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This chapter provides an overview of historical work, mostly by art educators. As an introduction, it differs in focus and intent from the two following chapters in which the authors discuss and interpret art education histories within the light of other cultural and educational histories. It seems important to begin this chapter, and indeed this section of the Handbook, with a question: Why study (or ignore) art education’s histories?

Mary Erickson (1979) has suggested that there are four reasons to study art education’s histories. History initiates us into the field of art education and helps us to develop a sense of belonging. A knowledge of history helps us to clarify contested ideas, and helps us to formulate questions to be asked about the present and future of art education. In short, attention to histories of art education helps us to understand “how we came to be where we are” (Stankiewicz, 2001a). In a recent Translations: From Theory to Practice, Stankiewicz (2001a) uses these concepts: initiation, identity, and ancestors; clarifying concepts; asking questions; and abolishing ghosts and myths, to structure her discussion of the “why” of historical studies in art education published since 1990. Among others who provide answers to the question: “Why study (or ignore) art education’s histories?” are Chalmers (1993), Erickson (1977), Efland (1992), Eisner (1992) and Soucy and Webb (1984). With only a few exceptions (such as the authors of the two following chapters), art educators have generally been slow to relate their work to either other histories of education or social, political, and cultural histories in general. (For a discussion of this issue see especially Soucy, 1991.)

Although it crops up from time to time as a conference topic, to date, few authors have addressed issues around the teaching of art education history to preservice teachers and to graduate students. Notable exceptions include Edmonston’s (1985) presentation at the first Pennsylvania State University history of art education conference and Stankiewicz’s (2001b) text for teacher education students—a major “history” contribution to the Davis “Art Education in Practice” series.
A BRIEF HISTORY OF ART EDUCATION HISTORIES

Don Soucy’s (1990) very comprehensive analysis of literature in the history of art education has been called “the first truly historiographic essay in our field” (Stankiewicz, 2001a). Although Soucy’s analysis has informed more recent reviews of art education history by other scholars (e.g., Raunft, 2001, and Stankiewicz, 2001a), there are also a number of earlier, but still useful, listings and descriptions of historical research in art education. Examples include Farnum’s (1941) contribution to the Fortieth Year Book of the National Society for the Study of Education and Keel’s (1965) chapter in the Sixty-Fourth Year Book and his earlier review in Studies in Art Education (Keel, 1963). In addition, Hamblen’s (1985a, 1985b) work, addressing issues of selection and interpretation in histories of art education published up to the mid-1980s is valuable; Norris’s (1979) comprehensive bibliography of primary and secondary sources in art education history is simply a listing, but is nevertheless of value to the serious scholar; and Soucy’s (1985a, 1985b) earlier attempts to address the limits and potentialities of research in art education history provide seminal reviews that have influenced subsequent work in art education history.

For example, Soucy (1985a, 1985b, 1990) made us very aware that when writing their histories, too many art educators have depended on secondary sources. Many histories have been based on the pioneering but limited work of Isaac Edwards Clarke (1885, 1892). Efland and Soucy (1992) trace Clarke’s influence on those who depended on his work when writing their own histories (e.g., Belshe, 1946; Chapman, 1978; Eisner, 1972; Eisner & Ecker 1966; Farnum, 1941; Gaitskell, 1948; Gaitskell, Hurwitz, & Day, 1982; Green, 1948; Hubbard, 1966; Kaufman, 1966; Saunders, 1976; W. G. Whitford, 1923). This heavy reliance on Clarke resulted in some biased and flawed, but nevertheless influential, histories. For example, two generations of art teachers-in-training learned their art education history from Logan’s (1955) Growth of Art in American Schools and Keel and Saunders’ (1966) special issue of Art Education. As the authors of the two following chapters show, we now embrace work with competing foci, methodologies, and interpretations.

The “growth” of art education history in doctoral dissertations, professional publications, conferences, and conference presentations has been a fairly recent phenomenon. Fifty years ago, very few doctoral dissertations focused on art education history, and, when they did, they tended to be fairly general (e.g., Belshe, 1946; Green, 1948; Hubbard, 1966; Rios, 1954). Korzenik (1995a), looking back on the next generation of historical research by graduate students, found examples of more specific and focused interest. In the mid-1960s, Studies in Art Education (1965) and Art Education (Keel & Saunders, 1966) both gave art education history a boost with the publication of special issues; and 20 years later, scholars such as Amburgy, Bolin, Efland, Soucy, Stankiewicz, and others did much to foster historical studies in art education. Beginning in 1985, the three Pennslyvania State seminars in art education history did most to revive interest in the study of art education’s past and to bring together scholars interested in historical inquiry (Amburgy, Soucy, Stankiewicz, Wilson, & Wilson, 1992; Anderson & Bolin, 1997; Hoffa & Wilson, 1985) as did Soucy and Stankiewicz’s (1990) edited text, Framing the Past: Essays on Art Education.

