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ABSTRACT

Much scholarly criticism has been written about the rapidly changing arts education curricular theories and policies of the last thirty years. These diverse, sometimes polarized, orientations alternately have emphasized curriculum content, instructional methods and evaluation and have advocated for various program structures. The critique often has been ideologically biased and relied on unclear philosophical distinctions. Overly dependent on criticism by individual scholars, practitioners, artist, advocates and policymakers, such critique seldom has documented systematically the broad policy processes and structures that inevitably transform curriculum ideology as policy is formulated. Recognizing, curriculum orientations effect more than student learning, this study examines the influence of these curriculum debates on the formation of ideas, ideas that eventually have informed arts education policy agendas.

Substantial policy research in arts education, however, often is limited due to a lack of reliable policy research methods. This study recognizes a need for a coherent theoretical framework, methodology and model tailored to the needs of policy research in an arts education environment. The philosophical writings of Michel Foucault and his outline of an archeological mode of discourse inquiry are examined for their relevance to idea formation in policy research. Through textual analysis, the model analyses three discourse organizations/communities (the Arts, Education and Americans Panel, The Getty Institute for Education in the Arts, and The Consortium of National Arts Education
Associations) from 1970-2000, the discursive forces operating in their situational context, the conceptual framework behind the organizations’ ideology, and, finally, the discourse strategies used by other and opposing communities simultaneously engaged in advocacy in their respective discourse fields.

The findings of this study demonstrate that Foucault’s theory, methods and the model constructed for this study are respectively relevant, valuable and effective when investigating idea formation in policy formulation. By using Foucault’s suggestions for discourse inquiry, this study revealed that the major importance of curriculum orientations are as advocacy mechanisms; ultimately the formation of ideas in curriculum theories, then, are secondary to negotiations inherent in political and policy discourse.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Within rapidly changing social, political, and policy environments, multiple curriculum orientations have evolved since 1970. And each orientation has promoted a defined educational purpose. George Geahigan (1992) characterizes the curricular “policy streams” in education and art education of the late 1960s and 1970s in four ways. First, one orientation is retrogressively focused on the concerns and needs of students, a form of child-centered education. Secondly, during the last thirty years of the century, educational reformers sought to use the schools for redressing the problems of minorities, a form of social reconstructionism. And, third, Geahigan (1992) identifies the widespread movement toward making the schools more “accountable” through an emphasis upon the “basics” and “testing” as representing “a revival of social efficiency.” (Geahigan, 1992, p. 14) As in the 1960s, the 1980s experienced a revival of concern for “excellence” defined by disciplinary structure and high standards. Simultaneously, Geahigan (1992) asserts “the current interest in cognition and the arts recalls the concerns that dominated education during the period of academic reform.” (Geahigan, 1992, p. 15)

Through program implementation, these curricular “streams” blended with each other by the end of the century. Arts PROPEL, continuing the work of Nelson Goodman, developed a studio-centered approach to promote cognitive functioning and the Getty
Center for Education in the Arts formalized Discipline-Based Arts Education. Both of these streams increasingly broadened their scope to address various social equity and accountability issues centered on multiculturalism, technological development and student assessment. And similarly, both initiatives sought more ways of linking the student with his “real” world experiences through varied interdisciplinary or holistic approaches to learning and by the inclusion of community-based learning through “partnerships.” Paralleling these movements (occupying a prominent position on the national agenda and funded primarily through the National Endowment for the Arts) were programs espousing experiential modes of learning. Centered on the artist-in-schools concept and often relying on the state arts council structure for implementation, these programs exerted a substantial impact on arts education practice and policy.

As early as 1969, Joseph Schwab (1969) described the range of ideas prevalent in curricular inquiry: “One curriculum effort is grounded in concern for the individual, another in concern for groups, others in concern for cultures, communities, societies, minds, or the extant bodies of knowledge.” (Schwab, 1969, p. 6) These diverse, sometimes polarized, world views alternately have emphasized curriculum content, instructional methods and evaluation and have favored various program structures. However, curriculum orientations affect more than student learning. While it is obvious that curriculum dictates what is (and is not) accepted content and instructional practice, it is not always as clear if curriculum orientations also influence and are integral to policy environments beyond the school. The extent that these curriculum debates (often politically controversial and conceptually confused) have influenced the on-going formation of ideas, ideas that eventually informed policy agendas impacting arts
education is unclear. Likewise, the influence of forces within the policy environment on idea formation, agenda setting, policy formulation and, ultimately, on classroom implementation is far from transparent. The continued lack of understanding of these interactions and their impact on the early stages of policy formulation can be attributed in large part to insufficient research in art education policy research.

Without benefit of substantial or reliable policy research, the field has remained overly dependent on criticism by individual arts education scholars, practitioners, artists, advocates and policymakers. As a result, the critique of the multiple policy forces that impact the future of arts education in the nation’s schools often has been ideologically biased and relied on unclear philosophical distinctions. Moreover, such critique seldom systematically has demonstrated an understanding of broad policy processes and structures that inevitably form and transform curriculum policy in its initial stages. Focused on ideological debate, little scholarship has addressed the viability of a given belief system within the policy environment, and/or the elusive political forces of discourse communities, their ideologies, and their political strategies.

Several barriers to policy research in the field are evident. In part, as in other fields of policy research, research in arts education often is focused on policy implementation and program evaluation; identified research issues, established theory and proven methodology continue to support work in these areas. But, on the other hand, the art education field has produced little research that clearly links educational ideology to policy concerns in general; research focused on the early stages of ideological formation and policy formulation is hindered by an uncertainty concerning the nature and linkage between the two processes. More importantly, while some policy issues are
identified through individual criticism, consistent and reliable methodologies derived from commonly used education or policy theories continues to impede research efforts to assess the dynamics of these intertwined areas.

**Statement of the Problem**

Therefore, recognizing the need for a theoretical, and more importantly, a related methodological means of charting the interplay of curriculum ideology, organizational mechanisms, institutional structures and situational forces in policy formulation, this study examines discourse theory and, in particular, Michel Foucault’s theory and methodology as a viable foundation for a policy methodology. The relevance of Foucault’s discourse theory centers around four potential functions. First, it provides an expansive framework for describing the broad ideological and political influences impacting the early stages of policy. Second, Foucault’s mode of discourse inquiry (his discourse principles transposed into a procedural method) provides a systematic analysis of the multiple, unparallel dimensions of political and policy processes. Third, Foucault’s methodology lends itself to the construction of a practical procedural model to gather data on policy interactions within a changing policy environment. Specifically, through an examination and comparison of written texts, this study interprets these interactions of prominent and emerging art education discourse communities and organizations, their contribution to current curricular ideas, their political strategies and their impact on the arts education discourse at the end of the century. In the end, the problem addressed in this study centers on assessing if Foucault’s theory and methodology can function as a reliable approach to arts education policy study, i.e. can it provide insight to idea formation and policy formulation in the field.
Research Questions

Despite some differences, characteristics of discourse analysis examined in this study are often parallel, compatible or complementary to methods used in policy studies. Based on an overview of the policy field in general, the argument presented here is that discourse analysis, a qualitative research methodology, offers another distinct research method to policy researchers. Discourse theory is primarily differentiated from traditional policy science, an area of policy studies, because of its divergence from quantitative research. However, the evolving field of general policy studies corresponds and exhibits affinities to Foucault’s theory (and his procedural recommendations) because of 1) their qualitative orientation, 2) their focus on integrating data within its context to discover new knowledge, and 3) their concentration on policy function rather than policy content. Although they may diverge on data collection and analysis procedures, policy study and discourse analysis offer insight into larger ideological and political realities impacting the formulation, implementation and evaluation of policy.

In order to confirm the value of discourse theory and Foucault’s methodological approach to policy research, the primary question for this study is:

What is the relevance of Foucault’s discourse theory for understanding the relationship of idea formation in arts education discourse to national arts education policy formulation?

Additional questions that clarify the major research question are:

- Does the methodology (and the model) offer a plausible means of explaining relationship of idea formation to curriculum policy discourse and formulation?

- Does the methodology (and the model) provide understanding of idea formation, and its relationship to policy formulation when applied to various contexts and cases?
• Does the methodology (and the model) provide for a focused examination and corroboration of discourse processes related to curriculum policy formulation?

• Does the methodology (and the model) account for researcher bias?

• Are the method and the model consistent with each other and with Foucault’s theory and mode of inquiry?

Rationale for the Study

Believing that unexamined ideas, even those that appear harmless, may have detrimental consequences, this study devises a methodology that attempts to untangle the role of philosophical ideas from the political influences in practical decision making. Research “… shapes people’s perceptions, and provides them with concepts to use in thinking about the work they do.” (Nisbet, 1999, p. 69) Nisbet describes the fundamental and instrumental purposes served by policy research in general education:

Defined narrowly, policy-oriented research is research which has direct application to current issues in educational policy or practice. A wider definition…is that policy oriented research consists of careful, systematic attempts to understand the educational process and, through understanding, to improve its efficiency. (Nisbet, 1999, p. 65)

First, this study is primarily focused on validating a methodology, a fundamental research goal; through Foucault’s focus on idea formation, it attempts to provide a careful and systematic means to detect and analyze the role of perception in policy decision making and the formation of policy concepts. As Nisbet points out, fundamental research may provide the “concepts for the analyses of problems and may even help to identify and define problems.” (Nisbet, 1999, p.65) By redefining the “reality” of the policy environment through a viable policy research methodology, this study provides insight into policy and curricular problems and solutions resulting from limited or inaccurate
conceptualizations. As it investigates underlying paradigms, examines how they are operationalized in a policy environment, and determines their impact on educational processes in arts education, it contributes to building theory in the field of arts education policy research.

Second, reconceptualizing the field via a new methodology also serves several instrumental research goals. Beyond simply providing better tools for theorizing about the field, it can identify underlying and previously unrecognized problems impacting educational effectiveness and institutional efficiency. Nisbet calls it “problem setting:”

Policy-makers and teachers tend to look to research to provide answers to their problems; but research can perform this function only when there is consensus on values, within the framework of accepted policy or in the context of established practice. Researchers are more likely to see the role of research as identifying new problems, or new perspectives on problems–problem setting rather than problem-solving. (Nisbet, 1999, p.68)

Similarly, while this study constructs new knowledge about a specific methodological approach to research problems, it indirectly addresses a broader question about policy evaluation: What criteria are appropriate to describe, analyze, interpret and evaluate the relationship between perceived problems and potential solutions before they are enacted into arts education policy? George Graham (1988) justifies such research: “policy orientation provides a means for dealing with humane purposes in the best scientific framework possible to aid those who will make social choices. The instrumental end is better intelligence.” (Cited in McCool, 1995b, p. 10)

Finally, this study will provide a research model to meet an identified and specific need for research in the field; to identify curricular policy ideologies that are inconsistent, inadequate or competing in such a way as to be a misleading guide to policy formulation. Laura Chapman (1982), discussing the ideologies of practice that have influenced the
“character of theory and research in art education,” comments that “...errors in thought, misperceptions, unquestioned values, and unexplained events can cause a good deal of human misfortune....” (Chapman, 1982, p.102) Likewise, David Pankratz (1998) questions the value systems driving the current interests in arts education research; he reflects on the connection of these values and interests to issues of practice, policy development and advocacy. (Pankratz, 1998, p.2) While there are many areas in the field where such conceptual inconsistencies occur, Liora Bresler (1998) recognizes several distinct factions effecting arts education policy development and suggests a dialogue between researchers, policymakers and practitioners to resolve “the multiple perspectives of these varied constituencies and their distinct underlying goals, commitments, and discursive styles.” (Bresler, 1998, p.1) As a response to these and similar concerns, this study seeks 1) to provide a theoretical and methodological framework for understanding contradictory ideologies embedded in art education curriculum, 2) to trace the transformation and continuity of these ideas in the policy making process, 3) to determine the political factions and strategies through which these ideologies inform arts education policy agendas, and 4) to understand the implications these ideologies have for interfacing policy with arts education practice. While a fundamental task for this study is to assess a discourse methodology, the instrumental rationale is to clarify simultaneously major curricular orientations as they relate to arts education policy agendas and to establish the manner of the ideological “congruence, interaction and disjunction” within arts education communities. (Smith, 1981, p.77)
Theoretical Framework: An Overview

In general, Diane MacDonnell (1986) characterizes discourse theory as constructivist, relationalist, and heterogeneous in nature. (Cited in Jacob Torfing, 1999, p. 3) Robert de Beaugrande (1994) describes discourse (founded in language) “as both structure and event, both knowledge and action, both system and process, both potential and actual.” (de Beaugrande, 1994, p.207) Jacob Torfing (1999), in contrast, emphasizes that “discourse is co-extensive with the social and cannot be reduced to either its semantic or its pragmatic aspects. All actions have meaning, and to produce and disseminate meaning is to act.” (Torfing, 1999, p.94)

Foucault’s theory of discourse emerged within a context of on-going scholarship related to discourse, policy and educational ideologies. Often referred to as “an unbounded group of writings,” ideas about discourse theory can be drawn from the fields of linguistics, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, history, literary criticism and political science. Rooted in the social unrest in many parts of the world during the mid-to-late 1960's, discourse theories offered a new way of conceptualizing and evaluating historical traditions and institutional structures, political processes and their influence on beliefs and values, the formation of individual and cultural identity and the artifacts and symbols that represented them. Following the translation and dissemination of the work of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, researchers in England and America during the 1970s and 1980s applied selected French discourse theory to educational problems.

Paralleling these emerging discourse theories, William Schubert (1986) notes the short history of the policy field in education. He credits Daniel Lerner and Harold Lasswell (1951) along with Stanley E. Balinger (1964) with aligning and even replacing
historical and philosophical foundations of education with educational policy studies that “make problematic and worthy of study any realm of knowledge, that potentially or actually has impact in the public sphere.” (Schubert, 1986, p. 140) With the congruence of scholarship in education and policy studies, several critical discourse theorists began work in educational policy. Writing about diverse aspects of education policy, John Codd (1988), Stephen Ball (1994), Hilary Janks (1997), J. J. Scheurich (1997) and Sandra Taylor (1997) form a general consensus on the nature and formation of social reality which leads them to see the policy phenomenon in educational settings as the result of discourse. However, varied research methods have been offered as ways of turning the theory into practical use. Other theorists such as Norman Faircough (1989), Michael Shapiro (1992) and Jacob Torfing (1999) also have built on the idea of discourse by building models stressing the power relations behind text and language, interactive processes and political influences. The model created in this study is informed directly and indirectly by current and compatible theories and research tools from the fields of discourse studies, public policy, and curriculum studies. However, because this study is concerned with the link between idea formation and policy formulation, it focuses on the relevance of Foucault’s discourse principles as an educational policy research method.

**Significance of the Study**

While seeking detailed and better information about policy making and practice during the last part of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, possibly the study’s major contribution is as a detailed example of discourse analysis used in arts education policy study. Although not a new philosophical perspective, as Pinar et al notes, there has been little effort to map contemporary curriculum discourses employing Foucaultian analysis. (Pinar et al, 2000,
The assumptions behind discourse analysis often are accepted and used in academic parlance without sufficient scrutiny. Certainly, its benefits or weaknesses as a developed methodological tool have not been tested or established firmly in education policy or criticism. Likewise, while literature in policy studies recognizes discourse-like phenomena in various policy processes such as diffusion, convergence and transfer, a language-oriented technique to data gathering and description combined with an integrated, multidimensional approach to analysis (similar to Foucault’s discourse formations) is not evident in the literature.

As Foucault does not provide a developed methodology but rather a mode of inquiry, the construction of an analytic model (based on his “archeological” assumptions) and interpretive procedures (based on his “genealogical” assumptions) to express his theory will expand the field of discourse analysis in general. Drawing upon the varied traditions in the fields of curriculum theory, art education and public policy research, this study will construct a conceptual framework that integrates compatible and complementary ideas, pertinent research processes, and previous knowledge from these disciplinary areas to address the multidisciplinary concerns within arts education policy research. The study provides a multidimensional tool for art education researchers seeking to understand the impact of policy processes on various facets of their educational endeavors.

By constructing a model, additional conceptual distinctions and relationships operating in discourse may be revealed. For example, in the model, discourse registers are created to give specificity to the levels of social complexity within the discourse field. In a similar way, the model of discourse interpretation provides a consistent procedure for
discourse policy comparisons. Working with such models allows a close examination and critique of Foucault’s original assumptions; therefore, its limitations can be noted, and expansions and modifications can be suggested.

Similarly, the methodological intent of this study is to allow language functions in the policy text to reveal ideological/functional relationship categories rather than accept the limitations of traditional categories, classifications, normative rules, metaphors and types of ideologies established in curriculum literature or policy studies. For example, while Eisner (1985, 1994) and others offer categories that are insightful generalizations about ideological concepts, Foucaultian analysis questions the usefulness of educational concepts without an understanding of their discourse relationship. Foucault would maintain these relationships (not specific concepts) form the reality of ideology and can only be discerned on a discourse-by-discourse basis.

At the end of Foucault’s discussion of the formations of discourse, he recognizes that many aspects of his discourse theory and recommendations for analysis remain ambiguous. At times, he appears to refute his own understanding of discourse because of the lingering uncertainties in his theoretical writings. However, although incomplete, his mode of inquiry is tantalizing for the qualitative researcher. Acknowledging that his theory ultimately may not transfer to a workable methodology, Foucault’s suggestions must be operationalized to come to that conclusion. Some ideas must be simplified, restricted, and defined in order to implement them as research tasks. Conversely, other ideas must be expanded or a procedure created to realize Foucault’s overall scheme. Simply put, the major significance of this study is to create a model that completes, in some limited sense, Foucault’s search for a means of validating discourse phenomenon
and to establish the relevance of his methodology as an alternative research approach for policy study in arts education.

**Delimitations and Limitations of the Study**

Despite the scope and flexibility offered by Foucault’s discourse theory and methodology, it still delimits this study in certain areas. Based on text analysis, the methodology is dependent on the availability of “rich” texts, texts that address topics or populations important to arts education policy study. Few texts in arts education seldom address directly curriculum as policy or provide curriculum statements revealing underlying policy concerns and/or strategies. Similarly, finding “unheard” voices in a discourse field, voices not represented by published texts, is a limitation of any study relying on textual analysis. Finally, policy documents rely, as a matter of course, on overly simplified statements intended to appeal to a broad spectrum of stakeholders. By choosing to examine only curriculum policy statements and not choosing to examine documents intended for more limited audiences and purposes, this study may not reveal some of consistencies or inconsistencies in a discourse community’s ideology.

The choice of Foucault’s methodology and its transposition into a policy model creates problems of focus and emphasis in analysis. In one respect, the broad historical scope (1970-present) and focus on government and federal institutions of this methodology may result in a lack of specific facts and issues of general education and the arts world; although addressed briefly in Foucault’s final formation, these “domains” are significant influences on arts education discourse. In reverse, the study’s focus on individual organizations/communities may overshadow the less obvious “trends” in the field of arts education as well as the larger political and structural changes surrounding
the field. Finally, the emphasis on organizations and, to a lesser extent, institutions diminishes the focus on individual discursive practice, which is a very strong discursive influence in a relatively small field.

General research problems result from the translation of Foucault’s theory and methodology to a policy model. First, the model is subject to occasional inconsistencies and/or ambiguities resulting from translating and aggregating concepts from Foucault’s collected theoretical writings. There are difficulties resulting from translating general philosophical abstractions to specific procedures and data collection tasks. Secondly, Foucault’s discourse analysis applied to policy is primarily descriptive and analytic rather than evaluative in nature; it is “limited” to providing information about discourse relationships. A secondary set of procedures, based on Foucault’s genealogical argument must be constructed and incorporated into the methodology to interpret and evaluate policy processes. Finally, while raising awareness of particular policy discourse patterns, discourse interpretations remain aggregated “truths;” they, as with other qualitative methods, may not be generalizable or even transferable.

**Definition of Terms**

**Ideology and Curriculum Orientation**

For the purposes of this study, “ideology” is a fairly coherent set of beliefs and values modified and developed as an interactive response to social and cultural phenomena; in part, its form is historical. Ideologies rely on a few simple, often unquestioned assumptions or implicit ideas about human nature derived from accumulated or aggregated experience. Such assumptions usually present social reality as a closed system, a structural totality. Often resisting linear, theoretical justifications,
ideologies often convey meaning and attribute value by dialectical interaction. From this perspective, an ideology is unable to exist independent of opposition. Because the goal of ideology often is to guide action to an expected or predetermined end, the term has acquired a pejorative connotation: Smith (1981) refers to “mere” ideology and James Sherry (1999) characterizes such ideologies as inconsistent doctrines designed “to support an unspecified or obscured source of values.” It is “a system of beliefs that makes a priori choices for followers rather than presents the real alternatives.” (Sherry, 1999, p. 242) While the explicit “curriculum ideology” is usually found in a stated purpose, its ideology must be interpreted from curricular subtext, from its choice of content, and from recommended practices. Existing outside of the stated or even the subtext of the written curriculum, Eisner (1985) refers to these value-laden and layered habits and relationships within the school culture as the “implicit” curriculum. They reflect the priorities of the common ideology of the school and, once established, they continue as ideological forms to reinforce those values. Nonetheless, all of the facets of curriculum represent knowledge chosen, organized and acted upon according to a system of beliefs and values. However, whether reactionary, conservative, or progressive in ideology, when curriculum functions, as a matter of course, to include or to exclude certain content or practice, it functions as policy.

**Policy and Curriculum Policy**

For the purposes of this study, “policy” is the decision making of political communities through established processes and structures in response to perceived problems. Policy is fluid, often described as “incremental,” and its definition often changes across specialized areas. It is stabilized by historical and institutional forms and
by non-discursive situational issues. Specifically, “curriculum policy” is an explicit design for action; usually it guides learning activities developed for use in a specific situation. Recognizing curriculum is a function of decision making, Schubert declares “the need to treat curriculum as a policy problem.” And, he concludes that policy creation is, at least, one goal of any curriculum. (Schubert, 1986, p.140) Finally, accepting Schubert’s (1986) depiction of curriculum as a form or subset of policy, “an integrative and interdisciplinary enterprise,” curriculum-as-policy will be treated in this study as a subset of the larger field of policy studies and curricular orientations will be treated as policy matters rather than as educational ones. (Schubert, 1986, p.10) These definitions highlight the need for a methodology to examine difficult, interrelated social, institutional and educational issues without dissecting and distorting them.

