are the positives and what are the negatives about it--why do you keep doing it?
> A: Well I think--first of all I don't sell much of my own art work, so there's the motivational factor there. So I'm sort of, you know getting paid for it, and I think teaching art is still highly involved in art. I don't look upon myself as a teacher as such, I look upon myself as somebody involved in art who happens to be teaching, and I would like to feel that comes through in my teaching.
> F: So you feel more like a facilitator?
> A: Ya, and my teaching style probably goes more toward that anyway...

Harvey enjoys working with the students, and seeing them learn and find success. He likes being in a position to "expose art" to the students. Like Tim, he finds art enjoyable to teach because it is "all-encompassing" and "holistic":

> F: Getting into teaching art, what appeals to you about

teaching art?
H: I enjoy working with kids. I enjoy working with--I like to see kids learn things, things that I learnt when I was young, and I like to see them become successful in their own ways, and feel good about themselves. I like to expose them as much as I can to the very vast world of art--to the arts. To just categorise and say art, because when you're teaching art in a room--it's much more.
F: What are the other areas that come into it?
A: Oh you can branch off into philosophy--one moment you can be talking about architecture and Frank Lloyd Wright, and the next moment you can be working with collage and talking about Picasso...So that's what I mean, you're dealing with all sorts of different areas. It's all encompassing and it's very holistic.

Negative aspects of teaching art

Wasting time seems to be the most negative aspect of teaching art for Tim. He finds teaching art exhausting, and this detracts from the time and energy that he could otherwise devote to his own art work. He finds teaching within the constraints of the school curriculum limiting. Finally, badly behaved children are a problem in that they are a negative influence on the collegial atmosphere he wants in his art room, and he has to waste time on dealing with these behaviour problems:

F...What doesn't appeal to you about teaching art?
T: The exhaustion of teaching art takes away from the energy that one could put into one's own art. That is a major one. The structure of the school system lends tremendous frustration to the job. The social attitudes among the children--among the population, towards art, can be quite negative.
F: How does the school structure frustrate or limit your teaching experience?
T: Art within a school has to fit into a time table, into programmes: children have to jump from one subject to another. We often have children who are quite undisciplined which is a society problem rather than a school problem--we have time restraints, one hour periods three times a week, so there is a lack of

continuity at times and for some children it's too much time. But these are minor technical problems.
F: Now the other question I wanted to ask was about the students you mentioned who bring problems themselves--which are social ones.
T: Now that's one of the biggest nightmares of teaching art.
F: Is that to do with taste?
T: No. They can be a derogatory influence on the studio atmosphere that one tries to create.
F: A collegial spirit?
T: Ya.
F: Because they're badly behaved or disruptive?
T: Ya. I have to give up time and energy dealing with irresponsible badly behaved children, which would be better spent with the mass of the children who are quite willing and excited to learn. So that's the problem for all teachers. This system more so than others.

Patrick is not bothered by the everyday "nitty gritty" problems of teaching art: the mess, or discipline problems, or time constraints. He finds the lack of credibility and status that art has to endure as a subject the most negative aspect of teaching it:

F:...what doesn't appeal to you about teaching art, if there are any difficulties?
P: I think perhaps something--I don't think this would be just symptomatic of my school, I think one of the things that annoys me increasingly is the--this happens as an artist too, is the lack of, credit's not the right word--the lack of credibility that art is given. It's really treated as a third rate activity, both as a subject in school and as an occupation in western society. I don't think I am bothered by nitty gritty things like kids that bother me...
F: Things like mess...
P: Yeah--you can put up with all that. I think what it really boils down to is that...I still havn't got the right word for it, it's not looked down upon--that's too strong, there's one very simple word for it...
F: It doesn't have the status it should have?
P: Yeah, that's right!

Catherine finds a major problem in the fact that art is often treated as a dumping ground for students. She believes this is because art is seen as an "easy credit";

students come into art at the grade eleven level, with no background in it. Consequently, she has to teach to many levels of competence, and this is difficult:

> F: What doesn't appeal to you, if anything, about teaching art--are there any things that you'd like to...
> C: Okay, one thing that bothers me is that art has traditionally been a dumping ground for students who find it difficult to fit in in another niche, and so are now looking for that last credit, and looking at the list of subjects and courses that are available. They look at art as a possible easy credit...But still students are coming in without the background--into grade eleven art. And what happens is that you have this tremendously wide wide range of abilities and experiences and backgrounds, and you have to address them all, so that you can't get as focused as you would like to, because you're trying to give something to everyone, at whatever level they're coming into...I don't teach to the average, I teach quite high. But what I do after I've delivered my lesson is go around and water down one to one when I'm dealing with individual stiudents, making it more palatable or intelligible to them.

Anrew is plagued only by discipline. it is something he'd rather not be bothered with:

> F: What are the things that don't appeal to you--if there are any?
> A: Well I don't know really--the discipline side of things bugs me. It's something I don't want to have to be bothered with, but you have to in a high school. So that's the main thing. The rest of it is fine!

Harvey's response to this question focuses on teaching in general, rather than teaching art: he said that he does not like clerical work; the politics of teaching, and working with lazy incompetent colleagues:

> F: What doesn't appeal to you?
> H: Doesn't?
> F: Uhum.
> H: Clerical work--I hate...I don't like a lot of the politics associated with teaching. I don't like a lot

> of the administrative problems that crop up because of external circumstances that affect you. I don't like dealing with shitty teachers, and there are lots of them around...I don't like working with incompetent people for any reason. I don't like working with lazy students. I just don't like lazy incompetent people.

Beliefs about which art learning experiences are considered to be most important

Tim believes that art should be studio-centred. He is very against non-studio pursuits in art, such as formal art history, art criticism and aesthetics. He believes that art learning of this sort trivialises art, and simply creates a sophisticated veneer.

Tim believes that "we learn by doing". Therefore at the school level, the experience of making art in the studio is the appropriate manner in which to learn art. In this way, Tim believes the students can learn what "worthwhile" art is, thus developing their critical and aesthetic sensibilities through studio production. Art history is not taught formally, but "sneaked" in, and dealt with topically, where appropriate.

Like Andrew, Tim seems to suggest that he too facilitates his students discovering worthwhile art for themselves, through "guided self-discovery", his role as a guide being of crucial importance:

> T:...We learn by doing, and this is one of the few areas in the school where the kids will really learn by doing. So the most important aspect to me, and the most important experience is to give the kids experience of working in a studio, of producing art--and worthwhile art, and through producing worthwhile art, get to recognise what art is about.
> F: And what worthwhile art is?
> T: Yes.
> F: So in being able to recognise what worthwhile art is, and being able to have some kind of value system...
> T: That value system is developed. Taking it a little

bit further, as a child begins to recognise in their own efforts something worthwhile, then I always have available examples of art that's been done, by other artists, slides--ranging from the cave apintings to the latest twentieth century painters. And the kid who understands that something that's happening in their art that they think is worthwhile, can be shown this other art, and they suddenly see that it's not an isolated phenomena, or a plaything, but very much part of the whole human experience.
F: Within a wider context?
T: Ya. And that's how I teach history.
F: So you teach some art history?
T: Yes, but it's incidental, I sneak it in. I let them see it when they're ready to see it.
F: So you introduce it when it's topical?
T: When it's topical to the experiences that they're having in studio practice.
F: So it's inspired by studio practice?
T: Yes.
F: Do you put it in the context that it came from chronologically?
T: No. These examples can come from anywhere in man's past or present.

T:...So they recognise quality in their own work, and they're shown these qualities in the work of other artists from all different cultures and times.
F: So it's being able to compare and contrast and appreciate cross culturally?
T: Yes. And the appreciation is there, when you deal with the kids that way. When a kid discovers something for himself, vast fields of flat colour, and then I suddenly show them some Goya, wow! They recognise it, they're not going to forget Goya.
F: So it's learnt by experience and by association? And by self discovery in a way?
R: Ya. Guided self discovery. That is important--the guidance, and that's my job.
F: Now are there any ideas that you don't think are important, any experiences that you don't want to...
T: Yes. I think art can be very easily trivialised and weakened. I see a lot of time and energy in non-studio pursuits of art, which seem aimed art giving a veneer of sophistication and understanding, and I think it is just a veneer. I wouldn't teach aesthetics as such, I wouldn't teach criticism as such...I wouldn't separate them from studio practice...they grow naturally out of studio practice.

Patrick believes the school art programme should be

studio based: he does not teach theory formally. There are no formal lessons in art history. He does not believe academic reading and writing are appropriate in art, so no essays are written. Thus the activity of producing art is the focus in Patrick's art programme.

Patrick believes that observation is the most important part of coming to grips with studio work: he talks about seeing and experiencing through the senses, and coming to terms with what is "really there". It seems that he means this both literally and metaphorically, suggesting that ultimately he believes integrity, through truth and honesty of intent, is the most important criterion of studio art:

> P: Okay so the idea of direct observation, learning to see--to see what is really there, not what one thinks is there. So I find myself really at odds with this whole business of talking about art, because I think it should be directly perceived and experienced through the senses. Now one can also take that learning to see on a much deeper philosophical level, if you want. But I think it all comes out of the--for an artist, out of their ability to really see and perceive things for what they are, not what they think they are. To be able to clear away all those cerebral levels and overlays--to get to a clear point where you can really directly see what's in front of you. I mean that intellectually and philosophically and spiritually and everything else as well, but I think it starts first with that direct visual perception.
> F: So you're not being literal, in the sense that you're not saying see figuratively?
> P: I even take it out of that, yeah. Yeah, see what that is, see what that actually looks like. And we'll go from there.
> F: So you start off with something concrete, and then move into more metaphorical references?
> P: In some ways I think people would think I'm very reactionary and old fashioned, but I don't really care.
> F: I've found a lot of people I know believe in starting with a very concrete observational looking, and then being able to work with the authority of real observation behind you.
> P: Exactly...I should say that in relation to the school that I'm teaching in, which is so heavily academic, and some of those kids are under intense pressure, when I see them, I want to give them

> something completely different...I want to give them a totally different experience. So for me, I want it to be studio-based, if that's putting it in the positive rather than saying I don't want them reading art history books, I don't want them writing art history essays.
> F: So you want it to be more of an active participation?
> P: And so do they. They really crave it...

Catherine believes that her art programme should be studio-based. She believes that art is not easy: it is a disciplined area of study, which involves frustration and struggle in the process of improving and learning. She wants her students to come to terms with this idea of a struggle, so that they realise that making art is something to be taken seriously.

Catherine finds that many of her students come to art with stereotypical ideas, which she implies are conservative and traditional. She believes it is important that they "stay loose" open and receptive to new ideas, at the same time realising that art involves discipline and hard work:

> F: What important ideas and experiences do you believe should be emphasised in teaching and learning about art? What sort of experiences do you encourage, and what ideas do you want them to learn about?
> C: Okay one of the things that I really would like to encourage in the students is to stay loose, and by that I mean to stay open. One of the hardest things I have to cope with is stereotyping. And students come in with a very fixed idea of what is acceptable in art. And so what I would really like to encourage the students to do is experience as many different forms of art, so that they understand different ways of communicating ideas....I would also like them to experience the idea of discipline, that although there's sometimes merit in a spontaneous piece of work, that there is a discipline attached to producing art work, and that it requires a thought and planning and a bit of a struggle, and disappointments and so on. It's not something that just falls into your lap...I like to stress the idea of sheer enjoyment--the pleasure of art, and the excitement...So the excitement of discovery, tempered with discipline and structure and planning and so on,

and the idea of staying open and flexible and accepting.
F: What sort of foundational ideas are important, if any? I mean do you think that basic drawing is important?
C: Yes, yes I do. I think drawing is important. And it almost features in every single assignment that we do, even if it's a three dimensional assignment. I like my students to work something out on paper--you know?...

Andrew believes that high school art should be studio centred. He doesn't teach art history or art criticism separately--they are taught as part of studio practice. He does not believe there is value in art criticism which is external to the studio work in progress--as he wonders, why make it difficult and criticise other work? When it was suggested that he could discuss both the students' work and other paintings, he did not believe that this would be as useful to the students. He points out that appreciating art does not help develop ability in art: it is clear that Andrew's definition of being art educated does not focus on thinking and knowing about art, but rather making art. He believes his own involvement as an artist is encouraging and positive for the students. He believes it is important for all art teachers to be practising artists, otherwise he sees the art teacher teaching in a "vaccuum."

Andrew believes he has succeeded as a teacher of art when a student becomes involved in art after school: he believes that then he has successfully fostered love and commitment to art. Andrew believes that part of his job is to build confidence in his pupils, at the same time realising that in art there is no guaranteed success. Like Catherine, he wants his students to acknowledge the struggle involved, thererfore allowing his students not to be afraid to "screw up":

F: In your teaching, what things do you want your students to learn--what are you trying to emphasise,

what's important to you?
A: The main thing, and I very seldom find this out, the main thing to me is when a kid does art when they leave school at some point in the next ten years or so, and they then do it regularly, either as a hobby or professionally. If that happens then I think I've succeeded. It might not seem like much of a goal, but I think it's a very important goal, that you've made them want to do that.
F: So you've fostered their love for it?
A: Yes. And that's a very abstract thing--there's no way of measuring that. And that to me is the most important thing. I do not want to teach a bunch of students to paint like me, or to draw like I do. That would be the last thing I'd want to do.
F: This is a question that you might not be able to answer verbally, but how would you foster their love, their passion for art, what sort of activities would you do with them--to develop that?
A: Well it's a tightrope anyway, teaching art--if they feel good about doing art, therefore they have to succeed--they have to get praise--they do something, and you find good points in it. And they begin to have confidence in themselves. So it's not minding to fail, not minding to screw up, and knowing that if they carry on they will do something that they'll feel good about, and somebody else might feel good about. I don't think it's tied up with knowledge of materials and all this other rubbish...And besides I've got fifty different levels of ability anyway.
F: Now how do you handle that?
A: I just have to use my judgment. A kid who is obviously doing very primitive images--grade nine or eight or seven level in grade twelve, I'm not going to say well you're not developed enough to pass grade twelve. You have to make a judgement--has that kid done better than they did previously? Is this an improvement--are they liking art better?
A: Ya, I try to.
F: You talked about a tightrope--what is your concept of that?
A: Well one side is teaching something, and being able to measure it just for yourself, and the other side is sort of letting the kids go off along their own lines--their own interests in art. Because if art's a personal thing, they have to develop their own images and their own ideas, but at the same time you have to teach them certain things--habits, ways of looking at things. You know if you go too far one way, which I think DBAE has--has obviously gone totally to one side.