ART EDUCATION HISTORY AS “RESEARCH”

Within historical research in art education, styles of historical investigation, selection, and interpretation vary. In their introduction to Remembering Others: Making Invisible Histories of Art Education Visible, Bolin, Blandy, and Congdon (2000) remind us that “each writer and historical document offers only a limited perspective on issues which are extremely complex,
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both in their occurrence and in their interpretation” (p. 2). We are sensibly cautioned by these and other authors that there is no single history of anything. To identify newer approaches to historical research and writing, Bolin et al. cite Burke (P. Burke, 1991), who posits that historians are working toward enlarging what is considered to be worthy of historical study; moving beyond the study of historical documents, providing multiple responses to historical questions; and acknowledging that there is no such thing as an objective history. Art educators are increasingly realizing that, even when dealing with the same subject, many different histories can be written (Bolin, 1995a; Efland, 1995; Erickson, 1985; Hamblen, 1987, 1992; Korzenik, 1985a; Michael & Morris, 1985; Smith & LaPierre, 1995; Soucy 1985a; Stankiewicz, 1995a, etc.). Sometimes we have engaged in inspiring evangelism and have presented our research as hagiographic stories of saints, for example, Zweybruck’s (1953) work on Franz Cizek as the “father” of art education.

Now art education histories are presented more as attempts to understand what really happened within wider ideological and social contexts. More art educators doing historical work are asking critical questions and using a wide range of interdisciplinary perspectives. For example, in the following chapter, Amburgy, Bolin, and Stankiewicz provide an excellent model for viewing 19th century art education within such contexts. Similarly, “invisible,” “overlooked,” and “obscured” histories of art education are increasingly addressed in a number of papers in Bolin et al.’s (2000) recent anthology, and by others such as Pearse (1997) and J. C. Smith (1992). Bolin et al. state that they sought to “provide a place for . . . family memory and community recollection” . . . to move toward recognizing and apprehending more of the frequently neglected, but extremely important experiences that should be noted within the history of art education” (p. 3). As Lemerise (2000) argues, this approach helps “diminish the propensity for hagiography that reinforces the cult of heroes” (p. 43).

The variety of research methods employed by those who “do” art education history have been effectively discussed by Marché (2000), Smith and La Pierre (1995), Stankiewicz (1995a), and others. Oral histories have been favored by, among others, Dambekains (1997), Stewart (1986), Stokrocki (1992, 1995), and Yates (1993); whereas Ashwin (1975), Korzenik (1983), and Pinto and Smith (1999) have been attracted to artifactual histories and working with ephemera. The use of archives for art education history has been a particular concern for Morris and Raunft (1995) and Stout (1985).

As in other areas of art education research, there has been a perceived schism between historical research and practice (Caldwell, 1997; Erickson, 1979). In an article in School Arts, Gaitskell (1953) alerted teachers to the fact that “Art education has a history,” and in her recent book Roots of Art Education Practice, Stankiewicz (2001b) specifically focuses on art education histories for art teachers. To help us understand and reflect on our practice is a definite purpose of this section of the Handbook.

BROAD PERSPECTIVES ON ART EDUCATION HISTORY

There are a relatively small number of single-authored books that attempt to present comprehensive histories of art education either in schools or in higher education. Among the classics are works by Bell (1963), Carline (1968), Efland (1990), Goldstein (1996), Logan (1955), S. MacDonald (1970), Pevsner (1940), P. Smith (1996a), Sutton (1967), and Wygant (1983, 1986, 1993). “Historical” chapters appear in most of the older “art teacher education” texts (e.g., Chapman, 1978; Eisner & Ecker 1966; Gaitskell, Hurwitz, & Day, 1982; Haney, 1908; Hubbard, 1967; Kaufman, 1966; Whitford, 1929) as well as in some more recent editions. As an example of historical content in a well-used text, we can consider Laura Chapman’s (1978) historical chapter “A Perspective on Art Education.” Chapman labels the period 1820 to 1920
“The beginning of art education” and discusses art as skill in drawing, art for cultural refinement, and art as craft and folk tradition. The period 1920 to 1940 is labeled “The Progressive movement” and includes a discussion of art as self-expression, integrated and correlated art, and art in everyday living. In her review of the 2 decades 1940 to 1960, titled “Mid-century Developments,” Chapman, discusses experimentation with materials, art education during the Second World War, art as a developmental activity, and art as creative behavior. The final section introduces the roots of some more recent practices: art as a body of knowledge and art and the social order.