Summary

This study seeks to validate Foucault’s discourse theory and mode of inquiry by applying it as a model to art education policy study. Through the identification of new data, previously missing and/or marginalized relationships, documented discourse influence and transfer, this study assesses the effects of discourse on curricular idea formation and evaluates the strategies and interventions exercised in arts education policy formulation over a 30-year period of time. Hilary Janks (1997) notes that “methodological questions about what “data” are needed for analysis and how that material is collected have been less important in critical policy work than the theoretical frameworks which are used and the questions which are asked.” (Janks, 1997, p.23) Hopefully, this study offers a methodological framework and a data collection model that addresses that concern.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Accepting William Schubert’s (1986) description of curriculum as a form or subset of policy, “an integrative and interdisciplinary enterprise,” this literature review surveys the major issues in three related disciplinary areas impacted by discourse activity. (Schubert, 1981, p.10) While the focus of this study is Foucault’s theoretical and methodological contribution to discourse research, the parallel efforts in public policy, educational policy and art education policy demonstrate a growing awareness of discourse phenomenon and an understanding of methodological need to document its effects. By examining and integrating relevant concepts from other fields of study, this study constructs a discourse analysis model to analyze the elusive policy phenomena in arts education policy. Drawing from these related fields as well as discourse theories and language systems analysis, this review of literature seek 1) to clarify parallel concepts and ideas used to characterize policy, 2) to examine theories and methodologies established for policy study and 3) to evaluate frameworks or models for policy interpretation. The goal of this study is to construct a policy discourse model based on Foucault’s views which is fully informed by research methodologies in related disciplines.
Relevant Theory and Research Literature: Policy Studies

Defining policy and, particularly, identifying its formative stages is inherently difficult because, as Daniel McCool (1995) says, “policy does not exist in discrete units; it is part of a complex system without clear demarcations. How does one study a subject without a beginning or an end, without parameters?” (McCool, 1995b, p.4) However, according to Robert Salisbury (1995), although the “notion” of policy is debated heavily, three positions have emerged in the field that parallel levels of discourse practice: policy is “the authoritative allocation of values for the whole society,” policy is “a general frame of authoritative rules...the precise boundary between policy and nonpolicy is nearly always debatable in the particular situation....” and policy is “political behavior [which] is goal-oriented or purposive.” (Salisbury, 1995, p.34) Within this framework of values, conventions (or rules) and political behavior, Stella Theodoulou (1995) describes policy as:

…deliberative, staged recursive, and administrative. Policy making is thus seen as a dynamic ongoing process confirming the importance of policy as a learning system. Policies are described in two different but important senses: how they are made and how they can be made better. (Theodoulou, 1995, p.5)

Although these “notions” are not necessarily inaccurate, they are elusive and, as such, explain the many research methods used to study policy. McCool (1995) explains policy studies until the last decade:

At one extreme, many studies of policy were descriptive and atheoretical. In many cases the ideological bias of the author was much in evidence. At the other extreme a very technical literature with an exclusive emphasis on empirical methodology developed under the rubric of policy analysis. (McCool, 1995b, p.5)

But as McCool implies, within the last decade theories and methods for studying the phenomenon of policy have evolved that focus on issues of importance in this study;
namely, theories and methods that can be characterized as non-linear, focused on processes of stability and change, and concerned with the transfer of policy ideas.

Until recently in the United States, the underlying values, conventions and behaviors of policymaking often have been characterized as embedded in a linear process of policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation. Nonetheless, theorists, such as John Kingdon (1995), view the policy components of values, conventions and behaviors as simultaneously existing in a policy environment and occurring together in a non-linear and interactive manner similar to Foucault’s description of “conditions of possibilities.” Kingdon describes the policy context as the diverse, intentional and unintentional influences behind policy decisions. Kingdon, for instance, might depict particular curriculum policy orientations, a system of articulated values, as a “policy stream” within a policy context. By viewing curricular ideas and their historical forms as a public policy stream, Kingdon might see them as subjected to established conventions of structures and processes of various sorts that change and narrow them into policy alternatives.

Likewise, in this environment, ideas routinely are adjusted to fit the immediate political strategies and behaviors of policymakers. Kingdon expresses the relationship of these ideas metaphorically:

The generation of policy alternatives is best seen as a selection process, analogous to biological natural selection. In what we have called the policy primeval soup, many ideas float around, bumping into one another, encountering new ideas, and forming combinations and recombinations. The origins of policy may seem a bit obscure, hard to predict and hard to understand or to structure. (Kingdon, 1995, p.109)

Implying that every policymaking decision is unique because of the diverse alternatives available to policy decision makers, Kingdon states: “...political events flow along according to their own dynamics and their own rules.” (Kingdon, 1995, p.107)
Continuing with his metaphor of natural selection, he explains that while the origins of policy ideas are somewhat haphazard and usually chance occurrences, “the selection is not.” (Kingdon, 1995, p.109) First, the larger social and political tenor of the times leads to the identification or recognition of a problem. Finally, the selection of policy streams (or curriculum orientations), relies on the same criteria according to Kingdon: “the ability of policymakers to anticipate technical feasibility, congruence with the values of community members, and the anticipation of future constraints... public acceptability, and politicians’ receptivity.” (Kingdon, 1995, p.109)

Similarly, offering an alternative to non-linear policy models, Charles Lindblom (1995) proposes an approach that views policy formation as “incremental.” Favoring comparative analysis over theory, his policy development model of “Successive Limited Comparisons” holds that value goals and policy actions are simultaneous; they “are not distinct from one another but are closely intertwined.” (Lindblom, 1995, p.116) Because the means and ends of policy often are not distinct, he maintains that the “rational” view of policy formation is “often inappropriate or limited” and/or leads to unrealistic decision making alternatives and policy expectations. “Incremental” approaches, on the other hand, have “formative evaluation” embedded in the process and allow for immediate course correction in policy decision making. For Lindblom, while narrowing the scope of “relevant” information and alternatives is a practical response of policy makers to an ever-changing policy context, such a model does not recognize or emphasize broader influences in the policy environment and makes decision making vulnerable to unexpected circumstances. Because of its focus on the individual case and because it acknowledges and addresses only the pragmatic needs and practices found in most policy
making situations, Lindblom’s view of policymaking lacks comprehensiveness. But, importantly, Lindblom presents a view of policymaking that is an interactive process; that recognizes the multifaceted, multileveled, multidimensional influences and interactive aspects of incremental policy formation, a reflection of the idea formation underlying policy action.

Other policy theorists focus on specific processes effecting policy objects (i.e. curricular goals, content, organization, implementation techniques, etc.) as they move through or in a policy environment and undergo the interaction of values, conventions and behaviors of organizations, institutions and communities. Besides a focus on group values, two areas in the literature that deal with policy innovation through agents of stability and change and processes of policy diffusion, convergence and transfer are of particular interest in this study.

For the most part, the literature on policy stability and change explores the dissemination of policy ideas through institutional and/or organizational sites and structures; it often includes an examination of both macro level contextual or situational influences and micro level internal processes of policymaking communities. Often policy stability is examined in models such as the advocacy coalition framework devised by Sabatier (1988), and, recently Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1999). Minstrom and Vergari see coalitions founded in “its members’ shared beliefs over core policy matters.” (Minstrom & Vergari, 1996, p. 421) Sabatier (1988) defines an advocacy coalition as:

…people from a variety of positions (elected and agency officials, interest group leaders, researchers, etc.) who share a particular belief system— for example, a set of basic values, causal assumptions, and problem perceptions—and who show a nontrivial degree of coordinated activity over time. (Cited in Minstrom & Vergari, 1996, p. 421)
Seen as part of a larger policy subsystem, coalitions make significant policy change in reaction to events outside of the policy subsystem according to Minstrom and Vergari (1996). This perspective focuses on the influences of the situational context and the response of the coalition and/or policy subsystem to those influences. Rather than viewing organizations as agents of change, organizations are seen as agents of long term stability. Policy making is seen as a reaction formation. And, these models chart patterns of organizational behaviors that direct “our attention to thinking about the ways that belief structures arise and adjust over time to bring stability to a policy subsystem.” (Minstrom & Vergari, 1996, p. 422)

Conversely, the policy change literature is more concerned with the reasons for the acceptance or rejection of certain policy ideas by organizations and coalitions in short-term decision making processes, decisions often made in crisis situations. This literature addresses specific, radical and active behaviors of change agents often referred to as policy entrepreneurs. Minstrom and Vergari describe such agents by their activities: they identify and define problems, they shape the terms of policy debates, they network in policy circles and they build coalitions. (Minstrom & Vergari, 1996, p. 423)

Seeking an approach that presents the combined elements of the advocacy coalition framework (Sabatier, 1988; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993) and studies of policy entrepreneurs and agenda setting literature such as Kingdon (1995), Minstrom and Vergari (1996) have built a model designed to reveal complementary aspects of policy stability and change. Showing the interrelationship with “politics of ideas” and change agents, Minstrom and Vergari (1996) examine four aspects that shape policymaking in a policy community: the scope of the community, the relevant time-frame, the degree of
structure in the policymaking process and the origins of crisis or incentive events. (Minstrom & Vergari, 1996, p. 424) Their model deals with multiple, but essential components in the formation of policy ideas and, therefore, policy alternatives.

Policy diffusion, convergence and policy transfer literature, on the other hand, provides insight about the patterns of both unintentional selection and the intentional strategies of choice derived from ideational alternatives. Policy transfer literature, an umbrella category for more specific types of policy innovation processes, deals with why and in what ways those processes (and, indirectly, the specific content) are influenced by the interdependence of policy environments. According to Dolowitz and Marsh (1996), policy transfer refers to:

... a process in which knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, institutions etc, in one time and/or place is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements and institutions in another time and/or place. (Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996, p. 343)

Evans and Davies (1999) and others working in this area attempt to draw more narrow concepts such as policy diffusion, policy convergence, and policy learning and lesson drawing together and present them as related dimensions of policy transfer. Policy diffusion deals (almost exclusively) with how a policy (or its elements) travels established pathways between contemporary policy environments; these theories often consider these patterns without addressing policy content. Policy convergence, on the other hand, deals broadly with unintentional, simultaneously created, similar policies stimulated by the same or similar contextual issues or problems; Bennett (1991) and others examine a range of data about content, structures, processes and function for evidence of convergence. Operating under the assumption that societies grow more alike, Bennett (1991) views convergence as temporal (rather than spatial) and dynamic (rather
than static) in nature. Therefore, he temporally brackets policy environments for comparative study. He contends that “Convergence implies a pattern of development over time....a condition of divergence or variability from some former stage.” (Bennett, 1991, p.219) Policy learning and lesson drawing literature (Rose, 1993) considers policy content as essential and integral to understanding transfer processes. For the most part, policy learning assumes policy is a rational, intentional choice or action and occurs because of the common values and routine behaviors and methods of independent policy actors. Some theorists in this area focus specifically on the strategic decisions of individual policymakers. However, Wolman and Page (2002) expand the concept of “learning” when applied to organizations:

...when individuals [usually identified by organizational position and representing multiple roles] acting on behalf of an organization and interacting with others in their organizations learn in such a way that the beliefs, attitudes, or values of relevant organizational members change and—in the case of policy transfer—organizational behavior changes. (Wolman & Page, 2002, p. 478)

Generally, in policy learning theories, the transfer of information, often is characterized as a communication process, it is viewed as rational and linear in nature and strategic decision making is seen as following patterns of information processing, assessment and utilization. (Wolman & Page, 2002, p. 479)

Paralleling these claims, Evans and Davies do not see policy transfer and policymaking as necessarily rational, but based on the subjective perceptions of policy actors. They conclude:

...policy making is not inevitably, or perhaps even usually, a rational process. Rather, it is often a messy process in which different policy solutions, and problem streams need to combine at the appropriate moment for a policy to develop. (Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996, p. 356)
Policy transfer, then, has a multidisciplinary character without the benefit of “a common idiom or a unified theoretical or methodological discourse from which lessons can be drawn and hypotheses developed.” (Evans & Davies, 1999, p. 361) Seeking a model for addressing the micro- and macro-level processes that mediate between the influences of the institutional structures and the individual policymaker, Evans and Davies (1999) suggest a meso-level analytical tool; a model that charts the “multi-layered, self organizing, interorganizational networks” of policy transfer; its “properties and relationships.” (Evans & Davies, 1999, p. 363) They propose a three-level framework (global, macro level of the state and interorganizational) for charting multiple influences and a very linear, twelve-step sequence to validate empirically that policy transfer has occurred. The subject of analysis in their model is the attempt, process or occurrence of transfer; their research goal is to provide “evidence of non-transfer,” “evidence of transfer” including “soft transfer” (ideas, concepts, attitudes) and “hard transfer” (elements of programs and implementation practices), and “degree of transfer.”

Similar to policy stability/change literature, policy transfer literature accepts the importance of the larger social issues and problems as reasons for transfer processes; Bennett, for example, theorizes that policy convergence results for the following reasons: the search for an optimum set of social arrangements, the influence of planning by a techno structure, replacement of an ideological with a pragmatic imperative, and the leveling impact of technology. But Bennett also is interested in the motivations and objects of convergence as revealed in individual circumstances. (Bennett, 1991, p. 216) For instance, he focuses on the structural and procedural details of convergence using case studies.
...it is not enough to say that comparable conditions produce comparable problems which produce comparable policies. There are also different political mechanisms, operating at the level of middle-range theory, through which policies might converge. (Bennett, 1991, p. 217)

As a result of attention to specific cases, much of the literature on convergence is based on different types of data and, therefore, the parallels are difficult to establish at the theoretical level.

Conversely, the organizational motivations (expression of producers, senders disseminators of information discussed by Wolman and Page) for policy change and/or transfer suggested in the literature have a good deal of similarity: emulation based on collective insecurity, elite networking among policy communities seeking to share expertise, harmonization resulting from perceived interdependence, and by an expression of power are the reasons for convergence suggested by Bennett. He proposes different types of evidence for each of these processes. (Bennett, 1991, pp. 220-229) Others, such as Evans and Davis (1999), see transfer displayed in similar processes (copying, emulation, hybridization, synthesis, inspiration), but they also recognize degrees in policy transfer motivated by utility of the moment. Equally, historical sources of policy lessons (the practice of the country, the organization, other political systems, etc.) and factors constraining policy transfer (program complexity, already established policy, resources limitations, etc) complete the agenda for researchers investigating the motivations or conditions necessary for transfer.

Both convergence and/or transfer theories focus on similar, but not always the same, objects of policy innovation. (Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996; Bennett, 1991; Evans & Davies, 1999; Wolman & Page, 2002)

• Policy Ideology: based in ideas, attitudes and concepts
• Policy goals: based in problem definition or intent on dealing with common problems
• Policy content/structure: based in organization of statutes, administrative rules/regulations, court decisions
• Policy instruments: based in tools to regulate, administer or adjudicate
• Policy outcomes: based in impacts, consequences, evaluation
• Policy style: based in types of response (conflict/consensus, incremental/rational, anticipatory/reactive, corporatist/plural)

Although these categories are well represented in the literature of policy transfer, Bennett warns that:

These distinctions, however, hardly represent sharply defined analytical categories. They tend to slice policy making into overly mechanistic and linear stages and are probably insensitive to the shifting and interactive processes of feedback that shape policy content. (Bennett, 1991, p. 218)

Each policy object discussed here might be considered as another manifestation of the community’s ideology.

The transfer literature reveals several slightly different conceptualizations of agents; for instance, March and Rhodes (1992) are concerned with the policy community, Haas (1997) focuses on the epistemic community, and Evans and Davis (1999) describe the policy transfer network. Nonetheless, at the interorganizational level, according to Evans and Davies (1999), several integrated aspects of transfer must be understood: the network of interorganizational policy communities and politics, the individuals representing the community’s processes of acquiring and utilizing knowledge, and those who function as “policy entrepreneur, key bureaucrats, politicians or privileged groups.” (Evans & Davies, 1999, p. 374)

Similarly, according to Dolowitz and Marsh (1996), transfer literature typically identifies categories of policy actors as elected officials, political parties, bureaucrats/civil servants, pressure groups, policy entrepreneurs/experts and supra-
national institutions. (Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996, p. 345) While, for this study, the role of policy entrepreneur representing the organization is relevant, the total community’s rationale for their decision making strategies and their exercise of or response to external power and influence are particularly important.

The major limitations of policy transfer theories are twofold for Dolowitz and Marsh; they maintain these theories emphasize pluralistic perspectives of multiple influences without fully acknowledging structural or institutional constraints on decision making. (Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996; March & Olsen 1989) And, moreover, such theories typically do not acknowledge that problem definition is a social or institutional construction. They maintain:

...it is not possible to explain policy transfer solely in terms of the decisions of political actors. The strategic decisions of actors are taken in a context which is mostly not of their making and which is characterized by structured inequality. (Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996, p. 355)

They continue:

We need to recognize that political actors operate within structural constraints. Some of the constraints derive from the political institutions within which actors operate; others are economic in origin based upon the structured inequality which characterizes societies. (Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996, p. 356)

Overall, despite the focus on processes, the policy convergence/transfer models reveal a weakness in charting functional relationships between levels and structures whether global, transnational, international, domestic (national, regional and local) and interorganizational, organizational and individual agents, mechanisms of transfer. Although many theorists in policy transfer restrict analysis to intentional learning which takes place on a conscious level and leads to specific decision making, the patterns of relationships between the domestic structures (economic, technological, ideological or
institutional) and the interorganizational and organizational agents are of equal importance in understanding the influence and transfer of ideas. These relationships may or may not be intentional and may or may not result in actual policy change, yet they do represent forces that shape policy. Although Evans and Davis (1999) maintain the focus of policy transfer analysis should be on “remarkable” change (which they believe is seldom at the organizational or micro-level and is most obvious on the intra-organizational level and above (the macro-level), they conclude: “There needs to be some account of how interorganizational relationships develop and help to precipitate processes of transfer.” (Evans & Davies, 1999, p. 365)

In a tradition of typologies centered on the multi-faceted policy phenomenon, public policy studies also offer parallel perspectives to a discourse analysis of communities. One of the concepts from public policy most applicable to interpretation of discourse findings is Lowi’s typologies of policy functions. In Steinberger’s discussion of the Lowi tradition, he delivers a persuasive argument that, for the most part, typologies represent multiple dimensions of policy which provide compatible and/or complementary perspectives. “It would seem, most importantly, that none of the typologies are antithetical to any of the others......each typology simply reflects one of the several ways in which policies can be conceptualized.” (Steinberger, 1995, p. 228) When Steinberger (1995) describes the former:

...insight of the typological traditions is not in its analysis of “objective” policy characteristics. Rather, the best of typologies are plausible and useful in that they describe (or, rather, can be used to describe) typifications that are generally and commonly employed by participants in the political process to define public policies. In other words, they are insightful in elucidating and in specifying socially constructed meanings. (Steinberger, 1995, p. 224)
In this respect, Steinberger (1995) is similar to Bennett (1991) who acknowledges that policy convergence, in particular, “is not a coherent theoretical position.” (Bennett, 1991, p. 230) Similarly, Evans and Davies (1999) recognize that their suggested policy analysis model does not have the status of theory. Nonetheless, they maintain “a sound model is not necessarily one that purely explains or predicts with precision;” it is, however, “rich with implications.” (Evans & Davies, 1999, p. 364)

Models proposed in the literature of policy stability/change and policy convergence/transfer address many of the same research goals and issues found in Foucault’s discourse analysis. By combining the corresponding principles of discourse and policy analysis (indeed, viewing discourse analysis as another means of gathering data in policy analysis), the comparative explanation of policy functions which is the focus of Foucault’s writings, can produce a model to address similar issues found in policy studies, particularly underlying social and political events and trends in the situational context, the effects of organizational attributes, and the formation of ideological constructs leading to policy formulation and policymaking strategies (as revealed through written texts). Overall, the following issues of policy inquiry specific to arts education can be addressed: What is the dominant curriculum discourses manifest in arts education policy? What are possible social and political effects of a curriculum orientation on arts education policy discourse and vise versa? Typically, how is a policy discourse community in art education structured? What are its mechanisms of policy influence and transfer? How policy discourses ideologies are formed, are institutionalized and how they function in this field? As these questions about policy practices are posed, additional typologies (gained through Foucault’s genealogical interpretation) may
provide answers to *why* a particular curricular orientation has the power to drive policy.

“They [policy functions] are not actively debated but emerge as a result of changing interests within a society that locate persons in various roles and distribute authority and responsibility differently.” (Shapiro, 1981, p. 148)

**Specific Theory and Research Literature: Education Policy Discourse**

In general, discourse analysis looks for patterns of relationships resulting from interdependence between text content, structures, processes, and behaviors. It assumes that there are "rules" underlying these interactions. This approach applied to education policy views the policy environment as 1) subjectively conceived, 2) incrementally constructed, 3) institutionally or structurally limited, and 4) a reflection of political power within a society. Although not intended as such, Foucault’s analytic procedures present a somewhat unevenly developed guide to the construction of a research instrument or model to describe and analyze the underlying patterns of policy interactions. While heavily dependent on describing and analyzing these patterns, Foucault’s methodology neither gives a model for analysis, nor does he provide extensive or ample examples to demonstrate his procedures.

Nonetheless, several educational and discourse theorists’ discourse perspectives have provided models which are helpful in building a tool of analysis for this study. Theorists writing about various aspects of education policy form a general consensus on subjective formation of social reality which leads them to see the policy ideology as a phenomenon of discourse. More specifically, other theorists recognize the need to clarify language usage, participants and processes, and political frameworks as mediating influences on policy formulation. Still others focus on contextual limitations on policy
development. While they may disagree on the specifics of policy or discourse definitions, they agree with or are compatible on many theoretical points. However, their analytical focus, their methodological point of departure differs; some begin with text and language analysis, others are concerned with interactions and processes and still others are primarily interested in contextual analysis; all are concerned with the policy as a tool of political power.