A: ...to me there is no correlation between history of art as such and being able to appreciate art and do art, quite honestly.
F: So you don't see a correlation between learning about art history and that reinforcing and growing in terms of making art?
A: No, not at all. Absolutely not. However I do feel that if a child comes along and says hey, I saw a really neat painting of such and such, and I'd like to paint like that, then you say okay well good, go and read about him...Studying literature I don't think makes you a better writer, I would say that any writer would agree. But you can have an appreciation of literature which is good, you can have an appreciation of art, but it has nothing to do with your ability to do it. And I don't think it even helps very much, in fact it probably hinders.
F: Do you think it may hinder because of seeing other images which may interfere with one's own intuitive images that come from yourself?
A: Yes, absolutely. And you know whatever we do has got to come from here, (gestures to self--heart). If what's coming from here is a bunch of other artists' stuff, then it's not going to be as creative or original if it comes from other sorts of experiences.

F: So you don't think that thinking about art, that standing back from it, even students standing back from their own work--do they do that? In a retrospective way look at work, after it's been done?
A: Oh yes I think that's important. I think criticism--a certain amount of analysis, not too much, and I go for Feldman's thing here, which is quite good and gives you a nice little handle and you can hang anything on it...

A: I think the main advantage (to self being an artist) is that I can say to a kid, "look I paint" or, "I'm an artist", and I occasionally bring stuff in to show them and I think they know that I'm a painter and not just a teacher, so that's good.
F: Well what do you think the implications are for someone teaching art at the secondary level, or at any level perhaps, who isn't making their own art, who doesn't have that...
A: I don't like it.
F: What bothers you about it?
A: Well I think they're teaching in a vaccuum. How can they comment on the feelings of an artist, how can they comment on the feeling of making art--the highs and the lows, how can they understand a kid coming in one day and being absolutely pissed off with his piece of

> artwork and then the next day something happens and it's great? It seems a very clinical way of teaching art. I'm not saying they can't do it, I'm not saying they won't get reasonable results--I don't like the idea.
> F: When you say clinical that it's kind of removed?
> A: Paint-by-numbers you know? Sort of right now we're going to do this, let's study skies...that to me has nothing to do with art. It's to do with superficial art.

Harvey's art programme is rooted in studio production. He believes it is important that his students learn to appreciate art. He believes it is important that they feel satisfied with their efforts in studio work. Harvey believes that one doesn't have to be good at drawing to be good at art, and he wants to "dipel that myth". He believes that "everyone can be successful" in art, and he wants his students to realize this:

> H:...I would like them (the students) to appreciate the fact that art's been around for a long time, and will continue to be around for a long time...And there's a good deal of other life experiences that come into play when talking about art...It's nice to see students who previously thought they weren't talented or weren't successful at making it, it's nice to see them go through the process of making something and feel good about it. And be able to learn something more about themselves as well. I like to initiate projects, both on my own and with students, and see them through. It's really nice to finish something--and see it through from start to finish.
>
> F: Just speaking personally, which ideas are important to you and which are not in teaching art?
> H: That everyone can make art, that everyone can be successful in a certain way. That you can learn how to create relatively successful pieces of work. I think there's a lot of things that can be learned. And I think through long hard practice you can refine a lot of skills and become quite successful...Most young kids think that art is just drawing, and if you can't draw, well you'll never be a good artist. Well I do everything I can to dispel that myth. And slowly build up knowledge of art history, build up knowledge of all the other art forms that are available. And then provide them with experiences that are both practical

and pleasant to be involved in.

In conclusion, Tim, Patrick and Andrew were educated through the visual arts, followed by certificates in education: teaching art was the most attractive financial alternative to being poor artists. Tim and Andrew attended similar institutions, in that they were required to take foundational courses in all media, and art history, while Patrick's institution was very influenced by the sixties genre: it was reactionary in that there were no formal courses as such; no grades; no written papers or courses in art history, and the institution was not accredited. Catherine and Harvey were both educated in art through teacher training courses, so that their studies were rooted in teaching methods. Both Catherine and Harvey regret that they studied under the umbrella of education rather than visual arts, as they feel their concentration in the art area was not adequate.

The positive aspects of teaching art for all the subjects centre around three aspects: first, that the subjects are teaching in an area they love; second, they enjoy communicating with the students--teaching them art, because they feel it is important, and finally they like teaching a subject which is "wholistic": which encompasses what Tim identifies as rational and intuitive thinking. All the subjects want to inspire confidence in their students, in their image making abilities.

Both Tim and Andrew find discipline problems an annoying nuisance in the classroom; for Tim, this wastes time. Tim finds teaching art within the constraints of the regular curriculum difficult. Patrick is bothered by the lack of credibility and status that art is afforded. Catherine believes that art is treated as a dumping ground for unsuitable students who think art is an easy credit, and who have no background in art, so that Catherine has to

teach to various levels of ability; this latter point was also made by Andrew. Harvey addresses generic problems in teaching--outside the realm of the art classroom: colleagues who are lazy and incompetent, school politics, and having to do clerical work.

Ideas and experiences which the subjects believe should be reinforced in their teaching, and which they hold in common as beliefs are: art should be studio centred; making art is not easy, but involves a disciplined effort; art history, art criticism and aesthetics should be taught as part of studio work, and finally, that they seek to foster a love of art, and confidence in their students through satisfying studio activities. Individuals beliefs about the most important aspects of art teaching were varied: Tim believes that we learn by doing, thus reinforcing the case for a studio centred curriculum; Patrick believes that learning to observe both literally and metaphorically, and combining that with integrity in what one is doing in studio art, is very important to teach to his students; Catherine wants her students to escape the fixed closed limitations of stereotypical ideas about art, so that they remain open to new ideas; Andrew believes that when a student of his commits him or herself to art in later life, he has succeeded as a teacher of art, in that he has fostered a love and appreciation of art; Harvey believes that you don't have to draw well to be good at art, and he wants to "dispel that myth", so that all students can make images which they find personally pleasing and satisfying.

Summary statements from this section can be seen in Table 2.

TABLE 2
SUMMARY STATEMENTS ABOUT TEACHING PRACTICE IN ART

Subject	Statement
Tim	We learn by doing, and this is one of the few areas in the school where the kids will really learn by doing. So the most important (experience is) working in the studio...and through producing worthwhile art, get to recognise what art is about.
Patrick	...the idea of direct observation, learning to see...to clear away all those cerebral levels and overlays...I mean that intellectually and philosophically and spiritually...but I think it starts first with that direct visual perception.
Catherine	I like to stress the idea...of the excitement of discovery, tempered with discipline and structure and planning and so on...staying open and flexible...
Andrew	It might not seem like much of a goal, but (to) make them (students) want to do it (make art)...it's a tightrope anyway, teaching art... they have to get praise...begin to have confidence in themselves...not minding to fail...whatever we do has got to come from here, (gestures self--heart).
Harvey	...everyone can make art, that everyone can be successful in certain way. That you can learn how to create relatively successful pieces of work...through long hard practice you can refine a lot of skills and become quite successful.

Theme Three: Beliefs and the Two Curricula

The role of art history, aesthetics, art criticism and studiowork in current practice

Tim's high school art programme is studio-centred, and he believes it is important to deal with art history, aesthetics and art criticism as part of studio-work. Examples from art history are introduced when Tim feels it necessary and topical. Tim believes that his students should develop critical awareness by being aware of the artist's intention, that is, the particular aesthetics being sought by the artist, for example harmony or discordancy. Tim believes that in making any choice--he cites the example of picking up a pebble off the beach, that one is actually making an aesthetic choice. It is through this kind of relatively commonplace example that he makes his students more aware of the breadth of aesthetics, and by implication, more critically aware. Much of what Tim learnt in his own training is being reinforced in his teaching: for example, critical and aesthetic awareness, and acknowledging the integrity of the artist's intentions.

Tim believes that Feldman's model for art criticism is appropriate--the ideas of formalism, expressivism and so on. Tim sees no point, however, in making these areas separate components from studio work, and then testing them. He believes they must be part of the stuio work experience.

> T: I do believe it is important to deal with art history, art criticism and aesthetics in my programme, but not as separate components!
> F: So again they come under the umbrella of studio-work?
> T: Ya.
> F:...I'm sorry to be so pedantic here...how would you guide the students in art criticism and aesthetics?
> T: ...I develop...I hope a critical awareness of what's going on. The examples I show will not always

necessarily be the ideal examples of good quality, in my educated opinion--I don't want them to have an uneducated opinion, but it's based on their own background...I want them to realise that they just have to look around...and develop that critical awareness.
F: So it's not just to objects of fine art, but to general objects of design...logos...
T: Their whole environment--their whole visual environment.
F: So do you talk about basic principles of design with them?
T: Yes, very much so.
F: ...How would you deal with the idea of aesthetics with them? (pause). Even if it's in a subtle roundabout way.
T: ...One can say , "look at this piece of work you're doing, there's something which is so out of tune, and it's not contributing to the whole--do you recognise it?" And the child has stepped back and begun to look objectively and say, oh yes, that colour--that 's killing the whole. Or, no, that's the key, the discordancy is the key that's making the piece worthwhile. So that's one way of getting into aesthetics.

F: So the intent is not necessarily harmonious?
T: It might not--some beautiful pieces of music are not harmonious, but they have other qualities--the truth of intent.
F: Is what determines?
T: Is the aesthetics that are being sought, are being strived for by the composer or the artist. And also recognising aesthetic qualities in the most mundane things.

T: ...I'm encouraging them (the students) to see that we do make choices--we walk on the beach and we pick up one pebble, we throw away pebbles--but there is always one we hold longer because it has certain qualities. It may be tactile, it may be shape it may be colour or pattern, which draws us towards that piece. And there's a recognition--usually not a conscious recognition, just an acceptance that this piece has--I like this one--it feels right, it looks right, it's interesting, it's exciting. And I want them to recognise that that decision, to hold that piece, even if it isn't brought to the surface of their consciousness, is the same type of decision that they might want to make in looking at their own sculpture, or other sculptures.
F: That recognition of something being right is a very important part of aesthetics.

T: I do deal a little bit with formal and expressive approaches to aesthetics in my discussions with the kids, dealing with their own work and dealing with their inspiration, which is their total environment. Whether there's a formal quality that makes it (the art work) beautiful, or whether it just seems to be--there's a perfection about it, or whether it is just a stimulating expressive quality. I want the kids to recognise these qualities.
F: Identify them?
T: Yeah.
F: Okay.
T: Which would be deadly boring if one put it down and said today's test is on good qualities, you have ten roughs in front of you, I want you to describe the qualities. This would be a non-lasting exercise in futility, I think, and yet they might get ten out of ten and you could call it an aesthetics test!

Patrick does not believe it is appropriate to deal with art history, art criticism and aesthetics as separate components from studio work. He cites the example of a formal course in art history, which he believes would come down to the banal memorization of data. Like Tim, he believes knowledge is only really learned when it has been "filtered through"--by experience, so that active participation is ultimately more beneficial eduationally, than the students being the recipients of information. Patrick does show students examples of the work of artists in art history--like Tim, when this is pertinent to a particular studio problem. These are isolated examples which are illustrative, and removed from their particular stylistic and historical context.

F: Do you believe it is important to deal separately, as separate components, with art history, art criticism and aesthetics, in your programme?
P: No not at all. Because I really think that art history would be largely meaningless, and it would be the memorisation and assimilation of a lot of data, as are so many other subjects. And it's not until something's actually gone through you and filtered through you that it becomes real true knowledge. The same with criticism--I mean we could sit there and

> criticise this or that, look at this and tear it apart and analyse it, and once again it would be largely meaningless...I prefer to do it in relation to okay now how can you go back and improve the upper left-hand corner--that sort of criticism. And then try that, and then let's look at it again...And the same with art history--you know? Come and look at this book over here, this guy's work here, it looks a lot like what you're trying to do. You know? Flip through here and see if this helps you out.

Catherine, like Tim and Patrick, deals with art history, art criticism and aesthetics as part of studio work. She says, however, that she does not deal with these areas as much as she would like to. She frequently uses an artist or a style, for example Fauvism, as a focus in her lesson planning in studio work. Art historical styles and/or artists are not dealt with contextually or chronologically. She puts up displays and discusses the work with the students, which she acknowledges is doing art criticism within the "context of studio work".

> F: Now do you believe it is important to deal specifically rather than perhaps generally with art history, aesthetics and art criticism in your programme?
> C: Separately meaning?
> F: As particular areas of study--if you think it is important to deal with them, are they part of general studio-work or are they separate, or do you not deal with them at all?
> C: I do deal with them--I don't deal with them as much as I would like to and I think that's something that I'm going to correct next year...But what I have done up till now is I have introduced various historical developments and then followed it up with studiowork, so I use it frequently as an introduction to an assignment. For example with the nines and tens when we were doing simplification of shape, I used Matisse line drawings, and I showed many many transparencies of his work. And so now when I talk about a Matisse type drawing they know what I'm referring to because they've experienced it in their own work...
> F: So it's dealt with as part of studiowork?
> C: Yes.
> F: Now what about art criticism as a separate

component: do you ever withdraw from studiowork to deal with it--is it dealt with as part of studiowork as well or is it separate?
C: Yes. I think it's done mostly within the context of studiowork. What I do is when an assignment is finished I make use of displays...and we will discuss what it is, and how well each one has fulfilled the requirements of the assignment--why they're good, what elements are being used and how, to what advantage and that kind of thing.

Andrew believes that his art programme should be studio-centred. He believes that art criticism and art history are lesser components of the studio focus. Aesthetics is a mystery to Andrew. He believes that someone defined aesthetics, and then a discipline was created around that definition. Andrew does criticise the students' work. However, when asked about using examples from art history for the purposes of art criticism, Andrew indicates that he believes that this would be inappropriate, and that it would be more valuable to focus criticism on the students' work. Here there is a misunderstanding, in that Andrew thinks that what is being suggested is that student work be excluded from art criticsm. When this point was clarified, that is that art criticism should include student work--as well as examples from art history, Andrew said that that would be "another subject"--not art. Here again, for Andrew the definition of being art educated would mean doing studio work--as he said, a person interested in art history need never pick up a paintbrush. For him, the content-based programme could not be defined as "art": it would make for inappropriate art learning at the school level, as it would be too academic and have too little to do with studio work.