THE RESEARCH INTERESTS OF ART EDUCATION HISTORIANS

The histories of ideas (sociocultural, economic, aesthetic, political, philosophical, religious ideologies and their influence on art education) have interested a number of researchers (e.g., Amburgy, 1985, 1990; Baker, 1982; Briggs, 1995; Chalmers, 1992a; M. Collins, 1997; Degenhart, 1986; Efland 1983a, 1983b; Freedman, 1986, 1992; Kern, 1985; Martin, 1991; McWhinnie, 1992; 1997; Moore, 1991, 1997; Palmer, 1991, 1997; Palmer, 1978; Purdue, 1977; Sahasrabudhe, 1997; Saunders, 1961, 1990; Smalley, 1997; Stankiewicz, 1997a, 1999; Weiley, 1957; Wood & Soucy, 1990). The role of government in art education has been studied by Hoffa (1985) and Korzenik (1987a). Again, the following two chapters provide excellent examples of work with such foci.


Regional and case studies seem to have been the particular forté of Canadian art education historians. Gaitskell (1948), Tait (1957), and Wood (1986) gave attention to the Province of Ontario. Lemerise (1992, 1995, 1997), Lemerise and Couture (1990), Lemerise and Sherman (1990), and Stirling (1997) have focused on Québec. Amburgy and Soucy (1989) and Soucy (1986a, 1986b) have focused on Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces, with Pearse and Soucy (e.g., 1987) giving particular attention to Halifax. Rogers (1983, 1985, 1990) has given most attention to British Columbia. As is documented in the following chapter, North American art education historians have probably focused most on Massachusetts, and especially on Boston (e.g., see Bailey, 1900; Bolin, 1985, 1987, 1990, 1995b, 1997; Efland, 1985a, 1985b; Korzenik, 1987a, and others); Pennsylvania has been the focus of work by Chalmers (1996, 1998), De Angeli Walls (1993, 1994), Marché (1995, 1997a, 1997b), and Winkelman (1990); Chicago by Amburgy (1997) and Finley (1992); Dayton, Ohio, by Loucks (1991); the Milwaukee public schools by Riley (1987); Puerto Rico by Galanes (1998); and the Southwest by P. Smith (1999) and Stokrocki (2000). Stark (1985) studied the regional influences of the Oswego Movement, and Freedman (1989) and Saunders (1985) studied the Owatonna Project.

The lives of art educators, art students, and artists have been of major interest to art education historians. However, as stated previously, some of the resulting accounts have been exercises in “saint-making” rather than critical histories. Among the biographical studies of art educators,
most work has been on Walter Smith (e.g., Barbosa, 1984; Chalmers, 1985a, 2000a; Green, 1966; Rocke, 1952; Sheath, 1982; P. Smith, 1992). Work on Viktor Lowenfeld has been published by LaPorte (1997), Peter Smith (1982a, 1983, 1985a, 1989), and others. Arthur Wesley Dow has interested Hook (1985) and Mock-Morgan (1976, 1985). Zahner (1987, 1992) has completed work on Manuel Barkan, and Sherman and Efland (1997) have published work on Victor D’Amico. Kenneth Beittel has interested Okazaki (1997) and Zurmuelen (1991). Henry Schaefer-Simmern has been studied by Berta (1994); Henry Turner Bailey by Stankiewicz (1997b); and Albert Anderson (1997) focused on Charles Godfrey Leyland. Chalmers (1985b, 1994) and Rogers (1984, 1987) have studied art educators associated with the South Kensington diaspora. On her own (Sessions, 1997) and with Richard Johnston (Sessions & Johnston, 2000), Billie Sessions has studied the life and work of ceramics educator Marguerite Wildenhain. June King McFee (Congdon & Degge, 1997), Mary Dana Hicks Prang, Rila Jackson, and other women associated with art education at Syracuse (Stankiewicz, 1983, 1985a,b); Eugenia Eckford Rhoads, Marion Richardson, Natalie Robinson Cole (P. Smith, 1984, 1990, 1996b), and Charlotte Perkins Gilman (Gaudelius, 1997) are among the many women art educators that have interested contemporary historians (see additional studies cited later under Gender Issues).

