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ABSTRACT

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF ART APPRECIATION EDUCATION: A CROSS COMPARISON OF THE PICTURE STUDY MOVEMENT WITH THE DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION MOVEMENT
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Directed by: Professor David E. Day

The history of art appreciation education has received increased attention since a 1985 Getty Center for Education in the Arts' report entitled, Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools. The Getty report challenges teachers to reform art education, to shift from viewing art as a tool for self expression to art as a body of knowledge based on the four disciplines of art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and art production. One hundred years ago, classroom teachers promoted the study of reproductions of art in a movement called picture study. This dissertation compares the picture study movement, and its remnants extant in the progressive era, to the discipline-based art education movement of today.

Period textbooks from three sources provide the primary data about early art appreciation education. First, a discrete picture study pedagogy is established through an analysis of three textbooks devoted solely to picture study. Second, an analysis of ten general art education textbooks from the progressive era shows that art appreciation
remained an integral part of an overcrowded art curriculum. Lowenfeld's seminal *Creative and Mental Growth* shows a shift in attitude toward art appreciation in a text that has been regarded as having only negative bearing on the art appreciation movement. Finally, the contemporary discipline-based art education movement is chronicled and cross-compared to its forebears.

The cross comparison is based on the following: philosophical foundations, approaches to curriculum, teacher audience and media, and format options. The researcher argues that the picture study movement of one hundred years ago and the discipline-based art education movement of today share an essentialist philosophy and imply a shared pedagogy, thereby establishing an important historical and conceptual niche for a heretofore neglected movement in art education history.
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CHAPTER 1

RATIONALE AND CONTEXT FOR THIS STUDY

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In 1985, the J. Paul Getty Center for Education in the Arts presented a challenge to educators across the country. Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools (Getty, 1985) urged Americans involved in art education to ask why cultural and historical aspects of art education had been virtually excluded from the curriculum. The Getty Center proposed a new approach to art education in which students not only create their own art, but also learn to appreciate the art of others. Specifically, for the Getty Center, this translates into providing schools with a written, sequential curriculum that is based on the four disciplines of art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and art production. It is the J. Paul Getty Trust's intention to devote a sizeable portion of its $50 million fund to change art education in America.

The effect of the Getty challenge on the art education community has been marked. Three major professional journals, Art Education, Studies in Art Education, and The Journal of Aesthetic Education, have devoted entire issues to discussion and debate about the Getty approach called discipline-based art education (d.b.a.e.). Although there
is as yet no sequential curriculum, nor consensus on the value of discipline-based art education, the movement has only just begun to gain momentum. One indication of official approbation of the approach was the presence of both Francis Hodsoll, then Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, and William J. Bennett, then Secretary of Education, at a recent Getty-sponsored National Invitational Conference. Both presented key speeches in support of Beyond Creating.

The problem facing art teachers and those classroom teachers responsible for teaching art (which has been estimated at about 80% of all public school art classes) is that most of them were trained in an era when teaching skills of creative expression was their sole task. Teaching skills of creative impression, or appreciation, was considered by many to be not only unnecessary but detrimental to students' emotional growth and development.

The history of this point of view has its roots in the theories of Viktor Lowenfeld, whose seminal textbook for teachers, Creative and Mental Growth, was first published in 1947 and remains the single most influential text of this era. Thus, those who may soon be expected to teach not only studio art but also art appreciation (in the form of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics) come from a tradition that not only neglected the teaching of those disciplines, but also advocated against the teaching of them.
Without a tradition for teaching art appreciation, the teachers who remain open to going "Beyond Creating" find a dearth of theory and practice upon which to build discipline-based curricula. Following the publication of the 1985 Getty Center report, Getty staff met with teachers and art administrators in a series of four roundtable meetings in Boston, Seattle, New Orleans, and Chicago. As reported in the executive summary of the proceedings of the meetings, participants expressed Lowenfeldian concerns about elitism and the stifling of expressive creativity and also voiced a need for more research into the conceptual bases and historical precedents for discipline-based art education (p. 3). It is these latter concerns that will be addressed in this study.

Since the publication of the Getty report, research has been undertaken to determine the recent history of the concept of discipline-based art education. The most comprehensive study of these historic precedents was underwritten by the Getty Center, researched by A. D. Efland, R. A. Smith, and E. Kern, and published in the Journal of Aesthetic Education in its Summer 1987 issue. These three studies support earlier research which credited Manual Barkan, Elliot Eisner, and Harry Broudy with propounding the theory that the scope of art education should be broadened to include appreciation. Although the theories of these thinkers might be familiar to art education professors and the most recently trained, they carry little currency with
practicing teachers who look for curricular models. Projects cited as models for curriculum building have been, for the most part, unconvincing in that they (with a few exceptions) have been short-lived and narrow in scope.

These above-mentioned theoretical and curricular precedents will be reviewed in this study and used as a basis for comparison to a much earlier art appreciation education movement that is generally known as picture study. The goal of this study is to thoroughly research the picture study movement which dates from the late 1800s to the early 1900s. During this time, public school teachers were expected to teach art appreciation to all students. Teachers had textbooks of art education that supported the inclusion of art appreciation, as well as student texts, chromolithographed reproductions of masterpieces, articles in general education journals and in specialized art education journals. The broad-based, sequential nature of the picture study movement suggests a strong parallel to the expressed goals of the Getty Center. Yet, researchers have, to date, discounted picture study, some dismissing it as a quaint attempt to teach morality through art. It is this researcher's belief that a study of the picture study movement can offer theoreticians and practitioners a window into a time when teachers did go "Beyond Creating."

1.2 Purpose of the Study

It is the purpose of this study to put the Getty call for inclusion of art appreciation into the curriculum into
historic perspective, with a focus on the early art appreciation movement, called picture study. Picture study primary source material, including picture study textbooks for students dating from the late 1800s to the early 1900s, art education texts for teachers from the same period, and period journal articles will be presented as the basis of an original history of a heretofore neglected aspect of early art education. Since the purpose of this study is to inform the present in light of the past, it will go beyond the albeit compelling antiquarian materials from the turn of the century and will draw parallels with the controversial discipline-based art education movement of today.

1.3 Major Research Problem and Research Areas

Problem: In a search for historic precedents to the current art education movement called discipline-based art education, researchers have neglected to study the broad-based curriculum movement called picture study.

Research areas include:

- An examination and analysis of picture study textbooks such as those by L. L. W. Wilson (1899), E. Hurll (1914), and M. S. Emery (1898). An examination and analysis of art education texts for teachers including those by eminent early theoreticians such as B. Boas, L. L. Winslow, F. Nyquist, M. Mathias, and W. Whitford. An examination and analysis of period education journals such as The Perry Magazine and The School Arts Book. These will be studied for the
purpose of ascertaining both the scope and content of the picture study curricula.

- Research into the philosophical rationales for picture study that were offered by its advocates. This area of research has been prompted by the contention of many writers that the underlying rationale for picture study was moral education. This point of view has been questioned by M. A. Stankiewicz (1987); this study will show that the underlying rationale for picture study was a philosophical system called idealism which promoted spiritual, as opposed to moral, objectives for art appreciation education.

- A cross-comparison of the picture study movement with the discipline-based art education movement will include not only a comparison of the underlying theories and philosophical tenets of each movement, as well as the content of the curricula, but will also include an analysis of the growth, development, and decline of picture study. This will be compared to the current growth and development of the Getty movement.

- In an effort to relate theory to practice in the most concrete way apparent to the researcher, selected techniques and pictures advocated by the proponents of picture study will be presented to a small group of volunteer students. Results will be reported via the recorded dialogue technique.
1.4 Methodology

The methodology for this study will be a historiographic search for new and relevant information on the picture study movement and a cross-comparison of that material with the Getty discipline-based art education movement of today. The creation of a hypothesis will emerge as a result of the study and the comparison. Generally, historiographic methodology involves four facets. Each of these will be addressed by the researcher.

Heuristic strategies include knowledge of collections, bibliographies, and techniques, especially as they relate to the collecting of historic data. In this study, the researcher will consult collections such as the art and history archive at the Boston Public Library, which has an extensive collection of the publications of the Prang Education Company of Boston, a leading publisher of early art education material. The Boston Athenaeum also houses archival material relating to Prang. The researcher will also consult two collections in Washington, D.C. - the National Education Association's library of "Proceedings" and the Library of Congress' collection of federal reports on art education. The Gutman Library at Harvard University, a repository of early education materials, will also be consulted.

Historical research is the second facet. Since the researcher cannot personally experience the "facts" of the picture study movement first-hand, she will rely on primary
source material. These collections of written and material accounts will make up "traces" from which the researcher will deduce what actually occurred. The facts of the discipline-based art education movement will be gathered from secondary sources; this can be justified because of the chronological proximity of this movement to the time of this study.

Knowledge of current interpretation, the third facet, includes knowing not only the facts of the history of both the picture study movement and the Getty movement, but also knowing how scholars have interpreted these facts. An example of interpretation has been cited above, wherein the picture study movement has been interpreted by art education historians as an effort to teach morality through art. This view has been unsupported by primary sources. Other interpretations of picture study have been posited by F. Logan and F. Wygant. In this study, the researcher will rigorously question and analyze these various positions in light of her own interpretation which will be based, in the case of picture study, on original source material.

The historical investigation of facts cannot be an end in itself; it is this researcher's goal to write a history of ideas (intellectual history) that establishes causal and/or chronological relationships both within each movement and across both movements. This process, the reconstruction of a movement from historic traces and the selection of those traces that are relevant to the art appreciation
movement of today and the subsequent establishment of relationships, will lead to the construction of a hypothesis that will connect the two movements.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Art education curriculum is undergoing a potentially radical shift from studio-based production lessons to lessons that incorporate the three disciplines of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics, as well as production. The resistance to change evidenced by the controversy stirred by the 1985 Getty Center Report, *Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools*, indicates a need for both theoreticians and practitioners to pause and reflect on both the current history of art appreciation and education and also its earlier history. Although some efforts have recently been made to study historic precedents for the inclusion of art appreciation into the public school curriculum, little effort has been made to study a time when art appreciation was pedagogically accepted. This study will contribute to the field by filling in this gap in art education history and by offering educators of today who are advocates of art appreciation education a curriculum model that withstood the test of nearly forty years of time.

1.6 Review of the Literature

The literature relevant to this study is in the area of art education history. This review will first consider books and dissertations, then articles published by professional journals and articles in collections (often
previously published in journals), and, finally, chapters in current textbooks. The history of art education is quite sparse and education historians have often depended on the work of Frederick M. Logan, author of Growth of Art in American Schools (1955), as their starting point since it is the only comprehensive art education history to date. Carrying forward that tradition, we will begin with Logan's work, but will also consider some less well-known art education historians from the past as well as from the present.

1.6.1 Books and Dissertations

Published in 1955 by Harper and Row, Growth of Art in America's Schools is a conversational review of the trends in art education from the early 1800s to the mid-1950s. Logan includes three fields of influence in his study; these include general education in the arts, artists' professional training, and social influences (p. 11). For example, in his chapter entitled, "Progressive Education," Logan offers a synopsis of the work of early childhood educator Maria Montessori and art educator Franz Cizek, sections on the Bauhaus and the Museum of Modern Art, and a few paragraphs on the Depression and the role of the national government in promoting the arts. As one might expect, because of this broad scope, Logan is able to chronicle trends, but offers few specifics. His personal writing style, which can be irritating as well as charming, leaves little room for objectivity.
Art appreciation education is mentioned twice, once in a deprecatory remark about the "narrow" nature of an art education movement which used "Appreciation of the Beautiful" as its slogan (p. 3). The other reference is a full section on appreciation in his chapter on progressive education. In America, progressive education was extant for about 50 years, from the turn of the century until the middle of the twentieth century. Some mark the formal birth of the movement with the founding of the Progressive Education Association in 1919 and the death of the movement with the Association's disbandment in 1955. The subtitle of the section is "What Develops 'Art Appreciation'?" and in it Logan answers the question in no uncertain terms. He first observes that the progressives often couched their objectives for art education in dual terms of appreciation and expression, but made little headway in accomplishing their goal (pp. 156-159). The weakness in Logan's remark is not in its assertion, but in the fact that he does not support it with data. However, when speaking of his own era (1950s), he can be considered a more reliable source: "We have continued to develop in the creative work of the classroom . . . made more familiar to us by the psychologists . . . But in the development of mature aesthetic judgments, a comparable progress has not been made" (p. 160). Thus, we might consider that his own era's depreciation of art appreciation may have influenced his decision to include very little about it in his text.
In a more positive light, Logan's book was extremely helpful in identifying the names of leading art educators across the decades that he considers. It was this writer's task to then locate the textbooks of these eminent art educators and to analyze these primary sources for art appreciation content and approach. In terms of the early picture study material, Logan makes no mention of picture study, nor of the writers, nor journals that will be included in this study. This gap in Logan's research again suggests weak scholarship in the area of art appreciation education. However, for this writer, Logan's book was an important starting point and it was read and studied carefully for threads of ideas that could be developed with more historical substantiation. In 1975, Logan wrote an article updating his 1955 book. Again, he offers the reader a valuable bibliography, but the text is a narrow chronicling of the contributions of art education professional associations.

In contrast to Logan's treatment of history is Foster Wygant's *Art in America's Schools in the Nineteenth Century* (1983). Because he has limited his scope to the 1800s time frame and has devoted half of his book to text and half to annotated bibliographies and appendices, Wygant can be considered a more reliable source. Again, however, art appreciation receives scant attention. This may be due to the fact that the picture study movement was just getting
under way at the end of the nineteenth century. In a four-page section (pp. 123-127) in a chapter on art education at the end of the century, art appreciation is included among nine components of art education. Picture study is directly addressed and Wygant carefully chronicles some of the early influences and contributors which provided this writer with important leads to texts and journal articles. However, the main weakness of Wygant's review of picture study is his contention that picture study was not concerned with art information such as compositional analysis and art history, but was more concerned with moral education (p. 124). As we will see, there is little in the picture study texts to substantiate this view.

The final book to be considered in this section was published in 1908 under the auspices of the American Committee of the Third International Congress for the Development of Drawing and Art Teaching. Compiled by James Parton Haney, *Art Education in the Public Schools of the United States* is a collection of articles by practicing teachers and supervisors that gives one a cross-sectional glimpse of the state of the field at and just beyond the turn of the century. Although not technically a history of art education, it functions as a good source because of its purported effort to represent schools across the country and also because Haney himself documents general trends in the lead article. Haney's collection contributed to this study by providing authentic voices of practitioners whose
comments were used to provide evidence that picture study did have a place in early art curricula. The weakness of the Haney book for this study was, of course, the limited time period covered; the strength, again, was its use as a primary source.

Five dissertations on the subject of art education history will be reviewed. Each will be taken in chronological order, beginning with Francis B. Belshe's 1946 doctoral dissertation for Yale University. Entitled A History of Art Education in the Public Schools of the United States, Belshe's work offers readers a general history with much of its emphasis on the development of the early drawing curriculum and on the subsequent industrial and manual arts curricula. Art appreciation and picture study are mentioned in two pages of Belshe's 216-page work. He writes five paragraphs about the nature of picture study, saying, for example, that "No other feature of public school art education in America has approached the revered position of the lesson in appreciation" (p. 79). Yet, he includes only one source -- a 1935 University of Texas bulletin. Needless to say, Belshe's work makes little contribution to the art appreciation aspect of art education history, but it did provide this writer with important insights regarding the correlation of manual art education with other trends.

In contrast to Belshe's dearth of primary source substantiation is the work of Harry Beck Green, whose dissertation for Stanford University was completed in 1948.
Entitled The Introduction of Art as a General Education Subject in American Schools, Green's work has been a foundation for most writers on the subject of art history since its publication. (One begins to discern the seminal influence of a piece of research as one reads bibliographies and acknowledgments and as one hears certain themes resonate, albeit credited, in others' work.) Green's research is important not only for its compelling telling of the early conflicts between those supporting the industrial rationale for art education and those opposing it, but it is also the most carefully researched of any of the works included in this review.

Green includes art appreciation and picture study in his seventh chapter of "Other Educational Movements." The foregoing chapters address mainly the drawing curricula. In 14 pages of text, with many detailed footnotes, Green writes about art appreciation in relation to prevailing utilitarian trends, about the use of pictures to decorate schools, and about picture study. (It was somewhat surprising to this writer that Green's well-honed investigatory skills hadn't uncovered a 1913 article by H. T. Bailey that made a definitive link between schoolroom decoration and picture study.) His three-page section on picture study again makes the unsubstantiated assertion that moral lessons were derived from picture study, but he balances this with the substantiated view that lessons were informational as well (p. 304). Since Harry Beck Green's
research has been widely used by art education historians, one can surmise that this unsubstantiated remark may be the source of the moral education label that has been attached to picture study since the 1950s. Unfortunately, most researchers have disregarded Green's comment that picture study was also informational. Although Green's section on picture study and related material is not comprehensive nor integral to his thesis, it provided this writer with a model art education history that combined primary evidence with commentary in a readable text.

Perhaps reflecting the lack of interest in art appreciation during the 1950s, the next dissertation to be reviewed has a University of Wisconsin copyright date of 1961. This is the first work in this review solely on the topic of art appreciation education. Orville Winsand entitled his dissertation Art Appreciation in the Public Schools from 1930 to 1960. Although limiting his study to the three decades between 1930 and 1960, Winsand does include a 13-page chapter on "Art Appreciation in the Decade Before 1930." Unfortunately, he neglects the early history of picture study and dismisses it with "Previous approaches to art appreciation were limited to a study of some of the masterpieces" (p. 16). Winsand does mention some of the prevalent art educators of the progressive period, such as Boas, Mathias, and Whitford, but cites only scant evidence for their views on art appreciation and concludes that progressive art educators wanted to balance art appreciation
with expression, but does not explain how they proposed to achieve this balance (pp. 20-21).

Winsand devotes much of his writing to factors he does not connect directly to the public schools. For example, in a 20-page section (pp. 50-70) of his chapter on the 1930s, Winsand includes material on psychological research and on programming for children in museums, but makes no connection between these movements and the public schools. He also gives John Dewey short shrift by characterizing his philosophy as "complex," then reducing its complexities to three paragraphs about useful arts, values, and "the appreciation process" (pp. 71-72). This writer does not deny that Dewey's writing can be difficult, but she sees more harm than good done by not attending to it in some depth. Dewey's work deserves attention by practitioners as well as theoreticians since he articulated his art education ideas within the framework of practice and process. Dewey urges us to both appreciate art and to reflect on the nature of the process. Finally, in terms of this study, Winsand's work addresses neither the early picture study movement nor the movement for discipline-based art education which had its roots in the late 1950s.

Stephen Mark Dobbs, who is currently on the staff of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, entitled his 1972 Stanford University dissertation *Paradox and Promise: Art Education in the Public Schools*. In a clear and concise retelling of the story of the history of art education from
the 1800s to the 1970s, Dobbs delineates three dominant trends. In Part I, he describes the industrial movement and the counteractions to it, as well as efforts to streamline the art curriculum. In Part II, which he calls "The Growth of Science and Art," he reviews the work of experimental psychology and of the progressives, including Viktor Lowenfeld. In Part III, Dobbs looks at the present "maturation of art education" and "promising prospects" which include a prediction that aesthetic education will come to the fore. (Elliot Eisner is credited in Dobbs' acknowledgments with being a "superb mentor"; his influence can certainly be felt in the reading of Dobbs' dissertation.)

Although Dobbs' organizational and writing skills are very much in evidence in this work, the broad scope resulted in a very general history, much like Logan's work. Dobbs does not include the topic of picture study in his work, yet he does include a section on Henry Turner Bailey's approach to art education through nature, which was conceptually useful to this study. Similar to Logan's work, Dobbs' dissertation functioned for this writer as a context from which she could begin her research.

The final work in this section is, in a sense, instructive as an example of a history that has a clear purpose, but which purpose becomes more important than the history. Peter Anthony Purdue's 1977 dissertation for the University of Oregon is entitled _Ideology and Art Education:_
The Influence of Socialist Thought on Art Education in America Between the Years 1890-1960. Half of Purdue's dissertation is devoted to an explication of general socialist thought and its relation to aesthetics, the second half of his work to providing evidence that the era of 1890-1920 was somewhat of a heyday for socialist art educational thought -- a heyday that was negated by influences prevalent from 1920-1960.

Purdue builds a case that prominent art educator and picture study proponent Henry Turner Bailey supported a socialist view by connecting Bailey to John Ruskin, William Morris, and artist Walter Crane. Purdue asserts that Ruskin, Morris, and Crane, as proponents of the concept of "guild socialism" and of the Arts and Crafts movement, were committed to the ideology of socialism (pp. 148-150). Since Bailey, as editor of the influential School Arts Book, used Morris' type, recommended books by Ruskin, Crane, and Morris, and occasionally wrote political editorials, Purdue believes he makes a case for his assertion that "The major socialist influence on art education during this period was The School Arts Book under the editorship of Henry Turner Bailey" (p. 161). The evidence presented does not support this assertion.

Although Purdue avers that John Dewey's Art As Experience is "rarely read in the field," he suggests that if people did read it, they would find in it a "critique of capitalism through a discussion of the translation of art
into cultural property and the ideological influences on art perception and appreciation" (p. 207). Perhaps Purdue should re-read *Art As Experience* (1934), since Dewey clearly articulates his position: "I think the idea that there is a moral obligation on an artist to deal with 'proletarian' material, or with any material on the basis of its bearing on proletarian fortune and destiny is an effort to return to a position that art has outgrown" (p. 190). Perhaps we can say that art education history has also outgrown this narrow interpretation that Purdue offers.

1.6.2 Articles

Until the recent Getty challenge to art educators to make fundamental changes in the art curriculum, the subject of past historic precedents in art appreciation education had received little attention in the art education professional journals. With the Getty challenge, there has been a felt need to ask where art education is now, where it has been in the past, and where it is going. With these questions come the many requisite general articles supporting the proposed inclusion of the disciplines of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics as well as articles critical of the changes. Those with an interest in history have begun to look to the past to find historic precedents or to understand how art education has come to be what it is today. The earliest articles addressing the history of art appreciation education surfaced in the 1960s during the research and development era; many of the most recent
articles have been underwritten by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

In 1966, Robert J. Saunders wrote "A History of the Teaching of Art Appreciation in the Public Schools" which was published by the United States Office of Education in part of its report, Improving the Teaching of Art Appreciation (Ecker, 1966). Although Saunders' title suggests a general review, his early history is, in fact, basically a review of articles published in the School Arts Book. (There are two other minor sections, one describing the theories of Arthur Wesley Dow and one on the growth of American art collections during this period.) School Arts Book, under the editorship of Henry Turner Bailey, does, indeed, merit the attention of the art education historian; however, this writer believes that it does not provide, unto itself, sufficient evidence. Saunders also fails to get underneath the text to the theoretical understandings of the writers. He does make links between Bailey and Dow (pp. 9-10), but leaves this writer unconvinced of their significance.

The second part of Saunders' history, covering the time span between John Dewey and the 1960s, is a peripatetic journey through cubism, futurism, pragmatism, and new media. Once again, most of the references are from School Arts Book. He does mention two textbooks, one by Sallie Tannahill (p. 32) and the other by Viktor Lowenfeld (p. 34). He asserts in one sentence that Lowenfeld and Dewey (in Art
as Experience) have similar ideas about art appreciation (p.35). This is unsubstantiated by Saunders.

To be fair to Saunders, this writer simply found a lack of focus in his article. Perhaps if he had only used the School Arts material to the exclusion of the works that treated somewhat superficially, he might have identified subtle changes in approaches to art appreciation while the journal was under various editors. Saunders' work was, in the final analysis, useful to this study in that he did thoroughly review the Henry Turner Bailey articles.

Elliot Eisner's historical insights are important since he has been a participant in the making of art education history for at least the last 20 years. In 1970, he wrote "Some Historical Developments in Art Education," which was published in a collection edited by G. Pappas. He mentions picture study and quotes a late picture study writer's proclivity to use pictures to promote patriotism and piety and decries the absence of modern artists from the picture study lists, but adds that "Art education until as late as the middle of the twentieth century was more a reflection of lay artistic tastes than it was a leader in shaping those tastes and in enabling students to experience the work on artistic frontiers" (p. 17). Thus, in his only reference to early art appreciation efforts, he raises an objection then answers it himself.

In the 1982 edition of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Eisner writes of the history of aesthetic
education that there have been four major philosophical conceptions: the epistemological, the experiential, the moral, and the perceptual (p. 89). Since his breakdown is based on classification of philosophical theory, it is relevant to this study only in that he comments on the work of John Dewey. Fortunately, because of the nature of an encyclopedia article, for readers whose only exposure is to Dewey's *Art As Experience* might be such an article, he elucidates rather than obfuscates Dewey's basic ideas (pp. 89-90).

Donald Arnstine also wrote a similar encyclopedia article for the 1971 edition of the *Encyclopedia of Education*. His article, "Art, Experience, and Education - A Philosophic Inquiry," again emphasizes theory, but puts theory into a historic framework. He divides art education theorists into three major schools. First are those who hold the Aristotelian tenet that "properly wrought works of art exhibit(ed) the norms of human action." Arnstine places Harry Broudy in this school. Second are those who conceive of art as expression of emotion; Arnstine places Viktor Lowenfeld in this school. Third are those who hold that "significant form" is the essence of art and study of perceptual elements (lines, colors, shapes, etc.) is the key to art education (pp. 320-322). Although John Dewey is mentioned in a later section, his work is not integrated into Arnstine's major conceptions section.
Arnstine's distinction between the intellectual approach of Harry Broudy and the emotional approach of Viktor Lowenfeld provided this writer with support for an important distinction. However, his third category (the compositional approach) is less convincing since, as will be shown in this study, art appreciation educators of both the intellectual school and the emotional school use compositional analysis as a tool.

Another important article that was encountered early in this study was published by *Art Education* in 1974. Ronald L. Jones' "Aesthetic Education: Its Historical Precedents" laid out the territory in which this writer would conduct the first part of her study. Jones presented a cohesive, albeit brief, history of aesthetic education that was clearly written, used reliable sources, and, in general, made sense. However, Jones did not undertake an analysis of what was transpiring in the field in his own times. He simply ends with a single paragraph about the revived interest in art appreciation and suggests that "The aesthetic concern advanced in recent years, although new in concept, is not revolutionary in character" (p. 16).

Arthur D. Efland, an art education professor at Ohio State University with a strong interest in art education history, wrote three articles that were relevant to this study. First, his "Changing Views of Children's Artistic Development: Their Impact on Curriculum and Instruction," which was published in Eisner's collection entitled *Arts,*
Human Development, and Education (1976), offers readers a unique perspective on one of the pioneers of discipline-based art education. After chronicling the work of child development theorists such as G. Stanley Hall, Franz Cizek (a European art educator), Viktor Lowenfeld, and Herbert Read, Efland considers the work of Manual Barkan, whose early writings provided a foundation for discipline-based art education. Efland suggests that Barkan's work marks a shift from looking solely at the developing child to looking at society at large as well. "For Barkan, then, the teaching of art cannot proceed from the needs of the child alone, but must take into account social and cultural factors as well" (p. 80). This conception of Barkan as a transitional figure in the history of art education is worthy of more study.

Efland's 1979 "Conceptions of Teaching in Art Education" published in Art Education is, again, a creative look at art education history. Efland divides theorists into two major camps; one is the aesthetic theory camp, the other is the psychological theory camp. He "force fits" these two groups into a single alignment which includes four orientations: mimetic/behaviorist, pragmatic/cognitive, expressive/analytic, and objectivist/gestalt (p. 23). Although one would have to have a deeper understanding of the fields of psychology and theoretical aesthetics than this writer can claim in order to adequately critique this conception, one can conceive of it as an oversimplification.
In this piece, Efland's division of art education into the aesthetic and psychological resonates with Arnstine's 1971 categorization, but Efland's "forced fit" pairing of the schools and his further elaboration of this scheme into three classes, each with its aesthetic/psychological label, feels very forced. For example, Efland identifies compositional analysis which he labels as the objectivist tradition, with Gestalt psychology (p. 24). However, as has been said, practitioners in the other traditions he mentions have consistently used compositional analysis as a tool. Also, although the fit works in terms of seeing parts and wholes, it is less comfortable when one considers that art education that emphasizes composition suggests analysis, and art education that emphasizes gestalt psychology suggests synthesis. In terms of this study, Efland's article provided the writer with yet another proposed framework that used the same historical facts and configured them in a new way.

In 1987, Efland was invited by the Getty Center for the Arts in Education to write "Curriculum Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education" for the Summer, 1987 issue of the Journal of Aesthetic Education which the Center underwrote. Unlike the aforementioned articles by Efland, this article was specifically about the inclusion of art appreciation into curricula. Although this writer was conducting her own research into the 1960s precedents for discipline-based art education before this article was
published and concluded that the key people were Barkan, Eisner, Broudy, Hubbard and Rouse, and Greer, she found it somewhat dismaying and, at the same time, reinforcing that Efland's article charted the same projects that she had chosen to include. (Actually, Efland also included a curriculum project under Laura Chapman that this writer chose not to include.) Unlike Efland, this writer also chose to combine her understanding of the theoretical bases from which each curriculum grew, thereby connecting the key people's theories with their espoused curricular practices. A second difference in this writer's treatment of the curricula models is the use of the prevalent characteristics of each model to predict what a Getty model might look like. Efland's article certainly contributed to this study's consideration of recent precedents; however, Efland completely neglected the earlier movement and dismissed picture study:

A form of art appreciation known as 'picture study' began to appear during the 1890s. Though picture study lessons stressed the elements of beauty in pictures, their primary intent was to improve public morality through art. Picture study remained a popular form of art appreciation through the first three decades of this century, but rarely did the aesthetic features of the works of art receive primary attention. (p. 59)

Unfortunately, Efland does not offer documentation for his commentary, nor does he discriminate between "elements of beauty" and "aesthetic features." Again, we hear reliance on Harry Beck Green's 1948 characterization of picture study and, again, it is unsubstantiated.
In 1986, an article entitled "The Ecology of Picture Study" was published by Art Education. Written by Peter Smith, the piece chronicles the life and works of Oscar W. Neale (1873-1957), a picture study proponent who took his collection of large reproductions on the Chatauqua tent circuit (p. 49) and also promoted the study of pictures in two books, one for adults entitled World-Famous Pictures (1933), and one published for children entitled Picture Study in the Grades (1927). Smith's narrative is a lively evocation of an era and of a Midwestern man who rhapsodized about pictures. Smith also offers readers a gentler assessment of picture study than some of his contemporaries whom he chides for their sometimes cynical assessment of the movement. Since Smith comprehensively treated Neale's works, this writer did not include them in her work. However, she did adopt Smith's stance of considering texts in the context of their own sometimes quieter, innocent times.

Evan J. Kern's 1984 paper for an October Kutztown Art Conference is entitled "Picture Study Revisited." It is useful in that Kern limits his sources to state curriculum guides for his information on the picture study movement. He references guides from many states, including a 1926 Mississippi guide, an 1894 Maine guide, and a 1947 North Carolina guide. In a sense, the strength of this piece is also its weakness. By using the state guides, Kern references what one might consider the "lowest common
denominator" of the picture study material. Kern uses the 1927 North Dakota course of picture study, which was based on ten "moral laws," to support his contention that picture study was, in part, morality teaching. Kern's 1927 reference is the only primary source evidence offered by any researcher for the assertion that the goal of picture study was instruction in morality that this researcher uncovered. He also includes the complete picture study text for Julien Dupre's The Balloon from a picture study series, a picture that his audience would unlikely deem valuable for any study by today's standards.

Kern's state guide resources were also used in his Journal of Aesthetic Education article of 1987, underwritten by the Getty Center for the Arts. "Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education: State Departments of Education Curriculum Documents" was originally supposed to include documents from the period 1945-1984, but Kern decided to also include documents from 1845 until 1945. His enumeration lists curriculum guides that referred to picture study, art appreciation, and study of ornament, as well as references to the disciplines of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics (p. 36). Researchers were hired in 36 states to find documents and, of the thousands uncovered, 926 were used for the study, distributed chronologically as well as geographically.

Given the enormity of the data base from which this study was working, one would expect more in-depth analysis
than appeared in the article. For each decade from 1874 until 1984, Kern offers his readers a few paragraphs characterizing the d.b.a.e. precedents found by the researchers. The choice for inclusion of material in the analyses seems almost arbitrary, as if a random page were taken from the data and commented upon. Picture study is given attention, often combining contradictory views of the material. For example, in the 1910-1919 decade, Kern writes that "an underlying moral theme can be found" (p. 40) in much picture study material, then cites picture study examples that feature art history and compositional analysis. What is most disappointing about this study is that, given the tremendous research resources provided by the Getty funding, no more was done with the material.

Last, but certainly not least, is the work of Mary Ann Stankiewicz, an associate professor in the Department of Art at the University of Maine. Stankiewicz' two articles, "The Eye is a Nobler Organ: Ruskin and American Art Education" (1984) and "Beauty in Design and Pictures: Idealism and Aesthetic Education" (1987), provided this writer with a standard for rigorous research and thoughtful commentary that she can only hope to attain in the future. In both articles, Stankiewicz writes of the picture study era, but has chosen to limit her studies to very specific people and their contributions to the intellectual history of the period. In the Ruskin article, she follows the influence of the British writer on the schoolroom decoration and picture
study movements. In the 1987 article, she documents the interrelationship of Henry Turner Bailey and William Torrey Harris and their shared belief in the philosophy of idealism. Relying on primary sources for the important points in her work, she provided this reader with a tour de force in research that is, indeed, humbling. However, even one's heroes have weaknesses. Again, as with other writers cited, Stankiewicz depends too readily on the moral education argument for the picture study material of the period. It is this writer's contention that oftentimes researchers confuse a call for spirituality for morality.

Stankiewicz also wrote a 1984 article entitled "A Picture Age: Reproductions in Picture Study" in which she reviews the technological advances that allowed picture study entrepreneurs such as Louis Prang to expand their markets to a wide public. This article was enlightening not only in its careful historic documentation, but also in its convincing argument that Prang was an important figure in early picture study history.

