In the previous chapter, Bolin, Amburgy, and Stankiewicz show that by the end of the second
decade of the 20th century the central conditions for today’s art education had been estab-
lished. This feat included the framing of the field under the general term “Art Education” in
1914 by Royal Bailey Farnum (Plummer, 1985). By the end of the First World War, North
American culture and U.S. art educators were on parallel courses, establishing mature cultural
identities while healing wounds caused by war, technology, and social change. Citizens were
conflicted over allegiances to European cultural roots and their independent aspirations, which
were grounded in multiple experiences of life in North America (Committee on the Function
of Art in General Education, 1940; White, 2001). The influx of immigrants, which had precip-
itated education’s earlier Americanization emphasis, had been severely restricted as a result
of postwar isolationism. European Modernism had a tenuous grasp on North American aes-
thetics. Despite the opening of Alfred Stieglitz’s Gallery 291 and the International Exhibition
of Modern Art (Armory Show, 1913), it would take until after the Second World War to fully
immerse American culture in Modernist ideals. Along the way, Albert Barnes’ Foundation
began in 1922, the periodical, Creative Art, was published in 1927, the Mexican Muralists
entered the New York scene in the late 1920s, and the Museum of Modern Art opened in 1929.
It should not be surprising then that Modern Art, as an object of study, was slow to reach North
American classrooms. Still, Modernism in the larger sense, as a way to envision change based
on action, universal principles, and individual experience, was perfectly aligned with Amer-
ican Pragmatic philosophy (Moore, 1997; White, 1998). That philosophy, which associates
inquiry with embodied responses to a changing world, provides a framework through which
art education found a place in schooling (Freedman & Popkewitz, 1985).

Healing Hands
At the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, educators and anthropologists alike
were interested in the role of the human hand in both individual and cultural development.
Handwork and crafts were considered developmentally important in that (a) the hand was the earliest tool through which thinking was organized and by extension (b) that technologies and tools, as the extension of hands, were seen to influence and structure people and cultures.

A belief in craft as a healing agent was applied to people, homes, communities, and industry. Handicrafts, pressed into the service of social work, were used as occupational, emotional, and social therapies to promote the well-being of children who were disabled, orphaned, or wayward (Koch, 1924, 1927a, 1927b; Levitas, 1920; McMahon, 1928; Pasto, 1967). For soldiers returned from World War I, with a significant sense of physical, mental, and social displacement, handicrafts provided therapeutic benefits. In locations throughout the country, handicrafts were pressed into service to rehabilitate soldiers injured and traumatized by both world wars (Duveneck, 1921; Green, 1948; Kilgore, 1922; Koch, 1921, 1923; Morris, 1920).

The war also highlighted the role of industrial arts and design in healing the economy. The effects of the submarine blockades of shipping from Europe had focused North American attention on its industrial products. The Art Alliance of America held an exhibition at this time of machine made textiles, perhaps the first example of machine-made products being displayed as art (Bement, 1941). Returning soldiers in turn highlighted the needs of late adolescents and adults to obtain skills needed in industry. A growing interest in Industrial Arts, thanks in part to the federal Smith–Hughes Act of 1917 and an increased awareness of the education needs of both industry and adults, influenced art educators to develop programs that were directly related to the common objects of everyday life.

A civic agenda for art, which had roots in the City Beautiful Movement promoted by women’s clubs and other civic organizations, was accelerated by war, technology, industry, the depression, and a widening awareness of rural conditions. Crafting artworks provided community and civic awareness. In the 1920s, community organizations like the American Legion initiated Art Weeks, first in Philadelphia and elsewhere in Pennsylvania, which spread across the country (Grattan, 1925; Ludwick, 1930; Mechlin, 1925). In classrooms, lessons pertaining to Holiday Art, pageantry, and celebration and festivals provided links to community values and everyday life. Teachers attended a growing cottage industry of summer schools in New England, California, Chicago, and New York or joined sketch clubs, like Philadelphia’s Fleisher Memorial, where people gathered to develop their drawing skills. Crafting artworks provided a sense of community and a civic infrastructure (Gluck, 2000).

Crafts were incorporated into public school drawing through Manual Training, Industrial Arts, and Applied Arts programs. Their inclusion was influenced by concerns related to industry, social management, and theories of child and race (Amburgy, 1990; Efland, 1990a, 1990b; Stankiewicz, 2001; Wygant, 1993). Hammock and Hammock’s (1906) textbook reflects the common practice including craft with drawing and design as a significant domain for art educators. School Arts Magazine (originally, 1901, The Applied Arts Book) editors, Fred Daniels, Henry Turner Bailey, Anna Lorette Cobb, and Pedro deLemos focused on Drawing and Painting, Design, and Handcrafts. Monthly thematic issues were related to each of these areas. Lemos’ work, which clearly stressed crafts traditions, was disseminated nationally through textbooks, Applied Art: Drawing, Painting, Design, and Handicraft (1920), The Art Teacher (1934), and a wide range of instructional portfolios.

University educators Frederick Bonser of Teachers College and Charles Bennett of Bradley University in Peoria, Illinois were instrumental in the promotion of Manual and Industrial Arts through program development and publications (Bennett, 1917, 1934, 1937; Welling, 1935). The first PhD (1914) granted from Teachers College in a field of study associated with art education was in Industrial Arts (Burton, 2001a). At the University of Missouri, Ella Victoria Dobbs established an Applied Arts Department, which included education methods courses in art and handwork. Verna Wulfekammer carried Dobbs’ work forward and developed a vibrant weaving program (McNeill, 1992, 2001). In Illustrative Handwork for Elementary School
Teachers, Dobbs (1920) provides explicit directions for grade school teachers to use drawing and physical activity, such as work at the sand table, bookmaking, illustration, and mapmaking, to integrate knowledge through physical activity (McNeill, 1992). Dobbs’ book relates handwork to a more general cultural interest of progressive educators in the organization of curricula around themes, which were understood through the grouping of associated activities. This approach parallels work by the Activity Movement at Teachers College, which emphasized action-in-the-world and handwork as a cross-disciplinary method of inquiry (Whipple, 1934).

The shift from Manual Arts to Industrial Arts marks a shift from the handmade to the designed environment. Designers from Europe were attracted by American wages in the late 1920s; and in the depression, the significance of the “everyday,” including everyday objects, became important. The Metropolitan Museum of Art (MET) began mounting exhibitions of Industrial Art in 1918 (Bach, 1927). In 1929, The Association of Art and Industries held the first Exhibition of Modern American Decorative Art in Chicago. Industrial arts programs, initially associated with training for specific industries, came to be more broadly associated with design, aesthetics, and consumerism (Cheney & Cheney, 1941; Stankiewicz, 1990; Freedman, 1989).

Industrial Arts, which was primarily for young boys, dealing as it did with work outside of the home, in the world, and with machines, formalized a gender split already operational in Manual Arts programs (Stankiewicz, 2001). The Household Art Movement, an integrated program that drew from science, sociology, and art, was targeted for girls (Goldstein & Goldstein, 1926). It specialized in home products such as handmade clothing, interior design, and handicrafts. Anna Cooley headed the Department of Household Arts at Teachers College (Smith, 1996a). The Art Institute of Chicago utilized the Better Homes Institute of its Extension Department to provide programming to create an awareness of aesthetics in everyday life (Zeller, 1989). In-school art programs, Household Arts, were connected with Everyday Art. The American Crayon Company, working with Bonnie Snow and Hugo Froehlich, published Everyday Art (1922–1974). Snow and Froehlich had developed a substantial following through their summer school work with Louis Prang and the publication of their 8-volume series, Industrial Arts Textbooks (Everyday Art, 1925; Katter, 1985; Snow & Froehlich, 1916, 1919). These two movements, although not formalized as strongly in academic settings, exerted an enormous influence on art teachers, who sought ways to connect with progressive ideas.