F:...what do you think about dealing separately--as separate components with art history, art criticism and aesthetics? And if you don't think it's appropriate to deal with these areas separately, could you say why not?
A: Well criticism of the kid's work...
F: And criticism of art historical work as well.

A: But why choose somebody else's work? The criticism that is going to be felt more by that kid is criticism of his own work and analysis. I mean why make it difficult and say well I'm not going to evaluate your work we're going to choose a famous painter's work.
F: Well the art criticism could include the child's work as well, but it's art criticism as an academic subject that we're talking about here.
A: Oh alright well I--that's nothing to do with art, that's another subject if you like.
F: And what about aesthetics?
A: Well the same thing there. I don't even know what aesthetics are really. Somebody decided to define aesthetics, and then they had a course to teach it. Well to me it's different things to different people, and to go and say it's a separate thing--it's all sort of highly academic and I don't think you can do that to art. Well I don't think you should.
F: What about art history?
A: Well the same thing there--you separate it out and have it--if somebody's interested in art history fine, they need never pick up a paintbrush. But I don't think it's anything to do with a studio art course at school.

Harvey believes that art history, art criticism and aesthetics should be dealt with as part of studio-work, and be generated by it. Like Tim, Patrick, Catherine and Harvey, he says that he shows students appropriate and topical art historical examples which are inspired by studio work.

Harvey believes that teaching a more content based curriculum would be "another aspect of teaching art", or, another way to approach art education. He believes that in order to teach this kind of curriculum, the teacher would need to be very "knowledgable". He believes there may not be sufficient qualified personnel to manage teaching a curriculum involving art history, art criticism and aesthetics.

F; Do you think it's important to deal specifically with art history art criticism and aesthetics?
H: Well yes, but it's hard to separate them. As an example here you're talking to a grade twelve student

about a particular aspect of their painting, and you happen to mention Picasso or Degas or another that is relevant to that comment. You're dealing with art history on that level, but you're not necessarily showing a slide and I think it's important to keep that whole aspect of art history workable and not continuously separating them...But there's nothing wrong with separating them, that's another aspect of teaching art. But that takes a lot of experience, I think, to do that effectively--it takes a lot of knowledge to be able to do that well...
F: Talking about knowledge--there is quite a lot of knowledge required to teach art history formally, as a separate component, and the same for aesthetic and...you'd have to study philosophy and stuff.
H: Yes, I know. Well that's the biggest downfall. If you had the personnel to handle that, in those areas, in one cohesive group--I know very few people who can handle that single-handedly.

Beliefs about the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guides

Tim believes that the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guides should not be used prescriptively, but as a reference. He believes that the Theme Guide is often used too prescriptively, and that this is just one approach to art education. When it is used prescriptively, the Theme Guide is limiting for the teacher. He does not use the guides often.

T: I think the most important aspect of the whole guide is the paragraph...that says this is a guide, not a prescription...It's a good reference, almost like a series of mental notes one makes to remind onesself on certain things you want to cover...I think it's biggest problem is being a thematic guide--it's often used prescriptively, and that's bad I think...I've thumbed through the guide and suddenly seen a fresh approach...I don't refer to it very often....I feel when it's used as a prescriptive guide it is very limited, especially being thematic--thematic is only one approach to art education.

Patrick has found the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guides "useless": he says he has done most of his lesson

planning by the "seat of my pants." Like Tim, Patrick does not subscribe to the thematic approach; he believes the thematic approach to studiowork is "art teacherish"; "cutesy" and has too much to do with words. He prefers the idea of the process--the experiencing of studio work, as opposed to a thematic approach.

> P: I had to teach Art 8 that first year. And I had no idea what to do. I mean I couldn't relate to these small kids, and I was furtively scrabbling around looking for something to give me guidance. And I found the Art Curriculum Guide totally useless. It was no help at all. And I pull it out periodically, and look at it, and I've found it not of much use at all. Most of the stuff that I've done, I've done by the seat of my pants.
> F: You have said something briefly, but what do you think about the thematic approach?
> P: I'm probably going to sound very arrogant here, but it really seems to me to be art teacherish, kind of cutesy...it's too literary--it has too much to do with words.
> F: The guide?
> P: No, the idea of working through a theme. That sounds to me more like a problem to be described in words.
> F: If you were to design a guide, what kind of suggestions and help would you give to people starting to teach art at the secondary level?
> P: Rather than theme I like building on the process and procedure. So I would design it along those lines.

Catherine believes the B.C. Art Curriculum Guides are more useful than does Patrick, although she does not refer to them often. While Catherine finds aspects of the Content Guide useful--the historical, media and imagery references, like Tim and Patrick, she does not value the Theme Guide, because she finds it more suited to elementary level students. She does not believe the Theme Guide is challenging enough for secondary level students:

> F: What is your opinion of the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guides--which aspects, if any, do you believe are important. If you don't use the guide much how do you find it doesn't meet your needs?
> C: I quite like it. I don't use it very frequently,

> mainly because I usually have quite a few ideas of my own...However I do periodically look into it--the sections that I've found most useful are the imagery and the application in each of the sections, like foundations, ceramics, textiles and so on...I like the reference on the right hand side to historical developments, you know? Where they suggest how to tie it in with a particular artist, so I like that...The section on themes...
> F: The whole book on themes?
> C: The whole book on themes, it tends to sort of go towards the elementary--I think it's quite..the choice of subject to me is not very...(pause)
> F: Challenging?
> C: Yeah, not very challenging, and it really doesn't reflect the interests of the senior students.
> F: So you think the themes are inappropriate for the secondary level?
> C: No, not at all. I think the themes can be actually quite interesting, but it has to be something that they're interested in.
> F: So the themes aren't that appropriate?
> C: Right.

Andrew was involved in a reaction panel to the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guides: his panel recommended that there not be one general foundation course in studio work, but rather separate foundation areas for each studio area. The rationale for this criticism is that having one foundational area implies that the students have to have covered that foundation course in order to take art. Andrew says this is impractical as art is an elective subject.

Andrew doesn't believe curriculum guides are necessary: he believes that a teacher of art should be resourceful enough to be able to come up with his or her own ideas. Consequently he doesn't use the guides. He believes the reason for their existence is a general societal and governmental move toward conservativism, coupled with a greater desire for measurability and accountability.

> F: You're familiar with the Secondary Art Guides? What do you think of them, are they useful? What was your involvement first of all? (With developing the Secondary Art Curriculum Guides: subject told

researcher he'd been involved).
A: We were a reaction panel... we reacted to what they had come up with.
F: Did they make changes based on your...
A: Not on ours actually--our little group, they didn't listen to us.
F: Really?
A: We said we thought each component should--you know how they've got a foundations section?
F: Yes.
A: Well they sort of say that that is <u>the</u> foundation, and then you go and do everything else. We said that the painting component should have a foudnation (of it's own)...the graphics...Not a foundation--one that was meant to be--to do with them all, we said first of all it's not practical, and secondly it's too much, to much foundation. You know it's like saying you've got to put in a semester before you can get into art, and you know that goes against my philosophy of the kids--what is this foundation? There is a body of knowledge that they have to have before they can do one of these other interesting things? I totally disagree with that...Look at the primitive painters, the naive painters and things of Europe and Saskatchewan and so on. There's no body of knowledge that you can check off and say right, you are now ready to be an artist, you are now ready to do art.

F: So do you think there are some good things about the curriculum guides--what's your general feeling?
A: I don't know, it's interesting. I don't know what I would feel if I hadn't got much training and I opened the thing up. I don't know how much help it would be.
F: Why? Would it be confusing or...
A: Ya, probably would be. I don't agree with the curriculum guides anyway, I think it's stupid...They're now going towards curriculum guides of course.
F: Why do you think they're going towards curriculum guides? What's the reason?
A: I think--well it's a conservative government you know, and they like to measure things...you've got to be able to measure it to see if it's working or not.

F: Do you use these guides much?
A: No, not really--no.
F: So do you have your own ideas for what you're going to teach?
A: Ya, and that'll vary each year. I mean God, if somebody goes through a whole bunch of training and they can't read a situation and teach it the best way, then there's no point in teacher training colleges or university.

Harvey is moderately supportive of the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guides. Like Tim, he believes they should be seen as guides, and should not be used prescriptively. He believes they need updating in the area of technology, however the fact that he is interested in this area probably has some influence on his opinion. Harvey believes the guides are inadequate in the areas of art criticism and aesthetics, and he'd like to see more Canadian art content in the area of art history--local artists and so on.

> F: What's your opinion of the B.C. Secondary Art Guides--if you do use them, which aspects are useful and which aren't?
> H: I use them, I think they're okay. I think they need some updating right now, especially with all the new technology--we're ten years behind. I think the B.C. or any curriculum is looked at by newer teachers, more inexperienced teachers. I think you'd find that very few teachers who've been teaching for ten years or more would be referring to those on a continuing basis. They're a guide--they're only meant as a guide...
> F: So you look at different aspects--like things that are suggested in image development, ideas like distortion, simplification and all that?
> H: Yes, I look at it, and take what I can glean from it.

> F: Do you think it's adequate in terms of the more theoretical areas like art history, art criticism and aesthetics?
> H: In terms of art history, I think there has to be more of a concentration of new and upcoming B.C. artists, and the impact of technology on art. In terms of criticism and aesthetics the guide is inadequate.

Beliefs about DBAE: implications for implementation

Tim is familiar with DBAE as a curriculum model: his opinion of it is unsupportive. Tim says if DBAE were to be mandated and implemented in local schools, he would be part of a group which would fight this move.

Tim's objections to DBAE are twofold: first he believes

that moving toward a DBAE curriculum would mean a move away from art to pedagogery, so that art would become a rigid examinable and "boring" subject. Second, Tim believes that art is a holistic subject, to be learnt and experienced in a holistic way; he believes that isolating one part lessens the whole, which is richer. Tim believes in learning by doing, and he says that where art history is part of the studio experience it is more naturally synthesised and absorbed and understood by the students:

> F: Okay. Are you familiar with the idea of DBAE, and that proposes that art be divided into four equally weighted areas, art history, art criticism...
> T: Yes I am.
> F: What do you think of it?
> T: It's a pile of crap.
> F: If DBAE were to be mandated, what do you think your needs might be in terms of updating to teach this kind of curriculum? (pause). Would you be able to teach this kind of curriculum?
> T: Oh I would be able to teach it, but I think it would be the most destructive move for the whole art education system, in that what we've been doing is moving away from the language of art, into the language of pedagogery, and we'd be very quickly becoming involved in making art boring as the kids find many of the other subjects in the school. I think we (should) continue teaching these four aspects, but base them in studio practice, and studio experience.
> F: So you wouldn't need to go back to school to study art history or anything, because you've done that? You did that in your teacher training?
> T: Yes.
> F: Now how would you feel about having to teach a more content based curriculum, and you've said something about that here, a little bit earlier--but what would you think of that? If the curriculum branch to do with art education in B.C. were to say okay we're now going to have DBAE mandated?
> T: I would probably be part of a group that would fight it very hard. And I would question the experience, qualifications and abilities of the curriculum branch who would wish to implement such a system...
> F: What are your objections to DBAE? You have already mentioned some of these, but just being very clear about these?
> T: I think my main objection would be that art is a holistic subject: it doesn't have constraints of time

it's not sequential. It can be rational but it isn't necessarily rational. To cut off one part of the whole and exphasise that one little part, I think lessens the whole. I think if the whole is there, these components are much greater. I have no objection to these things being taught, I think they should be taught, but I think they should be taught as part of the total. But I don't think that in adolescence children are ready and have enough experince, to begin to have any sort of historical perspective, and part of teaching art history through a studio involvement where history becomes an automatic part of what they are doing, as an example of others striving to do what they're doing, they begin to get a sense of history...

Patrick had not heard of DBAE. If it were to be implemented, he would not want to teach the content-based components, but would rather hire someone else to do this. Patrick would not consider upgrading to teach a DBAE curriculum--he would quit teaching art. Patrick, like Tim, is against the implementation of this kind of curriculum in art. He believes that the rationale for developing DBAE has been to give art education more status: this was one of the negative aspects of teaching art which he mentioned earlier. Patrick believes that it is very important to develop in his students practical art making abilities. He objects that DBAE would involve a great deal of reading and writing, effectively preventing the emphasis on developing studiowork skills and confidence which he so firmly believes in.

F: ...Now are you familiar with the idea of DBAE, which proposes that art is composed of four equally weighted components: studiowork, art history, art criticism and aesthetics? Never heard of it?
(subject shakes head).
F: Okay.
P: Being in an independent school I'm really quite isolated.
F: But few teachers have heard of it. I think in Canada a lot of people in the university situation have heard of it. And if it were to be implemented--I'm talking very much hypothetically here, because I want to draw implications from what my subjects say, if it were to be implemented, what do you believe your needs might

be, if you had to teach this kind of curriculum?
P: (laughter). My needs? Would be to hire another teacher, to teach the other three quarters!
F: So you basically wouldn't want to teach art history, art criticism and aesthetics as separate components?
(subject shakes head)
F: Would you consider upgrading if DBAE were mandated--made part of the curriculum?
P: I would probably look for another job--seriously.
F: That's okay.
P: Yeah, I would. And probably--if I'm where I am now, it probably wouldn't make any difference, I would hope...

P:...I'm sure this isn't their reasoning behind it, but for the kids who feel that they can't make art, I think it's so crucial to show to them and prove to them that they can! That they don't have to go a whole intellectual route about reading and writing about it! Ugh! I'm really against that, really against it.
F: Okay, so you really would be anti upgrading to teach a more content-based curriculum?
P: Yes, very much so.
F: It's interesting that this new development has come about...
P: You know it's funny it may in some ways...I just had a feeling for a number of years about the way art education is headed. It is headed this way, sure it is. It relates to what I said before about art not being a viable subject, this gives it more integrity if you like, more clout, more academic status--if this sort of thing was to be implemented, I could see the whole thing of...the reason that it can't be evalusted in the same way as math and science is that it's far more complex, far more important--it''s the sort of thing that you can't just label. So I think the whole reasoning behind it is totally backwards.

Catherine said she was "vaguely familiar" with the idea of DBAE. Her first objection was that students would need to be more academically gifted in order to cope with such a content-based curriculum adequately. She fears the result would be losing students who would find art too academically taxing.

Catherine believes the weighting of the four components is unbalanced: she would prefer to see sixty percent devoted to studio work, and the remaining forty percent to the other

three areas. She believes that art history is the area which is most important, and is more deserving as a separate and rigorous area of study; for this reason she feels the Western Civilisation programme is a very agreeable complement to studio art.