In summary, we can see that art education historians have, with the exception of Stankiewicz and Smith, neglected to rigorously research picture study. We have also seen that Harry Beck Green, Elliot Eisner, Arthur Efland and Foster Wygant have relied on the unsubstantiated argument that a major objective of picture study was moral education. It has been suggested that this may be the result of an overreliance on Harry Beck Green's seminal 1948 dissertation
and an overreliance on secondary sources. This study will use primary source material in the form of art education textbooks written for teachers to document and characterize early art appreciation education. The voices that will be heard are, for the most part, the voices of practitioners who are speaking to other practitioners (see Chapters 3 and 4). However, first we will consider the influences of key people who introduced and supported art appreciation education.
ART EDUCATION IN EARLY AMERICA: A PLACE FOR APPRECIATION IN A UTILITARIAN CLIMATE

2.1 Introduction

The history of art education in America has its beginnings in the utilitarian world of industrial art. Art education was viewed as a handmaiden to the industries that needed workers who could draw. Rote reproduction of linear drawings, however, was sometimes joined with a more aesthetic rationale in that teachers were encouraged to teach drawing because people of "taste" should have the skill. Nonetheless, art education in early nineteenth century America consisted mostly of technical drawing exercises. Into this somewhat arid climate there was an occasional introduction of the idea that art education could also teach about beauty.

The earliest evidence that American art education could be linked to "the good, the beautiful, and the true" and enter into the philosophical aesthetic realm came with transcendental educators like Elizabeth Peabody (1804-1894), who spoke easily of the connections between the physical, the spiritual, and the beautiful. Yet, in methodology, they continued to use drawing as the tool. Fine art appreciation was evidenced in the decoration of the classrooms with plaster casts of sculpture and occasional paintings. The assumption was presumably that students could inhale the
aesthetic messages that floated in the air from these works of art. These fine art classroom decorations are the first evidence that early American educators considered the classroom as viable a place for enjoyment of beauty as they did their parlors, a contemporary reflection of the movement away from a Puritanical denial of ornament.

The ornamentation of the school classroom eventually became a movement called "schoolroom decoration." Some of the industrialists who had earlier discouraged art education for anything other than that which served their own purposes now saw potential markets for reproductions of artworks. Thus, in a sense, the utilitarian impulse continued to give impetus to an aesthetic education movement. Others also saw value in bringing art reproductions into the classroom. Social reformers saw art as a potent humanizer. Hence, schoolroom decoration took on an upright social tone in that the upper classes could "do good" by purchasing reproductions of artworks and placing them in schoolrooms. It will be shown that the important historical turning point in the use of pictures for pedagogical purposes came in 1897 when a prominent art educator, Henry Turner Bailey, suggested that teachers use the reproductions to teach appreciation.

In this chapter, the reader will be introduced to seven key figures in early art education history. Each contributed to the American debate regarding the purpose of
art education. In the first section, through the words of William Bently Fowle, Horace Mann, and Elizabeth Peabody, we will see that art appreciation was not wholly neglected in early art education, but that its place was uncomfortable. In the second section, through the work of Walter Smith, Louis Prang, and William Torrey Harris, we will see the utility versus beauty debate take shape. In the final section, we will see how the parallel movement to beautify classrooms provided art education leader Henry T. Bailey with a platform from which to launch a formal art appreciation education program.

2.2 Utility versus Beauty: An Art Education Rationale

Early American educators addressed the issue of inclusion of art into the curriculum by advocating the teaching of drawing. The impetus for this movement came from Europe where industrialists sought workers skilled in draftsmanship who could provide ornamentation for their decorative arts. The teaching of art, in the form of drawing, became widespread in America in the late nineteenth century, also propelled by the utilitarian rationale of providing industry with workers trained at the taxpayers' expense.

However, educators also saw an aesthetic as well as practical rationale for teaching art. There is evidence that those committed to a transcendental philosophy taught art for spiritual reasons which resonated with the ideas of those imbued with an idealistic philosophy. In this
section, we will examine the views of three prominent educators whose ideas reflect the fundamental trends in art education in these early years.

2.2.1 William Bently Fowle (1795-1865)

William Bently Fowle has been credited with introducing art into the curriculum of American public schools. As a prominent Boston bookseller and educational reformer, Fowle advocated the teaching of art as early as 1821. Later, as a teacher at Boston's Primary School, he was able to put theory into practice. During his two years as a teacher, an unexpected tenure since he initially agreed only to temporary assignment necessitated by the illness of a faculty member, Fowle introduced many innovations, including the use of blackboards, map study, and linear drawing. The latter two studies were linked with geometry and students became proficient at making maps and reproducing complex geometric and ornamental shapes. Harry Beck Green avers that this initial use of art for practical purposes predicted future trends in the field. "Fowle's linkage of drawing with map-making and geometry presaged the industrial-type of art instruction which ultimately proved acceptable to a public suspicious of the utilitarian value of anything suggestive of the Fine Arts" (Green, p. 42). Yet, as we will see, the "Fine Arts" rationale did eventually gain credibility.

Upon returning to his book business, Fowle promoted the use of a French art textbook by Louis Benjamin Francouer
called *An Introduction to Linear Drawing*, which he later translated and published in three editions in 1825, 1827, and 1830 (Wygant, p. 140). Although this text, which was typical of many drawing manuals to follow, included exercises in drawing simple lines, angles, and geometrical shapes, there is evidence that the art appreciation impulse had not been totally ignored. The Francouer text included a didactic chapter entitled "Orders of Architecture" which was unrelated to the practical, rote exercises in the previous chapters. Also, in an 1847 edition of the text, Fowle argues that, besides being utilitarian, art education can also contribute to one's appreciation of the world: "Besides the professions which make the art of drawing their particular study, anatomists, naturalists, mechanics, travellers, and indeed all persons of taste and genius have need of it . . ." (Fowle, p. iii). Thus, although Fowle's efforts to introduce art into American schools did begin with technical drawing, his motivation wasn't purely to serve the needs of industry.

Although the movement to teach drawing was met with resistance from teachers untrained in technical skills, Boston's English High School required drawing of all students by 1836 and, in 1848, the School Committee of Boston placed drawing on a list of required grammar school subjects; however, there was no provision for a program, a teacher, nor a textbook (Klar, Winslow, & Kirby, pp. 25-26). In 1843, Fowle became publisher of Horace Mann's *Common
School Journal and through this medium the advocacy of art education was spread. Because of Fowle's work, Massachusetts has the distinction of being the first state to introduce the teaching of art and, as we will see, it was also the first state to require the teaching of art. However, as Haney has pointed out, during this period other leaders in the field, such as William Minifie of Baltimore, Rembrandt Peale of Philadelphia, and Jenu Brainerd of Cleveland, contributed to making the effort national in scope (Haney, pp. 26-27). This era is important in that it provided general art education with a permanent niche in the schools, although the nature of that art education, and the place for art appreciation education was, as yet, undetermined.

2.2.2 Horace Mann (1796-1859)

From 1837 until 1848, Horace Mann served as Secretary of Massachusetts' newly created State Board of Education, the first such board in the country. He also was editor of the Common School Journal, published by William Bently Fowle. Through these two vehicles, Mann was able to carry his influence far beyond Massachusetts' borders. Indeed, his concept of a modern public school system was a model for the nation. Art education historians also credit Horace Mann with popularizing the notion of art education and cite his 1844 recommendation that drawing be taught to all students as a watershed date. Mann's recommendation was based on a visit to Prussian schools and was pragmatic. By
teaching drawing at the same time as writing, students excelled in the latter. Ultimately, Mann would advise Massachusetts schools to teach drawing because of its efficacious effect on writing. However, Mann did not ignore the issue of teaching for appreciation. In the same report, published in Common School Journal in 1844, Mann argues that by training the eye through drawing lessons one would also learn "to observe, to distinguish, and to imitate" as well as to write (p. 132). This suggests powers of appreciation. Yet, for Mann, fine art appreciation had historically elicited contradictory impulses that he was never to resolve.

In a recollection of his childhood education, Mann reported the following, which was included in his wife Mary's biography entitled Life of Horace Mann (1865):

I had an intense love of beauty, and of its expression in nature and in the fine arts . . . Yet, with all our senses and our faculties glowing and receptive, how little we were taught! Our eyes were never trained to distinguish forms and colors. Our ears were strangers to music. So far from being taught the art of drawing, which is a beautiful language by itself, I well remember that when the impulse to express in pictures what I could not express in words was so strong that . . . it tingled down to my fingers, then my knuckles were rapped with a heavy ruler of the teacher . . . (pp. 11-12)

This Puritanical response to Mann's flights of aesthetic fancy was also reflected in his writings on art in the Common School Journal. According to Saunders, "Although he expressed interest in the arts, they were always subservient, in his mind, to the more direct needs of human
living: economic and educational well-being, and right political action" (1961, p. 105). This view is further supported by a journal entry (cited in Mary P. Mann's biography) which Mann made during his above-mentioned 1843 tour of Europe. He contrasts spiritual and aesthetic wakening: "To me the sight of one child educated to understand something of his Maker, and of that Maker's works, is a far more glorious spectacle than all the cathedrals which of the art of man has ever reared. . . ." (p. 191). Thus, Mann could support an appreciation rationale for art education if it were linked to the creations of God, as opposed to those of man.

This position is further delineated in his 1844 report to the Board of Education, wherein he recommends the teaching of drawing to assist in both handwriting and in the training of workers, but adds that drawing can also develop in the child a "new sense." Mann argues:

Teaching a child to draw, then, is the development in him of a new talent, - the conferring upon him, as it were, of a new sense, - by means of which he is not only better enabled to attend to the common duties of life, and to be more serviceable to his fellow-men, but he is more able to appreciate the beauties and magnificence of nature, which everywhere reflect the glories of the Creator into his soul. When accompanied by appropriate instruction of a moral and religious character, this accomplishment becomes a quickener to devotion. (p. 134)

The context for the word appreciate is key to an understanding of the pedagogical implications of this passage. Teachers are urged to inculcate the aesthetic
impulse in their charges; this is in marked contrast to Fowle's pragmatic stance. Yet, Mann advocates not an appreciation of the fine arts, but an appreciation of the natural world. Teachers are, thus, on the other hand, advised to ignore the creations of humans. One is reminded of Mann's early rap on the knuckles. Mann's final sentence points to a didactic solution; if the student doesn't appreciate "the beauties and magnificence," then the student can be taught them directly in moral and religious instruction. Perhaps the problem with teaching an appreciation of the creations of humankind involves our inability to reduce them to simple lessons; for Mann, this ambiguity could not be resolved.

Yet, Mann was able to eloquently compare the artist's task of creation of a masterpiece with the job of a teacher who has as her task the "formation of the soul." Mary Peabody Mann quotes from a journal entry written by her husband in 1837 in her 1865 biography:

June 22. Spent half an hour to-day in the Aethenaeum Gallery. Some exquisite paintings. What an art! - to vivify canvas, to make colors express soul. By means of language, we can, at best, only communicate ideas one by one. It is as though the ocean were to be shown to a spectator by separate drops. By painting and sculpture we see the whole soul at once: the great ocean of its thoughts and feelings is taken at a glance. No wonder the ancients called the arts "divine." And if it costs the artist so much labor, such sleepless study, such vehement strivings, to draw the outline of form with such wonderful exactness, to color the space within the outline with such exquisite skill, so that a mere trembling of his hand in the delineation, the slightest failure in the touch of his pencil, would mar his productions, - if all this toil and care and dexterity are
requisite to make a dead image, a lifeless, thoughtless, soulless copy of a soul, how much more toil and care are demanded in those who have the formation of the soul itself! (p. 78)

2.2.3 Elizabeth Peabody (1804-1894)

Known in the history of education for her pioneering work in establishing America's first kindergartens, Elizabeth Peabody was also a foremost writer, publisher, and general educator. Her devotion to art and art education merit attention in this study because, as a leading transcendentalist, she was able to resolve the philosophical dilemma posed by Horace Mann. (Mann was married to Elizabeth's sister, Mary Peabody.) As a friend and publisher of Boston's finest writers, Elizabeth shared ideas with Nathaniel Hawthorne, Washington Allston, Chester Harding, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry Thoreau, and Bronson Alcott. In 1830, Peabody joined the staff of Alcott's Temple School. Francis Graeter, a German artist and illustrator and Peabody's close associate, also joined the Temple School staff. Peabody greatly admired Graeter's aesthetic sensibilities and his ability to transmit ideas about beauty to students.

She describes a class in which Graeter used engravings of trees to show how artists portray the dual forces of nature. Peabody reported that she told Graeter that she was surprised at the students' powers of observation. According to Peabody, Graeter responded that:

... it was not the intellectual observation but aesthetic sensibility of which creative genius is the highest manifestation. The great artist in
making his landscape, made no mistake; the Power that creates the universe sets through him, and guides his hand to reproduce what has entranced him. This aesthetic sensibility is genius, and instinctive. On examining the works of Masters, it was found that they verified, as certainly as nature does, the theory of the two forces. (p. 347)

Peabody also recounts a conversation between Graeter and William Emery Channing which resulted in the thought that

... not only our intellect, but our aesthetic sensibility, like our moral sentiment, was no mere affection or transient emotion, but the substantial divinity of the human soul ... the artistic in man is also the divine. (p. 349)

From these remarks we can see that rather than separate the works of God from the works of man, as Horace Mann did, Peabody and Graeter saw both as emanating from the divine. God and man were not in competition.

Given this view, then, one must ask how it was translated into pedagogical practice. Ironically, Peabody and Graeter both advocated the copybook drawing methods that were in vogue as a result of William Bently Fowle's work. However, there were some important differences. Graeter used engraved prints of objects from the natural world (trees, leaves, shells, flowers, etc.) for object lessons on spiritual and human harmony that would precede copying (Saunders, 1961, p. 89). Peabody's methods are best represented in her own textbook entitled A Method of Teaching Linear Drawing Adapted to the Public Schools (1841). Teachers are instructed to copy patterns (squares, triangles, cubes, cylinders, vases, and houses) on the
blackboard; these are then copied by students onto slates or paper. The innovation in this text is the use of some three-dimensional and real-life objects. The Temple School also boasted artistic decoration in the form of plaster casts and borrowed paintings (Wygant, p. 28). By expanding drawing lessons to include objects from the real world and by introducing the contemplative and spiritual into art classes, Graeter and Peabody were supporting an aesthetic rationale for art education, in contrast to a purely utilitarian rationale.

2.3 Utility versus Beauty: The Debate

As has been shown, art education, in the form of drawing, was introduced to early America by William Bently Fowle, who offered the public a utilitarian reason for the teaching of art. Other leading educators, such as Horace Mann, supported the movement to teach drawing, also using a utilitarian rationale. However, in both Fowle and Mann, one can also detect the beginnings of a concern for the cultural aspect of art education. As we have seen, Fowle supported the teaching of appreciation of architecture and Mann grappled with the role of the fine arts in general education. The transcendental movement of the mid-nineteenth century provided philosophical support for an aesthetic and spiritual approach to art teaching. The art curriculum content of Elizabeth Peabody and Philip Graeter's teaching at Bronson Alcott's Temple School was still drawing, but their objective was not wholly utilitarian.
These competing rationales were also being felt in the public schools.

2.3.1 Walter Smith, Art Educator

Under the vigorous leadership of Superintendent John D. Philbrick, the Boston schools had promoted the teaching of drawing in the 1860s. However, Philbrick was realistic about the power of mandates that have no enforcement built into them. The State of Massachusetts had enacted legislation in 1870 requiring public schools to teach drawing and requiring towns of 10,000 or more people to offer free instruction in industrial or mechanical drawing to persons over 15 years of age, and local cities and towns were expected to comply. Boston turned for assistance to meet this mandate to an English art educator named Walter Smith (1836-1886). Since Massachusetts was the first state to require art education and Walter Smith would become a national figure embroiled in the art education debate, it is important to briefly examine his contributions.

The choice of England as a place to find a drawing supervisor made sense. England had been grappling with the issue of providing industry with trained artisans since 1851 and had completely reformed its Schools of Design. British art education historical Stuart Macdonald chronicles the people, places, and events relating to this movement and to its leader, Henry Cole, in his History and Philosophy of Art Education (pp. 129-252). It is not surprising that Boston sought a person trained to serve the needs of industry since
the people who were the political force that had petitioned the Massachusetts State Board of Education in 1869 to provide drawing instruction were connected to the "great branches of mechanical and manufacturing industry" (Green, p. 98). Again, their motivation has been presumed to be wholly self-serving:

The manufacturers wanted only a labor-pool of skilled craftsmen, trained for their benefit at public expense, and so they legislated art into the curriculum. They gave no indication that they acted on behalf of education, or of art, or of the child. (Green, p. 98)

However, as we shall see, there is some evidence to suggest that Louis Prang was an exception to this rule.

In order to lure Smith from his position as art master in Leeds, England, Boston negotiated with the state of Massachusetts for additional funds which resulted in Smith being hired as Director of Drawing for Boston three days a week and as State Director of Art Education for Massachusetts for two days a week. Two years later, he added a sixth day and became director of the country's first institution for art teachers, the Massachusetts Normal Art School. Smith was a prolific writer and speaker and his "organizational brilliance was well-suited to the enormous task of improving American taste, both in the design of industrial products and in the education of the public eye" (Dobbs, 1972, p. 21).

Notwithstanding Smith's great contributions to establishing art as a required subject with a specific scope and
sequence of drawing skills throughout the grades, one must also consider the effect of his views on fine arts education. He clearly distinguished between the fine arts and the industrial arts. He characterized fine arts as pictorial, natural, non-symmetrical, and involved with perspective and variety; the latter were ornamental, conventional, geometrical, repetitional, and symmetrical (Wygant, p. 58). The fine arts were outside the purview of Smith's conception of art education.

Smith's advocacy of art education devoted solely to the industrial rationale did not go unnoticed by those supporting a beauty rationale. Green (1948) cites an 1875 school committee annual report from the city of Boston which characterized those who dissented from Smith's views as those who think Industrial Drawing should, from the first, have in it a pronounced artistic element, and who regard any system as unsatisfactory which does not do what is here impossible, namely, surround children with beautiful forms of art, and lead them to appreciate their most subtle qualities. (p. 152)

An 1877 annual report allows that the "cultivation of the aesthetic instincts . . . by the use of casts, flat copies, and natural objects . . . is encouraged, and when successful, highly appreciated; but it cannot, from the nature of things, be carried very far" (p. 21). The report suggests that students in search of the aesthetic would be better served at Museum of Fine Arts classes.
This argument against aesthetic appreciation was again heard in an 1879 annual report in which the Boston Drawing Committee rebutted that the cost of providing an "artistic element" was a key factor:

Could they manage matters according to their liking they would turn the school rooms into studios, multiply special instructors, and provide fifty thousand children with casts, pictures, and autotypes, as well as colors, charcoal, and other artistic materials . . . We have bare walls and vacant corners in abundance which might be adorned with objects calculated to teach lessons of beauty to the children who would look at them were these, our critics, as eager to give as we are willing to receive. (pp. 3-5)

Besides these critics who advocated a less commercial and more aesthetic approach to art education, Smith also encountered resistance from teachers unwilling to give up time to be trained to teach Smith's system of teaching drawing. He also drew public animosity in his choice of a location for the Normal Art School (Green, p. 145-162). In a bitter public battle, Smith accused a leading Boston entrepreneur, Louis Prang, of staging a plot to have him dismissed. Prang rebutted in the Boston Advertiser (April 11, 1881, p. 1) that Smith was unable to listen to just criticism. By mid-July of 1882, the "plot" had been carried out, ending Smith's ten-year tenure in Massachusetts. He returned to England and died a premature death in 1886. As has been said, there is some evidence that Louis Prang's motives for supporting Smith's demise may have been based on his conviction that the beauty rationale was also appropriate for American art education.
2.3.2 Louis Prang, Industrialist

Although Louis Prang (1824-1909) did contribute to the demise of Walter Smith, he is important to this study because he also was an anomaly. As the owner of a printing business, he had much to gain by the public school training of people proficient in technical drawing. However, Prang also sold reproductions of works of art. Hence, he also stood to gain financially if art education included an "artistic element." There is also some evidence that he believed that art was intrinsically valuable to society and that he wanted to participate in promoting it for altruistic reasons.

As the son of a German calico printer, Louis Prang naturally took up his father's trade and was successfully practicing his craft in Westphalia when he decided to travel to France, Great Britain, and America to study recent technological advances in the field. An early American periodical included Prang in a series entitled "Famous Persons at Home" (Bacon, 1898) and assigns two motives to Prang's trip. "Besides the immediate motive of his journey, the young man carried with him another, - an enthusiastic desire to investigate methods for the amelioration of his fellow creatures, and for the diffusion of liberty of thought, speech, and action" (p. 7). This zeal for reform led Prang to organize a "revolutionary club" in Westphalia in 1848; he was 24 years old. However, the reform movement
was politically unpopular and Prang emigrated to America (via Switzerland) to escape retribution from the government. Once in America, Prang established his own printing business (in Roxbury, Massachusetts) and perfected chromolithography - a complex process that enabled his company to create facsimile reproductions of works of art (Stankiewicz, 1984a, p. 87). Although Prang would become known as the "Father of the American Christmas Card" and would realize much commercial success in selling maps, Valentines, menus, business cards, and fruit and flower prints, he was also devoted to reaching the masses with reproductions of respected art works. McClinton (1973) puts this into perspective:

Although pictures adorned the homes of the wealthy, the mass of Americans knew little of art and the popular taste in art was low; their only pictures were cheap, garish prints. Louis Prang sought to fill this gap and to improve the aesthetic appreciation of the average American. . . . His real interest lay in fine art and the reproduction of the works of recognized artists. (pp. 167-168)

Prang was also committed to improving aesthetic appreciation through his involvement with art education publishing.

In 1882, Prang founded the Prang Educational Company, which produced art materials for drawing and painting and also published textbooks and provided training for teachers (Freeman, p.23). Mary Dana Hicks, an art teacher from New York, joined the company as editor and authored many of its texts. Prang also published Chromo: A Journal of Popular Art, in which he was explicit about his motives:
For many years, it has been our dream by day and by night to popularize art and art ideas in the homes of our America, - not alone because of any financial benefit likely to accrue from it, but from higher aims of contributing more . . . to promote the social pleasures of our countrymen. (p. 4)

Thus we can see that Louis Prang's contribution to the utility/beauty debate was unique in that Prang was an industrialist who supported both rationales. He could see the need for trained technical draftsmen who could carry out the printing tasks in his factory and he could support the aesthetic dimension of art education both for altruistic reasons and because a populace made aware of fine arts would be more likely to purchase reproductions sold by his company. Prang could also support the proliferation of art education courses with the textbooks published by his subsidiary Prang Educational Company. Again, this effort satisfied both his entrepreneurial spirit and, by ensuring that the texts presented an art education balanced in both technical and artistic/appreciative skills, his concern for the common good.

2.3.3 William Torrey Harris, Commissioner

Advocates of an art education that went beyond the simple teaching of technical drawing were also supported by a popular philosophical movement called idealism that had its modern historic roots in the works of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). (The transcendentalists were also idealists but their movement was only extant from about 1830-1855.) American education was to feel the influence of
the idealist philosophy through the life and works of
William Torrey Harris (1835-1908), the nation's fourth
Commissioner of Education.

According to Lawrence A. Cremin, Harris was able to
reconcile his traditional Christian upbringing with the
impinging findings of science by embracing Hegelian thought
(p. 16). Harris held that "the human mind joins the
individual to an essentially spiritual universe, with
education aiming to unfold the child's divine potential
toward unity with that spirituality" (Wygant, p. 77). In
this view, the role of art is to express the Absolute in
finite terms; what is beautiful is an approximation of the
Ideal. "When we enjoy a work of art, say the idealists, it
is because, on the one hand, we see it as a true
representation of the Ideal; and on the other hand, it
serves to bring us closer with the Ideal" (Rosen, p. 19).

During his 17-year tenure as Commissioner of Education,
Harris wrote in support of cultural art education. In his
1897 essay entitled "Why Art and Literature Ought to be
Studied in Elementary Schools," Harris places art "among the
fundamental activities of the soul" which also include
religion and philosophy, which resonates with Platonic
ideals of the good, the beautiful, and the true (p. 325).
Harris reminds his readers again that art is to be taken
seriously and must be removed from the realm of simple
amusement and considered one of the "most serious and worthy
occupations of the soul" (p. 325). This view is in marked
contrast to the utilitarian stance in which art education was conceived in strictly narrow vocational terms. Art education was now being asked to serve the soul as well as the economy.

Harris recommends that teachers choose classic Greek and Roman art as well as "Romantic" art, which began with Christianity. He advises teachers to avoid "Symbolic" art which would include the art of Egypt, Eastern Asia, East India, Persia, and Western Asia (p. 326). These recommendations are based on Hegelian aesthetic theory. In a practical vein, he mentions that a "Mr. Prang of Boston" has made available to schools a model of the eastern facade of the Parthenon and that photographic reproductions of religious works by Raphael, Holbein, and Da Vinci are also available (p. 326). Harris concludes with a specific pedagogical recommendation that is important for this study:

If these photographs of architecture, sculpture, and painting are made to adorn the walls of the school-room, they will produce a permanent effect on the pupil's mind in the way of refining his taste, even if no studies are made of the motives that the artist has brought into their composition. . . . Art and literature preserve for us the precious moments, the elevated insight of seers who are, next to the religious seers, the greatest teachers of the human race. (pp. 332-333)

This was written in 1897, a time when Walter Smith's critics, such as Louis Prang, had gained ascendancy in the debate as to whether art education should serve cultural and spiritual needs of the populace or whether it should simply serve to train draftsmen. Clearly, the United States
Commissioner of Education leant support to those who supported the beauty rationale. It is also important to note that Harris refers to classroom "adornment" as one vehicle for educators to consider. (This community movement to decorate classrooms will be taken up in detail in Section 2.4.) This is important since Harris has also leant national credibility to a movement to bring reproductions of fine art into the classroom. Having reproductions in and available to classrooms was a first step in establishing an educational niche for art appreciation. The next step was using those reproductions for explicit pedagogical purposes.

With the support of industry in the provision of reproductions that could be used in schools and with the philosophical and political support of leaders such as William Torrey Harris, pictures and the beauty rationale made further incursions into the schools. At the same time that Prang was promoting the appreciation of pictures for the betterment of mankind and William Torrey Harris was speaking about the spiritual importance of exposure to art, artists and community people were placing art in classrooms, thereby laying the foundation for a formal, pedagogical approach to the study of pictures.

2.4 Schoolroom Decoration with Pictures

As we have seen, by the turn of the century the debate regarding the inclusion of the "artistic element" into art education had resulted in general approbation of the idea by the Commissioner of Education. As was noted above, William
Torrey Harris approved of the idea of placing reproductions of fine art objects in the nation's classrooms (1897). He, however, was not the first educator to suggest this idea. As has been noted, the transcendentalists addressed this issue in Boston's Temple School and, as Dobbs (1972) has shown, the issue was also addressed as early as 1840 in Horace Mann's *Common School Journal*. Also noted above are the Boston Drawing Committee's reports of 1875 and 1879, in which the committee complains about pressures from people concerned about aesthetic education and their underfunded efforts to place reproductions of fine art objects into classrooms. One of the first documented efforts to place reproductions of fine art objects in a public school occurred in Boston's Girls' High School in 1870 (Bailey, 1913, p. 88).

Although these events mark the beginning of the Schoolroom Decoration Movement, the most concerted efforts to make classrooms aesthetically pleasing came from Ross Turner, a Salem (Massachusetts) artist who was later dubbed "Father of Schoolroom Decoration" (Bailey, 1913, p. 88). An 1892 *Boston Sunday Herald* (unpaginated) reprint describes in detail Turner's Phillips School project in which he garnered community support through subscriptions in order to place casts and reproductions in the school. In 1893, Turner was asked by the Boston schools to help form the Boston Public School Art League. In 1908, Burnham reported that similar leagues had been started soon thereafter across the country:
in Chicago in 1893; in Worcester, Massachusetts in 1895; in Denver in 1898; and in Evanston, Illinois in 1901 (pp. 368-373).

Evidence for the forces that motivated those involved in the leagues can be divided into four categories which, for the purposes of this study, will be termed the social impetus, the decorative impetus, the spiritual impetus, and the pedagogical impetus. Lawrence Cremin notes that "To look back on the nineties is to sense an awakening of social conscience, a growing belief that . . . suffering . . . could certainly be alleviated . . ." (p. 59). This awakening was realized in the formation of many kinds of associations, civic commissions, leagues, and reform societies. Many of the participants were upper class women such as Chicago's Jane Addams, who spearheaded a project to turn dehumanized industrial workers into artist-laborers. Their vehicle for reform was often the public school and art was deemed a powerful tool. "A spirit of art, nurtured by the school, could ultimately infuse the whole productive process, raising it from the narrowest domination of men by machines to a genuinely human enterprise" (Cremin, p. 62).

There is good evidence that this social motivation served those who wanted to bring fine art reproductions into the classroom. The Boston Sunday Herald (1892) ascribes Ross Turner with the belief that it is important to serve the needs of the "great mass of the people" rather than cultivate the "patronage and appreciation of the
comparatively few who have means and leisure" (unpaginated). The Boston Public School Art League (1898) aimed to "ennoble the surroundings of school life, to give the children a glimpse of a finer world" (p. 1). The league also noted that many other women's groups had also "taken up the work" of decorating the schools (p. 10). The Herald also advises the Boston group to begin their work in the "poorer sections of the city . . . where the children have the least opportunity to see beautiful objects, and where the effect would therefore be likely to be most marked" (unpaginated). Turner (1900) also addressed the needs of poor rural schools.

A second impetus for the schoolroom decoration movement came from the Victorian impulse to adorn surfaces which was partially rooted in world expositions which educated American taste. Charles W. Elliot, President of Harvard University, wrote in 1905, in an essay ("Beauty and Democracy") reprinted in an art education journal, that Puritan denial of the need for beauty should be replaced with its cultivation (p. 3). He advises his readers to cultivate this sense of beauty in observation of the sky, the landscape, and in man-made structures. "To go to school in a house well designed and well decorated gives a pleasure to the pupils which is an important part of their training" (p. 7). And John Cotton Dana, eminent librarian, wrote in the same journal in 1906 ("Relation of Art to American Life") regarding a New Jersey schoolroom decoration project:
Schoolroom decoration came our way about this time, and we began to put up in rooms these inexpensive prints... things such as almost the poorest child can hope to have in his own home. In how many homes to-day hang lithographic, crayon, and steel plated horrors! (p. 11)

We can see that this attention to providing school children with well-decorated spaces in which to learn also was rooted in a concern that all children be exposed to minimum standards of taste.

The third impetus for introducing the art reproductions into classrooms can be characterized as the spiritual impulse. As has been noted, the prevalent idealistic educational philosophy promoted by people such as William Torrey Harris offered a belief in the spiritual side of man. In his 1899-1900 "Report of the Commissioner of Education," Harris wrote:

I sincerely trust that the school committee of the future will consider the furnishing of the walls of the schoolroom as much a part of its duty as furnishing desks and books, for as Americans we have developed too much of one side, considering nothing but that which appeals to us as practical, and ignoring that through which the glory of the past has been handed down to us. (p. 344)

A leader in the Boston movement, writing about schoolroom decoration, also averred that "Art is the outward manifestation of all that religion teaches..." (Page, 1898, p. 69). Both Harris and Page address the side of humankind that is in opposition to the utilitarian and material.

The fourth impetus, which will be further discussed in the following section, is the pedagogical. As has been
shown, schoolroom decoration was undertaken for the most part by people outside of the schoolroom. The role of the classroom teacher was not easily resolved. If this movement were to go beyond sophisticated interior decorating, there was the realization that teachers had to be involved.

Attention had been paid to the instructional possibilities inherent in the reproductions of fine arts objects. Walter Gilman Page had complained that "because a room contains pictures and casts, it does not follow that it goes beyond the point of mere decoration" (Page, 1898b, p. 317). Ross Turner was explicit in his recommendation:

The decorations of a school building should be on a higher plane and very different from those commonly used in domestic or public buildings. They should be, first, of the highest order of art; second, they should be educational and represent the best thought in the past history of the world in the form of architecture, art pure and simple, and historical associations. (1900, p. 204)

The decoration schemes that resulted from Turner's view of the didactic potential of schoolroom decorations included thematic rooms dedicated to topics such as ancient Greece and Rome, revolutionary America, and the Italian Renaissance. Yet, thematic content did not ensure that students would make connections, nor use the artworks for learning. Walter Gilman Page remarks in 1898 that "Not much thought . . . has been spent upon the part the teacher should play in school-room decoration . . . results can only be obtained through the teacher's interest" (1898a, pp. 69-70). The involvement of the teacher and the shift of this
movement from community-led social reform to teacher-involved art education revolved around the work of Henry Turner Bailey.

2.5 Synthesis: The Birth of Picture Study

As has been seen in this chapter, the pioneers in art education had to grapple with the issue of whether the field would serve the utilitarian needs of industry and simply teach technical drawing, or whether it would also serve the needs of the "artistic element." From the early utilitarian stance of William Bently Fowle and Walter Smith to the aesthetic stance of the transcendentalists and idealists, we can see that throughout this period a debate was waged, with no clear winners. Technical drawing continued to be taught and the fine arts made their way into the classroom through community efforts to adorn walls with reproductions of art. However, until teachers actually taught with or through these fine art reproductions, they would remain as decorations. The importance of this shift from fine arts passively adorning walls to the explicit use of them for educational purposes marks the birth of picture study which was a pedagogical movement with the explicit objective of teaching art appreciation. Picture study could not have grown without the preceding work of those concerned with introducing the "artistic element" into the classroom; they laid the foundation for art educators who would develop a pedagogy for appreciation.
In 1913, Henry T. Bailey, editor of the influential School Arts journal from 1903 until 1917, assigned the year 1897 as the official date of birth for the picture study movement. As we have seen, people such as Ross Turner and Walter Gilman Page had suggested that pictures and casts placed in classrooms for decoration also had educational potential. However, Bailey credits himself with having made the explicit recommendation in 1897 that the pictures hung for decoration could also be used "to give children an intelligent appreciation of pictorial art" (Bailey, 1913, p. 89). As Massachusetts' state Supervisor of Industrial Drawing from 1887 until 1903, Bailey was in a unique position to make that recommendation and, later, to support the movement he spawned through his editorship of School Arts. He was also educationally aligned with William Torrey Harris' philosophy of idealism, which provided him with a philosophical foundation for his beliefs regarding the importance of teaching art appreciation. (See Stankiewicz, 1987, for a convincing argument for the Harris/Bailey connection.)

Soon after the birth of picture study, Louis Prang published a series of art education textbooks (1898-1899) that included chapters on picture study. Although these were not discrete picture study textbooks such as those that we will examine in Chapter 3, they are worthy of attention since they combine art production and art appreciation in a single, aesthetically pleasing text. In the teacher's
It is hoped that this little book may help the teacher to bring the children new truths, new beauties, new possibilities, through knowledge, skill, and acquaintance with the beautiful in nature and in art, so that their ideals may from day to day grow broader, purer, and higher. (p. iv)

The twelve chapters of the text include material on seeing color, on illustrative drawing, on paperfolding and on sewing and decorating. The final chapter, entitled "Picture Days," is devoted to art appreciation and includes the recommendation that teachers set aside one or two days a month to study pictures (p. 97). Earlier in the text, Hicks recommends that the teacher "study the beauties of Art so that she may select for her children objects and examples and pictures that show in themselves the thought and desire and power of men to create the beautiful" (p. 2). Hicks chose two Millet pictures for the first book of the series. The other texts in this series, which span first through seventh grades, follow a similar ten chapter format, integrating production of art products with appreciation.