Household Arts and Everyday Art were seen by many educators as a means to reestablish the integrity of the American home. During the depression, art teachers commonly used everyday materials associated with these movements (Efland, 1983b; Stephenson, 1997). They also were seen as a way to reconnect Americans with their cultures of origin. In Baltimore, the “Homelands Exhibition” provided a display of the household arts of local immigrants (Karr, Winslow & Kirby, 1933). In School Arts Magazine volumes in the 1920s and 1930s were devoted to Americana themes like “Home,” “Sunny South,” “Pennsylvania,” “Rural,” “Our Country,” “Home & Garden,” “City and Town,” “Farm,” “Community Life,” and folk traditions from other places like “Other Lands,” “Orient,” “Art Abroad,” “Spain,” “Czechoslovakia,” and “Mexico.” Lemos connected folk arts with an emerging interest in home, community, and daily life. The paradigmatic example of this was the reverence, perhaps misplaced, in which art educators, Modern artists, and American culture held Southwestern Native American art. Their art was romantically seen as a pure example of a successful integration of art with community life (Bernstein & Rushing, 1995; Brody, 1971, 1997; Eldridge, 2000; Hyer, 1990; Smith, 1999; Stokrocki, 2000; White, 1997, 2001a, 2001b; Zastrow, 1982, 1985).

The opportunity presented by these developments was not wasted on the entrepreneurial initiatives of American business. Commercial ventures were eager to capitalize on and to promote art education. School Arts Magazine’s first advertisement (1905) was for Binney and Smith’s Crayola Crayons. Although advertisements in 1907 were balanced among materials,
art reproductions, and art services such as summer schools, by 1920, consumable art supplies dominated the advertising sections. Commercial interests were not only promoted through advertisements but also through rich networks of commercial people and teachers. At a Western Arts Association meeting in 1923, William H. Milliken of Binney and Smith and other “commercial men” formed “the Ship” (1923), an organization for suppliers of art materials to communicated with and influenced art education associations (Farnum, 1960). Art educators and commercial men often formed comfortable working relationships (Gregory, 1982). By the end of World War I, art education’s use of prepared instructional materials and supplies associated with handicrafts had been clearly established.

Designing an Image

Accompanying the democratic emphasis on learning by doing, scientists, artists, and educators alike searched for underlying principles that could guide all people to frame the moral, aesthetic, and instrumental aspects of their inquiry. Structural approaches to art making were prefigured in the work of postimpressionists and color theorists. In art education, Arthur Wesley Dow, Denman Ross, and Jay Hambridge in the United States, Aldolfo Best-Maugard in Mexico, and William Weston in Canada influenced a shift in studio instruction from imitating historic ornament to establishing principles of design (Brenner, 1929; McWhinnie, 1985; Rogers, 1984, 1990; Stankiewicz, 1990; Wygant, 1985). Design promised the democratization of beauty, even though it was accomplished through the abstraction of visual experience into intellectual categories though language.

At Teacher’s College, Belle Boas carried Dow’s work into the schools through her own teaching of preservice students, her influential textbook, Art in the Schools (1924), and her editorial oversight of Art Education Today (1935–1952). Boas used design foundations in the first two chapters of her text, after which she moved toward a more progressive methodology emphasizing the child’s interests and imagination (Boas, 1924, Smith, 1996a; Wygant, 1993; Zimmerman, 1982). A move away from Dow’s ideas can be seen in Cleveland, Ohio, art supervisor Margaret Mathias’ The Beginnings of Art in the Public Schools (1924). Mathias shifts the emphasis by relegating design principles to the end of the text, following a chapter on classroom arrangement. Her primary focus is first on the child’s world and second on different materials (Mathias, 1929; Wygant, 1993).

A search for underlying patterns also contributed to the child study movement’s interest in the ways images are constructed and perceived. Initial studies of children’s drawings conducted in Germany, by Kerschensteiner (1903), Lambrecht (1904), and Stern (1905), and in America, by Arthur Clark (1897), surveyed material that had been produced by children. At Teachers College, Edward Thorndike devised Standardized tests to study children’s visual development. His A Scale of Merit of Drawings by Pupils 8 to 15 Years Old (1913) and Test of Esthetic Appreciation (1916) were designed to identify a normal range of child behaviors for making and responding to art (Clark, 1985, 1987; Korzenik, 1995a).

In the city of Philadelphia, an oddly construed center of art education activity, funded by the philanthropic impulses of Albert Barnes, was being established. The primacy of education in the Barnes Foundation’s mission highlighted another aspect of the healing that was taking place in America, the reintegration of art and life. Barnes invited John Dewey to develop an education program to promote the analysis, appreciation, and enjoyment of artworks. For Barnes and Dewey, the fine arts and the decorative and folk arts had been artificially separated from one another, in a kind of class warfare. The Foundation’s art collection consisted of works by Cezanne, Renoir, Matisse, Van Gogh, Seurat, Picasso, Modigliani, and Pippin; but it also contained a variety of artworks from different times and places including African sculpture, Native American art, folk arts, and crafts works.
Barnes, Dewey, and Thomas Munro sought to develop a sequential structure for guiding the viewer’s appreciation of artworks. Although this structure stressed expressive and formal aspects of art experiences, it also historicized art within traditions of reference. The education program thus contributed a structure and a history for talking about art that went beyond the moral lessons of picture study and the pure formalism of Dow, Ross, and Hambridge. Experience with the arts could focus on commonalities that could in turn unite rather than separate people. In order for this to occur, they proposed that a larger organizing principle, aesthetic experience, was available to understanding connections among the arts (Holingsworth, 1994; McWhinnie, 1994, 1992; Stokrocki, 1992; Supplee, 1994, 1997; Wygant, 1985, 1988a, 1988b).

Design, as a solution to disorder, was also applied to the structuring of curricula and the organization of the professional status of art educators around a common language. James Haney (1908) and William Whitford (1933) articulated definable features of the field and their histories (Efland, 1990b). Art supervisors for states and cities, like Pennsylvania’s Valentine Kirby, Baltimore’s Leon Winslow, and New England’s Royal B. Farnum, designed curriculum through organizational structures such as units, lessons, and articulated goals. At Teachers College, James Kilpatrick’s Project Method brought together diverse knowledge and skills through units developed around organized themes. The design of curriculum allowed for the “correlation” of subjects through the identification of relationships among subject areas (Efland, 1990a; Guay, 1997; Katter, 1985; Wygant, 1993).

As these programs matured, design and consumerism provided a means to extend Industrial Arts beyond trade education and the industrial was embraced within the everyday. For example, Leon L. Winslow, Director of art education for the city of Baltimore, repositioned Industrial Arts within art education through units “correlated” with other subjects. Winslow advocated units of study such as for first grade, “What I saw at the circus,” or for sixth grade “The origin and development of athletes.” Lessons were then developed in relation to the following criteria: art information (knowing technical information about art), creative expression (applying studio skills), art appreciation (revealing beauty), industrial information (relating to organizational topics), and related information (referencing contextual information) (Klar, Winslow, & Kirby, 1933). Winslow’s ideas were extended in The Integrated School Art Program (1939). There he recommended texts like Art and the Machine (Cheney & Cheney, 1936, 1941) and Enriched Community Living (Burnett & Hopkins, 1936).

Creating a World

The failures of science and technology, experienced by people alienated by work and the experience of World War I, produced a different sort of hope for art educators: that art education could heal, revive, and integrate people’s emotional disconnection with the world. In a move perhaps unfathomable from a tradition-based perspective, hopes for this rejuvenation were placed in and on children. The Progressive Education Association, founded in 1919, developed Seven Cardinal Principles to guide the development of curriculum (Wygant, 1993). On the island of Manhattan, contact with the art of European Modernism, the psychology of Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung, the pedagogy of Franz Cizek from Vienna, and the political art of Mexico exerted a palpable influence. These educators saw that the primary site of healing would take place in the healthy development of the self (Freedman, 1989b, 1992, 1998; Hacking, 1995).