John Codd (1988) maintains that policy discourse constructs new ideologies, ideologies that are evolving forms of social control. The ideological mechanisms of social control, Codd believes, are embedded in policy documents which “legitimate the power of the state and contribute fundamentally to the “engineering” of consent. Such texts contain divergent meanings, contradictions and structured omissions, so that different effects are produced on different readers.” (Codd, 1988, p. 235) The manner in which documents engineer public consent of policy is through language:

…constructing particular meanings and signs that work to mask social conflict and foster commitment to the notion of universal public interest. In this way, policy documents produce real social effects through the production and maintenance of consent.” (Codd, 1988, 237)

To identify and understand these textual mechanisms, Hilary Janks (1997) focuses on the signifiers that make up the text, the specific linguistic selection, juxtaposition, sequencing, and layout. “It is in the interconnections that the analyst finds interesting patterns and disjunctions that need to be described, interpreted and explained.” (Janks, 1997, p. 329) However, such analysis also requires that the historical determinations of these selections be recognized in order to understand that these linguistic and textual choices are tied to the “conditions of possibility.” (Janks, 1997, p. 329)
Norman Faircough (1989) delineates the place of language within the framework of ideas known as “discourse.” He presents a visual model of discourse roughly equivalent to discourse elements which provides a point of departure in designing a rubric for policy text analysis. First, he maintains that language is a social practice determined by social structures; it is simultaneously a part of society, a social process and a socially conditioned process influenced by other (non-linguistic) parts of society. (Faircough, 1989, p.22) His “levels” of social organization are equated to Text (the immediate social environment), Interaction (a wider matrix for discourse processes) and Context (society as a whole). Faircough also suggests that this structure generates the appropriate method of analysis: description of text, analysis of the relationship between text and processes of production and interpretation of the relationship between these interactions and the social context. (Faircough, 1989, p.26) He does qualify his method of analysis in the following manner:

...analysis at the description stage differs from analysis at the interpretation and explanation stages. In the case of description, analysis is generally thought of as a matter of identifying and ‘labeling’ formal features of a text in terms of the categories of a descriptive framework.” (Faircough, 1989, p.26)

Unlike some who write about discourse ideas, Faircough clearly distinguishes discourse from written or transcribed language text: A text is an artifact rather than a process. Discourse, for Faircough, is a process that produces the text and the process of interpretation of the text, “for which the text is a resource.” (Faircough, 1989, p.24) But he suggests “we ought to be concerned with the processes of producing and interpreting texts, and with how these cognitive processes are socially shaped and relative to social conventions, not just with texts themselves.” (Faircough, 1989, p.19)
Jacob Torfing (1999) finds the language “bridge” built of symbolic codes that connects the discourse subject on the cognitive level with the text, guides the discourse and connects all these elements to the situational context. Approaching language as a cognitive building block, Torfing clarifies how language functions in discourse; how it creates a succession of discursive identities (or objects) and draws distinctions of equivalent and difference in the continuous, undifferentiated contextual conditions. For the discourse subject, “floating signifiers” temporarily fix ideological meaning and direct the subject’s discursive choices. While Foucault viewed ‘nodal points” as identifiable rationalizations for discoursal choice, Torfing sees them as a “…consequence of their reference to a certain symbolic code. As such, the conception of nodal points reveals the secret of metaphors: their capacity to unify a certain discourse by partially fixing the identity of its moments.” (Torfing, 1999, p.99) Torfing maintains that various idea configurations employ devises of metonymy and metaphor and present discourse participants with new and continuous discursive options. Cognitively speaking, “The tension between the differential and equivalent aspects of discursive identities is irresolvable, but political struggles may succeed in emphasizing one of the two aspects.” (Torfing, 1999, p.97) Regardless of the discourse emphasis or the subject’s choices, such cognitive dichotomies strengthen a tendency of discourse to designate concepts in ideological opposition. Therefore, at the symbolic level, language has the capacity to influence or change discourse interactions by either condensation or displacement of meaning (metaphor or metonymy).

With an another analytical focus, Codd cautions that the ideological mechanisms are not only found in textual analysis; discourse meaning is not simply
symbolic, it is inscribed in an on-going interactions in the discourse process. (Codd, 1988, p.242) For instance, concerned with “policy as text/discourse” in educational policy, Ball (1994) emphasizes the incremental processes of policy formation:

Policies shift and change their meaning in the arenas of politics; representations change, key interpreters...change.... Policies have their own momentum inside the state; purposes and intentions are reworked and reoriented over time. The problems faced by the state change over time. Policies are represented differently by different actors and interests.... (Ball, 1994, p.17)

Because the facets of policy, politics and power constantly change, Ball rejects the idea of a prescribed sequence or formula in educational policy making and he views educational policy outcomes as open-ended and unpredictable. Similarly, Faircough supports Torfing’s explanation of cognitive interpretation but, simultaneously, states that discourse analysis additionally requires the “social conditions of production” and the “social conditions of interpretation.” (Faircough, 1989, p. 25) Text analysis, then, is only a part of discourse analysis, which also includes analysis of productive and interpretative processes. “The formal properties of a text can be regarded from the perspective of discourse analysis on the one hand as traces of the productive process, and on the other hand as cues in the process of interpretation.” (Faircough, 1989, p. 24)

Examining the policy context or environment, Faircough summarizes the dimensions and their relationships:

In the case of interpretation, it is the cognitive processes of participants, and in the case of explanation, it is relationships between transitory social events (interactions), and more durable social structures which shape and are shaped by these events. (Faircough, 1989, p.27)

Even more concerned with contextual influences than Faircough, Peters and Marshall (1996) begin discourse analysis with isolating “the problem” within the wider policy context in order “to explicate the official values and interests behind “received”
(interpreted) definitions and to trace the history of the ‘the problem’ in official policy discourse. Then, they demonstrate how discourse rules are established and parameters set, identify the enabling and disabling structures to policy acceptance, uncover key political and policy processes, and, finally, they define “the problem” as it is revealed in the text. (Peters & Marshall, 1996, p.138)

Discourse emphasizes the importance of the social fabric that holds educational policy together and the language that defines its ideologies. According to Faircough, “These conventions and orders of discourse, moreover, embody particular ideologies” which contribute to both social continuity and social change. (Faircough, 1989, p.28) Although Codd (1988) also views educational policy statements as ideological texts, likewise, he assumes they are produced in a particular political context and, accordingly, the task of understanding the effects on education begins with the recognition of that context. (Codd, 1988, p.243) Citing Richard Rorty and other postmodernists, Peters and Marshall (1996) maintain “any attempt to provide a problem orientation in applied social sciences as seriously deficient should it exclude the consideration of context–the milieu or environs of the text or the text-analogue.” (Peters & Marshall, 1996, p.142) Sandra Taylor (1997) reinforces the need for contextual analysis of policy documents acknowledging the historical differences in language usage: “Differences in terminology reflect the particular historical and cultural context, and have implication for the ways in which particular concepts are used and understood.” (Taylor, 1997, p. 28) Discourse theory can be used to explore particular policies in their historical context; tracing how policy “problems” are constructed and defined and how particular issues get to be on the policy agenda. It is also useful in highlighting how policies come to be framed in certain
ways–reflecting how economic, social, political and cultural context shape both the
content and language of policy documents.” (Taylor, 1997, p. 28) Discourse analysis of
curriculum ideologies and their function in educational policy rests to a great extent on
the identification of these recurring patterns of meaning found in policy texts, interactions
and contextual issues: “for identifying and isolating potential areas of contestations
between stakeholders and for tracing the theoretical and/or value origin of these
differences.” (Peters & Marshall, 1996, p.139)

Finally, and very important for this study, Faircough sees these “orders of
discourse” are ideologically shaped by power relations in social institutions and in
society as a whole (Faircough, 1989, p.17) He also acknowledges that “...languages
appear to be the products of social conditions specific to a particular historical epoch.”
(Faircough, 1989, p.21)

How discourses are structured in a given order of discourse, and how structures
change over time, are determined by changing relationships of power at the level
of social institution or of the society. Power at these levels includes the capacity
to control orders of discourse; one aspect of such control is ideological–ensuring
that orders of discourse are ideologically harmonized internally or (at the societal
level) with each other. (Faircough, 1989, p.30)

Questioning the implications of discourse theory for human agency within such
powerful discourse forces, Sinfield (1998) asks: “If we come to consciousness within a
language that is continuous with the power structures that sustain the social order, how
can we conceive, let alone organize, resistance?” (Sinfield, 1998, p. 809) Janks (1997)
responds by advocating a critical discourse theory. While agreeing with Faircough that
language is a part of social practice, she maintains the interactions of the discourse field
and their connection with the larger society must be framed and explained as political
theory. Similar to Foucault, Janks understands language as ideologically shaped by power
relations in social institutions. “Ideological power, the power to project one’s practices as universal and ‘common sense,’ is a significant complement to economic and political power, and of particular significance here because it is exercised in discourse.” (Janks, 1997, p. 33) From this perspective, then, language can reveal the unequal distribution of power in the society. And, uncovering these “common sense” ideologies is a paradigmatic purpose for critical discourse analysis; it provides the means for individuals to resist total subjectivity.

**Art Education Curriculum Theory and Criticism**

Using the Penn State conference of 1965 as a pivotal policy event, subsequent scholarship reveals the growing awareness of the discourse phenomenon as a factor in arts education research. The following discussion 1) situates curricular orientations and their proponents during the time frame of this study, 2) examines common means of conceptualizing educational virtue found in curriculum criticism, and 3) discusses distinctions between curricular concepts and curricular processes influence by discourse theories. Finally, 4) this discussion charts common ideological lenses impacting the formulation of contemporary arts education policy.

The curriculum literature starting in the early 1960's reveals the seeds of curricular research for the next four decades. de Beauchamp (1961) concisely mapped the diverse views in the study of curriculum that would shape policy by the end of the century: Curriculum development with an outcome-based approach (Johnson, Miel, Mackenzie), theory to practice applications emphasizing development, selection and organization of content with a humanistic, cultural traditions approach (Broudy, Smith, Burnett), cross disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge with an emphasis on
constructed meaning (Phenix), and the development of theoretical foundations. (Cited in Dillon, 1994, p. 168) de Beauchamp (1961) anticipated the search for new theoretical knowledge would generate multiple attempts to define the many aspects of learning and to reflect those ideas in curriculum policy.

Looking for “patterns of norms, endeavors, and values,” Joseph (2000) summarizes the major approaches to curriculum studies at the end of the century. Joseph refers to Schwab (1973) and Bruner (1996) as curriculum theorists concerned with “commonplaces.” Both theorists are focused on the many processes and structures through which curriculum is expressed and experienced: through the disciplinary structure of subject matter, the developmental abilities of learners, the milieu of schools, classrooms and communities, teachers’ knowledge and ideology, and the state of curriculum-making science or art. Additionally, Bruner extends his “commonplaces” to the metaphorically-based “folk pedagogies.” He contends the assumptions and beliefs about appropriate educational purpose, content and practice are a part of the culture. (Cited in Joseph, 2000, p. 7) Cuban (1993) suggests a categorization of curriculum defined by participant roles and functions (official, taught, learned, and tested curriculum). Both Cuban’s roles and functions and Eisner’s (1985) explicit, implicit and null curriculum reflect and acknowledge multiple participants at many levels of decision making. Obviously, Pinar’s (1995) curriculum as discourse text is aligned most closely with Foucault’s theory of discourse. Historical, political, racial, gender, poststructuralist, deconstructed, postmodern, autobiographical-biographical, aesthetic, theological, and institutional discourses, according to Pinar, are a “form of articulation that follows certain rules and which constructs the very object it studies. Any discipline or field of study can

But Eisner’s (1985) and Valance’s (1986) classification of the intended and operational curriculum according to five prevalent orientations was pivotal in abstracting and recognizing core ideologies behind the total educational experience in arts education. More importantly, this focus began shifting from curriculum ideology based on predetermined conceptual categories to an ever-changing process, an incremental process constructed through interaction within the policy environment. By the end of the century, while de-emphasizing their idea of conflicting purposes, Joseph (2000) draws heavily on these orientations in her own broader understanding of “curriculum as culture” (Training for Work and Survival, Connecting to the Canon, Developing Self and Spirit, Constructing Understanding, Deliberating Democracy, and Confronting the Dominant Order). Expanding the scope of experience considered when discussing curriculum, each of Joseph’s categories includes “everyday behaviors and interactions, the artifacts that participants create, the use that people make of time and space, and the allocation of decision-making power” in addition to beliefs and values. (Joseph, 2000, p.13) Together, these abstract categories present a composite of educational virtues which, when
considered collectively, represent a full range of curriculum in classroom use and curriculum ideas in policy formulation during the last 40 years of the century.

Joseph’s (2000) “patterns” are useful beyond her immediate account of curriculum as an extension of culture. Collectively taken, such categories of curricular criticism draw attention to the organizing effects of ideology and point to curriculum policy functions dependent on corresponding curricular paradigms. In contrast to specific content or practice, these world views or statements of educational “virtue” often are equated with a stated curricular “purpose.” As Schubert points out, the curricular purpose “represents a special philosophical outlook.”(Schubert, 1986, p. 190) Avoiding a simplistic understanding of its nature, Schubert qualifies his description: the “sources of purpose are not distinct alternatives: rather, they are to be weighed for their relevance to situational needs.”(Schubert, 1986, p. 196) Similarly, Reid (1992) sees this constant changing of curricular emphasis as the embodiment of “a world view that we already espouse, or that we come to espouse as we make our plan,” and, secondly, as a product of varied institutional associations with specific purposes. (Reid, 1992, p.9) Reid views parallel Schwab’s position: “The generality of the intention is confronted with the uniqueness of the case. A curriculum is seen as having two faces, one abstract and institutional, one concrete and practical.” (Reid, 1992, p.15) But regardless of whether curriculum is conceived of as theoretical or practical (or its significance derived from the relationship between the two), grounded in historical/political or philosophical and/or psychological processes, the thrust of the stated purpose guides all aspects of the curricular endeavor. As a statement of ideological priorities by curriculum decision makers, curricular purpose indicates what is and is not worthwhile to learn, and why.
Also, the inherent possibilities and consequences for policy function, its formulation, its implementation and meaningful policy results are embedded in and stem from curricular purpose.

By 1994, Eisner had reconceived and redefined his curriculum orientations as six *ideologies*, which represent a broader framework for beliefs effecting education. Now grouped as “Religious Orthodoxy,” “Rational Humanism,” “Progressivism,” “Critical Theory,” “Reconceptualism” and “Cognitive Pluralism,” these conceptual groupings function as conflicting ideologies in a discourse field. Eisner (1994) draws the connection: “each orientation harbors an implicit conception of educational virtue. Furthermore, each orientation serves both to legitimize certain educational practices and to negatively sanction others. It also functions as an ideological center around which political support can be gathered.” (Eisner, 1994, p.70) Eisner realizes ideologies are used in specific actions to influence, not only curriculum-in-use, but policy formation. He recognizes these actions as based in acculturation and professional socialization: “There is a political process that inevitably must be employed to move from ideological commitment to practical action.” (Eisner, 1994, p. 52) As Eisner notes, a political consensus (derived from individual ideological commitments) is necessary to establish such priorities and it carries certain consequences:

> When a society is characterized by value plurality and when the political strength of groups is comparable, the process of enacting ideologies almost always leads to certain compromises. As a result, the public school curriculum seldom reflects a pure form of any single ideological position.” (Eisner, 1994, p. 52)

Although Foucault probably would reverse the order of ideological formation (discourse to individual commitment), Eisner is aligned closely with Foucault’s discourse theory as an explanation of political process and his idea of powerful ideologies as the
political determinants of policy. Each of Eisner’s curricular ideologies contributes significantly and differently to structures of Power/Knowledge within the field of arts education. From a historical perspective, Efland reinforces these ideological orientations: “...the history of art education [is] made up of events that occur in three discernible streams. I label these expressionist, reconstructionist, and scientific rationalist streams.” (Efland, 1992, p.6)

The combined efforts of Eisner (1985) and Valance (1986) along with other previous versions by Knellner (1971) and Goodlad (1979) produced a perspective which combines both purpose and function, the intended and the operational curriculum into curricular orientations of “cognitive development,” “academic rationalism,” “personal relevance,” “social adaptation/social reconstruction” and “curriculum as technology.” Put forward as conflicting and competing belief systems present in idea formation, they closely approximate the art education ideologies informing arts education policy discourse of the last 40 years. While, according to Joseph, Valance (1986) eventually suggested eliminating “curriculum as technology” because it was not goal-based, but dealt with “means,” the remaining orientations (and their variations) demonstrate a drive to identify rational (albeit different) systems behind decision making in the field. The categories below summarize and incorporate both descriptions and the evaluative views, presented by Eisner, but typical of period.

A concern for “Cognitive Development” often is aligned with many related conceptual components: “Existentialism,” “Personal Commitment to Learning,” “Constructing Understanding.” Its primary purpose is to develop fully the individual child’s cognitive potential, to instill intellectual learning skills through problem-solving
and to encourage personal initiative in a life-long learning process. Child-centered in respect to strengthening and challenging the individual student’s intellectual processes, the institutional perspective advocates increasing the cognitive achievements through interactive student/teacher partnership. Many advocates of this orientation are influenced by psychological and developmental theories of learning, and, until recently, scientific research in these disciplinary areas focused on cognition as rational as opposed to emotional. Art content in the curriculum often serves as an organizing principle in knowledge acquisition.

“Personal Relevance” also has several overlapping emphases: “Progressivism,” “Personal Fulfillment,” “Developing Self and Spirit.” The primary purpose is to provide self-actualizing opportunities, to enable students to construct and express personal meanings (values, interests, beliefs, etc.), and, through such experiences, to aid them in becoming fully integrated, self-determining individuals. This perspective also is child-centered, but in a holistic way. Assuming the student is “stimulus-seeking,” an individual first and a member of the group second, the curriculum seeks to elicit (from the individual student) his/her needs as a learner and to facilitate learning by offering a stimulating and nurturing environment. By building on the student’s interests, this orientation assumes motivational problems are diminished and individual areas of unique potential are encouraged. Reluctantly intellectual, this orientation is often based in a romanticized idea of children having access to natural “truths.” Nonetheless, this perspective reminds educators of the difference between schooling and education may center on the issue of individual freedom. Art in the curriculum serves as a mode of self-expression.
The primary aim of “Academic Rationalism” (often referred to as “Essentialism,” “Perennialism” or “Connecting to the Canon”) is to use the school as a conduit of cultural traditions. The stated purpose of the curriculum (voiced through teacher-guided instruction and institutionally prescribed school curriculum) is to maintain student access to the best of human productivity, to exercise a student’s critical thinking skills against previous standards of excellence, and to insure cultural reproduction at the highest level of ethical, moral, and philosophical thought. Favoring a disciplinary approach to curriculum choices, this orientation is pragmatic on several issues: the recommended curriculum includes: various modes of thought to stimulate different student interests, subject matter not easily learned or accessed by students outside of school, and, with a heavy emphasis on the rational, on disciplines that represent “fundamental forms of human understanding.” (Eisner, 1985, p.55) Often criticized for its bias in favor of the legacies of the dominant culture, it has countered with anti-elitism arguments for a curriculum that provides a common educational foundation for a democratic population. Art in the curriculum serves as a conduit of cultural tradition.

“Social Adaptation” and its related orientations (“Vocational Training,” “Personal Success Focus,” “Social/Civic Participation,” and “Training for Work and Survival”) assume a society-centered perspective. The major purpose is to help the individual student find personal success through serving the society’s needs. These needs, while variously defined, usually are intended to maintain the status quo in cultural values, the political processes and the institutionalized power structures while solving current social problems. The general content and institutional practices of such a curriculum includes work related skills, habits, attitudes and functions as vocational/professional
socialization. The goal of this curriculum is to produce a uniform and competent workforce. Art in the curriculum is a technique for integrating students into society.

“Social Reconstruction” is society-centered as well. On one hand, related to curriculum promoting democratic (or other) ideals and, on the other hand, related to critical theories that support efforts to achieve those ideals, the purpose of this orientation is to blend the realities of the classroom with the students’ social/political environment, to engage students through heightened social consciousness, to increase problem-solving by active participation and construction of their world, and, to come closer, one generation at a time, to social ideals. Often using community-based learning, to integrate students into a world outside of the classroom, this orientation, however, goes beyond creating a better world; the student learns to cope knowledgeably with the forces that influence his personal life and, indeed, have informed who he is. Art in the curriculum serves to engage students in social critique.

These rationally conceived categories were common in education and art education as Foucault’s theory and methods related to discourse phenomena are being disseminated in the early 1970s. In juxtaposition with a Foucaultian perspective of the same period, these categories of ideological formations reveal essential differences in thinking about idea formation and policy formulation derived from different research theories and methodologies. Progressing toward the end of the century, Foucault’s theory and methodology permeate work in multiple disciplines, particularly in the fields of public policy, educational policy and arts education policy.
Discourse Theory and Arts Education Policy Research

Many considerations inform the choice of research methods in policy study: the audience for the study, the nature of the policy domain to be examined, the policy research needs or research utility for a given time and local, and, probably the most important, the appropriateness of the methodological paradigm to the research problem. The following discussion addresses the latter consideration. Discourse theory is appropriate to policy research and arts education policy problems in the following ways.

Discourse theory offers a methodological construct focused on ideological issues which accommodate the belief and value systems inherent in curricular choices made by arts educators. When consensus is not present or strong, then, discourse analysis allows a relativistic assessment of policy purpose and function; it accommodates and accounts for diverse value systems within the policy environment by using numerous lenses.

Discourse analysis seeks to understand policy in a broader framework of power; specific values are viewed as instruments serving an established, powerful majority. As Nisbet (1999) points out:

Their concern is not so much a matter of being “right” (for there are different “right” solutions, depending on one’s values), but rather of reconciling divergent views in a solution which is seen as “fair” by a maximum number of those affected by it. In this, the aims and values of those with access to power must carry greatest weight.” (Nisbet, 1999, p.71)

Discourse theory relates various policy dimensions and charts policy activities across divergent educational systems and subsystems. When Codd (1988) characterizes policy study as cutting “across existing specializations to employ whatever theoretical or methodological approach is most relevant to the issue or problem under investigation,” he recognizes research methods in educational policy must accommodate a multi
dimensional phenomenon. (Codd, 1988, p.235) Similarly, Ball (1994) and Ozga (1990) suggest that it is important in educational environments to “bring together structural, macro level analysis of education systems and education policies and micro level investigation, especially that which takes account of people’s perception and experiences.” (Cited in Ball, 1994, p. 14) Because the success or failure of policy formulation at any stage depends on understanding subtle relationships producing policy ideas more than obvious policy substance, research methods that seek answers that are from one-dimension, rational and linear or that see policy interactions as causal, defined and predictable, may produce facts without insight. The research goals in educational discourse analysis aim to detect the play of different forces and mechanisms of political power, not only on policy making, but, ultimately, on established educational practice.

Discourse theory situates arts education communities within a larger social and political context and arts education curriculum and policy within a postmodern reality; it acknowledges a paradigm shift away from “Modernism” in the arts, to the concept of power (as opposed to truth) as knowledge in education and to a belief that learning, indeed the student or “subject” is constructed. As Rist (2000) explains: “...many decisions about education are conditioned by social codes, by shifting priorities, and increasingly, by political and economic considerations far removed from the immediate interests of researchers and teachers.” (Rist, 2000, p. 1014) A discourse methodology is attuned to the impact of those conditions on arts education policy formulation.

On a more procedural level, Foucault’s discourse analysis offers a way of gathering and categorizing specific data on policy functions from social texts; as a methodology, it offers a “bridge” at all levels and arenas of policy making between the historical forms
and contextual structures and processes and the policy artifact or text. The major strength of discourse analysis is not in the accumulation of specific data, but the construction of analytic frameworks, systematic tools to increase understanding of social systems. Although, Foucault’s discourse analysis procedures do provide tools to gather specific data on established discourse relationships, as Salisbury (1995) suggests “policy is necessarily an abstraction, therefore, to be approached through aggregative or summarizing analytic procedures. More concerned with the “rules” of discourse rather than the specifics of data, Foucault theory coincides with Salisbury: “It is patterns of behavior rather than separate, discrete acts which constitute policy.” (Salisbury, 1995, p.35)

And, as a system of interpreting data, discourse analysis can assess the meaning and influence of policy ideas. Foucault also is concerned with integrating this data into larger constructs. Although Foucault’s discourse analytic procedures are not concerned primarily with interpretative, evaluative, or predictive functions, the goal of his genealogical analysis is to seek principles underlying the discourse changes. Unlike his analytic procedures, Foucault’s writings encourage but do not provide clear guidelines for interpretation. However, Foucault does allow for historical comparisons where policy trends can be discerned through the careful assessment of change elements. Foucault’s use of “disjunctures” between discursive statements as a source of policy meaning may hold unique and rich possibilities for understanding other social constructions beyond policy.