Given that teachers could use the reproductions to teach "an intelligent appreciation," one must next consider what methods they would employ. Henry Turner Bailey clearly outlines his recommendations in a series of articles written for The Perry Magazine in 1899-1900. He moves from "The Picture Itself" (1899a) to "The First Lesson" (1899b) to
"The Child and the Masterpiece" (1900a), and "The Use of Pictures in the Public Schools" (1900b). Given Bailey's leadership in the picture study movement, we will look briefly at his recommendations as both a reflection of the historic precedents of the movement and as a presaging of issues that would be raised as the movement matured.

Bailey begins his series with a slight reproach to readers not to take masterpieces for granted. "To have the masterpieces of art upon the walls and the masters' names in memory may mean no more than to have the masterpieces of literature upon one's shelves, and to know them by their bindings" (p.169). He advises appreciators to take time with the masterpiece so that "its calm spirit comes not forth in haste, nor pride, nor vanity" (p. 169). Warning his readers that art appreciation must go beyond the intellectual into the spiritual realm, he remarks:

We may read about it and be told about it, we may learn its history and appreciate its technical qualities, but we shall not know it until it has spoken to each of us directly, until it has brought to our spirit a personal message too tender for words. (p. 170)

This, of course, resonates with the transcendentalist and idealist concern for unity with the Absolute through art. Thus, we can see that Bailey is urging teachers to approach art appreciation with a kind of spiritual reverence, as opposed to a utilitarian instrumentalism.

This reverential tone is also evident in the title of a series of four articles about picture study written by G.
Stanley Hall in 1900-1901 for *The Perry Magazine*. Entitled "The Ministry of Pictures," the series is a philosophical rationale for picture study that concludes with the remark that "The most important ministry of pictures, then, is the education of the heart, - in teaching the young to love, fear, scorn, admire those things most worthy of being loved, feared, scorned, admired" (1900, p. 388).

In his second article, Bailey responds to a query that he probably heard often in his state supervisory role: "How shall I begin the picture study?" Bailey models a lesson using Henri Lerolle's *The Shepherdess*; the lesson includes sections on the story, the composition and the artist, but he maintains his metaphysical stance with his remark about the power of the picture to help the viewer to attain a state in which the viewer's "immortal spirit may dwell in the realm of eternal peace and beauty" (p. 63). Bailey's division of the picture study lesson into sections on the artist (art history), on composition (art criticism), and on the story, would become typical picture study format.

In his third article (1900b), he begins to uncover a controversy among art appreciation advocates. He characterizes the camps as the "Laissez faire" group and the "Let us teach" group. The former want to "let it (art) speak for itself" while the latter want to "lead the child into all truth" (p. 362). Bailey allows that there is room for both views and quotes Platonic dialogue between Socrates and Protarchus which concludes with "Oh, Socrates, there is
wonderful difference in the clearness of different sorts of knowledge" (p. 365). This resolution may have been satisfactory for Bailey, but it was (and is) an issue that would continue to be debated. During this era, the "Laissez faire" attitude may have had its roots in the fact that many pictures placed in schoolrooms for decoration were placed by artists and upper-class women who didn't expect, nor want, the teachers to analyze them.

In his final article (1900b), Bailey would address another key issue in art appreciation education: which pictures should teachers choose for appreciation? According to Bailey, many poor choices were already hanging on schoolroom walls; he advocated a "second cleansing of the temple" and believed that the poor choices would be "exorcised by the advent of the masterpieces" (p. 441). (Section 3.3 will address this question further.) Picture study advocates would eventually develop graded picture study lists to guide teachers. Advocates would also approach publishers and, during the same years that Henry T. Bailey wrote these articles, the first discrete picture study textbooks were published, indicative of the momentum the movement had gained since its birth in 1897.
3.1 Introduction

Soon after Henry T. Bailey recommended that pictures decorating classroom walls should also be used for explicit educational purposes, a number of discrete picture study textbooks as well as a picture study journal were published. The earliest text (1898) was published for teachers by the Prang Educational Company; within a year, the Macmillan Company published a competitor, complete with an accompanying student text. Besides picture study textbooks, a picture study journal was also extant during this period, indicating widespread interest in the study of pictures. Documentation of this movement is also provided by a national study published in 1908. This chapter will show, by means of textbook analysis and complementary support material, that picture study was a serious pedagogical movement with a body of works for study and a repertoire of methods.

The content for picture study was masterpieces of art. A cross-comparison of the textbooks for picture choice shows that there was consensus regarding which artists were worthy of study and some agreement as to which works should be studied. The pictures fall into three thematic categories: pictures of the natural and rural world, pictures of people
across the ages and pictures containing religious images. Although the methodology for teaching about pictures differs stylistically, most picture study lessons included a didactic art history component as well as an analytical art criticism component. This, of course, resonates with the discipline-based art education movement of today. It is also an approach that was easily reducible to a textbook format and to methods and content that would be readily accessible to the teaching corps that, by today's standards, was academically unsophisticated.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section is devoted to a review and analysis of three picture study textbooks that were extant between 1898 and 1914. Although there is mention of these textbooks in the art education history literature, scant attention has been paid to the content of the textbooks. The second section of the chapter is a comparison and classification of the pictures chosen for study. The third section considers the place of picture study in the art education curriculum at the beginning of the twentieth century. Thus, picture study is documented as a discrete art education movement, replete with its own distinct textbooks, teaching materials, journal and pedagogy.

3.2 The Textbook Approach

3.2.1 *How to Enjoy Pictures* by M. S. Emery (1898)

In *How to Enjoy Pictures*, published by the Prang Educational Company, elementary classroom teachers could find
reproductions and information, arranged thematically, about more than fifty works of art. Emery avers: "As among books, so among pictures, the best names are almost always a safe guide-board pointing the way to a Palace Beautiful whose windows look out towards the Delectable Mountains" (p. 5). Emery's "best names" included Botticelli, Da Vinci, Michelangelo, Titian, Raphael, Rembrandt, Ruysdael, Maas, Rubens, Van Dyck, Holbein, Velasquez, Murillo, Corot, Millet, Bonheur, Turner, and Burne-Jones. The author interweaves both personal interpretation and factual art history content into lively narratives about each work of art. She compares and contrasts landscapes by Ruysdael and Corot; she urges readers to study the bones and skin of Rosa Bonheur's oxen in Ploughing in the Nivernais and she wonders aloud if Mona Lisa's smile is that of "one of those strange, fascinating creatures who could poison her husband, strangle her babies, and stick an opportune dagger into the heart of an unfaithful lover, all the while walking before the world with a show of virtuous calm" (p. 76). In the Mona Lisa piece, as with other pictures, she includes biographical data about the artist and a lengthy quotation from art critic Walter Pater (pp. 79-81).

The study of a picture's composition was also part of Emery's recommended methodology; however, this was accomplished in an informal, conversational way. She recognized that many would not approve of intellectual analysis: "It is possible that these pages may come to the
notice of picture lovers . . . to whom the analytic interpretation of a work of art seems a species of sacrilege and disenchantment" (p. 6). Undaunted by those who would be critical, Emery offers her readers analysis. An example is her commentary on *The Madonna and Christ Child* by Sandro Botticelli (1447-1515). After expeditiously providing us, in a short footnote, with biographical information about Botticelli, she launches into five paragraphs of description and interpretation of the painting. She helps readers appreciate such details as the sinuous curve of the Madonna's neck and the position of the child's hand on it, the "studded clasps and covers and silken wrappings" of a book resting on a table in the left corner of the canvas, and the backdrop of the western sky after sunset (p. 145). Emery illustrates Botticelli's curvilinear composition with a pen and ink sketch that shows the movement of the predominant lines (pp. 149-150).

M. S. Emery's use of compositional analysis paralleled a movement lead by a prominent art educator, Arthur Wesley Dow, who taught at Columbia Teachers College from 1904-1922. His text, *Composition*, first published in 1899 and later appearing in 12 editions, characterized composition as a system of art instruction that "leads to appreciation of all forms of art and of the beauty of nature" (p. 4). By emphasizing the structure or form of an artwork, Dow challenged those who would relate only to the subject represented. Art education researcher Foster Wygant relates
the popularity of Dow's book to contemporary art trends toward abstraction (p. 105). By emphasizing the form of an artwork, one could begin to appreciate works that were all form with no subject represented. Compositional analysis was also supported by Henry Turner Bailey and William T. Harris. In 1897, Harris recommended that "On stated occasions, say twice a month, explain to the pupils the motives that the artist has depicted in the composition of his pictures - for the composition is the first thing to study in a work of art" (p. 332).

The strength of the Emery text is her enthusiastic embrace of each of the "ways into" a work of art. She skillfully interweaves art history, professional art criticism, structural analysis, and personal response to works of art into a unified narrative. Each of her commentaries stands today as a readable, entertaining way to become familiar with masterpieces. However, Emery urges teachers to venture beyond *How to Enjoy Pictures*. Claiming that "This little volume is not offered as a contribution to art criticism," she provides a bibliography with more than 30 entries (p. 1). What she does claim to offer is one path to understanding, a path that combines personal interpretation with some authoritative commentary, and a path that also combines art history with critical analysis:

While it may be true that the most richly gifted or highly cultivated sensibility often takes in the beauty and the spiritual significance of a picture with unconscious aesthetic recognition and appreciation, it remains also true that different people have very different ways of absorbing ideas
and feelings and of enjoying these. There cannot reasonably be one exclusive highway to be followed by us all. (p. 6)

3.2.2 Picture Study in Elementary Schools by Lucy Langdon Williams Wilson (1899, 1900)

Wilson's *Picture Study in Elementary Schools*, published by the Macmillan Company, provided teachers of primary level (grades one to five) and teachers of the grammar level (grades six to nine) with student textbooks that contained a group of pictures arranged for study by months. Included in the primary course of study were five artworks per school month, grouped around the following themes: home and school, preparation for winter and Thanksgiving, Christmas, great masters, modern masters, vacation days in other lands, and nature. A similar monthly thematic format was followed for the grammar level textbooks.

Whereas Emery depended on teachers to begin their study of art appreciation with her narratives, then move into other sources, with the ultimate goal of weaving what they had learned into their own personal picture study lesson, Wilson recommends a "laissez faire" attitude. Wilson also suggests that teachers study the straightforward information she provides and "with the aid of the bibliography . . . she can drink still deeper from the Pierian spring." However, "This is not that she may teach the child more, but rather that she may teach him less" (1899, p. xxvii). Picture study advocates hotly debated this issue of how much information to impart to their charges. In 1907, a School
Arts Book writer argued that "A great work of art always possesses (a) quality of eloquence . . . children may be trusted to understand provided they are not asked to view it through the lens of mediocre instruction" (Hagarty, p. 386). In keeping with this philosophy, Wilson offers minimal direction in her "Method" section for each work of art. What she does offer, besides a bibliography for each work and artist, is a series of passages from art historians and art critics. She also provides biographical material about the artist.

Wilson's "Method" section is relegated to a few lines that characteristically suggest that the teacher share a bit about the artist's life and ask some meager questions about the subject matter of the artwork. The following, from the method section on the painting *The Mill*, by Rembrandt, guides sixth to ninth grade teachers:

> Of what is this a picture? What is the state of the weather? Why do you think so? Look at the sky; at the arms of the mill; at the water; at the people; at the cow; at the boat. What indication does each of these give of the coming storm? Do you like the picture? Why? Who painted it? Tell them so much of his life as you think suitable. (p. 181)

In contrast to Emery's approach, which unifies art history and art criticism in an informal, conversational text, Wilson segregates the words of the authorities from her own distillation of the artist's life and further separates the role of the teacher by placing teacher-directed questions in a sparse section at the end of the section. Unlike Emery's
spirited, provocative interpretation of the *Mona Lisa*, Wilson suggests comparing it to a Crivelli painting, offering students biographical data about Da Vinci, and then deprecates her audience by suggesting that "If now they (the students) are not full of enthusiasm for the beautiful lady, then it must be because you yourself are destitute of imagination, for childhood revels in mysteries" (1900, p. 80). Whereas Emery's enthusiasm infuses her writing about art and she expects this spirit to be contagious and to in turn inspire teachers to generate it in their students, Wilson offers us much erudite information but leaves us destitute of feeling for the works of art.

One can appreciate the contrasting pedagogies by examining how Emery and Wilson handle the same Botticelli painting, *Madonna and the Christ Child*, which Wilson calls *Madonna of the Louvre*. As was mentioned above, Emery sensitively weaves together a narrative that includes aspects of art history, art criticism, and compositional analysis through line drawing illustration. Wilson begins her section with a bibliography which is followed by a quotation, without comment, from John Ruskin. Finally, Wilson offers a brief, dry commentary that is basically a list of objects and people represented and a few languid paragraphs about Botticelli's life. Her "Method" section consists of the following:

Of whom is this a picture? How do you know? How is she holding the Christ-child? (Note that she nowhere touches his flesh.) How is St. John

One can easily condemn this dry approach and agree with Wilson's contemporary, Laura Dunbar Hagarty, that

The practice of naming and describing the details of a picture without unifying them, and so making them contribute to the dominant thought the master wished to express, is analogous to taking the measurements of a great statue without being in the least impressed by the message the sculptor intended to convey. (1907, p. 387)

Yet, in fairness to Wilson, whose texts were reprinted twice, she urged teachers to read and synthesize the materials themselves and to communicate to students only that information deemed essential. However, it is this writer's contention that she failed in providing teachers with a good model for this process. The commercial success of the Wilson picture study textbooks was undoubtedly due to their format and straightforward "cookbook" methodology. Reproductions of artworks were provided for students in the pupil books and methods consisted of a few unchallenging questions. It was a neat package, comparable to today's worksheets and workbooks, that required little preparation and thought.

3.2.3 How to Show Pictures to Children by Estelle M. Hurll (1914)

How to Show Pictures to Children, published by the Houghton Mifflin Company, was written for parents as well as for teachers. Hurll's emphasis in this volume is not teaching methodology nor the imparting of art historical and art critical material, but rather the appropriate choice of
pictures for appreciation. Hurll decries didacticism in picture study (p. 16), but joins Wilson in recommending that teachers and parents study art history and criticism so that they can better choose pictures and "little by little" impart what they have learned to their charges. This imparting of knowledge is, again, to be done with care since "The art of teaching at its highest point is an art of concealing art" (p. 16).

One can participate in this "concealing art" by introducing children to masterpieces through games and storytelling. Since many of the pictures recommended by Hurll are pictures of people, she recommends picture-posing or tableaux vivant (p. 43). Hurll reports on an experience using this technique with primary school children. Using six large reproductions (Millet's Sower, Titian's Lavinia, Murillo's Fruit Vendors, Le Brun's Madame Le Brun and Her Daughter, Rubens' Two Sons, and William M. Chase's Alice), students were carefully posed to mimic the people in the paintings.

The social service mentality of some picture study authors can be read into Hurll's comments about the suitability of the children, who come from a "slum neighborhood," posing as fine art models. "It might seem an unfavorable field for an art experiment . . . we did not let such difficulties deter us. These sons of toil need picture study, even more than the children of the rich, to bring beauty into starved lives" (p. 45). The difficulties that
Hum refers to included poor clothing and unclean bodies. Undaunted, Hurll and the classroom teacher had a thin girl change dresses with a plump girl so that she could play the part of Titian's Lavinia holding her bountiful tray of fruit far above her head.

The study of composition receives short shrift in Hurll's book. Although she writes about the three elements of principality, repetition, and contrast in a chapter entitled "How the Picture is Made," she concludes by saying that it is better if children feel the flow of the line in activities such as picture posing and adds that "The critical analysis of a picture would be a sad process if it were the end object of our interest" (p. 25). Again, Hurll's major interest is choice of pictures. Most of her attention is devoted to recommending artworks that have subject matter appeal as well as artistic merit. By attending only to subjects represented and by developing activities that further enhance this attention to representational art and by arguing against intellectual analysis of artworks, Hurll is at the opposite end of the spectrum from M. S. Emery who argues for a balance.

3.3 Which Pictures to Study? A Comparison of Choices

In order to document patterns of picture choice in the early picture study texts, lists of recommended artists and pictures from the three texts were compiled and cross-referenced. First, artist lists were compiled from the Emery and Wilson texts. The following artists appeared on
both lists: Botticelli, Raphael, Passini, Da Vinci, Michelangelo, Titian, Millet, Corot, Troyon, Bonheur, Geoffrey, Bastien-LePage, Rubens, Van Dyck, Rembrandt, Ruisdael, Velasquez, Murillo, Holbein, Turner, Burne-Jones, and Sargent. This is not surprising, since many of those listed were (and still are) considered "old masters"; others on the list were contemporary favorites. Since the Hurll text contained extensive lists, the above names were cross-referenced to ascertain if Hurll also included this list. As expected, most of the artists listed above are also in the Hurll text.

Next, the titles of the pictures recommended for study were compiled and cross-referenced. Again, the Emery and Wilson texts were tabulated first and the Hurll text was used for confirmation of findings. Interestingly, both authors chose not only similar lists of artists, but also chose 12 of the same pictures: Botticelli's Madonna and St. John, Millet's Shepherdess Knitting, Corot's The Willows, Troyon's The Return to the Farm, Bonheur's Ploughing, Geoffrey's Primary School in Brittany, Bastien-LePage's Jeanne d'Arc, Maes' The Spinner, Velasquez' Aesop, Murillo's Holy Family, and Turner's The Fighting Temeraire. A review of the pictures addressed in both the picture study journal The Perry Magazine (1898-1906) and in The School Arts Book (during Henry Turner Bailey's editorship of 1903-1917) confirms the finding that, although picture enthusiasts
differed on attitudes toward picture study methodologies, they agreed on picture choice.

Since the subject matter represented in the works of art was of importance to many picture study enthusiasts and was the basis for picture selection for some, a study was made of the subject matter represented in the pictures chosen by Emery and Wilson. Three major categories emerged and were corroborated with the Hurll text. The Natural and Rural World category accounted for 63 pictures. This category includes landscapes, animal pictures, and genre pictures of country life. Portraits and images of legendary and/or historical figures constitutes the second category called People Across the Ages. Thirty-four pictures are in this category. The final group is Religious Images and accounts for 22 pictures.

3.3.1 Pictures of the Natural and Rural World

The champion of nature study in art education was Henry Turner Bailey (Dobbs, 1972b, p. 48). By espousing the use of natural objects as models for drawing lessons, as opposed to geometric line and shapes, Bailey led the movement toward the pictorial and fine arts and away from the industrial (Green, p. 238). This renewed interest in the natural world could be traced to the influence of Froebel, Pestalozzi, Francis Parker, and the Oswego Movement. However, in art education, the movement first felt this influence in the articles published in School Arts and in the general art textbooks published by the Prang Educational Company in the
early 1900s. The Perry Magazine also promoted nature study with a series of articles by S. E. Brassill, the first published in October 1899, and later articles on bird study, field study, domestic animals, and school gardens. In picture study, the natural and rural world was celebrated with reproductions of paintings depicting lakes, willows, sunsets, moonlit skies, mountains, shepherds and shepherdesses, haymakers, ploughers, oxen, cats, dogs, and horses.

As Cremin points out in his Transformation of the School, there was a great difference between the needs of the urban schools filled with the children of recent immigrants and the rural schools that were still barely functioning as poor one-room schoolhouses (pp. 75-85). This fact wasn't lost on the urban picture study writers. James Frederick Hopkins, Director of Drawing in Boston, wrote in The Perry Magazine in 1898 that "the city child is interested in a preponderance of pictures illustrating the open country; while the country boy may turn with equal interest to something less suggestive of the scenes with which he is so familiar" (1898a, p. 5). In a later article (1899), he reiterates his contention that city children need exposure to outdoor life: "for the city child the beauties of the season must be brought far too often by the interest aroused in pictures . . . Concerning almost every example might be easily hazarded the guess of the tenement urchin who after studying most carefully a certain picture,
ventured the statement, 'It must be the country; it don't look like any place I ever seen'" (p. 196).

The works of the French Barbizon painters provided city teachers with paintings of country life that would introduce their students to an idealized view of that distant rural world. The works of a French peasant who became a painter became classic favorites in picture study. Jean Francois Millet (1814-1875), whose life could be an object lesson in the joys and toil of rural versus urban living, spent the last 25 years of his life in the rural village of Barbizon, France, painting peasants at work and rest. It is these paintings, many of which were acquired by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, that made their way into most picture study texts and lists. In a 1907 "Picture Study Symposium," published in School Arts, Ida Hood Clark, a Milwaukee supervisor, recommends Millet's pictures for primary grade students. "His pictures are humanistic, natural, strong, and crude, all characteristics that appeal to children . . . Children are fond of nature and Millet derived his art directly from nature" (pp. 486-487). Clara Louise Strong recommends Millet's The Sower and The Angelus and speaks of the nobility, reverence, and "heroism in humble life" elicited by the paintings (1904, p. 20). This marriage of natural world subject matter with the depiction of spiritual, pious people was well suited to the idealistic philosophy of many picture study adherents who were also
being asked by leading educational theorists to consider the concrete world of the senses.

If we could but take the children to the hayfield to frolic upon the new-mown hay, what lively interest would be manifested in the subsequent introduction of the beautiful hayfield scenes of Dupré. After a visit to a farm and a near view of the farm animals . . . what delight would every child exclaim . . . (Strong, 1904, p. 22)

With these words, Clara Louise Strong offers her list of farm animal paintings and, later, domestic animal paintings for the teacher to choose from. Many nineteenth century French painters, some from the Barbizon School, provided farm animal images. Rosa Bonheur's *Brittany Sheep* and Troyon's *Oxen Going to Their Work* are typical of this sub-category. Domestic animals, particularly cats, were also popular subjects for picture study. Both Hurll and Wilson recommend *Girl With a Cat* by German artist Hoecker, and Wilson also recommends *The Cat Family* by "one of the many Raphaels of Cats" (1898, p. 8).

The third sub-category of works reflecting the natural and rural worlds is landscape painting. Hurll did not advocate the use of landscape painting in her text. She maintained that children were better off playing out-of-doors than looking at pictures of bright light and air:

Landscape art pure and simple does not interest the average child to any extent. The love of nature in early years is due in a measure to the exhilarating effect of air and sunshine. The great out-of-doors is a glorious playground in which the child delights to sport like any other healthy young animal . . . In the mean time we can hardly expect a pictured out-of-doors to produce the same effect that the world of nature does on a child. (pp. 10-11)
Wilson and Emery did not concur with this point of view and included Rembrandt, Corot, and Ruysdael landscapes in their texts. Wilson suggests that study of Corot's *The Willows* "might profitably follow a nature lesson on the willows," presaging a progressive art education method that will be reviewed in the next chapter. She ends by quoting Ruskin's description of "silvery fountains transfixed in air" as a poetic interpretation of the painting (1898, p. 180).

Thus, we can see that picture study could reflect the concerns expressed by other education and art movements of the times. Picture study did not exist in an elite vacuum in the school curriculum; it could be used to enhance the value of nature study or to reinforce a popular nostalgia for the simplicities of rural life. Furthermore, it could do so with an unbridled enthusiasm that was discouraged by more factual or skill-based lessons. This enthusiasm for beauty and for the natural world is captured in lines from a poem by James Nack that accompanied Corot's *The Willows* in the Wilson primary pupil's book:

All is beauty,
All is mirth,
All is glory upon earth-
Shout we then with Nature's voice,-
Welcome Spring!
Rejoice! Rejoice!

(1900, p. 90)

3.3.2 Pictures of People Across the Ages

The second major class of subject matter represented in the pictures chosen for the Emery, Wilson, and Hurll texts
is "People Across the Ages." The point of studying the images chosen for picture study is to ascertain not only if there are similarities among the texts, thereby building a case that picture study was a discrete educational movement with its own body of knowledge to impart and methods to employ, but also to ascertain if the movement related to other trends in general culture and education. As we have seen, nature study in the schools and the romantic return to rural life influenced the choice of images in our first category.

In the category "People Across the Ages," we need to make an important pedagogical distinction between pictures that were used generally in education for illustrative purposes and those that were used for aesthetic purposes. The former suggests imparting of information through pictures whereas the latter suggests the imparting of aesthetic values. Henry Turner Bailey makes this distinction clear: "Illustrative art has as its aim the making of something clearer, more vivid . . . Fine art has as its aim beauty - 'Its own excuse for being.'" He adds that "in the illustration the story is of first importance; in fine art, the way of telling the story . . . Illustrations are to be consulted; works of art are to be contemplated" (1914, pp. 22-23). Thus, pictures of people, even if they were reproductions of fine art works, could have been used in classrooms to teach about the people portrayed, i.e., for informational or illustrative purposes.
and they could also be used for contemplative or aesthetic purposes. Although Bailey makes a case for keeping these purposes separate, picture study writers such as Emery were able to deftly combine the illustrative and contemplative into unified picture study lessons. Included in the 34 pictures in this class are American Pilgrims, Greek and Roman historical and mythological characters, children of royalty, and children of ordinary circumstances.

An example of a combined fine arts and informational picture study lesson can be found in both the Emery text and the Wilson text, in their respective lessons on Velasquez' Aesop. The subject of the painting, according to Wilson, is familiar to most children because Aesop's "Ant and the Grasshopper" is included in many first readers (1899, p. 47). She chronicles the undocumented life of the fabulist using the picture as illustration. This is followed by advice to readers to attend to Velasquez' portrayal of Aesop's sad, but kindly and wise face, thereby crossing into personal interpretation of the painting. Emery's insights delve deeper into a fine arts interpretation. She uses the image to speculate on Velasquez' motives for portraying the writer, suggesting that the painter had taken on a challenge that "A poet might do . . . but an artist never." She continues:

What the old Spanish master did was to set before us his conception of the kind of mind and the kind of life experience out of which the fables seemed to him to have grown, and he expressed himself in seventeenth century forms. (1898, p. 113)
Emery also writes about Aesop's enigmatic facial expression and she presents this material in terms of the myriad choices the artist has to make. Hurll, in her picture study text, discourages readers from using portraits of adults (p. 10), but includes an entire chapter on the subject of pictures of children.

Hurll advises her readers that "It was the glory of the English eighteenth century art to develop the beauty of womanhood and childhood, and from this school came forth a host of picture children to delight the world" (p. 107). Emery and Wilson, as well as Hurll, recommended this "host of picture children" to their readers. Besides eighteenth century English portraits, mostly by Sir Joshua Reynolds who was a picture study favorite, portraits of royal children by Van Dyck and Velasquez are also recommended for study. All three authors recommend study of the latter's Charles, Prince of Wales and Baby Stuart and they also recommend the former's Maria Theresa and Princess Margaret. The prim sweetness of Reynolds' Penelope Boothby and the lusty joy of Murillo's Melon Eaters, both portrayals of children of ordinary people, were also considered worthy subject matter for picture study. Wilson adds social commentary in her writing about the Murillo children, who are shabbily dressed but gleefully biting into their melons. She asks, "Do they look poor? Would they be as happy in our country? Why not?" (1899, p. 238).
We have seen in this category of "Pictures of People" that pictures such as portraits of known historical or mythological characters could be used to impart information and, in the same lesson, also be used to encourage appreciation. Picture study advocates chose pictures in this category to support learning in other subjects such as history with the pictures of the Pilgrims and royalty, but they were also clear in their goal to also teach aesthetic appreciation through personal interpretation of the portrayals and through analysis of the artists' intentions and techniques. The inclusion of pictures of children reflects the nineteenth century's renewed concern with the welfare of children and romanticized view of children. Children were also considered naturally appealing subject matter for the children who would study the pictures.

3.3.3 Pictures Containing Religious Images

We move from the profane to the sacred with our third subject matter category of pictures that contain religious images. Hurll maintains that "Madonna" art depicting a mother and child has naturally strong appeal to children and that "The theme makes an instantaneous appeal to children of all ages, and will never outgrow popular favor" (p. 98). There are 30 pictures in this category; one third are Madonnas, the remainder are Old and New Testament Biblical scenes. Emery recommends nine "Picture with Religious Themes" in her chapter of the same name (pp. 144-197), and Wilson recommends works with religious themes in her
suggested artworks for study both in December and during the months devoted to "Great Masters." Neither addresses the appropriateness of these works for a public school. In fact, Hurll says that "In innumerable schoolrooms all over the land" hangs Raphael's Madonna of the Chair and his Sistine Madonna and ends the section on religious art (which is also the end of her text) with the comment that "The subject has been the inspiration of the noblest art of past centuries, so that no one can in any measure understand the history of painting without studying this class of pictures" (pp. 127-128).

While Hurll is undoubtedly right in her assertion that an academic study of European painting would be remiss not to include such works as the above-mentioned Madonnas, she glosses over the problem of teaching with images that also contain information that may be controversial in a secular setting. In 1898, James Frederick Hopkins, a nationally prominent art educator and the art supervisor for the Boston Public Schools, addresses the issue in a somewhat veiled commentary about his picture study suggestions for the month of December. "There will be certain sections of many cities where the particular series outlines could not be wisely introduced . . . if the thought of the Christ Child cannot be accepted, the spirit of the gift-bringing season can be as happily treated with other examples" (1898, p. 38).

Although the early history of American schools was inextricably bound with religious instruction, the period we
are considering was one of major immigration that included non-Christian denominations. A late nineteenth century classroom is recollected in the words of Mary Antin, a Russian Jewish immigrant living in Boston. She recalls trying to "keep up by the sound" with the class's recitation of the Lord's Prayer and being admonished by a Jewish boy across the aisle. "I did not know but that he was right, but the name of Christ was not in the prayer, and I was bound to do everything the class did" (Antin, p. 244). Mary Antin was probably not alone in her assessment of what one did to become assimilated into mainstream American culture; however, there were undoubtedly a few students "across the aisle" who demurred at participating in December "Madonna" picture study.

In conclusion, we can infer from the classes of pictures chosen for picture study that choices were based on a number of pedagogic and cultural factors. First, most pictures were reproductions of paintings by artists traditionally categorized as "masters." Given the power of hindsight, we can wonder why contemporary art movements such as Impressionism were ignored; however, it is easy to understand why textbook writers would uphold the value of those artists who had withstood the test of time. Picture study had its roots in a traditionalism that argued for the value of "eternal verities" as opposed to untried, and sometimes spurious, trends. Within these traditional values, the place for appreciation of the natural world, for
people who held positions of privilege (a cultural elitism not yet wholly rejected in America), and for Old and New Testament images can be well understood. Picture study was an affirmation of traditional, conservative values; its role was not to be provocative.

3.4 The Place of Picture Study in Schools: A 1908 Study

Eleven years after the 1897 date marked by Henry Turner Bailey as the birth of picture study, the results of a national study of art education were published. Edited by James Parton Haney and prepared under the auspices of the American Committee of the Third International Congress for the Development of Drawing and Art Teaching, Art Education in the Public Schools of the United States (1908) provides us with a glimpse into the place of picture study in general art education a decade after its introduction. Haney's lead article, "The Development of Art Education in the Public Schools," credits a renewed interest in manually produced objects with a parallel art education effort to involve students in handcrafting objects. Haney contrasts earlier geometrical drawing curricula with the new "constructive work" curricula: "cardboard cylinders, cones, and parallelopipedon" were replaced by "pin cases, trinket boxes, calendar mounts, needle books, tie holders, and a host of other forms devised for use in the school or for gifts in the home" (p. 59).

Haney also reminds his readers that there are still "those who are strong in the belief that the primary purpose
of the work is not to give a technical skill and ability to produce, but a nicer sense of taste and a keener power of appreciation" (p. 72). Thus, although general art education had in some ways advanced from the copybook era of reproducing stylized drawings, it had retained a utilitarian rationale. As in the earlier era, however, voices calling for the beauty rationale and an art education that also taught for appreciation could still be heard.

It is also clear from Haney's report that picture study had survived into the first decade of the twentieth century and that some of the issues debated at the turn of the century continued to be viable. He makes a distinction between those supervisors who promote the introduction of the "art element" at an early age by teaching principles of composition and those who would use pictures simply for their narrative potential.

The picture they would not use to attempt to rouse in the primary pupil interest either in the artist or in the refinements of composition. Rather they would make it serve as a convenient medium to tell a story and to form the interesting centre of some language lesson. (p. 72)

Haney does maintain that there is national consensus about the value of providing pictures and casts for classroom decoration purposes and makes reference to a "slow but continuous invasion of both casts and pictures into the schools throughout the land" (p. 75). Thus, we can see that by 1908 the picture study movement and its progenitor, the
classroom decoration movement, had retained their respective positions in American education.

Other writers in the 1908 study also refer to picture study, generally in the larger context of drawing and/or construction activities. Cheshire Lawton Boone, in "Art Education in the Elementary Schools," refers to illustrative drawing, object drawing, design and mechanical drawing as subdivisions of the drawing curriculum, and says that "To these must be added a related phase, picture study, which in theory at least, aims to illustrate and explain the application of design and drawing in the fine arts" (pp. 165-166). In an accompanying article on "The Philosophy of Elementary Art Education," Colin A. Scott argues that the "higher stages of art" can only be appreciated "with the approach of adolescence" since aesthetic sense is "in all probability based on sexual emotion and unconscious development of love." He adds that Perry pictures can offer young children information, but "certainly leave them without the slightest aesthetic thrill" (p. 98). In these remarks we begin to hear a psychological, developmental perspective that was just beginning to gain force with educational practitioners.

Charles M. Carter reports on high school art education for the Haney study. He finds that high school art education has as a goal:

The cultivation of a sense of beauty, the clearing and fixing of visual impressions through drawing, the elevation of commerce and manufactures through the increasing use and appreciation of the arts of
design (and) the individual acquisition of drawing as a form of practical language. (pp. 201-202)

Many of the high schools that Carter surveyed listed "appreciation of the beautiful in art and nature" as a primary objective in art education. Examples of high school art appreciation curricula include a St. Louis, Missouri program that included weekly art history classes for third and fourth year students and a more extensive art history elective (pp. 213-214), and a Newton, Massachusetts program that "is particularly interesting as showing how advantage is taken of celebrated, easily accessible pictures" (p. 234).

Other evidence from the 1908 study that art appreciation had become an accepted part of the curriculum includes Harriet Cecil Magee's analysis of art education in the normal schools. Magee's historical continuum begins with art in service to industry and moves to art in service to nature and, finally, to art in service to culture. Of the last phase, she writes:

Whole classes of children and youths were found in our normal schools well able to discuss quite learnedly dates, periods, and national influences upon art and artists without a quickening pulse when a reproduction was put before them. (p. 272)

Interestingly, Magee suggests that this didactic phase was then replaced by an "effort to have the work of art studied for itself and for the feeling it inspired" (p. 272). This reflects the early textbook writers' concerns about
balancing the cognitive and affective aspects of appreciation.

