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1. ART EDUCATION IN AMERICA AND IN VIRGINIA BEACH: SOME CONTRASTS

Art instruction in the public schools of America is generally viewed as a peripheral subject matter area, a “nice” but hardly necessary component of the curriculum. It is not surprising that art teachers perceive their status as low or that they have a sense of isolation from the teachers of other subjects. This feeling of isolation is perhaps the consequence both of others’ perceptions of the marginality of art in school and society, and also of the artist-teachers’ own belief that each artist has the mission to create a unique artistic version of the world. And frequently the “best” art instruction is also seen as what transfers to the student as much freedom as possible within the school setting so that they might also forge their own individual versions of the world.

Art instruction in America is typically oriented toward the production of works of art. It is of little consequence that art curriculum guides suggest that students acquire something of the history of art, learn to perceive and respond sensitively to works of art, and to criticize works of art insightfully. But curriculum guides are frequently viewed as documents that merely suggest what might be taught, not what must be taught, and most art teachers do not use the textbooks that provide curricular structure for most other school subjects, so they are more fully responsible for the content and form of their instruction than other teachers. Art lesson planning is frequently intuitive; lessons are sketchily developed and recorded in the weekly plan book. The details for long units of instruction are more often to be discovered in the head of the art teacher than on paper.

It is also common practice for students at several grade levels to receive the same lesson on a single day. Although multi-grade lessons may facilitate planning and classroom management, they defeat the idea of a sequential program. It is common to hear junior high school art teachers complain that students are learning little in the elementary grades, and senior high school art teachers bemoan the quality of junior high school art instruction. The independence that school systems extend to art teachers added to the freedom that art teachers insist that they must have to function well, for better or worse, characterize contemporary art education.

To observe art teaching is to come to believe that a mild form of curricular anarchy is the common reality, but such is not always the case. In Virginia Beach, Virginia, the art program has a status essentially the same as other subject matter areas; articulated curriculum guides specify that there will be an equitable balance between learning to make art, learning about art and artists, and learning to perceive and respond to works of art, and where the guides are followed, art instruction focuses on concepts of art; and every art lesson is fully planned in writing. The art teachers are not romantic lone rangers; they do not feel that their artists’ prerogatives are being denied—teachers tell of the advantages of a unified program.

The secondary art teachers know what students are learning in the elementary grades. Art learning is not thought to be something that results from the automatic process of developmental unfolding; both the teachers and the students consider art a discipline to be acquired through considerable effort. Nor do they feel stifled creatively by the structure of the system; rather, teachers report that they have ample opportunity to experiment. The outcomes of the program are notable. When it comes to knowing about art and artists, for example, elementary school students are more knowledgeable than high school students from other school districts.
The students give unusually sensitive and insightful descriptions and interpretations of works of art, and the quality of the student artwork is high as well.

A SHORT HISTORY OF ART EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA BEACH

The story of the art program can begin just before the time when Virginia Beach City was “invented” from an ocean-front resort strip, a collection of small villages, farms, and naval installations that were threatened with incorporation into the city of Norfolk. The creation of a city nullified that threat. Now Virginia Beach is the largest city in Virginia with a population of more than 285,000 people. Its 310 square miles include 51 square miles of inland water, 38 miles of shoreline, and 26 miles of public beach. The highest point in the city is Mount Trashmore, a grassy hill formed from the municipality’s refuse. No city center will be found among the sprawling housing developments, shopping centers, industry, Mennonite farms, strawberry patches, Dismal Swamp, and military installations that stretch from the Chesapeake Bay to the North Carolina state line.

Before 1960, there was no unified art program nor art supervisor, only individual art teachers at the secondary level. By 1963, however, when Virginia Beach became a city, there were 35 schools and an embryonic art program. With community growth so rapid that for a time two-and-one-half new classrooms were needed each week, it was also an auspicious time for the development of an expanded art program. Although an art coordinator had been appointed, there were only three art specialists whose services were spread so thin that they were able to visit elementary school classrooms only once in every four months. “There were three of us doing gimmicky things, working hard and not accomplishing much, seeing the kids in December and again in April.”

The district’s first art coordinator, Ann Davis, made perhaps her most important contribution to the program by helping to secure a Title I grant that made money available for art slides, reproductions, replicas of sculpture, kilns, art rooms, cultural centers in schools, and the hiring of full-time art teachers in four of the elementary schools. Davis is convinced that the title money that amounted to about one-half million dollars a year for the first two years “put us ten years ahead.” Most important, the funds were used to hire six more art teachers—at first just for the remaining half of a school year. But these new art teachers were retained the following year, setting the pattern of having art specialists in each elementary school.

During the time the district’s second art coordinator was expending much of her effort overseeing the elementary school art program, things were also happening in the secondary schools. One high school principal began to require all teachers in his building to prepare written, comprehensive, well-documented lesson plans. “At one time the emphasis on lesson planning was so strong that there were weekly and monthly checks and the plans were turned in at the end of the year.” When this same high school principal became an assistant district superintendent, detailed lesson plans became a requirement throughout the district. While the teachers in most other subject areas were able to base their lesson plans on curriculum guides, the art teachers were not. Indeed, the art teachers sensed that the absence of an art guide, instead of an advantage that gave teachers freedom to teach whatever and however they pleased, became a detriment, preventing their program from enjoying the status of other subject areas. As they struggled unsuccessfully in subsequent years to produce a comprehensive art guide, this feeling of inferiority was painfully intensified.

1This quotation is from a former art curriculum consultant and one of the first three traveling elementary art teachers in Virginia Beach.
Lou Lowenthal had used an art guide in Richmond before coming to Virginia Beach. In 1969, she and another teacher “who was used to a guide and couldn’t work without one” produced their own. It became one of the bases for the first district secondary art guide and was handed to teachers with the suggestion that they might use it if they wished. Curriculum guides in Virginia Beach are not treated so casually today.

When the second art supervisor accepted another position, she left a legacy of elementary schools staffed with art specialists and a rudimentary secondary school art guide. Whereas her tenure had been one of quiet growth, Michael Fowler’s (the new art supervisor) was one of activity and no small amount of turmoil as the process of ideological awakening unfolded. Fowler believed in artist-teachers (this divided the artists from those who were not), that art teaching should be grounded in art, and that art teachers should be aware of the theories of art educators. Eisner, Feldman, and Burgart were invited into the district. Fowler “taught us to look around, to take the sophisticated view,” sometimes, however, with unfortunate results. “He himself didn’t know what he believed; when we would do it one way he would say, ‘why not another.’”

The district administration’s demand for a comprehensive curriculum guide led to frustration, chaos, and dismay among the art teachers. From 1974 to 1977 they met with Fowler both during the school year and in summer workshops to produce guides. They wrote many hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of art concepts, but draft after draft was discarded because “it wasn’t right.” Perhaps the attempt to integrate too much material, too many ideas, and irreconcilable points of view into a single document made the production of a guide impossible.

This succession of still-born curriculum guides posed a threat to the art program. In a district where instruction was strictly “by the guide,” without one, the art program was in limbo.

The central administrators were looking for an art supervisor who could produce a guide, and in Nancy Jones, an experienced art teacher with a doctorate in curriculum development, they saw someone who could get the job done. She arrived in July of 1977. Two weeks later she and a team of teachers were well on the way to producing a K-12 curriculum guide that was in the hands of all teachers by mid-fall. The speed of the guide’s production can be attributed both to Dr. Jones’ organizational ability and to the ideas and alternative philosophical positions that had emerged from the earlier struggles to produce guides.

Anthropologist Victor Turner’s concept of “communitas” characterizes the dynamic spirit, the closeness of feeling, the sense of endless power, and utter commitment to a valued enterprise of a group of individuals who find themselves interacting within a situation that is outside of or beyond the structure of their normal lives. Descriptions of Nancy Jones’ curriculum guide workshops sound remarkably like communitas. And, indeed, in an examination of the art curriculum developmental process and subsequent outcomes, Turner’s idea of communitas helps to explain the way in which the art teachers in Virginia Beach were able to buy into and become a part of the process of curriculum making. Because of this feeling of “ownership” and kinship, they continued to enthusiastically support and utilize the resulting guides.

Some of the teachers look back upon the curriculum development sessions (which were to continue for three summers) as almost magical times:

---

2From other sources I learned that the principal of the high school may have required the teachers in all subject matter areas without guides to write their own.

3These quotations are from Lou Lowenthal, one of the teachers who worked on many of the early draft curriculum guides.

"The summer on the guide was such an incredible thing, being able to use my own knowledge; I felt like a human being; I felt worthwhile." "This was the high-point of my career; we taught ourselves art history in those few weeks. We used lots more resources besides Jansen [History of Art]." "Nancy would have our task taped. You picked up the chapter you were assigned to write. When you were finished you crossed it out [with a feeling of pride]." "All who worked on the guide were psyched—even the ones who were not going to teach [the subject]." "We were flying high on art history. It wasn’t a job. We took it home with us. Even if it was suntan time we still worked." "When it was done I felt like I gave birth—like to a baby—afraid something was going to happen to it."

Although, according to Turner, communitas, "like the winged spirit that flies," cannot be evoked, the conditions that will facilitate its occurrence may be established. It appears that Nancy Jones was a master at establishing those conditions. Of her role, she says:

I came to the role of supervisor directly out of the elementary classroom, which was a little bit of a shock to begin with. Having just finished my degree [a doctorate] in curriculum development, I was certainly ready to take on this task. I was fascinated with the ways a group accomplished a task. So one of the things I wanted to do was to make the group experience for the teachers involved in writing curriculum enjoyable, learning, and positive. The curriculum guide product was important, but it was just as important to me to make the group function successfully. Of course I had done my research in the area of creativity for problem solving, so I wanted to use those ideas and incorporate that with the group and individually. Working in Virginia Beach was an unknown quantity. I walked in on July 1st, didn’t know a single soul, and had to have a curriculum set up by the opening of school. That was my charter.

Perhaps in other school districts the possession of a guide would be a fairly unimportant matter. In highly structured Virginia Beach it mattered very much. Nancy Jones adds:

Every other curriculum area, with a couple of exceptions in vocational fields, had curriculum guides well developed. Art was the exception. The teachers wanted guidance. They had done so much work and never seen a product. I think the other thing was the status of the art program. Art teachers are always concerned with how the program is perceived and compared with English and social studies, as well as the sports program. We had no curriculum guide and no firm requirements for administrators to come in and say “why aren’t you doing this?” They didn’t know what art teachers were supposed to be doing. Art teachers had no basis on which to go in to an administrator and say, “I need this.” He would say, “Why? Where’s your curriculum guide requirement for that particular thing? You don’t have to do sculpture, nobody says that. I don’t have to buy you clay.” So they saw the curriculum as a way of formalizing the program for acceptance by others.

The K-12 overview guide, which specified that students study and respond to art as well as make it, was followed by detailed guides for Art I, Art II, Art III and IV, Grades 6 and 7, and advance placement art history. With the basic art curricular structure in place and detailed guides developed for all areas with the exception of K-5, the district then began to allocate curriculum development funds to other subject matter areas.

It was not until the summer of 1983 that K-5 and secondary school art appreciation curriculum workshops were underwritten, following several years of requests for funding by Stephena Runyan who has been the art supervisor since 1980. Finally she will have the chance to put her own stamp on the Virginia Beach art curriculum. Since she served on several curriculum writing committees with Nancy Jones, she knows the program well, and this

---

5 These quotations are from an interview with Cindy Flegal.
6 Here Victor Turner quotes William Blake to express the special quality of communitas.
7 In her dissertation, Marjorie Wilson makes the point that although a spirit of communitas cannot be forced, some teachers are able to establish the conditions that ensure its repeated emergence.
knowledge of the curriculum and her commitment to the program is perhaps one of the reasons she was chosen to be art supervisor. Her supervisory role has been to see that the curriculum became firmly and uniformly established in each of the 62 public schools in Virginia Beach. In fact, Nancy Jones says Stef Runyan has probably been more vigorous in enforcing the standard curriculum than she herself would have been. Many of the 70 art teachers would probably agree.

SOME EXPLANATIONS

Why did Virginia Beach develop a strong unified program based on concepts of art, teaching about art and artists, and the critical evaluation of art when most art programs merely give lip-service to these ideas? Why is there the view that art is more than fun, that it also involves helping students to acquire the skills and knowledge associated with the disciplined making and experiencing of art? Why was art learning assumed to be more than a naturally unfolding process requiring only nurturing from concerned teachers? Although several hypotheses might explain the unique character of the Virginia Beach art program, the most plausible takes into account both the unique character of the art teachers and supervisors and the structure of a highly demanding school system.

Over the years, the Virginia Beach teachers did not seem to fit into the typical art educational mold. As a group they appear to have been, at least partially, immune to the Romantic epidemic that has infected art education from the 1930s until the present day. The teachers who had been most involved in working on the curriculum guides had come to art education by way of fine arts. They were people who had a genuine affection for art and art history. There were also those who had strong studio background. Although it was not possible to detect an explicit hiring practice that would have resulted in “Virginia Beach type” teachers, there may have been an implicit practice of hiring teachers who were well grounded in the discipline of art.

In the final analysis it was an experienced and influential cadre of teachers whose ideas formed the basis for the current art guides. These were teachers who believed in art instruction that was art-centered rather than child-centered, based on concepts rather than activities, and in which the study of art and artists was central. But if it were not for the district administrators’ expectations that the art program function like any other subject matter area, that the art program be carefully outlined in curriculum guides, that the guides be followed, and that art lessons be carefully planned, then the Virginia Beach program might be indistinguishable from many other art programs.

ART EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA BEACH TODAY

Located close to the geographic center of predominantly middle class Virginia Beach in the municipal administrative complex, the administration building of the Virginia Beach city schools grandly oversees a sheep pasture in which it is still possible to watch the birthing of lambs. From her cubicle office command post in this building, Stephena Runyan supervises an art program in 62 schools in which there are full-time art teachers not only in all the secondary schools, but also in all but six of the 45 elementary schools. (Some of the smallest elementary schools share an art teacher, and larger elementary schools have two art teachers.) Nearly all of the elementary schools have special art rooms. All 70 art teachers adhere to a common
set of art objectives. The teachers do not, however, teach from a common set of lessons; rather, they produce their own detailed lesson plans that carefully reflect the general principles found in their curriculum guides. To aid them in their teaching there are basic sets of art reproductions and slides in each school, a comprehensive collection in the district Instructional Media Center, complete sets of art books in each of the secondary school art rooms, and an adequate budget for supplies and materials. The program is highly unified and consistent, because the Virginia Beach schools are organized to ensure that what goes into the guides also goes into practice.

A PARADOX

Having chronicled this brief history of the art program in Virginia Beach we have arrived at a paradox. The art program, selected for its exemplary practice of art studio, history, and criticism, seems to contradict many of the deeply held assumptions about the conditions of freedom and autonomy deemed to be essential ingredients of creative art and, by extension, the necessary components of a flourishing and vital art education program. An exploration of the relationship between structure and autonomy as they relate to instructional innovation and student achievement becomes essential to the study of the Virginia Beach art program.

---

8 For further information about the Virginia Beach art program, contact Ms. Stephena Runyan, Art Supervisor, Virginia Beach City Public School, P.O. Box 6038, Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456.
2. TIGHT STRUCTURE AND DEGREES OF FREEDOM:
THE ROOTS OF CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION

Our society prizes creative and innovative behaviors; as the chief educational arm of society, schools assume the task of developing students' problem solving and inventive behaviors. Art educators claim that their subject is one of the few curricular areas in which creative thought and action are routinely encouraged—the claim is that novelty of idea and form, expressiveness, and spontaneity are the foundation for art instruction. Achievement of the creativity-oriented objectives of art education, it is commonly assumed, requires that both teachers and students be allowed the maximum degree of freedom permissible in the realms of both art instruction and art making.