In their discussion of the political nature of policy interpretation, Peters and Marshall (1996) note that “Policy analysis as a field of inquiry has proved itself receptive
to the methodological developments which have characterized the social sciences as a whole since the early 1970s.” (Peters & Marshall, 1996, p. 137) Discourse theories are now a part of a diverse body of inquiry available to provide substantial knowledge derived from language and texts.

With concern for the current shifts in theoretical and methodological paradigms impacting policy research, McCool (1995) notes “a striking feature of the literature of social science is that it is copiously salted with nontheoretical formulations.” (McCool, 1995b, p.21) Various forms of educational policy criticism, including studies based in discourse “theory,” can be characterized this way. Nonetheless, claiming that a dominant theoretical tradition (or methodology) has yet to develop in policy study, Mc Cool (1995) suggests “it may be unnecessary, and unwise, to attempt to place all policy science on the Procrustean bed of a single theoretical construct.” (McCool, 1995b, p.7) Although potentially destabilizing dominant paradigms and theories, Luke (1999) points out, new curricular models surface and, therefore, encourage further development of experimental modes of inquiry to examine new educational phenomena. (Luke, 1999, p.165)

Aligned with a movement toward open-ended methodologies, methodologies that reflect a “decentered” world view, Foucault’s theory excludes paradigms that are theoretical and/or historical and it does not recognize a “totalized” system of thought. Therefore, the methodology of this study accepts a broader definition of “theory” proposed by Culler (1997): theories that 1) offer a framework that can effect understanding outside of their original discipline, 2) are analytical and speculative in nature, 3) serve as a critique of commonsense concepts of “truth” and 4) promote thought and questions about “the categories we use in making sense of things.” (Culler, 1997,
Shapiro’s “pretheoretic model:” is more closely aligned with the framework adopted for this study: “a term for the various conceptual schemata which, while providing a framework for organizing and rationalizing some domain of human experience, do not qualify, strictly speaking, as theories. ‘Model’ seems to respond to this need.” (Shapiro, 1981, p.188) This kind of “theory” does not attempt to define reality, but attempts to organize “reality.” (Culler, 1997, p.8) This kind of model is needed to refine the inquiry process in policy studies and discourse theory alike.

A review of literature in arts education policy research reveals an emerging field heavily dependent on theoretical and methodological strategies of other fields, usually general education. Much of policy research in general education is qualitative in nature and often too focused on one issue, one site, or one community to provide arts education policymakers with general principles for policymaking. The lack of or limited scope of previous research in arts education policy has been summarized by Pankratz (1998). He notes the research is deficient on policy development and systemic change processes in arts education and he believes the lack of coordination between research, policy, and advocacy produces “an array of unintended consequences, some of them damaging to policy and practice in arts education.” (Pankratz, 1998, p. 1) Policy research is needed in many areas of arts education, but only certain facets are of interest in this study; specifically, the processes involved in idea formation and its impact on policy formulation. Particularly, in an era of “agendas” and “initiatives,” policymakers need to see their own bias and various paradigms at work in policy development. In regards to the use of research, Pankratz has noted: “Most, frequently... research is first filtered through policymakers’ values and assumptions. Research is then interpreted selectively.
Policymakers choose one or two findings from a study to use as the basis of a policy argument or proposal that suits their predetermined agenda.” (Pankratz, 1998, p.4)

Secondly, policymakers must dialogue, not only on how much or how good, but about the purpose of arts education in the nation’s schools. Eisner, on the role of policymakers as an audience for arts education research and advocacy, argues that policymakers: “must be educated about the value of learning the arts themselves. Merely attempting to serve a pre-established agenda of educational policymakers is an abdication of professional responsibility and a process that undermines claims for the value of the arts’ unique contribution to education.” (Cited in Pankratz, 1998, p. 4)

In addition to individual values, community consensus on purpose, arts education policy research must address the manner in which “policymakers’ decisions are conditioned by competing value systems and political agendas... is there policy research in arts education that might truly help decision makers to clarify, make, and justify decisions?” (Pankratz, 1998, p.4)

However, policy makers must be concerned with issues beyond the realm of personal and/or professional value systems; understanding the power of institutional structures and political process on or as a result of those belief systems is a beginning. The recognition of the limitations of strongly held beliefs about educational purpose against broad and diverse political factors is a necessary “reality check.” As early as 1982 Laura Chapman called attention to the need for policy research in arts education: “Even basic research, which seems to be remote from classroom activities, can influence how we think about teaching and have a greater effect on our work than we may realize. (Chapman, 1982, p. 103)
Contributions to the Arts Education Policy Literature

Codd (1988) groups policy studies: “Policy analysis is a form of enquiry which provides either the informational base upon which policy is constructed, or the critical examination of existing policies. The former has been called analysis for policy, whereas the latter has been called analysis of policy.” (Codd, 1988, p. 235) Within the last ten years, a relatively small number of studies in arts education policy have been analysis for policy. Generally, these studies have assumed that curriculum and policy statements flow in a linear way from a stated purpose. They are concerned primarily with collecting information to improve and/or reformulate a specific policy or set of policies by correcting policy processes: policy goals, formulation, implementation, and evaluation. And as Codd suggests, such policy studies assume the language of the policy text is “transparent” and, it is presumed, that if language clearly communicates the policy goals, a “correct” outcome will be insured. Secondly, most of these studies, while dealing with topics of national policy, are limited, nonetheless, to case studies about specific policy impacts. In an effort to provide new information and insights about the field of arts education policy, this study examines “for policy” issues (particularly idea formation), adopts a non-linear, multi dimensional methodology and assumes that language is not transparent.

This study provides additional conceptual lenses through which scholars, practitioners, artists, advocates and policymakers can identify and critique 1) the ideological content and subtext of curriculum policy statements and chart the role of current curriculum orientations in decision making, 2) the organizational mechanisms of influence and transfer inherent in arts education curriculum policy formulation, 3)
understand the political limitations of institutional structure and power on curriculum policy, and 4) the potential that discourse itself exerts within a given situational and/or historical context.

A specific contribution of this study is new information concerning the arts education policy environment during the bracketed time period of the study from 1970-2000. A detailed database of over 400 documents about or impacting arts education curriculum policy has been compiled to establish the scope of situational influences on three advocacy organizations: Arts, Education and Americans, Inc. (AEAP), the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (GCEA), and The Consortium of National Arts Education Association (CNAEA).

By focusing on three specific organizations and their discourse communities, this study gathers data from text production to build an organizational profile of its internal organization, its position on various curriculum ideas, typical mechanisms employed in policy activity and the use of designated personnel in advocacy.

The ideological content of policy is viewed in this study as important in two ways: it is a reflection of the value system informing curriculum orientation and policymakers and it is the “object” of discourse transfer. Examining the value systems informing curriculum orientations as they are expressed through curriculum policy texts, this study assumes policy research should enlighten and shape understanding. Through the study of discourse language, this study identifies policy issues resulting from conflicts of beliefs and actions about curriculum within the arts, education and the arts education community. Understanding the role of an individual policymaker’s commitment to a particular curriculum ideology within the policy community is an indirect, but extremely
important, goal of this study; that is, to demonstrate that “...discourse is not the majestically unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing, speaking subject, but, on the contrary, a totality, in which the dispersion of the subject and his discontinuity with himself may be determined.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 55) Foucault has written extensively on the social construction of individual identity. This construction process, explained by Fiske (1998) is ideology working at the micro-level:

The individual is produced by nature, the subject by culture. Theories of the individual concentrate on differences between people and explain these differences as natural. Theories of the subject, on the other hand, concentrate on people’s common experiences in a society as being the most productive way of explaining who (we think) we are. (Fiske, 1998, p. 308)

Fiske maintains: “Thus we are each of us constituted as a subject in, and subject to, ideology. As they construct the individual sense of self, such ideologies also create a social identity that determines social relationships and that positions the individual within social structures.” (Fiske, 1998, p. 308) Further refining Foucault’s views, Ball (1994) draws the connection between the individual, ideology and policy:

We do not speak a discourse, it speaks us. We are the subjectivities, the voices, the knowledge, the power relations that a discourse constructs and allows. ...In these terms we are spoken by policies, we take up the positions constructed for us within policies. (Ball, 1994, p. 22)

This study also unmask organizational mechanisms of influence and transfer paralleling curriculum orientation and examines their impact on art educators. By understanding and anticipating the impact of embedded values, art educators are better equipped to recognize the strategies and tactics as they are practiced by arts education organizations. Specifically, by examining the text materials produced by multiple groups in ideological competition, this model reveals the role of advocacy organizations and discourse communities on long-term educational change. Also this study is concerned 58
with the nature of the coalition of specific policy discourse communities (arts education scholars and researchers, artists and advocates and policymakers and practitioners) and organizations committed to a given ideological orientation. Ultimately, the study seeks to identify the ideological/functional processes that contribute to community effectiveness, either by identifying the policy communities that have been most successful in institutionalizing their ideology or the policy communities preventing or posing barriers to such efforts.

While focusing on organizational mechanisms of change, this study also seeks to clarify the political ideology and role of established institutional structures in curriculum policy. Governmental structures are viewed here as monuments of ideological stability and agents of power within the society; they represent the status quo against which organizations and discourse communities take action and they provide, therefore, a barometer of the effectiveness of discourse influence/transfer processes.

Finally, identifying the discourse texts and documenting the influences of the larger situational context, this study constructs a conceptual framework to gather information about broad situational, often non-discursive, influences impacting the arts education policy discourse. Discourse analysis highlights the potential power that discourse exerts within a given context. As Shapiro (1992) explains:

This is not the form of power described in traditional histories of political theory ...but a power that functions through discursive strategies and tactics, through the identities produced in the forms of knowledge and interpretation that normalize human subjectivity in various historical periods. (Shapiro, 1992, p. 271)

Summary

As Carroll (1997) suggests, the ultimate value of paradigm research is to ask questions that lead to problem solutions: questions such as “Is this problem due to
confusion or conflict or inconsistencies and contradictions within the governing paradigm of the field? Is it possibly related to the co-existence of several ideologies operating simultaneously within the larger governing paradigm? Is the problem related to powerful and competing ideologies held by others?” (Carroll, 1997, p.174) Paradigm research applied to arts education policy study would raise awareness of how art education curriculum ideology functions outside of the classroom, how it “interfaces with other sub-communities within the larger field of education, parent audiences, the political arena, and the public at large.” (Carroll, 1997, p. 180) However, an understanding of any paradigm, related to policy or education, depends on the availability of an appropriate methodology and instrument to examine the nuance of ideas, their relationship to each other and their correlation to a reality construct. Potentially, Foucault’s mode of inquiry provides that methodological support.
CHAPTER 3

FOUCAULT’S THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

An overview of Foucault’s major philosophical tenets will explain 1) the underpinnings of his discourse theory, 2) the relationship of his theory to his mode of inquiry, and 3) its significance and value in building a model for policy study in arts education.

On History and Universal Truth

In *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*, published in 1971, Foucault set forth ideas based in his critical investigation of power structures viewed through an “effective” historical perspective; simultaneously, he refuted traditional historical perspectives which emphasize the linear development of social morality. He claimed, by charting selected characteristics or origins of current behavior, significant and powerful social and political forces are marginalized, ignored or overlooked. In the process, historical approaches allege generalizations of the past as irrefutable “truths.” As might be expected, Foucault is equally skeptical about methods of analysis derived from historical paradigms; he sees them as an outgrowth of historical interpretation, a result of a “quest for and the repetition of an origin that eludes all historical determination.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 25) For example, he refutes the historical assumptions inherent in theories such as structuralism that claim discourse relationships are “...determined in advance and prefigured in a quasi-
microscopic form...” (Foucault, 1972, p. 70) His intent is not to treat “discourses as groups of signs ... but as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak,” as relationships with “... regulated ways (and describable as such) of practicing the possibilities of discourse,” and as processes always of the “now,” the ever-present, not the past. (Foucault, 1972, p. 49, p. 70)

Therefore, his discourse theory and mode of inquiry restrict predetermined descriptive categories or fixed systems of analysis; the model derived from his methodology focuses on what policy is rather that what is has been or should be. He brackets time to interpret an ever-present “now;” the model acknowledges the ever changing needs and multidimensional relationships of a policy environment and the incremental nature of policy change. While Foucault does not ignore the formal legacy of past social institutions, and their stabilizing influence, his methodology permits policy to be viewed as incremental.

Additionally, Rabinow explains: “Foucault is highly suspicious of claims of universal truths. He doesn’t refute them; instead, his consistent response is to historicize grand abstractions.” (Rabinow, 1984, p. 4) As other discourse theorists, Foucault adheres to one dominant principle: “There is no fixed center or perspective that controls reality formation; no external position of certainty, no universal understanding that is beyond history and society.” (Rabinow, 1984, p. 4) Often criticized for limiting ideas to the context of their emergence, Foucault sees reality constructed by discourse as a sequence of multiple and changing perspectives each creating a fragment of the “total” meaning. “Foucault’s aim is to understand the plurality of roles that reason [or any idea], for
example, has taken as a social practice in our civilization, not to use it as a yardstick against which these practices can be measured.” (Rabinow, 1984, p. 4)

Therefore, Foucault’s discourse theory and mode of inquiry contextualizes all discourse data historically, politically and socially and he incorporates multiple perspectives and unequal dimensions in analysis in order to grasp a fragmented reality. Likewise, the methodology is expansive in the data it examines. He avoids generalizations and he promises no transferable conclusions; the methodology, therefore, assesses each policy environment for its unique strengths and weaknesses.

**On Genealogy**

As an alternative to historical and universal truth, Foucault proposes a genealogical perspective that “deals with events in terms of their most unique characteristics, their most acute manifestations.” (Foucault, 1998, p. 381) As he explains: “An event, consequently, is not a decision, a treaty, a reign, or a battle, but the reversal of a relationship of forces, the usurpation of power, the appropriation that grows feeble, poisons itself, grows slack, the entry of a masked “other.” (Foucault, 1998, p. 381)

Genealogy, then, attempts to chart the “play of dominations.” (Foucault, 1998, p.376) The domination of one group over another leads to differentiation of values; and values become embedded incrementally in fixed structures and systems of rules and procedures. Foucault, however, makes it clear that:

Rules are empty in themselves, violent and unfinalized; they are made to serve this or that, and can be bent to any purpose. The successes of history belong to those who are capable of seizing these rules, to replace those who had used them, to disguise themselves so as to pervert them, invert their meaning, and redirect them against those who had initially imposed them; introducing themselves into this complex mechanism, they will make it function in such a way that the dominators find themselves dominated by their own rules. (Foucault, 1998, p. 378)
Foucault sees a genealogy recording the mechanisms behind power fluctuations and the interpretations of the rules as they change, as they are substituted, displaced, disguised or reversed. Shapiro (1992) describes the manner in which Foucault’s “genealogical imagination construes all systems of intelligibility... as the arbitrary fixings of the momentary results of struggles among contending forces, struggles that could have produced other possible systems of intelligibility and the orders they support.” (Shapiro, 1992, p. 270) For Foucault, Shapiro continues, “a given historical period has forces at work producing interpretations and overcoming rival ones. The present is not a product of accumulated wisdom or other dynamics reaching into the distant past. It comes about as one possible emergence from an interpretive agnostic.” (Shapiro, 1992, p. 271)

Therefore, his discourse theory, particularly through a genealogical analysis, provides a framework for interpreting the “play of dominations;” the methodology permits examination of the rise and fall of political forces behind policy making. Foucault sees the resistance of institutional structures/processes in opposition to multiple discursive and non-discursive change agents; the methodology characterizes policy formulation as a response to conflict in the current policy environment. And, by comparing over time the disjunctures of values, institutional rules and procedures and the common change mechanisms behind power fluctuations, the methodology reveals workable typologies of policy function.

**On Power and Knowledge**

Foucault sees the structural “imbalance” of power as inextricably intertwined with what he considers the “new” political structure of the “state.” (Rabinow, 1984, p.10) Despite this “imbalance” of power, Foucault presents all political movement as
interdependent. Although supported strongly by contemporary institutional practices, Foucault stipulates that the varied manifestations and hierarchies of power are controlled by the organization of ideas and control of knowledge. “Finally, I believe that this will to knowledge, thus reliant upon institutional support and distribution tends to exercise a sort of pressure, a power of constraint upon other forms of discourse.” (Foucault, 1994, p. 234)

In other words, discourse, knowledge and idea formation are limited and regulated by social forces and relationships of the moment; forces that maintain established power structures, political and social order. According to Foucault, these forces monitor possible discourses by “rules of exclusion:” social and cultural prohibitions, the acceptance or rejection of discourse values and beliefs with political language such as “reason and folly,” or “true and false.” (Foucault, 2000, p. 232) “I am supposing that in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its [discourse] powers and its [discourse] dangers, to cope with chance events, to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality.” (Foucault, 2000, p. 231) Because he maintains these principles of power relationships and social order or balance are constructed in societies of every time period by institutionalizing what is (or is not) “truth” or “knowledge,” his goal in discourse inquiry is to establish how the powerful factions and political structures constitute a given discourse, what rules or conventions govern these discourse forces, how their interactions are controlled by established procedures, and effected by non-discursive social issues and problems.
Therefore, his discourse theory considers the social and institutional limitations placed on discursive change; the methodology recognizes policy as seeking temporary solutions within a political “agonistics.” Foucault addresses the power factions controlling idea formation and the organization of knowledge; the methodology provides a way to uncover the ideology, the goals, and the effectiveness of organized scholars, practitioners, stakeholders, and policy makers. And the institutional or organizational mechanisms they use to disseminate ideas and knowledge through political text; the methodology allows a careful examination of policy language as a political tool.

**On Political Theory**

Foucault, as many discourse theorists, has espoused a theory which is based a view of human behavior as inherently political. However, as Shapiro notes, Foucault’s concept of discursive relationships suggests “a more radical and profound type of politicization of relations that have escaped normal political analysis and theory.” (Shapiro, 1981, p.154) For instance, discourses are “not merely bodies of ideas, ideologies, or other symbolic formulations, but are also working attitudes, modes of address, terms of reference, and courses of action suffused into social practices.” (Gubrium and Holstein, 2000, p. 493) Within these difficult to capture formations, Foucault perceives that systems of power determine the range of options, decisions and/or selections in the on-going construction of meaning.

Going further, his political conviction that the subtle, shifting order of power legitimizes knowledge and determines what is considered “truth,” is accompanied by the belief that such institutionalized power potentially fosters social inequality.

It seems to me...that the real political task in a society such as ours is to criticize the working of institutions which appear to be both neutral and independent; to
criticize them in such a manner that the political violence which has always
exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight
them.”(Cited in Rabinow, 1984, p. 6)

However, unlike many critical theories, Foucault’s rhetoric, his political critique
and agenda, are reserved. Although Foucault offers a way to examine political
relationships, his proposed mode of inquiry does not constrain the researcher to any given
political agenda; it is decidedly analytic and provides a systematic approach to social and
political functions which also may serve more neutral ends. As with other critical
theorists, Foucault uses discourse analysis to uncover the facts of discourse and, through
political criticism, raise consciousness of political forces. Similarly, Peters and Marshall
(1996) have stressed that discourse analysis and interpretation

... need not simply result in the negative activity of unmasking ideology,
conceived of as false claims to neutrality. It may also serve as the affirmation of a
set of shared values of a community, or as an agenda for progressive action, a
conception of interpretation as the liberation of suppressed or forgotten meanings,
or as the envisioning of new meanings which may give direction to social change.
(Peters & Marshall, 1996, p. 138)

The political perspective of Foucault’s critical discourse analysis rests upon the
assumption that “language” is the primary political instrument. Not defined by content,
the “discursive statement” is “language” expanded to include action, events, and
speakers. Foucault recognizes, according to Luke (1999), the institutional and
governmental use of language and discourse to control society; language is used to
“effectively construct, regulate, and control knowledge, social relations, and institutions,
and indeed, such analytic and exegetic practices as scholarship and research. By this
account, nothing is outside of or prior to its manifestation in discourse.” (Luke, 1999,
p.163) Foucault’s underlying assumption is that discursive practices determine
contemporary political possibilities and the discursive statement correlates to discursal
choice from the field of ideological ideas and strategies. As such, critical analysis, as Shapiro states, “provides a partial mapping of the political culture that resides potentially in a society’s system of signification (language and other meaning systems) and is actualized in speech. Discursive practices therefore are political practices.” (Shapiro, 1981, p. 129) As such, Shapiro points out, Foucault views discursive statements as data to be analyzed: “his approach, like that of the positivist, therefore purports to be strictly empirical; it is simply deployed on a different empirical domain, one that can only be seen as an empirical domain on the bases of an altered view of meaning.” (Shapiro, 1981, p.136)

Therefore, Foucault’s discourse theory and mode of inquiry connects political language to political activity; the methodology provides an indicator of larger political forces at work through the examination of policy documents. According to Foucault, language and political activity limit the range of options open to some individuals or groups within a society and, therefore, foster social inequality; a systematic examination of discursive practices and language in idea formation and policy formulation may discourage such political violence and may encourage positive community values in the formulation of institutionalized policy.