Magee also elaborates on the mechanics of training pre-service teachers, most of whom came from small towns where they had seen "little or nothing of the art of the past or present." Exhibitions of fine art reproductions were provided by "art publishing houses from Boston, New York, Chicago, and other art centers" (p. 277). Thus, teachers who would ultimately teach picture study with commercial reproductions were introduced to fine art though the same medium. The role of these companies in the promotion of art appreciation education has been mentioned in reference to the early influence of Louis Prang and in reference to the Perry Company's picture study magazine. Wilson, in her turn-of-the-century texts, also mentions the names of four Massachusetts companies (Prang Educational Company, W. H. Pierce and Company, A. W. Elson and Company, and Perry Pictures Company) that could provide teachers with fine art reproductions. It is ironic that those who promoted a most non-utilitarian, aesthetic philosophy of art education would ultimately be dependent on commercial interests to provide them with the objects needed for contemplation.

We can see from Haney's study that art appreciation had, indeed, not only found a place in the art appreciation curriculum at the turn of the century, but that it had maintained a position in the general art education curriculum. Again, this is not to suggest that art
appreciation was the centerpiece of the art curriculum, but it was deemed important. As has been shown, those who supported the beauty rationale were often in opposition to those who preferred a more practical, technical approach. However, most art educators attempted to balance both and offer classes in appreciation as well as drawing and crafts. Magee's study of normal schools, however, shows a dearth of formal classes in appreciation (p. 289). This can be attributed to her contention that art education had recently entered into a fourth phase in which the constructive arts and crafts had gained ascendancy (pp. 277-278). This view can be corroborated by a review of the tables of contents of the 1903-1917 issues of School Arts Book while under the editorship of Henry Turner Bailey. Most of the articles were directed to the making of art rather than to the appreciating of fine art. For example, Volume IV (1905) includes articles on drawing, metal work, applied design, pottery, water color, rug hooking, and a variety of other handicrafts. In a 1966 study of the art appreciation articles appearing in these volumes of School Arts, Robert J. Saunders mentions approximately 50 articles. This, at first glance, might suggest a preponderance of pieces on the topic; however, during those 14 years, there were hundreds of articles published. Yet, during those same years, we have seen evidence from the Haney national study that picture study continued to have a place in the schools.
Normal Instructor and Primary Plans, a general education journal for elementary teachers, also promoted picture study. For at least 15 years, from its earliest issues in 1915, the magazine published monthly picture study articles. Most of the magazine's covers during this period also featured color reproductions of the picture that was under study that month; often sheets of miniature reproductions (enough for a classroom of students) also accompanied the articles. This is further evidence that picture study was considered an integral part of the curriculum. Picture study lessons were also available in pamphlets published by the companies that supplied reproductions to the schools. Two examples are Anna V. Horton's 1921 The Art Appreciation Collection and Royal B. Farnum's 1928 Education Through Pictures; each followed standard picture study pedagogy and recommended study of standard picture study "favorites."

A 1914 general art education text by Henry Turner Bailey continued to argue for the important place for pictures in the schools. The beauty rationale continues to be promoted and is expanded to include beauty in the school surroundings, in school costume and in school work. Bailey argues that "we must develop a democratic art through the bestowal of taste on the multitude. This is the task of art education in the schools . . . Beauty . . . must be made the daily and ubiquitous habit of school life" (p. vii). His book is a philosophical treatise on the theory that "Taste
develops gradually through the making of choices with reference to some ideal" (p. 1). Exposure to fine art pictures is, in Bailey's view, an essential aspect of developing that view (p. 15). Bailey doesn't deny the more technical, practical objectives of art teaching, but he places the aesthetic rationale in perspective:

The teacher who can draw possesses undoubtedly an enviable advantage in teaching. But art education means far more than teaching children to draw. The teacher who possesses a fair degree of taste; who exemplifies in himself the art of applying a knowledge of form and color harmonies in dress and personal adornment; who is not content until every feature of his schoolroom is of such a character that it may contribute its share to the educational process; who insists that his pupils, in all they do, live up to all the light they have, and work at their highest possible level of efficiency, as he himself does; and above all a teacher who in addition has a brooding love for the boys and girls under his charge, and a perpetual enthusiasm for fine things, will be sure to achieve success in giving to his pupils an appreciation for the beautiful and a power to produce beautiful things. (p. 96)

This passage is important not only because it was written by a most prominent art educator and promoter of picture study but also because it bridges the early era of picture study with the progressive era. The latter will be explored in Chapter 4. Seventeen years after the birth of picture study, the man who could have dubbed himself with the title "Father of Picture Study" and who wrote often and well about the subject, continues to assert the value of fine art reproductions in the classroom. However, in 1914, Bailey presages the progressive era by suggesting that aesthetic values can also be taught in the context of everyday life.
3.5 Synthesis

In this chapter, we have seen, through a study of three picture study textbooks, that picture study was a discrete movement in art education with its own distinct body of knowledge (the artworks) and its own methodology. The fact that there were separate picture study textbooks supports the contention that picture study was, in reality, a movement with a following. By cross-referencing the texts and indicating similarities in artworks and artists chosen for study and similarities in concerns about methodology, this study further supports the contention that picture study adherents were working from an agreed-upon framework of works to study and methods to apply. While there was not always consensus as to which methods to apply, there was intellectual commerce regarding methodological issues. Further, these issues were not only debated in the textbooks, but also in the specialized picture study press and in the general art education press. Picture study was not a quaint educational frill promoted by an elite few who resided on the fringe. It was a serious attempt to introduce fine art to school children in ways that were both practical and that were supported by philosophical and nascent psychological thought of the time.

Finally, picture study supporters advocated a "discipline-based" approach to art appreciation. As described by current thinkers, discipline-based art education would encompass art history, art criticism,
aesthetics, and production. As we have seen, two of these disciplines were employed by the picture study writers under consideration. Art history, in the form of information about the lives and times of the artists, and art criticism, in the form of structural analysis and personal interpretation, were vital aspects of picture study methodology. Not only the textbook writers, but also the journal writers, gave credence to these disciplines. We can thus make a case that picture study is a historical precursor to discipline-based art education.
CHAPTER 4

THE INFLUENCE OF PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION ON ART APPRECIATION EDUCATION

4.1 Introduction

Progressivism in American education had a profound effect on art education, and in turn, on art appreciation education. In the philosophical realm, John Dewey took an early interest in the role of art as it related to the nature of experience. He also supported a shift from passive reception of art content and copying of geometric forms to an active "doing" of art. Most progressives, however, tried to be all things to all people and simply added art production and everyday crafts to their drawing curriculum. Although most art education researchers have assumed that this thereby eliminated art appreciation, there is good textbook evidence to the contrary.

Art appreciation, in picture study form and in other forms, was retained as a valued part of the art education curriculum. Teachers were advised to balance art production with appreciation. In this study, the inclusion of art appreciation has been substantiated in analysis of ten art education textbooks written by prominent progressive art educators. Appreciation of fine art reproductions, such as those used by picture study writers, was advocated as well as appreciation of useful or decorative art objects. Art
criticism, in the form of study of the elements of composition, was also included in the progressive texts.

Yet we will see that the problem with this all-inclusive curriculum was that teachers became overwhelmed with the sheer quantity of material they were asked to teach. Their general curriculum as well as their art curriculum had become overcrowded. As we will see, some writers recommended remedies for this problem such as interdisciplinary or integrated units of study in which art would be incorporated with other subjects. The overcrowding of the art curriculum served to dilute art appreciation education, which in the picture study era had a discrete place and supporting textbooks. Although it is historically important to note that the following textbook writers did make a commitment to balance expression and impression in theory, in practice appreciation became simply one more chapter in texts that were filled with expectations.

This chapter begins with a review of the early art education writings of John Dewey, a leading progressive. The early writings are followed by a consideration of Dewey's *Art As Experience* (1934). Although it is not a textbook, it presages many of the trends that will be identified in the textbooks. The textbooks are first grouped by author and are then grouped in loose chronological order.
4.2 John Dewey's Contribution to the Theory and Practice of Art Appreciation Education

Progressivism in American education had its heyday during the 1920s with John Dewey at the forefront of the reform movement. Although it is not in the scope of this work to chronicle Dewey's general contribution to the movement, it is important to see his writing about art education as both a reflection of current thought and as an initiator of it. On the event of his seventieth birthday, Dewey himself said that although he had been as much a barometer and predictor of change as he had been an initiator, he had gotten credit for causing the change (Cremin, p. 116). It is in the light of Dewey as barometer of change that we will examine his ideas about art education and the experience of art; these ideas are offered as a theoretical context for the textbook discussion that will follow.

In 1894, John Dewey became head of the combined departments of Philosophy, Psychology, and Pedagogy at the University of Chicago, after spending his graduate school years at Johns Hopkins University steeped in the works of Kant and Hegel. The shift from his early idealism to pragmatism has been attributed to his sensitivity to depressing social conditions he witnessed in Chicago (Meyer, 1967, p. 260). In 1896, Dewey and his wife set up a Laboratory School that was to attract national attention. "The Dewey school was, in truth, quite unlike the
conventional affair, with its lines of benches and muted young awaiting their master to quiz and drill them. Instead there were activity and talk, the incessant, gusty chatter which emanates from children interested in what they are about" (Meyer, p. 260). Dewey's ideals for his school were summed up in "My Pedagogic Creed," published by the National Education Association in 1897. In sharp contrast to the idealist view of schools in which absolute eternal verities are transmitted by authoritative means, Dewey's schools would be based, not on a body of knowledge, but on a method. The method was one of social progress and reform (Cremin, pp. 99-100).

If the schools were to both reflect social process and be an instrument of social change, then we might ask what the role of the student was. For this part of his theory, he borrowed from Darwinian evolutionary thought and suggested that the student was simply to grow, to evolve into a full human being who could ultimately participate actively in a democratic society. The setting that would best allow for this growth was one which mirrored social life at large:

Dewey believed that by virtue of this life in society man achieves a social self that is not the result of a simple Darwinian process of natural selection on the biological level, but rather that the human mind emerges only at the social level of interaction (Butts, p. 340).

Thus, through experience both with the environment and with other living creatures, the child in Dewey's view will grow
naturally into one who can both understand the environment and, with others, change it.

We can picture Dewey's hypothetical students in an unstructured social situation, interacting naturally with others as they might have in earlier agrarian settings, all slowly evolving into people worthy of a democracy. However, we might now ask about the role of the teacher and the place for curriculum. For Dewey, the teacher was a participant in a democratic process which resulted in a determination of what would be learned. She was not the sole source of authoritative knowledge, nor the sole decision maker as to which bodies of knowledge were worthy of attention. In 1918, one of Dewey's disciples translated this vague conception of curriculum into a method for determining curriculum called "The Project Method" (Cremin, pp. 216-217.)

Dewey's method for teaching curriculum was based on scientific problem-solving method in which one first defines a problem, then observes conditions, forms a hypothesis and tests it for social consequences. By claiming that the formal disciplines and methods had contributed to the social problems of the day, and by proposing an educational solution to those problems, Dewey and his fellow progressives caught the attention of the American public. "Here was a great lever to pry loose the encrusted regime of formal subjects and logically organized subject matters that characterized most of the late nineteenth and early
The logic of the disciplines was to be replaced by the psychology of the individual.

4.2.1 Early Writings

In 1896, in a speech to art educators entitled "Imagination and Expression," Dewey clearly expresses his belief that children must be actively engaged in their educational pursuits. Art activity was not only intellectual engagement, but also physical engagement. This reflected his evolutionary ideas that people must actively engage with the stuff of their environment. He told the teachers that:

If there is one principle more than another which all educational practice (not simply education in art) must base itself, it is precisely this: that the realization of an idea in action through the medium of movement is as necessary to the formation of the mental image as is the expression, the technique, to the full play of the idea itself. (p. 8)

This concept of action would be in full accord with the activity-based curricula to be described; however, it is important to note that Dewey said this in 1896, at a time when many art teachers were still using copy books for their "active" drawing lessons. Dewey does not mention picture study, nor the value of contemplation of art.

In another lecture to art teachers, Dewey spoke in 1906 about the role of culture and industry in art education. According to education historian Lawrence Cremin, "Of all the dualisms Dewey attacked, none was more crucial to his
view of progressivism than the ancient divorce between
culture and vocation (p. 124). This view is key to
understanding the progressive stance regarding the value of
the fine and practical arts. As will be seen in the
textbooks from this era, once the need for industrial
drawing was eliminated by technological advances,
illustrative drawing and craft activities were introduced.
In the realm of art appreciation, teachers were encouraged
to include appreciation of the so-called "minor arts" as
well as the fine arts. Dewey supported these changes in
practice with his philosophical tenet that held that culture
and class had been historically linked, but that in a
democracy there was no room for this basically elitist
division. "Dewey believed that democracy necessitated a
reconstitution of culture, and with it the curriculum . . ."
(Cremin, p. 124). This reconstituted curriculum would teach
the value of work in the context of art. In his 1906
lecture, Dewey spoke of this connection. "To feel the
meaning of what one is doing, and to rejoice in that
meaning, to unite in one concurrent fact the unfolding of
the inner emotional life and the ordered development of
material external conditions - that is art" (p. 17).

In 1904, Dewey left the University of Chicago to join
the faculty of Teachers College at Columbia University in
New York. During these early decades of the twentieth
century, his stature rose "as philosopher, educator, and
social commentator" (Cremin, p. 119). In Democracy and
Education (1916), which was to become a classic in educational thought, Dewey reiterated his contention that it was unwise to separate the "practical man" from "the man of theory and culture" and the fine arts from the industrial arts. One way to eradicate the false dichotomy was to bring art into leisure for all people. "Education has no more serious responsibility than making adequate provision for enjoyment of recreative leisure . . . for the sake of its lasting effect upon the habits of mind. Art is again the answer to this demand" (p. 205). He suggests that the value of art appreciation is wide in scope and shouldn't be "confined to such things as literature and pictures and music. Its scope is as comprehensive as the work of education itself" (p. 235). Thus, we can see the democratic social rationale for including appreciation of home decoration, clothing, and industrial design in the art curriculum.

Although Dewey doesn't mention picture study by name, he does caution his readers not to teach standards of appreciation, because of the "danger that standards so taught will be merely symbolic; that is, largely conventional and verbal" (p. 234). He says that when the fine arts are agencies for developing appreciation (as opposed to non-instrumental experiences) this "leads to methods which reduce much instruction to an unimaginative acquiring of specialized skill and amassing of . . . information" (p. 236). Fine art appreciation, for Dewey,
depends on the quality of experiences with any objects, fine or industrial, and "when they develop in the direction of an enhanced appreciation of the immediate qualities which appeal to taste they grow into the fine arts" (p.237). He later explores this process in detail in his 1934 Art As Experience.

Although the above may lead one to think that Dewey might denigrate the value of fine art paintings, he, in fact, placed paintings on a pedestal because they could be concrete embodiments of his theories on the nature of experience. Many of Dewey's ideas regarding appreciating paintings were formulated in association with Albert C. Barnes who directed The Barnes Foundation and published the Journal of the Barnes Foundation in the mid-1920s. Dewey shared Barnes' view that:

"... to make of paintings an educational means is to assert that the genuine intelligent realization of pictures is not only an integration of specialized factors found in paintings as such, but is such a deep and abiding experience of the nature of fully harmonized experience as sets a standard or frames a habit for all other experiences. In other words, paintings when taken out of their specialized niche are the basis of an educational experience which counteracts the disrupting tendencies of hard and fast specializations, compartmental divisions, and rigid segregations which so confuse and nullify our present life. (Dewey, 1926a, p. 148)

In three essays published by the Barnes journal, Dewey presages ideas which he would fully develop in Art As Experience (1934).
In "Experience, Nature and Art" John Dewey, writing for the Journal of the Barnes Foundation in 1925, claims that fine art is not a product, but is a process. His functional definition is that fine art "occurs when activity is productive of an object which affords continuously renewed delight . . . The 'eternal' quality of great art is its renewed instrumentality for further consummatory experiences" (pp. 160-161). In "Affective Thought in Logic and Painting" (1926), he describes the effect of this art on an appreciator.

For the spectator who 'clicks' so intimately and intensely in the face of works of art . . . there are released old, deep seated habits or engrained organic 'memories,' yet these old habits are deployed in new ways, ways in which they are adapted to a more completely integrated world so that they themselves achieve a new integration. Hence, the liberating, expressive power of art. (p. 145)

Thus, we can see that fine art appreciation was conceived of as a process that could, at its best, be a prototype for consummatory experience. Both Barnes and Dewey see appreciation of art as a process that results in personal synthesis and in liberation from cultural constraints. Here, too, Dewey argues against art as an instrument for transmitting cultural heritage.

In a third Barnes Foundation essay entitled, "Individuality and Experience," which was published in 1926, Dewey offers his readers an important insight regarding the role of the art teacher. Dewey had often been put in a position of defending his ideas in the face of extreme
interpretation by practitioners who simply let students do what they pleased and called it progressive education. These proponents of unfettered, free self-expression were supported by some theoreticians (whom we will address in the next chapter), but not by Dewey. Education historian Adolphe Meyer avers that "The cult of self-expression, so eagerly promoted by certain progressive schools got no support from Dewey" (p. 261). In his essay, Dewey describes two extremes. On one hand, there is the teacher who is a "self-proclaimed authority who says the 'Lord speaks through me'" and, on the other hand, there is the teacher who says "Above all let us not suggest any end or plan to the students . . . for that is an unwarranted trespass upon their sacred intellectual individuality . . ." He says that the former suppresses children while the latter "is really stupid" (pp. 152-153). In Dewey's view, the teacher is one who should know both subject matter and the child and should be able to "share in a discussion regarding what is to be done and be as free to make suggestions as anyone else" (p. 154).

Dewey also addresses the issue of modern art. In "Affective Thought in Logic and Painting," he applauds the Barnes Foundation's support of contemporary artists. It is important to recall that modern art had been introduced to Americans at the Armory Show in 1913 and had been very coldly received. By 1926, Americans had accepted the Impressionists, who had been exhibiting since the 1870s in
Europe, but Americans were still suspicious of non-representational art. Dewey comments on Barnes' concept of modern integration of elements of art such as color, line, mass, etc., and says "The fact that this more subtle and complete integration usually involves deformation or distortion of familiar forms . . . accounts for the fact that they are greeted at first with disdainful criticism . . . But in time a new line of organic associations is built up . . . (and they) cease to give trouble and to be annoying" (p. 148).

In summary, John Dewey's ideas both predicted and were barometers of changes in art appreciation education during the progressive era. As we will see in section 4.3, which includes an analysis of textbooks from this era, art educators valued "Professor Dewey's" theories and translated many of them into practice. His insistence on the active nature of learning was reinforced in art classes that, by their very nature, involved "doing." The project method allowed teachers to integrate appreciation of art objects, both fine and useful, into units of study on a wide range of topics. Again, Dewey's insistence that the useful, or decorative, arts also be incorporated into the art appreciation curriculum was heeded by practitioners. Finally, Dewey's theories, as expressed in *Art As Experience*, about the nature of the art appreciation experience were to remain in the theoretical realm, but are
nonetheless worthy of our attention since they suggest a progressive ideal that may still inform the present.

4.2.2 **Art As Experience: Role of Appreciation**

Although *Art As Experience* is mentioned by writers on art education history, it has generally been ignored by art educators. This may be due to the somewhat demanding writing style that Dewey employs, or it may be due to the fact that there is little evidence that the aesthetic theory postulated ever found its way into practice. First presented as a series of ten lectures at Harvard University in 1931, it was published in book form in 1934 and contains many of the ideas mentioned in the essays that have been reviewed. Dewey's social concerns are clearly articulated in his chapter "Art and Civilization." Arguing that "art is the great force" that effects consolidation of separate minds into one civilization, he allows that art can help us to understand another culture by being the "means by which we enter, through imagination . . . into other forms of relationship and participation other than our own" (p. 333). But he returns again and again to one of his central ideas—that art must not be reserved for the elite few. "As long as art is in the beauty parlor of civilization, neither art nor civilization is secure" (p. 344).

By connecting art to everyday experience (of a special kind, which will be discussed), Dewey returns also to his contention that the fine and useful art distinction is useless. He says that he wants to "restore the continuity
between the refined and intensified forms of experience that are works of art and the everyday events, doings, and sufferings that are universally recognized to constitute experience" (p. 3). He advises readers to find beauty in the grace of a ball player as well as in artworks (p. 5). He also finds potential aesthetic (which he spells "esthetic") experience in arranging a room (p. 78, p. 136). For Dewey, the key is in having an experience as opposed to just having an experience.

In an experience, every component part flows seamlessly into another part and all parts are conjoined by what Dewey calls a "pervasive quality" (p. 42). Although an experience is characterized by this quality of unity, it is also characterized by phases of "doing and undergoing." When one considers this theory in terms of a producer of art, it can be easily grasped since artists work with material (either from the environment or the material of their own bodies) and the creative process can be conceived of as an intimate relation between artist and material, an exchanging of energies that, in good art, results in a work that is truly born of the relationship. However, with appreciation, the concept gets a bit convoluted since we have creator, artwork, perceiver, and response. Dewey realized this difficulty and, in a remark often quoted by writers on art appreciation to rationalize neglect of this book, says "It is not so easy in the case of the perceiver and appreciator to understand the intimate union of doing and undergoing as
it is in the case of the maker" (p. 52). However, throughout the book he does attempt an understanding of the appreciator.

Dewey parallels the experience of the maker with that of the appreciator. Both processes are active; the appreciator is receptive during the undergoing, surrendering phase (which is not passive) and is recreative during the doing, organizing phase. "Without the act of recreation the object is not perceived as a work of art. The artist selected, simplified, clarified, abridged, and condensed according to his interest. The beholder must go through these operations according to his point of view and interest" (p. 55). To be a rich appreciator, one must have stores of experiences which Dewey calls "indirect and collateral channels of response." These are gotten through direct motor and emotional involvement with the world outside of oneself (pp. 98-99). This resonates with Dewey's early ideas on the nature of the living, growing organism and the active nature of education.

We can see a doing/undergoing kind of reciprocity in this view of appreciation wherein an individual with stores of experiences resulting from active commerce with others and the world, comes into contact with an art object that is the concrete embodiment of another's experiences and commerce with the world. The perception becomes yet another experience, hopefully an experience, that changes one and contributes to the percipient's growth. "The perceiver as
well as the artist has to perceive, meet, and overcome problems; otherwise, appreciation is transient and overweighted with sentiment. For, in order to perceive esthetically, he must remake his past experiences so that they can enter integrally into a new pattern. He cannot dismiss past experiences nor can he dwell among them as they have been in the past" (p. 138).

Once the initial phase of appreciation is "done and undergone," the appreciator enters into a phase of reflection during which a process of discrimination of elements of form prevails. Dewey reminds us that this is not simply an analysis of elements that give order to the experience. He allows that live creatures demand order, but they also demand novelty or "a touch of disorder." Disorder "adds emphasis, distinction, as long as it does not prevent a cumulative carrying forward from one part to another" (p. 167). The energy that carries this movement back and forth from order to disorder and ultimately forward to a consummation is described in terms of an organic rhythm (p. 163).

Again, Dewey warns against false dualism between form and subject matter, and insists that form is inseparable from content (p. 171). To really appreciate these multiple relations in a work of art, that is, the rhythms of energy, the interrelations between form and content, and the interconnections between artwork and perceiver, one must above all give an artwork sufficient time. "No work of art
can be instantaneously perceived because there is then no opportunity for conservation and increase of tension, and hence none for that release and unfolding which give volume to a work of art" (p. 182). The result of devoting time to a work of art is that the perceiver will move from an appreciation of the parts to an experience of the "pervading qualitative unity" in the work. "Not only must this quality be in all 'parts,' but it can only be felt, that is, immediately experienced" (p. 192).

A third phase of appreciation is criticism. "The phase of reflection in the rhythm of esthetic appreciation is criticism in germ and the most elaborate and conscious criticism is but its reasoned expansion" (p. 146). Dewey's brand of criticism is far removed from what he calls judicial, legalistic criticism. "The trouble with very much criticism . . . is that the critic does not take an attitude toward the work criticized that an artist takes toward the 'impressions he has received from the world'" (p. 306). The process of criticism that Dewey supports depends first on the quality of perception of the art work and moves from that experience to a description of the perceptible elements such as color, light, and placements. Dewey calls the process a survey, a "social document" that can "be checked by others to whom the same objective material is available" (p. 309). In a nod to the traditional discipline of art history, Dewey allows that if one participates in the art critical process, then one should have knowledge of the
traditions from which the art comes and knowledge about the development of the particular artist who has created the artwork (pp. 311-312). Finally, the critic must also experience the pervasive unity of the artwork, must discover that underlying strand that weaves the parts together. "This unifying phase, even more than the analytic is a function of the creative response of the individual who judges. It is insight. There are no rules that can be laid down for its performance. It is at this point that criticism becomes itself an art . . ." (p. 313).

We can see that Dewey's conception of the process of art appreciation depends on three main factors. First, the percipient enters into the experience with a store of experiences that will interact with the experience of the artwork, resulting in a rhythmic "doing and undergoing" that is ultimately a consummatory experience based on direct, immediate perception. Second, the appreciator enters into a discriminatory phase during which the parts that make up the whole are appreciated individually and in relation to one another. This phase transcends the formal analysis of Arthur Dow's Composition (1899) because emphasis is placed on the integration of the elements and in discernment of a unifying, pervasive quality that supercedes the parts. Finally, one can enter into a critical phase that is an elaboration and expansion of the second phase, and includes knowledge of art historical information as well as careful
perceptual surveying of the work of art and a final synthesis.

Clearly, for Dewey, the emphasis is on the qualitative experience of the individual perceiver who is expected to spend personal time with the object. Almost by its very nature, this process is not practical for fine art appreciation in most schools. First, to arrange for individuals to be in the presence of real works of art presents logistical problems for most teachers. Even if one were to arrange field experiences that allowed for this way of experiencing a work of art, the implicit assumption is that the percipients had been schooled in an environment that contributed to their store of experiences. This may have been the case in the 1930s for those who had been in the radically progressive schools, but it is not an assumption that could be made by the vast number of public schools that took bits and pieces of progressive thought and wove them into a traditional authoritative pattern. And, finally, although Dewey's philosophy is, at times, an eloquent argument for an aesthetic process, what most educators demand is a product in the form of a curriculum, or at least a repertoire of methods that fits a definite scheme.

We will see, however, that there are three aspects of Dewey's theories that did get translated into practice. As has been mentioned, Dewey's recommendations that art classes become physically active and that art appreciation include
everyday objects were consonant with the Arts and Crafts movement and were integrated into art education practice.

Finally, and the most important aspect for this study, is Dewey's willingness to search for a niche for art appreciation. Most of *Art As Experience* is about the nature of creating art and about its dual doing and undergoing processes which also help Dewey describe the nature of experience itself. Yet, as has been shown above, he weaves thoughts about appreciation of art into his text. Like his precursors in the picture study era, Dewey sees a place for art history and criticism and, his three-part scheme shares some elements with schemes proposed for discipline-based art education. And like his contemporaries whose writings follow, Dewey was not willing to denigrate appreciation and dismiss it as an elitist undertaking. The issue of art appreciation education remained vital for these progressives.

4.3 General Art Education Texts for Teachers

4.3.1 Introduction

As we have seen, John Dewey's theoretical writings reflected three trends in art education in the progressive era. First, there was a movement to activity-centered learning. Although this approach to education would suggest a preclusion of the more contemplative appreciative learning, we will see that in practice the progressive art educators instead opted for a balance of art production, or activities, and art appreciation. As has been noted, many
researchers have neglected thorough study of the progressives' approach to appreciation since it has been assumed that either they rejected it out of hand, or that they simply gave lip service to it. Ralph Logan's history of art education reflects the latter view (pp. 156-157). A second trend that appeared in both the theoretical writings of Dewey and in the practical art education textbooks was the trend to creation and appreciation of useful as opposed to fine art objects.

This shift to appreciation of useful art objects had its roots in both an art education movement called "manual arts" and in a general cultural movement called the "arts and crafts movement." Manual art education, first promoted at the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition, was originally tied directly to industry's needs by its Russian and Scandinavian inventors. Students would be taught how to use the tools of the trade by making useful objects that could be used in the home or the school. The Scandinavian method was called sloyd. Americans have been credited with introducing the "general cultural value of handwork" (Belshe, p. 60). This move to both make and appreciate the aesthetic value of everyday objects was praised by an Ohio superintendent who, in writing an introduction for a manual arts textbook, praised the program's aesthetic value:

... here I saw rooted deeply in the child's own continuously growing experience ... an art which is capable of enhancing the utilities of life by clothing them in beauty, capable of rendering the materialities of life lucid with their recognized
This movement to enhance useful objects with beauty was also gaining momentum in the public sphere through the efforts of William Morris' Arts and Crafts Movement. In 1904, Morris adherents showed their wares at the St. Louis Fair which, in turn, inspired educators to introduce the creation and appreciation of the crafts of pottery, weaving, basketmaking, and wood construction (Belshe, p. 60).

The third trend in progressive art appreciation education was the teaching of the elements of composition, as described in Arthur Wesley Dow's Composition (1899). As has been noted, Dow's analytical formalism was used by early picture study era writers, but it did not predominate. John Dewey also made reference to formal analysis, but favored an integration as opposed to a segregation and isolation of constituent parts. Many progressive textbook writers did not take a stand, they simply added explanatory materials on the elements of composition and formed committees to decide what the terminology meant (Whitford, pp. 66-82). One can appreciate the dilemma that might have led to the formation of these "committees on terminology." Given that language about visual art is considered by many to be beyond the pale and given that there was an effort by formalists to capture some aspects of visual art with language, art educators felt the need to at least agree to what they meant when they used certain terms.
Thus, we can see that progressive art education textbook writers were challenged by the field to include many sides of art education. By the 1920s, these included appreciation and production of everyday art objects, elucidation of the formalist language of elements of composition, as well as engaging activities that allowed the child self expression. Also retained from the earlier turn of the century curriculum were lessons in drawing and traditional picture study lessons. Art appreciation education thereby expanded to include not only appreciation of fine art reproductions, but also appreciation of useful arts and formalist language was also proffered as one way to generate talk about art.

In choosing texts to review in this section, the writer selected, with one exception, only texts for teachers by prominent art educators who wrote during the 1920s and 1930s. Frederick Logan’s *Growth of Art in American Schools*(1955), which is devoted to a review of the works by the most important personalities that influenced art education from the early nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century, was used as a first reference for locating these leaders. Names were later corroborated by continued reference made to them and/or their works by other writers. Although most art classes were still taught by the classroom teacher, large urban centers often employed art specialists and most systems had art supervisors. Unlike the earlier specialized picture study textbooks, these texts are general
art education textbooks written for a field that was slowly becoming professionalized. Again, art education textbooks written for teachers are important primary source evidence for the assertion that art appreciation was maintained in the art education curriculum during the progressive era. It is also important to note that the texts in this section were published between 1927 (30 years after the birth of picture study) and 1942 (45 years after the birth of picture study), indicating a continued belief in maintaining a niche for appreciation.

4.3.2 **Art in the Schools** by Belle Boas (1927)

As the Director of Fine Arts at the Teachers College (Columbia) Laboratory School, Belle Boas was influenced by the art appreciation theories of Arthur Wesley Dow, who was also a teacher at Columbia. Boas accepted Dow's use of the elements of composition, dedicated her textbook to him and two of the seven chapters of *Art in the Schools* are devoted to the elements and principles of design. She illustrates the use of formal elements such as line, mass, and the use of light and dark with examples from past masters of art and suggests that "Students of the visual arts should study the works of masters not only for the discovery of the elements . . . but also for the understanding of the principles by which these elements are worked into patterns" (p. 18).

Thus, Boas explicitly supports the continued use of masterpieces in the classrooms; her course of study also reflects this commitment.
Acceptable subject matter for the art class for most grades includes illustration, figure drawing, landscape and still life painting, abstract and applied design, and home decoration. Interest in home decoration resonates with the progressives' concern with the decorative arts which are a part of the everyday life of the student. Boas writes poetically, as she often does in this text, about the need to teach not only skills but attitudes, to teach "The ability to fit easily into that part of the universe which is our home, in order that life may be less brutal and worth living" (p. 1). In addition to the chapter recommending the above content areas, Boas ends her text with two chapters on fine art appreciation. Chapter Six is entitled, "Picture Study: Teaching Appreciation" and Chapter Seven is entitled, "The Use of the Museum: Advantages and Disadvantages."

Thus, in a seven-chapter book, we have two chapters devoted to composition and an additional two chapters devoted to appreciation, again indicating that Boas, as a leading progressive art educator, had not eliminated appreciation from her text.

For Boas, art appreciation was a slow process that comes only with "study and understanding" (p. 90). She tempers this intellectual view with a nod to the emotional, but holds to her position that "The aesthetic qualities of a picture, fine spacing, interesting composition, color harmony, rhythm of lines and masses, can be understood without reference to their emotional power" (p. 90). Boas
only cautiously suggests what should be taught at each developmental level; she does suggest that art history be reserved for upper grades and that younger children respond most to the story and color of a picture (p. 91). She maintains that understanding of composition will develop slowly through the grades. Her text is, thus, less a "how-to" manual than it is a text about attitudes toward art and toward children. Given this context, however, it is surprising that she offers her readers picture study lists.

It is important to note that Belle Boas' graded picture study lists not only use the terminology "picture study" but also include many of the same pictures recommended by early picture study writers. Ten pictures are recommended for grades one through four; many are by "old standby" picture study artists such as Millet, Velasquez, Van Dyck, and Reynolds (pp. 91-93). Grade five is assigned landscapes, grade six is assigned narrative pictures, and grade seven is assigned portraits. Junior high students study figure compositions and senior high students "should learn the great schools of painting and architecture if time can be given to it" (p. 100).

We can thus see in our first instance of a progressive art education textbook that art appreciation has a central place and that the picture study format of recommended graded lists and attention to pictorial subject matter, as well as art history and composition (especially in the upper grades) has remained central. However, we must also keep in
mind that, although Boas did devote space in her text to picture study, she also recommended in her course of study that students also draw figures, landscapes and still lifes as well as study home decoration and design. This is to be accomplished in what she describes as standard time devoted to art classes: one hour per week in the elementary schools, one and one half hours per week in the junior high schools and in elective courses in the senior high schools (p. ix).