Are conditions of unrestricted freedom actually necessary for artists, student artists, and their teachers? The art program in Virginia Beach exists within a system of tight structure and firm control that is generally believed to discourage not only innovation on the part of the individual teacher, but even worse, the students' creative artistic development. As paradoxical as it sounds, the reduction of freedom may not interfere with innovative art teaching. There is little evidence that requirements and expectations squelch novel teaching behavior.

STRUCTURE IN VIRGINIA BEACH

The term structure by itself may simply refer to the arrangement of the constituent parts of an organization. Therefore, I use the term tight structure to indicate that within the system there are numerous clearly specified restrictions upon the degrees of freedom for individual action and decisionmaking placed upon school administrators, teachers, and students. From top to bottom there are not only well-established and carefully delineated procedures, guidelines, and expectations that govern behavior, but also the assurance that undesirable deviant actions will be noted and eliminated.

The system functions smoothly; each participant—whether prime mover or pupil—knows his or her place, function, and role. But does the tight structure also provide the art teachers with the freedom and autonomy that they perceive to be necessary to teach effectively? For the answer to this question we must look both to the character of the structure and to teachers' beliefs about the effect of that structure on their art program.

THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

The way in which the school district has systematized the process of curriculum development provides one of the most revealing examples of structure. Each of the major subject matter areas has a standing curriculum committee composed of supervisors, counselors, teachers, parents, and students. These committees meet for at least five school days each year to: (1) make recommendations regarding curriculum matters, (2) provide unification of the K-12 curriculum, and (3) receive input concerning curriculum development and the district's instructional program. Art teachers are elected by their peers to serve on the committee, and they are expected to represent the interests of their colleagues. The minutes of the curriculum committee meetings are circulated throughout the district. Before any new curriculum development
project in art is approved, the art supervisor goes before the board of education to assist in making a case for the development. James Darden, the central office administrator charged with the responsibility for supervising the functioning of all curriculum committees, says that the superintendent does his homework well and “knows just about everything about a new curriculum proposal so that he can present it to the board.” The curriculum committee structure provides the means by which the curricula in all areas are monitored by the administration, as well as providing for continual review and development by the art staff.

The formal agenda of issues discussed tells only part of the story of the curriculum committee. The committee members in the meetings alternate between dedicated seriousness and testing of wits and wills. They know one another’s curricular hobbyhorses, and the joking centers around Cindy’s love for art history and Sue’s for creativity. The curriculum committee still possesses a bit of the spirit of communitas that pervaded the original curriculum guide development workshops. From all appearances the curriculum committee belongs to the teachers, and they use it as the means for continually revitalizing their art program.

THE CURRICULUM GUIDE STRUCTURE

The K-12 guide outlines five major purposes or comprehensive goals for the art program stated in terms of student development:

1. a heightened awareness of self and sensitivity to the environment;
2. an ability to express himself visually;
3. an ability to think creatively;
4. a knowledge of cultural heritage; and
5. an ability to make qualitative visual judgments.

Specific objectives appropriate for students at each level of instruction are keyed directly to the purposes and content areas. The guide points to art concepts and suggests activities that will assist students in understanding the concepts; it contains sample lesson plans prepared on the standard art lesson plan forms used by almost every art teacher in the district.

After the guides were prepared the teachers were told that they were to either: 1) use the objectives and the suggested lessons; 2) use the objectives and devise their own activities and show how they achieve the objectives; 3) write their own units again showing how they meet the goals; or 4) do whatever they choose, but write justifications for their departure from the curriculum. It seemed to me that almost every teacher combined the first three options. None to my knowledge now chooses to follow the fourth option of departing from the basic outline of the guides. Perhaps teachers believe that the freedom they need to innovate and create is already allowed within the curriculum structure.

As I interviewed teachers and observed their teaching I began to form opinions about their beliefs pertaining to the various dimensions of structure in which they worked. It seemed important to confirm my opinions by surveying the beliefs of the entire art teaching staff in Virginia Beach. Consequently I constructed an inventory that collected four distinct types of teachers’ beliefs:

1. beliefs about self;
2. general beliefs—what is generally held as true or what others believe to be the case;
3. beliefs about what is good or right; and
4. beliefs about goals—the things toward which one strives.

9This outline of the ways in which the teachers might meet the objectives is from an interview with Nancy Jones.

10In their book, Cognitive Orientation and Behavior, Springer, New York, 1976, Hans Kreitler and Shulamith Kreitler present a great deal of evidence to show that belief and attitude inventories that use only one or two belief types do not predict behavior (in other words, there is little relationship between battery score and actions). They have also shown that if the four belief types are systematically built into inventories, there is a strong correlation between battery score and behavior.
Teachers responded overwhelmingly that they had the desired freedom to teach art as they wished when presented with statements such as: “Although the district art guide specifies goals and areas to be covered, I feel that I have all the freedom I want to devise my own unique approaches to the teaching of art”; and “Most art teachers find ample room for innovative and creative lesson planning and teaching while still working within the basic structure of the guide.” The mean score for the subset of statements was 4.43 on a 5.0 scale—certainly a challenge to the notion that art teachers would feel constrained if required to work within a tight curricular structure. (The percentages of teachers agreeing and disagreeing with each of these statements may be found in Appendix A.)

THE LESSON PLANNING STRUCTURE

It is, of course, one thing for a curriculum guide to be prescriptive and quite another thing to assure that prescriptions are followed. Here again the tight structure of the district has a profound effect. It is school board policy that every teacher prepare a complete written lesson plan for each lesson that is taught. (Some lesson plans refer to units of instruction and span several days and others refer to only a single day’s activities.) The art lesson plan forms provided by the district have spaces for the major topic, subtopics, objectives, equipment, supplies, teacher activities, student activities, evaluation, and vocabulary. The form assures that each teacher will attend to standard components of lesson preparation. The use of the form coupled with the expectation that all teachers will plan their units and lessons in at least the amount of detail called for on the form assures a minimum common level of preparation for each lesson.

On the desks of the Virginia Beach teachers one sees two- and three-inch thick ring binders in which the lesson plans for lessons already taught, those currently being taught, and those to be taught may be inspected. And inspected they are—by the supervisor and by building administrators. Although building principals are supposed to be familiar enough with the curriculum to determine from a review of lesson plans whether the art guide is being followed, probably only a few are able to make this judgment during their mandatory semi-annual checks. The art supervisor, however, can and does continually monitor the relationship between guide and lesson plan.

I saw tattered gray lesson plans with multiple modifications in ballpoint pen and colored markers made atop the original pencil writing. Other lesson plans were enshrined in unmodifiable plastic laminate. Regardless of whether they have been kept alive through modifications or embalmed in plastic, these plans are one of the central keys to the Virginia Beach art program. In effect teachers are asked to rewrite the curriculum guides in their own way and thus each has made the curriculum his or her own. In this process I observed instances where the teachers’ own objectives were mapped onto those of the guide, and instances where the guide’s objectives contributed to and broadened those of the teachers.

Some teachers plan anew each year while others have developed large pools of lesson plans to draw upon as they plan a year or a unit of instruction. One teacher who was especially proud of her plans told me that she uses approximately 250 lesson plans a year from her pool of 350, and that she writes about 30 new plans each year—usually during the summer. She has a filing system for the plans as well as a coordinated file for reproductions of works of art and other visual materials. In the past, teachers have reproduced some of the plans they considered to be their best and shared them with others in the district. Some in-service meetings have even been devoted to criticizing lesson plans. It is my assessment that the
# LESSON PLAN  
**ELEMENTARY ART**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major topic:**  
Principles of Design: Movement, Rhythm, Direction  
Make art: Collage  
Study of Artists and Works of Art

**Student Objectives:**  
(As a result of this lesson, students will have an opportunity to learn to do the following:)

1. Define, discuss, and identify movement, rhythm, and direction in their own work and works of others.
2. Recognize the use of collage as a medium of expression over time and that contemporary art is the result of continuous development and change.

**Teacher Activities:** (Motivation, demonstration, discussion, audio-visuals, bulletin boards, etc)

- Discuss movement
- Introduce Dadaism/painting
- How does it show movement?
- What does it look like to you?
- Change - inventions - new ideas - artist
- Celebrate machines - CHANGE, MOVEMENT
- Other artists chose to distort images - see Jeremy Bentham's print.
- Art creates movement and direction through illusion.

**Supplies and Equipment:**
- Scissors
- Glue
- Rulers
- Pencils
- 9x12 paper (assorted colors)
- Visuals

**Vocabulary**
- Movement
- Art direction
- Collage

**Evaluation Methods/Questions**

- How does your collage show movement?
- Distortion? Can you find reproductions that show movement?

**Comments** (Changes for future use of plan, possible follow-up activities)

If students finish early, they can complete a worksheet on distortion and illusions.
requirement to produce lesson plans directly related to the guides, and the checking of those plans to assure correspondence to the guides, have more than any other factor assured the uniformity of art instruction across the district. My conclusion is also that the careful and comprehensive lesson planning has raised to an extraordinary height the level of professionalism of the art teachers, not to mention the quality of the instruction.

When presented with statements about lesson planning, the teachers as a group also indicated their support for this dimension of structure. To the statement: “I think that I should be left alone to plan my own individual art program free from the interference of a supervisor or a curriculum guide,” virtually every teacher disagreed. And to statements such as: “Even if our district didn’t require it, I would want to prepare careful weekly and daily lesson plans,” the teachers were in strong agreement. On a five-point scale the mean score for this subset of questions was 4.34. The teachers unquestionably support a system in which there are expectations that the curriculum guide be followed and that each lesson be carefully planned and documented.

THE TIGHT SUPERVISORY STRUCTURE

It was reported that the superintendent, Dr. Brickell, “has no tolerance for teachers who do not teach.”¹¹ This attitude pervades the system—not in an oppressive or threatening way, as I saw it, but with the view that if teachers are not performing well, they should be helped to improve.

Here is one example of the process.

As I stepped into Cindi Barrow’s classroom I thought, “It looks just like a Virginia Beach art room.” After visiting over half the art classrooms in the system I had grown to expect a prominent display of reproductions of works of art. I wasn’t disappointed; the display on the end wall was labeled “La Galerie.” Reproductions of paintings by Hopper, Eakins, Homer, Bellows, and Wyeth were arranged exquisitely. Above the display was the sign “LOOKING AT ART” with teacher-made reminders such as, “What is the artist trying to say?” “What visual cues does the artist use to convey his ideas?” “Does the work record history?” The lessons I watched being taught were initiated through discussions of works of art—the seventh graders’ narrative painting project began with an analysis of Wyeth’s Christina’s World. (“She got stabbed.” “She was going to the house and fell.”) By the time the students started their own narrative paintings they had clear ideas regarding the possibilities for producing art that told stories. Before a class of third grade students began landscape paintings they discussed the differences between the landscape paintings of Vlaminck and Inness. The fifth graders had a lesson on Surrealism. In the teacher’s overview of the year’s units, under the heading “visual aids,” I saw references to Picasso’s “Three Musicians,” “Portrait of a Woman,” the work of Durer, Tobey, and Dubuffet. Everything I saw told me: “Here is a bright, young, paradigmatic Virginia Beach art teacher—just the kind they try to hire.”

The teacher herself, however, told me differently. It was the tight structure of the system that had made her into a Virginia Beach teacher.

During Cindi Barrow’s last two years as an art major at Radford she spent the summers on Virginia Beach’s ocean front. During the two years following graduation she also spent time there, taking an occasional job as a substitute art teacher. Then “I took a long sub-job, and fell into this job.” During her essentially unsupervised time as a substitute teacher she had not attempted to follow the Virginia Beach guide. She taught no art history, didn’t use

¹¹This quotation is from Lou Lowenthal and it reflects a general view held by many teachers that within the district there is a high expectation of professional behavior.
reproductions, and even thought the curriculum guide "vague—I was not crazy about it." In fact since she had accepted her full-time position after the fall orientation sessions for beginning teachers, she hardly knew what was in the guide. But she was soon informed by her supervisor and through a series of evaluations and memos that she would need to write proper lesson plans, include the study of works of art and artists in her lessons, and teach conceptually. In short, the supervisor insisted that she teach art the Virginia Beach way; in Cindi Barrow's words, "to do something intelligent, to teach for the concept, not the product."

Cindi Barrow began to work with a professor of art education at a nearby university, and with his help (although it is doubtful that he himself knew how to teach in the Virginia Beach manner) and with the help of her supervisor she came to her own understanding of what was expected of her. Her planning, the content of her lessons, the lock of her room, her teaching—all came to have the quality of the system. The system's guidelines, expectations, and supervisory monitoring were sufficiently influential to change an ordinary (but lively) art teacher into an extraordinarily insightful, effective, and still lively one.

Teacher responses to the tight supervisory structure were also positive. To the statement, "I resent anyone telling me either what or how to teach," three-quarters of the teachers were in disagreement. As a group, they overwhelmingly agreed with statements such as: "It's good to have supervisors and administrators who see to it that the art curriculum is being followed." The mean score for the subset was 4.10. Thus even in the sensitive realm of receiving suggestions and criticism there was still a positive response to the system's tight structure.
STRUCTURE, THE INDIVIDUAL, AND THE COMMUNITY

For those who see art-teacher autonomy as something akin to the autonomy of the artist, and who see autonomy in general as a necessary condition for creative teaching and artistic production, the tight structure and sense of community that prevail in Virginia Beach may seem paradoxical. Yet there is considerable evidence that the artist is also a communal and societal being who is both free and dependent upon the work of others for his or her style, ideas, and even conception of the artistic enterprise.

In a time when the romantic notion of the artist pervades our culture as well as the world of art, the societal conception of the artist has not been entirely unknown. Within groups such as the Pre-Raphaelite Brethren, Impressionists, Futurists, Cubists, Nabis, Surrealists and Dadaists, and Abstract Expressionists, individual artists used communally generated ideas as the basis for their novel productions. And although their work possessed novelty, that novelty may be seen as growing from the outwardly rejected but persistently overpowering conventional seedbed of past artistic practices. New art is dependent upon old art in at least two ways—as something to extend from and as something to react against. And more likely than not groups of artists foment artistic revolutions.

The importance of the group and societal and cultural factors has not been given adequate consideration in art education. When the notion of artistic invention growing from community and convention is related to the tight structure of Virginia Beach, it is possible to see that there is artistic precedence for art teachers to work together and thereby gain strength through unity in a common curricular cause. The teachers pool their talents and energies to establish a solid discipline-based curriculum. This idea is best illustrated by the change in attitude of an art teacher who was among those most strongly resistant to the structured curriculum. (I judged her to be an outstanding teacher—an artist with numerous awards to her credit, detailed knowledge of the current New York art scene, and an uncommon ability to instill a sense of professionalism in her high school students.) She said that before the guide, "it wasn't that we didn't have lesson plans, but we didn't have the mandated structure. Now that things are written down we know what we are doing, we can communicate with others. I became more structured but more creative at the same time." Time and time again I listened to art teachers insist that in accepting the conditions of a tight structure they had given up none of their freedom and that the structure had actually provided them with the foundations for innovative behavior.

STRUCTURE, CREATIVITY, AND THE DISCIPLINE OF ART

The prevailing belief in art education that artistic development requires the young student-artist to be free from external influences can be seen in both educational and artistic thought.