The Discursive Statement

The methodological focus for Foucault is the discursive statement. The discursive statement depends more on an understanding of discoursal function than on the meaning behind a logical structure of signs and/or symbol systems. Instead of an analysis of “words,” Foucault attempts to reunify language and experience; he refers to discourse components as “the living plenitude of experience, the rules of discourse.” (Foucault,
1972, p. 48) He distinguishes discursive statement from other common systems of
language analysis: it “...does not replace a logical analysis of propositions, a grammatical
analysis of sentences, a psychological or contextual analysis of formulations; it is another
way of attacking verbal performances, of dissociating the various regularities that they
obey.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 108) Unlike systems built on the sign or sequences of signs, he
regards the discursive statement in the following way:

It is not so much one element among others, a division that can be located at a
certain level of analysis, as a function that operates vertically in relation to these
various units, and which enables one to say of a series of signs whether or not
they are present in it. The statement is not therefore a structure (that is, a group of
relations between variable elements.... (Foucault, 1972, p.86)

Foucault concludes, then, that the discursive statement cannot be analyzed by
determining the smallest measurable unit of language or by general categories of usage;
“Language and statement are not at the same level of existence; and one cannot say that
there are statements in the same way as one says language constitutes a statement...”
(Foucault, 1972, p. 85) Discursive statement is rather an “operational field of the
enunciative function and the conditions according to which it reveals various units (which
may be, but need not be, of a grammatical or logical order).” (Foucault, 1972, p.106)

One should not be surprised, then, if one has failed to find structural criteria of
unity for the statement; this is because it is not in itself a unit, but a function that
cuts across a domain of structures and possible unities, and which reveals them,
with concrete contents, in time and space. (Foucault, 1972, p. 87)

“Discourse,” for Foucault, refers “more generally to reiterated key words and
statements that recur in local texts of all kinds. Such statements appear intertextually and
comprise familiar patterns of disciplinary and paradigmatic knowledge and practice”
(Luke, 1999, p.16) In other words, as the researcher identifies the components of the
discursive statement, fragments of various language systems may be encountered; that is,
incomplete sequences or partial units of meaning. Stressing the “value” versus the “truth” of the discursive statement, Foucault’s archeological and genealogical method provides the means for discerning the “valuable” constructions or relationships in discourse and discursive statements. While Foucault’s perspectives may not be fully developed as methodological ideas, they suggest a compatible way of accessing data about discourse ideology, processes, and institutional structures and interpreting their impact on idea formation and, ultimately, on policy formulation.

**The Archeological Analysis**

As a philosopher, Foucault sought to construct an analytic method devoid of the overlay of previous perspectives from the history of ideas, thought, knowledge or science. Particularly, he chose to dispel the notions of tradition, conscious influence, development and evolution. Similarly, he elected initially to put aside what he referred to as “reflexive categories“ based in principles of classification, normative rules, and institutionalized types in order to view with more clarity the processes and manifestations of discourse relationships. He stipulates: “All these groups of discourses that are to be described are not the expression of a world-view that has been coined in the form of words, nor the hypocritical translation of an interest masquerading under the pretext of a theory...” (Foucault, 1972, p. 69) Foucault was intent on revealing the unstated and far less obvious influences of ideology in human interactions.

In the *Archeology of Knowledge*, first published in 1969, Foucault sets forth procedures for gathering and examining data on discourse and the discursive statement. His analytic method “… recasts all data and research artifacts as discourse.” (Luke, 1999, p. 171) And he approaches social text as archeological artifacts or “finds.” Through his
method of investigation that “decenters” the research focus, that is, incorporates multiple perspectives on discourse reality, he seeks to demonstrate that a discourse, while not definable, is subject to describable systems and regulated ways. Through the dispersion of discourse texts, various organizational modes of expression, their conceptual frameworks and their repeated use of certain mechanisms of influence/transfer, a system of unequal and unparallel dimensions for idea formation, Foucault’s mode of inquiry accesses the degree of regularity of discourse function which is central to understanding discourse phenomenon.

**The Genealogical Interpretation**

Against a backdrop of contending powers within a society, discourse inquiry seeks to understand the mechanisms behind discoursal selection, behind power fluctuations over time. A genealogical perspective provides a partial insight through comparative analysis of different “bracketed” discourses. Torfing maintains, “The discourses in question are formed on the basis of a particular episteme, which provides a basic view of the world that unifies intellectual production during a given age.” (Torfing, 1999, p.90) By placing disjunctive discourses side-by-side, Foucault’s genealogical approach advocates “a shortness of vision” which reveals “disjuncture.” In Shapiro’s words:

…supplemented by a glance at the past, a glance aimed not at the production of a developmental narrative but at showing what we are now. This ‘What we are now’ is not meant as simple decryption of the current state of things. Rather, it is an attempt to show that the ‘now’ is an unstable victory had at the expense of other possible nows. (Shapiro, 1992, p. 279)
And, according to Torfing, Foucault held that the meaning and understanding of social practices is found in the “play of discontinuities in the history of discourses.” (Torfing, 1999, p.90)

**Summary**

Drawn from his combined writings, Foucault’s theories support a two-sided method of inquiry for examining discourse: based in his description of the discursive statement, 1) his archeological method provides a set of procedures for the description and analysis of an individual discourse and 2) his genealogical method (an “effective” history) supports a comparative interpretation and evaluation of discourse analysis data gathered from different time periods. These complimentary perspectives allow discourse to be assessed case-by-case and generally. The methodological goal is to untangle ideational transfer produced by discourse processes and to reveal influences of power structures within a time bracket and over time.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Foucault’s archeological and genealogical ideas are foundational to the total research design of this study. This chapter 1) explains the research design components derived from Foucault’s “System of Dispersion:” “Formation of Objects,” “Formation of Enunciative Modalities,” “Formation of Concepts,” and “Formation of Strategies;” these systems generate procedures that guide the data collection and they, simultaneously, interrelate data from different discourse formations. Also, 2) the overall plan of the study is outlined, 3) the model modifications to Foucault’s theory and mode of inquiry are clarified, and 4) the research population and, the text sample choice is explained.

Research Methodology: Specific Procedures

Assuming the archeologist’s detached perspective, Foucault’s method of description and analysis leads him to ascertain the rules of a discourse, its “coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 38) Although he has identified four central dimensions of discourse or “systems of dispersion,” he implies other systems of formation and analysis might be possible. However, following his suggested procedures, each discourse can be identified, described and analyzed within each dimension by noting significant relationships (“nodal points”) that distinguish it within a network of discourses. And, finally, Foucault’s purpose in using multiple
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTS (Text Identification)</th>
<th>MODALITIES (Organizational Profile)</th>
<th>CONCEPTS (Ideological Concepts)</th>
<th>STRATEGIES (Discursive Choice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorities of Delimitation</td>
<td>Places of Observation</td>
<td>Forms of Succession</td>
<td>Points of Diffraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfaces of Emergence</td>
<td>The Speaker</td>
<td>Forms of Co-existence</td>
<td>Principles of Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grids of Specification</td>
<td>The Subject</td>
<td>Procedures of Intervention</td>
<td>Authority of Function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Foucault’s Analytic Formations: Research Design Components
“systems of dispersion” is to reveal diverse discursive mechanisms not visible immediately when using a singular lens; he hopes to see the social and political forces previously hidden or marginalized behind the mechanisms within the field of a discourse. Clearly, at this stage, he demonstrates a major concern for the analytic; his rules of formation identify evidence of discourse and address the questions of “how” single discourses function in a larger context. He exemplifies his purpose by posing a series of questions about discourses: “What are they? How can they be defined and limited? What distinct types of laws can they obey? What articulation are they capable of? What sub-groups can they give rise to?” (Foucault, 1972, p.26) Although his analytic procedures do not directly address interpretative and/or evaluative processes, Foucault anticipates that this archeological discourse data eventually is used in social and political critique. Foucault’s explanation of these formations may provide some insight into what kind of information each system can provide and how that particular data reveals a different reality construct.

**Formation of Objects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorities of Delimitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surfaces of Emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grids of Specification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The methodological purpose behind Foucault’s examination of the formation of objects is to identify information on the text production impacting a single discourse; data is gathered from textual sources limiting discourse activity such as larger social issues/practices, institutions, organizations/communities, the discourse field, and individual discursive practices as well as texts serving as catalysts for discursive change. The procedures reflect Foucault’s concern for mapping multiple forces of change and stability.
within society, their relationship to each other, and their varied use of political language and text in idea formation. Simultaneously, the formation analysis suggests organizing texts based on the level of institutional power they represent and in their intended or apparent use. The following procedures collect and organize data on text production for examination as follows: Authorities of Delimitation represents varied established power structures, the Surfaces of Emergence charts new political forces entering the discourse, and Grids of Specifications designates texts by political use of language.

**Authorities of Delimitation**

Foucault speaks very generally about the “Field of Discourse” as simultaneously occurring, contradictory and competing social and political forces. Authorities of Delimitation are forces which counter, delimit or restrict the discursive activity of change agents in a discourse. He recognizes these authorities usually are hierarchical in influence and represent levels of relative power. Although he does not suggest specific guidelines to define these levels, he suggests clarifying the field of discourse and disentangling sources of political influence. Extrapolating from his discussion, the following scheme may reflect these delimiting forces: texts are designated as relating to larger discourses or contextual issues within the society, statements representing institutional structures, the processes and practices of discourse organizations/communities, and individual discursive practices. Although Foucault’s intent is to deconstruct the discourse influences represented by these influences, objects or discursive statements within a distinct discourse usually are impacted by multiple levels of authority within a society.

These registers of discourse obviously represent decreasing levels of complexity. Foucault hopes to demonstrate, for instance, how various levels reflect various
restrictions on discourse. And, in the process, they reveal the overall power structure within a society. These tasks identify the institutional or organizational characteristics unique to each discourse register and its favored manner of expressing itself. Likewise, the Authorities of Delimitation reveal the stabilizing mechanism of established social practices; currently established behavior patterns, norms, common systems of thought or cognition revealed through text.

**Surfaces of Emergence**

Secondly, Surfaces of Emergence are textual artifacts appearing within the historical period bracketed for the discourse, produced by identifiable communities, and exhibiting object value and meaning of consistent levels of “rationalization, conceptual codes, and types of theory.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 41) While these discursive statements cannot be described neatly, in Foucault’s own words:

What one must characterize and individualize is the coexistence of these dispersed and heterogeneous statements; the system that governs their division, the degree to which they depend upon one another, the way in which they interlock or exclude one another, the transformation that they undergo, and the play of their location, arrangement, and replacement. (Foucault, 1972, p. 34)

Described in this manner, discourse objects are statements of attitudes, beliefs, value (and their relation to one another). Foucault attempts to identify and position significant discursive objects as they enter a discourse field. Also, by identifying objects in the discourse field, he identifies potential forces of discursive change as well as forces representing institutional stability.

Briefly explained, by mapping the planes or “surface of emergence,” Foucault is employing a chronological, not a historical idea; the function of this first task is to establish the order or succession in which objects or ideas emerged, exhibited certain
kinds of meaning, and competed with other discourse objects, discourses, etc. and disappeared. Besides the succession of emergence, some objects or artifacts gain significance over others; that significance often is obvious and discernable in a survey of text production. Finally, a discourse is subject to complex internal relationships such as ideological and political alliances of institutions, organizations/communities or individuals which impact object formation; these relationships, partnerships, etc. often are most obvious by surveying text production within a field. Within options offered in this matrix of sequential appearance, relative values and relational significance, Foucault claims “...discourse finds a way of limiting its domain, of defining what it is talking about, of giving it [the object] the status of an object–and therefore of making it manifest, nameable, and describable.” (Foucault, 1972, p.41) These relationships of objects are clarified by the examination of specific discourses; only then does Foucault call for the identification of rules governing the formation of discourse objects on a case-by case basis.

**Grids of Specification**

Grids of Specification are texts representing various types of discursive practice of organizations or institutions; they are another way that discourse artifacts can be grouped for analysis, they represent another way ideas and knowledge are reorganized and transformed by usage. Each type of text has a specific function that distinguishes it from other types of texts, and each discourse generates distinctive text specifications. Foucault’s Grids of Specification account for those distinctions.

To some degree, Foucault assumes examining any discursive text alone will reveal “inherent ideological ambiguities, distortions and absences” of the discourse and
whatever habits of organization and political strategies it may use to mask “the contradictions and incoherences of the ideology that is inscribed in it. (Codd, 1988, p.30)

However, Grids of Specification provide sufficient range of examples of texts to view the multiple instruments used in discourse activity. Provided the texts are “naturally occurring rather than isolated brief examples,” these “grids” will form a continuum of text production of a given discourse organization/community or institution (de Beaugrande, 1994, p. 208). By presenting representative types of texts produced by a given organization or institution, this task reveals commonly used tools of discourse transfer. Because these texts are directed toward a particular audience, the membership of the community generally can be identified.

Collectively, the multiple procedural tasks designed to examine the formation of objects provide comprehensive discourse facts designed to capture the unity of discourse, a phenomenon that cuts “across a domain of structures and possible unities, and which reveals them, with concrete contents, in time and space.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 87)

However, these descriptive procedures only provide a topology of objects: text titles, numbers, dates, ideological and political sources and functions. Certainly, Foucault’s view of discourse is not limited to lists and classification of documents. According to Foucault, the significance of discourse objects is relational:

... let there be no misunderstanding: it is not the objects that remain constant, nor the domain that they form; it is not even their point of emergence or their mode of characterization; but the relation between the surfaces on which they appear, on which they can be delimited, on which they can be analyzed and specified. (Foucault, 1972, p.47)

His theory requires an analysis of types of relationships between these artifacts and the conditions that allow them to exist.
Once Foucault establishes the significance of the discourse object or statement, he changes his lens to examine another discourse dimension. These enunciative modalities are neither equal nor parallel to other dimensions that Foucault sections off for examination. The methodological purpose behind the examination of the formation of enunciative modes is to investigate the many ways discursive relationships are articulated in an institution. By creating a profile, he examines the internal and external activity of a single institution. The procedures reflect Foucault’s concern for the institutional impact on individuals and vise versa; eventually, on ideological influence and transfer. Through text production, the following procedures examine the structure/processes of the institution, “the place of observation,” the individuals chosen as speakers, and the individuals designated as subjects. Although on discontinuous planes, Foucault maintains these disjunctive relationships are precisely where discourse meaning is revealed: patterns of choice are made visible, power structures are uncovered and discursive mechanism are disclosed. Ideological frameworks (what a given community “privileges,” what constrains its “subjects” and what is espoused by its institutional “speakers”) are disclosed. The consistencies or inconsistencies of the organization are substantiated, ultimately, in the textual consistency or hybridism of its discursive statements.
Place of Observation

The “Institutional Site” and supportive subcultures are described by Foucault as the place where discourse interactions can be observed. The procedure for describing and analyzing institutional sites is not clearly explained in Foucault’s writing. No doubt, he acknowledges institutional influences are complex and, to a great extent, site specific. The researcher must devise a system of mapping the various ways in which the institution expresses itself and, then, verify those modes of expression against other commonly used modes in the discourse field. Foucault, however, does cite the hospital as his institutional example; he does generalize that discourse derives its legitimacy or “instruments of verification” from its institutional point of application, “a place of constant, coded, systematic observation, run by a differentiated and hierarchized...staff, thus constituting a quantifiable field of frequencies...” (Foucault, 1972, p. 51) He cites that verification or reinforcement is gained “from variously acquired forms of information in such institutional sites.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 51) Also the secondary institutions or subcultures (such as libraries and laboratories) contribute to discourse exchange through the influence and transfer of information. (Foucault, 1972, p. 51) The institutional complex functions to attract, to select, to change and to normalize ideological practices within the society through various mechanisms of transfer and influence.

While Foucault’s example of the hospital (and, at a later time, the prison) and its affiliated or supportive institutional subcultures function to display unparallel and unequal structures and processes on discourse, his definition of “institution” leaves many other questions unanswered. For instance, arts education is seldom recognized institutionally at the national or governmental level, and, therefore, institutions where
policy (beyond the school) is implemented consistently it is not aligned completely with Foucault’s understanding of the word “institutional.”

**The Speaker: Mechanism of Influence**

Often an extension of the institution, the speaker is identified as a symbol of the discourse ideology. His/her role defines the community’s purpose and activity. From all the possible individuals who are engaged in a discourse community, the speaker is given multiple and related privilege: from formal institutional credentialing to personal prestige among other participants. Likewise, the speaker is privileged with access to information, is positioned strategically within a communications network (internal and external to the discourse) and functions within organizationally defined and sanctioned authority. Foucault maintains the choice of the speaker is an issue of internal institutional power structures.

The speaker, within these interactive processes, is another way in which a discourse expresses itself. An analysis of the function of the speaker within a discourse community reveals a good deal about the political nature of discourse relationships; the authority of personality (i.e. the value of credentials, knowledge, success, leadership and beliefs), the congruence between the organization’s and the speaker’s ideology and, finally, the speaker’s as an effective mechanism of influence.

Overall, Foucault attempts to differentiate the unique status of those individuals allowed to speak for the whole. He asks: How is the speaker accorded the right to participate in the discourse, how (and in what manner) does s/he become qualified in the eyes of those s/he represents, how is s/he personally defined and limited by the specific discourse s/he promotes, and what are the conditions or discourse contingencies
necessary for his/her continued support by the discourse community. What are the status and the role of his/her work when s/he is no longer symbolic of the dominant ideological paradigms and power structures. In his own words, he asks: “What is the status of the individuals who–alone–have the right, sanctioned by law or tradition, juridically defined or spontaneously accepted, to proffer such a discourse?” (Foucault, 1972, p.50)

**The Subject: Mechanism of Transfer**

The subject perceives and disseminates discourse codes; s/he is the discourse conduit of ideas. Much like the speaker, the subject is defined by his/her function within a discourse and its field. S/he plays two major roles: his/her perceptual role, defined by Foucault as the ever “optimal perceptual distance” and his/her communication role within information networks. The subject is engaged usually in multiple institutions and discourses and serves to absorb, to synthesize and to transfer information from one discourse community to another. The exchanges between an individual subject in actual discursive practice and the accepted “rules” or ideologies of discourse communities that house those individuals represent two closely intertwined political processes. Foucault maintains the individual subject is not to be viewed as the source of discourse or as a unifying factor in the relationship of discourses. The individual subject is one of many parts of any discourse. Discourse is not “a phenomenon of expression” by the subject, but rather the reverse; the subject is an expression or dispersion of the discourse in which the subject is involved. (Foucault, 1972, p. 54)

Typical of Foucault, it is also important to recognize the subject often is aligned with various, sometimes opposing or contradictory institutional or community environments. As a carrier of coded ideas and beliefs (usually embedded in language),
the subject is a mechanism of change; s/he translates, transposes, and transfers discourse objects. Unlike the symbolic role of the speaker who operates within and is limited by a stabilizing and systematic ideology, the subject often is an unconscious agent of change. The subject’s communication between discourses and the conventions by which s/he articulates and transfers ideas is more difficult to trace than the community’s influence on the subject.

The major function of these formation tasks is to examine the disposition of individual discourse participants in relationship to institutional structures/processes, to understand how an individual speaker is “chosen” and a subject become “committed” to a given ideological discourse, to recognize that an individual gradually assimilates incongruent ideas and patterns of thought and action into the construction of self. Foucault assumes discourse participants are often unaware of the sources of and the conflicts between multiple ideological components, or of the tremendous power of the discourse forces that convey them. Foucault reiterates: “...it must now be recognized that it is [not] by recourse to a psychological subjectivity that the regulation of its enunciations should be defined.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 55) Emphasizing the socially constructed self, Foucault’s idea of individual or subjective engagement in discourse parallels cognitive processes, but it is not based on any psychological theory. Constructed from the conditions of possibilities of the discourse, Foucault alludes to the motive or incentive of the subject and the speaker to participate in discourse as an attempt to “find oneself, to wrap and gather oneself in the dazzling interiority of a thought that is rightfully Being and Speech... in other words, Discourse....” (Foucault, 1998b, p.150) In order to participate in “the fellowship of discourse,” the discourse participant ultimately
submits to restrictions of “ritual” and its demand for “doctrinal adherence.” (Foucault, 2000, p.238-240) Therefore, through an analysis of texts produced by multiple participants, the discourse forces can be detected.

Acknowledging that the participant’s roles are on discontinuous planes of ideology and function with the institutional site, Foucault maintains, nonetheless, “...discourse is not the majestically unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing, speaking “subject”, but, on the contrary, a totality, in which the dispersion of the “subject” and his discontinuity with himself may be determined” has particularly important implications for any field heavily dependent on idea formation. (Foucault, 1972, p.55)

As Foucault contemplates the structures and mechanisms that are responsible for discourse influence and/or transfer, he focuses once again on language usage and the process of recreating-via-reorganizing knowledge. The methodological purpose behind an examination of the formation of concepts is to discover the relationship of concepts and concept groupings within a single text. In the process, the methodology identifies the rhetorical and discoursal mechanisms responsible for idea formation. The procedures reflect Foucault’s interest in language as a political instrument to perpetuate ideology and secure power.

Foucault designates “concept,” not as a deductively constructed set of principles, but as “...a succession of conceptual systems, each possessing its own organization, and
being articulated only against the permanence of problems, the continuity of tradition, or the mechanisms of influences...” (Foucault, 1972, p.56) As he organizes concept groupings, he avoids predetermined categories: “one describes the conceptual network on the basis of the intrinsic regularities of discourse; one does not subject the multiplicity of statement to the coherence of concepts, and this coherence to the silent recollection of a meta-historical ideality.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 62) From Foucault’s perspective, these concepts are not found in a simple word count, but must be identified in all their different language manifestations, must be recognized as whole and fragmented ideas, and must emerge without benefit of predetermined categories.

Foucault’s procedure for conceptual analysis is to discover the language functions (or the designated use of ideas) in a particular discursive practice. Additionally, these individual tasks chart when, how and how consistently a concept grouping functions in the discourse field. Foucault acknowledges that conceptual analysis links very different discourse phenomena:

...the way in which, for example, the ordering of descriptions or accounts is aligned to the techniques of rewriting; the way in which the field of memory is linked to forms of hierarchy and subordination that govern the statements of a text; the way in which the modes of approximation and development of the statements are linked to the modes of criticism, commentary and interpretation of previously formulated statements, etc. It is this group of relations that constitutes a system of conceptual formation. (Foucault, 1972, p. 59-60)

Nonetheless, he argues that the incongruities revealed between conceptual groupings are meaningful, previously unseen patterns in discourse.

**Forms of Succession**

In order to identify concepts within a discourse text, Foucault charts the manner (time, order, distribution or subordination) in which various manifestations of conceptual
groupings appear in an “enunciative series” (inference, implication, reasoning, descriptions, generalizations, specifications). The spatial distribution and linear succession of the concepts establish its “form.” Foucault notes that, as concept groupings emerge, these forms of succession become the “architecture of a text” and textual format designates meaning as “an obligatory set of schemata of dependence, of order, and of successions in which the recurrent elements that may have value as concepts were distributed.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 57) Foucault suggests both the way in which the rhetorical scheme is perceived and a manner of recording it for analysis:

a general arrangement of the statements, their successive arrangement in particular wholes; it [is] the way in which one wrote down what one observed and, by means of a series of statements, recreated a perceptual process; it was the relation and interplay of subordinations between describing, articulating into distinctive features, characterizing, and classifying; it was the reciprocal position of particular observations and general principles; it was the system of dependence between what one learnt, what one saw, what one deduced, what one accepted as probable and what one postulated. (Foucault, 1972, p.57)

Then, Foucault examines the developing argument by its dependence on rhetorical schemes; he examines how these conceptual groups function to establish meaning in the text (as hypothesis, verification, assertion, critique, general law, application). As a reflection of perceptual and cognitive processes, the tasks reflect Foucault’s concern with how these concept groupings combine into rhetorical functions (attribution, articulation, designation, derivation).