4.3.3 The Beginnings of Art in the Public Schools (1924), Art in the Elementary Schools (1929), and The Teaching of Art (1932) by Margaret Mathias

With her three texts, published in 1924, 1929, and 1932, Margaret Mathias' writing spans much of the progressive era. As an Ohio art supervisor and later as the head of the Fine Arts Department at New Jersey State Teachers College, Mathias knew the needs of both public school teachers and teachers in training. Her 1924 text was based on her experiences as a teaching supervisor in the Cleveland Heights Public Schools in Ohio. Considered a forgotten classic by Logan (p. 155), The Beginnings of Art in the Public Schools is devoted to the art education of Kindergarten and lower primary grade children. Interestingly, appreciation is the stated rationale for art education, but appreciation of others' work is balanced with self expression: "If we are to hope for a society with art appreciation and some ability to meet art problems, an adequate art course must provide for developing ability for
self-expression and for understanding the expression of others" (p. 1). It is important to note that art education is no longer offered as vocational training as with the early drawing curricula, but rather as essential to a cultured, well-balanced life, as with the early picture study curricula.

Mathias cites the works of John Dewey to support her contention that art classes must begin to rely on the "scientific" findings of the day, especially those in the field of psychology (p. 11). The use of art activities as tools for self-expression and mental health are only hinted at in Mathias' writing, but she relies heavily on psychological theory in her section on developmental levels (pp. 6-9). In fact, in her chapter on art appreciation she suggests a matching of the subject matter of works of art to the concerns of students at various developmental stages. Thus, for example, it is recommended that young children who are still attached to the home be shown homelife pictures by artists such as Millet and Jesse Wilcox Smith (p. 64).

As with Boas, Mathias devotes a separate chapter to the subject of art appreciation; other chapters are devoted to art activities based on using such material as clay, cloth, wood, and paint. Mathias criticizes traditional picture study, admonishing the classroom teacher to reject lessons in which "The child is treated as a blank catalogue in which we would indelibly inscribe such productions as the world has termed masterpieces" (p. 63). Mathias suggests that
instead of forcing adult interpretations on students, that they be taught instead to "read" pictures (p. 66), but she later demurs from that suggestion and warns that any use of masterpieces could inhibit a child's ability to work spontaneously (p. 71).

This mixed attitude is typical of many progressives who wanted both to allow process-centered education to proceed untrammeled and also wanted to teach product or content. An example of a weak compromise in the area of art appreciation is Mathias' "model" picture study lesson on Ruysdael's The Landscape with the Mill in which she attempts to teach content about Holland while supposedly eliciting the second graders' uninhibited feelings about the work (p. 66).

In her 1929 Art in the Elementary Schools, appreciation and expression are still posed as mutually supportive goals, but Mathias begins to question the need for everyday craft activity. "The question of how much time children should spend in making articles from wood, clay, cloth, and metal continues to be debatable" (p. 145). However, she adds that appreciation of decorative art objects is still acceptable. This view is reiterated in her chapter dedicated to art appreciation; appreciation must be expanded beyond paintings to include not only the other major arts of sculpture and architecture, but also the minor, or decorative, arts and appreciation of one's immediate surroundings (p. 154). The mild discomfort with limiting appreciation only to
masterpieces is also felt in Mathias’ remarks about methodology which follow.

Once again, Mathias recommends that teachers spend time eliciting children's responses and feelings about the works of art by having them "read" the works for themselves; however, even this much verbalization is questioned:

Do not force the discussion too far. There is much to enjoy about a work of art that is not within the realm of language. It is a mistake to think that every phase expressed must be transposed into words by children. We have no reason to think that the person who stands long and silently before a picture is enjoying it less than the person who stands continuously chattering about it. (p. 160)

We can see from this text that both the content of the art appreciation curriculum and the methodology for teaching about art is being questioned. Mathias offers her readers no lists of pictures nor objects for study, nor does she offer a proven methodology. By bringing both the traditional content as well as the process into question, and offering no replacement, teachers were left only with the mandate to teach for appreciation: "Art education has for its purpose the development of the art abilities of each individual in order that he may experience the unquestioned joy of creative work and aesthetic satisfaction" (p. 5).

Techniques for teaching the "joy of creative work" were strong, but techniques for teaching "aesthetic satisfaction" were weak.

Mathias’ tone in her 1932 textbook entitled The Teaching of Art is more confident than the tone in her 1924
and 1929 texts. In 1932, Mathias' first and "most important" reason for teaching art is to help students attain "creative power." A second reason is to help students master "principles of arrangement" so that they may satisfy their "desire for beauty." Appreciation of others' work is the third goal. Although we noted Belle Boas' reliance on the formal elements and principles of composition of Arthur Wesley Dow, Mathias' early texts did not demonstrate a similar reliance. However, her 1932 text not only offers readers formalism as a second goal, but she also devotes two chapters to explication of elements and principles, using traditional and contemporary works of art to illustrate them. The appreciation of these aspects of composition is one of three phases of appreciation which Mathias delineates, the others being appreciation of content and appreciation of craftsmanship (p. 309).

Appreciation, in the 1932 text, is described in terms of activity; "Doctor Dewey's" ideas on the active nature of both imagination and appreciation are cited (p. 318). Again warning against what she characterizes as superficial, set responses to art, Mathias says that "There seems to be a popular opinion that there is some set response to every work of art" and that it is the teacher's job to find it out and tell it to the students (pp. 324-325). She rejects this method and suggests instead that appreciation begin with an exhilarating joy that only later leads to intellectual analysis (pp. 318-319). Unlike the earlier texts, she
offers no model art appreciation lesson, but expects that
the teachers will learn gradually from experience. Yet she
does say that teachers can provide an environment which will
help students to grow in aesthetic awareness.

Ironically, Mathias suggests that one way that teachers
can provide an appropriate environment for budding
realization of beauty is by establishing an "aesthetic
shrine where one could see something lovely" (p. 177).
This, of course, resonates with the ideals of the early
proponents of classroom decoration, who provided classrooms
with framed reproductions and plaster casts. The irony of
this is that, one the one hand, Mathias argues for a "hands-
off" attitude toward fine art appreciation and, on the other
hand, she recommends setting standards for what is beautiful
by enshrining art. A second paradox in her text can be seen
in her devoting two chapters to explaining elements and
principles of composition, then arguing against using them
in explicitly intellectual analysis.

We can see that Mathias was consistent in her argument
for retention of a place for appreciation in her three
texts. Each has a chapter devoted to appreciation and each
gives appreciation an important focus in the overriding
goals of her art programs. Mathias, however, weakens that
commitment to teaching appreciation by her deprecation of
traditional methods and by, in turn, not having confidence
in new methods such as the "reading" of a work of art to
further elucidate those practices. In her 1932 text, she
resolves this by saying that "One must know the world's masterpieces in order to enjoy one's art heritage . . ." but suggests that "one's art heritage" should be taught in history class (p. 311).

4.3.4 Introduction to Art Education (1929) and Art Stories (1933) by William Whitford

William G. Whitford, the much respected chairman of the University of Chicago's Department of Art Education, wrote in 1929 that "We have had as slogans of art education, 'Art for Art's Sake,' 'Art for Industry's Sake,' and now we have 'Art for Life's Sake'" (p. 3). As we have seen, this concern for everyday art had been promoted by those influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement and by the manual arts movement. Whitford indicates that this rationale had been widely accepted and had been officially adopted by art educators at the 1927 National Education Association Convention (p. 12). Yet, Whitford does not wholeheartedly endorse this trend; he links concern with everyday arts to the industrial, utilitarian rationale and argues for a balance between an art education that aims to inculcate "sensitiveness to beauty" through "art talks and demonstrations" and an art education that is based solely on "practical production" (p. 20).

The articulation of this important distinction between appreciation and production crystallizes the progressive art education debate. Again, the progressives cited did not reject appreciation out of hand, but sought to find a place
for it in an art education curriculum that was increasingly crowded with art production activity. In Whitford's view, both should be attended to equally and less attention should be directed to what he calls the "fads and frills" that have cluttered the curriculum:

We speak of fine art, applied art, constructive art, practical art, representative art, visual art, decorative art, graphic art, plastic art, the space arts, useful arts, household arts, manual arts, and the industrial arts, the arts of design, aesthetic arts, independent arts, time arts, minor or lesser arts, related arts, fictile arts, classical arts, commercial and advertising art, civic art, theater art, modern art, etc. (p. 83)

As with other progressives reviewed thus far, Whitford views appreciation as a key goal for art education: "The paramount aim or objective which underlies the entire school program in art to-day is that of developing rich appreciation, understanding, and knowledge of art and beauty, and the utilizing of this knowledge in meeting the problems of reality" (p. 88).

Although this rationale would appear to put Whitford squarely in the educationally conservative camp that would argue for content over process, his curricular recommendations are instead yet another compendium of activities that echoes the above list that he decried. In his list of activities for elementary classrooms, picture study (mentioned by name) was listed as one of 13 classroom activities for the first through third grades and as one of 19 for the fourth through sixth grades (pp. 188-222). At the junior high level, a "special study of pictures" and
"story of art" are two of 17 activities (pp. 146-148). At the senior high level, art appreciation is listed as one of 11 possible electives (pp. 149-152), but a general art appreciation course is suggested as a requirement for all students. In an assessment of how much art education the typical student of the 1920s received, Whitford estimates that the average student can expect to have a total of about 800 hours of art education in his or her lifetime. One can see that although appreciation was touted as being key to the curriculum, little formal instruction time would have been devoted to it in Whitford's scheme.

Given that time devoted to appreciation was limited, Whitford did, nonetheless, suggest a way to integrate it into art classes. Besides the abovementioned references to traditional picture study and the inclusion of a chapter in his 20-chapter text devoted to a "General Art Appreciation Course for High Schools," Whitford argues that psychologists linked the power of appreciation with creative effort and that the "inherited ability to love the beautiful" is linked to "technical ability" and that practical production can lead to aesthetic appreciation. Although he rejects Arthur Wesley Dow's methods (p. 101), he advocates using the elements and principles in lessons that begin with simple explanations of compositional theory followed by "some practice in recording art theories in objective form" and by study of fine art, decorative art, industrial art, and
natural objects that also illustrate the compositional theories under study (pp. 190-191). Unlike Boas, Whitford does not offer a list of art objects or reproductions for study; like Mathias, Whitford seeks to find a place for appreciation in a crowded curriculum.

Whitford's *Art Stories* (1933) provides teachers with a student textbook series that attempts to solve the problem of including appreciation in an increasingly overcrowded curriculum. In this series, Whitford, Liek, and Gray use art appreciation content as the basis for material designed to teach reading. Their goal is simple: "Through varied pictures and interesting reading the child is made increasingly conscious of beauty of color, form, and line as seen in nature, in pictures, in all his surroundings" (p. 3). Reflecting the tendency of progressives to be all things to all people, the authors use not only fine art reproductions and methods reminiscent of traditional picture study, but also integrate everyday art topics such as interior decoration (of home and school), clothing, architecture, landscape, and design.

Picture study favorites by artists such as Velasquez and Raphael are accompanied by text about the artists and the works. A Book Three lesson about Gainsborough's *Blue Boy* is typical of an integrated lesson. Besides appreciation of the painting, which is reproduced in the textbook, the lesson also teaches other cultural values; efficiency is well served. Not only is the child practicing
reading skills (the introduction notes that reading specialists reviewed the vocabulary), but the child is also taught a bit of costume history and is advised on decorum in his own clothing. However, the tone of the text is a bit discomforting. As with much of the progressive appreciation material that deals with "home and personal arts," one senses a class bias. It's as if the settled Americans, such as the writers of the textbook and the teachers, are teaching an underclass how to "look like" Americans. In fact, Whitford in his 1929 text remarks that art education for those in small manufacturing towns should be practical, whereas art education for residential towns "where pupils come from well-to-do families" should be cultural (p. 46). In Art Stories, he attempts to combine the practical and the cultural.

4.3.5 *Art Education in Elementary Schools* by F. V. Nyquist (1929)

F. V. Nyquist of the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Baltimore, Maryland, begins his 1929 text, *Art Education in Elementary Schools* with a tripartite division of the history of art education. Those with economic aims seek an art education that will serve industry's needs for better designers; Nyquist avers that art education with economic aims has been discredited since there has been no proof that skills taught to service industry transfer to other school subjects (pp. 18-19). Those with pedagogical aims seek an art education that will serve to train students' eyes and
hands, Nyquist credits "natural educationists" such as Rousseau, Froebel, and Pestalozzi with this use of art education. Pictures became an important part of object lessons for those who used art education for pedagogical purposes (p. 15). Finally, there are those with cultural aims, like Nyquist himself, who, in the classical tradition, seek an art education that teaches appreciation:

Art as a cultural value in education has been a recognized sponsor of appreciative power in enjoying the beauty of art and nature; of developing judgment in the discrimination of ugliness from beauty and degrees of art quality in objects of the fine, industrial and allied arts; through art information and contacts of promoting understanding of the artists' ideals, problems and the significance of his work; of producing permanent interests in the arts serving as an ennobling influence and a worthy use of leisure time; and in general of constituting a regulative factor in human behavior. (p. 15)

Nowhere in this lofty statement does one find mention of the practical production versus aesthetic appreciation dilemma posed by Mathias and Whitford.

Although Nyquist's five-chapter text does include a chapter devoted to drawing and one devoted to "design and construction," it is clear that he believes that art education should be understood in cultural terms. Art is understood as both a language and as a provider of aesthetic experience. It is the latter of these functions that he addresses in his art appreciation chapter. Unlike Boas, Mathias and Whitford, Nyquist offers his readers a specific art appreciation methodology and he educates his readers as to the theoretical reasons why he recommends the approach.
Contemplation is the key concept in Nyquist's scheme:

It is in this field of aesthetic contemplation that the highest value of art to society resides, serving as it does to raise individual experience above the commonplace to the spiritual experience and ministering on the same plane to beauty as the religious experience does to the good. (p. 35)

Clearly hearkening back to the idealism of the early picture study proponents, Nyquist reasserts the role of the eternal verities of the good, the true, and the beautiful and their role in making better people and, ultimately, a better world. However, he differs from the early educators in that he believes that the route to appreciation is not through the intellect, but through feelings.

After clearly delineating and rejecting three methods for teaching appreciation which include the chronological, the analytical, and the interpretive, he offers readers the contemplative method. The chronological method of teaching biographical or historical data may, claims Nyquist, result in understanding, but not appreciation. The analytical method of teaching the elements and principles of composition may result in understanding of workmanship, but is ineffective in stimulating an appreciation of the whole. Earlier in his text, Nyquist quotes John Dewey on the importance of the consummatory nature of the experience of art (p. 38). Finally, he rejects a new method which he calls the interpretive method, in which art is interpreted with other art forms such as music or literature because it
only employs one language to take the place of another (pp. 130-134).

The contemplative method, based on the theories of Frank Herbart Hayward, is accomplished in seven stages (p. 135). Prior to the teaching of the lesson, the teacher predicts and eliminates any distractions (step one) and begins to build anticipation with the children (step two). The lesson proper begins with an understanding that the teacher personally appreciates the artwork (step three) before he or she proceeds to present the object (step four) to the students. It is in this stage that the students are given ample time to contemplate the work of art. This is followed by two phases of discussion; first aesthetic responses are shared, then factual information about the work is shared (steps five and six). Teachers are warned not to allow the discussion to become too intellectual (p. 140). The final step is "learning the object by heart."

Objects for study can range, at first, from popular pictures chosen by students to reproductions of masterpieces.

Nyquist's willingness to commit himself to an art appreciation technique that, at first glance, appears to be new to the field is commendable in light of other writers' unwillingness to either totally break with the picture study tradition or to offer fresh alternatives. However, when one scrutinizes Nyquist's ideas, one can see that he, too, compromises. By stating at the outset that he supports the classic tradition wherein art is taught as cultural content,
one would expect consistency in the stance. If the role of art education is to transmit eternal aesthetic verities, then how can one argue that the methodological route is via subjective feelings? Further, if one accepts, in the classic tradition, that there is a body of knowledge worthy of attention, then it is inconsistent to suggest that it makes no difference if the object contemplated is a magazine photograph or a masterpiece. Finally, a comparison of Nyquist's recommended method with the methods of a picture study writer such as M. S. Emery yields many similarities. Both argue for an approach that suggests contemplative synthesis, as opposed to brash analysis. Perhaps it is a cognitive and affective synthesis that both seek.

4.3.6 Art Education in Principle and Practice by Klar, Winslow, and Kirby (1933)

Art Education in Principle and Practice, published in 1933 by the Milton Bradley Company, was written by three practicing art supervisors. Walter Klar was Supervisor of Art and Elementary Handwork in Springfield, Massachusetts (home of the Milton Bradley Company); Leon L. Winslow was the Director of Art Education in Baltimore, Maryland; and C. Valentine Kirby was Director of Art Education for the Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction. Like most of their progressive predecessors, the authors recommend a balance of expression and appreciation, but add a third objective which they call "information." The art information objective is described as covering a "mass of
subject matter of great social importance"; but it is recommended that it is more easily attained if art information can be correlated with social studies subject matter (pp. 2-3). By abdicating responsibility for the teaching of art historical material to those who teach social studies, the authors devalue the importance of the art information objective.

The "principles and practices" advocated for meeting the appreciation objective are also telling:

Teachers may encourage appreciation then through surrounding boys and girls with the beautiful, through presenting lessons in a sensitive and artful manner, through examining with children works of art which have been selected by experts as being beautiful, through leaving each work of art studied with the feeling that there is in it an indefinable something which can never be explained. In plainer English, art teachers should never practice vivi-section on a masterpiece. (pp. 7-8)

In marked contrast to the aforementioned textbook authors, who each addressed the place that formal analysis should play in an art education curriculum, these authors instead offer readers a way to integrate art into general units of study. Art, in this scheme, becomes a handmaiden to the more generic goals of the integrated units, thereby weakening its place among the disciplines.

The methodology for integration of art into thematic units of study is based on the use of elaborate "content organization charts." Suggested elementary grade topics for the charts include subjects such as the circus; the work of policemen and firemen; visiting farms, zoos, and docks; and
the growing and manufacturing of cotton. For each unit, the authors advise teachers to integrate art information, appreciation and expression. Generally, art information includes bits of art history and composition whereas appreciation means "An examination, without analysis of works of art, through exhibitions in the classroom" (p. 130). An exception to this use of art as part of thematic units is a recommended fifth grade unit entitled "A Study of Art Expression in the United States." As has been noted, prior to this time art deemed worthy of prolonged attention tended to be European "masterpieces" whereas, in this era, American attention begins to turn toward work coming from its own shores. A separate, required course in art appreciation is also recommended for high school students.

Pictures are recommended for purchase by Klar, Winslow, and Kirby. Although picture study is not mentioned by name, non-analytical appreciation is advocated by the authors. Another recommendation they make is for a "shrine of beauty" - a recommendation that resonates with both nineteenth century writers and with a similar recommendation by Margaret Mathias in 1932 (p. 177). Pictures suggested for purchase are also reminiscent of earlier textbooks. Works by Millet, Murillo, Breton, and Velasquez are listed. In this scheme, pictures would be a classroom focus for what one might call "incidental" or "spontaneous" appreciation or
they could also be used if they could be integrated into subject matter covered in the interdisciplinary teaching units.

By advocating the integration of art with other subjects the Klar, Winslow, and Kirby textbook is clearly more content-centered than process-centered. This preference for cultural content, rather than self-expression is, however, somewhat submerged in the organizational charts. Art information is but one small piece of the teaching units. As has been said, art has only a contributory role. Yet, by integrating it into the required subjects they ensure a place for art in the crowded curriculum.

The authors also argue for content integration by deferring to John Dewey's psychological/logical distinction. They argue that if one attends to the psychological needs of the learner, one will be sure that ideas are associated with one another, not kept separate in "logical" disciplines (pp. 152-153). Art explicitly becomes a means rather than an end:

Through the illustrating of ideas in history, geography, literature, arithmetic, physical education, nature study, and music, art as a school subject becomes a means to an end, the end being a more complete and better learning or understanding of the other subject or subjects with which art is correlated. (p. 168)

However, regardless of how practical or psychologically
sound this approach was, it served to weaken art's distinct place in the curriculum and, in turn, weakened art appreciation's place.

Walter Klar worked with another art supervisor on the writing of a small book called The Appreciation of Pictures, published in 1930 by the Brown-Robertson Company, a major supplier of reproductions for schools. Written with Theodore M. Dillaway, Director of Art Education in the Philadelphia Public Schools, the book reflects many of the tenets expressed in the above textbook. Appreciation is viewed as a slower, more intense process than is the simple understanding of art information. Like Nyquist (1929), Klar and Dillaway aver that students must contemplate a work of art before they analyze it (p. 15). This also is the non-analytical attitude that Klar, Winslow, and Kirby take toward appreciation in their 1933 text. Klar and Dillaway limit the scope of their book to simply recommending an attitude toward appreciation that begins with quiet contemplation and only later moves on to information and expression. Few specific pictures are recommended for study, nor does the book provide specific art information; however, the writers do make specific recommendations as to how to correlate art appreciation with subjects such as English composition, poetry, music, and storytelling.
4.3.7 The Integrated School Art Program (1939) and Art In Elementary Education (1942) by Leon L. Winslow

Like other progressive art educators, Winslow also advocates a balance between appreciation and expression in his 1939 textbook. For Winslow, an art education program "must furnish a rich offering of subject matter and of experience, in which a balance between information and activity has been carefully observed" (p. 20). However, we can discern a shift in emphasis from earlier textbooks and from Art Education in Principle and Practice (1933) for which he was a co-author. In The Integrated School Art Program, Winslow argues that the role of art has been expanded beyond the "art for art's sake" rationale and now "turns on its service to man in his inner adjustment to an environment which shifts and changes with unexampled rapidity" (p. 3). This therapeutic view is also carried to a role that art education can play: "art education should obviously be regarded as one means of securing mental and emotional balance in living . . ." (p. 4). John Dewey is cited as a supporter of this view (p. 9). Art education is now not only a means to enhance other subjects but it is also a means to achieve psychological balance. With this shift to a psychologically therapeutic rationale, we can also discern a shift in curricular emphasis from content to process, from information and appreciation to expression and from the contemplative to the active.
Although art appreciation in this text now includes student appreciation of each other’s work (p. 42), traditional art appreciation of known artists has not been entirely eliminated. Winslow continues to recommend integration of art into thematic units of study and art information is incorporated into these units. In his junior high school program, he also includes a section devoted to "Reproductions of Paintings" in which he advocates that teachers order art prints from the Artext Company and says that they should "play an important role" in the curriculum (p. 173). However, it is not clear exactly what this "important role" should be, aside from classroom decoration. Again, his list is strongly reminiscent of the early picture study lists. Art appreciation is also recommended as an art elective for senior high school students among many other electives, most of which are devoted to art production (p. 201).

Winslow, in his 1942 text *Art In Elementary Education*, carries forward his argument that art production and art appreciation be balanced. In this volume, he returns to the use of content organization charts which we saw in the 1933 text. In his writing on art production, Winslow supports the trend toward the useful arts and recommends that drawing and painting be de-emphasized. "Drawing and painting are not nearly so important in human life as most art course-of-study makers would seem to have us believe. Architecture . . . furniture, costume, and numerous machine-made things
and products of the handcrafts are of far greater significance in the lives of most of us than are drawing and painting" (p. 120). He relates this trend to art appreciation as well and suggests that teachers consider ordering pictures of decorative art as well as fine art objects (p. 120).

Besides offering readers numerous content organization charts wherein art production and appreciation are integrated, Winslow also suggests that teachers attempt to make their lessons more unified by not separating integrated art lessons into categories such as information lessons and appreciation lessons. Echoing John Dewey, Winslow says that learning is "like breathing, as inhaling is followed by exhaling, so is . . . expression by appreciation" (p. 38). Again echoing Dewey, Winslow also prophesies that art education will grow out of a "pragmatic philosophy" that teaches that "art is experience":

The art education of the future will afford activities in creation and appreciation which will help the child to grow in awareness of the art about him, to become experienced in his ability to use the principles of design in controlling his environment and himself, in his power to design and to mold his life aesthetically. (pp. 66-67)

Although these are indeed lofty goals, they implicitly suggest a turn in art education that will eventually lead to the demise of art appreciation education. By placing emphasis on the needs of the child, rather than on the needs of society, Winslow presages a pure child-centered approach that will argue that art education cannot serve two masters.
Yet, Winslow only hints at this problem. In these texts, separated by only three years, he can argue on the one hand that "It is essential that we use our subject matter to promote the social growth of our pupils rather than to retard it by an undue emphasis on pure art problems" (1942, p. 38), and on the other hand, regarding art appreciation, that "no picture is sufficient unto itself. Those who look at it must be taught how to interpret its meaning and how to enjoy its beauty" (1939, p. 266). In the former statement and in aforementioned remarks, Winslow argues for an art education that can fill the social and psychological needs of the child, while in the latter remark Winslow argues for an art education that teaches given values. Yet his methodology is based on neither, but instead reflects a compilation of content-centered and process centered art objectives that are imbedded into subject matter from other disciplines.

4.3.8 Fine Arts for Public School Administrators by Sallie B. Tannahill (1932)

Like Margaret Mathias, Sallie B. Tannahill (the author of the final textbook to be reviewed in this section) was associated with Columbia Teachers College which, during the progressive era, had wrested art education leadership from the Massachusetts College of Art. Eventually, as we will see, this leadership moved to Pennsylvania State University. Tannahill begins her book by asserting that "Of all the fields in the curriculum perhaps no other has undergone more
radical changes in purposes and procedures than has the field of art" (p. v). Although Tannahill uses the term "fine arts" in her title, she is quick to point out that she makes no distinction between the fine arts and the minor arts; in her use of the term "fine arts," she includes both. She calls on administrators to support an art education that will serve the needs of all people. She avers that art for the masses has been overlooked and calls for "Art for All" which could be a "powerful and enduring influence on the education of the youth in this country" (p. 106). Underlying this concern for the "masses" is also a concern for what Tannahill views as a demise in taste (p. 6). By furnishing students with "examples of the finer things in art" the schools will "inspire, enrich, and widen the experiences of children" (p. 28).

This inspiration, enrichment, and widening of experiences is undertaken by offering students three kinds of art learning: creative self-expression, appreciation and technical work. Recommending that the bulk of the elementary student's time be spent on creative self-expression, she allows that picture study (a term she uses) can proceed, but very slowly, because:

Many a picture of real worth has been spoiled for a child . . . because some overzealous art teacher analyzed it into lines, masses, and colors in a manner too technical for a child. And how lamentable to bore children with facts of artists' lives! (p. 62)
Although Tannahill's concern about formal analysis has been addressed by other textbook authors, it is especially significant since Arthur Wesley Dow was also a prominent teacher at Columbia Teachers College. (She does credit Dow with "revolutionizing art teaching" and with leading it away from nineteenth century copybooks [p. 4].) She suggests that teachers begin by exposing students to the works of contemporary artists and only later study "the art of remote ages and of far-away countries" (p. 9).

Although art appreciation is listed nineteenth in a total of twenty suggestions for art subject matter, Tannahill distinguishes herself from the other textbook writers by strongly advocating that contemporary art be used. Her appreciation of contemporary art can be linked to her beliefs about the value of self-expression in art education. Both students in art classes and contemporary artists were expected to please only themselves with their art and to freely express what they felt. They could understand one another. She encourages teachers to use the works of Cezanne, Matisse, Gauguin, Van Gogh, Degas, Rousseau, Seurat, and Renoir (p. 64). Elementary grade level appreciation of the works of the "old masters" was also acceptable to Tannahill, but only if this were limited to pictures that "really interest them" (p. 63). At the junior high level, less self-expression and more appreciation was allowable (p. 82); whereas, at the senior high level, a required course in art appreciation was
recommended because "All citizens need the richer life that an appreciation of art provides, they should have the background that art discrimination affords to enable them to better serve the community . . ." (p. 104). Tannahill's outline for this course is a mix of the fine and decorative arts.

In her textbook, Tannahill reinforces many of the strains that we have seen throughout the progressive era. First, the dictum that one must attempt to balance art activity and art appreciation is reflected in her efforts to characterize art learning in a tripartite system that includes appreciation as well as creative self-expression and technical work. Second, her insistence that the minor arts be considered equally with the fine arts is a typical concern of the progressives and of John Dewey. Third, Tannahill's belief in the value of the work of the modernists also fits with a progressive belief in the importance of free and spontaneous expression. Tannahill distinguishes herself from the other progressives by taking such a strong stand in favor of including them. Finally, Tannahill is also typical of the progressives in her unwillingness to negate the cultural importance of traditional art appreciation, yet in her tandem willingness to leave the bulk of well-considered and well-developed lessons and units in art appreciation to a single senior high school course.
4.3.9 Summary

In 1932, Sallie Tannahill distinguished between the "old" art education and the "new" art education. The old art subject matter was organized logically, whereas the new was organized psychologically. In the old art education, subject matter was imposed by the teacher and was arranged logically; in the new art education, subject matter is arranged psychologically and is based on the child's interests. In the old art education, art was an isolated subject; in the new it is integrated into units of study. In the old, the teacher is a taskmaster, at best a teacher of fine arts, but not a teacher of children. In the new art education, the teacher is a gentle guide. In the old system, a definite, short period of time was devoted to art, whereas in the new system, art time is based on a flexible schedule, according to need. Finally, in the old system, the "child becomes repressed, dull, loses interest in art" and "lacks real appreciation." In the new art education, the child is "free from fear and inhibition" and experiences an "expansion of personality" (pp. 10-12).

Tannahill's distinctions are telling in that, in this writer's view, the progressives described above are neither wholly in the new category nor have they wholly rejected the old. In the following chapter we will see that Viktor Lowenfeld certainly moved the progressives into a new education, but the textbooks we have seen provide little evidence that these changes (advocating a more process-
centered, psychologically oriented curriculum of self-expression) dominated mainstream progressive art education thought. In fact, this writer has shown that the progressive art education textbook writers continued to hold the "old" art education value of art appreciation, but had difficulty providing a new progressive pedagogy for appreciation.

At this juncture, then, one must raise the question as to whether the "old" approach to appreciation could have been melded with the "new" progressive ideals, or whether, in practice and theory, they are mutually exclusive. The traditional picture study subject matter was based on accepted "masterpieces," thereby suggesting the logic of an art history and criticism discipline behind the choices. Naturally, when one accepts a body of knowledge and when one decides to impart that body of knowledge, one thereby "imposes" it on the child. The progressive textbook writers made weak efforts to avoid this imposition by suggesting that students freely choose pictures to study or that they be exposed only incidentally to masterpieces decorating classroom walls. An art education with a psychological rather than a disciplinary, content orientation would be uncomfortable venturing outside the interests of the child.

In the picture study era, art appreciation certainly was an "isolated" subject; our study of the discrete picture study textbooks and the evidence of entire journals devoted to picture study support this contention. The progressive
concept of integrating or correlating art with other subjects in units of study did address the problem of the overcrowded art curriculum, but, as we have seen, served to further diminish time devoted to art appreciation. As has been asserted, progressive art education textbook writers did continue to include separate chapters devoted to appreciation and the principles of composition, but many also advocated using art as a means to broader curricular ends. This dichotomy regarding art's discrete place in the curriculum can also be seen in Tannahill's characterization of the old system as providing students with a definite, but short, time and the new system opting for flexibility. If there is neither a set curriculum nor a designated time to even expose students to others' art, one must wonder whether the touted goal of appreciation could have realistically been attained.

Finally, in assessing the progressive contribution to the field of art appreciation education, one must not overlook the fact that the writers we have examined did retain the concept. They did not reject it out of hand. Many also recommended a required high school course in art appreciation, although, as we have seen, the content for the courses varied widely. Progressive writers such as Nyquist also recommended spending contemplative time with works of art, using them as ends in themselves rather than as a means for teaching other subjects or as a means for psychological release. Progressive writers can also be credited with
introducing contemporary art into the curriculum and also with grappling with issues of formalism.

Yet, in an effort to avoid an overly intellectual and passive curriculum, progressive art education textbook writers simply crowded their textbooks with a melange of both the old and the new. As F. V. Nyquist pointed out in 1929:

. . . the relatively intangible major outcomes of art instruction being in the nature of esthetic attitudes, developed judgments, abilities, interests and appreciations have been often regarded as negligible, while in the efforts to make results concrete much material of dubious value has been inserted into art instruction. (p. 41)
CHAPTER 5

THE LOWENFELD ERA: ART APPRECIATION DEPRECIATED

5.1 Introduction

With the 1947 publication of Viktor Lowenfeld's Creative and Mental Growth, the history of art appreciation education begins to take a decidedly downward turn. Although the aforementioned progressive textbook writers kept a place for appreciation in their crowded art curricula, it was the theoretical psychologists who argued against its inclusion. Lowenfeld's general art education theories were based on psychological stage theory of development and on his own empirical research. His approach to art education provided overburdened educators with a fresh and, to them, scientifically validated way to teach art. Expression of one's self, through art, was key to developing and understanding creative and mentally healthy individuals. In this scheme, scant attention was paid to the cultural imperative rationale for art appreciation education.

We will see that this movement was predicted by progressive educators such as Harold Rugg and Rosabel Macdonald. They, too, argued for the preeminence of the role of expressive art production, as opposed to the progressives who called for a balance between art production
and art appreciation. One can thus see a gradual shift away from appreciation toward production and further toward art production for the specific purpose of self expression. In the eight editions of Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth*, which spanned four decades, one can also see a gradual hardening of this position against art appreciation education. In the early editions, not usually cited by art education historians in their studies of art appreciation education, one may be surprised to find inclusion of an art history unit and an art criticism chapter on the elements of composition. However, later editions co-authored by W. Lambert Brittain take a definitive, negative stand against the value of art appreciation education.

5.2 Signposts for Change: Rugg and Macdonald

The progressive background from which Lowenfeld's theories emerged provided an important transition for art appreciation education - a transition from the inclusion of art appreciation in a crowded art curriculum to an approach that was almost solely dependent on self-expression. Skills of impression took less and less precedence. One of the earliest progressive proponents of this view was Harold Rugg, whose 1928 *Child-Centered School*, written with Ann Shumaker, includes two chapters devoted to the state of art education. In "The Copybook Regime in Art" the authors decry what they term the "formal school" of art education which is absorbed in the "real life of the concrete,
objective, material world . . ." (p. 207). In place of product, the authors offer teachers and students the process model of the artist. They suggest that teachers and students alike follow in the footsteps of contemporary artists who are known for "taking off the lid" (p. 235). This recommendation served to turn art educators away from the outer world, with its cultural and industrial imperatives, to the inner world of the individual.