Robert Motherwell says it this way: "What is specific to American art as opposed to European art, is the idea of inventing yourself from scratch."\(^{12}\) I'm not sure that the idea is uniquely American, and I am quite convinced that the notion of "inventing oneself" had its origins in Europe. Certainly the idea that the artist and the child artist should be treated as natural creatures who, by necessity, develop and work either apart from or free from the restrictions of culture and society can be seen in the eighteenth-century philosophy of
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Rousseau. Although it may not be possible to trace the line directly from Rousseau to the twentieth century artist and child artist, it is perhaps possible to claim that Rousseau's philosophy of a natural and societally uncontaminated development has pervaded both our ideas of how the child should be educated in art and how the artist educates or "invents himself from scratch."

Thus we see a vision of the child, the student artist, and the artist separated by age and experience but joined in the obligation to work free from artistic convention. It is also possible to see the enormous contradictions that might arise between a carefully specified and highly structured art program and the ideal of individual teacher and student autonomy. Those holding the romantic view of the artist and of the child as a neophyte artist have seen artistic conventions as undesirable stereotypes that must be avoided at all costs. The child artist and the student artist were both seen as unfolding through stages that required no contribution from the discipline of art. Any instance of image borrowing was seen as evidence that the precious natural unfolding process had been disrupted. Such borrowing was to be halted before it destroyed the young person's natural creativity. Yet the very concept of going beyond the conventional (creativity) requires, if not the possession of conventional sets of ideas, skills, and practices, then at the very least a knowledge that they exist.

It is doubtful that the Virginia Beach art teachers have developed a philosophy of art teaching based on a knowledge of the relationship between convention and invention in artistic creativity. They do not, however, hesitate to base their teaching on the images of artists, and they seem not to see the use of these images as an impediment to their students' creativity. Their responses to a series of belief statements reveal their position.

To the statement about their own practice, "I frequently show the images of artists in order to stimulate my students' own creative efforts," 98 percent of the teachers either strongly agreed or agreed. However, there was no consensus on the normative statement, "It is unfortunate when a student borrows or copies an image from the work of an artist or from another student," which probing to determine if there was still residue from the romantic notion of the natural-child artist. Only 10 percent of the teachers strongly disagreed, 36 percent disagreed, 24 percent were undecided, 19 percent agreed, and another 10 percent strongly agreed. The words "copy" and "borrow" obviously still have negative connotations for art teachers, and the Virginia Beach teachers are no exception. Perhaps the teachers believe that it is possible to learn from artists without copying from them. This notion is confirmed by the fact that nearly all the teachers agreed when presented with the general belief statement, "Showing the works of artists actually contributes to students' ability to originate novel works of art of their own."

In addition to basing their teaching on the images found in the work of artists, the teachers do not hesitate to instruct their students in the discipline of art. They overwhelmingly disagreed when presented with the statement, "It is not good for art teachers to instruct students in the techniques and processes of art; students should discover these things for themselves." And there was strong positive agreement to such statements as, "The art teachers in this school system believe in instructing students in the same basic processes and techniques that are used by artists."

It is possible to examine the consequences of the tight structure upon the students on logical grounds. If innovative, novel, and creative artistic behavior is ultimately dependent upon a knowledge of artistic conventions and styles, then the Virginia Beach students have an
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advantage over other students who do not learn about the ways and means of art and artists—they have a solid foundation from which eventually to create. Recent research has shown that young people who grow up in a “paradise” in which their art is free from most adult influences have their creative options markedly reduced rather than expanded.\textsuperscript{14} The imaginative artwork of the Virginia Beach students supports the fact that a conventional foundation is not an impediment to the creation of art.

**TIGHT STRUCTURE AND INNOVATION**

One of the greatest fears of those who view tight structure as detrimental to educational practice is that it will reduce the chances for educational innovation and creative teaching. Another possibility, the one seen to exist in Virginia Beach, is that educational innovation and creative teaching are at least as likely to occur within a tightly structured school system with a solid curricular base and high expectations for teachers and students. The essential premise is that in the latter case there is an established framework from which innovation might emerge. Certainly this seemed to be so as I observed proposals being made for the revision and extension of the curriculum guides by members of the art curriculum committee. But there is another, less formal type of innovation that extends well beyond anything envisioned within the curriculum guides and yet depends quite equally upon the well-structured support of the school system.

At a meeting of the Virginia Beach Neptune Festival committee, Lou Lowenthal, representing the schools, was asked, “Couldn’t the students do something exciting?” Her quick reply was, “We could go for The Guinness Book of World Records,” and with a bit more thought she added, “We could make the world’s longest sand sculpture.” The idea began to grow and Stef Runyan applied her administrative abilities and the backing of the central office to the project. The world’s longest sand sculpture must be a single piece, and yet 62 individual schools, scores of teachers, and hundreds of students of all ages were to be involved. There had to be a single theme, and yet one that allowed for individual school and even individual student initiative. Schools had to be assigned space corresponding to the number of students who were willing to join in this optional weekend activity. Buses had to call for teachers and students at each of the district’s schools. Arrangements had to be made for official documentation of the length of the sculpture, and the whole project had to be completed before the tide came in.

The students at the Gifted and Talented Center made a day’s trial run and their teachers, Lou and Alex, found the sand too dry, the sand sea monsters too difficult to connect, and the sculpting too time consuming. Stef Runyan took the lead in deciding that the sand sculpture would be a train with hundreds of cars—each built, decorated, and possessing whatever character the individual art teachers and students decided upon. Bulldozers commandeered from Virginia Beach City would be used to bank damp sand for the train cars. A dozer with a smaller blade would be used to cut through the bank to form the individual cars. This part of the operation took practice, too, before it worked successfully. The U.S. Navy agreed to furnish helicopters and jets for photographic documentation.

\textsuperscript{14}In a study of the drawings of Egyptian children, “Benign and Threatening Worlds: The Themes, Compositions, and Styles of the Story Drawings of Egyptian Village, Working Class, and Middle Class Children,” Pennsylvania State University and Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt (unpublished monograph, 1980), Brent Wilson, Nahil El Hussein, and Marjorie Wilson illustrate that young people who do not have access to adult graphic models merely borrowed from one another.
The logistics of the event were like those of Christo's *Running Fence*, but he had days to build his fence; the Virginia Beach operation had to be accomplished in a few short hours. In the seconds before the incoming tide began lapping at the first fantastic traincars, jets were scrambled (on radio command from Stefan Runyan) and the Virginia Beach art program had scored another success. The feat of a single sand sculpture measuring 1.3 miles in length could not have been accomplished without the solid organizational structure of the school system, nor would the enterprise have been notable without the individual creativity of hundreds of students and their teachers.

Going for "The Guinness" is an example of how the structure of the district can be employed to mobilize the students and teachers to create an enormous and impressive work of art, and in the process to promote a feeling of unity and accomplishment among themselves—not to mention the sense of community pride and satisfaction in the project and in the art program. It is possible that we might find this kind of activity at the district level and still see little more than ordinary teaching in the day-to-day art program. Therefore, the question that also needs to be asked is whether or not there is evidence of imaginative teaching in individual classrooms. Are teachers content merely to follow the guide—to do a solid but conventional job of teaching? In short, does the tight structure of the district reduce individual teacher experimentation to develop novel approaches to art teaching? It is my observation that there is a great deal of imaginative teaching in Virginia Beach.

To cite a compilation of examples that either I observed or teachers reported to me:

- a time line used for a "Journey Through Time" study of art history from cave to modern times in an elementary school;

- a school gallery of famous art; making Medieval-style banners;

- when studying architecture, the setting up of environmental structures, modular units, and balloonlike forms;

- making paper for an East-West calligraphy project—soft papers for Oriental brushes and hard ones for Western quills;

- a Medieval art unit with costumes, decorations, and banquet;

- students dressing up as famous artists and painting in their style;

- a figure drawing lesson in which students reconstructed their own history of drawing—how they might have drawn at age three, five, eight, etc.—(there was reference to other children's drawings at these ages), next a study of how humans were depicted in ancient Greece (how they drew figures seven and one-half heads high), and finally a study of figure drawing through the ages; school hallways filled with quotations about art and artists;

- 12 students going to the studio of a visiting artist for weekly painting sessions;

- a "conceptual" project that involved the construction of 35 life-size "dummies" and a photo documentation series of "a day in students' lives" (in school buses, library, cafeteria, assembly, etc.);

- the construction of a 20-foot plastic pyramid to show solar heat "levitation";
the construction of a 100-foot wind tunnel painted inside and out and filled with balloons;

a student dressing as his or her favorite painting and telling viewers about “himself” or “herself”;

students doing extensive research on works to be shown in upcoming art exhibitions, attending the shows, and having the students act as docents (museum visitors have even joined the tours);

taking high school art students on trips to European art museums;

taking high school students to universities to hear lectures by art historians; doing a unit on “Patrons of the Arts” by recreating the House of the Medici and having students assume the identities of Cosimo, Lorenzo, Giuliano, etc., and the artists that they sponsored—Donatello, Michelangelo, etc., role-playing the parts and then having an Italian dinner with the participants around a long table;

posting reproductions of works of art in the hall, with clues to the artist’s identity, and awarding small prizes to the first 10 students who correctly identify the artist;

during youth art month inviting parents to join classes of children who are studying figure drawing through the ages, and after viewing the stiff Egyptian and the more relaxed Greek, Renaissance, and modern approaches to drawing, parents drew from a model along with their children (parents who participated—105 in one week—made such comments as “I thought you just gave them a piece of paper, they really learn things in here.”);

developing a slide show on “The History of the Smile in Art”;

a unit on protest and propaganda art;

painting a lifesize version of Picasso’s Guernica on the end wall of the art room, and filling all other available wall space in the room with versions of well-known paintings and the self-portraits of artists;

recreating the lives of Impressionist artists through role-playing and doing paintings in the style of the artist;

the construction of an eight foot by 50 foot three-dimensional mural that changes images as the position of the viewer changes;

after studying mythology the creation of a mythical creature museum;

an art history “Investigation Game” in which each child becomes an element of the picture, looks for himself or herself, then explains how he has been used and what he or she contributes to the work;

students working in small groups to produce floor to ceiling murals of King Tut’s tomb and then the entire main hall of the school becoming the entrance to the tomb (and cave paintings, and a Greek temple in other years);

taking teams of junior high school students to feeder-elementary schools to demonstrate art techniques and explain the junior high school art program;
assuming the identity of an artist or the acquaintance of an artist of a particular time and writing letters to another person living in the same period explaining something of the artists’ work, what he or she is trying to accomplish.

The tight curricular structure is the focus for tight supervision, which assures an adherence to the basic objectives of the art program. However, the curriculum was originally devised by the teachers, they continually and systematically revise it, and each has the responsibility to activate and make specific the general prescriptions of the guides. Through in-service meetings, informal gatherings of teachers, and the sharing of approaches to teaching through word of mouth and the trading of lesson plans there seemed to be just as much implicit encouragement for individual inventiveness as there was explicit direction for following the principles of the guide.
3. THE VIRGINIA BEACH CURRICULUM: COMPONENTS, BELIEFS, AND OUTCOMES

By this time there should be little need to note that if the Virginia Beach Art Curriculum Guide outlines five components of art education upon which units of instruction and individual lessons will be based, then we can expect to see those components reflected in every teacher's yearly plans. Indeed all of the plan books reflect instruction in: (1) perception and sensitivity (seeing and feeling visual relationships); (2) principles and elements of design; (3) study of art and artists; (4) critical evaluation of art (criteria for appraising visual forms); and (5) making of art (direct personal experience with art media). Do these components reflect adequate conceptions of art, art history, and art criticism? What is the quality of the instruction that relates to each component? Do the components receive equivalent instructional emphasis and time? What do the teachers actually think about the components, and what do students learn in each of them?

As I continue my review of the Virginia Beach program, I wish now to describe its character, explicate its meaning, and judge its quality and merit by using three methods: first, the examination of the curriculum in light of its historical and theoretical bases; second, to report upon the beliefs that teachers hold about the various components of their curriculum; and third, to assess the outcomes of the program in terms of student beliefs and performances.

THE ELEMENTS AND PRINCIPLES OF DESIGN COMPONENT

The most ubiquitous component of the Virginia Beach curriculum is the elements and principles of design. This fact should come as no surprise to any observer of contemporary American art education. Today curriculum guides at all levels of instruction are pervaded with the elements and principles. An observer of American art education 70 years ago might have made the same comment.

At the Third International Congress for the Development of Drawing and Art Teaching held in London in 1908, Cheshire Boone characterized the latest development in American art education—the elements and principles of design. He said:

It is difficult to offer a picture of design as presented in the elementary school. The subject is new, and in its best form has been developed within the past dozen years. Recent impetus has unfolded its possibilities so rapidly and made so manifest its practical value that the growth has been uneven. Everyone attempts to teach it.

It was probably zeitgeist—the spirit of the late nineteenth century (when art was taking an abstract turn, Fry's and Bell's aesthetic theories of "significant form" were in the making, and Japanese prints had been discovered in the West)—that led Fenollosa and Dow to devise systems of art education based on abstract principles of design. Fenollosa asked why it was not recognized "that the lines and the masses of dark and light and the colors may and do have a

15Lois Drator, an art teacher in Scranton, Pennsylvania, with the support of the Pennsylvania Art Education Association made a collection of approximately 200 art curriculum guides currently available in Pennsylvania. Virtually every guide of the approximately 200 on display featured the elements and principles of design.

harmonic charm of their own in their own right, a beauty and infinity of pure visual idea, as absolute and independent as the sound-idea in music?" Subject matter no longer mattered; what was basic to art was the organization of lines, shapes, and colors. And just as Boone said, the idea of basing art instruction on design spread like wildfire. Through the influence of Fenollosa and Dow the elements and principles of design pervaded ar: educational practice. As early as 1898, The Prang Elementary Course in Art Instruction quotes Dow and uses his ideas, and by the 1920s the elements and principles had moved from Dow's influential book, Composition, to the standard art educational textbooks, and to curriculum guides. Easily withstanding the assaults from the progressive education movement and the Lowenfeld era, the elements and principles of design have been copied and recopied as they have moved from the oldest to the newest art curriculum guides. The Virginia Beach guide is no exception.

In Virginia Beach almost every art lesson touches upon the elements and principles of design in one way or another. When the Virginia Beach teachers were asked to respond to such statements as: "I believe that a knowledge of the elements and principles of design is essential to the perceiving of a work of art," there was no strong disagreement. There was overwhelming agreement to the statements: "In our district art teachers include at least some study of the elements and principles of design in each lesson"; and "Almost every lesson I teach includes a component relating to the elements and principles of design." There was a good deal less unanimity of response to "In the final analysis, the elements and principles of design are the most important aspect of my art program." Thirty-one percent of the teachers strongly agreed, another 31 percent agreed, 12 percent were undecided, 22 percent disagreed, and 2 percent strongly disagreed. There is little question that the elements and principles of design are the central core of the art instruction. At the same time teachers are in considerable disagreement about the absolute importance of these elements and principles.

The students in Virginia Beach appear to acquire at least some of the same attitudes as their teachers toward the elements and principles of design. A belief inventory was administered to 262 students representing the upper elementary, middle school, elementary school gifted and talented program, junior high school Art I, and senior high school Art IV and V. Three-quarters of the Virginia Beach students surveyed agreed with the statements, "When I see a painting I like to look for the kinds of shapes, colors, and patterns that it has"; "When I get older I want to learn more and more about how artists use shapes and lines to make rhythms and patterns in art"; and "It's very important to learn to see how artists balance shapes and create patterns in their paintings." Only about half of the students, however, agreed that "Art class has helped me to look for designs and patterns in almost everything I see"; and about the same number disagreed with "Most of the kids in my class think that it is pretty stupid to look at the arrangements of shapes and lines in paintings." (The mean scores for each student belief subset are in Appendix B.) In light of the fact that to experience works of art in terms of the elements and principles is an abstract affair that draws attention away from the literal subject matter, the art program in Virginia Beach might be considered very successful in transferring a set of beliefs from the curriculum guides to the teachers to the students.