Catherine acknowledges that she would need in-servicing in all three content-based areas. However, she also says that she would not be receptive to this new curriculum, because of the impact it would have on her students, who she believes would drop out of art.

F: Are you familiar with the idea of DBAE--have you ever heard of it before?
C: Well I'm vaguely familiar with it...
F: You've heard of it?
C: I have, and the proportions, the equal proportions...
F: The four components?
C: Yes, and those four areas I would have a great deal of difficulty with. I think it would take a very mature art student on a much higher level...
F: Academically?
C: Academically and artistically to be able to see the need for equal weighting for those four components.
F: What do you think of the weighting--I mean giving...
C: I think it's wrong. I think I would put studio probably no less than sixty percent of the course, because you lose them: I've done it, I've tried it out and if you spend too much time on the criticism, on the evaluation, you lose students, particularly the ones that find it hard to--who are not academic, and who find it hard to sit and listen through a lecture...But certainly acknowledging the need for the other three areas, but breaking down the remains to forty percent.
F: Do you think that any of them should be a separate academic--more rigorous area of study?
C: Yes I do.
F: Which ones?
C: The historical--the art history, I feel is very essential. The western civ. programme which is a course taught at our school and other high schools, is very good...I would always like to see every art student go through the western civ. because it's a separate course she has time to devote to the art history, whereas I have to slip it in whereever I can. But it does support the art programme rather well.

F: Now if DBAE were to be implemented--hypothetically, if it were to be mandated in fact, what do you believe your needs might be personally, in terms of upgrading to teach this kind of curriculum?
C: I think I would really need to get some upgrading in the area of criticism--and some historical--improve my historical background. What was the third area?
F: Aesthetics.
C: That too. I would definitely need in-servicing. I mean what I have is adequate because of the emphasis on studio, but I think if you were going to attribute greater weight to those other areas I would get--I would want to, I don't like being in a postion of not being on top of something.
F: How would you feel about it if it were to be mandated--that is DBAE, and also how would you feel about having to upgrade to teach a more content-based curriculum? Would you be receptive to it or...
C: I would not be receptive to it.
F: What would your concerns be?
C: Well I--as I mentioned, I would be extremely concerned about devoting that much time to content because I think I would lose a lot of students, because they would drop out.

Andrew, like Catherine, had heard in a nebulous way about DBAE. When asked if he would upgrade to teach this curriculum, Andrew said he wouldn't--he'd leave teaching.

Andrew believes that this kind of curriculum is not an art curriculum at all--it is something else. Andrew believes DBAE has come about because of conservativism and the need for measurement and accountability.

F: Now you're familiar with DBAE?
A: Not really--I mean I know I had heard of it before you asked this...
F: Well it proposes these four equally weighted components: studio-work, art history, art criticism and aesthetics. The first thing I wanted to ask you in terms of DBAE is if it were to be implemented--I'm going to ask you what you'd think of that in a minute, but if it were to be implemented, would you be able to teach that kind of curriculum?
A: No.
F: Would you have to upgrade to teach it?
A: No, I don't think so. (pause). I wouldn't--I'd quit.
F: You'd quit?
A: Ya, or I'd teach something else.

F: Okay. Well that was my next question--how you would feel about upgrading to teach a content based curriculum--how you'd feel about doing that, and also what you think the impact that kind of thing might have?
A: Oh well it would kill art--absolutely! I know it would. And it's nothing to do with that (art)--it's another course. You're saying you want to introduce something else into the school, at the expense of art. That's exactly what's happening here.
F: Why do you think DBAE has happened? Why is there this move?
A: Conservativism I guess--those great measurement people. I mean you can test history of art can't you? You can hold up a slide and say "who did that--what year, oh gosh, jolly good you really understand the subject, you knew that!" And you can measure it and you can have your scales and your graphs and the whole bit.

Although Harvey says he had previously heard something of DBAE, he believes that DBAE would afford a greater emphasis on the process of making art: this is clearly a misunderstanding of the DBAE philosophy. However Harvey acknowledges that the teacher would have to have administrative and parental support, a suitable personality to handle DBAE, and that the programme would be "difficult to operate" in most schools. He would need re-training in art history and art criticism. In spite of having said that DBAE would afford more emphasis on the process of making art, Harvey concludes by saying that he thinks an art programme like this would "die within a year" as most students want to concentrate on studio work. This indicates that on reflection, his opinion of DBAE is not as supportive as it was at first:

F: Are you familiar with the idea of DBAE which proposes that art be comprised of four areas...
H: Yes, yes.
F: If this were to be implemented, what do you believe your personal needs would be as an art teacher, upgrading to teach this kind of curriculum, or do you feel you would be able to teach it right now?
H: I would feel that I would need some re-training in

criticism and in art history.
F: And this would be in order to teach art history chronologically...
H: Yes. And then there's aesthetics, I feel I would want to brush up on that.
F: So appropriate courses in those things would be appropriate for you?
H: I'm not sure it's the most important thing though--I'm wondering if these other areas are more important.
F: Well how would you feel about it--upgrading to teach this kind of curriculum?
H: I'm sure that it wouldn't be anything terribly new--the emphasis would change, so I'd want to become very familiar with it.
F: There'd be more theory and less studio-work.
H: Yes, perhaps, but that's not the way I understand it. The way I understand it there's more of a balance and you still have your studio time and so on, you're still making your work, but there's more of an emphasis on the process and there's an emphasis on the critical aspects of it--and relating that to classes like say western civ.--are you familiar with that?
F: Uhum.

F: I think that DBAE, in terms of the way it's written about at the moment, studio-work is only a one quarter component. The other three quarters are these theory based areas, art history and so on, so on paper you would in fact be doing much less studio-work, but I'm sure each teacher could interpret and manipulate the components to suit his or her curriculum.
H: Right. I think you'd have to be in some very neat situations to be able to teach that.
F: Okay tell me about them. What would be a better situation to be in to teach...
H:...There has to be interest and support from home. I think the administration has to be sensitive to the instructor, he has to have the personality to deal with it. I think it would just be a really difficult programme to operate in most schools...Relatively speaking there are quite a few qualified people, but an area like that (DBAE) would be very difficult to carry out. I can't see a programme like this operating. I think your art programme would die within a year.
F: What do you think the kids would think of it?
H: Most kids would want to just make art and not discuss it or write about it. But again in a particular type of school I think there would be great success with a programme like that.
F:...how (would) you feel you would be able to handle this, and what (do) you think of it as an idea.

H: I know what my gut reaction to it is--I really don't know...I think your school situation's going to have to be very unique.

Beliefs about personal upgrading needs and art teacher training

Tim believes that future teachers of art should have a very broad-based preparation, including art history, and more mandatory studio courses in essential areas: drawing, painting, sculpture, applied design, fabric design, commercial and applied design, craftwork, draughting, and art history--to include architecture. Tim believes that the elective nature of much tertiary level art education affords the aspirant art teacher a rather spotty grasp of studio activities, so that their skill application as teachers is limited.

Tim also believes that a bachelors degree in fine art would be preferable to the "broad-based B.Ed. degree", and he believes the Emily Carr College of Art in Vancouver would be a suitable institution for upgrading to offer B.F.A. degrees. This would be completed by a professional year in education.

Tim believes that entry into the visual arts programme should be very selective and competitive. Students should have to submit portfolios in order to be considered. Tim believes that if more rigorous requirements are made in the selection of future art teachers, the quality of art teaching will be improved. Tim believes it is too easy to get into a general B.Ed. programme, where the student could elect to major in art education, without much background. Again he sees this kind of graduate doing a "very limited job": his prognosis for improvement is not cheery--he believes a short-term skill development in-service course, can never be the equivalent of a long term undergraduate

commitment to studying the visual arts.

In the conversation a devil's advocate approach was taken: Tim was asked if having to submit portfolios for entry to a visual arts programme, might exclude persons who could be very competent art teachers, but who do not have evident ability in studio art. Tim replied that many more excellent teachers would be gained--rather than lost, with this approach to selecting candidates.

Tim believes that a person who professes and practices in art, and by implication who loves that area, will be a more expert, able and motivated teacher of art.

> F:...I wanted you to talk a little bit about teacher training for art teachers here in B.C., and talk about what you think should be part of the course work, based on your experience.
> T: Yes. I think it should be a very wide based preparation--I would like to see much more studio mandated courses...
> F: For teachers at the secondary level?
> T: For teachers at the elementary or secondary level.
> F: Okay.
> T: I think that the studio courses should not necessarily be courses of choice. I think they should cover the wide spectrum of art.
> F: Name the things that you think are essential.
> T: Drawing, painting, three dimensional craftwork, and in that I cover things like what is often referred to as applied design, commercial art, weaving, fabric art, sculpture shoudl definitely be there, and not just as a little component of applied design but as a field fo human endeavour. I would also put architecture, which I have not seen in the North American system... (including) some draughting and some history.
>
> T: ...I'd also like to see some study of--how should I put this: Art in the market, or art in the environment...In town planning...in everyday products and packaging ranging from furniture to fashion.
> F: So you mean increasing awareness of good design?
> R: Increasing awareness of good design.
>
> T:...I've come across art teachers who are perhaps rather good in fabric arts...but who have no experience of abstract drawing, representational drawing, non-representational drawing, who are limited in their

understanding of art history. They may have a great deal of history in their particular field, let's say fabric design, but there's no understanding of the history of architecture or the history of painting or ornamant.
F: So you're saying there's a deficiency in terms of a broad understanding of all areas of art, of visual art, of art history--of all these things?
T: Yes.
F:...Would there be anything else?
T: I'd like to be more specific here. Instead of a broad-based B.Ed. degree to become a secondary teacher of art, I would like it mandatory at least a Bachelor of Fine Art, from an accredited institution. And I don't think that the university fine art departments are doing this adequately at the moment. I think perhaps that some of the central institutions---for example locally would be the Emily Carr College of Art, should be upgraded to a technological or aesthetic university, and that the diploma from these places should be upgraded to a degree standing. And that means making much greater demands on the students who are going there. At the moment it's relatively easy to get into these institutions. I think they should be much more selective in the students they get in, and then much more rigorous in their demands...
F: In order to enter students should submit a portfolio of work?
T: Certainly.
F: There's not enough of a selection process going on?
T: There's not nearly enough. And if a more rigorous selection of candidates is made, then the demands for graduation can be upgraded as well...then a professional year in teacher training.

T:...I'm also looking at how easy it is to do a general B.Ed., and take art as a secondary subject, without the background, that teacher is then coming into the school and will frequently be the only person inthe system (school) who has any knowledge or training or background in art. And because of their very limited background, they're going to do a very limited job, no matter how hard they work. And they can go to these in-service courses all over the place, and they might pick up a little bit of skill here, a little bit of skill there, but two weeks is not the equivalent of a commitment, an undergraduate commitment to four or five years.

F: Now just to be the devil's advocate for a minute here, the thing is that many people would say, okay if you had to submit a portfolio of work to get into

university, that means that certain people who don't have the ability, but who might be very good art teachers, wouldn't get in. Do you think that that would be a problem? That you need to have the ability to draw to be a good art teacher?
T: Yes, yes. I think that person may be a good teacher, (with no artistic ability) but I think that we would gain many more first class teachers who do have ability.

T: ...I think the chances of getting a really good teacher in an area, is to take someone who professes in that area, who practices in that area. I think the chances are you'll produce better teachers of that subject, if that person has expertise, and, I think, love and passion in that area.

As far as improving his own teaching practice, Tim believes that in-service is boring and prescriptive: he feels he experiences in-servicing whenever he comes into contact with art outside the classroom--whether physically, mentally, or socially. He believes his continuing involvement as an artist is very valuable in renewing and enlightening his teaching practice.

F:...what are personal needs regarding improving your practice, perhaps in the form of in-servicing and so on, if you have any personal needs. Do you feel there's anything that you would like to have to make your practice better?
T: I think with the restrictions in the system just now there's none which are really possible. I think in-service would be one of the most deadly boring things to do. I argue that I do in-service work every time I observe, every time I look at a painting, every time I do a scribble, or a drawing, or every time I work on a piece of sculpture or work on a painting--or go to an exhibition or look at friend's painting, or talk to friends about their art. That to me is my in-service. I don't want any formal in-service on prescriptive ways of studio management.

Like Tim, Patrick believes that the visual arts route is preferable to art teacher training through art education:

F:...What do you think is important for people who are

> going to become teachers of art, to do as courses of study at university?
> P: Oh well...as I intimated before, I would prefer the visual arts/BFA route and a professional year after that.

Patrick believes that taking (art history) slides and strengthening the school's collection of art books would sufficiently improve his teaching practice. It is clear, however, that Patrick is hoping to concentrate on enhancing his practice in the content-based areas, particularly art history, which he did not study formally at the art college which he attended:

> F: ...If you wanted to improve your practice...would it be in the form of inservicing, or a course of study...
> P: It would be taking more slides and getting more books for the school.

Like Tim and Patrick, Catherine believes that a degree in visual arts is preferable to a degree in education specialising in art education. She believes the art education route affords the student inadequate skills in the studio area. Students graduating in this area lack confidence, in Catherine's opinion. Catherine believes that in teaching, the teacher's competence is greatly improved when he or she has personally experienced the processes which are being taught in the lesson--hence the belief that student art teachers should experience a broad-based foundational training in different media, in order to practice as art teachers competently and confidently.

Catherine believes that enthusiasm and love of art is essential in teaching it: being a practising artist would be a bonus.

Catherine finds that her own education in art education was inadequate. In the field of art history she has had to educate herself by reading, and she still feels that her education is incomplete.

F: Now in terms of being a teacher of art, what do you think an ideal teacher of art would be like? What would the qualities be?
C: A high level of enthusiasm for the subject. A love, a personal love of art. I would look for somebody who was very creative, very inventive...
F: A practising artist themselves?
C: That would be a great plus...

C: I--from my own experiences, I think they should go through fine arts. They should get a bachelor of arts first, and then I think they should take their teacher training.
F: Now do you see the art ed. route as being inadequate?
C: Well I think when it's just art ed., I think their skills are inadequate.
F: The skills?
C: The studio skills are inadequate. And I think as a result they (the students) lack confidence; I've had two student teachers this year, and I'm quite sure that given some time they will be very good, but both really lacked confidence--and it was basically to do with the fact that they didn't have the skills.