Picture study gets short shrift in *The Child-Centered School* and its place is relegated to the realm of salesmanship in which students are "sold" the value of classic artworks: "These 'penny classics' about which children wrote polite and stilted little essays, could have their day only in a regime which vaunted memorization of facts, the acquisition of learning" (pp. 212-213). Here we see the expressed dichotomy between process and product, between learning through art versus learning about art. For the later progressives, art education was a technique, not a body of knowledge with a history based in the disciplines. Indeed, picture study enthusiasts would probably not have disagreed with Rugg and Shumaker's association of their work with memorization and acquisition of learning. Providing students with a legacy of cultural learning was an assumed value. This view will be reasserted when we consider the goals of the current discipline-based art education movement.
Rugg and Shumaker also comment on fellow progressive art educators such as Whitford, Winslow, Klar, and Boas, whom we have considered in Chapter 4. The authors give them credit for professionalizing art education, but criticize them for their intellectualism. Rugg and Shumaker maintain that, for the early progressives, "Creative, constructive, manipulative activity with art materials was always to further the appreciation of some intellectual art principle" (p. 217). Rugg was reluctant to give credit to these art educators who attempted to bring some order to a crowded art curriculum that had grown unchecked. It makes sense that these art educators would try to reduce art education to a distinct body of knowledge, apply their organizational schema to it, thereby providing classroom teachers with a practicable guide to art education methods and materials. As we have seen, art appreciation education was simply fit into their schema; content was delimited and methods recommended. However, for Rugg and Shumaker, the art appreciation component could never be schematized: "In these schools an academic knowledge and recognition of what has been considered beautiful dominates not only individual creation but that private, personal, and delicately poised thing – appreciation" (p. 224)

The new route, as proposed by authors such as Rugg and Shumaker, to capturing that "private, personal, and delicately poised thing" was not paved with courses of study, nor with organizational curriculum charts. It was
paved with an understanding of psychology and a commitment to the process needs of the child as opposed to the content needs of a set curriculum. Although Whitford, Winslow, Klar, and Boas gave lip service to the importance of free expression in art education, it was Rosabel Macdonald's 1941 text, *Art As Education*, that gave the psychological approach to art education full attention. In fact, Macdonald avers that the teacher of art must be not only an artist, but also a psychologist (p. 71).

Macdonald contrasts the warmth and vitality of true appreciation with intellectualism (p. 18). She separates appreciation from the disciplines of art history and criticism and claims that the teaching of these disciplines could be detrimental to the "emotional contribution that art can offer students" (p. 19). Macdonald is in agreement with Rugg and Shumaker that appreciation is intensely personal and claims that efforts such as picture study offer the educator no evidence that students have really "excluded everything from their consciousness to listen for the emotion created in them by it (the artwork). Lacking such experiences, they have not had real appreciation of it as a work of art." In this view, appreciation of another's art is best achieved through doing one's own art. One has to listen to one's own emotions before one can listen for emotions in another's work.

When creative activities are properly used by the teacher the specific child under his guidance becomes far better prepared for appreciation of art and of life than the combination of all the
stereotyped courses in art history, art principles, or design techniques could have made him. (p. 253)

However convinced that self-expression was the route to appreciation, the late progressives were reluctant to eliminate it entirely from the art curriculum, Macdonald's 1941 text offers a "Course of Study in Art Appreciation for the Present Public High School." She apologetically suggests that in ideal situations with small classes and sufficient time devoted to art classes, that one would not need such a course structure (p. 216). Similar to high school art appreciation courses cited in Chapter 4, Macdonald's course includes fine arts topics such as architecture, painting, and sculpture, as well as decorative arts topics such as textiles, wallpaper, and rugs. Information about these topics is provided, as well as a list of suggestions for independent projects. Although the course objectives are psychological in tone and include goals such as active perception, self-release, and self-expression, the course is oriented to acquisition of knowledge.

In summary, both the Rugg/Shumaker and Macdonald texts are important for this study since they clearly make a distinction between an intellectualism that they associate with art appreciation education and the beauty rationale and a psychological view that is characterized as warm, personal, and process-centered. Interestingly, however, Macdonald does not go so far as to eliminate appreciation
altogether. Like the progressives cited in Chapter 4, she writes her "appreciation chapter," but unlike them, she questions the value of it. Also, like many progressives, she reserves art appreciation for the high school level. As we will see, this tradition was carried forward by Viktor Lowenfeld.

5.3 *Viktor Lowenfeld, Art Education Leader*

5.3.1 **Background**

Art education historian Donald Jones maintains that Viktor Lowenfeld (1903-1960) "emerged in the late forties as the most influential art educator of our professional history" and that, although his work didn't discount aesthetic education, his "influence upon art education, as it was put into practice was detrimental to the growth and development of the aesthetic dimension of children" (Jones, p. 15). Arthur Efland, also an art education historian, cites Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth* as "the most influential textbook on art education in the present century" (1979, p. 28). Frederick Logan (1955, p. 217) also cites Lowenfeld's work as seminal.

Given the influence of this key figure and his textbook that was first published in 1947 and, 40 years later, is in its eighth edition, we will devote the remainder of this chapter to a study of the role of art appreciation in the eight editions of his textbook. Viktor Lowenfeld is most popularly known for his psychological stage theory of creative and mental development. Lowenfeld delineates the
stages which are evidenced in the art of children and adolescents as the scribbling state (two to four years), the pre-schematic stage (four to seven years), the schematic stage (seven to nine years), the stage of dawning realism (nine to eleven years), the pseudo-naturalistic stage (eleven to thirteen years), and the period of decision (adolescence). These stages are the foundation of his textbook and they remain constant throughout the eight editions.

The format for *Creative and Mental Growth* is basically similar in all editions. There are chapters devoted to a developmental description of each stage; characteristic artworks by students at that level illustrate the text. Recommendations as to how to motivate students who are at these various stages and also which art materials are appropriate for each stage are also provided. Paradoxically, the Lowenfeld theory was meant to promote creativity through spontaneous free expression on the part of students, but in practice the theory was often translated into prescriptive charts that teachers could cling to. Lowenfeld's description became prescription.

Although known for his interdictions against teaching art appreciation, the first (1947) edition of *Creative and Mental Growth* did, in fact, address the aesthetic needs of the child. In his Preface, Lowenfeld says that one must venture beyond the "aesthetic standpoint" to "look behind the doors to see the sources from which their (children's)
creative activity springs" (p. v). Unlike Rugg, who claimed that progressive teachers took an intellectual approach, Lowenfeld admonishes progressive teachers for using only an "intuitive approach" and suggests that they rely instead on the findings of psychology. Creative and Mental Growth "attempts to give any teacher, not only art teachers, an understanding of the psychology necessary for the understanding of the child's creative production" (p. vi). Given this emphasis on production, however, he does allow that during adolescence skills and critical awareness take precedence over unconscious creation. This critical awareness becomes the rationale for including art critical material on the elements of composition into the first edition of his text (1947, p. vii). The key to understanding why Lowenfeld includes aspects of art appreciation in his textbook is in considering the context for his inclusion. It is important to note at the outset that most of the content of Creative and Mental Growth (in all of its eight editions) is devoted to descriptions of children's art products and processes through the lens of psychological developmental stages and that the issue of art appreciation plays a very small part in these texts.

5.3.2 Eight Editions of Creative and Mental Growth: Art Appreciation Analysis

According to Lowenfeld, "A work of art . . . can only be understood when the driving forces which lead to its creation are understood" (p. 156). To Lowenfeld, there is
no absolute truth in a work of art because truth is relative. When considering works of art, he maintained that one must look to the epochs and cultures from which the works came and to the intentions of the artists who created the works. Ideally, these understandings of elements of composition, art epochs, and intentions of artists should flow naturally from the student's own creative work. "Questions of aesthetics or composition cannot or, better, should not be taught, but must grow out of the individual work of the student" (p. 165). (Emphasis Lowenfeld's) Yet, like Macdonald, the first edition of Lowenfeld's textbook includes an outline for a unit entitled "History of Art" (pp. 248-250). This unit may be seen as an accommodation to a generation of teachers who traditionally taught appreciation and production.

Included at the end of the chapter that covers the "Period of Decision" (adolescence), the history of art outline is in a section called "Laboratory Work." The unit of study begins with modern architecture and directs students to comparisons of the new with the old, then proceeds to functionally designed furniture and to consideration of "modern pictures" and murals. In contrast to previous progressive units of art appreciation, contemporary art (represented by abstract artists Calder, Kandinsky, and Mondrian as well as expressive artists Picasso, Leger, and Rouault) here takes precedence. Carrying forward his suggestion that students learn about
the relative truths in art, Lowenfeld suggests that they study the relationships between art and life in ten epochs and cultures by studying a spoon, a house, and a picture from each epoch and culture (p. 249). This reinforces his concept of relative aesthetic value and also relates art objects to the everyday life of a student who will have commerce with spoons, houses, and pictures. He also suggests lessons on the relationship between technique and content by studying how different epochs or cultures worked with pictorial content on a variety of surfaces and with a variety of materials. Examples include basilica frescos, medieval book miniatures, and Renaissance tempera and gold paintings. The "Laboratory" sections remain in the Lowenfeld text until the fourth edition when W. Lambert Brittain becomes co-author.

Although art appreciation has taken on a different form in the early Lowenfeld texts, it is still afforded validity as a part of the art education curriculum. In contrast to earlier progressives, the text emphasizes modern art and uses art history to teach relative value rather than absolute value of chosen artworks. Its inclusion in the text's final chapter on last stages of development is critically important since Lowenfeld believed that, prior to this stage, students were not ready to think critically, nor should time be spent on anything but self-expression. This shift of art appreciation from the elementary grades to the upper grades had been presaged by the early progressives;
however, their rationale for teaching appreciation was that school had a civic responsibility to teach cultural heritage. The difference between their approach and Lowenfeld's approach is that Lowenfeld suggested teaching about art as a socio-political commentary on an age - yet another way to come to understand one's own version of truth by understanding the society in which one lives. In the first edition he says:

The concept of 'truth' should be established from as many angles as possible, especially with the help of works of art, of different epochs and cultures. It will then become evident that 'truth' is relative . . . To show and demonstrate this relationship between experience and art work in the greatest possible varieties is one of the most educational means that may eventuate in an unhampered interpretation of experience. (p. 156)

Lowenfeld's first edition addresses issues of interest to those concerned with aesthetic education. In his "The Meaning of Aesthetic Criteria," which serves as an introduction to the section on the elements of composition, he includes his warning that the elements of composition (line, space, light/shadow, and color) should not be taught directly to students. The section on composition is included, he says, because it is considered an important tool for the teacher (p. 166).

It is not the student but the teacher who must learn the meaning of composition, and understand it, in order to guide the student. In this way, certain qualities or needs of expression or aesthetics can be achieved with the least effort and discouragement. (p. 166)
In the work of Lowenfeld, what to past art appreciation adherents was a systematized way of looking at another's work of art becomes a tool for understanding one's own psyche. What brought intellectual distance for one group brings psychological closeness for the Lowenfeldian adherents.

Lowenfeld's first edition describes the various stages of creative growth and development in terms of general characteristics, human figure, space, color, and design and he suggests topics and techniques for the teacher that are appropriate to the stage. These aspects are charted at the end of each chapter. In the second edition (1952/1953), Lowenfeld changes the charts by replacing the above aspects with indications of growth: intellectual growth, emotional growth, social growth, perceptual growth, physical growth, aesthetic growth, and creative growth. Again, these are charted at the end of each developmental stage chapter. This schematic framework remains basically the same through the following editions from 1957 to 1987.

In the second edition of Creative and Mental Growth (1952/1953), Lowenfeld's description of aesthetic growth is based on the individual's ability to bring internal consciousness to terms with the external world. Although this process is dependent on organizational processes, in this view the organization is highly individual and culturally relative.

Aesthetic growth is organic with no set standards; it may differ from individual to individual and
from culture to culture . . . If we attempt to regiment aesthetics, we arrive at dogmatic laws which have their expression in totalitarian rules . . . all set rules rigidly applied to any creative expression, are detrimental to aesthetic growth (p. 40).

(This reference to totalitarianism is particularly pointed, since Lowenfeld fled from Nazi Germany.) One might then ask how we assess the aesthetic growth and development of a child given that there are no standards. According to Lowenfeld, "aesthetic growth reveals itself by an increasing sensitivity to the total integration of all experiences concerning thinking, feeling, and perceiving" (p. 40).

The tension between this description of aesthetic growth that is to have no standards and the aforementioned inclusion of a section on the elements of composition which certainly suggests a framework for standards points to an important contradiction in Lowenfeld's work. In fact, if we examine a sampling of the evaluation charts for aesthetic growth for each stage, we will find compositional "standards" such as unity (e.g., "Does the child think in terms of the whole drawing when he draws?" [p. 43]), and color distribution (e.g., "Are colors related to each other?" [p. 215]). These aspects of composition and aesthetic growth remain in place, unremarked upon, and unrelated to appreciation of another's art through the third edition (1957). However, in the third edition, Lowenfeld does add a section on appreciation of others' works in his introductory chapter.
The third edition (1957) is important to examine carefully because it is the last edition over which Lowenfeld had full control. (He died in 1960 and W. Lambert Brittain became co-author beginning with the fourth edition of 1964.) In it, he retains sections describing aesthetic growth and he also retains his section on composition, although it is no longer part of his chapter on adolescence. It now stands as a separate chapter entitled, "The Meaning of Aesthetic Criteria." The content remains basically the same, although his decision to make it a separate chapter is important in that he removes it from the context of stage development. Lowenfeld's addition of an appreciation section in his introductory chapter on the meaning of creative activity in elementary education is divided into three parts - the level of the appreciator, the subject matter, and the means of expression. The psychological basis for appreciation is self identification with the artist.

Lowenfeld maintains that children react differently to pictures and art objects as they move through developmental levels. To support this stance, he cites a 1955 doctoral dissertation undertaken in the graduate program that he directed (p. 33). His own negative experience with classroom teachers who are so involved with their own appreciation that they neglect their own pupils' responses is also cited as evidence. The pupils' responses (as opposed to the teacher's responses) should be the basis for
appreciation. However, questions such as "How do you feel about this picture? Of what does it remind you? Do you like it?" are admissible (pp. 33-34). Lowenfeld adds a warning that "It must, however, never be forgotten that the aim of art appreciation is not to 'analyze' pictures or to learn to 'understand' a work of art" (p. 33). Subject matter of pictures for children should be a consideration only inasmuch as the child can identify as intensely with the subject as the artist did. The same holds for the means of expression. The child must ultimately identify himself or herself with both content and medium. For the latter, Lowenfeld suggests that teachers help students to identify themselves with a color just as they would identify themselves with a friend. Lowenfeld is more at ease inveighing against what one should avoid in the area of art appreciation than he is at making positive suggestions.

One can see how this self-identification approach fits well within a psychological framework in which the teacher's energies are devoted to the unfettered creative and mental growth of the individual child. Yet, this "relational" approach to art appreciation can only ultimately lead to a belief that all interpretation is subjective and that one can simply dismiss a work of art because it holds nothing with which the observer can personally relate. One also must pause at Lowenfeld's suggestion that a teacher can help a line or color come alive for a child through self-identification, yet cannot communicate his or her own
enthusiasm for a color or line, nor certainly a longstanding academic appreciation of an artist's contribution to color or line. These admonitions of Lowenfeld's resonate with his comment that dogma of any sort can result in totalitarian thinking. It is ironic that many readers have taken Lowenfeld's own rather dogmatic words out of context to support eliminating art appreciation altogether from the curriculum and have dogmatically followed his non-interference "rules." One passage that recurs in contemporary reviews of Lowenfeld's influence on art appreciation education is from his third edition:

Don't impose your own images on a child! All modes of expression but the child's are foreign to him. We should neither influence nor stimulate the child's imagination in any direction which is not appropriate to his thinking and perception. The child has his own world of experiences and expression. (p. 14) (Emphasis Lowenfeld's)

Although this was not said in the context of art appreciation education, it is certainly reflective of the spirit toward art appreciation that readers carry away from the Lowenfeld texts.

After Lowenfeld's death in 1960, W. Lambert Brittain became co-author of Creative and Mental Growth. Although the changes related to art appreciation in the fourth edition (1964) are minimal, the changes between the third and fifth editions are substantive. The fifth edition (1970) section on aspects of growth that includes aesthetic growth remains similar, and Brittain reiterates the Lowenfeldian warning that "Art activity cannot be imposed
but must come as a spirit from within" (p. 33). Lowenfeld's chapter on elements of composition, formerly entitled "The Meaning of Aesthetic Criteria," becomes "The Development of Aesthetic Awareness" in the fifth edition. The section on elements of composition is deleted from this edition. Maintaining the assertion that aesthetic awareness is developmental and that it means "educating a person's sensitivity toward perceptual, intellectual, and emotional experiences" the text also warns that "It is possible to get over zealous . . . The need for developing an understanding and appreciation of those things around us must come from the person himself. There is no evidence that aesthetics can be easily measured, or that absorbing the vocabulary of aesthetics will refine one's taste . . ." (pp. 315-317).

Commenting on the use of art history to teach appreciation, the fifth edition of Creative and Mental Growth (1970) suggests that art history is only one view of one "authority" that "does not necessarily provide us with an appreciation . . ." (p. 319). The argument that one should know art as part of one's cultural heritage is also debunked:

Some art educators would no doubt argue that art appreciation of individuals needs to be cultivated and taught by those who are somehow wise and educated. This goes against the basic assumption of democracy, in which every person, unless previously intimidated, is usually a strong defender of his own views and tastes. (p. 320)

Again, the issue of art appreciation here becomes a socio-political concern that gets convoluted in arguments such as
those about elitism and totalitarianism. This view is reiterated in the discussion of contemporary interior design that reflects an "insecure society" that wants to escape into a dated "world of meaningless stereotyped patterns," but refuses to recognize the works of modern artists such as Rauschenberg (pp. 322-323). The text continues with an indictment of the "gracious living" model of aesthetics which has no meaning for children who come from environments that are both "dirty and depressing," and finally suggests that "Aesthetics must be removed from the good, the true, and the beautiful" (p. 324). In this rejection of Platonic idealism, Creative and Mental Growth clearly resonates with John Dewey's Art As Experience. Since, in this view, there are no eternal verities, the role, if any, for art appreciation education is that it is in the service of self awareness.

This concern for the instability of truth also extends to concerns about the relative value of artworks. Using the 1899 Wilson picture study text as an example, the fifth edition of Creative and Mental Growth points to the dated choices of pictures and suggests that a Picasso might be more appropriate, but later adds that today's choices might be viewed as amusing by future generations (p. 335). Brittain's choices for objects of art for study reflect earlier progressive curricula -- changing foliage colors, the texture of clothing, experiences in buildings. Choosing pictures for children to appreciate is discouraged; however,
once the junior high age is reached, there can be more latitude (p. 340). In the final analysis, the prescription for those concerned about art appreciation remains: the ultimate goals for art education should be awareness of self and awareness of one's own immediate environment. Outside of those considerations, one has to address socio-political issues of class, elitism, and dogmatism before one can teach art appreciation.

The sixth (1975), seventh (1982), and eighth (1987) editions are basically similar in format to the fifth edition. However, there are some textual changes that merit mention. In his introduction to the sixth edition, Brittain refers to the decision to isolate the discussion of aesthetic growth from the rest of the child's development (p. v). This isolation of the chapter, which first occurred in the fifth edition, evidently caused concern in the field. This is not surprising since this change coincided with expressed concerns in the field that art education under the influence of Creative and Mental Growth had all but eliminated art appreciation education. (See following chapter on the research and development era.) By including a chapter on the subject, even though it did support those who chose not to teach appreciation, Brittain was still nodding to the continued interest in the debate.

Brittain retains the chapter title "The Development of Aesthetic Awareness" in the three editions, but changes the location of the chapter from Chapter 12 in the sixth edition
to Chapter 4 in the last two editions. He continues to cite studies that support his premise that aesthetic education should not be taught at the elementary level (1975, p. 401). He does allow again that children could be given the opportunity to "pick out" pictures (originals or reproductions) that they can share with each other, adding that "The teacher, too, should be able to have some say in the selection of such works of art" (p. 402). This contradicts former stands. Secondary students are encouraged to seek out appreciative activities in the workaday world of dressmakers, printers, and construction workers because one "who is fascinated with the construction methods of the local contractor is also ready to appreciate the fine arts" (p. 405). The assumption is that developing sensitivity to the "real" world is more valuable than developing sensitivity to fine arts.

In moving the aesthetic awareness chapter from twelfth place to fourth place, Brittain remarks in the preface to the seventh edition (1982) that the chapter "deserves a place with the other important factors that give a basis for understanding and planning experiences with children" (unpaginated). He adds new studies by researchers interested in stage theory of aesthetic development. One wonders if Brittain is simply waiting for a researcher to correlate aesthetic stages with Lowenfeld's creative and mental growth stages, thereby providing support for not including art appreciation at the elementary level. Other
than the new studies, the content of the chapter mirrors his fifth edition.

In the eighth edition (1987), Brittain makes some content revisions in the fourth chapter. He asserts that "Aesthetics may be thought of as the nonfactual, nonobjective reactions of a person to the environment" (p. 102). He later reasserts this point: "the appreciation of art thrives on discussion and is not subject to the usual test of factual knowledge regarding style, period of history, or artist" (p. 106). This view of appreciation as essentially subjective musings is further buttressed in an expanded section on aesthetics and society's values in which the case of the incorrectly attributed painting, The Golden Helmet, is cited as an example of relative value. (Until recently, the painting was attributed to Rembrandt.) The continual flux of society's values is reiterated as yet one more reason to tend to the child's needs rather than to society's needs. The child's needs can be consistently predicted; society's needs cannot.

Brittain directly addresses critics such as researchers Lovano and Kerr who decry the lack of art programs that include appreciation. Brittain counters that it isn't a lack of instruction that makes students culturally illiterate in the visual arts, it is their developmental inability to abstract from the concrete until they are twelve years old (p. 123). Brittain doesn't deny that fifth and sixth graders can be taught art appreciation, but
contends that "interest in the fine arts would be lost in the process" (p. 123). He grudgingly suggests that teachers wait until students are at least twelve or thirteen years old, but adds that even then the use of reproductions rather than original works of art could be psychologically detrimental:

We need to do more than show pictures to children, more than provide them with a vocabulary so that they can respond properly. Artists are real people, reacting to the world, expressing feelings, manipulating colors, experimenting with form, doing the same things that children do. Until children understand this bond, the arts are passive and the mode of presentation is irrelevant. (p. 134)

5.3.3 Summary

We have thus come full circle, returning ultimately to a Lowenfeldian edict that those involved in art education should be involved only in process. Once we introduce an image outside of the immediate experience of the child, we introduce content. Ironically, the calls for free expression that are an essential component to creative and mental growth were transformed into a teacher's art education bible that offered teachers what they thought was a scientific rationale for not teaching art at all. It was sufficient if they could describe the stage that their charges had reached and provide appropriate art materials so that students' natural creative and mental abilities could unfold.

However, it is also clear from this examination of the eight editions of Creative and Mental Growth that neither
Lowenfeld nor Brittain was wholly comfortable denying any place for art content or art appreciation. By continually moving material that was traditionally in the province of art appreciation in order to ascertain if it had a place in a psychological view of art education, the authors show that it remained, and still remains, a problem not solved. Unfortunately, the result of this indecisiveness was that art appreciation temporarily lost its place in art education.
6.1 Introduction

Although the appreciation aspect of art education was for the most part ignored by those trained according to Lowenfeld's theories, a movement among theoreticians emerged in the early 1960s to counter this prevailing practice. The central argument was that studio art should be balanced by art appreciation. Three major figures and two minor figures who played a role in this movement will be introduced. As has been mentioned above, Lowenfeld's theories prevailed during this time and, to a large extent, continue to prevail today. Little of the new theory was translated into large scale practice.

During the 1950s, two trends piqued the federal government's interest in promoting an art education that would include art appreciation. With the launching of Sputnik in 1957 educators began to look at inherent weaknesses in the nation's schools. Attention was focused on the curriculum. Jerome Bruner gathered an interdisciplinary team of scholars to a conference at Woods Hole, Massachusetts and from this conference emerged his classic book, *The Process of Education* (1960). His advice to the nation's schools was to look to the nature of subject matter taught (as opposed to the nature of the child).
Bruner claimed that children should be taught to understand the "structure of the discipline" in the same way that scholars understand the structures of their disciplines. Once children understand how those in a particular field think, they can apply this way of thinking to new problems. This argument for a "discipline based" approach to education encouraged art education theorists to look at their discipline beyond the narrow confines of the creative artist (in whose discipline it was difficult, if not impossible, to find a universal structure) to the other art disciplines of art history, art criticism and aesthetics.

The second societal influence that gave impetus to what came to be called the aesthetic education movement was an increase in general support and appreciation for the arts and humanities. This was especially apparent during the 1961-1963 administration of John F. Kennedy and was carried through subsequent administrations. In 1963, the federal government's support of aesthetic education was evidenced by the establishment of the Arts and Humanities Program within the Department of Education's Bureau of Research, where it stayed until 1970. Funding was generous; Engel (1975) reports that the U.S.O.E. Bureau of Research supported over 200 projects, spending about $10.6 million over a timespan of six years (p. 75).

From 1964 until 1966, the U.S.O.E. sponsored seventeen conferences to bring together theorists as well as
practitioners interested in aesthetic education. One of the pivotal conferences was held in 1964 at Pennsylvania State University, one of the foremost trainers of art educators and, ironically, the academic home of Viktor Lowenfeld. Lowenfeld had died in 1960. June McFee notes that the Penn State seminar "grew out of the need for quality research in art education . . . There was money to support such research because value was then held high that education was a major force in social reform and that art education was a significant part of education in a free society" (McFee, p. 276). The focus of the conference was on art education as a discipline with a subject matter structure, in contrast to the Lowenfeldian focus that art education was a psychological tool for the freeing of self expression. The issue for researchers at the conference was not only to flesh out this theory of art education as discipline-based, but also to propose a way to transform that theory into practice for the nation's schools. The work of five of the eminent thinkers who participated in this process will be reviewed.

6.2 Manual Barkan and the CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program

Vincent Lanier has characterized Manual Barkan as a leader who "powerfully spearhead(ed)" a movement which bred a new kind of art education (Lanier, 1974, p. 12). Barkan was prescient in his pre-Sputnik, pre-Penn State Seminar doctoral dissertation entitled A Foundation for Art
Education (1955). He called for an art education that would have as its base not only the making of art, but also the appreciating of art. In 1963, Barkan asked, in a journal article by the same title, "Is there a discipline of art education?" His answer was that "Art education could become a discipline if it would develop a distinctive structure" (Barkan, p. 4). He reiterated this view when he was at the Penn State Seminar when he urged his peers to create curricula that "must solve difficult problems of dealing with recommendations to attend in certain ways to certain features of art" (1966, p. 243).

Barkan's approach to the problem of how to give a "distinctive structure" to art education so that students would "attend to art in certain ways" was to look at the ways that scholars attend to art.

Manual Barkan was concerned about the structure of the body of knowledge about art, and so he maintained that just as artists, critics and others engage in disciplined structured inquiry, so too should art educators when they introduce children to art. He indicated the need for art educators to 'synthesize the knowledge in art of the artist and the knowledge about art of the aesthetcian, the critic and the historian'" (Parrott, p. 75).

At the Penn State Seminar, Barkan accepted the task of writing a proposal to research and develop this concept.

After three years of wrangling with the U.S. Office of Education about the nature of the proposal, it was decided that the Central Midwestern Regional Laboratory (known by the acronym CEMREL) would sponsor Barkan's work. In 1970, Barkan, in close association with Laura Chapman and Evan
Kern, published *Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic Education*. A key concept in *Guidelines* was that curricula should be based on the problem-centered inquiries of art professionals (Efland, 1987, p. 70). This concept is imbedded in the text that makes up the first quarter of this tome; the rest of the book is devoted to an extensive glossary that only begins to address the "distinctive structure" issue. It appears that the authors had to address the issue of agreeing on terms before they could proceed. Unfortunately, that dialogue was not continued by Barkan beyond the phase of defining terms due to his untimely death shortly after *Guidelines* was completed.

Stanley Madeja was given the task of directing CEMREL's efforts to create a curriculum based on the Barkan *Guidelines*. Although the resulting *Aesthetic Education Program* did not strictly adhere to Barkan's recommendations, CEMREL and Madeja did produce twelve units of study that were designed to heighten "those vital sensitivities which enable individuals to make informed judgments about things which matter to them" (Madeja, p. 11). The units were designed around six "centers of attention": Aesthetics in the Physical World, Aesthetics and Art Elements, Aesthetics and the Creative Process, Aesthetics and the Artist, Aesthetics and the Culture, and Aesthetics and the Environment. Madeja planned to integrate visual art with all of the fine arts into units which were ordered sequentially for elementary grade level students. The
prevailing methodology would be the abovementioned one of problem solving.

The general nature of the content of the units reflects the belief held by Madeja that the materials would be used by the classroom teacher who might not have special arts expertise. Within the units, the activities were written so that each one could stand separately, thereby giving the classroom teacher flexibility to mix and match activities to meet her needs. Each lesson included an introduction, lesson and materials. Lesson titles suggest the somewhat abstract nature of the content: Making Patterns Into Sounds, Examining Point of View, Perceiving Sound Word Patterns, Relating Sound and Movement, Constructing Dramatic Plot, Forming with Movements (Hurwitz & Madeja, p. 131).

Criticisms of the Aesthetic Education Program have been directed at both its content and style. Geraldine Dimondstein objects to its analytical approach.

The materials allow for no tolerance of ambiguous meanings - the tensions, conflicts, and resolutions that are inherent conditions of an aesthetic experience. Rather they attempt to set up forms of pleasurable experience related to formal units by breaking (them) up into interchangeable components that operate independently of the expressive content of that experience. (p. 16)

Efland cites a critique of Gilbert Clark that, although many of the packages reached classrooms, they sat on shelves because they were difficult to use. Clark compares them to the science kits of the 1960s and 1970s in terms of the difficulties practitioners had in keeping the parts together
and in replacing and replenishing kits (Efland, 1987, p. 71).

The writer can personally attest to the above criticisms of the CEMREL materials, as she purchased one of the kits in 1975 for use in an elementary school library/media center. She can still recall, nearly fifteen years later, opening the impressive yellow box and being disappointed with a confusing array of concrete parts to serve, paradoxically, lesson plans with very abstract content. She recalls also wondering how, as the person responsible for maintaining the kit, she would keep track of the pieces. In the final analysis, she didn't have to worry because the abstract, analytical nature of the materials held little appeal for the teachers and the kit sat on the shelf gathering dust.

In a positive light, however, the writer did have success promoting a less ambitious Barkan-inspired program. In 1967, Barkan and Chapman published Guidelines for Art Instruction Through Television for the Elementary School, which resulted in the production of Images and Things - 30 20-minute programs for ten- to thirteen-year-old students. Each program functioned as a separate entity and revolved around a theme such as "Stars and Heroes" or "Sea Images." The programs explored how the theme was rendered in selected works from the arts and humanities. Visual art was a strong component. Images and Things continues to be broadcast on instructional television.
The contribution that Manual Barkan made to art appreciation education was in his posing of the important question as to what disciplines were central to art education and in his support of balancing studio art with the disciplines of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. This concept has prevailed in the research and development community for more than 20 years; however, the translation of the idea into practice has met many obstacles. It has been suggested that the CEMREL program failed because Madeja didn't adhere to Barkan's original themes (Efland, 1987, pp. 69-70). As we saw above, others blame the format. Perhaps the underlying reason is that the federal government was looking for a "quick fix" curriculum that would bring appreciation back into the schools and that the discipline-based theory hadn't been developed enough.

The developers of the CEMREL program were also committed to including all of the arts and also to including the thoughts of an advisory group of practicing performing and visual artists in their program. One critic maintains that by doing so they got only a "lowest common denominator" base for their work (Efland, 1987, p. 70). This would also partially account for the abstract nature of the content.

On the other hand, the success of the Images and Things series can be attributed to the ease with which teachers could use the programs, given that they had access to educational television. The content of the programs was also concrete; and, as is also indicated by the title, the
focus was on visual art. Yet, the series did little to advance the cause of a truly discipline-based art education that incorporates studio art with art history, art criticism and aesthetics. In practice, the program afforded the classroom teacher with twenty minutes of easy cultural education; there is no evidence to suggest that these programs were ever tied to studio art classes.

6.3 **Harry Broudy and the Aesthetic Eye Project**

Ralph A. Smith, editor of the *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, marks the beginning of the aesthetic education movement with a 1951 essay by philosopher Harry Broudy. He says that it was Broudy who inspired "the beginning of renewed systematic concern with aesthetic education" (1971, pp. 146-147). Harry Broudy advocates an educational goal of "enlightened cherishing" for all students; he places this concept in a framework of values education and wants educators to commit themselves to the development, in students, of enlightened preferences. "The problem of quality, both in life and education . . . comes down to the possibility of systematic instruction and expertise judgment in the realm of feeling" (1970, p. 286). For Broudy, aesthetic education gives meaning and value to later experience; it educates our life of feelings.

One accomplishes this education of feeling by turning to the works of those artists who exemplify fine-honed expressions of feelings. Exemplars of great artists' works provide perceivers with paradigms of direct understanding.
"by which the most cultivated people of the past perceived their world" (Broudy, 1970, p. 290). It is Broudy's contention that the valuing of these works teaches not only connoisseurship, but also teaches students the criteria that the cultivated use to justify their preferences. Although Harry Broudy's influence has not been widely felt in the development of programs or curricular materials, he has been the major philosopher in the discipline-based art education movement. Manual Barkan provided the movement with the "what" of the discipline of art education, i.e., the four disciplines, but Harry Broudy provided the "why."

In 1972, Broudy published an elaboration of his 1951 essay, a book entitled Enlightened Cherishing: An Essay on Aesthetic Education. Broudy first makes a distinction between critics of the schools who either want to change education to suit their views of what a school should be or critics who object to a school's methods (p. 4). Broudy asserts that he will do neither because the former is too global while the latter is too minute. Broudy's middle path is a kind of criticism that is concerned with an education in values that results in a "love of objects and actions that by certain norms and standards are worthy of our love" (p. 6). Why is this kind of education important? Because "The good society, like the good life for the individual, involves examining the stereotypes and not merely rebelling against them, and this examination is carried on by cultivated persons - buffs in thinking, feeling, and
perceiving - connoisseurs who use the critical tradition to move forward to new ground. This is the enlightened life" (p. 115). How does one, given this belief, educate for enlightened cherishing?

Broudy begins to answer this with his conception of the mind as "no more and no less than the operations by which it creates, stores, retrieves, and combines the imagic surrogates of the real world" (p. 14). This is a philosophical view based on realism. Carrying forward this tradition, Broudy says that "imagination must be disciplined by thought if cherishing is to be enlightened" (p. 15).