17 The quotation from Ernest Fenollosa is found in Walter Beck, Self-Development in Drawing, Putnam, New York, 1928, p. 135.
18 J. S. Clark, M. D. Hicks, and W. Perry, The Prang Elementary Course in Art Instruction, Prang, Boston, 1898.
19 Arthur Wesley Dow's Composition was first published in 1899 (J. M. Bowles, Boston) and by 1913 it had gone through seven editions. It went through a total of 20 editions before its final publication in 1941.
20 The sample for the belief inventory was not drawn randomly. Rather, groups known to represent particular features of the program were selected.
The consequences of organizing the art curriculum around the elements and principles of design, however, seem not to have been carefully considered in Virginia Beach (or for that matter, in very many other places). This nearly “scientific” and analytical approach to the teaching of art leads to the development of units on “line,” and then “shape” as if these elements could exist separately within any composition; they cannot. Because it is possible to deal with design abstractly quite apart from consideration of subject matter or object to be designed, art projects frequently end up being little more than the designing of designs. Instead of design becoming a means to some artistic end it becomes an end in itself. Too often this is the case in Virginia Beach.

When art is reduced to mere design, attention is drawn away from other viable concepts around which units of the art curriculum might be organized. The subject matters and themes of art; expressive qualities and expressive content; style; role, function, and purpose; symbols, for example, are equally important attributes of art that may be forgotten or at best subordinated to pure design.

One curriculum guide in Virginia Beach does point to an alternative to the elements and principles structure of the curriculum. The Art Curriculum Guide: Grades 6,7 suggests that instruction be organized around themes correlated with those of other subject matter areas such as: communication—media messages and letters, signs and symbols; cultures—long ago and far away; American art today; the environment—habitats and the world of nature; fantasy—imaginary journeys and illusion and invention; form and function—adaptations in nature and man’s creations; and self-awareness—discovering the self and inside myself. This guide signals a departure from the Virginia Beach practice of forming units around design concepts. The elements and principles of design are still in the sixth and seventh grade guide but they assume the role of means rather than ends.

STUDYING ART AND ARTISTS: THE HISTORY OF ART OR LOOKING AT PICTURES?

In Virginia Beach one of the five major purposes of the art program is that students gain “a knowledge of cultural heritage,” and one of the five major components of the art program is a “study of artists and works of art.” Although neither the purpose nor the component says “art history,” together they might be interpreted to mean that Virginia Beach students are supposed to receive art history instruction. They do.

The study of art history provides a way for students to develop conceptions of past, present, and future realities, of the realities of self as seen through others whom artists have depicted, and of mankind’s conceptions of the true, the good, and the desirable. It is the art historian who guides us in our study of art. And if we look to the methods and processes employed by art historians we find them investigating works of art in light of their historical context to see the way in which art both forms and is formed by culture. They develop theories about why works look as they do; they search for the influence that one group of works has on subsequent works; they interpret meanings of symbols and allegories; they group works of art into categories such as artist, style, school, and period; and they attribute works to particular artists. If we were to specify the characteristics of an ideal art history program in
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21The conception of the way in which art functions to expand cognitive orientation to four realities—archeological, common, prophetic, and normative—is from H. Kreitler and S. Kreitler, Psychology of the Arts, Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina, 1972.
the schools we might see the extent to which the range of interests of art historians has been translated into the content of art historical instruction.

The objectives relating to the study of art and artists found in the Virginia Beach K-12 curriculum guide do point to an important set of art historical outcomes. For example, by the end of third grade, students are to be able to “recognize similarities and differences in works of art produced in various times and places”; “know that art has been used to document significant historic events”; and “identify uses of visual arts in today’s world.” By the end of seventh grade the goals to have been achieved are: “understand the purposes of art”; “know sources of and be able to use resource materials on art history and appreciation”; “be able to identify artists in several fields”; “realize that art has a past, that it has changed over time, and that contemporary art is the result of continuous development and change”; “recognize the contributions of artists of various ethnic groups to the American culture”; “discuss the place of art and artists in society and in the local community”; and “be aware of the variety of art forms used in business and industry.” At the end of their program, students who elect to study art in the secondary grades are to be able to: “identify the general style and period of some major art forms and know the general social context in which they were produced”; “establish relationships between a work of art and the cultural/ethnic context in which it functions”; “have a command of terminology that is adequate to discuss and write about works of art”; “be able to raise questions about important problems in art and appreciate the efforts of those who have attempted to formulate solutions to those problems”; and “discuss the philosophy underlying such major movements in art as Cubism, Surrealism, Romanticism, Impressionism, Baroque, Expressionism, and contemporary styles.”

In general the objectives grow in complexity and specificity from one level of instruction to the next. As the activities and content sections of the guides are reviewed, however, it becomes evident that there is no comprehensive program that specifies art historical periods, artists, and cultures to be studied at a given grade level (except in the sixth and seventh grade guide). Nor are there concepts and activities that in any way approach the sensitivity and specificity of the objectives themselves. (Again there is an exception—the guide for advanced placement art history outlines an extraordinarily comprehensive, specific, and insightful course of study.) In actuality the individual teachers are left on their own to determine the particular periods and artists that will be studied at a given grade level. Consequently there is no unified sequence of art historical concepts, content, and activities. One factor more than any other, the Shorewood reproductions, determines the content of the art historical instruction. Because ample supplies of reproductions representing some styles and few representing others are available in each of the schools, Impressionism, Pointillism, and Cubism are studied year after year while much of the remainder of art history gets short shrift. If other areas of art history are seen as important, then the art history program may be seen as a partially composed mosaic. Nevertheless, the strong positive beliefs held by the teachers regarding this component of their program shows that they generally value what they are doing.

When teacher beliefs about the study of art, artists, and the cultural heritage were assessed, there was strong agreement about the value and the outcomes of the program, except in one crucial area. First the agreements: 90 percent of the teachers either agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, “Even if objectives relating to teaching about the artistic cultural heritage were eliminated from our art curriculum guide, I would continue to teach about it.” (The overwhelmingly positive response not only shows the strength of their belief, it also seems to indicate that the teachers would feel free to add to the basic curriculum if they thought it desirable.) They also agreed with the statements: “Most of the art teachers in the district are
thoroughly committed to teaching about art and artists”; and “My students gain a lot of basic knowledge about the artistic cultural heritage.”

Perhaps most telling of all was the statement, “Most of the students in our district actually gain only a superficial knowledge of the visual cultural heritage.” The desired direction for the response was strongly disagree; only 6 percent did so, 31 percent disagreed, 33 percent were undecided, 24 percent agreed, and 4 percent strongly agreed. Although it is not possible to read the teachers’ minds, we are left to wonder—from such diverse responses to statements about what their own and what other teachers’ students are learning—if teachers might not believe that more could be accomplished in the area of art, artists, and visual cultural history. And just what is being accomplished?

A 29-item multiple-choice test on which students were asked to identify the styles of works of art, the artists who painted specific works, the times, locations, and cultures in which works were produced, and technical words used to describe features of works of art was administered to 231 students from fifth to twelfth grade.22 Four of the items on the test were the same as those used for the National Assessment of Educational Progress in Art. Thus it is possible to compare the performance of Virginia Beach students with that of a national sample of students.

When shown Dalí’s painting *The Persistence of Memory* and asked “This painting is an example of what style of art?,” 9.6 percent of 13-year-old students and 16.3 percent of 17-year-old students from the national sample selected Surrealism as the correct response.23 Forty-five percent of all Virginia Beach students gave the correct answer. Even 26 percent of the Virginia Beach fifth grade students answered correctly, 70 percent of the fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students in the gifted and talented program, and 100 percent of advance placement students.

When asked the same question about a Monet painting of waterlilies, 21 percent of the national sample of 17-year-olds selected Impressionism as the correct answer; 49 percent of all Virginia Beach students answered correctly.

Sixty-one percent of all Virginia Beach students could identify Picasso’s painting *Three Musicians* as an example of Cubism; only 15 percent of the 17-year-old students in the national sample selected the correct answer.24 Compared with the performance of the national samples, the Virginia Beach program is tremendously successful.

On questions where there are no national data for comparisons, the Virginia Beach students also performed well: 77 percent of all students could identify a painting by Seurat as an example of Pointillism; 75 percent could even name Seurat as the painter of a Pointillist work. Seventy-five percent of all students correctly identified a Pollock painting as an example of Abstract Expressionism, but only 33 percent answered correctly that it was painted in the United States. Here we are able to see an example of what the program does and does not accomplish.

When the total test scores of the various groups of Virginia Beach students are examined we learn that two classrooms of fifth grade students and a broadly representative sample of sixth grade students each answered 14 of 29 questions correctly; intermediate grade gifted and

---

22The sample of 231 students was not selected randomly. There were students from two elementary schools, from a middle school, from the gifted and talented center, from three junior high schools, from Art IV and Art V from two high schools, and from advance placement art history classes from two high schools.

23This exercise is reported in *Art and Young Americans, 1974–1979: Results from the Second National Art Assessment*, National Assessment of Educational Progress, Denver, 1981.

24These data are from the *Art Technical Report Exercise Volume* (results from the first National Art Assessment), National Assessment of Educational Progress, Denver, 1978.
talented students averaged 20 correct responses; ninth grade Art I students answered 17; high school Art IV and V students, 23; and advance placement art history students averaged 27 correct answers out of the 29 possible.

The art history test did not probe deeply to determine if the more complex art history objectives outlined in the curriculum guides were being achieved. After interviewing many students I concluded that they generally were not. How could they when they were not presented with content and activities related to the objectives? Only the advance placement art history students as a group, a few of the Art IV and V, and intermediate grade gifted and talented students were seen to be achieving most of the art history objectives.

There was one final means to determine the outcomes of the art history program. The belief inventory administered to students had two subsets of items related directly to the study of art history and to looking at the work of artists.

The first set of statements relates to students' beliefs about styles of art. When presented with the statement, "I'm pretty good at recognizing the different styles of paintings such as Impressionism and Pointillism," 57 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed. (As we have already learned, 77 percent of another sample of students did correctly identify an example of Pointillism and 51 percent identified Impressionism. Consequently we may have a fair amount of confidence that the students' beliefs about their achievement corresponds closely to their actual achievement.) The total mean score for this subset of items was 3.41 on the five-point scale.

Students' beliefs about the study of art history were positive but not nearly as positive as those relating to style. When presented with statements such as "Most of the kids in my class know quite a lot about the history of art," only 30 percent to 40 percent of the students responded positively. The students apparently do believe that "it's a good thing for kids to study about art made a long time ago." Sixty-six percent agreed with the statement. And to the related normative statement, "I think it is a good thing for kids my age to try to understand the ideas and feelings that can be found in the paintings of artists," 76 percent responded in agreement. But to "in next year's art class I hope that we study some more about the history of art," only 39 percent of the students were in agreement. The mean score for this subset of items was 3.05—positive but just barely. The students' beliefs about what they are learning corresponds with my own observations. They can identify styles, artists, and periods, but most of them realize that they know little more than that about the history of art. Furthermore, even as they recognize it as knowledge that is desirable to possess, they seem not to value the study of art history very much.

The conclusion that I must make about art history instruction in Virginia Beach is that it results in a level of student knowledge that significantly surpasses that of most other school districts. The results of the instruction that all students in the district receive relating to art and artists show dramatically on the test of general art history knowledge. The performance, however, may be attributed to the fact that students receive instruction about the same few artists and styles in the elementary grades, again in junior high school, and yet again in senior high. Many other artists, periods, and styles remain unnoted at any level of instruction. Moreover, instruction relating to art and artists seems more like the picture study of a bygone era—where the artist, the style, and the features of the work are noted, but where important cultural, expressive, and art historical antecedents and consequences are ignored. Only in the advance placement art history program at the senior high school level and in a special program for intermediate grade gifted and talented students is it possible to find art history instruction that matches the promises made by the art history objectives of the curriculum guide.
The criticism I have just given must be qualified. It is not entirely the fault of the Virginia Beach art program that there are few art history practices to match their objectives. To my knowledge, nowhere in art education in the United States is there a comprehensive program of art history instruction that has an outline of content and activities that might serve as a model for the Virginia Beach program. It is surely too much to expect a group of teachers who must get on with the act of meeting their students each day to devise a comprehensive, discipline-based, theoretically sound art history program that the art educational academics who tout such things have themselves failed to formulate. The findings from the Virginia Beach art history program point to a pressing need for art-history-related curriculum development in art education.

CRITICISM WITHOUT CRITERIA

Critical evaluation of art is one of the five main components of the Virginia Beach curriculum. The K-12 guide states that by the end of third grade, the students should be able to do such things as: “identify basic principles and elements of design qualities in visual work and in the immediate environment”; “recognize expressive qualities such as action, anger, happiness, and other elements of the expressive content of visual forms”; “give evidence of a beginning art vocabulary, with continual expansions through the acquisition and use of new terms”; “know and be able to identify new art forms, such as painting, drawing, sculpture, and printmaking”; “respond by talking about art in their own words, thus expressing the results of personal observations”; “accept the range of special interests and abilities of their peers.” (This is an inclusive list of the objectives for first to third grades.)

By the end of seventh grade, the guide states that the students should be able to: “compare and describe works of art with respect to their aesthetic meaning, sensory qualities, media, and techniques used”; “be able to discuss such questions as ‘what is art?’ and ‘why is one work of art considered better than another?’”; “make judgments about the aesthetic quality of the community environment”; “compare expressiveness in visual art with expressiveness in writing, music, dance, and other areas”; “compare art works of various styles that depict similar subjects, for example, portraits”; “give evidence of understanding detailed composition” (the list is not inclusive).

As a result of the high school art program, the guide states that students should be able to: “describe, interpret and evaluate visual works of art using terminology, concepts, and metaphors appropriate to art criticism”; “select criteria for aesthetic judgment and apply it to his own work and others”; “make and justify judgments about artistic merit beyond statements of mere preference in both oral and written forms”; “formulate criteria for making aesthetic judgments about the artistic qualities of consumer products, the visual environment, and mass media” (the list is not inclusive).

These objectives incorporate major aspects of art criticism, and generally the higher level objectives expand upon the themes of critical behavior specified in the lower level objectives. The Virginia Beach curriculum guide, however, is far more specific in outlining art criticism objectives than in suggesting activities through which the objectives might be achieved. In the curriculum guide, for example, a half-page of 11 critical evaluation objectives for fourth through seventh grades is followed by a cryptic list of six activities: “self evaluation,” “group evaluation,” “written evaluation,” “display of student work,” “critical evaluation of the environment,” and “critical evaluation of master works.” There are 11 words listed under the vocabulary section. In contrast for the same grade levels, the objectives relating to the elements and
principles of design are followed by six pages of activities and vocabulary lists. The objectives relating to the making of works of art are followed by a 12-page outline of activities and vocabulary lists. In Virginia Beach, as, I think, in the rest of the country, the level of conceptualization in art criticism is far below that of the design and studio areas.