Margaret Naumberg, founder and director of the Walden School, was instrumental in the development of the field of art therapy (Agell, 1980; Hagaman, 1985; Packard, 1980; Troeger, 1992). Florence Cane, Naumberg’s sister and the school’s art teacher, broke with the emphasis John Dewey had placed on the role of social habits in education (Agell, 1980; MacIver, 1989; Packard, 1980, Smith, 1996; Wygant 1988, 1993). In this rarified atmosphere of private school attention and New York art world allure, Naumberg and Cane formed the prototype for the
Modernist artist–teacher. Cane developed what she saw as a culturally neutral classroom, freed of artworks and other associations with the past. Cane’s methods promoted the free use of the student’s body so that marks could be made in an uninhibited manner. The role of the art educator was to unfold the layers of culture that inhibited this inner artist. For this to occur, the foundations of art education shifted from the crafting of drawings and objects to an expression of feelings developed “through” the inhibition of restrictive responses (Cane, 1926, 1929, 1951; Freedman, 1987, 1989, 1998; MacIver, 1988; Thistlewood, 1990; Smith, 1996a; Wygant, 1988a, 1988b). The use of the metaphor “through” characterizes a focus on the child as emerging into a different sort of ideal person: a freely expressed human being.

The teaching of creative expression was lubricated through the use of soft and wet artist materials such as crayons, pastels, and tempera paints, as opposed to the hard dry pencils of the 19th century. By the late 1920s, North Carolina art educator Ruth Shaw had invented the ideal vehicle for unrestrained creativity, finger paint, marketed in the mid-1930s by Binney and Smith (Stankiewicz, 1984, 2001). Not surprisingly, Shaw moved from North Carolina to New York via Europe (1932) to teach at the Dalton School. Children produced art works at Progressive Education schools throughout the country that bore a remarkable likeness to the work of Georgia O’Keefe and Arthur Dove, American Modernists in the Stieglitz Circle associated with Cane and Naumberg (Cane, 1929). While self-expression paralleled free speech as identifying symptoms of the construction of American democratic values, viewed differently, it seems that above all else children, free or not, mimic adult values (Korzenik, 1995; Wilson & Wilson, 1977).

**DISTRIBUTING CULTURE**

From the 1920s to the 1940s, the movement of ideas and peoples, shaken by wars, displaced by shifting economic conditions, and uncertain as to the form that self-government might take, created new opportunities and perspectives. The federal government played a limited role in art education’s development, although depression-era programs (WPA) provided the groundwork for later federal initiatives (Funk, 2000). The vibrancy of Modernism, however, influenced conservative and radical changes that were distributed through the dissemination of people, ideas, and artifacts.

**Philanthropy**

The most influential supporters of research in art education were philanthropic foundations, of which the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY) was the dominant force. Since the end of World War I, the CCNY had been interested in funding adult and community education. Its funding of art education proved to be less successful than its support of scientific research (Freedman, 1989a; Funk, 1990, 1998; Lagemann, 1989). However, the CCNY was the primary supporter of the American Federation of the Arts (AFA) founded in 1909 (Funk, 1998; Levy, 1914; Mechlin, 1925).

The AFA was an arts advocacy group composed of a collection of business and art professionals, artists, and educators. The AFA published the *American Magazine of Art* (*Art and Progress* until 1909; *Magazine of Art*, 1937–1953), which provided regular information about art education, including the AFA convention notes and annual reports. From 1912 it published the *American Art Annual*, founded by Florence Levy in 1898, which listed national art organizations. It also published Mrs. Everett Pattison’s (1923) *Art in Our Country*, a survey of notable monuments, architecture, and art works throughout the United States (Levy, 1914; Mechlin, 1925; Pattison, 1923).
The AFA was an arbiter and promoter of taste and culture including the merits of outdoor advertising, community art projects, art museums, art in the schools, and war memorials. It took as one of its missions an advocacy for the creation of the National Gallery of Art. Its other activities included a “portfolio service,” which circulated prints to schools, clubs, and individuals. As an extension of this program, the first art education through radio, Art in Everyday Life, was broadcast out of New York on WEAF in 1925 (Mechlin, 1925).

The CCNY had been apprehensive about funding art education, citing the Barnes Foundation as one of the few successful initiatives (CCNY, 1924, 1930). In 1924, Richard F. Bach, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Frederick Keppel produced The Place for Art in American Life, a report for the CCNY that commented on the sad state of art education, which was perceived as a “fad or a thrill” (CCNY, 1925, 1930; Everyday Art, 1925; Funk, 1998; Keppel & Duffus, 1933; Tannahill, 1932). Keppel’s work spurred the CCNY to fund its second community arts center, after Santa Barbara, California, in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, from 1926 to 1934. Still, CCNY was hesitant to support programs when the administrative structure in the art education was undeveloped. By 1930, with the election of a strong AFA president, Frederic A. Whiting, from the Cleveland Museum of Art, and the country in the midst of a depression, the CCNY was ready to intensify its support by funding several community arts projects (CCNY, 1938).

The most successful of these was the Owatonna project (Owatonna, MN, 1932–1939). Robert Hilbert at the University of Minnesota was one of a number of educators concerned with the promotion of art in rural education (Hibert, 1924, 1925). Melvin Haggerty of The University of Minnesota and Henry Suzzalo of CCNY envisioned the structure of the project; afterward Edwin Ziegfeld, Barbara Smith, and Hilbert became influential members of the team. Owatonna focused on “Art as a way of life” using aesthetics and design for the understanding of the role of industrial products in everyday life (Freedman, 1989; Kern, 1985). As a research project, it was designed to (a) develop a method of community analysis, (b) develop a course for the study of art, and (c) develop the community’s interest in the arts by involving the community in adult education, classroom curricula, and teacher education (Saunders, 1985). As an alternative to socialist reactions to capitalism, Owatonna embraced the education of the citizen-as-consumer, whose lives were filled with imported images and things (Belshe, 1946; Burton, 2001b; Efland, 1965, 1990; Freedman, 1987, 1989a; Haggerty, 1935; Jones, 1974; Logan, 1955; Saunders, 1985; Smith, 1996a; Stankiewicz, 2001; Wygant, 1995; Ziegfeld, 2001; Ziegfeld & Smith, 1944).

Cultural Capital
American art museum educators sometimes emphasize the aesthetic properties of art works; other times, they stress historical relatedness, interdisciplinary relationships, and opportunities for social advocacy (Cherry, 1992; Ott, 1985; Svedlow & Troxell, 1997; Wittmann, 1966; Zeller, 1989). At the beginning of the century, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts’ Benjamin Ives Gilman saw art objects as ideals that model excellence. Art museums, unlike science museums, were seen as places to experience and be impressed rather than taught (Zeller, 1989). Progressive Education contributed several versions of museum education wary of too many cultural influences and historical connections. In 1928, Margaret Lee of the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh instituted two Saturday art classes for children, the Tam O’Shanters and the Palettes. Reflecting the influence of Franz Cizek, students learned first to imitate a studio process, which was in turn related to artworks in the galleries (Judson, 1989). Similarly, Francis Taylor at the Worcester Art Museum in the early 1930s believed that use of media and processes could provide opportunities for empathetic relationships with art works (Zeller, 1989).
The use of studio experiences found their greatest resonance in the museum work of Arthur Lismer and Victor D’Amico. At the Art Gallery of Toronto, Lismer founded the Children’s Art Centre in 1932. The Centre was later replicated in 17 other locations throughout Canada. Lismer saw both the child artist and the artist-as-child sharing in a universal act of creative expression, which represented the wonder of life (Korzenik, 1995). Exhibitions of children’s work from these centers traveled abroad in 1934 and throughout Canada in 1937 (Hinterreiter, 1967; Pearse, 1988, 1992, 1997; Saunders, 1954; Turner, 1992).