These tasks locate concept groupings not only in the discourse interaction, but also in “the mind or consciousness of individuals.” “In the analysis proposed here, the rules of formation operate...according to a sort of uniform anonymity, on all individuals who undertake to speak in this discursive field.” (Foucault, 1972, p.63) In other words, the individual is “subject to” ideological concepts of a discourse, not the reverse.
Foucault maintains: “Such an analysis, then, concerns, at a kind of *preconceptual* level, the field in which concepts can coexist and the rules to which this field is subjected.” (Foucault, 1972, p.60) In this understated, but very important aspect of discourse theory, language use is seen to determine the cognitive possibilities of those participants involved in any given discourse and, indirectly, to condition their acceptance/non-acceptance of discourse ideology. However, as participants negotiate through multiple discourses, they do not function as if a concept is valid for all discourses. Nor, do they assume an equal or parallel meaning from one concept to another. For instance, concepts change form, meaning and function as a discourse develops. As a discourse develops, concepts mold the cognitive processes and, therefore, the commitment of participants to a recreated idea and preferred ideology. As the participants move from one discourse environment to another, s/he is an agent for the transfer of ideas.

Foucault notes that, as concept groupings emerge, these forms of succession become the “architecture of a text” and textual format designates meaning as “an obligatory set of schemata of dependence, of order, and of successions in which the recurrent elements that may have value as concepts were distributed.” (Foucault, 1972, p.57) Foucault suggests both the way in which the rhetorical scheme is perceived and a manner of recording it for analysis:

a general arrangement of the statements, their successive arrangement in particular wholes; it [is] the way in which one wrote down what one observed and, by means of a series of statements, recreated a perceptual process; it was the relation and interplay of subordinations between describing, articulating into distinctive features, characterizing, and classifying; it was the reciprocal position of particular observations and general principles; it was the system of dependence between what one learnt, what one saw, what one deduced, what one accepted as probable and what one postulated. (Foucault, 1972, p.57)
Forms of Co-Existence

Forms of coexistence are indicators of emphasis and value given a conceptual grouping or ideology within the discourse field. The forms represent the field of presence or all ideas or concept groupings within the conditions of possibility. By focusing on those ideas currently accepted and used in a specific discourse, the field of presence presents statements “...acknowledged to be truthful, involving exact description, well-founded reasoning, or necessary presupposition....” (Foucault 1972, p.57) These statements indicate the underlying ideological position of the institution within the discourse. The institution may support its ideology by implicitly or explicitly referencing “experimental verification, logical validation, mere repetition, acceptance justified by tradition, authority, and commentary, the analysis of error....” of other and opposing positions in the discourse field. (Foucault 1972, p.57)

By the “field of concomitance,” Foucault refers to concepts and concept groupings found elsewhere in other discourse statements of the institution, in other dissimilar discourses, or in other similar discourses of another time, that is, concepts found outside of the present discourse field and yet privileged in the text as valuable. All the objects or statements appropriated (in part or as a whole) from other, sometimes different domains and/or discourses are confirmed by analogy, general principle, transferable models or the function of a higher external authority. Looking for relationships between these domains, Foucault suggests that similar concept groupings exist which deal with quite different issues, but may have analogous purposes or function.
And finally, through the field of memory, Foucault looks for discursive statements informed by past discourse, statements that are “no longer accepted or discussed, and which consequently no longer define either a body of truth or a domain of validity....” (Foucault, 1972, p.58) However distant, “the relationships of filiations, genesis, transformations, continuity, and historical discontinuity can be established.” (Foucault, 1972, p.58) These tasks examine concept function in the domain(s) internal and external to the discourse where the concept group actually is accepted and used, where it coincides with what is considered valid and/or normative and when it demonstrates a genealogical continuity. (Foucault, 1972, p. 57) Although the concepts may not be used directly in the text, the field of memory provides another dimension of discoursal data; particularly, it demonstrates how strongly entrenched some ideas are to the discourse field.

**Procedures of Intervention**

Foucault suggests concept groupings in textual form are a primary means for documenting and tracing components of ideology into discourse; that is, his methodology assumes designated concepts are recycled and the ideologies eventually transformed through processes of textual “intervention.” Procedures of intervention, are one of the most important aspects of Foucaultian analysis; they refer to “...the way in which one transfers a type of statement [that is, a conceptual form and meaning serving a particular function] from one field of application to another....” (Foucault, 1972, p. 57) As a concept grouping is transferred into different discourse structures (formal construction, configuration of texts, relationships between texts, detailed rhetorical practices and/or characteristics of historical periods), its form, meaning and function change. Noting that
these structures are of “rather different kinds,” Foucault suggests rhetorical categories. But he makes clear that such a system of categories is not “valid for a direct, immediate description of the concepts themselves.” (Foucault, 1972, p.60)

Similarly, concept form, meaning and function are changed according to discoursal mechanisms or interventions. Examples of these procedures are: “techniques of rewriting” where linear descriptions are transposed to classificatory tables, “methods of transcribing” where concepts originating in a “natural” language are expressed in a “more or less formalized and artificial language,” “modes of translating” where quantitative statements are changed into qualitative formulations and vice versa, means used to approximate, that is, to make a statement more exact and more refined structurally, the manner employed to extend or restrict a concept in different time periods, means used to transfer ideas between fields of application, or methods of systematizing propositions “...that already exist, because they have been previously formulated, but in a separated state; or again the methods of redistributing statements that are already linked together, but which one rearranges in a new systematic whole....” (Foucault, 1972, p.59)

When these mechanisms of influence and transfer are combined, the discourse characteristics undergo a change. As the concepts are recycled, the underlying propositions are rearranged and/or resystematized and a new discursive unity is created. The function of Foucault method is to capture discourse concepts being circulated and continuously modified by rhetorical structures and discoursal processes; to document the extension or the restriction of their previous form.
According to Foucault, discourse itself cannot be objectively translated. Foucault cautions: “...to analyze the formation of concepts, one must relate them neither to the horizon of ideality, nor to the empirical progress of ideas.” (Foucault, 1972, p.63) “The most one can do is to make a systematic comparison, from one region to another, of the rules for the formation of concepts.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 63) He does suggest:

One stands back in relation to this manifest set of concepts; and one tries to determine according to what schemata (of series, simultaneous groupings, linear or reciprocal modification) the statements may be linked to one another in a type of discourse; one tries in this way to discover how the recurrent elements of statements can reappear, dissociate, recompose, gain in extension or determination, be taken up into new logical structures, acquire, on the other hand, new semantic contents, and constitute partial organizations among themselves. (Foucault, 1972, p. 60)

**The Formation of Strategies**

- Points of Diffraction
- Points of Determination
- Authority of Function

The methodological purpose behind the examination of the formation of strategies is to reveal principles or theories of discursive choice; to trace elements of on-going discourse between opposing factions within a discourse field. Through decisions discovered in the previously examined dimensions (objects, enunciative modes and concepts), the discourse characteristics (contextual, organizational, ideological, and discoursal) can be compared; simultaneously, an analysis of the formation of strategies demonstrates the continuous grouping and regrouping of discourse ideas into new discursive statements within the discourse field. The procedures reflect Foucault’s interest in uncovering the dominant political powers (via discoursal factors or principles) impacting a discourse field.
Labeling these factors or principles as “nodal points,” Foucault looks for evidence of these factors in the repeated strategies or themes implicit in these discoursal choices. Such strategies represent the discursive choice, the rationalization for the choice and the mechanisms influencing the decision making. Strategies or themes of discoursal choice generally are found in statements as goals; they often are statements of purpose combined or qualified by statements of function (or how the purpose must be implemented). Often, these strategies are revealed in fragments through previous levels of formation analysis. While most texts are hybrids on the conceptual level, the discourse strategies revealed in texts are embedded in the use made of concept groupings to justify choices about a social issue, define a problem, provide institutional guidelines or negotiate a favored action through discourse participants. The procedural tasks identify contrasting elements used in the discourse field (points of diffraction); they compare those ideas or strategies around which decisions are made (principle of determination) and, finally, they determine those strategies with the greatest impact on discursive choices in the field.

**Points of Diffraction**

Establishing points of diffraction, two ideas are used to describe discoursal strategy: incompatibility and equivalence. Specifically, “incompatibility” refers to elements (drawn from and influenced by the dimensions of objects, enunciative modes or concepts) in the same discourse which cannot enter “under pain of manifest contradiction or inconsequence—the same series of statements.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 65) These discourse factors or principles have no basis of comparison. On the other hand, “equivalence” refers to elements “formed in the same way and on the basis of the same rules; the condition of their appearance are identical; they are situated at the same level;
and instead of constituting a mere defect of coherence, they form an alternative....”
(Foucault, 1972, p.65) Whether or not coherence ultimately is achieved within an organization or in a discourse field, the tension produced between these inherent contradictions within the discourse field provokes a discursive choice; strategies of choice or “link points of systematization” become evident in the discourse as “various mutually exclusive architectures... appear side by side or in turn.”(Foucault, 1972, p.66)
These tasks within the analysis of the formation of diffraction represent single discursive choices; single discursive choices from many discourse dimensions are “the immediate unity and raw material out of which larger discursive groups (strategies, theories, themes) are formed.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 66) In short, every organization will emerge with a series of individual acts and text, express itself with characteristic statements and promote certain concepts and concept groupings; the result is a pattern of functional strategies impacting the field of discourse.

**Points of Determination**

Discursive selection or choice based on contemporaneous or related discourse influences external to the discourse is integral to Foucault’s theory and method. Points of determination examine “the role played by the discourse being studied in relation to those that are contemporary with it or related to it.....” (Foucault, 1972, p. 66) By examining the discourse reset in a discourse field, the “Economy of Discursive Constellation” examines whether the discourse serves as one of many formal, equally valued, but different positions [i.e. one art education ideology in relationship to an other or opposing art education discourse], perhaps as a concrete model of a broader ideology [i.e. art education representing a general educational ideology] or if it mutually functions in “a
relation of analogy, opposition, or complementarity with certain other discourses [i.e. art education in relationship to art].” (Foucault, 1972, p. 66) The position of the discourse within a field of discourses determines the delimitation on idea choice, ideas restricted “at a higher level and in a broader space.”(Foucault, 1972, p. 67)

Foucault’s points of determination acknowledge the multiple discursive choices that are possible at any time; he compares discourse choices with those options within the discourse field. And, he seeks to determine the principles that permitted or excluded a certain number of statements. The tasks identify the “principles of possibilities” and “principles of exclusion” that contribute to discourse choice. Simply put, these tasks establish what decisions were possible for a given organization/institution and, specifically, why some decisions or choices were avoided.

**Authority of Function**

Finally, the authority of function refers to the relationship of a discourse to non-discursive processes extrinsic to itself; that is, indirect processes that do not interfere with discourse unity, its character or the rules of its various formations. These relationships are exhibited, for instance, in discourse interaction with the persistent problems and practices within a society, in the rules of approbation generally accepted for discoursal influence or transfer, and in the idealization of ideas, beliefs, values, etc.

The discoursal relationship to these external circumstances, that is, how the discourse appropriates and redefines those problems for secondary purposes, how it represents causes that are not internal to it, and how it integrates its view of the problem into the social fabric is a discursive choice and indicative of its ideological power to function within the situational context. Looking at the relative success of the discourse in
influencing or transferring its ideology into a broader realm, Foucault suggests that the discourse be evaluated by its acceptance in practice. In this study, that acceptance could be represented by the curriculum-in-use, controlling the participation in the profession (i.e. those who can influence or transfer ideas) or the curriculum elements incorporated in policy statements."

Foucault contends these larger problems present another interactive relationship, another element in idea formation; and, according to him, these elements, likewise, follow identifiable rules. Clarifying these final examples of discourse interaction as authorities of function, Foucault again stresses their integral relationship to idea formation:

In any case, the analysis of this authority must show that neither the relation of discourse to desire, nor the processes of its appropriation, nor its role among non-discursive practices is extrinsic to its unity, its characterization, and the laws of its formation. They are not disturbing elements which, superposing themselves upon its pure, neutral a temporal, silent form, suppress its true voice and emit in its place a travestied discourse, but, on the contrary, its formative elements. (Foucault, 1972, p. 68)

Of particular interest in this formation analysis of strategies is the manner in which a discourse community consistently distinguishes itself via its choices from the discourse field. Foucault offers little guidance about the motivation or incentive for collective choice. He allows the possibility that strategies are born out of “necessity” which makes them “successive solutions to one and the same problem....” or “chance encounters,” but clearly he believes strategies (themes, theories) evolve from “a regularity between them and define the common system of their formation....” (Foucault, 1972, p.64) Yet, he maintains:

And just as one must not relate the formation of objects either to words or to things, nor that of statements either to the pure form of knowledge or to the
psychological subject, nor that of concepts either to the structure of ideality or to
the succession of ideas, one must not relate the formation of theoretical choices
either to a fundamental project or to the secondary play of opinions. (Foucault,
1972, p. 70)

Similarly, he abstains from viewing discourse as only political strategy, a rational
statement of “truth” followed by an intentional act: “All these groups of discourses that
are to be described are not the expression of a world-view that has been coined in the
form of words, nor the hypocritical translation of an interest masquerading under the
pretext of a theory....” (Foucault, 1972, p. 69)

The Plan of the Study

Philosophically, Foucault imagines that discourses have internal rules and
exercise control over what he refers to as “another dimension of discourse; that of “events
and chance.” (Foucault, 1994, p. 234) He describes these as the major narratives, told,
retold and varied; formulae, texts, ritualized texts to be spoken in well-defined
circumstances; things said once, and conserved because people suspect some hidden
secret or wealth lies buried within.” (Foucault, 2000, p. 234) These underlying
narratives are a bridge from institutional discourse to the daily individual discursive
practices. Such discursive functions “reiterate, expound and comment” on the larger
discourses in the society. (Foucault, 2000, p. 234) An analysis of discourse formations,
then, is to identify, describe, and analyze these narratives. But they:

…must be described as systematically different ways of treating objects of
discourse (of delimiting them, regrouping or separating them, liking them together and
making them derive from one another), of arranging forms of enunciation (of choosing
them, of placing them, constituting series, composing them into great rhetorical unities),
of manipulating concepts (of giving them rules for their use, inserting them into regional
coherences, and thus constituting conceptual architectures. (Foucault, 1972, p. 70)
Also, Luke (1999) proposes, discourse analysis as applied to educational environments and texts reflects the micro-macro dilemma common in the disciplines from which it has been derived.

The outstanding task for critical discourse analysis, then, is to provide detailed analysis of cultural voices and texts in local education sites, while attempting to connect theoretically, and empirically these with an understanding of power and ideology in broader social formations and configurations. (Luke, 1999, p. 167)

The plan of this study is to create, implement and evaluate a model for policy discourse that provides the methodological “bridge” between the arts education policy text and text representing broad social actions. The model completes, adjusts and modifies, and makes concrete the tasks Foucault outlined as the four dimensions in which discursive ideas form. Initially, a database is created around the tasks of the Formation of Objects. Based on the identification of texts, the model for this study uses texts in four ways to examine the four different dimensions proposed by Foucault; the texts are selected for textual, multitextual, intertextual, and contextual analysis. Finally, a genealogical model is constructed to compare discourse functions from 1970-2000.

**Model Modification: Discourse Communities, Organizations and Institutions**

Throughout Foucault’s writing, his focus is on large social institutions and their role in discourse. But this study seeks to focus on the less defined role of organizations in discourse activity. While many of the characteristics identified or described by Foucault are applicable to organizations, a definition of the differences is necessary to understand both Foucault’s ideas about institutions and the view of organizations presented in this study.

Pinar credits King and Brownell (1966) with introducing a new dimension to curriculum studies; they saw disciplinary bodies of knowledge as emerging from
“communities of discourse,” “a corps of human beings with a common intellectual commitment who make a contribution to human thought and to human affairs.” (Cited in Pinar et al, 1995, p. 170) This description of discourse communities is useful because it links the idea of a collective commitment to a set of ideas, followed by a related action. Although the process of achieving “collective commitment” is difficult to define, Steinberger (1995) suggests policy participants inevitably engage in typification as they construct policy meaning. (Steinberger, 1995, p.225) Therefore, constructing a profile of a policy community with a “collective commitment” depends not only on the identification of a consistent ideological purpose but on documenting the conventions, the rules and the regularity of its community functions. (Foucault, 1972, p. 31-35, 37) For instance, communities are defined by their discourse order, type of discourse and actual practices.

Clarifying the discourse field, that is, discovering the various discourse communities present, is equally difficult because of the fluidity of communities. Foucault demonstrates how fluid the collective commitment to discursive ideas can be:

What one must characterize and individualize is the coexistence of these dispersed and heterogeneous statements; the system that governs their division, the degree to which they depend upon one another, the way in which they interlock or exclude one another, the transformation that they undergo, and the play of their location, arrangement, and replacement. (Foucault, 1972, p. 34)

Institutions, at the opposite end of the continuum, are often defined by ideological form and resistant to change processes. Unlike discourse communities, the institutional ideology is not as fluid and may approach problems more traditionally, it may state issues more broadly, and it may be more consistent conceptually within itself and more thematically aligned with broader social values and structures. From a somewhat epic
view, they often are sites of competing ideological forces and power within a society.

Faircough (1989) explains the purpose and function of social power and authority within institutional structures.

How discourses are structured in a given order of discourse, and how structuring change over time, are determined by changing relationships of power at the level of social institution or of the society. Power at these levels includes the capacity to control orders of discourse; one aspect of such control is ideological—ensuring that orders of discourse are ideologically harmonized internally or (at the societal level) with each other. (Faircough, 1989, p. 30)

From this perspective, broadly defined governmental institutions existing at the national, state and local levels are integrated with non-governmental institutions at all of these levels to form discourse orders (i.e. the political system, the legal system, the medical system and the educational system).

Institutional analysis offers a precise way to generalize about existing arts education policy. However, evidence of institutionalization of arts education within national, state or local policy is relatively minimal. Despite the infrastructure created by the National Endowment, the field of arts education exists primarily as “camps” of opinion. Therefore, while the field is involved in ideological struggles, evidence of the institutionalization of those ideologies is scattered and inconsistent; it exists often on a “preinstitutional” or organizational level.

At the organizational level, private foundations, religious organizations and professional associations/federations strive to institutionalize their ideology into the norm, to make, according to Fiske (1998), norms which are “ideologically slanted in favor of a particular class or group of classes but are accepted as natural by other classes, even when the interests of those other classes are directly opposed by the ideology reproduced by living life according to those norms.” (Fiske, 1998, p. 307) Often referred
to as the “engineering” of consent, Fiske proposes that all social institutions including organizations and lesser defined “communities” are interrelated in this process:

At the unstated level of ideology, however, each institution is related to all the others by an unspoken web of ideological interconnections, so that the operation of any one of them is “overdetermined” by its complex, invisible network of interrelationships with all the others. Thus the educational system, for example, cannot tell a story about the nature of the individual different from those told by the legal system, the political system, the family, and so on. (Fiske, 1998, p. 307)

The implications for modifying Foucault’s method for this study are 1) all communities and organizations within a discourse field exhibit certain similarities to larger institutional networks (congress, federal agencies, etc.). Policy discourses seldom stand without institutional support; indeed, the structural relationships of rules or conventions for a given discourse usually are set by associated institutions. 2) Discourse communities and organizations seek to normalize their ideology and impact the nation’s schools. Therefore, the degree of institutionalization of arts education within these large systems is reflected the policy purpose and function of the dominant education paradigms. 3) Through institutional and community interactions both social continuity and social change are insured. Although these broad assumptions make it easier to conceptualize “institution,” “organization” or “community,” a specific understanding of the demarcation for each remains vague.

Research Population and Text Sample

All areas of a discourse field produce “texts.” “The concept of text implies both a specific piece of writing and, much more broadly, social reality itself.” (Pinar, et al., 1995, p. 48) But, as many critics have noted, a “policy text” is an encoded record of the relationships of the discourse field; the conflicts, compromises, and consensus of policy makers revealed through language systems. As suggested by Codd (1988), policy
statements and their associated documents are “cultural and ideological artifacts to be interpreted in terms of their implicit patterns of signification, underlying symbolic structures and contextual determinants of meaning.” (Codd, 1988, p.243)

**Organizations and Texts**

In this model, the goal is to uncover in advocacy statements of art education organizations the curricular ideologies and policy functions that drive arts education policy makers and, thereby, to reveal the direct and indirect mechanisms of idea formation that control decision making in the field. Choosing policy texts for analysis begins with establishing the archeological “finds” in art education of the last 30 years. In short, following Foucault recommendation to observe the “field of the facts of discourse” in its “non-synthetic purity,” the researcher samples, as a starting point, whatever artifacts that remain of the discourse and, then, studies “their internal configuration or secret contradiction.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 26)

Text choice in this model follows certain criteria: 1) All of the texts are repeatedly referenced remnants of arts education discourse activity of the three bracketed time periods, and they collectively represent a historical time line of nationally visible arts education policy action from 1970-2000, 2) acknowledging that the text may “simply put a regulatory framework around developments that are already in place or continue a trend or change already considered for some time beforehand,” the texts substantially reflect or reinforce the contemporary curriculum ideologies. (Deem and Behony, 2000, p. 194) And, 3) the texts collectively represent individual arts education advocacy organizations at a pivotal point in their activity. Finally, 4) the texts analyzed in this model
simultaneously represent the organizational structures and processes evident in its
contemporary field of discourse.

Each organization, within a short time after the publication of its primary policy
statement, published a series of monographs, a collection of essays, or companion texts
advocating the organization’s curricular orientation, its recommended program structure
and its implementation strategy. (The primary texts are used in single text analysis of
concepts and the secondary texts are used in multi text analysis of enunciative modes.)
Following Foucault’s procedures outlined in the surfaces of emergence, three advocacy
organizations and their policy statements are chosen for discourse analysis: The Arts,
Education and Americans Panel (AEAP), The Getty Institute for Education in the Arts,
and The Consortium of the National Arts Education Associations. Each organization 1)
was dominant during a different bracketed time period, 2) they emerged sequentially over
the three decades presented in this study, 3) they represented a distinct ideological
framework, and 4) they represented visible and powerful factions in arts education
discourse on the national level.

The following texts have been chosen for Discourse Organization #1.