The idea that students should become sensitive to the features and qualities of art may be found in art educational objectives of the late eighteen-hundreds. The expanded and more technical notion that students should learn to function as art critics dates only from 1963. It may be that the ways art critics go about their tasks have never been clearly enough delineated within the field of art education. Granted, Feldman's scheme for experiencing works of art (describe, interpret, and evaluate) has found its way into the Virginia Beach objectives. But an adequate conception of the critical act has not. Such criteria as the hedonic canon of aesthetic pleasure; the organistic standard of unity of sensory, formal, expressive, and subject matter elements; the grasping of the vividness and intensity of the experience of the work through metaphorical description; or judging the work on the basis of its success in symbolizing the essence of an era, an idea, or a medium are not to be found in Virginia Beach (nor, most likely, in other programs). Nor has it been realized that the critical act is essentially one of recreating a work in the medium of words; and that this recreation of the work involves writing. Art educators, including those in Virginia Beach, have seen the value of art criticism, but they have not recognized the structure of the discipline of art criticism.

Even though the area of art criticism is not very well conceptualized in the curriculum guides, the teachers in general indicated that they considered the art criticism portion of their program to be functioning reasonably well. As we shall see, however, they do have some reservations. First, teachers believe that their own students are learning to judge art. Almost all of the teachers (95 percent) agreed with the statement, "After studying in my classes, students are able to make sensitive judgments about the quality of works of art." And they thought criticism to be important. The statement, "Of the major objectives of our art program, the one relating to making qualitative visual judgments is the least important," received nearly 90 percent disagreement. But to the revealing statement about what should be done in the area of criticism—"I really don't need to spend more time than I do now in teaching my students to perceive the qualities of art and to make well-reasoned critical judgments of artistic merit; presently they are learning to do these things well"—only 6 percent gave the preferred strongly agree; 49 percent, however, did agree with the statement.

There appeared to be some question, also, regarding the emphasis that the criticism component received. When given the statement, "The objective most frequently ignored by teachers in the district is that relating to making qualitative visual judgments," only 4 percent of the teachers gave the most preferred strongly agree, 22 percent agreed, and 41 percent were undecided. Again the responses seem to reflect considerable differences in beliefs about the status of art criticism in Virginia Beach. The lack of consensus confirmed my own observation that there was a strong desire among the teachers to instruct students in the ways of art criticism, coupled with a lack of clearly defined critical practices; and in at least some instances little

---

25In 1899 the National Education Association appointed a Committee of Ten on Drawing in the Public Schools. One of the goals for art education developed by the committee was "A forward development in the faculty of sight." Reported by W. H. Klar, L. L. Winslow, and C. V. Kirby, Art Education in Principle and Practice, Milton Bradley, Springfield, Massachusetts, 1933, p. 27.


instructional time was devoted directly to art criticism in any form. Under such conditions how successfully do Virginia Beach students learn to criticize works of art?

To determine the kinds of art critical skills the Virginia Beach students had acquired as a result of their art instruction, 145 students representing various instructional levels were asked to give written descriptions and judgments of a printed reproduction of Marc Chagall's painting *I and My Village*. The reproduction was placed in front of classroom groups of students and they were asked to write about the painting taking care to respond in ways that they had learned in their art classes.

Following their descriptive writing the students were asked to judge whether they thought the painting was "good," "just all right," or "poor," and to give reasons for their judgments.

The contents of the students' descriptions and judgments were analyzed through the use of a set of 28 classifications.26 The set contained a classification relating to comments about the media, techniques, and processes used in making the painting; sensory qualities; characterizations of the design, composition, or structure of the work; a classification for noting the analysis of specific relationships of features within the work; one for noting the expressive character of the work; a classification relating to the literal objects and events of the work; another for comments about the work's meaning; and classifications for style, artist, and the context in which the work was made. For analyzing the judgments of the work there were classifications for preferences; organismic; contextualistic; hedonic; formistic; mimetic; *a priori*; and statements of the artist's capabilities.29 There were classifications for anecdote, the use of metaphor, and whether the response involved a subjective description of the effect of the work on the viewer.

As a group the Virginia Beach students did very well in describing, analyzing, interpreting, and judging *I and My Village*. Space allows only a cursory summary of several extremely complex sets of data. (A brief summary of the statistics for this task may be found in Appendix C.)

As a group, 55 percent of the Virginia Beach students commented on the design, compositional, and structural features of the painting—four to five times the frequency found in the National Assessment data.30 Nearly three-fourths of the students noted specific relationships among aspects of the painting—markedly higher than in any other group that I have studied.31 Twenty-nine percent of the total sample responded with a characterization of the expressive, modal, or overall feeling of the work—a small number, but still notable because of the difficulties involved in first synthesizing and then characterizing the expressive quality of the painting. A surprisingly high number (81 percent) commented on the sensory qualities of the painting—again higher than for other groups that have been studied.32 Overall the students made a surprisingly high use of the classification dealing with comments about the style of

26The classifications from which this set was developed are found in B. Wilson, *The Development and Testing of an Instrument To Measure Aspective Perception of Paintings* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1966). Similar classifications were also adapted for use in scoring several of the National Assessment art exercises.

29Stephen Pepper, *The Basis of Criticism in the Arts*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1956, holds that there are four world-views (Formistic, Contextualistic, Organistic, and Mechanistic) from which adequate aesthetic-judgmental criteria can be drawn. He also outlines several criteria that he considers to be inadequate.

30The Second National Art Assessment report, to which I have referred previously, reports data on an exercise in which young people were asked to compare the aspects of two paintings of flowers. The 17-year-old students made responses relating to the compositional and formal features of the two works less than 12 percent of the time.

31In an extensive study of student responses to works of art, only about 30 percent of the high school art students tested made relational-analytic responses to a group of 34 paintings (B. Wilson, *The Development and Testing of an Instrument To Measure Aspective Perception of Paintings*, Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1966).

Chagall’s painting. The average usage for all groups was 41 percent; and 57 percent of the combined groups commented on the meaning of the work.

Although I have claimed that the Virginia Beach art criticism program is not highly developed, these data, especially when compared informally with the data from other groups, illustrate that the Virginia Beach students are unusual in their descriptions and analyses of a work of art. I have no hesitation in attributing these extraordinary performances to the program, which emphasizes the study of attributes of works of art.

When it comes to judging the quality and merit of the painting, the results are mixed. It may be that the features of the art program that contributed to the success of the students in describing and analyzing the work actually lead students to employ inappropriate judgmental criteria. Ask any Virginia Beach teacher, “What criteria do you use to judge works of art?” and the answer is, “The elements and principles of design.” This ubiquitous system constitutes one way of describing the features of a work of art; it does not, however, provide adequate judgmental criteria. A painting can be full of rhythms and still be an aesthetically inferior work. The insistence that a work of art have a center of interest leads to the judgment that Pollock’s paintings are bad. The design of a work may be highly unified and yet the expressive quality, subject matter, and meaning utterly disjointed. When I pointed out the inadequacies of their judgmental criteria the Virginia Beach teachers were hard pressed to present alternative ones.

The reliance upon the elements and principles of design is revealed in the criteria that students used to judge *I and My Village*. The most frequently used judgmental criterion was the *a priori* classification involving reasons that rested upon claims of self-evidence, upon appeals to uncorroborated authority, or without an adequate appeal to evidence. Statements such as “It’s good because it’s got rhythms, or red, or it is good because it is modern art, or creative, or original” are all examples of the *a priori* classification. Sixty-one percent of all students employed some aspect of this criterion.

About a quarter of all students used the adequate criteria relating either to the organistic unity or the “flavorsome” vividness and intensity of the work. These adequate-criteria classifications were broadly drawn so that in many cases the responses placed within them were frequently very close to the undesirable *a priori* criteria. Still they mark instances in which the students’ judgments were at least headed in the right direction. And the design principle unity was usually classified under the organistic criterion relating to the interrelatedness of the parts of the work.

The judgmental statements of the Virginia Beach students are notable for one criterion that they did not use frequently. The mimesis category classified responses in which the work was judged on the basis of how much the objects in the painting corresponded to objects in the phenomenal world. Only 10 percent of their responses were placed in this classification.

And so what might we conclude about the Virginia Beach students’ abilities to function as art critics? Students describe the sensory and formal aspects of the work and analyze its features far more fully than any group that I have studied. Their pattern of judging works, however, reflects the less than desirable *a priori* criterion model set by their teachers.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE COMPONENTS OF THE VIRGINIA BEACH ART PROGRAM

As with all art programs in the United States, the studio component is the most predominant feature in Virginia Beach. Gathering teachers’ beliefs about their studio program seemed not to be as useful as determining some of the relationships they thought existed among the
various components of the program. As we shall see, there is a bias, but perhaps not an unexpected one, toward studio activities.

When teachers were given the general belief statement, "Most art teachers in the district think it more important to develop students' creative and expressive abilities than to teach them about works of art and artists," less than one-third of the teachers gave the disagree-response that would be indicative of a curriculum balanced between history and studio. The teachers, however, seem to see themselves functioning somewhat differently than their colleagues. When given the statement, "In my art program I place more emphasis upon developing students' abilities to express themselves than upon teaching about the cultural heritage or perceiving works of art," nearly half of the teachers disagreed.

Puzzling and somewhat contradictory beliefs were revealed when teachers were presented first with, "I show reproductions of the works of artists to my students primarily to provide motivation and stimulation for their own expressive works," to which no one strongly disagreed, 27 percent disagreed, 8 percent were undecided, 39 percent agreed, and 24 percent strongly agreed. Surely it is possible to study something of the visual cultural history while introducing a studio lesson, but it was my observation that in most classrooms almost as soon as art history instruction appeared it disappeared in the rush to get to the studio project. Still the teachers express strong general beliefs about the artistic heritage; 80 percent of the teachers agreed to the statement, "In the long run concepts learned about the visual and artistic cultural heritage will be just as valuable to students as anything they gain from art-making activities." The essential clash of values between making art and studying it is clearly revealed in the responses to these two statements. And the long—and tremendously enjoyable—tradition of "making" overshadows the less stimulating practice of studying art history. Nearly two thirds of the teachers responded positively to the matter of imbalance through this goal-oriented belief statement, "Generally speaking, in our art program we teachers still need to place greater emphasis than we do now on the study of art and artists and upon learning how to perceive the qualities of art, while placing less emphasis on art-making." Finally, 80 percent agreed to the statement, "Our art program has just about the right balance between making art, studying about art and artists, and learning how to perceive and judge works of art." It is not possible to distinguish if the teachers were responding to the written curriculum guide or to the practiced curriculum of daily lessons taught. From other responses it is possible to conclude that the teachers are in strong support of their curriculum with its balanced emphasis on making, studying, and experiencing, but they realize that practice does not quite correspond to prescription. Most of the students' time in the art classroom is spent working on studio projects.

And in Virginia Beach the outcomes of the studio program are very good indeed. The disciplined approach to art studio instruction results in a general standard of work that is both technically and creatively very fine. And the strong belief expressed by the teachers that studio art instruction involves learning the skills, processes, and techniques of artists is apparently passed on to the students. When asked to respond to statements about the discipline of making art, 88 percent of the students agreed with the statement: "I often try and try again to get my artwork to look just the way I want it to." And the statement: "I'm willing to work hard and practice for years if that is what it takes to be a good artist" received a positive response from nearly half the students. They indicated, too, that making art is not an easy matter. To the statement, "most artists have a pretty easy time making their painting," 84 percent disagreed. The mean score for this subset of five questions was 4.03 on a five-point
scale. Making art may be fun, but in Virginia Beach students agree that it also involves lots of hard work.

CONCLUSION

The characterization of the Virginia Beach curriculum may seem contradictory. Although the art history and critical components of the program were not well developed in relationship to the studio practices area, the performance and beliefs of the students indicated considerable achievement. The explanation for this puzzling state of affairs may be found by relating Virginia Beach practices to what is probably occurring elsewhere. Across the nation some individual art teachers provide instruction relating to art history and criticism; in general, however, the practice is probably minimal. After having examined what is currently being accomplished in Virginia Beach we have some basis for speculating about what performance could be like across the nation if instruction in art history and criticism were given a place alongside studio instruction.
4. INSIDE VIRGINIA BEACH ART CLASSROOMS

In each of the previous three sections, the total Virginia Beach art program—its history, character, curriculum, teachers’ beliefs, and student outcomes—has been the focus of critical attention. We now move to the art classrooms to illustrate ways in which the curricular prescriptions and tight structure seem to have influenced the character of the art teaching in Virginia Beach. The classrooms and episodes described here are characteristic of the teaching that occurs in Virginia Beach every day.

ARTROOM AS TEACHER

The artrooms in Virginia Beach seemed to both reflect and to teach the basic goals of the curriculum. For example, just to the left of the doorway of a spacious Plaza Junior High School art room is a neatly lettered sign, ART IS TO SOCIETY AS DREAMS ARE TO THE PERSON. There are at least a dozen other such quotations tacked around the room: CAUTION IS THE ENEMY OF ART, AND EVERYONE IS MORE CAUTIOUS THAN HE THINKS (Robert Motherwell); IMAGINATION IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN KNOWLEDGE; KNOWLEDGE IS LIMITED, IMAGINATION IS NOT (Einstein); DRAWING IS A WAY OF REASONING ON PAPER (S. Steinberg); and others by notables ranging from Goethe to Isadora Duncan.

After the first sign is a “HELP” list of things needed for the artroom, more sayings, and then a handsome display of reproductions of prints (featuring Rembrandt’s The Ratscatcher), descriptions of the intaglio printing process, and the steps in an assignment to produce an edition of five intaglio prints. Keeping to the left wall, we encounter a large display of the principles of design with emphasis on balance and unity, and another display of elements. And finally, “ART, ART: What’s Happening in the World of Art?”: a series of newspaper and art magazine clippings. Turn the corner to the back wall, and there in an alcove is the teacher’s desk, more quotations, and after that a large display of the STEPS TO GOOD COMPOSITION.

Moving now to the right-hand wall, there is a drying rack, a chronology chart of artists and their times from the Time/Life series on “The World of” prominent artists, a long display of student paintings from a project on color schemes, accompanied by large reproductions of artists’ works (Modigliani, Klee, Hopper, etc.) each with a label indicating the color scheme of the painting—monochromatic, triadic, etc.—more quotations, a corner, and to the right of the door on glass windows looking out to the hallway, six large mythical beasts made of transparent tissue paper. The walls of this and most classrooms in the district bespeak both the concepts on which the art instruction is based and the works of artists from which the concepts themselves are derived.

ART EDUCATION AT WOODSTOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

A careful examination of Nancy Prichard’s art classroom at Woodstock Elementary School reveals the care with which everything has been arranged to facilitate the teaching of art. On the large display board at the side of the room there is a map of the world, and from
points on the map, colored lines of yarn stretch outward to nearly 40 reproductions of works of art that were created in these various geographic and cultural locations. At the back of the room to the right of the sink is another large display titled “Careers in Art.” The words “Designer,” “Craftsman,” “Teacher,” “Photographer,” “Cartoonist,” “Architect,” are lettered on cards pinned next to photographs of artists-in-action along with reproductions of the works they produce. A side counter holds a file of small laminated reproductions arranged vertically so that children can easily see works that they might wish to select for study. It is the front of the room, however, that is the focus of attention. Each day it is possible to find on sections of the front board the title or theme of the lessons to be taught to the various grades. Below the lesson titles one frequently finds a neatly printed outline of steps to be followed in completing a project, or large cards on which diagrams illustrating technical processes have been drawn and labeled. Reproductions of works of art rest on a nearby table so that they can be displayed at the appropriate time, as reproductions of some kind are used during most lessons.
Before Nancy Prichard teaches her first class in the fall the entire year’s schedule has been planned. She has devised her own form with “Grade” at the top and three columns labeled “Unit,” “Concept,” and “Activity.”