Broudy doesn't deny the role of imagination to scientists, but argues that it is easier to justify the good fruits of imagination in science than it is in the arts and humanities.

Thus, Broudy's prototypical mind - a mind that stores, transforms, retrieves, and creates images - is the mind of the artist. By disciplining our minds to imagine and perceive as an artist imagines and perceives, we will deepen our store of "imagic associations," thereby expanding our capacity for enlightened cherishing. In a telling comment about the role of psychology in this conception, Broudy writes:

Responses (to art) can be complex or simple, rich or impoverished, stereotyped or vividly original; one cannot predict what they will be. If we could predict the response, we would not be dealing with art or with aesthetic experience; we would be doing empirical psychology. Perhaps one day psychology will be able to predict the responses to all possible stimuli. On that day there will be little
room for imagination, and the psychologists will have cured us of it. (p. 28)

The basis of this remark is Broudy's belief that to be human is to be able to imagine what might be and what ought to be.

Besides imagination, aesthetic experience is made up of perception. It is in this realm that schools can train students. "Aesthetic education is first of all the training of imaginative perception to enable the pupil to apprehend sensory content, formed into an image that expresses some feeling quality" (p. 57). The three components of sensory content, formed image and feeling quality become the cornerstones of Broudy's art appreciation teaching methodology. "Aesthetic scanning" is the term used for this four-part perceptual approach. Aesthetic scanning "involves the exploration of sensory, formal, expressive, and technical qualities" (Hamblen, 1985, p. 4). Since Broudy's technique requires no prior knowledge of the art object, it is well suited to the needs of the generalist classroom teacher.

Aesthetic scanning involves following a prescribed path through many levels of perception. In 1987, Efland published a chart (p. 84) entitled, "The Nature of Informed Aesthetic Response - Levels of Aesthetic Perception as Described by Broudy." First, one identifies as completely as possible the aesthetic object's sensory properties. By scanning the object visually, one can perceive shape, color, texture, proportions, etc. These are termed skills of
observation. Next, one responds to "ways in which objects or events are organized to achieve expressive power." This is accomplished by identifying formal properties, especially as each varied element contributes to the organic unity of the whole. One scans for theme, thematic variation, balance, rhythm, evolution (movement of one part to another) and for hierarchy (dominant and subordinate elements). In the third phase, one responds to the value import of objects which is construed to mean what the object "has to say." This is accomplished by scanning for expressive properties. This step is explained: "Objects and events which are aesthetic possess metaphorical and presentational characteristics which evoke responses from one's "imagic stores" and translate sensory properties into pervasive qualities such as mood language . . . dynamic states . . . (and) idea and ideal language" (p. 84). Finally, one notices how the object was made, although this is not necessary. Broudy makes the distinction between skills of impression, such as those described above, and skills of expression (1976, p. 87).

The effect of Broudy's theory on practice was felt in his eighteen month Aesthetic Eye project, undertaken in 1975-1976 and funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. The project was designed for 50 teachers and museum educators who were taught Broudy's scanning technique in a summer institute. During the summer, participants wrote lesson plans which they then field-tested with their
respective classes the following school year. During the year, they were supported in their efforts by Aesthetic Eye project staff (Efland, 1987, p. 84). Besides the scanning technique, teachers included art critical material which was subdivided into historical, recreative, and judicial aspects.

One important difference between the Broudy approach and the Barkan/Madeja approach is in the area of curriculum. The CEMREL program resulted in a written product, whereas the Broudy project resulted in training in a process. A second difference is the Aesthetic Eye's emphasis on visual art, contrasted to the CEMREL attempt to include concepts common to all of the arts. Both programs abstract elements from perceptual experience and categorize them into formal properties, thereby valuing the critical processes over the historical processes or studio experiences.

As a philosophical realist, Harry Broudy's belief in the existence of eternal verities is in sharp contrast to the progressive pragmatists who held to the idea that process and activity were of utmost importance. The realist stance can also be contrasted to the empirical psychologists who have little interest in what might or what ought to be, but rather concern themselves with observing and describing what is. Although both the realists and the empiricists depend on sensory data as a basis for knowledge, the realists maintain a belief in the existence of the mind. In this regard, the realists are philosophically aligned with
the idealists. In 1987, Broudy himself aligned the Hegelian idealists with contemporary supporters of d.b.a.e.: "For many of them (Hegelians), internalizing these cosmic attributes of Being with the help of instruction was the definition of education. This notion or some form of it continues to be the claim of those who want the schools to make art a part of the required general curriculum" (p. 30). Both realists and idealists believe that there is a body of knowledge that is worthy of our disciplined attention. Thus, the picture study idealists and the contemporary realists share an essential belief in the importance of art appreciation education as a vehicle for transmitting exemplars of higher order thinking and feeling.

6.4 Elliot Eisner and the Kettering Project

Elliot Eisner has been a foremost proponent of art appreciation education. As past president of the National Art Education Association, Eisner has had a platform from which to speak his views and he has done so often and well. His Educating Artistic Vision was published in 1972 as a textbook for teachers and advocates the inclusion of art critical and art historical material into the curriculum. Eisner delineates art critical material into five dimensions: the experiential, the formal, the symbolic, the thematic, and the material (pp. 106-110). He also recommends the inclusion of art historical material in the art curriculum as a way to "understand the context of the work (which) requires an understanding of the conditions
that give rise to the work as well as the way in which the
work affected the times. . ." (p. 110).

As a curriculum specialist, Eisner argues that we must
enlarge the scope of the curriculum beyond the discursive.
"What is most important in human experience is not what is
apparent, but, instead, what is felt about what is apparent"
(1982b, p. 60). He claims that the reason for using the
arts in education is that humans need to use their senses to
alter their ways of looking at themselves and the world:
"Human beings become saturated, bored, and eventually
withdraw psychologically if opportunity to alter their
states of mind is unavailable" (1982b, p. 74).

In 1967, the Charles F. Kettering Foundation funded
Eisner to create an art curriculum that could be taught by
classroom teachers to young children. The curriculum was
arranged according to increasingly complex concepts and its
format provided for student practice after the introductions
of each new concept (Efland, 1987, p. 78). The Kettering
Project produced a two-volume curriculum; one volume was
devoted to lessons on art criticism and art history and one
volume was devoted to the studio production. The lessons
were supported by many multimedia resources packaged in
large "Kettering boxes."

The Kettering curriculum structure, as described by
Eisner (1972b, p. 10), is based on the following structure:
(1) Domain, (2) Concept or Mode, (3) Principle or Medium,
(4) Rationale, (5) Objectives, (6) Motivating Activity, (7)
Learning Activity, (8) Instructional Support Media, (9) Evaluation Procedures. The domains of art learning include the productive, the critical, and the historical which are described by Eisner as "making visual form, learning to see visual form, and understanding the cultural aspects of visual form in the history of art" (1972b, p. 10). The productive domain is subdivided into various modes of production and the critical and historical modes are subdivided into concepts. For example, the critical domain includes the concepts of color, composition, and line. Although the Kettering materials were never made commercially available, for the last ten years the state of Hawaii has been publishing them and has mandated their use. The state has further ensured their use by providing a supervisory support structure for the local schools.

Elliot Eisner articulates some important assumptions that clearly mark differences between him and those loyal to the Lowenfeldian school of art education as self expression. He first argues for the importance of art education for its own sake, as opposed to the Lowenfeldian view that art is a psychological tool. He argues against the developmental stage theories insisting that art is a "complex form of learning and is not an automatic consequence of maturation" (1972b, p. 6). He elaborates on this point by suggesting that while children's drawings may show similarities at particular stages of development, these are only indications of the lowest levels of development or "uncultivated levels
of performance" (p. 6). Eisner debunks unidimensional approaches to art education and further argues that it is essential for generalist classroom teachers to have a written curriculum.

Eisner's contribution to the research and development era's search for discipline-based art education is his thorough approach to curriculum building, as is evidenced by his Kettering Project, and his careful articulation of the practical educational implications of including art appreciation, as is evidenced by his 1972 teacher textbook, *Educating Artistic Vision*. The textbook is basically a 300-page argument for discipline-based art education. Unlike the art education textbooks reviewed earlier, it is more conceptual than practical and offers no specific curricular guidelines nor lesson plans. Finally, Eisner's leadership role has ensured a place for art appreciation in the platforms of the national organizations.

6.5 Art In Action and S.W.R.L.: Two Format Options

Although neither Guy Hubbard nor Mary Rouse are mentioned in the same breath with such as Broudy, Barkan, and Eisner, their contribution to the art appreciation cause has, perhaps, outweighed the headier outputs of the aforementioned theorists. The research for their series of six art textbooks was begun with a grant in the late 1960s from the John D. Rockefeller III Fund as well as with some support from the state of Missouri (Efland, 1987, p. 76). First published in 1972, the K-6 textbooks entitled *Art in
Art in Action include sequentially planned lessons that incorporate art production and art appreciation. Even though the Hubbard/Rouse emphasis is on studio art, especially in the lower grades, it is balanced in the upper grades with numerous art appreciation lessons. According to Hubbard and Rouse, *Art in Action* is "not designed to substitute for a trained (art) teacher. It is designed to perform the function of fundamental art education when no art teachers are present in a school" (Hubbard & Rouse, p. 31). This is important since it has been estimated that approximately eighty percent of all art classes are taught by generalists, not by specialists.

The program accomplishes this general education function by its dependence on specific, easily accomplished behavioral objectives stated in direct language for the teacher (in the teacher text) and for the K-6 student (in the student text). An example of the language from the fifth grade student textbook is "You have cut out a number of squares, circles, and triangles and used them to demonstrate dominance in a design" (Hubbard & Rouse, p. 18). Objectives are grouped into six categories that cross the grades: Learning to Perceive, Learning the Language of Art (formal elements), Learning About Artists and the Way They Work, Criticizing and Judging Art, Learning How to Use Tools and Materials, and Building Productive Artistic Abilities. Classroom teachers using this program devote two forty-
minute periods a week to teaching the lessons, which are grouped in sequences of four lessons to a unit.

The role of art appreciation in the program is reflected not only in the expressed goals and methods, but also in the materials used to support the lessons. In the research and development phase, which included more than 9,000 students and 330 teachers, reproductions were used. "The work of artists plays an important part in the program. It presents selections of the best artistic expression. These works serve specific learning objectives, however, and do not imitate the outmoded tradition of 'picture study'" (Hubbard & Rouse, p. 26). (This is further evidence of the contemporary deprecating attitude toward picture study.) In the textbook version of Art in Action, prints are incorporated into the text; however, it is important to reiterate that art production is still the centerpiece around which art history, art criticism, and aesthetics revolve.

In assessing the contribution of Art in Action to the research and development era of discipline-based art education, we will consider the relationship of means to ends. Hubbard and Rouse are clear in what they wanted to accomplish, which was a fundamental art program for elementary schools. They started with art production which was familiar to teachers and incorporated art history and art criticism into this framework. They ultimately chose a very practical means to achieve this end - a textbook. The
fact that the series is now in its third edition and has been adopted by 20 states attests to the success of this strategy. Finally, Hubbard and Rouse are realistic about what they can accomplish: "The particular approach of the program grew out of what we know about the people who would use the program and the conditions under which they work. The result, again, is austere, yet practical, and defensible in view of what we currently know about educating people" (p. 20).

6.6 Dwaine Greer and S.W.R.L.

Although Dwaine Greer was also not a central theorist in the first two decades of this era, his work at the Southwest Regional Education Laboratory (S.W.R.L.) in the late 1960s and early 1970s deserves mention because of a format innovation and also because he is now the director of the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, a teacher training arm of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Called a "scholar in his own right," he headed the team that developed the discipline-based S.W.R.L. Elementary Art Program (Rush, p. 204).

The S.W.R.L. project, funded by the National Institute of Education in 1965 (and revised in 1972), was geared for K-6 classroom teachers. Greer, who was the person who coined the phrase "discipline-based art education," based his program on a study of the role models of artist, art critic, and art historian. Although the program has not been reviewed extensively, one writer claims that "the
The curriculum provides for the acquisition of basic techniques of the artist, the fundamental skills of the critic and the elementary knowledge of the art historian" (Engel, p. 18). The S.W.R.L. Elementary Art Program seeks to develop the skills of an educated "Renaissance" person who will eventually have a working knowledge of the three disciplines, as opposed to developing the art production skills of the gifted few who can do art well.

The basis of the curriculum is existing works of art. Students are introduced to the medium of the work through exploratory activities, then they move on to learn technical skills, and, finally, they create and critique their own efforts. Thus, the "viewing, analysis, and interpretation of adult artists' works . . . are always, in some way, related to the work of the students" (Hurwitz & Madeja, p. 248). This K-6 program utilizes more than 1,500 images of adult art, made accessible through a series of filmstrips that show the artworks and also show the teachers how to teach the lesson.

Although the S.W.R.L. Elementary Art Program was not as ambitious as either the aforementioned projects in terms of reaching targeted audiences, the format innovation of using the filmstrip to make visual artworks accessible is important. By also using the filmstrip format to train teachers, teachers are delivered a message about the visual, imagic nature of an art program that includes appreciation. Thus, both Hubbard and Rouse, as well as Greer, have
contributed media options for the yet to be developed ideal discipline-based art education program.

6.7 Beyond Creating: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

Leilani Lattin Duke, Director of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, wrote in 1983 that the story of the Getty Center began with industrialist J. Paul Getty (Duke, p. 5). As one of America's most successful businessmen, J. Paul Getty used much of his considerable fortune to amass an impressive collection of Greek and Roman antiquities, Renaissance and Baroque paintings, and French eighteenth century decorative arts. These objects are now housed in the Getty Museum, which is architecturally a recreation of a Roman villa and is located in Malibu, California.

Besides the museum, the J. Paul Getty Trust, established in 1982, with an annual $50 to $60 million budget, has been charged with the responsibility for at least three other activities. These include establishing a conservation center, a center for the arts and humanities, and a center for education in the arts. It is the last of these which is relevant to this study. In 1983, Duke wrote about the visual arts focus of the Center: "As we became more cognizant of the multifaceted problems which confront arts education ... we realized it was impossible for us to know at the outset the ultimate direction and substance of
our thrust in arts education . . . " Duke continues that the Center decided to focus initially on the visual arts (p. 6).

The Getty Center supports four ongoing education programs: an art education case study project, a school personnel development project, an application of media project, and a Getty Museum demonstration project. To date, it is the first of these programs, the case study project, that has received the most attention in the field. The results of the case study project, conducted by the Rand Corporation, were published in 1985. The title of the Rand report is, in itself, telling: Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1985). In the Preface, it is clearly enunciated that the Trust wanted to examine the state of public art education and to understand why it is "accorded such low status in most of our nation's schools" (p. iv).

An early Getty study had characterized current art education practice as "fostering creative expression and developing artistic skills . . . to the virtual exclusion of teaching children about cultural and historical contributions of art . . ." (p. iv). The Beyond Creating study was an effort to identify school districts that shared the Getty belief that "if art education is ever to become a meaningful part of the curriculum, its content must be broadened and its requirements made more rigorous" (p. 5). Specifically, for Getty, this translates into providing the
schools with a written sequential curriculum that is based
on the four disciplines of art history, art production, art
criticism, and aesthetics. The Getty view is that it is
essential that the curriculum is accorded the same standards
and legitimacy as those of other academic subjects (p. 4).

Seven systems offering acceptable programs are cited in
the report: Virginia Beach, Virginia; Palo Alto,
California; Whitehall, Ohio; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and
Hopkins, Minnesota. Although each district included had
unique methodological aspects, they shared qualities that
the Getty Center deems are essential. These include
academic rigor, a clearly articulated conceptual base and a
written curriculum that is supported by teacher training
(pp. 58-62). Interestingly, in the seven programs cited,
the role of the art specialist was not as a teacher of art,
but as a coordinator of classroom generalists who actually
taught the curriculum.

On the final page of the Beyond Creating report, there
is an invitation to the reader to be provoked into more
reflection. "The Getty Center encourages further thought on
this subject and hopes that the report will stimulate
dialogue in communities around the country." On April 7,
1985, The Boston Sunday Globe featured a lead story in its
Learning Section reporting that the "J. Paul Getty trust
takes art seriously," and that "Because of one man's passion
for art," students will now be engaged in thinking about art
(Fanger, p. 70). Three major art education journals also
responded to the Getty call. The National Art Educators Association journal, *Art Education*, which is geared basically to practitioners, has followed the Getty revival of the discipline-based art education movement very closely. The major part of two recent issues (January and September, 1987) has been devoted to the subject. The same association's research journal, *Studies in Art Education*, devoted part of its Fall, 1984 issue to a comparison of the work of the 1964 Penn State Seminar to the Getty work in discipline-based art education. Finally, the most comprehensive coverage of the movement to date is the Summer, 1987, special edition of the *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, which contains ten papers devoted to the topic of discipline-based art education. (This issue of the journal was underwritten by the Getty Center.) Although the Getty-led d.b.a.e. movement is still in the formative stages, it is possible to piece together some assumptions from the abovementioned resources and from the early research and development writers in order to draw a comparison with the art appreciation education efforts of the early "pioneers."
CHAPTER 7

CROSS COMPARISON OF THE PICTURE STUDY MOVEMENT WITH
THE DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION MOVEMENT
AND THE INFLUENCE OF THE PROGRESSIVES

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we will compare the three movements under study — the picture study movement, the progressive movement (including the influence of Lowenfeld), and the discipline-based art education movement. There will be three major points of comparison. First, we will consider the philosophical foundations of each and note the important similarities between the idealism espoused by picture study advocates and the realism espoused by the discipline-based art education advocates. To these essentialist views, we will contrast the progressivists' doctrine. Second, we will cross compare the three pedagogies, in terms of art appreciation curriculum. Both the content of the curricula and the methods will be compared and contrasted. In this section we will predict, based on the precedents set during the two early eras, what the Getty Foundation will promote for art appreciation curricula and what stumbling blocks it might encounter. Third, we will consider the audiences for art appreciation curricula, both in terms of teacher audiences and student grade level audiences. We will also compare the media that have been used to transmit art appreciation curricula in past eras and predict, based not
only on format but also on philosophical beliefs, what format the Getty discipline-based art education might take.

7.2 Philosophical Foundations

Herman H. Horne, an eminent educational philosopher and proponent of an idealist philosophic stance, tells us that "idealism holds that knowledge is man thinking the thoughts and purposes of this eternal and spiritual reality as they are embodied in our world of fact" (1942, p. 140). This view, also espoused by William Harris and Henry Bailey, helped late nineteenth and early twentieth century teachers make the transition from an education based on religious beliefs to a secular education still committed to the spiritual life of the child. A belief in the eternal verities still prevailed. Art appreciation education came to embody an appreciation of the "Absolute's" perfection; these ideas and ideals were presented in works of art. Art was considered a revelation of the "infinite whole of reality expressing itself in finite forms" (Horne, p. 140). Thus, art served both as a form of the Absolute and as a vehicle for the Absolute. Again, Rosen summarizes this view: "When we enjoy a work of art, say the idealists, it is because, on the one hand, we see it as a true representation of the Ideal; on the other hand, it serves to bring us closer to contact with the Ideal" (p. 19).

These idealist beliefs rest on a dualist conception of humanity: humans have two sides, a body and a mind, or soul. The immortal mind is superior to the body and this
knowing mind is the ultimate vehicle of true education. The mind comes to know eternal truths through training and discipline. Rationality, in the idealist view, is the preeminent value; the rational intellect should supercede the sensing body. Based on this scheme, and presuming that certain works of art hold truths worth knowing, we can come to know these truths held in art through thoughtful, disciplined study. Yet, since we are still dependent on our senses for this exercise, we are still in Plato's cave. Studying art will prepare us for contemplation of the ultimate "forms," an activity that is purely intellectual. If we ignore the enduring values in the masterpieces we will suffer a spiritual poverty.

Because the idealist views are explicitly value-laden and, further, these values are clearly articulated in educational objectives, the early picture study idealists have often been considered moralists. As has been cited in the literature review, this view still exists, but without primary source evidence. This writer contends that it is the picture study writers' sometimes zealous, missionary tone that accounts for this label. Idealists do not deny that they teach values; however, by labeling picture study as moral education, these writers suggest that teachers used art appreciation to teach a code of behavior. Using art to explore issues of ideal value does not necessarily lead to using art for the purposes of teaching one how to behave. This writer has found scant evidence to suggest that the
prevailing picture study objective was to ask "Does this picture have a moral?"

Idealists, on the other hand, do not deny that there are valid questions to be raised vis-a-vis art and morality, and philosophers through the ages have grappled with this issue. However, this writer contends that art education historians who use this label are not referring to the complex philosophical debate around morality and art, but are instead using this label's contemporary negative connotation to dismiss picture study. Further, they do not support their contention with references to picture study primary sources as evidence for their claim. As has been shown, picture study writers sought to introduce students to the idea of beauty by exposing them to art masterpieces. The methodology used by the picture study writers we have considered included an integration of art history and art criticism into lessons based on imparting information and questioning, a pedagogy that resonates with discipline-based art education.

For the progressives, represented in philosophy by the school of pragmatism, knowledge was not a set body of absolute ideals that one can know through speculation. John Dewey chides the idealists in the following passage from *Art As Experience* (1934):

"... the 'ideal' is so cutoff from the realities, by which it alone can be striven for, that it is vapid. The 'spiritual' gets a local habitation and achieves the solidity of form required for esthetic
quality only when it is embodied in a sense of actual things. Even angels have to be provided in imagination with bodies and wings. (p. 198)

The pragmatists suggest that one look to process and activity rather than to product and contemplation in order to find meaning. In the pragmatic view there is no intrinsic value in the knowledge represented by the disciplines. Knowledge is not a set body of facts and abstractions, but is, instead, a process based on the nature of the organism's experiencing of its interaction with the environment. In John Dewey's terms, it is the process of doing and undergoing. Mind/body dualism is rejected in favor of consideration of the whole person. In educating the whole child, progressives maintain that we must consider the social, physical, and, ultimately, the vocational aspects of life. If we begin with the child, rather than with the subject matter, we will learn what to teach and how to teach it. Any other system teaches a rigid adherence to authoritarian values.

The value of practical knowledge for the progressives was apparent in their art appreciation curricula which advocated inclusion of everyday objects into the appreciation lessons. The rejection of absolutes was apparent in both the early progressives and, of course, in the Lowenfeld texts. The textbook writers considered in Chapter 4 demonstrated this rejection in two ways. First, although they included art appreciation in their texts, they questioned some of the earlier tenets regarding choice of
artworks and using didactic methods. Second, by trying to
democratically include many facets of art education in their
recommendations, they could make a case that they were not
being absolutists. As we have seen, both approaches served
only to dilute the art appreciation curriculum. Further,
the later progressives held that an activity-based art
curriculum was of utmost importance.

Realists, represented by discipline-based art education
philosopher Harry Broudy, would disagree with both idealists
and pragmatists regarding the nature of knowing. For them,
the natural (as opposed to the supernatural) laws of the
universe provide humanity with essential guideposts to
understanding the nature of humans and the world. Matter is
neither to be neglected, as with idealists, nor is it to be
considered simply in the context of the experience of the
individual. Realists hold that comprehension of matter and
the natural laws that rule it can be achieved by sensory
attention. This attending to matter will ultimately lead to
comprehension of absolute forms which embody truth. It is
as though the Known of the idealist becomes the Known of the
realist; yet, both share a conservative belief that there is
a separate, orderly realm of knowledge that a person can
come to prehend. Thus, both argue for the necessity of a
traditional subject matter-based curriculum that embodies
the cultural wisdom of those who have come to know. Breed,
an eminent realist educational philosopher, defends this
view in the face of pragmatists:
They rush to the conclusion that activity is the all-pervasive educational principle and content nothing but a philosophic fiction. In the same single-track perversity, they look upon subject matter as a non-essential, even pernicious, control in education and propose to erect their curricular edifice exclusively on pupil interest. (p. 137)

Realists, on the other hand, "erect their curricular edifice" on the senses.

It follows that realists will give a ready place to art appreciation since it fits naturally not only with their conservative belief in transmitting cultural heritage, but also with their epistemological stance regarding the importance of using sensory data as a bridge to higher intellectual pursuits. For realists, the physical and psychical intersect; sensations exist both inside and outside the mind (Breed, p. 111). This separates them from extreme empiricists who would give credulity only to that which can be objectively experienced and ratified by others. The danger in this view is expressed by the idealist Herman Horne, who rejects neorealism because it treats the student's reactions "as still mechanical, though selective" (p. 153). Regardless of the idealist and realist niggling on some differences, they both hold an essentialist view in which the value of conserving cultural learning is held high.

In summary, we can see that the philosophical perspectives of the picture study advocates and of the discipline-based art education advocates resonate with one another. Supporters of both movements hold an essentialist,
conservative philosophic stance. Essentialism was a term coined at a 1938 meeting of education administrators, some of whom rejected progressive ideology and argued for a return to systematic, discipline-based formal education. The term "essentialist" is now used to encompass both the idealist and the realist in that they both hold that "it is the duty of formal education to transmit a core of ideals, ideas, meanings, and understandings which constitute the American cultural heritage . . ." (Atkinson, p. 85). The "essence" of both picture study and d.b.a.e. is that there is a body of knowledge (artworks) worth studying in a formal, organized way. The value of art education lies not in its role as a reflector of creative and mental growth, nor is its role to help the individual adjust to everyday life. Art education, for picture study adherents of a hundred years ago, and for discipline-based art education adherents of today, is valuable because rational exposure to a body of artworks is but one step on the path to higher understanding.

7.3 Approaches to Curriculum

A second area of cross comparison is the art appreciation curriculum, its content and methods. In the early era, picture study was a separate curriculum, as is evidenced by the Emery, Wilson, and Hurll textbooks and the journal articles cited from the Perry Magazine and School Arts. Teachers were expected to teach the drawing curriculum as well as the art appreciation curriculum.
Their picture study curriculum was based on selected masterpieces and the aim of study of the masterpieces was to enhance students' appreciation of "the beautiful" as well as to help them see beauty in nature, in a simple agrarian life, and in other people (ordinary, heroic, and religious). Picture study advocates also recommended the use of compositional analysis in combination with art historical material about the artist. We noted that there was consensus regarding many of the works of art to be studied and the approaches to be used, indicating that there was a discrete picture study pedagogy.

The art appreciation curriculum during the progressive era was retained in spite of the era's commitment to other aspects of art education, ultimately resulting in a curriculum crowded with myriad components such as nature study, arts and crafts, illustrative drawing, and manual arts. One solution to the overcrowding dilemma was to integrate art appreciation with other subjects such as social studies. One recommended method for achieving this integration of subjects was the project method. As described by William Heard Kilpatrick (1871-1965), the project method encouraged students to discuss, plan, and create as opposed to read, tell, and recite (Broudy, 1965, p. 152). Projects were undertaken on interdisciplinary topics, as opposed to strict divisions based on subject matter categories. Art appreciation thus lost its discrete
curricular status when it became integrated with other subjects and became a handmaiden to the general project goals.

Within the art curriculum itself, appreciation continued to be an expressed goal of many progressive textbook writers. However, by adding the goal of expression to the art education curriculum, appreciation was further diluted. Some progressive textbook writers were also wary about art appreciation education methodology per se.

Although some continued to advocate a picture study technique of combining art historical material about the artist with some art critical compositional analysis, others expressed concern about destroying appreciation through didactic lessons. The Lowenfeld movement, of course, led teachers to consider art education in terms of expression of creative and mental growth, thereby eventually eliminating appreciation from art education practice.

Supporters of the discipline-based art education movement can again be compared with the earlier period. Current recommendations for a discrete art appreciation curriculum that specifically has as its goal to move "beyond creating" is certainly reminiscent of the art appreciation movement of one hundred years ago. The earlier practitioners separated drawing, which had its roots in industrial training motivation, from picture study, which had its roots in idealist aesthetics. The d.b.a.e. adherents believe that they will be able to fashion
curricula that call upon the disciplines of art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and production. Recalling the early picture study texts' use of the works of art historians and art critics, one can surmise that this, based on past precedent, is not an unrealistic goal. However, when one considers incorporating art production into this model, one must pause.

Many still conceive of art production in Lowenfeldian terms of creative self expression; art is a tool which promotes and reflects creative and mental growth. This approach is, of course, not what the d.b.a.e supporters are advocating. If we consider art production as a discipline, we must next ask, who are its disciples? If our answer is that artists will provide us with the foundation of the "discipline," then we need to recall Manual Barkan's difficulties in working with practicing artists in order to generate an agreed upon basis for their work. The result was a tome that consisted of definitions of terms. Furthermore, any art production that is considered in the larger framework of the academic disciplines of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics, should probably also share in the academic tradition. Ironically, the very phrase "academic art" will drive most artists back to the protected solitude of their studios. On the other hand, if the d.b.a.e. supporters attempt a true integration of art production into their curricula, they could be at cross
purposes with their own objective of transmitting cultural heritage.

One cannot easily promote a liberal, process-centered pedagogy and at the same time argue for a conservative, knowledge-centered pedagogy. Perhaps it is the challenge of the d.b.a.e. proponents at this time to redefine creative self-expression so that they are not forced to move "beyond creating," but instead are able to move with creating. In order to do this, they may have to move the fourth component of d.b.a.e., art production, to a place outside of traditional content-based disciplines into a separate, but equal, niche. As has been said, it would be inconsistent to argue that art production should continue in the Lowenfeldian tradition; however, it is conceivable that students could be trained to master one or two art media in a production curriculum that had both the rigor that the disciplinarians are demanding and the personal freedom that is fundamental to creative expression.

One would expect a difference between the d.b.a.e. advocates and their picture study predecessors in that the realist philosophical base of d.b.a.e. will lead it to a methodology that initially relies more on sensory data. This is evidenced by Harry Broudy's "scanning" method. However, picture study advocates, as we have seen, also made important use of sensory data in their structural analysis of pictures. They rationalized this, in light of their idealist belief in spiritual absolutes, by saying that a
study of form could lead to an understanding of "eternal" form, thereby tying sensory data back to the spirit.

The supporters of d.b.a.e realize that they do not have the luxury of the turn of the century educators to simply add art appreciation to the curriculum. They also realize that if art is to gain equal academic status with other subjects then it must, in fact, be promoted as a discrete realm with a specific body of subject matter that has scope and sequence. The source of this curriculum must be the academically accepted subject matter authorities. Unlike the early picture study supporters, there may be no easy consensus on what cultures deserve attention, on which artists to study, nor on which works of art to build a curriculum. Like the progressives, they will also be faced with questions from developmental psychologists about the role of process in this very product-centered approach. Intellectual descendants of Lowenfeld will wonder, as one recently has (Feldman, 1987), when students are psychologically ready for such a curriculum. One also must speculate about whether or not the Broudy rationale for d.b.a.e. will be convincing to teachers unaccustomed to philosophical rationales.

This raises the question as to who, ultimately, should decide if discipline-based art education is a worthwhile pursuit for American educators. Jean C. Rush, in an editorial for an issue of Studies in Art Education that was devoted to discipline-based art education, wrote that
"Discipline-based art education, as a focus for the
development and clarification of theory rather than a
program of instruction, could provide a much-needed vehicle
by which to converge the theoretical bases of the
profession" (p. 204). This is a telling comment regarding
the issue as to who should decide about the future of art
education. Ideally, theoreticians would be encouraged, as
they were at the federally funded Penn State Seminar in
1965, to gather together to debate the basic and fundamental
issues around a shift from a creative expression art
curriculum to a discipline-based art curriculum. As has
been said, no clear consensus has yet been reached regarding
the value of d.b.a.e. and those academicians who are
"believers" are still defining and characterizing the four
separate disciplines.

The Getty Center has exerted most of its energies in
training regular classroom teachers and in building
curricula that is discipline-based. Through the private
enterprise model, the Getty Center is "selling" its new
brand of art education to public educators. The involvement
of entrepreneurs in early art education history could be
viewed as historic precedent. In 1941, prominent art
educator Royal Bailey Farnum commented that "at one time,
commercial houses dealing in art supplies even shaped the
course of (art) study and, to a large extent, controlled the
demand and supply of teachers" (p. 695). Although some
theoreticians have been involved as d.b.a.e. supporters
(Broudy and Eisner, for example), little funding has been provided to those who do not share the d.b.a.e. beliefs. The role of private enterprise in affecting public policy has long been debated and will not be resolved in this work. However, the federal, state, and local bodies that govern the future of art education should, minimally, provide dissenters with an open forum to express their beliefs.

Finally, in support of a positive public response to the return of art appreciation, we must consider the ethos of the times. As was noted, the notion of turning away from the nature of the individual learner toward the nature of the discipline began with public reaction to Sputnik. Today, there is a similar "call to arms" from writers concerned with the educational future of this country. Reports such as A Nation at Risk (1983), and books such as Mortimer Adler's Paideia Proposal (1982) and E. D. Hirsch's Cultural Literacy (1988) suggest that current reforms are basically essentialist views based on a valuing of absolute knowledge. This call is also supported by the private sector. In this climate, a call for a return to teaching about cultural heritage that comes from a powerful private sector foundation is bound to be heard.

7.4 Teacher Audience and Media

A third area of comparison relates to the potential audience for a discipline-based art curriculum and also to the medium for transmission for the curriculum. As was noted, during the research and development era, a number of
curricular models was devised. All of the models assumed that the generalist classroom teacher, as opposed to the art specialist, would be responsible for teaching the art curriculum. The untrained generalist was to teach the CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program, the Hubbard/Rouse *Art in Action* texts and Greer's S.W.R.L. Elementary Art Program. Although classroom teachers were also the audience for Eisner's Kettering Project, the state of Hawaii provides an elaborate supervisory support structure for teachers using the materials. Broudy's Aesthetic Eye Project drew its audience from classroom teachers, art specialists, and museum educators. The Getty Center supports a plan whereby classroom teachers are responsible for teaching a discipline-based art curriculum, while specialists function as supervisory support staff. With the exception of the Aesthetic Eye Project, all of the above research and development projects were directed to the elementary grades.

As we saw, the picture study texts were also directed to elementary grade levels. This commitment to the early grades may reflect both logistical realities and philosophical similarities that both the picture study era and the d.b.a.e. era share. Logistically, it is easier to incorporate "new" subjects into the elementary grades because, for the most part, classes are self-contained usually with one teacher who is responsible for teaching all subjects. The teachers of elementary classes have greater flexibility with their schedules and with their choice of
subject matter to teach, yet many complain of an already overcrowded curriculum. Teachers at the turn of the century also often had difficulty fitting in picture study (Chase, p. 335). Nonetheless, many did have a set picture study curriculum available to them in the form of a textbook. A second reason for the commitment to elementary grades may be that, from an essentialist point of view, it is never too early to introduce subject matter to students.