C: In terms of teaching you know, you can teach a lesson abaout something that you havn't experienced; you can teach a lesson about something that you have experienced intimately, and you can certainly tell which is which--whereas that personal experience--what it does is it enriches your lesson, and it allows you to sort of deviate a little bit, to show little bits of information that are not in the book--you know? And you're speaking from personal experience. And the students are very convinced by that--they find--they can always detect when you are speaking from personal experience, or whether it's something you read the night before. That always comes across.

F: Now for people who havn't had that experience with art history--at the tertiary level, what do you think the implications are for those teachers. Do you think they have to do a lot of extra reading and stuff?
C: Absolutely, absolutely--speaking from personal experience. I did not have that, and it's something that I have tried to compensate for by really trying to sort of educate myself by reading and so on. And I really do not consider my education to be over, by any manner or means.

When asked about upgrading formally Catherine did not talk about art history, but she believes that she would like to investigate painting for her own purposes.

> C: I would like to explore the area of painting. I feel fairly good about the drawing although I do intend to take some courses at the art school in Victoria.

Andrew, like Tim, Patrick and Catherine, believes the visual arts route is preferable to a bachelors degree in education in art eduation. Like Tim, Andrew believes that an art college like Emily Carr in Vancouver would be ideal in offering the foundational visual arts background which he considers essential for teachers of art to have, covering all basic areas: drawing, painting, printmaking, ceramics, sculpture and so on. Andrew believes a foundational background like his own would be most appropriate. He considers the B.Ed. in art education inadequate. Like Tim, Andrew believes a long term commitment to art in the form of the visual arts degree has no comparison in quality with the elective nature of courses in art education.

> A: I prefer the visual arts route. I don't know whether it's because I'm from there, but ah...
> F: What sort of courses do you think should be taken?
> A: What are we saying here, in the B.Ed route in art?
> F: No not necessarily, in your ideal course that students could take and then become teachers of art. What foundational courses?
> A: I don't know really. Pretty close to what I did, I think. Emily Carr is close to that too. They have a foundation year, and you can begin to go in a particular direction, and gradually as you go down the four years you begin to specialise.
> F: So it would be doing drawing, painting, printmaking, ceramics, sculpture--all that, in first year?
> A: Yup. At an art foundational level I think. I would say that that would work there (at Emily Carr)... But if you're commited and you go into an art school, and you know it's a four year course, and presumably you're serious about it, so I think you should. You know it was great that I did some mosaic work.

> A: It's only at U.Vic in Phys.Ed and Music and Art that they can do a B. Ed. in the subject, all the other subjects you go to the faculty of English or whatever, and then do a one year teacher training course...Although they're still getting a B.Ed., they're at least doing the courses, they're not learning how to teach them, whereas art and music and phys.ed., they're doing art and music and phys. education courses, and I find them a little Mickey Mouse--well very Mickey Mouse actually.

Andrew believes that there are no particular courses which he would like to take to improve his practice, but rather contact and the exchange of ideas with other art teachers would be the most beneficial: for this reason he likes to visit teachers at other schools.

> F: ...if you had to have anything tailor-made for you to boost your teaching, to help your practice, any kind of in-service course like in ceramics, could you think of anything? I hate to call it in-servicing because it sounds like artificial insemination with cow, but you know what I mean?
> A: No I think the things I've got most from have been accidental, they really weren't planned. I find one of the most valuable things for a teacher to do, or for me to do, is to go to other schools and see what they're doing, and talk to other art teachers.

Harvey isolates problems which he considers are prevalent among student art teachers: these problems are rooted in pedagogery--in teaching practice, rather than in competence in the subject area. Harvey says that student teachers know very little about general art classroom management and classroom control: it seems that many of the problems that Harvey isolates are to do with inexperience in teaching--they are problems which should be addressed by general teacher training, and improved by teaching practice.

Harvey believes that there is not enough contact between the university and what is taking place in art teacher education, and the art classroom. What Harvey seems to be implying is twofold: that there is a tenouous

relationship between theory and practice, and that art education professors are unaware of the problems of the art classroom, because they do not frequent high school art classrooms. The content area which he believes is inadequately addressed in art teacher training is technology, which is an area in which Harvey is particularly interested and to which he makes frequent references.

Harvey believes that all art teachers should be practising artists. He believes this enriches the teacher, and allows him or her to empathise with students. Harvey believes that art teachers who are not artists would be better suited to teaching content-based curricula, such as in DBAE.

> H: ...Seeing some of the practicum teachers, there's something wrong somewhere. I am seeing weaker teachers now than ever before.
> F: Really?
> H: Oh!
> F: What are the inadequacies? Maybe you could point to them?
> H: Sure, exactly! They know nothing about art supplies...no experience in setting up an art room...trouble with assertion...classroom control...they don't know anything about the new technology...I think they (art teachers) should all be practising artists, as should every art teacher. When was the last time that any of the art teachers from the school district were even invited up to the university to see what's going on? When was the last time--except when they come out to supervise their practicum students, that an art education prof entered an art room, talked to the teacher? There's no connection, or a very slim connncection, at best. And it's only a connection because of the bureaucratic necessity.
>
> F: I was going to ask you about art teachers being practising artists...
> H: They all should be!
> F: How does it relate to your practice, how does it relate to it and make it better?
> H: It helps you understand. I think being involved in the experience of making art as well as having a product at the end is great--a wonderful experience for

anyone, whether it's a kid or an adult.
F: Having said that, what do you think the limitations might be for teachers of art who do not practice art, who are more theoreticians?
H: I don't think there's a place for them necessarily, unless they could work in a programme like the one you just described to me.

Harvey believes that he would improve his teaching practice by doing extra work in the fields in which he has already specialised, and is practising: sculpture, film and computer technology. He would not be entirely opposed to in-servicing, if there is something he could learn from it.

F: If you were to improve your practice as an art teacher, if you could think of something, whether it was a retreat in the mountains, painting, an in-service course or just time off to read?
H: A combination of things; It would be nice to take a year off to study in some of the areas that I like personally, or want to know more about.
F: What would those areas be?
H: Work in sculpture, some work in video and some work in computer. Those three major areas. I'd also like some time to do my own work, travel.
F: So the idea of in-servicing wouldn't appeal to you?
H: In a way sure, if there are people out there that have some things to say, why not?

To conclude the last section: in examining to what extent the subjects include art history, art criticism and aesthetics in their programmes, in all cases these content-based areas are dealt with as part of studio work. Tim likes to use Feldman's models for art criticism: he believes that critical awareness ultimately improves the aesthetic quality of studio work, so that through examining art historical examples, and the students' own work, he addressses all three content areas in studio activities. Patrick is very opposed to writing essays and book learning in art, therefore he is not at all supportive of formal separate academic areas in art learning: Patrick's own education at the "reactionary" art college, where art learning was very

informal, may influence his beliefs. Patrick believes that learning only becomes true knowledge when it is experienced. He believes that art history would merely involve the assimilation of data which would be meaningless in comparison to the experience of active involvement in studio work. Tim shares this belief in that he talks about learning by doing. Andrew believes that it is pointless to criticise artworks which are not part of studio production. He says he does not know what the term aesthetic means. Harvey, like Andrew, believes that separating the components is difficult, and is a completely different way to teach art, which would not necessarily be defined as art as such, because art would not be produced. Content-based art education would be another subject area, separate from studio art.

In general, the subjects do not frequently use the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guides: Tim believes that they must be seen as guides, and not be used prescriptively. Tim believes that the thematic focus of the Theme Guide is dangerous in that it is used too prescriptively. Patrick finds the Guides "art teacherish" and "cutesy". Catherine finds the Theme Guide unchallenging for secondary level teachers of art. Andrew thinks the idea of having an art curriculum guide is unnecessary, as art teachers who have spent years at art college should have ideas of their own. Harvey uses the guides from time to time, saying he believes they need to be updated technologically, and with new information on British Columbian artists.

None of the subjects supports DBAE as a curriculum model. Tim believes that as art is holistic, separating the whole into parts, lessens the whole. Tim says he would be able to teach the DBAE curriculum, but would be part of a group that would fight its implementation. Patrick says he would not be able to teach a DBAE curriculum: he would need someone else to teach the other areas, but if DBAE were to

be implemented, he'd quit teaching art. Catherine would need to upgrade in all three content-based areas in order to teach a DBAE curriculum: she believes that the weighting of the components is not correct, and that studiowork should be alloted 60% of the weighting, while art history, (which she believes is the most important of the content areas) and art criticism and aesthetics should be alloted 40%. Catherine would not be receptive to the implementation of DBAE. Andrew would quit teaching if DBAE were implemented. Harvey initially thought that DBAE would allow him to continue teaching an entirely studio-based curriculum in art: he believes that a programme like this would need considerable administrative support, and that it would die within a year because of the difficulties in implementation, and the lack of support for this kind of programme by students.

None of the subjects want formal educational upgrading or in-servicing: Tim finds the idea of in-servicing boring. He argues that every time he looks at or is involved in artwork, he is doing in-service work. Patrick feels he needs to upgrade his art history resources--again his informal education in this area may be to blame. Catherine would like to take some extra painting courses; she pointed out that she believes her education is incomplete, so she is constantly reading in the areas in which she did not have formal education--art history and so on. Andrew finds talking to other teachers a very useful way of sharing and fostering ideas: this would be his focus for improving his teaching practice. Harvey would like to explore his speciality areas further: technology and sculpture.

Finally, the subjects wholeheartedly support a visual arts programme for the training of art teachers, to be followed by a professional year of education. This would include foundational studio courses in all the major studio areas, and art history. Tim and Andrew both believe, (and it seems that this is shared by the other subjects,) that short

term courses in art education are not the equivalent of a long term (for example four year) commitment to art in the form of a visual arts degree.

Both Catherine and Harvey regret having gone through art education. Tim believes that institutions need to be very selective about whom they accept in visual arts programmes, so that students should submit portfolios of work as candidates: this would ultimately ensure better quality art teachers. Catherine believes that teachers of art should experience the procedures which they are teaching, preferably in their training, as she has found that personal experience of what she is teaching improves her practice.

Harvey believes that all art teachers should be artists: this belief is shared by all the other subjects, all of whom are practising artists. As Tim says, a person who "professes" in that area, will be able to teach it better.

Summary statements from this section can be seen in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 3

SUMMARY STATEMENTS ABOUT THE BRITISH COLUMBIA SECONDARY ART CURRICULUM GUIDES

Subject	Statement
Tim	I think the most important aspect of the whole guide is the paragraph that says this is a guide, not a prescription...It's a good reference...I think it's biggest problem is being a thematic guide--it's often used prescriptively, and that's bad I think.
Patrick	...I found the Art Curriculum Guide totally useless...I pull it out periodically, and I look at it...the thematic approach seems to me art teacherish, kind of cutesy.
Catherine	I quite like it. I don't use it very frequently, mainly because I usually have quite a few ideas of my own...The book on themes...tends to sort of go towards the elementary.
Andrew	I don't know what I would feel if I hadn't got much training and I opened the thing up. I don't know how much help it would be...I don't agree with curriculum guides anyway...
Harvey	I use them, I think they're okay. I think they need some updating right now, expecially with all the new technology...I think (the Guides are) looked at by newer more inexperienced teachers.

TABLE 4

SUMMARY STATEMENTS ABOUT DBAE

Subject	Statement
Tim	Oh I would be able to teach it, but I think it would be the most destructive move for the whole art education system, in that what we've been doing is moving away from the language of art, into the language of pedagogery. I think we should continue teaching these four aspects, but base them in studio practice.
Patrick	For the kids who feel that they can't make art, I think it's so crucial to prove to them that they can! That they don't have to go a whole intellectual route about reading and writing about it. Ugh! I'm really against that, really against it.
Catherine	I think it's wrong. I think I would put studio probably no less than sixty percent of the course, because you lose them: I've done it, I've tried it out and if you spend too much time on the criticism, on the evaluation, you lose students.
Andrew	Oh well it would kill art--absolutely! I know it would. And it's nothing to do with (art)--it's another course.
Harvey	I can't see a programme like this operating. I think your art programme would die within a year...Most kids want to just make art, and not discuss it or write about it.

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

This study was guided by two general questions:

1. What do high school art teachers believe is important in teaching art?
2. What is the relationship between these beliefs, curriculum theory in art education, and implementing change?

Three dominant themes emerged in thinking about, reading and re-reading the transcripts:

(a) The background to currently held beliefs about teaching art.

(b) Personal beliefs about teaching art: beliefs held individually and commonly, and the way these are implemented in teaching practice.

(c) The subjects' beliefs in relation to the British Columbia Secondary Art Curriculum Guides and DBAE--implications for change and teacher education.

Regarding the first theme, it is clear that art has been an important part of the lives of each subject since early childhood. This congruence in the findings indicates that a commitment to art may begin in early childhood for many people who devote their adult lives to working in some area of the field. As children, all the subjects displayed special interest and ability in art, which was encouraged. It is clear that the subjects' involvement with art originated with early pleasurable experiences which focused on studiowork activities. The studiowork focus continued through school and tertiary level education. In all cases, a personal commitment was made to art at a particular point. It was usually later that the subjects consciously decided to teach art.

Regarding the second theme, it is clear that all the

subjects' education, whether in art education or the visual arts, was studio centred. It is therefore not surprising that all the subjects believe, in common with one another, that art should be studio centred; that the art teacher should preferably be a practising artist, and finally that art is not an "easy" subject, but requires disciplined effort through which the subjects seek to foster love and confidence in their students' art making abilities. Read (1966), says of instilling confidence, that this is a priceless gift, which most good art teachers seek to inspire in their students. Wilson (1987) says that most art teachers think of themselves as artists, and that this is directly correlated with the studio emphasis in their training. The "creative expression" idea still dominates thinking in art teaching, says Wilson (p.7). The findings of this study concur with Wilson's views.

All the subjects' personal involvement and experiences in art are centred in studiowork: all currently believe in teaching a studio centred programme. This concurs with Dewey's (1934) view that human beings learn beliefs through experience, because all the subjects' personal experiences in art have revolved around studiowork. The subjects believe in and implement the idea that art should be studio centred, and that critical, aesthetic and historical awareness should be centred in and generated by studio practice.

The third theme relates to the subjects' beliefs in relation to two curricula: the British Columbia Secondary Art Curriculum Guides and DBAE. None of the subjects uses the British Columbia Secondary Art Curriculum Guides frequently--they rely on their own ideas regarding studiowork activities, feeling that these are more exciting and challenging.