Thus, for fifth grade, under the unit titled “Elements and Principles of Design,” the concepts “Movement, Rhythm, and Direction” are listed; collage is indicated as the activity through which these concepts will be taught.

The plan for the lesson (p. 7-10 above) shows that Nancy Prichard used Duchamp’s painting *Nude Descending the Staircase* as an example of a painting showing movement. Moreover, as the lesson was taught she developed the idea that early in the twentieth century Duchamp and other artists celebrated machines and inventions and incorporated technological imagery into their art. Prints of Feininger’s work and examples of Op art were also shown (for their rhythmic qualities) before the students began to make their own cut paper collages that were to show movement.

**A MORNING IN THE ART CLASSROOM AT INDIAN LAKES ELEMENTARY**

Susan March tells of the year at Indian Lakes when overcrowding necessitated the hiring of a second art teacher. This new teacher had not yet learned to use the guide and was not sure what to teach and kept asking, “What project are you doing next?” to which Susan would respond with an explanation of the concepts that were next to be taught. “To her, my answers may have seemed square.” Square or not, Susan March showed me overview plans for the last six years of teaching. In a glance it was possible to review the 30 lessons, each with the key objective, problem, procedure, and materials, for first through fifth grades. This year’s completed plan outlined, for example, lessons for first graders such as “What is art? Why artists create art objects; The variety of art objects”; “Colors have feelings—introduced with a discussion of Picasso’s Blue period”; and “Shapes in a city (with a discussion of the shapes to be seen in cities, and a listing of the shapes that students have put into their paintings).”

During my morning’s visit to Susan March’s classroom she taught a class of first graders a lesson on line, which began by Ms. March saying “I’m going to write a word on the board.” “Line.” “Who can name me some different kinds of lines?” to which children answered “straight”; “curly”; “diagonal” (with an affirming, “very good,” from the teacher); “horizontal”; and “close-line.” Not understanding “close-line” Ms. March asked the young respondent to come to the board and draw his unique line—two schematic poles and a clothes-line stretched between. Next Ms. March demonstrated how a variety of line types could be drawn vertically (“from top to bottom”) in chalk on black paper, cut along, and the series of resulting shapes mounted on background paper of another color. The students produced, with hardly a hitch, their own versions of what they had seen Ms. March demonstrate. None of the students noticed, nor seemed to mind that, when cut and mounted, what had started out as lines became shapes and patterns. They did, however, tell anyone willing to listen how this “looks like a castle,” or a plant, or a nose, or a Christmas tree.

Next came a class of second grade students who were to receive an introduction to a unit on papier-mâché masks.

The session began with Susan March saying, “I like the way this class does patterns, but we were not the first people to invent patterns, because a long time ago there were tribes all throughout Africa and they made masks. And can you tell me what they made them for?” One student responded with, “To celebrate stuff.” “That’s right! celebrations; and who can tell me what types of events they might be celebrating?” “Dances.” “Right, there would be dances;
and they might celebrate what else?” “Holidays.” “Right; they may not have the same ones we
do—they might celebrate what?” To which another student responds, “Holy ceremonies.”
“Holy ceremonies, that’s right—for rituals they would use masks especially. I want to mention
that we are lucky to have some of the masks here—in museums—because what do you think
they did with them after the ceremony?—That we don’t do with our art work?” Susan has an
amazing ability to lead students to the correct answer, and one responds, “Throw them away?”
“That’s right; they just threw them away after the ceremony when they didn’t need them
anymore. They just threw them away because they had a different attitude toward art than we
do. But I want to show you a few of these to show you how they used decorations and patterns
on their masks, and then we are going to build a form for a mask today and next week we are
going to cover the mask with a papier-mâché mixture and burlap and make the mask more
complete. We are just going to build the foundation today. I’ll show you how to do that later.”

“Let’s look at patterns and how they used simple shapes in their masks and how they had
patterns. What do you think this may have been used for?” A student answered, “A vacuum
cleaner.” “Well I don’t think they had vacuum cleaners then, but look at the outside shape.”
Ms. March led the students to see a sunlike pattern, the simple yet unusual shape of the eyes
in another mask, and the head of another—accompanied by oohs and aahs. “It’s really a nice
pattern and it might give you some thoughts to use on your masks.” She shows another, and
says, “This one is painted very decoratively. I have seen tennis shoes that have similar pat-
tterns. So plan your shape. Some of you may want to start with a round mask similar to this
top one, or some of you may want to start with a shape like this—or close to it—or if you want
you can change the lines of it and make an animal’s face. You might want to cut around to
make the ears. You might even want to think of the kind of ceremony that you might use the
mask for.” With a few more suggestions the students go to work. Ms. March helps them with
the planning and cutting, and at the end of the period the students at each table are asked to
hold up their mask shapes for the rest of the class to see.

By the time the last second grader has left the room there is a line of third graders wait-
ing at the door. When they are seated, Ms. March says, “There is something that I want to
bring to your attention that we have talked about the last three times—something that we
mentioned when we decorated pots. What do you call what we did along the edge?” Student:
“Designs.” “Yes, designs, but when you repeat a design over and over?” Student: “Pattern.”
“Pattern, that’s it, pattern. Now today I want to show you one of my favorite artists. Picasso.
Now Picasso, Pablo Picasso, used patterning and there is something special about the way he
used patterns. When he first started working—he really changed his artwork during his life—
when he first started painting he used all blues—dull colors. And how do you think he felt at
that time?” One student answers “Cool colors,” and another says, “Sad.” “Pretty sad, and
then he went through a period in his life when he painted everything with rose colors, and how
do you think he felt?” The obvious answer came from several corners of the room. “Pretty
happy about it, and he painted portraits of people. He started painting portraits of people that
looked pretty realistic—that looked somewhat the way people looked, but then along came this
invention (and many of you have this invention in your minds) and this invention could take a
picture of someone exactly the way they looked. What am I talking about?” In chorus, “The
camera.” “The camera, and if the photograph could make a person look exactly the way they
were, then he [Picasso] didn’t want to spend hours and hours and hours, and weeks, and
months, and years just to do what a photograph did so he did something more. He decided
that he was going to do a portrait of somebody where you could see the front view, and the side
view, and maybe the back, or the top of the head, or all kinds of views of the person at once in
the same painting. I want you to look at this painting and tell me where this woman is looking. One part of the face is looking straight at you and one part . . . ?" Student: "Toward the door." There follows a teacher-led analysis of several of Picasso's portraits from the 1930s period. Ms. March introduces the term "abstract," defines it, "not realistic," and then says, "Today I'm going to give you a sheet of paper and I know that everyone in this class can do pretty much a lifelike portrait already. I'm going to have you do something different. I'm going to have you do a self-portrait—a portrait of yourself—designed in an abstract manner like Picasso's. So instead of having both eyes looking straight forward, one might look in one direction and one in the other. What about the nose? What could it do?" And so on. Paper and paint were distributed and the students produced some amazingly cubist portraits.

These three lessons illustrate how some of the instruction in Virginia Beach is focused solely upon the abstract elements of design, and how other instruction has the work of art or a concept derived from the history of art as its basis, but with elements or principles of design still found as an important aspect of the instruction.

Susan March is a master at leading discussions, and in her lessons she continually reviews concepts from earlier lessons—earlier in the year, or from previous years.

THE EDUCATION OF GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS

A group of five fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students are seated around one table in the library of the Old Donation School for Gifted and Talented students. Stacked on the table are books on Cezanne, Monet, Manet, Renoir, Degas, and a portfolio of prints. One student reads aloud to the rest from an encyclopedia entry on the Impressionists. Another student writes
about what was happening in the world when the artists worked. When Lou Lowenthal, one of the teachers, comes into the library she directs the students' attention to the compositions of Cezanne's paintings and how his style influenced the Cubism of Picasso.

The task on which the students were working had been given to them earlier that morning: To research the life of one of eight artists (Seurat, Monet, Degas, Cezanne, etc.) noting such things as his time, country, and contemporary events, his style, techniques, subject matter, and important works, and then decide which artists in the group "should be examples of change and authority, as well as important in the art world." In short the students were to determine the influence that the artists had on subsequent artists.

At another table more students are working on the same assignment. The second art teacher, Alex Saulsbury, asks: "If you were to meet with the class now what would you tell them?" David answers, "That you can't really tell which artists to eliminate [they had to trim the list from eight artists to five] until you have found out everything and how important they were." And Tracy adds, "You can't just chuck out one and say Picasso because maybe that one is as important as Picasso." (Picasso was not on the list of artists being researched. The students had wondered why he wasn't and were ready to add him to the list.) Mr. Saulsbury: "Ah, so Picasso is back in the ballgame. Tracy, which one had you decided to eliminate?" David answers, "Monet." Jeff: "No, Seurat." Mr. Saulsbury: "And then someone decided you could not eliminate Seurat; why?" Tracy: "He made a change in art." Mr. Saulsbury: "What kind?" Tracy: "He started using dots instead of solid straight colors." Mr. Saulsbury: "So we have to leave him in. And what about Picasso?" David: "We have to eliminate someone else. What were your reasons for leaving him off the list?" he asks Mr. Saulsbury who explained, "I'm going to use him in another period" (to be researched by another group of students). The students are satisfied and return to a discussion of the artists on their list.

Mr. Saulsbury: "What about Van Gogh?" David: "When he started he did just dull portraits and then he changed." Mr. Saulsbury: "Why did he change?" David: "He got tired of doing it the old way of doing pictures and he wanted to get away from it." Mr. Saulsbury: "Is that good or bad?" David: "You can't really say." Jeff: "Good." Tracy: "You have to find out if the change is good." Mr. Saulsbury: "And do you suppose that people liked the change that he made?" Tracy: "No. I mean if somebody invented a new art form, say tomorrow, some people—some critics would say it is—I mean what they said about the others, 'even a monkey could have done it.'" Mr. Saulsbury: "Would that stop you if you were the artist?; because you guys are future artists; right? If we were critics and we were hostile to you, would you stop? What would you do?" David: "I would do what I thought was art—what I thought was good, you know." Tracy: "Well, maybe if nobody would buy it...." David: "But if I thought it was good from my standards, I would keep doing it. O.K." Mr. Saulsbury: "I'm your teacher and suppose I told you, David, what you are working on is horrible, what would you do?" David laughs and says: "Stop; because you are an art teacher and if you say it's not good I get all scared and say I'd better not do it. If your teacher says it's wrong you don't do it again." Mr. Saulsbury: "Do you suppose his teacher was also critical of him at various times?" David: "Probably." Mr. Saulsbury: "Did he stop? Do you look at yourselves as being artists?" Tracy: "Yeah." David: "To a point." Mr. Saulsbury: "What point is that?" David: "We are not full artists. (This is a fourth grade student speaking.) We are artists to other people our age, maybe, but if we are ranked to someone like Van Gogh we are just like sketches. You have to wait until you are older until you get popular." Mr. Saulsbury: "You have to wait until you are older to become an artist?" David: "Not actors; there are children
actors.” Mr. Saulsbury: “But what about children artists?” To which David replies: “There are a few. There are a few here.”

If there are not already artists at the Old Donation Center, there are surely artists in the making. In this fragment of conversation between three students and their teacher we have heard students questioning the teacher for leaving Picasso off a list of important artists; listened to a discussion of the criteria for judging artists to be historically important; heard students’ views of what it is like to be a revolutionary artist; and gained insights into these young people’s perceptions of themselves as artists. Such discussions are typical at this unusual center for students gifted and talented in art.

During the 1962-1983 school year there were 137 students participating in the Center’s art program. On each school day one of five groups made up of fourth through seventh grade students leaves their home schools to come to the Center for a full day of art instruction. The Center’s two art teachers, Lou Lowenthal and Alex Saulsbury, each have approximately 14 students assigned to them on any given day of the week, but frequently all the students work in the art studio, photography lab, or sculpture lab on projects organized jointly by the two teachers.

Having art all day long one day each week permits the exploration of such things as styles in art—in one year the students studied abstraction, Impressionism, Photo-realism, Surrealism, Pop, and Non-objective art; they investigated interdisciplinary topics such as human anatomy, the science of visual perception, the physics of color and light, creative writing and myths, and computer graphics; and they created their own superheroes to be incorporated into beautifully produced comicbooks.

The art program at the Old Donation Center for the Gifted and Talented follows the Virginia Beach curriculum. But with so much time devoted to disciplined, high level, equitably balanced art instruction in history, criticism, and studio, these students are able to make such extraordinary progress that the work of elementary students is often like that of advanced high school art students. Many of them, in fact, believe that they are on their way to becoming artists, but not all of them. At least two boys have decided that they wish to become art historians. One of the aspiring historians, Mark, a sixth grader, has become so knowledgeable (and outspoken) after three years at the Center that the teachers have resorted to having him lead the discussions during the art history and criticism sessions—which he does with amazing skill, sensitivity, and insight—in order to allow the other students the chance to respond.

ADVANCE PLACEMENT ART HISTORY AT BAYSDALE HIGH SCHOOL

Students don’t generally come flocking to enroll in an art history class without encouragement. And there are not very many academically talented students at Bayside High School who are interested in advance placement college credit. So Ms. Flegal recruits them by going into other classes to explain what the course is like. Once her pitch has been made they can’t wait to sign up.

Cindy Flegal may have been born enthusiastic, but becoming an art history teacher took a long time. In college she started out as an elementary education major, took a class in “art for the classroom teacher” and switched her major to art education. She says her college art appreciation and art history classes were not so good—"I’d love to go back and teach them my way"—but still, "I got excited about studying art—so excited." When she began teaching junior high school in Virginia Beach there was no curriculum guide, but on her own she began relating the work of artists to the work of her students and eventually developed the idea of
having art appreciation with every lesson. She began teaching high school art and thinking about a special art appreciation or art history course. The art curriculum committee approved of the idea, and with district approval and funding from the administration, a 524-page advance placement art history guide was produced. (Those who worked on the guide with Cindy claim that at one time the guide was three times that length. One of the first tasks Stef Runyan had as art supervisor was to trim the guide to a reasonable length. Cindy believes that the length of the first drafts of the guide reflected the fact that the committee members were teaching themselves art history.)

The art history guide is based on Jansen’s History of Art. And it contains an insightful discussion of the relative merits and weaknesses of the chronological and thematic approaches to teaching art history. (In the end the chronological approach with thematic supplementations is suggested.) Feldman’s continuum for seeing works of art is presented (sample descriptions, analyses, interpretations, and judgments are outlined). The guide contains discussions of such things as vocabulary, style, aesthetics, how to plan for the teaching of art history, and lesson by lesson content and suggestions for teaching the course.

In her course Cindy Flegal teaches “for the exam”—the final advance placement examination administered by Educational Testing Service. The students take the course to get college credit and she sees to it that they do. (Last year none of her students scored below a three—a score of two qualifies the student for college credit—and most got scores of four and five.) And in the process they come to love art history; and they learn more about it than one would ever think possible for high school students, through doing such things as writing their own short (75-word) analyses of each of the 927 illustrations in Jansen’s History of Art, and two or three times a week writing timed (usually ten-minute) essays about key works.

A class period might be introduced by Cindy Flegal telling the students:

We have three things I want to do today, to go back to the early Renaissance, run through a review of that because that sets the stage for the modern world. We will look at a few slides from the high Renaissance just to keep our thoughts going, and then I have something fun—a tray of slides of Leonardo da Vinci. I want to read to you from a source concerning his work because the style of writing is that which I expect from you even though it is written by an art historian. I think you can benefit from his vocabulary, his sentence structure, from the kinds of things he talks about when he views artworks.

Later in the period the students are shown a painting of a female by Michelangelo, and then the discussion moves to the differences between Michelangelo and Leonardo.