Interestingly, during the progressive era more attention by art educators was turned to the adolescent learner; the interest in psychological development most likely contributed to this. In fact, a 1940 Progressive Education Association report entitled The Visual Arts in General Education devotes its entire second chapter to the psychological development of the adolescent. As has been noted, art education texts from this period consistently included recommendations for junior and senior high school art appreciation curricula. Since much of the progressive art education curricula was activity centered, it followed that the elementary grades would engage in more active learning while the secondary grades would engage in more knowledge-based curricula in preparation for college admission. Many advocated for a required art appreciation course at the high school level. Again, this may relate directly to psychological developmental theory wherein intellectual approaches to art were not considered appropriate for younger students. Thus, based on past
precedent and on a comparison of the d.b.a.e. movement with
the picture study movement, one can predict that the Getty
Center will promote the elementary level generalist as its
target audience.

The essentialist art appreciation teacher will function
as a benign taskmaster, transmitting cultural heritage.
Unlike the progressive teacher, she will not be an equal
participant in the learning process; she will function as an
authority, we can thus imagine a d.b.a.e. teacher and her
counterpart from a hundred years ago as both holding to the
notion that it is their responsibility to transmit eternal
verities, found in masterpieces, to their charges. They
would defer to a set curriculum that had been formulated by
those with special wisdom in the disciplines, what Harry
Broudy calls "buffs" (1972, p. 115). They would differ in
that the early idealist teacher would, as Horne has
described, "sense the presence of the eternal in the
temporal" (p. 163). The contemporary d.b.a.e. teacher, with
her philosophical base in realism, would base her authority
on natural laws, functioning, as Breed argues, not only in
loco parentis, but also in loco naturae (p. 101).

The format of art appreciation curricula could very
well begin with a study of the technologies that have been
available to creators of art appreciation curricula. As has
been noted, the introduction of colored reproductions
through the process of chromolithography was a key factor in
the dissemination of art appreciation materials at the turn
of the century. Public fascination with reproductions, in combination with their low cost, provided entrepreneurs with a ready market. Schools became another market for proliferation of reproductions, ranging from tiny individual prints available for a penny to large framed reproductions for classroom decoration. An important facet of picture study in many schools was distribution of tiny prints that could be pasted in notebooks or in handmade albums. As has been noted, many companies became involved in the business of supplying schools and businesses with pictures.

Teachers during the progressive era continued to rely on printed reproductions, but slowly new technologies allowed pictures to be projected. Less attention was paid to techniques for mounting and framing prints. During the research and development era, technology was in full bloom and we saw the development of a television series, the use of filmstrips by the S.W.R.L. project, and the creation of Kettering boxes filled with three-dimensional objects. The Getty Center has taken due note of the power of video and has devoted an entire project to exploring the use of television as a tool to spread the d.b.a.e. "gospel." To date, there has been little discussion in the d.b.a.e. literature regarding the relative power and weakness of a reproduction as opposed to experience with an original work of art. Since the Getty Center is in a unique position, due to its administrative proximity to the Getty Museum, to add to the knowledge base about the relative merits of various
media in relation to experience with original works of art, this writer expects that this will become an important issue in the near future.

7.5 Format Options: A Return to the Textbook

Besides consideration of what medium to use to present objects, we must also consider the issue of format for the methodology. In other words, in light of past precedents, how might supporters of the discipline-based art education movement promote its acceptance across the country? As we have seen, the early picture study enthusiasts relied on textbooks, some, such as the Wilson series, designed for students as well as teachers. Later textbooks were general art education compendia of methods for teaching many aspects of art, one of which was art appreciation. Although the Lowenfeld texts certainly cannot be cited as examples of textbooks that promoted the teaching of art appreciation, the powerful influence that they had on the field suggests that we consider them as well. Textbook formats used by writers from the research and development era will also be included.

The strengths of the textbook format are also its main weakness. Textbooks offer weary teachers straightforward advice as to what to teach and how to teach it. There is little independent research demanded of the teacher and she can feel satisfied that she has responsibly "covered" the requisite material if students are exposed to textbook content. This also, of course, leaves much room for
superficial scanning and leaves little room for individual creativity, if used as a sole resource. When comparing the early textbook approach, however, of M.S. Emery, one can conceive of a textbook that functions as a gentle teacher of the teacher, who, in turn, communicates some of both the knowledge and the attitudes of the text to her students in her own way. On the other hand, a text such as that of L. L. Wilson, with its accompanying student text, provides students with pictures for appreciation and provides teachers with a few simple questions to raise, but can only be expected to provide both with minimal exposure to a certain number of reproductions of works of art.

One might envisage textbook entrepreneurs seizing the opportunity to create art textbooks like the Wilson texts published nearly one hundred years ago. For each chosen artwork, the text would delineate an art history, an art criticism, an aesthetics, and a production method. Art objects would be easily accessible in either a student text or in a media kit consisting of filmstrips and/or video tapes. With this text and accompanying material in hand, the teacher and her school system will be satisfied that they are on the frontier of the new discipline-based art education.

The textbooks used by teachers in the progressive period were designed as training tools. Besides the major weakness already mentioned, in that these textbook authors felt compelled to include all aspects of art education,
thereby giving art appreciation short shrift, this format was also problematic in that it depended on a supervisory structure that would ensure that its recommendations were being carried out. Since one of the Getty Center's organizational schemes is to have art specialists become support staff, this approach to training may be appropriate. One might envisage, therefore, a textbook for generalist elementary teachers that presents the basic tenets of the four disciplines, states objectives to be achieved, and suggests, but does not mandate, methods for achieving the goals. This textbook would be used in teacher-training institutions to replace reliance on Viktor Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth*.

Finally, we might ask why, in terms of form and content, has the Lowenfeld text been in ascendancy for more than 40 years? What can the supporters of the discipline-based art education movement learn from this phenomenon? First, as we have seen, Lowenfeld's theories resonated with the interest of his times in psychology and, specifically, in psychoanalysis. By providing teachers with a psychological health rationale for teaching art and by providing them with a specific scheme for understanding students' psychological growth and development, Lowenfeld provided art education with a curricular niche and with a methodology. Most importantly, his was a methodology that had little reliance on teacher aptitudes for either making
or appreciating art. In some ways, the best art teacher was the one who did the least.

In terms of format, Lowenfeld's textbook was straightforward. One could simply look up the chapter devoted to the age level one was teaching and there one could find recommendations of specific materials and media that were specially suited to a child at that level, and one could find descriptions of the kind of work one could expect of a student. Most of the text was descriptive, rather than prescriptive. Again, this would be reassuring to a teacher because neither cognitive nor psychomotor art education skills were expected of the classroom generalist. The emphasis was on feeling. A final appeal for classroom teachers was that their students probably liked the freedom posed by such a system; for many, art class was undoubtedly a welcome release from an otherwise structured school experience.

Supporters of discipline-based art education might take from the Lowenfeld text the organizational format of including material for each grade level. Supporters of d.b.a.e. might also consider experimenting with a descriptive format for some of its material so that teachers can get a feeling for the kinds of outcomes that are expected of them. The Getty Center also needs to develop a strong unified voice, such as that which came from Lowenfeld's Penn State graduates. Although many felt that Lowenfeld and his followers were sometimes too strident
about their views, it was probably this fierce commitment to their beliefs that contributed to the strength of their leadership in the field.

7.6 Summary

In conclusion, this writer has, through this study, suggested parallels between the picture study movement and the discipline-based art education movement. There is continuing evidence that d.b.a.e. is in philosophical synchronization with the times. William Bennett, outspoken education critic and former U.S. Secretary of Education, supports a conservative art education that goes beyond "undisciplined appeals to emotions and feelings" (Cohen, p. 8). As recently as March, 1989, the Christian Science Monitor published a full-page feature about discipline-based art education, with one headline that read "Getty Art Education Plan Catches On" (Wood, p. 12). However, this writer suggests that the supporters of this movement listen to the lessons of art education history and reconsider the nature of the "art production" that is a component of its four-part scheme. As we have seen, picture study writers separated their drawing curriculum from their appreciation curriculum. The early progressives overcrowded their art curriculum with an overwhelming assortment of art production suggestions, and also included recommendations to continue to teach art appreciation.

The Getty Center also must directly address the concerns of the developmental psychologists, rather than
including them as an afterthought in their publications. As has been shown, the view from psychology may be directly at odds with philosophical essentialism, which is concerned with the nature of the subject rather than with the nature of the individual. If this is indeed the case, then appropriate arguments must be offered. Perhaps the Getty Center could take a lead from the classroom decoration/picture study movement and begin less controversially by first re-introducing masterpieces into the classroom environment, and then suggesting methods for using the prints for pedagogical ends.

Another consideration is the similarity of the role that private enterprise has played in both the picture study movement and in the d.b.a.e. movement. As has been shown, Louis Prang, an early American industrialist, was a key figure in providing art reproductions to schools and in his support of the beauty rationale for art education. J. Paul Getty's trust is providing both the impetus and the funding for the discipline-based art education movement. Both the Prang and Getty involvement suggest humanitarianism, but there is also a suggestion of elitist noblesse oblige.

A final concern regarding the involvement of academicians in the formulation of a new art education curriculum is a practical one. If, indeed, the new art education is to be based on the discipline of aesthetics, art history, art criticism, and art production, then one can imagine endless disputations over terminology and theory.
These could ultimately result in pedantic, abstract lessons that are intellectually valid, but do not speak in the simple elegant terms to which children respond. Perhaps the d.b.a.e. theorists should look to M. S. Emery's humble, but practical, art appreciation textbook for some guidance. As she says in her introductory chapter, a little learning is "not a dangerous thing unless its possessor mistakes it or tries to pass it off for great learning" (p. 3).
APPENDIX

ART APPRECIATION DIALOGUES AND LESSONS
The goal of this small study was to bring some of the insights gained from study of the picture study movement of one hundred years ago to art appreciation lessons for students of today. A second goal was to bring the subject of art appreciation to elementary and middle school students so as to be able to listen to their insights, their puzzlements. This willingness to listen to insights of young students is supported by the writings of Gareth Matthews (1980). Matthews teaches that we can learn as much from the young as they can learn from us. Besides using Matthews' approach in discussions about art with the students and using techniques suggested by picture study writers, the researcher culled from her own studies in critical and creative thinking to find appropriate methods.

The subjects for this Fall, 1988 study were eight students from a suburban school system south of Boston. Four were elementary students (two girls and two boys) and four were middle school students (two girls and two boys). The elementary students were fourth graders and the middle school students included two seventh graders and two eighth graders. Students were chosen by their teachers who were asked, simply, to recruit students who "liked to discuss things." The two groups met separately with the researcher; there were three 45-minutes sessions per group. Both groups focused on the same art and the same techniques were used with both groups. The meetings were audio-recorded to
facilitate future access to the data. Permissions were obtained from school systems and from the parents and a final letter was sent to students and parents.

Due to positive response of students and teachers to the introduction of art appreciation, the school system applied for a small grant to bring similar lessons to three classes of fourth graders who, in turn, would share pictures with their parents and with two kindergarten classes. From these sessions, four "Art to Go" packets were developed and are included in this Appendix.

The three artists whose work the small groups studied were chosen because their works were used by picture study textbook writers. This enabled the researcher to consult lessons written during the picture study era for both content and form. The three artists also represent three countries and three eras in art history. Both the second (Millet) and the third (da Vinci) lessons and the four "Art to Go" packets follow the standard picture study format of limiting study to one work of art and providing art history and art criticism. However, the first lesson (Rembrandt) follows a unique approach in that 11 works of art were presented. The researcher wanted students to be introduced to the concept of an artist's body of work and how it can be seen in the art historical context of both the artist's life and times and in the context of an artist's style of painting.
The work with the small groups of students, some of whose reactions are reported below, and the work with the whole classes of students was different in that the large group exhibited more exuberance. This may have related to the fact that the large group lessons built up to a culmination activity at a local art gallery and it may also relate to simple group dynamics that occur in different teaching/learning configurations. Both groups were open to the artworks presented and responded positively to the questions and assignments. Another logistical difference noted between the small groups and the large groups relates to the size of the reproductions. The small groups had easier physical access to the images. They could more easily support their assertions with visual evidence that the rest of the group could easily see. The large classes walked by the images in a simulated "gallery tour" so that they could view the images at distances of their choice.

Lesson 1: Rembrandt (1606-1669)
Works of Art (Full color reproductions/10" x 14"):

Self Portrait (1629-1630)
The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicholas Tulp (1632)
A Lady and a Gentleman in Black (1633)
Self Portrait With Hauberk and Gold Chain (1633-1634)
Self Portrait With Saskia (1636)
Nightwatch (1642)
Portrait of Nicholas Bruyningh (1652)
This lesson started with a brief discussion in which the distinction between an original work of art and a reproduction was discussed. The 11 reproductions of the above paintings had been posted on the wall, face down, prior to the students' arrival. As the researcher turned over each piece, she asked students to distinguish an original from a reproduction. Next, students were asked to spend time with each work of art and to work with a partner to group the paintings into classes. (The researcher compared it to a matching game wherein students would be able to say that the first, third, and sixth paintings "went together because . . .") Students were encouraged to create as many groupings as they could and to use paintings in more than one group. Although the paintings were displayed in chronological order, students were not informed of this fact. The initial goal was to simply encourage students to spend time with and to look closely at each image. The researcher also wanted to help students feel comfortable with their own ideas about the art.

Responses to the works of art and to the classification exercise were, for the most part, about the subjects represented. Both student groups chose to sort the images
into groups in which people portrayed had similar hair styles or hats and in which people were alone, paired, or in a large group. All were fascinated by Rembrandt's portrayal of human dissection in *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicholas Tulp*; one student gasped, upon discovering the subject of the painting, "They're cutting through his arm!" Another middle school student asked, "Why would anyone pay to have this painted?" Discussion turned to the educational role of an autopsy and the professional status that scientists might hold being involved in the activity. One student related dissection of a human body to the ninth graders' dissection of a squid. The researcher led students to consider Rembrandt's use of light and dark in all of the reproductions, and asked if they saw evidence of inner light as well. One elementary student said that Rembrandt's portrayal of his sister-in-law suggested that she had "light in her heart" and another commented that "she feels like she's part of the book." (Her face and the open book that she reads seem to illuminate each other.)

Following the student response segment, the researcher used the paintings to share a bit of historical information about Rembrandt's early life as a successful portrait painter, his marriage to Saskia, his acquisitiveness, his later poverty and his continued devotion to portraying the human face. Information on individual images was also shared in the form of vignettes about the missing child in a portrait of a couple, about the cutting down and misnaming
of Nightwatch, and about the mis-attribution of The Man With the Golden Helmet.

Lesson Two: Millet (1814-1874)

Work of Art: The Young Shepherdess (1870-1873)

(Reproduction: full color postcard)

In this lesson, the researcher chose to present the work of art in postcard format. This decision reflects a picture study era technique in which students were provided with small "penny picture" reproductions of works of art that they were to study. A common practice was to have students paste their penny pictures into notebooks; the teacher would provide commentary which students would transcribe under their pictures. The picture study notebooks would often become prized possessions. This researcher wanted to know if students of the 1980s would respond positively to this notion of having their own miniature reproduction and to the notion of copying another's words. Interestingly, both groups of students responded enthusiastically to both propositions. Both groups were genuinely appreciative that the postcard would be theirs to keep and both groups ambitiously took notes from the researcher's art historical synopsis based on picture study text material of Millet's life and times and drafted them into paragraphs to accompany their postcard reproductions. They were asked to share both the postcard
and their paragraphs with a family member, which most reported that they did.

The second half of the class was devoted to reflection on the image of The Young Shepherdess. At the start of the class, the researcher had distributed the postcards, face down, and asked students not to look at them until so directed. After the somewhat didactic notetaking exercise, the researcher asked students to imagine that they had just been commissioned to paint a picture (in oils) with the only stipulation being that the title was to be The Young Shepherdess. Students closed their eyes and conjured up their painting. Most students imagined a painting with a shepherdess represented quite realistically, many had her dressed in light blue and white, "Like Little Bo-Peep." Yet, most of the images were distinct in that they varied by portraying the shepherdess with a few sheep, or surrounded "by thousands of sheep," in the distant background on the middle ground, sitting or standing, and two students included menacing animals nearby. All emphasized the shepherdess in her setting, i.e., her environs were as important as she was.

Finally, students were invited to turn over the postcard and to comment on the many choices an artist must make when painting a picture. Unlike the student images, Millet's shepherdess fills the canvas and is dressed in worn clothes. This visual finding was related to the art historical notes in which Millet's embrace of rural life and
of the peasantry is mentioned. The researcher ended the class with a quote by an art critic who suggests that the yellow straw hat that encircles the shepherdess' head and her posture as she sits on a boulder suggest that she is like a saint or a queen. Although the researcher was fascinated by that interpretation, the students were not interested in it, perhaps because it had not come from them.

Lesson Three: Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519)
Work of Art: Mona Lisa (1504)

The researcher chose this image because both M. S. Emery and L. L. Wilson had included it in their texts, each with a very different analysis. The goal of this lesson was to emphasize art criticism of one work, as opposed to either spending time with many works from one artist or by devoting study to solely art historical information about the artist's life and times. This was accomplished by uncovering Mona Lisa's facial features one at a time. First, only the eyes were uncovered. Students responded that they were "strange," "mean," and "maybe sneaky or evil." Next, students looked at only the mouth. Students responded that she "looks like she's keeping a secret" and "she's kind of smiling." Another middle school student said, "She's smirking with that smile." Another suggested that she "looked like a guy," reflecting a current theory
that the work may be a self-portrait. An elementary student said that it "looks like a joke painting," suggesting a paradoxical image. Another said that it "looks like she knows something that's bad and she knows it's going to happen." Next, we looked only at the background. Students were quick to notice that "it doesn't match her" and another asked, "Why would they do it (paint the picture) there?" One offered an explanation that she had posed in front of another painting. All agreed that the background had an "unreal" feeling; a middle school student described the background as "a mystical palace . . . not something you'd go out and see around the corner."

The discussion of the *Mona Lisa* ended with a somewhat wistful reflection on the "mysterious" nature of art in that we sometimes never know "for sure" what an artist's intentions were, and that we may not want to know. We agreed that the joy in art may be the search, the "puzzlement" as Gareth Matthews calls it. The researcher can only hope that puzzling over art may, like the philosophy Matthews speaks of, also lead students to appreciate the "strangeness and wonder lying just below the surface even in the commonest things of daily life" (Russell, p. 16, as quoted in Matthews, 1982).

As was mentioned, the researcher's work with the small groups led to a school project in which the three classes of fifth graders learned about four artists (Rembrandt, Vermeer, Degas, and Miro), then shared what they had learned
with kindergarteners in activity-based lessons. They also shared learnings with their families. The fifth graders were provided with "Art to Go" packets which consisted of a color reproduction of a work of art and an art history/art criticism lesson. The "Art to Go" packets were based on the four lessons undertaken in the classroom. Students were asked simply to take the packet home and share it with a family member or members prior to the project's culmination at a local art gallery. At the gallery, where large poster-size reproductions of the artworks studied were displayed, many parents delightedly recognized the artworks that "we talked about at home."

Included in the following pages are the four "Art to Go" lessons, the letter explaining the project to the junior high school principal, the release letter sent to parents of the eight students, and a letter to the large group participants inviting them to the culmination.
ART TO GO: INFORMATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR APPRECIATION

ARTIST: REMBRANDT van RYN (1606-1669)

ARTWORK: The Nightwatch (1642)

Art History

In 1606, a miller and his wife, a baker's daughter, celebrated the birth of their fifth son, whom they named Rembrandt. The Dutch family was called van Ryn because a branch of the Rhine River ran near their windmill. Rembrandt was the only child in the family to be educated at the university. At the age of fourteen, he enrolled in the famous University of Leiden. Rembrandt's parents hoped that their son would become a lawyer, but Rembrandt's love of art prevailed and he left the university after one year so that he could apprentice himself to master artists. In their studios, he learned the latest painting techniques and by the 1620s he was ready to open his own studio. An art dealer named Hendrick van Uylenburgh liked the artist's work and encouraged his associates to have their portraits painted by Rembrandt. By 1631, Rembrandt had become such a famous portrait painter that he moved to Amsterdam - a much larger and important city than his native Leiden.

In 1634, Rembrandt married Saskia van Uylenburgh, a cousin of his friend Hendrick. Saskia was the orphaned daughter of wealthy parents, so her wealth combined with Rembrandt's own growing fame as a painter enabled the couple to live a comfortable and exciting life. Rembrandt painted a picture of himself and Saskia during this period called Self Portrait with Saskia (1636), in which they appear to be toasting their happiness together. Yet, if you look closely at Saskia's face you might see a slight bit of discomfort. Perhaps she knew that their happiness would be short-lived. Six years after she posed for the painting, Saskia died, probably as a result of complications from the birth of their third and only surviving child - Titus.

During the period 1630-1645, Rembrandt painted a great number of portraits; he painted portraits of prominent people who paid him for his work, but he also painted self-portraits and portraits of his friends and relatives. His ability to see into the souls of the people who sat for him gave his work a reputation for depth and meaning. The eyes of the people Rembrandt painted look out at us with lively interest or sometimes with a touch of sadness. Take time to look into the eyes of the people Rembrandt painted and communicate with them across the centuries.
Art Criticism Questions -- The Nightwatch

1. The Nightwatch is a group portrait of a militia company. The canvas is huge (12' x 14½') and was even larger but was cut when it was moved from the original wall where it hung. Look at the reproduction and mentally enlarge it. How many people are in the painting?

2. For many years, people thought that the militia company was painted at night because of the dark tones. Someone even changed the title from The Militia Company of Captain Frans Banning Cocq to The Nightwatch. After a careful cleaning, people discovered that, in fact, Rembrandt painted the company as it left its dark guild hall and entered into daylight. This way of painting a group was very unusual; most artists painted groups inside their meeting halls. Another unusual feature is the inclusion of the girl and the dog. Can you figure out why Rembrandt included them?

3. Look carefully at each of the people shown. Choose one person to study. What is the person doing? How is he/she related to others near him/her? How is the person standing? How is the person gesturing? What will the person do next?

ART TO GO: INFORMATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR APPRECIATION

ARTIST: JAN VERMEER (1632-1675)

ARTWORK: Milkmaid (1660)

Art History

Because the paintings of Jan Vermeer have only been appreciated by great numbers of people during the last 100 years, many of the details of his life have been lost. From town records we know that Vermeer spent his life in Delft, Holland and that he was born in 1632, was married in 1653, and died bankrupt in 1675. Records tell us that Vermeer's wife sold two of his paintings after his death in order to pay the baker's bill, probably a sizeable bill since they had ten children! Besides the scarcity of details about Vermeer's life, we also have few of his paintings to study. Only 35 of Vermeer's canvases survive.

We who live in the Boston area are very lucky to be able to visit one of those paintings. Vermeer's The Concert can be seen at the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum. It is in the Dutch Room of this palatial museum. Three other Vermeer paintings can be seen at the Frick Museum in New York City. Many of Vermeer's paintings are of ordinary people going about their lives inside their houses. Activities include playing music, pouring milk into a bowl and one person handing another a letter. What fascinates us when we look at Vermeer's pictures of these events is that they become almost holy in our eyes. Through Vermeer's eyes we can come to appreciate the beauty of a moment frozen in time - the way light comes through a window, the geometric pattern of a floor, the bright, deep colors of a maid's dress. In his painting called The Love Letter, he shows us a curtain that is pulled back to reveal a servant handing her mistress a letter. One writer says that "As we look at The Letter, we feel as if a veil had been pulled from our eyes; the everyday world shines with jewel-like freshness, beautiful as we have never seen it before" (Jensen).

Art Criticism Questions -- Milkmaid

1. First, make a list of everything that is included in this painting. For example, loaves of bread, rolls, bowl, etc. Now, beside each item that you have listed, describe the feeling of the surface of each object. How has Vermeer included so many textures in one painting without confusing us or making our eyes tired by jumping from one to another?

2. Where does the light come from? Can you see it sparkling?
3. Some people believe that Vermeer was a reserved or shy person. Does this painting give you a shy feeling? Why?

4. Write a poem that reflects the thought of the milkmaid as she pours the milk.
ART TO GO: INFORMATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR APPRECIATION

ARTIST: EDGAR DEGAS (1834-1917)

ARTWORK: Two Dancers (1877)

Art History

Today, many people love the paintings of the Impressionists; however, when the Impressionists first painted their countryside scenes, flowers, and ballerinas most people disliked their work. They were used to detailed paintings of Greek gods and goddesses, of Biblical scenes and portraits of famous people in stiff poses. The Impressionists wanted to show everyday life, mostly out of doors, and wanted to paint quickly to give viewers a spontaneous sense of color, shape, and light. Edgar Degas was trained to paint in the old-fashioned way; in fact, he spent his early career copying old master paintings. Born in the southern part of France in 1834, Degas was the son of a banker who turned to art early in his life and remained dedicated to only his art throughout his life. He haunted the theatres where ballerinas practiced their dancing and the racing tracks where he could draw horses and jockeys. When people hear the name "Degas" they often first remember his ballerinas.

Art Criticism Questions -- Two Dancers

1. Where was the artist when he painted the two dancers? Was he below them? At the same level? Above them? Why would Degas want to paint ballerinas from this angle?

2. Pictures of dancers make us think of motion, but still pictures don't move. Yet, somehow, the two dancers do seem to move for us. How has Degas achieved this feeling?

3. Nearly half of this picture is the stage floor and yet Degas chose to not include one dancer's left hand. One writer has called Degas "one of the most skillful pictorial composers of any time" (Canaday), meaning that Degas was an excellent arranger of people, objects, and emptiness in his paintings. Can you figure out why he placed the dancers in the corner and why he painted their surroundings as he did?

4. Look carefully and you will find a third dancer . . .
Joan Miro was born in the Catalan region of Spain in the city of Barcelona; his birthdate was April 20, 1893. After studying art in Barcelona in his early life, he visited Paris, France and eventually divided his time between Paris, Barcelona, and his farm in Majorca. Miro believed that paintings didn't necessarily have to include anything recognizable. He, along with many other modern artists, felt that line, shape, color, texture, etc. communicated by itself. By arranging spots, lines and bursts of color on a canvas, Miro was often somehow able to make people smile. Some people think that Miro's art is playful, and that he was acting like a young child when he painted. Others think that his artwork has a scary side to it. Perhaps that is what interests us about Miro's paintings -- they have a contradictory feeling about them.

At the time that Miro began to paint, there were three new experiences that people were having that may have affected his ideas about painting. First, scientists were discovering that solid matter was really made up of moving bits of energy. The second influence was from psychiatry; people were beginning to study their own dreams and nightmares. The third influence was in communication and transportation; people were influenced by worlds quite different from their own world. Some modern painters wanted to help people have these new experiences through art; they didn't want to copy the "real" or ordinary world -- some wanted to playfully upset people. They wanted us to learn to love the unusual.

**Art Criticism Questions -- Dog Barking at the Moon**

1. We know that Joan Miro could paint a realistic looking dog. Look at the dog in this painting. How is it like any dogs that you know? Now look at the moon. Compare and contrast the moon and the dog.

2. Can you tell what sort of surface the dog is sitting on? How is the dog posed? Pretend that you are the dog. Are you comfortable? What are you doing? Barking? Thinking? Staring? If you are staring, what are you staring at?
3. Does Joan Miro want us to climb the ladder? Enter into the world of the picture by climbing the ladder. Describe the world that you have entered -- the colors, the weather, the creatures, the light, the sounds, the sensations...

4. Respond to the comment that "Any kindergarten child could do that!" Is it easy for adults to be like children? Why does Joan Miro want us to be playful like the very young?
Mr. Robert Willett, Principal
South Junior High School
1103 Main Street
Hingham, MA 02043

Dear Mr. Willett:

Thank you for your interest in this small art appreciation project that I would like to undertake at your school. I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in the field of education. Although my work is largely a historical study of a nineteenth century art appreciation movement called "picture study," this project with a small group of junior high students will allow me to apply theory to practice. (I have also proposed to work with a small group at South Elementary School using the same pictures and similar techniques.)

I have attached my formal university request to work with students. Basically the project will consist of three forty-five minute small group meetings that I will conduct during the students' study hall (period "E"). The topic will be the appreciation of the three works - Mona Lisa by Leonardo da Vinci, Night Watch by Rembrandt, and a Millet country scene. None of the images is controversial, nor do I expect that the discussions will range beyond aesthetic issues. I will ask for parental permission to audio-record the discussions so that I can later transcribe the tapes and ascertain whether our discussions yielded any art historical, art critical, or formal aesthetic material. (In the current jargon, this is called a discipline-based approach to art education.) The transcriptions, or parts of them, will be used in my dissertation; however, only first names of students will be used.

Mr. William Alberti has graciously agreed to be my liaison with students regarding identifying students, scheduling the sessions, finding space, etc. Since I understand that you are on a six-day rotating schedule, I suggested six possible days in the coming weeks for the sessions. These include September 28th and 30th and October 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th. I would be available to meet with parents on September 26th. (A permission form for parents is attached.)
Thank you for your assistance. I look forward to working with South Junior High School students.

Sincerely,

Jane M. Gaughan
Dear Parent or Legal Guardian of ________________,

Your child has been recommended for participation in an art appreciation research project. The research will be conducted by Jane Gaughan, a doctoral candidate from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. The study will consist of three small group discussions of masterpieces of art. The discussions will be based on an approach to art appreciation called picture study which was used by teachers in the later 1800s and early 1900s. The purpose of the research is to find out whether these early art appreciation lessons and contemporary student responses to these lessons have any relevance to current theories of art appreciation education.

The benefits and detriments of participation in this study are as follows:

**Benefits**
1. Increased awareness of the value of fine art.
2. Possible identification of a student's talent in the field of art appreciation.
3. Opportunity to participate in stimulating dialogues with fellow students.

**Detriments**
1. Absence from three study periods. (The researcher will be a liaison between students and their teachers regarding making up missed school work.)
2. Audio-recording and transcribing of free and open discussion of the artworks could lead to some shyness and embarrassment. (Only first names of students will be used in the written transcriptions.)

Jane Gaughan will be available at South Elementary School on Monday, September 26th from 3:30 p.m. until 5:00 p.m. to respond to questions in person or by telephone (#749-2893) or she can be reached at home at #698-5472. If you and your child decide that you would like to participate, please sign below.

** has permission to participate in three art appreciation small group discussions that will be conducted by Jane Gaughan at South Elementary School on the following dates:

- Wednesday, September 28, 1988
- Friday, September 30, 1988
- Tuesday, October 4, 1988
I understand that the discussions of the masterpieces will be audio-recorded and that the tapes will be transcribed and analyzed to determine whether the discussion questions elicit art appreciation. I also understand that results of the study will be reported in Ms. Gaughan's doctoral dissertation and that the transcripts will be appended to the dissertation and that only first names will be used. (Participation is voluntary and students can withdraw at any time.)

_________________________________________ (signature)

_________________________________________ (relationship)

_________________________________________ (date)
Dear Art Appreciation Project Participants and Parents,

First, I would like to thank the four South Elementary School students and the four South Junior High School students and their parents for their willingness to be involved in this small experiment. As was suggested by one of the parents, I would like to share the results of the students' responses to the artworks discussed. (No individual's responses will be commented upon since that was not the intent of the study.) As explained at the outset, what I wanted to get was a feel for what interested the students as a group and what techniques the groups seemed to prefer.

On September 28th, we looked at a series of reproductions of the paintings of Rembrandt. The reproductions were hung in chronological order, but the students were not apprised of that fact. Each group was asked to create different classes or groupings of the images. What I wanted to learn was which aspects of the images they would use for their classifications and I was interested to know if the elementary group's classes would be different from the junior high group. Both groups chose similar ways to group the images. Some examples of groupings included: similarities in clothing, similarities in poses and numbers of human figures, lack of background detail, expressions on faces, and predominant colors. Except for the last classification, i.e., predominant colors, students paid most attention to the subject matter of the pictures as opposed to the way the artist chose to paint the subject matter.

On September 30th, we used postcard-sized reproductions of Millet's The Young Shepherdess. (Each participant was invited to keep his/her postcard and was encouraged to share it with family members. I hope this was accomplished!) The reason for the change in size of reproduction has precedent in the history of art appreciation education in the late nineteenth century/early twentieth century movement called "Picture Study." During these years, students received small reproductions of artworks which they often pasted in notebooks along with written information that had been dictated by the classroom teacher. In this session, I imitated this dictation process and gave students art historical notes (mostly biographical) that were taken from a picture study textbook. Interestingly, both groups willingly took down the dictation, with the junior high students feeling more at home with the note-taking. At the conclusion of this, I again tried to introduce material
about the way Millet chose to paint the shepherdess (sometimes called an art critical approach) and found, again, that this aspect held little interest for the students of both groups.

Our final session on November 4th was centered on Leonardo da Vinci's Mona Lisa. Because of the inherent mysteriousness surrounding this painting, we did spend time in a discussion which integrated art history and art criticism. We asked ourselves many questions regarding Leonardo's depiction of "La Giaconda" - her unfathomable smile, the otherworldly background, the misty veil that seemed to surround her and related these to some art historical information about the artist's life and times.

In conclusion, I learned from these discussions that much of the advice to teachers offered by the early picture study enthusiasts held true with both groups of students. Some of these tenets include beliefs that students will respond to art historical information of a biographical nature, that art criticism material about painting style can be integrated into an art historical lesson and that students have the capability to respond deeply to art. In light of recent trends spurred by the Getty Center for Arts Education in California to bring art appreciation back into the curriculum, this small study is an indication that students from the upper elementary and junior high level will respond to both art historical and art critical aspects of art appreciation if afforded the opportunity. Again, I would like to thank both the students and parents for their willing participation.

Sincerely,

Jane M. Gaughan
On Wednesday, January 11, 1989, we will be celebrating the culmination of our Art Appreciation Project that has been undertaken for the past two months. Our host for the culmination is the Hingham Galleries Limited n 28 North Street in Downtown Hingham. Each of the fifth grade classes has studied four artists (Rembrandt, Vermeer, Degas, and Miro) and has shared understandings of the art with South School kindergarteners. These across-grade sharings have been under the direction of Mrs. Avis Goldstein and have involved the fifth graders and kindergarteners in special hands-on art activities. Fifth graders have also been asked to share their appreciation of one of the works of one of the artists with their families. Each student has been provided with an "Art to Go" print and an information sheet to help with the at-home sharing. Our final sharing will be with the community-at-large when we gather together at the Hingham Galleries Limited shop for an informal exchange. You and your fifth grader are invited to join us from ____ until ____. We look forward to seeing you.

Sincerely,

Jane M. Gaughan
Project Consultant

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

We will ____ will not ____ be able to attend the culmination on January 11, 1989.

____ (number of people) will attend.

Signed ____________________
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