None of the subjects supports DBAE. The main objection to DBAE is that it would no longer be what the subjects

consider an art curriculum, which they believe should be studiowork centred. The subjects believe that art taught according to a DBAE curriculum should not be called "art", but that it should be given another name. This is because they believe DBAE is largely an academic area of study, and should be named as such, for example art history, or western civilization. The term discipline-based is not enough to distinguish this curriculum from a studio-centred curriculum, as it could refer simply to a highly structured foundational emphasis in studio art, not involving other components. In view of being asked to teach art history within a broadened curriculum, such as is proposed in DBAE, Wilson (1987) says of art teachers, "their education has not prepared most art teachers to teach this broadened curriculum" (p.7). Again, this study concurs with Wilson's statement.

In examining the subjects' beliefs in relation to the two curricula, it is clear that the subjects of this study are not receptive to implementing curricula in which they do not believe. This suggests that curriculum developers in art education should consult teachers and study their beliefs and opinions, before the development and implementation of a new curriculum. At present, art teachers have a kind of informal freedom in what they teach. Consequently, there is no way to ensure the implementation of a new curriculum in art, if implementation is not mandatory--unless the teachers responsible for implementation collaborate on what they should like to initiate collectively. It is suggested that collaboration would ensure greater success in implementing change.

Recommendations

The researcher highly recommends the phenomenological approach, as educative for both subject(s) and researcher, in affording both persons to come to a mutually understood and therefore truly hermeneutic truth.

In order to conduct a study of this nature it is suggested that researchers bear the following points in mind: first, the researcher should choose a phenomenon to be studied which is intriguing, and preferably something which has been experienced personally. For example, it was essential in this study, that the researcher knew and understood intimately the issues discussed in the conversations. This is because the conversations were highly specialised in focusing on specific issues in art education. It is also essential, in the conversations, that the researcher is never judgmental of the subjects' opinions, but accepts them unconditionally.

Other studies which could evolve from this one are:

1. Further phenomenological study of the beliefs of art teachers.
2. A phenomenological study of the beliefs of art education academics who support DBAE, particularly if this were conducted as a comparative study with art education academics who do not support DBAE.
3. A phenomenological study focusing on the strengths and weaknesses of art teacher training in relation to what practising art teachers believe should be taught. This is because teachers in practice have the benefit of hindsight in terms of what they found most useful in their own art teacher training, in relation to teaching practice. Subjects to be interviewed could be drawn from the art teaching profession at the elementary, secondary or tertiary levels.

This study began with a committed interest in a particular phenomenon: the gap between theory and practice in art education. It could be said that this was the first stage in van Manen's (1984) suggested method for practising

phenomenology, "turning to a phenomenon which seriously interests us and commits us to the world" (p.27).

Reading the literature on phenomenology inititated further commitment, that is, to pursue a study of this nature. While reading the literature to do with phenomenology clarified and deepened the researcher's understanding of phenomenology intellectually, it was in the experiences of having the conversations with the subjects that the researcher more deeply understood phenomenology: this was through continually seeking for a more conscious awareness and sensitivity, and for greater interactive subjectivity of being. In this sense, the researcher believes that phenomenology is not so much a methodology as a way of being.

REFERENCES

Aoki, T. (1980). Curriculum Implementation as Instrumental Action and as Interpretive Praxis. University of Alberta.

Asch, R. (1976). Teaching Beliefs and Evaluation. Art Education, 29 (6), 18-22.

Barkan, M. (1962). Transition in Art Education: Changing Conceptions of Curriculum Content and Teaching. Art Education, 15 (7). 12-18,27.

Barrow, R. (1984). Giving Teaching Back to Teachers. London, Ontario: The Althouse Press.

Blackman, C.R., Fleming, E., Kerr, M., and Simmons, J. (1977). Louisana Public School Art Teachers: Profile, Preparation, and Opinions. Research Report, 12 (7). 1-11.

Broudy, H. (1966). The Structure of Knowledge in the Arts. In R. Smith (Ed.). Aesthetics and Criticism in Art Education (pp 23-45). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Bruner, J. (1986). Actual Minds, Possible Worlds. Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press.

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986). Becoming Critical. Lewes, East Sussex: Falmer Press.

Carson, T. (1986). Closing the Gap Between Research and Practice: Conversation as a Mode of Doing Research. Phenomenology and Pedagogy, 4 (2), 73-85.

Chamberlain, G. (1974). Phenomenological Methodology and Understanding. In D. Denton (Ed.). Existentialism and Phenomenology in Education. (pp. 119-138). New York: Teachers College Press.

Chapman, L. (1982). Instant Art Instant Culture: The Unspoken Policy for American Schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Day, M.D. (1987). Discipline-Based Art Education in Secondary Classrooms. Studies in Art Education, 28 (4). 234-242.

Dewey, J. (1929). The Quest for Certainty: A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action. New York: Minton Balch.

Dewey, J. (1934). Art as Experience. New York: Minton Balch.

diBlasio, M.K. (1978). The Need for Critical Examination of Belief Claims in Art Education. Art Education, 19 (2). 6-9.

diBlasio, M.K. (1985). Continuing the Translation: Further Delineation of the DBAE Format. Studies in Art Education, 26 (4). 197-205.

Ecker, D. (1966). The Artistic Process as Quantitative Problem Solving. In E.Eisner, and D. Ecker (Eds.). Readings in Art Education (pp. 57-68). Waltham, Massachussetts: Blaisdell.

Efland, A.D. (1988). Studies in Art Education: Fourth Invited Lecture. How Art Became a Discipline: Looking at Our Recent History. Studies in Art Education, 29 (3). 262-274.

Eisenhart, M., Shrum, J., Harding, J., Cuthbert, M. (1988). Teachers' Beliefs. Educational Policy, 2 (1). 51-70.

Eisner, E., and Ecker, D. (1966). (Eds). What is Art Education? Readings in Art Education (pp.1-27). Waltham, Massachussetts: Blaisdell.

Fry, R. (1933). Art History as an Academic Study. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Fullan, M. (1982). The Meaning of Educational Change. Toronto: OISE Press.

Gadamer, H. G. (1975). Truth and Method. New York: Seabury Press.

Gadamer, H.G. (1976). Philosophical Hermeneutics. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Goetz, J and LeCompte, M. (1984). Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research. London: Academic Press.

Gray, J., and MacGregor, R. (1987). Proacta; Personally Relevant Observations about Art Concepts and Teaching Activities. Canadian Review of Art Education: Research and Issues. 14. (2). 23-33.

Greer, D. (1984). Discipline-Based Art Education; Approaching Art as a Subject of Study. Studies in Art Education, 25 (4). 212-218.

Greer, D., and Rush, J. (1985). A Grand Experiment: The Getty Institutes for Educators on the Visual Arts. Art Education, 38 (1). 24-35.

Hauser, A. (1966). The Scope and Limitations of a Sociology of Art. In R. Smith (Ed.). Aesthetics and Criticism in Art Education (pp. 273-283). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Hausman, J. (1988). Back to the Future: Reflections on Present-day Emphases in Curriculum and Evaluation. Art Education, 41 (2). 36-41.

Hubbard, G. (1967). Art in the High School. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lahr, S. (1984). Who Teaches Art: A Report of Recent Surveys. Studies in Art Education, 25 (2). 115-120.

Langer, S. (1970). Expressiveness. In G. Pappas (Ed.). Concepts in Art and Education (pp. 168-174). Toronto: Collier MacMillan.

Lattin Duke, L. (1988). The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and Discipline-Based Art Education. Art Education, 41 (2). 7-12.

MacGregor, R. (1985). An Outside View of Discipline-Based Art Education. Studies in Art Education, 26 (4). 241-246.

McFee, J. K. (1966). Implications for Change in Art Education. In E. Eisner and D. Ecker (Eds.). Readings in Art Education (pp. 181-194). Waltham, Massachussetts: Blaisdell.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). Phenomenology of Perception. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research Interviewing. Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press.

Morris, J., and Stuckhardt, M. (1977). Art Attitude: Conceptualization and Implication. Studies in Art Education, 19 (1). 21-26.

Muth, H. (1988). A Commentary on DBAE. Art Education, 41 (2). 19-22.

Pearse, H. (1987). Art Education in Canada: A View from the Edge. Canadian Review of Art Education Issues and Research, 15 (1). 57-62.

Read, H. (1966). The Aesthetic Method of Education. In E. Eisner and D. Ecker (Eds.). Readings in Art Education (pp. 259-269). Waltham, Massachussetts: Blaisdell.

Ricouer, P. (1973a). From Existentialism to the Philosophy of Language. Philosophy Today, 17 (2/4). 88-96.

Ricouer, P. (1973b). The Task of Hermeneutics. Philosophy Today, 17 (2/4). 112-128.

Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rune, D.D. (1982). (Ed). Dictionary of Philosophy. New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld.

Silverman, R. (1988). The Egalitarianism of Discipline-Based Art Education. Art Education, 41 (2). 13-18.

Smith, R. (1986). Excellence in Art Education: Ideas and Initiatives. Reston Virginia: National Art Education Association.

Triandis, H. (1971). Attitude and Attitude Change. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons.

van Manen, M. (1984). Practising Phenomenological Writing. Phenomenology and Pedadogy. 2 (1). 26-57.

Webb, N. (1987). Editorial: The Big Picture: One Man's View and A Reply. Canadian Review of Art Education: Issues and Research, 14. (2). 1-13.

Weitz, M. (1966). The Role of Theory in Aesthetics. In R. Smith (Ed.). Aesthetics and Criticism in Art Education (pp 84-94). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Wilson, B. (1987). Art Education in the United States. Canadian Review of Art Education: Issues and Research, 15 (1). 3-10.

Zais, R. (1976). Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row.

APPENDIX

"TIM"

F: How did you first become involved with art as a young child at school--was it at school, or was it in other ways?

T: Before school.

F: And how did that happen?

T: Through play, and I developed some facility--and at school that facility was encouraged.

F: You had a talent...

T: I discovered early that it was possible to represent what one wanted to represent--some people call it talent, I think it's lucky. Just a lucky discovery.

F: What were some of your most memorable experiences with art?

T: As a child?

F: Yes, as a child, and growing up at school.

T: I think being able to put ideas into pictures, and being praised for being good at something.

F: Was it one thing that you were really good at, or were there other things?

T: I was a reasonably bright student at school, but I stood out in art from the herd--and that gives one tremendous encouragement.

F: Can you remember when you first felt a real interest or a real committment to art, that this was something you really wanted to follow through on--even if it was very early?

T: I think it was very early--I think it was before secondary school, which would be by the age of ten.

F: Did you know at that stage that you wanted to do this for your life?

T: Yes--ah, three of four things, I wanted to be a sailor, I wanted to be an engine-driver, I wanted to be a farmer, I wanted to be an artist. I havn't driven engines, but I've done the other three! (Laughter).

F: And what were the circumstances that made you decide to become an art teacher?

T: Financial.

F: Otherwise would you have become a sailor?

T: No I would have become an artist...

F: So teaching art was the financial alternative?

T: The financial alternative after art school.

F: Otherwise you would have been a practising artist.

T: Exactly.

F: When you went to art school did you know that you were going to teach art, or did you go there purely to explore

your studio-work?

T: Purely to explore studio-work. It loomed at the end as one way to make a living.

F: So you decided towards the end of your studies that this was what you were going to do?

T: Yes.

F: Now where did you receive your training, what sort of an institiution was it, and what was your training like? What were the memorable experiences about that?

T: I had some training in London, part-time study, and enjoyed that--at St. Martins' College of Art. I went to one of the central institutions of Scotland where I had a vast varied comprehensive almost Renaissance academic type of training...

F: Where you had to do very structured drawing...

T: Very structured drawing, painting...

F: Academy style?

T: Very much academic. It also entailed a lot of history...

F: Art history?

T: Art history, history of architecture, history of ornaments. I probably did as much structural anatomy as a G.P. does. It was pretty rigorous.

F: Sound very much like traditional academic training of the

nineteenth century.

T: But more liberal in that opportunities were always available to explore your own ideas and expressions.

F: Do you think that that kind of very structured training is a good foundation--has it been a good foundation for you in terms of draughting--just basic drawing ability?

T: I think in terms of knowledge, background, understanding, critical awareness, aesthetics, history, and practice--it was an excellent training.

F: Now in terms of understanding--I'm trying to get into the specifics of how the understanding was reinforced: would it be in things like form and tone, and shape and those kinds of things--so that--in other words it would increase your observational skills enormously.

T: It increased these, but it also increased critical skills enormously.

F: Being able to see objectively whether something is "correct" or not?

T: Yes, I think I know what you're getting at. It also--from the point of view of one's own art, one became very self-critical perhaps, over critical, in that kind of environment, but also became very aware of what made art tick, through the years, through the centuries--and where the real strenghts in art lie.

F: Where would you say the strengths lie?

T: I think that's something we change our emphasis on as we

gain more experience. But I would say a very honest committment by the artist--an intuitive and a rational understanding...

F: Intuitive and rational...

T: Either or--separately or together. I think that that makes it extremely important to understand the formal qualities, the abstract qualties, of all art and architecture--when I say art I should keep it very broad.

F: Yes because you could talk about applied design in the same way.

T: Ya--you could talk about applied design, you could talk about some of the great craftsmanship of stained glass or silver, or jewellery...

F: What do you think increases your aesthetic awareness in the kind of training you got--because you mentioned aesthetic (earlier)?

T: I think in searching for understanding and honesty in one's own art, one is forced to look at what's gone on in the past, and what is happening currently. And it made me critical--I think one begins to understand critically what it is that makes good art.

F: Would you say that it doesn't have so much to do with the idea of beauty as with truth?

T: Truth more than beauty certainly. Isn't beauty truth, and truth beauty?

(laughter).

F: We're talking about Keats now! That's very interesting. Now you were talking about the very traditional training that you got, and I was wondering about the art history and how you enjoyed that?

T: Oh it was an essential part of working in the studio.

F: How was it essential--what was the relationship between studio and art history?

T: Although art history was taught as a separate series of lectures, one would come across problems dealing with drawing, painting, graphic design, sculpture--and automatically go and search out how the greats had dealt with similar problems. It was a complete parallel to the studio practice.

F: I agree. Now I'll come back to that later. Talking about teacher training now, do you think that that is important for future teachers of art?

T: Essential.

F: I don't mean training I mean studying.

T: Studying art history would be essential. And I think it should be a comprehensive art history, rather than a specialised area.