Ms. Flegal asks the review question: What was Leonardo’s purpose in making men that was different from Michelangelo’s purpose in making them?

Six students speak almost at once with answers like “Michelangelo was concerned with power and masculinity.” “Painting a God who could create Adam.” “Leonardo wanted to portray man’s soul.” “The creative divine inspiration.”

And there are specific follow-up questions such as, “Do you think the woman on the right exhibits an internal psychological state, the intensity of her soul, the intention of her mind? Or do you think she just expresses force, or power, or beauty?”

The language Cindy Flegal uses to explicate works of art is searchingly poetic. And she supplements her own explanations with choice examples from the writing of art historians. Perhaps that is why her students are able to produce, in a few minutes, pieces of writing such as this, written in response to details of paintings of a Baroque and a modern hand:
The modern hand nulls the reality of the Baroque hand by employing thick quick brush-strokes of black and blue paint to create a linear design abstractly resembling a hand. The painting appears like a fingerprint drawing of a child. The chosen colors are opposites and pursue a feeling of opposites and clashing tensions. The modern composition’s mood of tension stems from an unsureness of the individual’s self. The Baroque hand is engulfed in a mystic dark background. It emerges from the vast unknown toward light reflected in the dots of color. The light brush strokes of dark color employ “tenebriost,” a technique used to represent a dark mood or the vastness of unknown darkness. The strong contrast of light and dark impresses upon the viewer little feeling of linearness, but total interest in color, form, and volume.

The writing may be rough, but we know that it is a searching, feeling mind that drives the pen. The written word is the stuff from which art history and art criticism are made, and Cindy Flegal’s students sometimes transcend the mere study of others’ words to produce original historical and critical writing of their own.

BECOMING AN ARTIST: STUDIO INSTRUCTION AT KEMPSVILLE HIGH

Robin Clair teaches the advanced placement studio art classes at Kempsville High School. My past experience had taught me that frequently the teachers who are most concerned with helping their students develop as artists are the very ones who ignore instruction in art history and criticism, so I thought to myself, here will be the real test of the Virginia Beach curriculum.

The advanced students are often in the art room for at least two periods a day. They have each determined the basic theme of the project to which they will devote a year’s work. Ginger’s theme is “Light and Celebrations”—an idea that developed from a photograph of a birthday party taken when she was five. She has made a glazed ceramic birthday cake and painted a series of birthday cakes with lighted candles. The paintings have a resemblance to the pastry-paintings of Wayne Theibaud—a resemblance that Ginger noted, she said, only after her work began to acquire the same qualities. At first I thought her latest work to be entirely abstract. But the 40 by 50 inch canvas consisting of row upon row of brilliant dots and luscious four-inch-long miniature sausages of acrylic paint squeezed directly from the tube, she told me, represented lighted candles.

While Ginger’s project developed from personal experience and was only casually related to the work of other artists, Tim’s paintings evolved directly from the work of others. He informed me that his paintings of heads and groups of figures (that reminded me of the European Neo-Expressionists) were borrowed from sources as diverse as Northern Renaissance altarpieces and the German Expressionist paintings of Nolde. “I see a head or a composition of figures that I like, and I borrow it.” And as I studied his journal-sketchbook, it was clear to me that what he borrowed was also transformed. The rich mixture of words, collaged pages, and drawings gave evidence of hundreds of ideas in the process of development and transformation. In some ways Tim’s approach to the use of artistic sources was reminiscent of the way the Virginia Beach teachers grounded their instruction in the works of artists.

This is only the studio part of the art instruction at Kempsville High. Each week the students spend a part of a period in a group criticism session. One Friday I watched the students respond to the paintings and drawings that Adam had produced since the beginning of the year. There were two distinct directions evident in his work—highly detailed fantastic science fiction illustrations (a carry-over from his year in the commercial art program at the
vocational/technical school) and small, quickly executed expressionistic portraits in oil. Before the session was concluded I heard Adam's fellow students make suggestions about how he might fuse the strongest features of both his "styles" and listened to Adam excitedly describe what his next work was going to be. This was studio criticism in the best tradition of artists helping other artists to sharpen up their work.

Robin Clair's students also get lots of opportunities to sharpen their critical skills. Although the courses she teaches are directed primarily toward helping her students refine their studio skills, they do a great deal of talking and writing about art. Among the mimeographed tasks that she hands to students I found: "Art Forum is reputed to be one of the most respected magazines for information concerning contemporary art in the United States. Please review and critique one major article in Art Forum."

In another task titled "What Are Your Influences?" the students were first asked to (1) read a poem by the sculptor David Smith (the poem asks, "The question—what are your influences"); (2) contemplate Smith's artwork; and (3) answer the following questions:

(a) What influences (things you have done, seen, heard, read, felt or imagined) affect your art work?
(b) What media and techniques do you consider most appropriate for your needs to pursue a logical communication in a personal course of study in the visual arts?
(c) What visual arts communication do you wish to promote in the development of your artwork?
(d) What career possibilities do you perceive for your area of concentration?

Throughout the year the making of art is interspersed with writing about the personal and cultural consequences of the visual artistic act. In Robin Clair's classroom students learn that artists think (and write) as well as make art.

CONCLUSION

It is possible for art teachers to draw upon two major traditions for the teaching of art. One tradition is derived almost entirely from content and practices that have evolved within the field of art education. These school-art projects frequently have little relationship to the art practiced by artists. The other tradition upon which teachers might draw is that of the milieu of art and artists, school practices that can be directly related to what artists think, feel, do, and produce. In the Virginia Beach classrooms it is possible to find both traditions—it seemed in nearly equal balance. Instruction relating to the elements and principles of design, for example, represents the former. Instruction derived from a study of the problems that artists themselves undertake represents the latter. In this chapter we have seen a fair sampling of this second and, to my mind, more desirable tradition as it frequently occurs in Virginia Beach.
5. FINAL WORDS

The art program in Virginia Beach is as much a product of the high expectations and support structure of the school district as of any other factor.

Had it not been for Superintendent Brickell's belief that Virginia Beach should have an art program, and that it should be supported like any other subject matter area, the art program would not have developed as it did. (Granted, as I asked why there was such a well-supported art program, I repeatedly heard administrators and art teachers say, in effect, "Our community wanted a good art program." But such perceptions of community desire are easily ignored if they do not correspond to the views of the school administration.)

Dr. Brickell wanted a good art program as a part of a good total district educational program. He and his central office staff set the conditions within which there was a demand for a comprehensive curriculum guide. And they hired an art supervisor who could produce a guide and continued to underwrite the production process until it was complete. Even before the comprehensive guide and the subsequent specific guides were in place, they had established a structure assuring that teachers would follow those guides. Assistant Superintendent Walter Carroll helped devise a plan whereby curriculum development would be representative, democratic, orderly, and ongoing. Assistant Superintendent Carlton Boyer insisted that lessons be carefully planned, so that teachers would thoughtfully and professionally elaborate upon the general concepts of the curriculum guides, and, in effect, individualize a common curriculum. And Deputy Superintendent Bruce McGuire's work with the building principals has helped them to become curriculum leaders in their schools. (He notes that principals could play a still more active role; nevertheless, many of them do know the art curriculum, and they do monitor the art instruction in their schools through their mandatory visits to the art classrooms and their reviews of the art teachers' lesson plans.) Pat House's high expectations and support help the supervisors to perform well; and Jim Darden, who oversees the curriculum committees, facilitates the process of curriculum development.

Because of the supportive structure of the system, the art program is not dependent upon just the superhuman efforts of outstanding supervisors. The program is institutionalized enough that it would continue essentially uninterrupted even with a change of supervisors. It already has.

As I emphasize that the Virginia Beach art program has become outstanding because that is the way the district administration expected it to be, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the content of the art program reflects the widely held art educational view that art instruction should be more than just making art—that it should include the study of art history and the practice of art criticism. An enlightened vision of art education, introduced into a school district which demanded that art teachers actually engage in the practices that would lead to the achievement of their own goals, has led to an extremely effective program.

We should remember, too, that the art teachers in Virginia Beach are unusual. Collectively, they teach in ways that are rarely found in art education. They have genuine and strong beliefs that art is a discipline, that art instruction should be given according to concepts and should not merely be a series of activities. History and criticism have important places in their program. And if these two aspects of their program are not as fully developed as they should be, the fault seems to lie more with the field of art education for failing to provide adequate instructional models, than with the teachers themselves. Perhaps most important, the
art teachers have demonstrated that unified action and a common curriculum can result in outstanding student achievement. Contrary to popular belief, the adherence to a common curriculum has limited neither individual initiative nor individual curricular innovation; the solid curricular base may actually have encouraged imaginative teaching.

The tight structure of the system might be used to encourage even more teacher-initiated curricular innovation. Many of the innovative practices that I observed were related to Youth Art Month where the idea that "I should do something unusual" has developed among the teachers. As I observed teachers engaged in unit and lesson plan development, I thought to myself, "If the district told the teachers that they were to devise new and novel means to achieve the program's objectives, they would do so, just as they have me: every other expectation extended to them by the district administration."

More changes are still on the way for the Virginia Beach art program. As the result of a forward-looking and innovative Curriculum Review and Assessment Committee which worked for two years in the evaluation of the entire curricular offerings of the district, there will be a fine arts requirement for all Virginia Beach high school students. Semester courses in both art and music appreciation are now being developed, and will be offered for the first time in the fall of 1984.

When the findings that make up this study of the art program in Virginia Beach are considered in light of the desire for changes in art educational theory and practice, a further point needs to be made. The actual practice of art education is related more to what is found in curriculum guides than in the theoretical articles and research reports of the academics and intellectuals of art education. (The Virginia Beach teachers were generally unaware of the important literature and writers in art education.) Although art curriculum guides may not be followed in other places as closely as they are in Virginia Beach, guides are indicative of grassroots goals, contents, and processes of art instruction. New guides are compilations of the gleanings of old guides. Consequently, such things as the elements and principles of design persist through a succession of decades, each decade seeming to possess a new art educational idea that was never quite translated into general practice. New objectives, content, and teaching practices simply have not broken into the nearly closed cycle of curriculum guide development. If change is to occur, one necessary ingredient might be the production of model guides that are based on the best theory available, and that also provide at least some fully developed models for practice.

Are [the Virginia Beach program's] features generalizable enough that they might serve as a model for other art programs? Does it provide a model worth emulating? Perhaps the most important feature of the Virginia Beach program is the structure of the school system within which the program has been established and continues to thrive. (In fact the tight structure of the district may itself be a consequence of context—a well-educated and mobile middle-class populace in a place where a residue of southern conservatism, politeness, orderliness, and a touch of military discipline prevail.) It is probably impossible for art educators, acting independently, to emulate this part of the program because it depends upon the administrative pattern of a school district. If all school districts were so well organized, so efficiently and effectively administered, and so enlightened concerning both their general educational program and the value they place on the role of art in that program, then art education in this country would rest on solid footing. As it now stands, basic changes in American art education would probably have to be preceded by changes in both the values and the administrative practices of school superintendents, their staffs, and school principals.
Although the district makes the art program what it is, there are still attributes of the curriculum that merit emulation. If translated into sound practices, the art history and art criticism objectives from the curriculum guide could revolutionize art teaching in America. The thematic organization of the sixth and seventh grade guide is a superb model for the integration of art with other subject matter areas, while in no way infringing on the integrity of the subject matter of art. Finally, the Center for the Gifted and Talented merits special mention. At the Center special students make remarkable progress as experiencers and makers of art when they work with gifted teachers in art for a full day each week. But as I point to individual schools and particular practices, it should be remembered that the program is unified and that art throughout Virginia Beach is taught well.

Before I started my study of the process of art education in Virginia Beach I had stated my belief that it was impossible to find in the United States a unified, coherent large city art program that gave equitable attention to instruction in studio practice, art history, and criticism. Now I believe otherwise.

If through experience in the three realms—art making, art history, and art criticism—students expand their conceptions of the realities of self and world, of the future and the desirable, then, in my opinion, the students of Virginia Beach have a greater cognitive orientation to the world than most.
Appendix A

AN INVENTORY OF TEACHER BELIEFS ABOUT THEIR ART PROGRAM

All of the items from the teacher belief inventory are presented in this appendix. The instrument was developed to provide an indication of the cognitive orientation of the teachers toward the (1) tight structure of their school system, (2) program status, (3) program content and balance, and (4) art and art teaching. When it was discovered that most of the subsets of the inventory had high reliability estimates (considering the fact that there were as few as four items in a subset) the decision was made to report the data for each subset individually. The reliability estimate for the entire instrument is .80. There were three subsets where the reliability estimates were .26 or below. For most subsets, however, the reliability estimates were above .50 and as high as .71. (In the subsets where there are low reliability estimates, it is my opinion that it is not the instrument that is at fault; rather it is thought that individual teachers were unclear regarding their beliefs in these three areas. Thus the low reliability estimates actually yield valuable insights into the programmatic weaknesses.)

Because the teachers' responses seem to me to provide such an accurate gauge of the character of the program, the percentages of teachers responding to each point of the agree-disagree scale have been indicated for each item.

In the inventory subsets there are generally statements relating to the four belief types—beliefs about self, norms, goals, and general beliefs (p. 7-8 and fn. 10 above). The belief type that each statement represents is indicated immediately following the statement. (Of course these belief-type indications were not present when the instrument was administered to the teachers.) The number of each item indicates the place the item held during the administration.

The inventory was administered in two sections. Items 1 through 50 comprised the first section and 51 through 60 the second. Fifty of the art teachers responded to the first section of the inventory, and all 70 of the art teachers responded to the second section. Responses were given anonymously and the completed inventories were either mailed to or given directly to the researcher.