Autobiographical studies of art educators are perhaps more available in art education than in other curriculum areas. Beginning in 1972, the art education program at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, has sponsored a series of autobiographical lectures by well-known art educators. In 2001, the lectures (Raunft, 2001) were published by the National Art Education Association. In this volume, which includes contributions by 28 art educators, some accounts are more helpful to historians than others. The following art educators reflect on aspects of their lives: Rudolf Arnheim, Victor D’Amico, Ralph Beelke, Laura H. Chapman, Natalie Robinson Cole, Stanley Czurles, Elliot W. Eisner, Edmund B. Feldman, Charles D. Gaitskell, Pearl Greenberg, Eugene Grigsby, Jr., George W. Hardiman, Jerome Hausman, Albert Hurwitz, Ivan E. Johnson, Kenneth Lansing, Frederick Logan, Viktor Lowenfeld, Edward L. Mattil, June King McFee, Mary Adeline McKibbin, John A. Michael, Henry Schaefer-Simmern, Harold Schultz, Frank Wachowiak, Foster Wygant, Theodore Zernich, and Edwin Ziegfeld. Ralph Raunft (2001) introduces this volume with a strong discussion of “autobiography and issues of meaning.” He states:

Autobiographies, through their narrative emplotments and reflections of the authors, give order and meaning to life and are different than experience. A specific autobiography... has specific focus, range and limitations, yet reflects the uniqueness of each lecturer with regard to their personal and professional lives. With every autobiography, we see an author’s self-awareness being structured into some order that mediates between subjective and objective reality. The question of reality forces the reader or researcher to look at an autobiography in the context of memory and the self... (p. xii)

Although not strictly autobiographical, some histories utilize the insights of close family relationships. For example, Guilfoil (2000) writes about her father (Frederick George Kurz) as artist, designer, and educator, and, her niece Lemerise (2000) provides particular insights into the life and work of Canadian art educator, Irene Senecal.

Artists as educators and the education of artists, areas of growing interest among art historians, have received particular attention by D. B. Burke, (1987), Carroll (1994), Chamberlin-Hellman (1981), Davis (1996), Funk (1990), Hinterreiter (1967), Johns (1990), McRae (2000), Pearse (1986, 1992), P. Smith (1987, 1991), Toub (1997), and others. The lives of art students, too, have received some attention, for example, in Korzenik’s Drawn to Art (1985b). Other examples of work in this genre are Glavin’s (1993) careful use of archival resources to reconstruct...
the early art education of Maurice Prendergast. Art historians, too, have become increasingly interested in this type of work, for example, in “The Lure of Paris” Weinberg (1991) studied American painting students and their French teachers, and Klayman’s (1981) dissertation reported on the art education of John Singleton Copley.


Histories of professional associations have received some attention and John Michael (1995) has addressed particular methodological issues in writing such histories. Van Dommelen (1985) studied the history of the Pennsylvania Art Education Association; MacGregor (1979), the Canadian Society for Education through Art; Michael (1997) and Saunders (1992), the National Art Education Association; and Rhoades (1987), the International Society for Education through Art. Within the larger associations, some subgroups have usefully documented their history; a good example is Check’s (2000) history of the founding of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues Caucus of the National Art Education Association.

Within our field, there are a number of celebratory institutional and program histories, often published as centenary projects by the institutions themselves. Among those who have studied art schools are Chalmers (2000a), Dean (1924), Hoyt and Field (1898), and others who focus on the Massachusetts Normal Art School; Marsh (1983) who focuses on the Corcoran School of Art; Dwyer (1989) focuses on the Pittsburgh School of Design for Women; Phelan (1996) on the School for American Craftsmen; Soucy (1989, 1996) and Soucy and Pearse (1993) on the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design; and Supplee (1995, 1997) on the Barnes Foundation. Chalmers (1996, 1998) and De Angeli Walls (1993, 1994) have both made detailed historical studies of the Philadelphia School of Design for Women. Chalmers (1996, 1998) and Morse (2001) also looked at its precedent, London’s Female School of Design (later the Royal Female School of Art); and Weisberg and Becker (1999) studied the (American) women at Paris’s the Académie Julian. In a nicely focused study on the successor to the Philadelphia School of Design for Women, “Whatever happened to the art education class of 1942,” Fitzpatrick (2000) focuses on the art educational experiences of six women who graduated from the Moore College of Art in 1942. From both personal memory and library research, Phyllis Gold Gluck (2000) evokes the heady days of the art school of the Educational Alliance and its role in Jewish American life on Manhattan’s Lower East Side.