F: Do you mean a chronological survey of western art history?

T: Ah--I wouldn't restrict it to western...

F: So eastern as well?

T: I'd also look at African, Oceanic...

F: Is there anything else you want to say about your training that you feel has influenced your beliefs about what is important in teaching art?

T: Well after many years of practising as an art teacher I went back and did an M.Ed. at an American university. I was critical about going back to do this, and I felt--let's say it was a financial hoop I had to jump through.

F: You mean because of your job?

T: Yes. I went with a certain amount of cynicism, and was very pleased to examine some of the finer theoretical work that was going on at the American university level.

F: What did you think of it?

T: I thought a lot of it was extremely interesting, especially the curriculum planning that was being done, but I felt that there was a tremendous amount of defensive work that was being done in keeping art in the curriculum of the North American public schools. Which I think was a battle that was won a long time ago, and instead of examing it, I felt there should be much more examination of the quality of the people who were teaching the subject, rather than putting the subject in (the curriculum) and having it taught by inadequately trained people.

F: So you feel that is a problem--inadequate training?

T: Inadequate training.

F: And how do you see the inadequacies--where are they mainly, in your experience?

T: I think there's a lack of professional training in art before going into education. At one time I almost felt that a new science had been developed which had very little ot do with education, and very little to do with art, and it's called art education! How do you like that?

F: Well it's interesting. Do you mean the science is the history of art education and...

T: No--I think a parallel might be...I think if one is teaching science, I think one should be taught science by a scientist. If one is being taught motor mechanics, one should be taught by a motor mechanic. And I think that if one is being taught art, one should be taught by an artist. But there was too much emphasis on education without enough knowledge of the subject that was being taught. At the same time, I think some of the fine defined areas that I came across in the American university system, were excellent areas of definition. I think also--this could become a critique of different methods across the Atlantic--so although I make some derogatory remarks about North American education, I think I should also say there was a lot of strength came out of it. I like the approach to--some of the approaches to studio-work, And I liked the egalitarian approach, where art is available, and should be made available to all, irrespective of academic ability, artistic ability. I like the participatory democracy of the American system, but I felt that it would be a much better system if that democracy was being applied by people who had a better training in art. So I'm looking for an artist who's also an educator. I think my criticism of the system is that

they want educators who have some interest in art. And frequently that's what they get. Without having an understanding of art: that's my major criticism.

F: Okay now what appeals to you about teaching art?

T: At this time of the year, very little! (laughter).

F: Then think of September!

T: Well I'm dealling in an area of passion and an area I love, and I do get the message through to masses of young people who are unaware that this aspect of life exists. And that's good. It's beautiful to find people discovering themselves. I think one of the other appeals is that in our school system which is very much a progressive rational type of system, we have an area where we can deal in a whole way with understanding and intelligence.

F: How do you inspire that intuitive intelligence in your students?

T: Through studio practice.

F: Do you have a fairly structured programme?

T: At this age level extremely structured.

F: But within that structure there's room for exploration?

T:There's room for self exploration and for personal exploration, but I think it's more important that they have a foundation of practice and learn some basic--almost a grammar.

F: Right. What doesn't appeal to about to you about teaching art?

T: The exhaustion of teaching art takes away from the energy that one could put into one's own art. That is the major one. The structure of the school system lends tremendous frustration to the job. The social attitudes among the children--among the population, towards art, can be quite negative.

F: How does the school structure frustrate or limit your teaching experience?

T: Art within a school has to fit into a time table, into programmes: children have to jump from one subject to another. We often have children who are quite undisciplined which is a society problem rather than a school problem--we have time restraints, one hour periods three times a week, so there is a lack of continuity at times and for some children it's too much time. But these are minor technical problems.

F: Now the other question I wanted to ask was about the students you mentioned who bring problems themselves--which are social ones.

T: Now that's one of the biggest nightmares of teaching art.

F: Is that to do with taste?

T: No. They can be a derogatory influence on the studio atmosphere that one tries to create.

F: A collegial spirit?

T: Ya.

F: Because they're badly behaved or disruptive?

T: Ya. I have to give up time and energy dealing with irresponsible badly behaved children, which would be better spent with the mass of the children who are quite willing and excited to learn. So that's a problem for all teachers. This system more so than others.

F: Yes. What important ideas and experiences do you believe should be emphasised in teaching and learning about art, which ideas are important to you and which are not. This question has two parts to it, so let's look at the first part first, which ideas and experiences you believe should be emphasised.

T: Let me go with what I'm teaching here, it may be something quite fresh. I think learning by doing going right back to--what the hell's his name now, the great American educational philospher?

F: Eisner, Dewey...

T: Dewey--no not Dewey--the name will come to me in a moment. We learn by doing, and I think that the way to learn is by doing, and this is one of the few areas in the school where the kids will really learn by doing. So the most important aspect to me, and the most important experience is to give the kids experience of working in a studio, of producing art--and worthwhile art, and through producing worthwhile art, get to recognise what art is about.

F: And what worthwhile art is?

T: Yes.

F: So in being able to recognise what worthwhile art is, and being able to have some kind of value system...

T: That value system is developed. Taking it a little bit further, as a child begins to recognise in their own efforts something worthwhile, then I always have available examples of art that's been done, by other artists, slides--ranging from the cave paintings to the latest twentieth century painters. And the kid who understands that something that's happening in their art that they think is worthwhile, can be shown this other art, and they suddenly see that it's not an isolated phenomena, or a plaything, but very much part of the whole human experience.

F: Within a whole wider context?

T: Ya. And that's how I teach history.

F: So you do teach some art history?

T: Yes, but it's incidental, I sneak it in. I let them see it when they're ready to see it.

F: So you introduce it when it's topical?

T: When it's topical to the experiences that they're having in studio practice.

F: So it's inspired by the studio practice?

T: Yes.

F: Do you put it in the context that it comes from

chronologically?

T: No. These examples can come from anywhere in man's past or present.

F: Well that's interesting.

T: But I would hope that by the time my graduating students--and I've taught mostly up to the grade twelve level, senior high level, the chronology begins to establish itself. As the children get used to looking at references and to referring to works of art, they begin to understand, and of course they're guided a little by--they begin to see that the whole idea of exciting broken colour was something that the Impressionists started, so if I show them Impressionist work...but I might show them work from--Byzantine mosaics, which have the same sparkle, the same quality. So they recognise quality in their own work, and they're shown these qualities in the work of other artists from all different cultures and times,

F: So it's being able to compare and contrast and appreciate cross culturally?

T: Yes. And the appreciation is there, when you deal with the kids that way. When a kid discovers something for himself, vast fields of flat colour, and then I suddenly show them some Goya, wow! They recognise it, they're not going to forget Goya.

F: So it's learnt by experience and by association? And by self discovery in a way?

T: Ya. Guided self discovery. That is important--the guidance, and that's my job.

F: Now are there any ideas that you don't think are important, any experiences that you don't want to...

T: Yes, I think art can be very easily trivialised and weakened. I see a lot of time and energy in non-studio pursuits of art, which seem aimed at giving a veneer of sophistication and understanding, and I think it is just a veneer. I wouldn't teach aesthetics as such, I wouldn't teach criticism as such, I woudln't teach as such, I wouldn't separate them from studio practice.

F: You would not teach them at all?

T: No, I teach them as part of the studio. They grow naturally out of studio practice. But I think that at the high school level, they are particularly out of place...

F: As separate components?

T: As separate components. A diligent student might begin to get--might amass enough knowledge to talk convincingly about art and about criticism. And perhaps a few brighter students will in fact have learned some appreciation and leaned some critical awareness, but I don't think that critical awareness is of any real importance, and will be mastered by any but a very small minority of students, unless it's discovered through studio practice and guided instruction at the appropriate time.

F: Do you think--my next question actually deals with what we've just been discussing, but do you think it is important to deal with art history, aesthetics and art criticism...

T: Well let me answer that again...

F: But again I'm talking about these as separate components, and how you deal with those?

T: I do believe it is important deal with art history, art criticism and aesthetics in my programme, but not as separate components!

F: So again they come under the umbrella of studiowork?

T: Ya.

F: Well in that case, and I'm sorry to be so pedantic here, we've spoken about how you'd incorporate art history, but how would you guide your students in the other areas, in art criticism and in aesthetics?

T: Very simply in discussing--perhaps we're doing some graphic art, some lettering some advertising, I will draw on the community: I will ask them if they've ever seen such bad design as the design of the new building that's gone in, and that terrible bit of lettering that's been put up there. So I develop it there--I hope a critical awareness of what's going on. The examples that I show them will not always necessarily be the ideal examples of good quality, in my educated opinion--I don't want them to have an uneducated opinion, but it's based on their own background...I want them to realise that they just have to look around... and develop that critical awareness.

F: So it's not just to objects of fine art, but to general objects of design...logos...

T: Their whole environment--their whole visual environment.

F; So do you talk about basic principles of design with them?

T: Yes, very much so.

F: So why a design isn't pleasing and so on? So how would you deal with the idea of aesthetics with them? (pause). Even if it's in a subtle roundabout way?

T: How would I deal with it?

F: Ya.

T: One example is in teaching colour, I will draw analogies between music and art, and I have asked them to look at their work and perhaps a piece of architecture and look for notes of colour, notes of tone which are out of tune with the rest of the piece. And frequently that works. One can say "look at this piece of work you're doing, there's something which is so out of tune, and it's not contributing to the whole--do you recognise it?" And the child has stepped back and begun to look objectively and say, oh yes, that colour--that's killing the whole. Or, no, that's the key, the discordancy is the key that's making the piece worthwhile. So that's one way of getting into aesthetics.

F: So the way you're dealing with aesthetics there is in terms of what makes something pleasing, and being alerted to discordant elements in something...

T: Yes, the elements that make something displeasing.

F: And we were talking about the fact (earlier) that aesthetics is more to do with truth than beauty, so in that sense, in saying that a chord of music is out of place, is

it untruthful--do you think that it would detract from the all-round harmony of the piece of music?

T: If harmony was the artist's intention. And I used the word intention just now, I often use that word with the students--what is your intent here. And if their intent is to do something, then they're being dishonest if something else is happening.

F: So the intent is not necessarily harmonious?

T: It might not--some beautiful pieces of music are not harmonious, but they have other qualities--the truth of intent...

F: Is what determines?

T: Is the aesthetics that are being sought, are being strived for by the composer or the artist. And also recognising aesthetic qualities in the most mundane things. I teach a sculpture course, and I start with very simple geometric fundamentals, in the sculpture course, completely non-representational--to introduce them to the language of sculpture. But I will probably start that course by bringing in a bunch of rocks and stones and pebbles from the beach, and just asking them ot go through and find pebbles which they like, and then ask them why they like it, and then start looking at the qualities that make that a worthwhile piece. Usually that's after the first few pieces of sculpture have been produced.

F: So you're really looking at the integrity of a finished piece of art--I'm talking about art rather than something made by nature.

T: Yes. I'm also encouraging them to see that we do make choices--we walk on the beach and we pick up one pebble, we throw away pebbles--but there's always one we hold longer because it has certain qualities. It may be tactile, it may be shape it may be colour or pattern, which draws us towards that piece. And there's a recognition--usually not a conscious recognition, just an acceptance that this piece has--I like this one--it feels right, it looks right, it's interesting, it's exciting. And I want them to recognise that that decision, to hold that piece, even if it isn't brought to the surface of their consciousness, is the same type of decision that they might want to make in looking at their own sculpture, or other sculptures.

F: That recognition of something being right is a very important aspect of aesthetics.

T: I do deal a little bit with formal and expressive approaches to aesthetics in my discussions with the kids, dealing with their own work and dealing their inspiration, which is their total environment. Whether there's a formal quality that makes it (the art work) beautiful, or whether it just seems to be--there's a perfection about it, or whether it is just a stimulating expressive quality. I want the kids to recognise these qualities.

F: Identify them.

T: Yeah.

F: Okay.

T: Which could be deadly boring if one put it down and said today's test is on good qualities, you have ten roughs in front of you, I want you to describe the qualities. This

would be a non-lasting exercise in futility, I think, and yet they might get ten out of ten and you could call it an aesthetics test!

F: Really what you seem to be saying is going beyond a cognitive activity, that it must be something that affects their feelings and their own experiences: that is has meaning for them in terms of experience?

T: Yes. It could be cognitive...

F: As well?

T: As well.

F: You don't want those things to be divorced?

T: They mustn't be!

F: Right. Now what is your opinion of the B.C. Secondary Art Curriculum Guide? Well there're two actually, the Content Guide and then Theme Resources. Which aspects of these do you believe are important, if any? Or...

T: I think the most important aspect of the whole guide is the paragraph--I don't have one in front of me, but there's a paragraph that says this is a guide, not a prescription, and that's the most important of the whole lot. It's a good reference, almost like a series of mental notes one makes to remind onesself of certain things you want to cover. I fear it's biggest--do you want the problems with it as well?

F: Yes I do!

T: I think it's biggest problem is being a thematic guide--

it's often used prescriptively, and that's bad I think, it's a danger. The little paragraph that says this is only a guide, this is not a prescriptive guide, it's not a prescriptive curriculum--I think is missed, and that is it's major problem, otherwise I think it's an excellent resource book, to be picked at and referred to occasionally.

F: What sort of bits do you pick at, or perhaps which bits do you think other teachers may find useful?

T: I like some of the content part, and resource part, where there's a few addresses there which can be useful--where to get posters...Occasionally I'll be rather tired with an approach I've taken--negative space and graphic design or sculpture, and I've thumbed through the guide and suddenly seen a fresh approach. But I might also discover that in a piece of literature or a piece of poetry or in a television programme, where something is implied rather than stated, which will stimulate me to examine another approach to what is basically a visual or creative problem in the studio classroom. I don't refer to it very often.

F: Well you have a lot of rich experience yourself...

T: Yup. But I feel when it's used as a prescriptive guide it is very limited, especially being thematic--thematic is only one approach to art education.

F: What approach do you prefer? In teaching studio work, or anything!

T: I vary tremendously. I will teach the same thing from three different angles, just to make the thing more interesting for me, perhaps with three different classes. I might start with a structural approach, dealing with

components of picture, I might deal with line, shape, tonal structure, colour, rythmn--so I'm dealing with a formal abstract approach. But I might teach the very same lesson, dealing with visual phenomena, being a still life group or a portrait. Then I might teach the very same thing again from a purely expressive point of view, dealing with the emotive content, but in teaching it, I'll really be covering the same areas.