In New York, Victor D’Amico also advocated a form of creative expression that assumed a universal creative impulse, which could be awakened through the use of materials. D’Amico’s work as the head of the art department at the progressive Fieldston School (1926–1948) prepared him to develop programs for the Museum of Modern Art (MOMA) such as The Young People’s Gallery, a space to exhibit high school art (1938). While there, he organized The Children’s Art Carnival (1942–1969) funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. The Carnival included a motivational workspace and a creative workspace, both of which could be viewed by adults from a separate viewing area. D’Amico’s work also traveled. He sent the Children’s Carnival to Trade Fairs in Milan, the World’s Fair in Brussels, and to New Deli (D’Amico, 1960, 2001; Efland, 1990; Kim, 2001; Newson & Silvers, 1978; Sahasrabudhe, P., 1997, 2001; Sherman & Efland, 1997).

Thomas Munro advocated a different form of relationship with the arts. As curator of education at the Cleveland Museum of Art, Munro developed programs that closely tied the art museum with certified art educators. Munro based his teaching on aesthetics and art criticism, with an emphasis on logic and clarity of language. Although his emphasis was not ahistorical, neither was it contextual. As with the program at the Barnes Foundation, where he worked for 4 years, works were related to one another as the function of different aesthetic values with the provision that unity was a common characteristic of outstanding work (Logan, 1965; Ott, 1985; Stockrocki, 1992; Zeller, 1989).

Henry Kent at Metropolitan Museum of Art developed programs to correlate art works with other subjects. One of his teachers, Anna Curtis Chandler (1917–1934), dramatized art works through stories related to the narrative of the image and its historical period. Chandler dressed in period attire, formed groups of children into tableau vivants, produced plays, turned these into books, and eventually (1932) developed two programs for CBS’s American School for the Air (Zeller, 1989; Zucker, 2001).

Kenneth Chapman, then working for the Museum of New Mexico, used motifs from pottery chards to teach university students and Indian School children about historical traditions in Native American pottery. To formalize this study, he established the Indian Art Fund to develop an extensive collection of Native American pottery and other crafts. This initiative motivated John D. Rockefeller Jr. to support the establishment of The School for American Research (White, 2001).

In the 1930s, museum educators like Francis Henry Taylor of the Worcester Museum, Philip Youtz of the Pennsylvania (later Philadelphia) Museum of Art and the Brooklyn Museum, and Theodore Low of the Walters Art Gallery resisted the notion that artworks speak for themselves, and that art appreciation and studio production could adequately address the meaning of artworks. These educators saw art objects as rich resources that functioned in relation to language, other objects, and social customs. For Theodore Low, the most radical of the group, museum visitors need be provided with multiple methods of interpretation and points of entry to understand the artworks as cultural history (Zeller, 1989).

Mass Media and the Technologies of Delivery

Newly emerging technologies in image reproduction and transmission allowed people to see and hear about art, in their own homes and schools (McNeill, 1997; Wygant, 1993).
Photography and magazines such as *School Arts* (1901–present), *Everyday Art*, *The Masses*, *Creative Art*, *Keramic Studio*, *Ladies Home Journal*, and so forth, provided images and commentary to their subscribers. In 1925, the AFA introduced adults to art education through the radio series, *Art in Everyday Life*. The first program in the series, *Its Importance to You and Me*, by Robert W. De Forest emphasized the availability of aesthetic perception to all who saw beauty in everyday objects. Florence Levy’s *The Museum of Art: How To Use and Enjoy It* emphasized adult education, the integration of art and life, and an orientation toward a consumer society (American Magazine of Art, 1925; Forest, 1926; Levy, 1925; Mechlin, 1925).

In 1929, two radio initiatives, *The Ohio School of the Air*, conducted by William H. Vogel, and *The American School of the Air* (ASA), the more widely distributed NBC broadcast, focused on the use of radio for curriculum development (Bolin, 1992). These broadcasts were intended for teachers who, equipped with a set of corresponding art reproductions and instructional materials, would facilitate connections among the announcer, the images in the sets, and their students (Bolin, 1992; Zucker, 2001). Articles in art education periodicals such as “Children’s Radio Broadcasting in the USSR” (School Arts, 1934) suggest art educators’ widespread interest in the use of technology in their field.

The early integration of mass media was also used for the education of adults in rural areas. Early programs out of Buffalo, New York, in 1930, Kentucky in 1932, Kansas in 1942, and Pittsburgh featured radio talks supplemented with photographs of the art works published in local newspapers (Bolin, 1992; Salkind, 1985). The most successful of these programs, the weekly (1934) *Art in America* broadcast by WJZ in New York, was subsequently carried by 37 affiliates (Bolin, 1992; Cahill & Barr, 1934; Funk, 1998, 1990).

The radio was also used to broadcast programs that taught people how to make art. Of these, James Schwalbach’s *Let’s Draw* (1936–70) produced over the *Wisconsin School of the Air* was highly successful (Bolin, 1992; Kelly, 1992). For 34 years, Schwalbach developed programming that emphasized art making, not as a step-by-step process but as a creative act that stressed symbolism over formalism or expressionism (Kelly, 1992). As the show developed, audience participation was encouraged through various techniques such as guest artists, art groups, manuals, teachers’ guidelines, and prizes.

The use of radio for art education gave way to film and television. The first broadcast about art on television occurred in conjunction with the inauguration of the new MOMA building in 1939. The program, a Belgian movie about Van Eyck’s *Adoration of the Lamb*, included commentary by MOMA’s Alfred Barr accompanied by musicians playing 15th-century instruments. This was followed by art critic Emily Genauer’s survey of the masterpieces at the New York World’s Fair. Television, because it provided images, became a model medium for providing adult art education (Kastner, 1940).

Art educators also used television for instructional purposes. Ed Mattil, Gil Albert, Joe Servillo, and Alice Schwartz put together *Key to the Cupboard* in the 1950s. The program consisted of short segments of appreciation, application, and history presented by Schwartz, a friendly mouse puppet, and an art historian. Mattil and Schwartz produced *Meaning in Art*, a 60-program, 6-year series funded and used by the Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction. Schwartz also produced *Images and Things* for Indiana University (Mattil, 2001).

**Migrations**

Although isolationist impulses following World War I limited immigration, Western European immigrants, existent minority populations, and crafts from around the world increasingly influenced art education. Some of these influences came from within the country. While Pedro deLemos was editor (1919–1950), Native American crafts played a prominent role in *School Arts Magazine*. Native American crafts from the pueblos of the American Southwest were seen as the ideal Household Art in which art and life were integrated. Classroom teachers responded
to these articles with articles of their own, describing how they incorporated Native American crafts and designs into their classrooms. In mainstream culture, traditional Native American work was being elevated from relic to art as evidenced by a 1919 exhibition in New York organized by Mabel Dodge Luhan and John Sloan (Cahill, 1922; Smith, 1999; White, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c).

It was common practice for art education periodicals like *School Arts* and *Everyday Art* to feature crafts from folk traditions around the world. A 1933 *School Arts* issue devoted to the art of the Soviet Union demonstrates the scope this practice, which lasted through the Second World War. Probably the most radical influence from outside of mainstream art education culture came in the form of murals from Mexico. The political and educational works of Mexican artists, like Diego Rivera, Jose Orozco, and Frida Kahlo; and art educators, like Adolf Best Maugard; were popular with both progressive and conservative art educators (Barbosa, 2001; Brenner, 1929; Clark, 1926; Pepper, 1935; Taylor, 1935). Although socialist political messages of the muralists may not have been embraced over time, appropriation of public spaces by art teachers through mural projects continued to gain legitimacy. Jose Orozco’s work as Visiting Lecturer at Dartmouth College (1932), where he painted a mural on the Baker Library, pioneered the implementation of artist-in-residence programs (Green, 1948).