For Single Text Analysis:

Arts, Education and Americans, Inc. (1977). *Coming to our senses: The
Significance of the arts for American education.*

For Multi Text Analysis:

[Junius Eddy (1981), *Case for the arts in schools-*#7; Ruth Weinstock (1981), *Arts in the
curriculum-*#8; Mary Louise Bliss (1981), *Creative collaborations-*#9; Nancy Morison
Ambler and Barbara R. Strong (1981), *Arts in the classroom-*#10]*
The following texts have been chosen for Discourse Organization #2

For Single Text Analysis:

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts. (1985). *Beyond creating: The Place for art in America’s schools.*

For Multi Text Analysis:


The following texts have been chosen for Discourse Organization #3

For Single Text Analysis:

Music Educators National Conference. (1994). *The National Standards for education in the arts: What students should know and be able to do in the arts.*

For Multi Text Analysis:

Music Educators National Conference. (1994). *The Vision for arts education in the 21st century: The Ideas and ideals behind the development of the National Standards for education in the arts*

**Context and Field of Discourse Texts**

As ideology defines itself, it establishes its power base in opposition to other ideologies. The purpose of discourse field analysis is to compare and contrast organized communities (scholars, artists, practitioners, advocates, policymakers or others, if appropriate) and chart their mechanisms of influence/transfer on the discourse in question. The texts from art education, art and general education are 1) texts produced within the bracketed time frame of the discourse, they represent different discourse domains of action or interaction within the discourse field or situational context, 2) they represent distinct organizational structures, 3) they exemplify other or opposing stated
curricular and policy views within the discourse, and 4) they define and respond to
situational issues/problems differently. In short, they verify the conditions of possibility
in the discourse field.

The following texts have been chosen for Discourse Field #1: 1970-1979

For Intertextual Analysis:


Alliance for Art Education. (1977). *Toward coordinated federal policies for support of arts education*


The following texts have been chosen for Discourse Field #2: 1980-1989

For Intertextual Analysis:


Americans Council for the Arts (ACA). (1988). *Can we rescue the arts for America’s children? Coming to our senses 10 years later.*


The following texts have been chosen for Discourse Field #3: 1990-2000

For Intertextual Analysis:


The Arts Education Partnership. (1992). *The Power of the arts to transform education*

Because the primary focus of this study is to demonstrate and assess a methodological approach, not all items in the database will be used and/or used extensively in analysis. For instance, a limited number of texts represent registers of influence and serve as a basis for summarizing the contextual forces on the community. Likewise, the text production of the organizations and discursive practice is summarized to indicate the scope of the community’s activity. While all texts identified in the database are the basis for the Formation of Object analysis, texts chosen for examination in an analysis via other formations (and the manner in which those texts will be used, i.e. textual, multi textual and intertextual analysis) are determined by the specific purpose of that formation analysis.

Summary

Derived from Foucault’s mode of inquiry, the policy model for this study determines the method for data collection and treatment. Constructed to meet the needs of arts education policy research, the model reflects four dimensions for gathering evidence of discourse idea formation suggested by Foucault: Objects, Enunciative Modes, Concepts and Strategies. Each sequential formation reflects aspects of Foucault’s discourse theory through different methodological purposes. The archeological models 1) situate arts education policy documents within a policy environment, 2) profiles the intermingled characteristics of arts education discourse organization/community expression contributing to these texts, 3) explicates the various subtext of significant arts education policy statements, and 4) interprets levels and complexities of policy strategies and function of the discourse field on emerging arts education policy from 1970-present.
CHAPTER 5

THE FORMATION OF OBJECTS: DEMONSTRATION OF MODEL

Purpose of Objects Formation Model

Data revealed through the model about the formation of objects is primarily descriptive. In an effort not to overlook important, but inconspicuous relationships, this formation analysis initially scans the significant levels and forms of arts education discourse objects represented by the published texts between 1970 and 2000, the bracketed period of the study. The texts are identified and a database is constructed using Foucault’s suggested tasks and the registers of influence to designate the objects to appropriate groups. Consisting of 400 plus textual artifacts impacting arts education discourse, the database represents pertinent texts accumulated, located and obtained through standard research sources: the Worldwide Web, Library of Congress, Ohiolink, Educational Abstracts, Eric, Congressional Universe, etc. For the most part, the model and database are the foundation for contextual or situational analysis. This contextual analysis provides a backdrop for the formation of art education policy ideas. Through an expansive process of identification and description of related or pertinent arts education texts, the model for object formation insures a purposeful selection and a careful representation of texts to provide data on a given arts education discourse and to represent adequately the diverse policy streams in the discourse context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational Context</th>
<th>Institution Structures</th>
<th>Discourse Field</th>
<th>Discursive Practices</th>
<th>Chronology &amp; Sequence of Text Emergence</th>
<th>Organization Initiatives &amp; Affiliations</th>
<th>Significance of Texts &amp; Titles</th>
<th>Policy Statements &amp; Reports</th>
<th>Sponsored Research, Scholarship &amp; Criticism</th>
<th>Rules, Regulations &amp; Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government Actions</td>
<td>Federally Supported Agencies</td>
<td>Organized Communities: Art Education, Art, &amp; General Education</td>
<td>Individual Scholarship, Research &amp; Criticism</td>
<td>Title Number &amp; Sequence</td>
<td>Projects, Alliances &amp; Partnerships</td>
<td>Repeated Citations &amp; References</td>
<td>Position Papers, Meetings &amp; Media</td>
<td>Commissioned Papers &amp; Research Reports</td>
<td>Advocacy Agendas &amp; Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Formation of Objects: Text Identification Database 1970-2000
First, the model for the authorities of delimitation identifies and categorizes arts education texts by their relationship to levels of policy discourse within the social order (primarily represented by the federal government). Various registers (which are model modifications) demonstrate the presence and level that curriculum issues in the arts are institutionalized. These designated “registers” in the model, are represented by federal government action, by federal agencies or federal agencies dealing with art and education issues (the National Endowment for the Arts and the U.S. Department of Education), by a range of discourse organizations/communities impacting arts education through advocacy (including, art, education and arts education advocacy organizations) and by individual discursive practices in the field (in this study, the critical response of arts educators to the primary policy statements). Once the discourse registers are identified, the limitations of the situational context on discursive activity can be addressed.

Secondly, the surfaces of emergence provides a closer examination of a particular aspect of the field: while the tasks in this model could be applied to any specific ideas, institutions, etc., in this study, surfaces of emergence will examine dominant organizations (such as the Arts, Education and Americans, Inc., The Getty Institute for Education in the Arts, The Consortium for National Arts Education Associations) advocating for the art education field. Although not exhaustive, the focus of this model task is on organizational text emergence (as indicated by the database); it maps the chronology and sequence of text production (number, dates, sequence of titles). Through an overview of organizational text production, the model distinguishes the significant impact of specific texts (texts deemed sufficiently important on some level by discourse participants) to warrant closer textual examination. Also, the tasks chart the ideological
and political partnerships and/or alliances of the organizations represented by texts published during the bracketed discourse periods. These tasks reveal an individual policy community’s patterns of influence and pathways of ideological transfer. According to Foucault, mapping the surface of emergence establishes relationships in dimensions of time and place; “place” including the political position, the relative strength of the organization’s ideological forces in shaping the discourse field, and the power of a given advocacy community and its ideology in relation to overall discourse forces.

Finally, the model for the grids of specification designates the organization’s body of texts by intended use or unintended function, their apparent or “intended” audience and the manner in which discourse ideas are divided, contrasted, related, regrouped, classified and correlated by the targeted audience. While recognizing that few texts have a single audience, purpose or function, the model designates all arts education texts produced by the dominant organizations as advocacy statements, although they specifically may be designated as internal rules and regulations, as sponsored scholarship, and as curricular or policy implementation guidelines, etc.. Such grids of specification reveal the hierarchy of organizational interests and intent; for instance, whether an organization is focused on abstract theoretical recommendations or guides to practice unfolds much about its underlying world view, its beliefs about the learning process, its understanding of the purpose of schooling and the value it places on institutionalizing cultural practices, particularly art. The emphasis within the specific grids also reveals the organization’s perception of the power structure, the manner in which the organization targets a policy audience within the discourse community, identifies particular factions of policy decision makers and locates organized advocacy support and resources. The texts
used in this study are characterized as advocacy statements which include curriculum policy recommendations articulated for the purpose of influencing policy decision makers to a particular world view, to presenting arts study as valuable in reinforcing particular processes of learning and/or by advocating for a defined institutional position for the arts either within the schools or supported by federal agencies.

**Discourse Context #1: 1970-1979**

**Authorities of Delimitation**

Between 1970 and 1979, the database for this study reveals 79 texts representing the social discourse on education, and specifically arts education. Various registers demonstrate the level that curriculum in the arts had been institutionalized. Additionally, the registers reflect the discourse order of ideological communities and individual discursive practice for the decade.

**Situational Context: Congressional Action**

During the 1970s, educational reform expanded discourse into the general society; the trend was toward “a new, more capitalistic, less educator-oriented, and less locally democratic network of curriculum policy makers to replace the Educational Policies Commission of the NEA [National Education Association].” (Schubert, 1991, p. 113) Although congressional action reflects a strengthening involvement in the arts education discourse, the influence of the discourse field is not obvious in new legislation. Most arts education policy developments were rooted in the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.* Various titles allowed numerous initiatives that potentially benefited the arts: school-based projects, the acquisition of instructional and library resources for
programming, expanded supervisory personnel and support for research and professional development.

A few pieces of legislation enacted by Congress during the 1970s on related arts and education issues provided indirect support for arts education. The *Education Amendments of 1974* (PL 93-380) authorized an Arts Education Program of the U. S. Office of Education. It provided for the first categorical support for the arts in elementary and secondary schools. The statute gave focus to a prior year’s legislation by stipulating that a program of grants and contracts be carried out through arrangements with the JFK Center for the Performing Arts “to encourage and assist state and local education agencies to establish and conduct programs in which the arts are an integral part of elementary and secondary school programs. Most state and local projects funded through the program concentrate on training teachers, artists and administrators—those who bring the arts to children.” (Munley, 1999, p. 51)

On the other hand, along with on-going appropriations to arts-related federal programs and agencies, the *National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Amendments of 1973* (PL 93-133) and the *Arts, Humanities and Cultural Affairs Act of 1978* (PL 94-462) which amended and extended the *National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965* demonstrates growing congressional support for museums, the National Councils on Arts and on Humanities, and state involvement in cultural support of public agencies and private nonprofit organizations through grant programs.

By the end of the decade, the *Education Amendments of 1978* (PL 95-561), another extension of ESEA, provided for and equalized multiple forms of federal aid to state and local educational programs and agencies. While none of this legislation singled
out arts education per se, many of its provisions targeted specific groups such as Indian or Native American and adult education programs and, as is the case with congressional action throughout this decade, sought to promote and streamline a broad framework of social reform efforts where arts education could be used instrumentally.

**Institutional Sites and Structures: Federal Agencies (NEA, USDE)**

Undercurrents within the discourse context would slowly gather momentum for arts education in the 1970s. Several events and texts emerge representing the central concerns and pivotal interactions of various federal agencies. The text production, somewhat limited, reflects continuing efforts of Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) and Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory (SWRL) supported by the United States Department Education (USDE) and NIE research funds. Sporadic collaborations between the USDE and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) reflected a divided responsibility for arts education and indicated an institutional uncertainty about the position of arts education in the federal bureaucracy. In 1970 the NEA contracts with CEMREL for the first time to evaluate the Artists-in-Schools program and to propose a basic instruction curriculum supplemented with art encounters. Notable collaborations of this sort are represented in the 1970 involvement of the USDE in the expansion of the Artists-in-Schools program, USDE support for the development of the Pennsylvania State University arts impact interdisciplinary model (1973), and the 1975 joint agency report on the Artists-in-Schools program, *Extending the dream* (1975). Advocating a focus on programming, rather than teaching, still other significant collaborations emerge; in particular, the Office of Education and the Kennedy Center form the Alliance for Arts Education (AAE) in 1973. On occasion, the NEA
attempts to sever its dependence on the Office of Education. For example, it requests an amendment to its enabling legislation in 1973. However, interagency issues of “teacher” training (who is the “teacher” and what agency, if any, is responsible for training the “teacher”) are never resolved fully. Certainly, funding for teacher training is a major issue for both agencies. In addition to a belief in the “artist-teacher,” NEA policymaking seems driven to identify an inexpensive workforce: for instance, the NEA suspends appropriations to the Office of Education for teacher training institutes in 1973, yet soon contracts with Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) to administer and evaluate the expanded Artists-in-Schools Program.

Additionally, significant events throughout the decade often involve defining interagency responsibilities and directing agency appropriations for programming. Along with community-based initiatives through the Expansion Arts Program, the Office of Education begins transferring funds to the NEA to expand the Artists-in-Schools (AIS) program (1970); this support becomes a permanent arrangement in 1972. The USDE appropriates Manpower Development and Training funds to train artists for employment in the schools (1973), NEA funds were reallocated internally to the AIS program (1973) to off-set budget loses from USDE, and the agency commits funds through the Challenge Grant Program in order to leverage local matching funds in 1978.

The USDE’s involvement in arts education, similar to CEMREL, appears to take the form of limited consulting with additional funding and statistical record keeping commitments rather than policy making per se. Ernest Boyer’s (1977) *Arts in education: The View from the FOB6* is an example. In addition to the struggle for who is the “teacher,” the focus on workplace skills was evident in *Arts, cultural services and career*
education (1973) published by the Center for Occupational and Adult Education. In 1974, after the formation of AAE (an Office of Education and the Kennedy Center collaboration) in 1973, Congress authorized categorical support for Arts in Elementary and Secondary Education (PL 93-380).

During most of the decade, the NEA leadership had a strong if not direct, effect on arts education. Under Chairman Nancy Hanks (1969-1977), the agency focused on the development and availability of cultural institutions and the promotion of art as a cultural legacy. “As head of the Endowment from 1969 to 1977, Hanks had the skill and time to affect profoundly and lastingly the political context and agenda of federal policy and programming for the arts and arts education.” (Gee, 1999, p.6) According to Munley, “The AIS program was cited as an example of a program the NEA was using to reach all geographical regions of the country” when Congress became concerned about the concentration of NEA funds in metropolitan areas. (Munley, 1999, p.49) As early as 1974, a National Advisory Panel for the AIS program was established under the leadership of Dr. Thomas Bergin, Notre Dame University. As the economic crisis of the mid-1970s deepened, Munley (1999) recounts that at a 1975 meeting of state AIS coordinators, “all agreed that the basic problem with the program was a lack of consensus about its main priority; the individual artist as the catalyst for the program, or students in the schools.” (Munley, 1999, p. 52) While the NEA’s primary concern was for the individual artist, according to Munley’s research, Congress, on the other hand, was concerned about the economic displacement of arts specialists in the schools. Conflicting curricular ideologies were complicated by economic and workplace concerns and professional insecurities.
With the appointment of Livingston Biddle as chair of the NEA in 1977, events and texts reflect a steady, continuous and minimal growth in the agency’s attention to arts education; agency attention primarily focused on audience development for performing arts organizations and museums. In 1978, a Memorandum of Understanding between the Office of Education and the NEA was an attempt to delineate each agency’s responsibility in policy making and programming in arts education. Simultaneously in 1978, the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities (NEA, NEH, IMS, JFK center and the Smithsonian Institution) established a working group to focus on “collaboration at the local level between schools and cultural organizations.” (Munley, 1999, p. 57) Inter-agency dialogue remained polarized on many issues, but, for a while, there were some efforts toward bureaucratic consensus. In 1978, a federal interagency committee produced *Arts education 1977: In Prose and print* (1978). Formed and chaired by Junius Eddy, the committee appears to have had little impact; no immediate federal level action was evident.

Despite the disparity in the size of the population served, the NEA’s major constituency continued to be the art community, and art organizations represented an institutionally protected group. The Task Force on the *Education, training and development of artists and arts educators* (1978) recommended that the NEA’s primary responsibility was to this population; the role and responsibility of the agency to arts education was one of advocacy. The NEA appears to have continued the promotion of professional artists in the classroom as a preferred educational delivery system. As Munley (1999) points out, the local and state arts organizations and arts service organizations “were silent on the issue of arts education.” (Munley, 1999, p. 61) Unlike
the arts, Wyszomirski (1997) concludes the policy paradigm for arts education at the NEA was never fully formulated, legitimated and developed:

In arts education, the NEA focused its efforts on the presentation of art in the schools by artists. Arts study as part of the curriculum was essentially left to the existing system of public and private instruction. This approach resulted in two delivery systems for arts education experiences, and the two were never fully integrated. (Wyszomirski, 1997, p.3)

At the end of the first decade of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), an ideology, a purpose for arts education was still underdeveloped, but a preferred delivery system emphasizing artists-as-teachers was institutionalized at the national level and formalized by increasing collaborations of federal agencies, the commitment of taxpayer dollars, the implementation of programs and, of course, the installation of a small, but unified bureaucracy. All of these practices were accepted without benefit of substantial and external program evaluation. Responding to mounting criticism of the NEA programs and corresponding with Biddle’s new leadership at the NEA, the AEAP, chaired by David Rockefeller, Jr. and funded by the Office of Education, the NEA and the Rockefeller Foundation produced *Coming to our senses; The Significance of the arts for American education* in 1977.

**The Discourse Field: Other and Opposing Organizations**

For this first discourse field, other or opposing discoursal factions are scattered and relatively lacking in unity. Emerging texts reveal activity in the field is centered on the work of federal agencies, the collection of data on the state of arts education in the schools, and monitoring existing programs. During this bracketed period, arts education scholars and the professional organizations, often with federal aid, continue to define and redefine theories and develop model frameworks of practice. Besides the AEAP (JDR 3rd
Fund), CEMREL and the arts education professional associations were responsible for most advocacy and scholarly activity in the field in the 1970s. Along with institutes for teachers and administrators and numerous curriculum frameworks and models, their activity is documented in notable text examples such as CEMREL’s *Arts and aesthetics: An Agenda for the future* (1977), *Through the arts to the aesthetic* (1977) and the collaboration of HEW with the four professional organizations, *Try a new face* (1979). Of particular interest are the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) text *Toward an aesthetic education* (1971) and the NAEA’s second *Report from the commission on arts education* (1977).

As early as 1976, the major professional organizations began occasional joint meetings and information gathering efforts. The AAE (JFK, USDE) was very active in facilitating early collaborations: it was instrumental in the Arts Education Advocacy seminars (1976), in efforts with the National Arts Education Advisory Panel which produced *Toward coordinated federal policies for support of arts education* (1977), and with the national arts education associations’ text, *Merging agendas for arts education* (1978). To a far lesser extent, arts organizations such as the American Arts Alliance and the ACA were involved in advocacy for arts education; when active, they supported the position of AEAP and contributed to a more obvious presence of arts education on the national agenda. Occasionally, the general education community voiced a concern for education in the arts; the National School Boards Association (NSBA), for instance, published *Arts in education: A Research report* (1978). Reflecting the perennial political conflict over federal vs. local control, art education associations through the Assembly of National Arts Education Organizations (DAMT) supported a partnership between the art
specialist and the general classroom teacher over partnerships with outside artists; they maintained the authority of the institution of the local school over the arts agency or institution.

In the midst of concerns about the value of “basics” in general education, many art educators were attempting to redefine the “basics” to include the arts. Even the Council on Basic Education produced *Arts in basic education: Two papers* (1979). Many art organizations with a vested interest in arts-in-education or other federally sponsored outreach programs demonstrate an increasing interest through publications on educational concerns. Finally, despite these early advocacy efforts, the discourse field documents demonstrate the topic of public education in the arts was not an issue for organizations and agencies that dealt with overall education issues. Although occasionally the periodicals of these organizations show individual discursive practice, deliberate organizational policy statements dealing with arts in the curriculum are rare.

**Individual Discursive Practice: On Contemporary Critical Issues**

Efland credits the arts-in-education movement with drawing attention to 

...the arts as neglected subjects in the curriculum. As a movement toward accountability began to be felt in the early 1970s, arts-in-education programs enjoyed a good press, reminding people that the arts belonged in the school. Finally, it projected an image of the arts as an area of the school program where participatory activity was championed, countering the image of passive engagement with art, which was sometimes characteristic of discipline-orientated curricula. (Efland, 1990, p. 247)

However, *Coming to our senses* (1977) was not without critics. The pivotal publication of Laura Chapman’s *Instant art, instant culture* (1982) with her phrase “de-schooling” the arts was, according to Gee (1999); “...the first politically contextualized explication and analysis of a recognizable national policy for arts education.” (Gee, 1999,
The most controversial curricular issues raised were voiced by Laura Chapman (1982): She asks (1) Is justice served by minority access to arts education, 2) Can the “truths” of a self-proclaimed artist provide “trustworthy knowledge and its transmission,” 3) What issues of social power are involved in who is allowed to speak or to teach, 4) What classes control the presence or absence of programs in the schools, and 5) Are the priorities of public education different from public funding for the arts. In addition, Chapman (1978) and others such as Ralph Smith (1978), Hilda P. Lewis (1978), June King McFee (1978), Michael Day (1978), Nancy Johnson (1978), Richard Ciganko (1978), Bette Acuff (1978), mostly representing perspectives of professional art educators, responded with negative critique of the AEAP study. Taking issue with many of the themes in the study, they opposed the intervention of government and political forces outside of the professional communities in decision making about curriculum and program delivery.

Representing many individual voices, the professional arts education organizations such as the National Art Education Association (NAEA) continued to find ways to integrate the arts into the established curriculum and, as a result, to establish curricular models and practices with a focus on artistic canons. Conversely, ideas about the instrumental use of the arts as a means of teaching other subject areas, arts as a means to a broader based “aesthetic knowing” began to surface among educators. Still unable to achieve consensus and to articulate a unified curricular ideology, purpose, instructional method or assessment procedure, educators and arts educators were clear, nonetheless, in questioning the NEA program, its educational virtue, efficiency or effectiveness. So while apparently the AEAP study increased public awareness of art education ideas, the
Panel’s failure to involve the established arts education community in the formation of its final policy recommendation added to the already existing divide.

**Surface of Emergence: Organizational Text Production**

**Chronology and Sequence of Text Emergence**

A review of the database of arts education and related texts compiled for this study reveals that between 1974 and 1981 the Arts, Education, and Americans panel published or sponsored twelve major policy statements. After *Coming to our senses* (1977), the *Report series* (1980-1981) and Bloom’s *Source book* (1980) all are published within a two-year period. Between the 1977 publication of *Coming to Our Senses* (1977) and the 1981 conclusion of the *Report Series* (1980-1981), panel collaborations were limited. Still, as late as 1982, the JDR Fund collaborated with Exxon Educational Foundation to support Jane Remer’s *Changing schools through the arts* (1982).

Collectively, the number and sequence of these text publications, the manner in which they reflect organizational discourse position and activity in relation to other organizations, and the significance and dominance of its relatively few texts within the discourse field provides a view of both the influence and support for the organization’s curriculum rationale.