F: When you say visual phenomena how would you handle that?

T: Observation.

F: So it would be a more formal drawing or painting?

T: Formal drawing or painting.

F: You wouldn't be so prescriptively clear about things like tone and colour?

T: No, I would be prescriptive and clear about these.

F: Okay. But if you were doing the visual phenomena approach, as opposed to the more formal approach, where you're talking specifically about rythmn and colour and line and stuff...

T: I would be--let's say we're dealing with visual accuracy, with accuracy of representation...

F: Oh so you're talking about accuracy of observation?

T: So accuracy--representation is what we're looking for. Then I'd be very prescriptive about line, shape, scale, structure, tone. On the other hand if emotive content was

what I was looking for, I'd be asking questions about colour, tonality, contrast, rythm, to see that the children are aware that these are important aspects that they use to express that. And I would use a loosening up process, sort of an excitement process, to get that expressive side going.

F: How would the loosening up process go?

T: Oh it might be jumping around the studio, it might be making loud noises, it might be trying to translate one's own awe, to create one's own excitement, to encourage their own excitement. To be aware of it and try to express it--that excitement.

F: Okay. Now going on, what are personal needs regarding improving your practice, perhaps in the form of in-servicing and so on, if you have any personal needs. Do you feel there's anything that you would like to have to make your practice better?

T: I think with the restrictions in the system just now, there's none which are really possible. I think in-service would be one of the most deadly boring things to do. I argue that I do in-service work every time I observe, every time I look at a painting, every time I do a scribble, or a drawing, or every time I work on a piece of sculpture or work on a painting--or go to an exhibition or look at friend's painting, or talk to friends about their art. That to me is my in-service. I don't want any formal in-service on prescriptive ways of studio management.

F: So you are involved in your own studio-work, and that gives you a certain amount of inspiration, and ideas?

T: Ya.

F: Are there any things about improving your practice--I also mean making certain courses non-elective, periods longer, any housekeeping things that could be changed to improve your practice.

T: Yes. I've managed to get art as a mandatory subject in grade eight in this school.

F: Great!

T:I think that that's enough. I wouldn't want it to be any more than that, I think it should be an elective after that. My feeling is that the children going through this system should have at least one session of being taught art by someone who knows something about it.

F: Okay. So is your experience of teaching positive?

T: Very positive!

F: So they have some kind of understanding when they leave.

T: Ya.

F: Okay. Are you familiar with the idea of D.B.A.E., and that proposes that art be divided info four equally weighted areas, art history, art criticism...

T: Yes I am.

F: What do you think of it?

T: It's a pile of crap!

F: If D.B.A.E. were to be mandated, what do you think your needs might be in terms of updating to teach this kind of curriculum? (pause). Would you be able to teach this kind of curriculum?

T: Oh I would be able to teach it, but I think it would be the most destructive move for the whole art education system, in that what we've been doing is moving away from the language of art, into the language of pedagogery, and we'd be very quickly becoming involved in making art boring as the kids find many of the other subjects in the school. I think we (should) continue teaching these four aspects, but base them in studio practice, and studio experience.

F: So you wouldn't need to go back to school to study art history or anything, because you've done that? You did that in your teacher training.

T: Yes.

F: Now how would you feel about having to teach a more content-based curriculum, and you've said something that here, a little bit earlier--but what would you think about that? If the curriculum branch to do with art education in B.C. were to say okay we're now going to have discipline-based art education mandated?

T: I would probably be part of a group that would fight it very hard. And I would question the experience, qualifications and abilities of the curriculum branch who would wish to implement such a system. I would point out the years of experience of many of the most successful art teachers throughout the world, not just currently, but over the past several hundred years, and suggest to them that they stop being so damm stupid.

F: What are your objections to D.B.A.E.? You have already mentioned some of these, but just being very clear about these?

T: I think my main objection would be that art is a wholistic subject: it doesn't have constraints of time, it's not sequential. It can be rational but it isn't necessarily rational. To cut off one little part of the whole and emphasise that one little part, I think lessens the whole. I think the separate components, added together, the four components, are less than the whole. I think if the whole is there, these components are much greater. I have no objection to these things being taught, I think they should be taught, but I think they should be taught as part of the total. But I don't think that in adolescence children are ready and have enough experience, to begin to have any sort of historical perspective, and part of teaching art history through a studio involvement where history becomes an automatic part of what they are doing, as an example of others striving to do what they're doing, they begin to give them a sense of history, and they begin to develop that historical perspective, rather than making history of art a dry academic area.

F: Now in terms of people teaching art--other art teachers in the community of art teachers, and people in training, I remember we mentioned art history in terms of this earlier, and I wanted to pick that up. You were talking about your training and I wanted you to talk a little bit about teacher training for art teachers here in B.C., and talk about what you think should be part of the course work, based on your experience.

T: Yes. I think it should be a very wide based preparation--

I would like to see much more studio mandated courses...

F: For teachers at the secondary level?

T: For teachers at the elementary or secondary level.

F: Okay.

T: I think that the studio course should not necessarily be courses of choice. I think they should cover the wide spectrum of art.

F: Name the things that you think are essential.

T: Drawing, painting, three dimensional craftwork, and in that I cover things like what is often referred to as applied design, commercial art, weaving, fabric art, sculpture should definitely be there, and not just as a little component of applied design but as a field of human endeavour. I would also put architecture, which I have not seen in the North American system.

F: When you say architecture do you mean the history of architecture or draughting?

T: I would say some draughting and some history.

F: And some designing?

T: Yes.

F: Do you think that that's good in terms of spatial relationships and understanding space.

T: Excellent. Successful architecture is some of the finest

functional sculpture that we know. I'd also like to see some study of--how should I put this? Art in the market, or art in the environment.

F: Art as it exists in...

T: In town planning, in...

F: Oh I see...

T: In products in everyday products and packaging ranging from furniture to fashion.

F: So you mean increasing awareness of good design?

T: Increasing awareness of good design.

F: Why do you think that bad design exists?

T: It's probably cheaper to produce bad design.

F: Because you don't have to pay an expensive designer?

T: It's also because--a lot of good design exists as well, in the marketplace, but a lot of bad design is out there, simply because there has been no question asked about the aesthetic quality. And many of the decisions being made about design are being made by people with no knowledge or background. And I can give you a good example of this: for a long time the interior of ocean liners, the choices about furnishing and fabrics were being made by wife of the ship builder--that type of decision was being made. When you start bringing interior designers in, who have trained in design or architecture, who have knowledge and understanding and practice in aesthetics, then the quality increases

tremendously. Good design in fact produces a better product. I think of North American which employed stylists who followed fashion, and the parallel is going on with European cars, which in many cases may have been less sound in their engineeing, but were certainly much more efficient in their design and their shape and their form--a simple matter of aesthetics again there. I couldn't have this conversation with many of my North American trained colleagues in art education.

F: Why?

T: Because they perhaps have a very narrow understanding of one area of art...

F: What area do they usually have an understanding of?

T: Sometimes its drawing, sometimes it can be a--I've come across art teachers who are perhaps rather good in fabric arts, whose choice of colour and fabric may be excellent, but who have no experience of abstract drawing, representational drawing, non-representational drawing, who are limited in their understanding of art history. They may have a great deal of history in their particular field, let's say fabric design, but there's no understanding of the history of architecture or the history of painting or ornament.

F: So you're saying there's a deficiency in terms of a broad understanding of all areas of art, of visual art, of art history--of all these things?

T: Yes.

F: What I was asking you about earlier, and we went off at a

very interesting tangent, which I'm very glad about, but I was asking you about what you feel--getting back to the whole North American situation of art teacher training, and you were saying that necessary would be a good grounding in all these areas of the visual arts. Would there be anything else?

T: I'd like to be more specific here. Instead of a broad-based B.Ed. degree to become a secondary teacher of art, I would like it mandatory at least a Bachelor in Fine Art, from an accredited institution. And I don't think that the university fine art departments are doing this adequately at the moment. I think perhaps that some of the central institutions--an example locally would be the Emily Carr College of Art, should be upgraded to a technological or aesthetic university, and that the diploma from these places should be upgraded to a degree standing. And that means making much greater demands on the students who are going there. At the moment it's relatively easy to get into these institutions. I think they should be much more selective in the students they get in, and then much more rigorous in their demands...

F: In order to enter the students should submit a portfolio of work?

T: Certainly.

F: There's not enough of a selection process going on?

T: There's not nearly enough. And if a more rigorous selection of candidates is made, then the demands for graduation can be upgraded as well. These demands can be increased so that your graduate student does in fact have a thorough knowledge and background and practice in fine art,

and their degree can be the equivalent of a B.A. in Fine Arts. I think there should be some parallel studies, but I don't think there should be a massive emphasis on secondary subjects within that area, within their studies. Once you start getting this high quality fine art degree, and then a professional year in teacher training.

F: Are you talking about an institution something like the Bauhaus?

T: Not necessarily. I'm talking about something that already exists in West Germany, in France certainly, in England, Scotland.

F: The Glasgow School of Art--that tradition of excellence?

T: Yes.

F: Of education in the visual arts.

T: Of education in the visual art. And then a further year of teacher training which would qualify you.

F: That seems to be what we both did.

T: Ya. In mentioning that I'm also looking at how easy it is to do a general B.Ed., and take art as a secondary subject, without the background, that teacher is then coming into the school and will frequently be the only person in the (school) system who has any knowledge or training or background in art. And because of their very limited background, they're going to do a very limited job, no matter how hard they work. And they can go to these in-service courses all over the place, and they might pick up a little bit of skill here, a little bit of skill there, but

two weeks is not the equivalent of a committment, an undergraduate committment to four or five years.

F: Now that brings up two things I want to ask you, would you say that art history would be important at the level of the B.A. that you're talking about...

T: Oh yes!

F: And any specialised courses in...

T: It would be a mandatory subject.

F: And that was what you said before, the chronological, western/eastern, primitive/oceanic art etcetera. Now what about separate components at this level in aesthetics and art criticism?

T: Yes, at this level.

F: Tertiary level you think, rather than secondary and elementary?

T: Tertiary level it should be mandatory. Because the committment is already there in the studio side.

F: And at this level do you think it enriches the studiowork?

T: I think it complements it, I don't think that anyone working seriously in the studio side can survive without doing the other side. If the course weren't there the people would go and do them privately--they'd do personal research.

F: So the aesthetics would involve philosophy?

T: Certainly.

F: Now just to be the devil's advocate for a minute here, the thing is that many people would say, okay if you had to submit a portfolio of work to get into university, that means that certain people who don't have the ability, but who might be very good art teachers, wouldn't get in. Do you think that that would be a problem? That you need to have the ability to draw to be a good art teacher?

T: Yes, yes. I think that person may be a good teacher, (with no artistic ability) but I think that we would gain many more first class teachers who do have the ability.

F: Do you think that the ability to draw implies a greater understanding of...sorry I don't just mean drawing I mean painting and so on, do you think that that ability to do that well, implies that you have a greater understanding, an intuitive understanding and a cognitive understanding of what it takes to be a teacher of art?

T: That's the very question that I've set myself for a Ph.d. thesis! Exactly that question!

F: Well it's a very good question. And one that I'm fascinated by. Where are you going to do your Ph.d.?

T: I'm not going to do it. I've got the whole thing laid out though. I asked the question, does formal training in representational drawing, does that contribute to successful artistic work for an art student. I'm asking the question--personally I think it does, but I'm coming from a...

F: A bias?

T: From a biased point of view in my own background. But I think that...(pause).

F: Does it make you a better teacher? Training and talent?

T: I think that good teachers of art are fairly rare to find. My immediate question when I'm looking at the qualities of a teacher, I have three sons, would I like that person to teach my child? And I want them taught art by an artist. So I'm looking for someone who has this ability. Similarly I want them taught music by a musician, not by someone who is an aesthetician with an interest in ah--a specialised interest in--and I have a cousin who's area of study is musicology, but he doesn't play any musical instruments, I don't think that person is going to be a good music teacher. They might be. But I think the chances of getting a really good teacher in an area, is to take someone who professes in that area, who practises in that area. I think the chances are you'll produce better teachers of that subject, if that person has expertise, and, I think, love and passion in that area.

F: Love and passion for the subject?

T: Ya.

F: You can't love something, really without being involved with it?

T: That's what I'm saying.

F: So it's involvement, it's committment, it's total involvement in the process.

T: Ya. I don't think you can have an amateur art teacher. You've got to have a committed art teacher.

F: And that implies that the teacher is an artist...

T: I think if they're committed they would have to become an artist. And I think we can weed out those who lack the committment, by demanding formal training and education at the tertiary level in fine art. In practice and theory.

F: That's very interesting. What would the qualities be..if you were going to decide who was to teach your three sons art, what qualities do you believe that art teacher should have. I mean as a human being and as an art teacher?

T: Well there must be an endless list of qualities! I think I'd be looking for the ability to communicate--to communicate their passion, so I'm looking for their passion. A love and understanding of their art, of which they must be willing to share. A joy of seeing their students succeed, irrespective of their studnets abilities. So I'm not talking about the selective few students who are already in love with art, as I was as a child. I was a child who was in love with art, so I must have been one of the easiest people to teach. When I take a bunch of kids who don't know anything about art, they think it's something to do last period on a Friday in elementary school, while the teacher's busy doing something else, that it's a frivolous pursuit. I think the teacher has got to take art deadly seriously, that doesn't mean solemnly, art can be deadly serious but it can also be hilarious. It doesn't have to be solemn. I think a teacher has also got to be patient to some extent, but a reasonable disciplinarian. And they've also got to methodical in their studio management: organised and methodical. And one of the weaknesses I see in the present art education training

system is lack of studio management.

F: Well thank you so much for talking to me, it's been marvellous.

VITA

Surname: Humby Blaikie Given Names: Fiona Mary
Place of Birth: Durban Date of Birth: 13th March 1957

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL, SOUTH AFRICA	1975
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA	1976 to 1978
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, CANADA	1987 to 1988

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions:

B.A.(Art)., 1978 University of Cape Town, South Africa
H.D.E. (secondary)., 1978 University of Cape Town, South Africa

Awards:

University of Victoria (through Government of British Columbia) grant: $3,000

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis, (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a memeber of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without written permission.

Title of Thesis

The beliefs of secondary art teachers in relation to educational background, curricular issues and teaching practices.

Author [redacted]

(Signature)

Fiona Humby Blaikie

(Name)

31st October, 1988

(Date)

ISBN 0-315-50118-9