Immigrants, many Jewish, fleeing unstable conditions in Western Europe in the 1930s and 1940s, brought with them sophisticated ideas developed in Europe’s urban centers. The closing of the Bauhaus by the Nazi regime in 1932 resulted in the immigration of some of its central figures to North American colleges and universities: Annie and Joseph Albers to Black Mountain, then Yale; Walter Gropius to Harvard; Lazlo Maholy-Nagy to Illinois Institute of Design; Gorgy Kepes to MIT, and so forth. The Bauhaus curriculum, which placed a priority on materials and design, became so pervasive that art educators came to see the Bauhaus as the origin of a design-based curriculum (Edwards, 1982; Efland, 1990; Wygant, 1993). The effects of this influence could be seen in art education periodicals from the mid 1930s through the 1970s. Their unsentimental embrace of the machine age meshed with pragmatic Americans looking for a fresh place to start after the strain of WWII. Bauhaus-trained and independent-minded Marguerite Wildenhain was an influential figure in the American Studio Potter Movement of the 1940s and 1950s whose Pond Farm in California contributed to a new tradition of summer studio workshops (Sessions, 1997, 2000).

Events in Europe affected not only artists but also researchers including Henry Schaeffer-Simmern (1896–1978), Viktor Lowenfeld (1903–1960), and Rudolf Arnheim (1904– ). Schaeffer-Simmern was influenced by the research of Gustaf Britsch, Franz Cizek, and Gestalt psychology. He theorized the universal availability of artistic cognition and the teacher’s role as a guide toward increasingly more complex forms of visual thinking. In *The Unfolding of Artistic Activity* (1948), Schaeffer-Simmern’s research became available to American art educators (Abrahamson, 1980a, 1980b, 1985, 1992, 2001; Smith, 1982b, 1996a).

Viktor Lowenfeld’s immigration to the United States in 1939 had an enormous influence. From Austria he brought an interest in haptic perception derived through his work with the blind, stages of development identified by Kerschensteiner, a visual-haptic theory of art initiated by Alois Riegel, and the creative expression of Cizek (Arnheim, 1983; Lowenfeld, 2001; Saunders, 2001; Smith, 1982a, 1987, 1989, 1996a). While teaching at the Hampton Institute (1939–1946), he refined his visual-haptic theory, wrote *Creative and Mental Growth* (1947), and developed a respect for his African American students. It was his work at The Pennsylvania State University (1946–1960), where he established the program in art education (1946), that confirmed his influence on art education. Lowenfeld was a charismatic colleague, mentor, and teacher (Beittel, 1982; Edwards, 1982; Hausman, 1982b; Madenforte, 1982; Saunders, 1982; Youngblood, 1982). His image of art education as a process through which a child’s maturation is enhanced and developed sequentially came to dominate the field (Efland, 1976a).

By the time of Rudolf Arnheim’s arrival in 1940, the passage to America of Jewish intellectuals dismissed from German universities was well established. Arnheim was a Gestalt psychologist whose early work involved the study of the illusion of movement in film. Psychology grounded his argument for the primacy of perception in cognition, as opposed to language. These ideas were articulated primarily through *Art and Visual Perception* (1954) and *Visual Thinking* (1969). Arnheim’s research paralleled the influence of Bauhaus pedagogy and prepared the way for aesthetic education and art-as-language metaphors of the 1970s (Behrens, 2001; Corwin, 2001; Korzenik, 1993; Pariser, 1984).

**ORGANIZING THE PROFESSION**

The CCNY noted, in 1930, that its interest in developing a systematic means of initiating and administrating national arts research projects was difficult given the lack of a coherent organizational structure associated with art education. It took until after the end of World War II for a professional organization of art educators and research programs at the doctoral level to develop to the point where they could take on a systematic study of the profession.

**Building Consensus**

The development of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) is a study of the interplay among national, regional, and individual visions and needs. Since 1883, there had been a Department of Art affiliated with the National Education Association (NEA), but by 1913 it had become fully appropriated by a Manual Training and Industrial Arts affiliate group, which in turn was dropped by NEA in 1919. The strength of the field rested within regional organizations (Clark, 1926; Michael, 1997, 2001; Saunders, 1992).

Keppel and Bach’s 1924 report, which characterized attitudes toward art education as a fad or a frill, generated a lot of talk (CCNY, 1932; Knouff, 1924; Smith, 1996a; Tannahill, 1932). It also contributed to the founding in 1924 of the Federated Council on Art Education (FCAE) to facilitate communication among arts organizations on issues concerning education in public schools, museums, and colleges and universities (Whiting, 1926). The FCAE made little headway, but it did reinforce Royal Bailey Farnum’s commitment to a national organization.

Throughout the 1930s and 1940s there continued to be competing visions for the appropriate way to structure a national organization. One strain developed out of the NEA, which in 1933 reestablished a department of art. The problem with this solution was its inability to integrate with the powerful the regional organizations. By 1947, with a membership of only 127, it was apparent that this organizational structure must change. Through this period, the NEA served as a placeholder for what would become the NAEA (Saunders, 1966, 1978, 1992).

Along the way, the needs for a national organization had been recognized from within the regional organizations themselves. In 1935 Farnum, through his office at the FCAE, polled the profession and found that there was an interest within the regional associations to develop a national coalition. At the end of 1935, Farnum disbanded the FCAE and started the National Association for Art Education (NAAE). Although the regional associations endorsed this project, within 2½ years it became apparent the NAAE could not address national needs (Saunders, 1978, 1992).
A more selective initiative developed in 1942 at the MOMA, where Victor D’Amico organized the Committee on Art Education (COAE). Unlike the political agenda of the NAAE, the COAE was a forum where art educators, often associated with museums and universities, could gather and learn from influential artists and artworld personalities. This committee was guided by D’Amico’s advocacy for an artist–teacher model. The COAE developed into a national organization, holding meetings at university locations throughout the country and providing a forum for researchers, artists, and educators. It was, however, a product of D’Amico and MOMA. His retirement and the fading of progressive education precipitated its end in 1969 (D’Amico, 2001; Freundlich, 1985; Sahasrabudhe, 2001).

The final stages of the founding of the NAEA took place in 1947. Marion Quin Dix of the EAA was instrumental in developing relationships with the NEA. Dix, together with Italo deFrancesco and Adella Church of the Art Department of the NEA, strategized a plan for the Council of Affiliated Art Associations. Their plan was presented to the Art Department at the NEA and regional representatives at the NEA national conference in Atlantic City. The political problems of representation were solved first by Dix’s appointment of Edwin Ziegfeld as temporary chair and through a summer meeting in Cincinnati, where the relations between the national and the regional associations were formalized (Burton, 2001; Saunders, 1992; Ziegfeld, 2001). The NAEA was housed at Kutztown University until Ralph Beelke, in 1958, moved it to Washington (Beelke, 2001; Gregory, 1982, 1983, 1985a, 1985b; Michael, 1997).

The arts continued to be a useful means for healing, in this case to unite a world community still recovering from World War II. The founding of UNESCO by the United Nations was based on this vision. In 1951, Charles Gaitskell, Thomas Munro, and Edwin Ziegfeld met with Herbert Read and Trevor Thomas for a seminar in Bristol, England, to discuss the formation of the International Society for Education through Art (INSEA). Edwin Ziegfeld was again elected president of a newly formed art education organization. After the Bristol conference, Gaitskell, who had also attended the first NAEA conference in New York (1951), returned to Canada determined to create The Canadian Society for Education through Art (CSEA), which was formed in 1955 (Gaitskell, 2001; Lemerise & Sherman, 1997; Qualley, 1997; Rhodes, 1985; Saunders, 1954; Shoaff-Ballanger & Davis, 1997).