For each statement an asterisk marks the end of the scale indicative of a strong cognitive orientation toward structure, artistic discipline, etc.
Belief subset: Status and Program Support (reliability estimate .64); subset mean score 4.03

1. I personally believe that the status of the art program is as high as that of any other subject matter area in the school district. (Self)

* (A) STRONGLY AGREE 31%
  (B) AGREE 29
  (C) UNDECIDED 4
  (D) DISAGREE 31
  (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 02

4. I think that the art program in this district receives a high degree of support from the central office administration. (Self)

* (A) STRONGLY AGREE 33%
  (B) AGREE 45
  (C) UNDECIDED 12
  (D) DISAGREE 10
  (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 0

5. I think that the art curriculum guides in this district are probably among the very best in the country. (Norm)

* (A) STRONGLY AGREE 63%
  (B) AGREE 27
  (C) UNDECIDED 10
  (D) DISAGREE 0
  (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 0

23. I need to work harder to convince my principal of the importance of my art program, he/she just doesn't understand. (Goal)

  (A) STRONGLY AGREE 08%
  (B) AGREE 16
  (C) UNDECIDED 14
  (D) DISAGREE 24
  * (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 37

24. I would like to be involved in future art curriculum guide development that might be conducted in the district. (Goal)

* (A) STRONGLY AGREE 47%
  (B) AGREE 35
  (C) UNDECIDED 16
  (D) DISAGREE 02
  (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00
25. The art program in this district is one of the best in the country. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  55%
(B) AGREE  22
(C) UNDECIDED  20
(D) DISAGREE  00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00

27. The art teachers in the district are generally satisfied with the status of the art program (the esteem in which it is held by administrators, other teachers, and parents). (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  16%
(B) AGREE  39
(C) UNDECIDED  20
(D) DISAGREE  18
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  02

39. My principal strongly supports my art program. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  53%
(B) AGREE  31
(C) UNDECIDED  08
(D) DISAGREE  04
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  04

Belief Subset: Lesson Planning  (reliability estimate .63); subset mean score 4.34

14. Even if our district didn't require it, I would want to prepare careful weekly and daily lesson plans. (Goal)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  59%
(B) AGREE  35
(C) UNDECIDED  04
(D) DISAGREE  00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  02

22. Its good for art teachers to be required to make unit and daily lesson plans. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  43%
(B) AGREE  53
(C) UNDECIDED  04
(D) DISAGREE  00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00
26. I think that most of the art teachers in the district see the value of preparing detailed lesson plans. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  35%
(B) AGREE  43
(C) UNDECIDED  18
(D) DISAGREE  04
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00

28. I think that I should be left alone to plan my own individual art program free from the interference of a supervisor or a curriculum guide. (Self)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE  00%
(B) AGREE  02
(C) UNDECIDED  04
(D) DISAGREE  15
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  49

Belief Subset: Programatic Uniformity (reliability estimate .71; subset mean score 4.14)

2. When teachers don't follow the curriculum guides, it is detrimental to an art program. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  31%
(B) AGREE  45
(C) UNDECIDED  14
(D) DISAGREE  06
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00

34. Teachers should adhere to the basic guide so that when students transfer from one school to another in the district they will still receive the same sequential art instruction. (Goal)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  41%
(B) AGREE  47
(C) UNDECIDED  02
(D) DISAGREE  08
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00

45. One reason most of the art teachers in the system follow the guide is so that the 55,000 students in the district will be instructed in the same basic sequential art program. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  22%
(B) AGREE  45
(C) UNDECIDED  14
(D) DISAGREE  14
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  02
49. It is good when a student can move from one school to another within the district and still have the same basic art program. (Norm)

* (A) STRONGLY AGREE  51%
(B) AGREE  45
(C) UNDECIDED  04
(D) DISAGREE  00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00

Belief Subset: Curriculum Guides  (reliability estimate .46; subset mean score 4.09)

8. Most of the teachers in the district give only lip-service to the art curriculum; most of their lesson plans actually have little to do with our guide. (General Belief)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE  00%
(B) AGREE  02
(C) UNDECIDED  27
(D) DISAGREE  39
* (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  31

10. I think that it is essential for all art teachers in the district to adhere closely to both the spirit and the letter of the curriculum guides. (Norm)

* (A) STRONGLY AGREE  33%
(B) AGREE  31
(C) UNDECIDED  12
(D) DISAGREE  18
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  02

12. I actually have little desire to follow our district's art curriculum guide. (Goal)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE  04%
(B) AGREE  02
(C) UNDECIDED  00
(D) DISAGREE  31
* (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  63

17. Personally, I carefully follow the objectives set forth in the art curriculum guide. (Self)

* (A) STRONGLY AGREE  39%
(B) AGREE  59
(C) UNDECIDED  02
(D) DISAGREE  00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00
31. Almost all the art teachers in this district base their lessons on the objectives outlined in the curriculum guide. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 20%
(B) AGREE 45
(C) UNDECIDED 33
(D) DISAGREE 02
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

Belief Subset: Supervisory Structure (reliability estimate .49; subset mean score 4.10)

16. It's good to have supervisors and administrators who see to it that the art curriculum is being followed. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 43%
(B) AGREE 47
(C) UNDECIDED 06
(D) DISAGREE 00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

18. No matter how experienced I become as an art teacher, I still want to receive suggestions for improvement from my supervisor. (Goal)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 55%
(B) AGREE 39
(C) UNDECIDED 02
(D) DISAGREE 02
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

37. Most of the art teachers in the district openly welcome supervisory suggestions regarding both their teaching practices and the content of their lesson plans. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 16%
(B) AGREE 37
(C) UNDECIDED 35
(D) DISAGREE 06
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 02

42. I resent anyone telling me either what or how to teach. (Self)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 02%
(B) AGREE 08
(C) UNDECIDED 12
(D) DISAGREE 57
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 19
Belief Subset: Teaching About Art, Artists, and the Cultural Heritage (reliability estimate .18; subset mean score 3.87)

6. Most of the art teachers in the district are thoroughly committed to teaching about art and artists. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  20%
(B) AGREE  49
(C) UNDECIDED  20
(D) DISAGREE  04
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00

7. Even if objectives relating to teaching about the artistic cultural heritage were eliminated from our art curriculum guide, I would continue to teach about it. (Goal)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  41%
(B) AGREE  49
(C) UNDECIDED  08
(D) DISAGREE  00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00

19. My students gain a lot of basic knowledge about the artistic cultural heritage. (Self)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE  24%
(B) AGREE  57
(C) UNDECIDED  14
(D) DISAGREE  04
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  00

33. Most of the students in our district actually gain only a superficial knowledge of the visual cultural heritage. (General Belief)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE  04%
(B) AGREE  24
(C) UNDECIDED  33
(D) DISAGREE  31
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  06

Belief Subset: Teaching Students to Make Critical Judgments (reliability estimate .05; subset mean score 3.30)

11. Of the major objectives of our art program, the one relating to making qualitative visual judgments is the least important. (Norm)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE  04%
(B) AGREE  00
(C) UNDECIDED  06
(D) DISAGREE  51
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE  57
13. After studying in my classes, students are able to make sensitive judgments about the quality of works of art. (Self)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 22%
(B) AGREE 63
(C) UNDECIDED 12
(D) DISAGREE 00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

30. I really don't need to spend more time than I do now in teaching my students to perceive the qualities of art and to make well-reasoned critical judgments of artistic merit; presently they are learning to do these things well. (Goal)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 06%
(B) AGREE 49
(C) UNDECIDED 22
(D) DISAGREE 18
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 04

47. The objective most frequently ignored by teachers in the district is that relating to making qualitative visual judgments. (General Belief)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 06%
(B) AGREE 24
(C) UNDECIDED 41
(D) DISAGREE 22
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 04

Belief Subset: Program Balance (reliability estimate .66; subset mean score 3.65)

3. Most art teachers in the district think it more important to develop students' creative and expressive abilities than to teach them about works of art and artists. (General Belief)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 12%
(B) AGREE 27
(C) UNDECIDED 33
(D) DISAGREE 24
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 04

15. Our art program has just the right balance between making art, studying about art and artists, and learning how to perceive and judge works of art. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 41%
(B) AGREE 39
(C) UNDECIDED 20
(D) DISAGREE 00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00
35. I would be quite happy to see the concepts relating to art history and art criticism removed entirely from our art curriculum guide. (Self)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 00%
(B) AGREE 00
(C) UNDECIDED 00
(D) DISAGREE 27
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 69

38. In my art program I place more emphasis upon developing students' abilities to express themselves than upon teaching about the cultural heritage or perceiving works of art. (Goal)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 04%
(B) AGREE 39
(C) UNDECIDED 08
(D) DISAGREE 35
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 12

40. I show reproductions of the works of artists to my students primarily to provide motivation and stimulation for their own expressive works. (Self)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 24%
(B) AGREE 39
(C) UNDECIDED 08
(D) DISAGREE 27
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

43. In the long run concepts learned about the visual and artistic cultural heritage will be just as valuable to students as anything they gain from art-making activities. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 35%
(B) AGREE 45
(C) UNDECIDED 10
(D) DISAGREE 08
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 02

44. Generally speaking, in our art program we teachers still need to place greater emphasis than we do now on the study of art and artists and upon learning how to perceive the qualities of art, while placing less emphasis on art-making. (Goal)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 18%
(B) AGREE 39
(C) UNDECIDED 18
(D) DISAGREE 24
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00
48. It is just as important for students to learn about the artistic heritage as it is for them to express themselves through art. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 45%
(B) AGREE 43
(C) UNDECIDED 02
(D) DISAGREE 08
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

Belief Subset: Curricular Freedom (reliability estimate .26; subset mean score 4.43)

9. Although the district art guide specifies goals and areas to be covered, I feel that I have all the freedom I want to devise my own unique approaches to the teaching of art. (Self)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 57%
(B) AGREE 27
(C) UNDECIDED 08
(D) DISAGREE 06
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

20. The best curriculum guide is one that specifies goals and general areas to be covered while allowing teachers a great deal of room for creative innovation in their lesson planning. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 80%
(B) AGREE 12
(C) UNDECIDED 02
(D) DISAGREE 06
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

46. Most art teachers find ample room for innovative and creative lesson planning and teaching while still working within the basic structure of the curriculum guide. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 45%
(B) AGREE 43
(C) UNDECIDED 00
(D) DISAGREE 00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

50. I wish I had much, much more freedom than I do now to devise my own art educational objectives, content, and teaching strategies. (Goal)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 04%
(B) AGREE 04
(C) UNDECIDED 08
(D) DISAGREE 47
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 34
Belief Subset: Elements and Principles of Design
(reliability estimate .07; subset mean score 3.92)

21. In the final analysis, the elements and principles of design are the most important aspect of my art program. (Norm)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 31%
(B) AGREE 31
(C) UNDECIDED 12
(D) DISAGREE 22
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 02

29. I believe that a knowledge of the elements and principles of design is essential to the perceiving of a work of art. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 67%
(B) AGREE 18
(C) UNDECIDED 06
(D) DISAGREE 08
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

32. In our district art teachers include at least some study of the elements and principles of design in each lesson. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 39%
(B) AGREE 49
(C) UNDECIDED 12
(D) DISAGREE 00
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

36. Almost every lesson I teach includes a component relating to the elements and principles of design. (Self)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 57%
(B) AGREE 41
(C) UNDECIDED 00
(D) DISAGREE 02
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

41. The elements and principles of design are the most important single component of our art program. (Norm)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 22%
(B) AGREE 31
(C) UNDECIDED 08
(D) DISAGREE 35
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 04
Belief Subset: Artistic Discipline (reliability estimate .53; subset mean score 4.25)

51. It is not good for art teachers to instruct students in the techniques and processes of art; students should discover these things for themselves. (Norm)

  (A) STRONGLY AGREE 00%
  (B) AGREE 01
  (C) UNDECIDED 04
  (D) DISAGREE 37
  *(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 57

53. I want my students to acquire some of the same basic art skills that experienced artists employ. (Goal)

  *(A) STRONGLY AGREE 61%
  (B) AGREE 31
  (C) UNDECIDED 01
  (D) DISAGREE 04
  (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 01

55. The art teachers in this school system believe in instructing students in the same basic processes and techniques that are used by artists. (General Belief)

  *(A) STRONGLY AGREE 25%
  (B) AGREE 43
  (C) UNDECIDED 22
  (D) DISAGREE 06
  (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 03

57. I seldom ignore the opportunity to teach a student in such things as how to draw a figure in action or how to depict three dimensional space. (Self)

  *(A) STRONGLY AGREE 55%
  (B) AGREE 27
  (C) UNDECIDED 04
  (D) DISAGREE 07
  (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 06

Belief Subset: The Use of Art in the Teaching of Art (reliability estimate .51; subset mean score 4.21)

52. I frequently show the images of artists in order to stimulate my students own creative efforts. (Self)

  *(A) STRONGLY AGREE 64%
  (B) AGREE 34
  (C) UNDECIDED 01
  (D) DISAGREE 00
  (E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00
54. It is unfortunate when a student borrows or copies an image from the work of an artist or from another student. (Norm)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 10%
(B) AGREE 19
(C) UNDECIDED 24
(D) DISAGREE 36
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 10

56. Showing the works of artists actually contributes to students' ability to originate novel works of art of their own. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 58%
(B) AGREE 37
(C) UNDECIDED 03
(D) DISAGREE 01
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00

58. It is not good to show students the images of adult artists because the influence will prevent them from developing their own original artistic expression. (Norm)

(A) STRONGLY AGREE 01%
(B) AGREE 00
(C) UNDECIDED 03
(D) DISAGREE 34
*(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 61

59. The art program in this system results in some of the most creative student art work to be seen anywhere in the country. (General Belief)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 31%
(B) AGREE 43
(C) UNDECIDED 19
(D) DISAGREE 03
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 03

60. I want my students to use the lessons from the long heritage of art as they create their own original works of art. (Goal)

*(A) STRONGLY AGREE 54%
(B) AGREE 39
(C) UNDECIDED 04
(D) DISAGREE 01
(E) STRONGLY DISAGREE 00
Appendix B

STUDENT BELIEFS ABOUT ART*: MEAN SCORES FOR ALL VIRGINIA BEACH STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Mean Score (All Students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Requires Discipline and Hard Work</td>
<td>4.04 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know About Careers in Art</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the Meaning of Art</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think That Art Instruction is Important</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think it Important to Study the History of Art</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think it Important to Look at Art</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think it Important to Study the Elements and Principles of Design</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think it Important to Study and Recognize Styles of Art</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think That They Have Good Imaginations</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think it Important to Express Feelings Through Art</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think it Important to Study About Abstract Art</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A copy of the 49 item inventory of student beliefs about art maybe obtained from Brent Wilson at The Pennsylvania State University, School of Visual Arts, University Park, PA 16802.

**A score of 5 would indicate the highest cognitive orientation toward the referents of each of the belief subsets.
Appendix C

PERCENTAGES OF SELECTED GROUPS OF VIRGINIA BEACH STUDENTS EMPLOYING THE VARIOUS CONTENT ANALYSIS CLASSIFICATIONS AS THEY DESCRIBED "I AND MY VILLAGE"
PERCENTAGES OF SELECTED GROUPS OF VIRGINIA BEACH STUDENTS EMPLOYING THE VARIOUS CONTENT ANALYSIS CLASSIFICATIONS AS THEY DESCRIBED "I AND MY VILLAGE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Using Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIFTH GRADERS (29)</td>
<td>3 79 17 10 7 48 72 48 93 34 10 24 10 0 28 27 3 7 3 72 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFTED/TALENTED ELEMENTARY (23)</td>
<td>13 91 88 22 4 66 96 30 91 70 60 82 34 0 22 13 0 0 4 66 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR. HIGH ART I (29)</td>
<td>20 93 45 35 10 76 87 21 86 62 69 48 7 0 10 14 7 3 7 62 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL (20) ADVANCE PLACEMENT ART HISTORY STUDENTS</td>
<td>4 85 55 30 0 55 79 30 90 60 60 85 30 5 25 30 20 10 10 45 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

PERCENTAGES OF VIRGINIA BEACH GROUPS RESPONDING CORRECTLY TO KNOWLEDGE-OF-ART MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Fifth Grade (53) %</th>
<th>Gifted &amp; Talented (27) %</th>
<th>Art I (80) %</th>
<th>Art IV (24) %</th>
<th>Advance Placement (20) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Dali as Surrealism</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Dali as the Painter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified the Dali Painting with the Modern Period</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Monet as Impressionism</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Monet as the Painter</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Van Gogh as the Painter</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Picasso as Cubism</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Picasso as the Painter</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified the Picasso with the Modern Period</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Seurat as Pointillism</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Seurat as the Painter</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Matisse and Fauvism</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Matisse as the Painter</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Pollock as Abstract Expressionism</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified the Pollock with America</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>Fifth Grade (53)%</td>
<td>Gifted &amp; Talented (27)%</td>
<td>Art I (80)%</td>
<td>Art IV (24)%</td>
<td>Advance Placement (20)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Rembrandt as the Painter</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Leonardo as the Painter</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified the Leonardo with the Renaissance</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Cathedral as Gothic</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Cave Painting as Prehistoric</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified the Parthenon as Classical</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated the Parthenon with Greece</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated a Mask with Africa</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Contour Line in a Matisse</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Positive Shapes in a Matisse</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified the Effect of Lines in a Matisse</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Matisse as the Painter</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Braque as a Still Life</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified a Braque as Cubism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Reliability Estimate for the Knowledge Battery was .83