Among historical studies of university art education programs and departments are work by Siegel (1981) on Adelphi University; Johnson (1985), on the University of Arkansas; Dambeckains (1996), on the Pennsylvania State University; Wygant (1959), on Teachers’ College, Columbia; Stankiewicz (1979), on Syracuse; Fitzpatrick (1992), on the University of Iowa and Indiana University; and McNeill (1992), on the University of Missouri.

Marché (1995, 1997a,b) studied 60 years of changes in art education in a Pennsylvania School district, and Funk (2000) has made a case study of education in the 1930s Federal Art Project.

Histories of publications have also received some attention. Together Brewer (1999), Chalmers (1999), Chapman (1999), and Collins (1999) reviewed 40 years of Studies in Art Education. Shumaker (1985) analyzed the content of Art Education from 1948 to 1984, and Stephenson (1997) used the contents of School Arts to examine depression-era art materials.
In his studies of Pedro deLemos and Native American presence in art education (e.g., White, 1997, 2001), and in his chapter in this Handbook, John Howell White has also made extensive use of the contents of School Arts.

Haynes (1993, 1997) and Henry and Nyman (1997) have studied the roots of multicultural art education practice. Chalmers (1992a) studied the origins of prejudice in our field. Although documentation of the lives and work of African American artists is increasing, less has been written about those who were also educators. Exceptions include the work of Augusta Savage (Cochran, 2000, and J. C. Smith, 1992) and studies by Claxton (1997), C. A. Hollingsworth (1988), Hubbard (1985), P. Smith (1987, 1988b), and Stanford (1984). Audrey Dear Hesson, the 1951 first black graduate in art education from the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, is the subject of a fascinating oral history by Harold Pearse (2000). Native American art education has received some historical attention (see Chalmers, 2000b; Eldridge, 2001; P. Smith, 1999; Stokrocki, 1997; White, 1997). McColllister (2000) documents the work of a number of persons who worked with a traditional Blackfoot (Idaho) arts program between 1976 and 1981.

Forman (1968) and Stankiewicz (1984b, 1988) have addressed European precedents in general. Histories of the South Kensington Diaspora and its impact in other parts of the world, including North America, have been provided by Chalmers (1985a, 1994, 2000a), Denis (1995), Rogers (1983, 1984, 1985, 1987), and Sproll (1994). Germanic foundations are the topic of studies by Ashwin (1981), Morris, Raunf, and Pfeiffer (1985), Moynihan (1980), P. Smith (1982a, 1982b), Whitford (1994), and others. The influence of Swedish Sloyd is the topic of Eyestone’s (1992) study, and American influences on art education in Brazil and Japan have been studied by Barbosa (1984), Foster (1992), and Okazaki (1994).

Art education for special populations has received limited historical attention (e.g., Troeger, 1992; Zimmerman, 1985). Abrahamson (1985) studied implications for art education and art therapy found in the work of Henry Schaefer-Simmern; Chalmers (1992b) reported on learning to draw in the military; and Abia-Smith (2000) writes about historical and contemporary approaches to museum education for visitors with disabilities.

Radio art education has been the topic of studies by Bolin (1992), Funk (1998), and Kelly (1992). Although aspects of children’s art and early childhood education have been of research interest to many art educators, children’s art seems to have been of less interest to historians. (Exceptions include Finnegan, 1997; Freedman, 1989b; Korzenik, 1981; Leeds, 1989; Pariser, 1985; Sienkiewicz, 1985; Tarr, 1989; Turner, 1992; and Wilson, 1985, 1992). An interest in industrial arts education and manual training is evident in the work of most art educators who study the 19th century. The topic has been the specific focus of work by Anderson (1992), Bennett (1926, 1937), Gerhard (1997), Maffei (2000), Saunders (1976), and Stanford (1984). Clark (1985, 1992), Joyce (1997), and others have contributed histories of testing and assessment; and histories of museum education, becoming more numerous in the field of museology, have been the focus of work by a few scholars in art education (e.g., Abia-Smith, 2000; Din, 1998; Newsom & Silver, 1978; Ott, 1985, 1992; Schroeder, 1992; Svedlow & Troxell, 1997; Zeller, 1989).
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