Developing a Research Agenda

Art education’s professional organizations resulted from social and political needs that transcended both local and regional interests. The theoretical basis for these shared interests needed to be defined through research (Keel, 1963, 1965). Prior to World War II, art education had neither an established research identity nor a systematic approach to funding projects. The research that had been conducted was done by psychologists or educators, often funded by philanthropic, as opposed to by federal, sources (Hoffa, 1994).

Higher education programs for the training of art teachers, beginning with the Massachusetts State Normal School (Mass College of Art) in 1873, were widespread in the United States and Canada. Teachers College had a sustained history in education research, but its first PhD in art education was not granted until the late 1930s (Burton, 2001). This situation changed with the GI Bill of Rights (1944). Universities now needed a supply of qualified professors with advanced degrees whose perspective could inform the field (Eisner, 1965b; Stankiewicz, 2001). The period after World War II also precipitated a shift in the gender of the heads of university art education departments. Prior to 1950, it was common for women to head art education programs. As programs shifted to include both the training of teachers and the education of research professionals, the gender of the heads of art education programs shifted from women to men (Edwards 1982; Hutchens, 2001; Logan, 2001; Smith, 1996).
Loosely constructed, art education has a history of research through the work of people like Florence Cane, Marion Quin, Ruth Faison Shaw, Natalie Robinson Cole, and Sally Tannahill, whose qualitative methods informed their ideas about teaching (Cole, 2001; Gregory, 1982; Hausman, 1982a; Smith, 1985a, 1985b; Stankiewicz & Zimmerman, 1984). But it was primarily psychologists and educators who developed empirical studies related to the field. At the University of Minnesota, psychologist Florence Goodenough (1924, 1926) conducted the Draw-a-Man Test and Measurement of Intelligence by Drawings. At the University of Iowa, psychologist Norman C. Meier designed the Meier-Seashore Art Judgment Test (1929) and Meier Art Tests (1942) (Clark, 1985, 1987, 1992; Clark, Zimmerman, & Zurnuehlen, 1987; Weider, 1977; Whitford, 1926; Zimmerman, 1985a, 1985b; Zurnuehlen, 1985).

In addition to these tests for intelligence, curriculum research, like the Owatonna Project, was conducted to assess educational programs and surveys, and reports such as Art in American Life and Education (Whipple, 1941) provided an overview of the field. The most significant longitudinal research was the Eight-Year Study (1932–1940) by the Progressive Education Association with funding from the Carnegie Fund for the Advancement of Teaching. The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between high school courses and college success rates. Although not specifically an art education project, it did show that high school students would select art courses if free to do so. It also showed that those same students had equal or improved results in college compared to students whose courses were prescribed (Logan, 1955; Plummer, 1969, 1985; Wygant, 1993).

The research developed in these early years was influenced by psychology and creative expression. The publication of this research was also important to identify the field. In 1948, Art Education, the journal of the NAEA, was first published (Michael, 1997; Schumaker, 1997). In 1949, the Eastern Arts Association created the Research Bulletin. As the regional associations became absorbed into NAEA, the bulletin was transformed in 1958 into Studies in Art Education (Brewer, 1999; Chalmers, 1999; Chapman, 1999; Collins, 1999). In 1970, NAEA’s Kenneth Beittel and June McFee worked to establish the Seminar for Research in Art Education (SRAE) to develop new knowledge about the field (Qualley, 1997).

New research funds were available after the United States government’s passage of the Cooperative Research Act (1954), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), and the National Arts and Humanities Act (1965), which created the National Endowment for the Arts. In place now were three levels of organization: a national professional organization, a system to educate researchers in the field, and a system for disseminating emerging ideas. Such initiatives marked the maturation of art education. The influence of researcher and project administrators, as opposed to the classroom teachers, initiated questions about the relationship between the tacit knowledge of the practitioner and the theoretical and empirical knowledge of the researcher/administrator. Fundamental questions arose regarding the authority upon which art education was based and the goals that its practitioners might set for themselves (Eisner, 1965a; Stankiewicz & Zimmerman, 1984; Strommen, 1988).

QUESTIONS OF IDENTITY

As the national identities of Art Educators were established, people holding divergent perspectives could engage in informed critical discussion. The later part of the 20th century chronicles how the field responded to these differences. Despite the ascent of New York City to the status of the cultural capital of Modernism, the descendants of that project, artists and art educators alike, became increasingly dissatisfied with enterprises like creative expression that viewed inquiry as culturally and historically detached.
Establishing Prototypes

Until the beginning of the cold war, the federal government had shown little interest in either education or the arts, let alone art education. New Deal initiatives (1933–1939), like the Works Progress Authority (WPA), were the first government programs designed to assist the arts (Funk, 1990). But these were not research, education, or even welfare programs but work relief programs designed to help artists suffering during the depression. Following World War II, the Soviet Union’s development of nuclear capabilities (1949) and their launch of Sputnik into orbit (1957) provoked a rethinking of the federal neglect of education (Efland, 1990a, 1990b, 2001). Like the conditions that influenced the state of Massachusetts to legislate its Drawing Act in 1870 (see previous chapter), the federal government now looked to education to improve its competitive position in the world (Bolin, 1990; Farnum, 1925).

Educators began to frame their language around what was basic. Schools were seen to promote learning as opposed to social development. The Council for Basic Education, a nonprofit organized to promote this mission for education, was formed in 1958 (Down, 1979; Smith, 1966). Following the passage of the National Defense Education Act (1958), mathematics and science representatives from CCNY, the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Sciences, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science gathered to discuss curriculum development at the Woods Hole Conference. Jerome Bruner’s (1960) account of the conference in *The Process of Education* proposed that the work of scientists, mathematicians, and so forth, was structured, disciplined, and based on a history of prior practitioners. Bruner’s scheme valued the uniqueness of the relationships between knowledge and skills that constituted disciplined inquiry. It also looked to experts in the disciplines to reveal what their work entailed. Educators needed to identify what subjects could be said to be disciplines, identify the ways that inquiries in those disciplines are structured, and translate those structures into a developmentally appropriate sequence of instruction for students (Efland, 1988, 1990). Art educators now had to make the case that the arts were disciplined and basic. This self-questioning is evidenced by a series of articles for *Studies in Art Education* that addressed the fundamental identity of art education as a discipline (Dobbs, 1979; Erickson, 1979).

Oddly enough, it was scientists Jerrold Zacharias and Joseph Turner, members of the President’s Science and Advisory Committee’s Panel on Educational Research and Development, who saw the need for a balance between science and the arts (Efland, 1984). Their Yale Seminar on Music Education (1963) was the first of 17 projects in the arts funded by the Arts and Humanities Department of the USOE (Efland, 1990a, 1990b; Hoffa, 1977). Kathryn Bloom, the newly appointed director (1963–1969) of the USOE–A&H, understood that there was a need to fund research initiatives in the arts. Her first project, *The Seminar on Elementary and Secondary Education* in 1964 held at NYU, picked up on the tradition of Victor D’Amico at MOMA, which favored the expertise of art professionals over art educators. This initiative foreshadowed the Arts-in-Schools program of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the Arts in Education Program of the John D. Rockefeller III Fund (Ecker & Hausman, 2001; Fowler, 1980; Hoffa, 1997). At The Ohio State University, the USOE funded David Ecker’s *The Research and Development Team for the Improvement of Teaching Art Appreciation*, which marked an intensification of the role of aesthetics in art education. The most far-reaching project was *A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development* (1965) held at Penn State. The Seminar was organized by Ed Mattil, Ken Beittel, Elliott Eisner, David Ecker, Jerome Hausman, and Manuel Barkan (Efland, 1984; Mattil, 1997). The conference included philosophers, artists, art critics, psychologists, and art educators. It was informed by Manuel Barkan’s (1962) conception of art education as being structured around art production, art criticism, and art history, June King McFee’s concerns for the social dimensions of art, and
Ecker’s ideas that art was involved with the qualitative aspects of experience (Beittel, 1997; Ecker, 1963, 1997; Efland, 1984; Hamblen, 1997; Hausman, 1997; Hoffa, 1997; Lanier, 1963; Mattil, 1966, 1997; McWhinnie, 1997; Smith, 1997; Zahner, 1997). Following the Penn State Conference and Kathryn Bloom’s stay at the USOE, art education developed in two directions: one dominated by art educators and the other by arts administrators.

The Penn State Seminar contributed to a series of aesthetic education initiatives, involving responding to art in structured ways that provided guidelines for developing curriculum. Ralph Smith’s (1966a) book, *Aesthetics and Criticism in Art Education*, and journal (1966b), *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, informed this discussion. Manuel Barkan, Laura Chapman, David Ecker, and Jerome Hausman submitted a successful proposal to the USOE for the development of an Aesthetic Education Program, to be administered by Barkan, Chapman, and Evan Kern followed by Stanley Madeja at the Central Mid western Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) (Chapman, 1982, 2001; Efland, 1987; Jones, 1974; Kern, 1997; Madeja, 1977a, 1977b, 2001). Initiatives included the development of the CEMREL kits and instructional packages for classroom use. Aesthetic education kits were also developed for Eisner’s Kettering Project (1967–1969) at Stanford University. Kettering boxes, intended for the use by non-specialists in elementary classrooms to teach art, delivered a sequenced curriculum structured around art production, history, and criticism (Clark, 1975; Copeland, 1983; Eisner, 1968, 1970, 1972, 2001b; Dobbs, 1992; Wygant, 2001). And in at the Southwest Regional Education Laboratory (SWRL), Duane Greer, working through ideas developed by Harry Brody and Rudolf Arnheim, used the disciplines of art criticism, aesthetics, art history, and studio production to provide models for structuring lessons (Dobbs, 1992; Efland, 1990). These initiatives provided the basis from out of which the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (later Getty Education Institute for the Arts) developed its art education project under the direction of LeiLani Lattin-Duke (Wilson, 1997). Greer coined the term Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) for the approach the Getty would take in providing curriculum development institutes for elementary classroom teachers in art instruction (Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987; Greer, 1984; Greer & Rush, 1985; Wilson, 1997).

These initiatives envisioned a public education that could instruct all students in ways to approach art and that would provide meaningful experiences throughout their lives (Chapman, 1982). The discipline-based initiatives shared a reasonable premise: Start with what society wants children to become, determine its attributes, and then figure out how to teach it. However, it was on this point the Social Reconstructionists took issue with what they perceived as DBAE’s limited perspective. For example, they claimed that the academy’s record on social equity was spotty and that the kinds of knowledge academics hold is a small portion of what informs visual culture (Jagodzinski, 1997). Criticism also came from art educators associated with creative expression and child development (Burton, Lederman, & London, 1988; Greenberg, 2001).

The other strain of art education, following the legacy of the USOE and a perspective that looks toward discipline experts, held that qualitative experiences through direct exposure to the arts, through artist-in-residence and event programming supported by adequate staffing, was the best means of ensuring an authentic arts experience for students. This was the possibility that motivated the work of Kathryn Bloom, who left the USOE to direct the Arts in Education Program (AIE) (1968–1979) at the John D. Rockefeller III Fund. The AIE developed programs throughout the country (Bloom, 1980). These programs provided a foundation for future community-based initiatives (Eddy, 1980). The remaining USOE connection to art education was through its funding of the Alliance for Arts in Education and the National Committee for Arts for the Handicapped in 1975 (Killen, 1999a, 1999b). Both projects were directed through the Kennedy Center. These programs depended on state arts councils and community art centers, rather than on public schools, to administer and deliver programming.
These differing directions in programming reveal long-standing differences in focus. Art educators by and large look for ways to structure learning. Arts professionals look for ways to promote art-related experiences for students. In the 1990s, the legacy of federal support declined and there was less emphasis on experiential opportunities like the Artist-in-the-Schools Program or academic research. The central directive of federal policy, since the Goals 2000 initiative in 1994, has been the promotion of assessment and National Standards (Beittel, 1997; Clark, 1992; Dambekalns, 1997; Ecker, 1997; Eisner, 2001; Hamblen, 1997; Hausman, 1997, 2001; Hoffa, 1985, 1994, 1997; Joyce, 1997; Marche, 1997; Mattil, 1997; McWhinnie, 1997; Payne, 1985; Pittard, 1985; Smith, 1997; Zahner, 1992, 1997).

Establishing Inquiry

Throughout the century, inquiry was an issue in art education. Florence Levy (1910) wanted art to “guide his spirit of inquiry” (p. 121). From the 1950s art educators suggested that both making and perceiving art engage us in problem-solving and posing activities (Efland, 1987; Eisner & Ecker, 1966; Jansen, 1992; Kern, 1987; Smith, 1987). Most influential in its revelation of the limited ways that this is incorporated into teaching was Arthur Efland’s (1976, also 1983a) “The School Art Style: A Functional Analysis.”

Many art educators have stressed the making of art as a form of critical engagement. David Ecker (1963) revisited the ideas of John Dewey stressing the artistic process as a series of problems that are qualitative as opposed too theoretical. The artist both poses and solves these problems. Eisner (1962) and Paul Torrance and Paul Hendrickson (1961) studied creativity as a form of inquiry. Edmund Feldman (1962) placed the artist in a greater social context (Feldman, 2001). Artists engage in existential problems, the solutions for which model solutions for all of us (Chalmers, 1999).

Closely related to the idea of art making as a form of inquiry, requiring a self-reflexive consciousness is the concept of art as a language/symbol system. As early as 1925 School Arts Magazine had an issue titled Visual Education. George Kepes’ (1944) Language of Vision and Rudolf Arnheim’s (1969) Visual Thinking presented highly influential conceptions of what it means to think visually. Nelson Goodman (1976) contributed his theory that visual art is not a language per se but rather a symbol system, dense in its semantic features but lacking a rule-governed syntax. Goodman’s ideas grounded Howard Gardner and David Perkins’ work on Project Zero at Harvard University. Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Theory and Project Zero’s ARTS PROPEL research project provided a model for considering reflection as consciously developed component of studio activity. The ARTS PROPEL model also incorporated the use of process portfolios as part of its curriculum (Gardner, 1989).

One of the lasting achievements of the discipline-based initiatives was the incorporation of language as a critical component of art education. Although there had been a tradition in art education for appreciating and discussing art works, art educators became interested in the ways language facilitates the development of conceptual structures for understanding art. For this to have been accepted, language and images needed to be seen not only as symbolic systems but also as interdependent systems (Mitchell, 1994; Parsons, 1998; Wilson, 1966). Texts that emerged from the aesthetic education movement, like Hubbard’s and Rouse’s (1973) Art: Meaning, Method, and Materials and Chapman’s (1978) Approaches to Art in Education and (1985) Discover Art, directed the field’s attention to a careful use of language (Hubbard, 1982; Neil, 1985; Siskar, 1997). Eliot Eisner’s (1972) Educating Artistic Vision stressed the need for structuring thought. Edmund Feldman’s (1970) Becoming Human through Art and June King McFee’s (1967) Preparation for Art applied the importance of language to the social function of art. Mary Erickson developed strategies for using language to frame historical relationships. Feldman’s work on art criticism was extended through the writings of Terry Barrett (1994),
whose *Criticizing Art* not only amplified methodologies for critically approaching art works but also enriched the field by promoting the use of contemporary art. Barrett’s model suggested that the choice of artworks may also provoke inquiry. Marilyn Stewart’s (1997) *Thinking through Aesthetics* emphasized the importance of a careful use of language to develop conceptual relationships.

### Establishing Community

Art education has a long history of being connected to community work. Dewey’s spiral curriculum operated out of the assumption that a child first knows his or her own world and subsequently applies this knowledge to other places, times, and cultures (Efland, 1995b). Initiatives like the city beautiful movement, art weeks, pageantry, rural education, community centers, Progressive Education, WPA, Mexican Muralists, Industrial Arts, Household Arts, Owatonna, and correlated art have all been closely linked to community development. The goal of these efforts, however, was to Americanize, uplift, or train students as they came to assume mainstream values (Amburgy, 1990; Freedman, 1989, 1998; Funk, 1990, 2000; Stankiewicz, 2001).

The conception of art education as being connected to possibilities for critical inquiry required a recognition of critique as being “for,” “through,” and “based on” the perspectives of different communities of interest. Community-based initiatives sought ways to acknowledge those divergent community voices and to use community resources. Civil Rights initiatives, accelerated by World War II, Brown v. Topeka in 1954, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and philosophical issues, related to the social construction of meaning, called into question essentialist notions of exemplary artworks and academic models of inquiry (Haynes, 1993). If art was a deeply social human activity, then differing communities of experience might bring different values to the field (Haynes, 1993, 1997).

Mainstream art educators, for the most part, were very slow to acknowledge their complicity in the underrepresentation of minority concerns either as content or as method (Henry & Nyman, 1997). *School Arts Magazine* before World War II had few works by African or African American artists. One exception was the Barnes Foundation, which consistently supported African American artists and educators (Jubilee, 1982). During the 1920s and the early years of the depression, the Harmon Foundation developed eight art centers throughout the country to promote African American artists. Artists who developed and showed at the New York center, like Aaron Douglas, Hale Woodruff, and Palmer Hayden, went on to establish influential careers (Grigsby, 1977; Hubbard, 1985, 1992). Also in New York, Augusta Savage developed the Savage Studio of Arts and Crafts in 1931 (Cochran, 2000). Lowenfeld’s work at the Hampton Institute informed the efforts he made to support African American art educators at The Pennsylvania State University. Under his advisement, John Biggers (1955) produced an unorthodox dissertation, *The Negro Woman in American Life and Education: A Mural Presentation*. Lowenfeld’s encouragement and Biggers dissertation exhibit an understanding of a need in the field to find alternative ways of articulating concerns of different communities of thought (Grigsby, 1977; Smith, 1982a, 1996).

The NAEA in 1971 recognized the importance of diverse voice through the establishment of the Committee on Multiethnic concerns (Grigsby, 1997; Qualley, 1997). Vincent Lanier’s (1969) “The Teaching of Art as Social Revolution” presses issues related to the social theory and Chalmers’ (1996) Celebrating Pluralism presents a social reconstructionist agenda in some contrast to the more conservative impulses of earlier discipline-based initiatives.

Feminist art educators developed a more radical critique of the depth to which art education theories and practices were grounded in perspectives based on privilege and power. They questioned why art education, which has always had a high percentage of women practitioners, has framed its history in relation to male leadership, instructed students through the use of artists, artworks, and artforms that replicate male privilege, and promoted male-biased conceptions of curriculum and instruction. Georgia Collins (1977) and Sandra Packard (1977) took a critical look at the status of women and women’s perspectives in art education. Collins maintained that not only were women in art education systematically excluded from leadership positions, but also curriculum models were being developed out of aesthetic principles that reflected male sensibilities, which assume hierarchies and dominance, as opposed to female sensibilities, which value integration and connectedness (Collins, 1977; Collins & Sandell, 1984; Sacca, 1989, 2001).

These efforts never produced coherent overarching curriculum initiatives backed by the financial power of the USOE or the Getty but they have had a tremendous influence on the development of curricula that reflect feminist sensibilities (Congdon & Zimmerman, 1993; Patterson, 1997; Sacca & Zimmerman, 1998; Speirs, 1998; Stankiewicz & Zimmerman, 1984, 1985; Zimmerman & Stankiewicz, 1982). Issues of equity also led to the founding of the NAEA’s Women’s Caucus in 1975, the Caucus on Social Theory in 1982, and the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Issues Caucus in 1996 (Check, 2000; Qualley, 1997). Minority rights were explored on several fronts. The emphasis on exemplars in art education, reflected in the Back-to-Basics and Excellence movements, was radically critiqued as a false conception of the value art education holds for students. Kristin Congdon and Doug Blandy’s (1987) Art in a Democracy stretched the traditional methodologies associated with the field. They also brought art education’s attention to issues related to folk artists and people with disabilities (Abia-Smith, 2000; Bolin, Blandy, & Congdon, 2000; Congdon, 1985; Congdon, Blandy, & Bolin, 2001; Traeger, 1992). Textbooks, too, responded to the broader conception of community. Eldon Katter and Marilyn Stewart (2001) in their series Art and the Human Experience emphasized community through thematic units developed around broadly shared human processes. Researchers like Christine Ballangee Morris (2000) and Mary Stokrocki (1997, 2001) applied ethnographic and community-based research methods toward understanding the visual cultures of various peoples. Recently, art educators have sought to redefine the field through the study of visual culture, material culture, and mass arts (Bolin & Blandy, 2003; Chapman, 2003; Duncum, 2001; Freedman, 2000). These initiatives stress the importance of the intersection of community and critically as the foundations of the field. They advocate for a critical pedagogy that connects students with their lives through an examination of the roles images, artifacts, and performances play in the construction of identity (Chapman, 2003).

CONCLUSION

Art educators continue to wonder about the relation between art education’s role as a tool for critical self-examination and/or a tool for uniting people around shared beliefs. Art educators also continue a vital dialog between social reconstructionist perspectives based on multi-centered, situated approaches to learning and conservative perspectives, promoted through
initiatives such as *A Nation at Risk* and *Goals 2000*, which embrace definable standards based on exemplary models. Between these two stances, however, there is much agreement on the value of an embodied understanding of critical theory as a means to develop relations between art and life. This emphasis on criticality differs significantly from earlier approaches that used aesthetic distance as a means to bridge that same gap.

One senses from viewing the past, when North American people looked to craft, design, and authentic self-expression as a means to heal and reintegrate their lives, that emerging technologies and their social repercussions influenced art’s role in education. As was true then, technologies frame our perceptions, provide images to study, the means to study them, tools to manipulate them, and lifestyles to be embraced and resisted (Garoian & Gaudelius, 2001). In this mediated world of visual culture, both cognition—embodied in forms such as art, art classrooms, and mass culture—and technologies—embodied within us—effect cultural practices in dynamic and unforeseen ways. These interactions present art educators with tremendous opportunities to reconfigure their field in relation to a wider range of cultural practices. Art educators ask not only how an image made in London might be transported to, understood, critiqued, emulated, and resisted in rural Mississippi, but also how an image made in Mississippi might transform the lives of its makers and the lives of others.

The history of art education is informed by the dynamics of these movements. As an area of research within the field, it contributes to the stories that we tell about who we are and why we do what we do. As the relationships among images, words, social institutions, and folk and progressive practices and beliefs intermingle, art education’s history becomes a more complex tale of shared and unshared interests, of odd alliances and understandable disagreements, which will become increasingly reliant on research by others and critical self-examination to develop its stories in useful ways.
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