**Ideological Streams and Political Affiliations**

In addition to published policy texts, the foundation sponsored other forms of advocacy. Eventually, according to Chapman (1982), the JDR 3rd Fund attempted to develop a national advocacy network in order to place arts education on the national policy agenda. Shortly after the demise of the Arts and Humanities Program (AHP) at the USDE and the appointment of Kathryn Bloom as director of the JDR 3rd Fund in
1968, the Fund was engaged in some capacity over a 12-year period in six projects across the nation, all prior to the publication of *Coming to our senses* (1977). This early field research of the organization started in 1967; the *Arts in education source book* (1980) documents both the formation of ideas and the resulting pilot projects with school districts and state departments of education. “This foundation [JDR] was active in the area of public schooling in the period between 1967 and 1979, granting $5.5 million to school districts, state departments of education, arts councils, and educational laboratories” (Fowler cited in Efland, 1990, p.245)

Besides the Rockefeller-funded collaborations with school districts and state departments of education, the projects often were jointly sponsored with other arts or arts advocacy organizations (such as the NEA, ACA, AAE, or the Kennedy Center) and, occasionally, the USDE. Another mechanism for influencing national policy and institutionalizing its agenda was the “blue-ribbon panel” itself. Although much “field research” had been accomplished earlier, The AEAP, chaired by J.D. Rockefeller, formalized its research approach (employing survey, for the most part) to produce recommendations to Congress. By providing implementation and administration resources such as the Evaluation and Documentation Service (1975), the goal of the organization’s various task forces was to have arts education services become an indispensable part of the school program.

**Text Significance and Selection**

Soon after this phase of the Arts in Education (NEA-AIE) program of the Fund and almost 11 years after the establishing law for the National Endowment (PL 89-208) in 1965, the Panel’s extensive text, *Coming to our senses* (1977) emerges as the first
significant ideological statement on arts education curriculum by an active advocacy community funded and politically positioned to institutionalize its views. Also, the text is the first substantial policy position of the “blue ribbon” Panel since the organization’s inception as the ACA in Education in 1972. Although reorganized only three years before as the Arts, Education, and Americans Panel in 1974, the text reflects, in one respect, an organization approaching the end of its life, but also it reveals a discourse community aligned with a given unified perspective that would continue to be a force within the discourse field until the end of the century. For these reasons, the text distinguishes itself as the primary policy document produced by the discourse community and as a text most representative of the community’s conceptual framework.

The text addresses the major social and political concerns of its time (and, in a limited way, the curricular issues within general education) as well as advocating and clarifying the need for increased attention to arts education. It summarizes the political and educational agenda of the movement: 1) it emphasizes all of the arts disciplines or aesthetic education and an interdisciplinary use of the arts to teach other subjects, 2) its tendency is “to seek solutions to educational problems outside of the school” and to involve non-educators in decision making about arts education, 3) to encourage “a performance bias” (“Action was given priority over contemplation”) and, finally, according to Efland (1990), 4) its tendency is to justify activities by non-artistic, social/psychological goals and the instrumental use of the arts to achieve those goals. (Efland, 1990, p. 246)

During 1980-1981, the AEAP began a series of publications that reflect both a belief in individual creativity and a corresponding conviction that successful arts
education reform is dependent on resources exterior to the schools. These texts, *The Report series* (1980-1981), collectively document the organization’s plan for communicating and transferring their ideas to a larger and targeted audience of community leaders and decision makers.

**Grids of Specification: Explanation of Text Purpose and Function**

In the grids of specification, texts are categorized by their diverse forms and functional relationships within the organization’s advocacy plan. However, each document also has a particular and preferred use within this study. *Coming to our senses* (1977) contains enumerable abbreviated case studies intended to stimulate teaching practice and student activity in the classroom, but it is the most known and the most complete representation of the organization’s theoretical and research “findings.” As such, it has been chosen for a detailed, single text analysis of concepts. A significant body of secondary texts, the AEAP’s *Report series* (1980-1981), ten separate, but related publications representing advocacy implementation artifacts, and, finally, the *Arts in education source book* (1980), a retrospective compilation of case studies of seven, sequenced arts-in-education projects will be used for multitext analysis. All of these texts are categorized as advocacy statements although they represent, combined, a set of diverse texts, i.e. texts to articulate various tenets of the community’s overall purpose, to serve different advocacy functions, and, generally, to expedite the community’s efforts to institutionalize its plan. While the *Arts in education source book* (1980) and the *Report series* (1980-1981) are texts serving several specifications; those reports or issues have been limited in this study to those dealing primarily with program theory, curriculum
content and instruction and methods of delivery, those aspects of the text that
demonstrate the organization’s advocacy emphasis.

First, they collectively represent an organized advocacy campaign directed at
involving the general public in school programming and, indirectly, encouraging
practitioners to accept community and art world collaborations in school programming.
Of the texts examined (including *Coming to our senses*, 1977), all are concerned with
justifying a place for the NEA “arts in education” programs, specifically drawing
attention to their role in the classroom, the school and the school district by case
eamples.

Similarly, the texts produced by AEAP address audiences and policy makers who
are, for the most part, outside of the local schools *per se* (parents, school board members,
etc.). Clearly, designed to appeal to a broad audience, each text advocates different
resources to be found outside of the school as indicated in their titles: *People and places*,
*Ideas and money*, *Financial resources*, *School boards*, and the *Creative community*.

Likewise, although the texts reveal an organization that has a narrow repertoire of
advocacy tools; depending on polished texts almost exclusively, its secondary texts
(including Bloom’s *Source book*) have a clearly stated and very practical format, a “how-to” list for implementing the Panel’s ideas.

**Discourse Context #2: 1980–1989**

**Authorities of Delimitation**

Between 1980 and 1989, the database for this study reveals a total of 131 texts
representing the social discourse on education, specifically arts education. Through
congressional actions, NEA and USDE texts, the publications of various communities
and organizations, and individual discursive practice the model demonstrates the levels that curriculum in the arts was institutionalized.

**Situational Context: Congressional Action**

(1985) by the Committee for Economic Development sustain Apple’s characterization of the “excellence movement.”

Reflecting societal concerns but exercising more of an oversight interest and a policy-oriented function toward general education, congressional action took the form of several pieces of legislation. The primary focus on educational reform during this decade continued to be on science and mathematics, institutional support systems, and targeting vocational and immigrant education in elementary and secondary education. Early appropriations continued to be directed toward established art agencies and programs, the Arts and Humanities Act Amendments of 1983 (PL 98-306) continued to organize and reorganize those same agencies. Of particular interest was the Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1985 (PL 99-194) which provided for a joint study with USDE on the state of arts and humanities education in public elementary and secondary schools. This mandated study would have broad implications for arts education. And, finally, as the education discourse expanded to a concern for higher and postsecondary education, trade competitiveness, and social issues in education such as civil rights, drug abuse and education, drop out and retention rates, literacy, gifted education, and technology emerged as dominant themes. The Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (PL100-297) also brought to the fore legal considerations for Alaskan, Hawaiian and Native American culture and art. Nonetheless, by the end of the decade, educational legislation increasingly emphasized issues of technical and vocational training, math and science education and accountability through assessment. By 1990 the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations (PL 101-512) authorized a new program for arts education through the
NEA; agency funds to states were increased while an override reduced monies to the arts disciplines within the agency. Suggested by The United Arts Group, but no doubt prompted by earlier mandated legislative attention to arts education, this override signaled a shift in attention to arts education.

**Institutional Sites and Structures: Federal Agencies (NEA, USDE)**

By the end of the decade of the 1970's, there was little evidence that the USDE would become an active advocate for arts education despite occasional collaborative texts such as *Arts, education and the states* (1985) with the NEA and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). With the exception of the appointment of a Special Counsel for Education, the Assembly of National Arts Education Organizations noted that the USDE Task Force recommendations were not implemented. In fact, in 1981, the Department instituted block grants and eliminated categorical federal education funds for arts education.

Additionally, as Munley comments, the bureaucratic organization hindered policy development in arts education:

> The federal arts bureaucracy moved towards a more fragmented approach to art education, while the art education community moved towards a more holistic approach. The re-authorization statute (1980) redefined parameters for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH and the NEA). The NEH was to focus on history and criticism in the arts, and the NEA was to focus on production. (Munley, 1999, p. 63)

The educational programs of the NEA became more entrenched bureaucratically and ideologically with repeated reorganization and renaming of the program; Artists-in-Schools (1980) was renamed the Artists-in-Education in 1984. Four years later in 1988, the program again was renamed the Arts-in-Education Program; according to Gee, “...to reflect the Endowment’s broader programmatic thrust....Arts in Education meant literally
the insertion of artists and arts organization programming into schools; arts in education was never intended to be “of” educators and schools.” (Gee, 1999b, p.14)

While the discourse increased on disciplined-based ideology among arts educators, it is significant in itself that the National Endowment did not publish extensively on arts education at this time. Some published research was an unsuccessful attempt to justify NEA impact on the public (Public Participation in the Arts survey, 1982 and 1987) some texts, such as Richard Orend’s *Socialization in the arts* (1987), are collaborative efforts to point out the public function of arts education. And some of these texts are a direct institutional response to the growing concerns with program accountability that would result eventually in the congressionally mandated report, *Toward civilization* (1988). Most of the NEA publications regarding education centered on administering the Arts-in-Education program and grant programs to state and local school districts. Texts such as *New guidelines* (1986) for the NEA-AIE program and, approaching the 1990s, NEA-AIE *Five-year plan* (1988) and NEA-AIE *Program overview* (1989)

Aligned with Hodsell’s apparent attempts to shift responsibility for educational content and instructional methods to local and state venues and to assume the role of advocate in a general sense, the NEA took advantage of the network of state arts agencies it had created to cosponsor with the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) five conferences in 1984 across the country on “arts as basic education.” Corresponding with the Congressional Arts Caucus “oversight” hearings on arts education in the House of Representatives (1984) and the 1985 reauthorization hearings, congress mandated that the Endowments complete “a report on the status of arts and humanities education by the

*Toward civilization: A Report on arts education* (1988) resulted from a direct request from the United States Congress to reassess the policy of the National Endowment for the Arts regarding education in the arts. The report was requested because of conflicting reports (internal and external to the NEA) on the progress in arts education. The study, to be completed in two years, was to be designed and implemented in consultation with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. The text takes a basic “needs assessment” approach to the field; it is organized around issues of practice, of curriculum, of evaluation, of teacher preparation, of research and of leadership and it is aimed at identifying the role of the National Endowment in meeting those needs.

Several diverse studies in education and arts education influenced the theoretical position espoused in NEA’s report, but the Getty report, *Beyond creating* (1985) was published as the NEA was in the process of preparing its mandated study. And as Gee points out, for the first time the NEA consults with a member of the arts education community, Brent Wilson (Pennsylvania State University), to oversee the report’s research. As a result of Hodsell’s personal vision and Wilson’s involvement, Gee (1999b) suggests that the “report articulated a radically broader vision of the purposes of K-12 arts education than the Endowment’s artist-centered school programs had ever envisioned.” (Gee, 1999b, p.12) Maintaining that a federal agency should not promote curricular models, Hodsell’s concerns shifted to educational outcomes, a pivotal turn in the formation of national arts education policy. According to Munley’s research
Hodsoll stated it is most important to consider what it is that one wants students to learn and at what ages. He added that defined minimum competencies and curricula, textbooks and sequence of activities must also be considered, as well as what is done in the studio, in the regular classroom, as part of other subjects, and what outside the school and at home. (Munley, 1999, p. 71)

Again, according to Munley (1999), Hodsell, reports the findings of Toward civilization (1988) to Congress: “the Department of Education would provide leadership through the National Assessment of Education Progress Program in terms of which content areas are to be tested. It would also gather and disseminate information through its ERIC system, and provide leadership in the curriculum content areas.” (Munley, 1999, p. 75) Again, the responsibility for arts education was divided between federal agencies.

In the last half of the decade, the NEA implemented its newly articulated vision of its leadership role by establishing “research centers to collect, disseminate and research arts curriculum information” and thereby signaled an apparent agency interest in sequential arts curricula. In 1988, the NEA would sponsor Toward a plan for cultural literacy (1988), a product of the National Arts Education Research Center.

Between 1987-1991, the NEA grants known as AISBEG resulted in partnerships and collaborative actions at the state level between arts agencies and departments of education. Although some critics claim this program produced more clashes than cooperation over curriculum, it would continue and merge with the Arts Education Partnership (AEP) Grants after Hodsell’s resignation in 1989. (Gee, 1999b, p.12, 13, 14) Similarly, the NEA supported the 1989 National Coalition for Education in the Arts (NCEA); growing out of ACA and MENC collaboration that had produced the “Philadelphia Resolution” (1986).
The Discourse Field: Other and Opposing Organizations

Several pivotal factors in 1982 impacted the discourse field of art education. Spurred on by all of these factors and school reform discourse in general education, different discourse communities examined how the NEA goals for and services to arts education could be improved. Established six years before *Toward civilization*, (1988), the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (GCEA) now was entering a very active period. Coining the term “discipline-based art education” or “DBAE” to represent its views, it engaged scholars, advocates, etc. to clarify its position, expand its political influence and design strategies for program implementation at the school level. But activity in the discourse field was increasing generally. Sharing the discourse field with the GCEA were communities whose efforts had begun earlier; while organizations occasionally faltered, the communities realigned and combined with increasingly internal discourse unification. Closely associated, AEAP (JDR 3rd Fund) and the ACA are an example. The AAE, encouraging partnerships with a variety of organizations, continued a steady stream of publications and events advocating for performance-based curriculum: such as *Upsidedown curriculum* (1981) and *Performing together* (1985). Also, a deepening of interest in arts education among nationally visible organizations in arts, general education and higher education was notable: the NASAA, *(Arts and education handbook*, 1988), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), *(Arts, education and the states*, 1985; *Options and opportunities in arts education*, 1984) and the Arts in Higher Education Working Group *(Arts education: Beyond tradition and advocacy*, 1988).
One of the strongest indicators of a growing coalition of interests was the collaboration of MENC with ACA (NCEA); the collaboration (which existed in some form as early as 1958) produced the *Philadelphia resolution* (1986), The Interlochen Symposium (1987) and the resulting text *Toward a new era in arts education* (1988). Addressing many policy issues outside of the classroom, a research and reform agenda was more evident in ACA publications such as *The Challenge to reform arts education* (1989). NAEA was possibly the most diligent about addressing the major curricular policy issues; in three years (1986-1989) research on the state of the visual arts in the schools (*National survey of art(s) education*, 1986), issues surrounding “excellence” (*Excellence in art education*, 1986) a national curriculum (*Fail-safe arts course*, 1989), and the role of arts education in society (*Art education, civilization and the 21st century*, 1988) were addressed. Toward the end of the decade, the National Arts Education Research Center (committed to research and perspectives from the practitioner) began to produce research-based reform themes such as *Toward a plan for cultural literacy* (1988). This discursive activity, nonetheless, was insufficient to insure the inclusion of the arts in the six education goals endorsed by the National Governors Association in 1986.

**Individual Discursive Practice: On Contemporary Critical Issues**

Despite differences about delivery systems, Gee (1999b) describes the paradigm shift that occurred during the 1980s within all sectors concerned with arts education:

Connections were sought in terms of how a work of art reflects or repudiates the values of the society in which it was produced, and how those insights might relate personally to a student’s life. The conviction that the arts must be taught in a sequential manner, where students build on what they learn from year to year, was also fundamental to this broadened and more academic conception of arts
education termed “discipline-based” by some, “comprehensive” by others, and “basic” by the NEA. (Gee, 1999b, p.11)

Critics, including Elliot Eisner (1987), Jerome Hausman (1985), Vincent Lanier (1987) and Joanne M. Goeller (1985), again primarily professional art educators, provided contemporary critical response to Beyond creating (1985). In summary, they voiced continued concerns about government intervention (based on its search for curricular models), about the marginalized role of the individual teacher (in favor of the policy maker), about the trend toward a national curriculum, about platitudes without solutions, about ideas without examples, about community-based rather than curriculum-based programs.

As Efland (1987) points out, individual criticism has been directed both at discipline-based art education as identified with the GCEA and at ideas in Ralph Smith’s Excellence in art education (1987) for the conservative tenor of their proposals and for their tendency to see art education as the study of past cultural achievements certified by credentialed experts. “Critics...have claimed that DBAE and the excellence initiative tend to make art learning a passive form of engagement, as symbolized by their reduction in the importance assigned to studio studies.” (Efland, 1990, p. 254)

**Surface of Emergence: Organization Text Production**

**Chronology and Sequence of Text Emergence**

A summary of the texts produced by the GCEA reveals the level of their activity and influence within the discourse field of arts education was high. From 1982 through the end of the decade, the organization contributed in many ways through the sponsorship and production of advocacy texts, video materials and events related to curriculum policy. Although not as prolific as in the 1980s as it would become in the 1990s, their
written texts would have significant impact on changing the discourse field. Besides Beyond creating (1985) and the Journal of Aesthetic Education issue (Summer 1987), texts topics ranged from early tentative explanations of DBAE (Art history, art criticism and art production, 1984; Discipline-based art education, 1984) to published proceedings of roundtable series on its original text (Beyond creating: A Roundtable series, 1986; Discipline based art education: What forms will it take, 1987; Issues in discipline-based art education: Strengthening the stance, extending the horizons, 1988) to the compatible views of individual scholars such as Elliot Eisner (The Role of discipline-based art education in America’s schools, 1988) and Harry Broudy (The Role of imagery in learning, 1987).

**Ideological Streams and Political Affiliations**

Shortly after the J. Paul Getty Trust was founded in 1982, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts emerges under the leadership of Leilani Lattin Duke. The Center concentrated its efforts in its first two years on gathering information about the state of art education (in collaboration with the Rand Corporation and selected scholars), on defining and establishing a consensus on its curriculum ideology (as is exemplified in a special edition of the Journal of Aesthetic Education, Summer 1987), and on seeking community and organizational support from arts education professionals through multiple, professional conferences and workshops. In addition, the GCEA, aiding the formation of a consensus around its perspective, often published follow-up texts of the proceedings of these sponsored events. The most important of these efforts was the formation of the Consortia (1983) of regional practitioners, academics and policymakers and the establishment of surrounding communities committed to educational change: the
Regional Institute Grant Programs (1987) and the DBAE Summer Professional Development Institutes (1988-1995). These processes culminated in *Beyond creating* (1985) and would be retrospectively documented in *The Quiet evolution: Changing the face of arts education* (1997).

The organization seldom collaborated with established policymakers at the federal level during the 1980s. A few examples are evident in the early 1990s: collaboration with NSBA (*Arts for life*, 1990), with AEP and the Kennedy Center (*The Power of the arts to transform education*, 1993) and with the National Education Association (*Teaching in and through the arts*, 1995).

**Text Significance and Selection**

Prior to the publication of *Beyond creating* in 1985, common ground among the GCEA’s contributors had been established by a commissioned research effort with the Rand Corporation, *Art history, art criticism, and art production: An Examination of art education in selected school districts* (1984). The text represents the organization’s first unified policy statement on art education. Although *Beyond creating* (1985) is a recognizable product of a new and distinct discourse community, characteristic of the Getty’s publications, it deferred to individual speakers representing facets of an emerging consensus, represented an aggregate of voices drawn primarily from business, general education and the academic community.

Gee describes the GCEA’s pedagogical theory found in *Beyond creating* (1985): “That view differed from, but was not inconsistent with, the broadly conceived, humanities-oriented vision of K-12 arts education that had evolved out of the “discipline-centered” reform movements of the early 1960s.” (Gee, 1999, P2, p.10) The curricular
ideology can be characterized as narrowly focused on the visual arts as a separate discipline to be valued in it’s own right, it relied on academic expertise over teacher experience, it encouraged an intellectual, rationally conceived arts study approach, and, although there is evidence that the Getty appropriated various dominant tenets on content and delivery (multiculturalism, partnership, etc.) into its discourse, it was conservative on cultural issues. (Eisner, 1994; Smith, 1996)

In the summer of 1987, the Journal of Aesthetic Education devoted an entire issue to Discipline-based art education; the major thrust was to explain the overall rationale. The Getty clarified, in detail, its traditional vision for an art curriculum in the schools, grounded in theoretical and historical antecedents (Smith, Kern, Efland, Sevigny) and divided into stand alone disciplines (Clark, Day and Greer). The text also gives a more detailed interpretation of the interrelationship of the four disciplines within a curriculum construct (Spratt, Kleinbauer, Risatti, and Crawford). Finally, the text integrates and justifies its orientation with current trends and beliefs in developmental psychology (Feldman). Overall, the Getty promoted an ideology and a plan for “cultural literacy” and academic “excellence.”

**Grids of Specification: Explanation of Text Purposes and Functions**

Following the publication of *Beyond creating* (1985), the Getty’s production of discourse texts is prolific and wide ranging on issues from curriculum to teacher preparation. While limited to the visual arts, it was aimed at all levels of institutional art education (the K-12 classroom, museums, universities) and its texts addressed all text specifications. With considerable expenditures of resources, the Getty produced advocacy texts that dealt with both the abstract and the theoretical and, subsequently, classroom
practice. Clearly in *Beyond creating* (1985), it focused first on developing a rationally-conceived, research-based curricular framework; the Getty relied on outside resources such as the Rand Corporation to establish the “needs” in the field and on authorities from the larger discourses of business and general education (as well as arts education) to communicate its message. For this reason, *Beyond creating* (1985) is the curricular policy statement chosen for single text analysis. The aggregate of the voices in the *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (1987), however, presents highly intellectual arguments for arts study; the organization relies on academe, particularly established art education scholars to provide the theoretical foundation for suggested instructional methods and/or practice. Because the organization initially appears to have solicited a diverse group of speakers and their publications often are compilations of related perspectives, its texts pose certain problems of consistency when used for conceptual analysis. However, the problems encountered in definition of ideological ideas are, themselves, indicative of a forming, not an established, consensus and the discourse patterns and relationships specific to this discourse community. Nonetheless, the texts reveal, from early in its history, the GCEA has a very strong world view and institutional orientation that permeated its texts and guided its discursive choices.

The GCEA texts chosen for this study are distinct in that their audience is targeted toward visual art education scholars and practitioners, usually art specialists. Their texts function on the level of professional identification; they appeal to individual educators and policy makers on all levels who respect scholarly authority over practical expertise, who understand the hierarchy of roles within the profession, who desire to preserve cultural traditions and who, within this professional culture, are positioned to effect
change. Although the Getty’s grassroots efforts to engage practitioners or discourse subjects in reform efforts is reflected in documenting specific school programs across the country as “exemplary” models, their advocacy is focused at a higher level of professionals. While the advocacy goal was to achieve parity for arts education, the targeted audience and policy makers for advocacy texts was typically outside of the classroom, and often outside of the school.

The Getty’s advocacy activity extended over a decade and its text production was prolific. While the selected texts for this study, a relatively small sampling, focus primarily on program theory and curriculum content, by the 1980s education advocacy campaigns are no longer limited to print materials. Nor, according to Gee (1999a), were they dependant on “the one-to-one, constituent-to-congressperson implorations.” (Gee, 1999a, p. 7) Although beyond the scope of this study, a full examination of Getty texts specified for all purposes and in all media format might yield a much fuller insight about the discourse mechanisms used by the organization. In addition to written texts recording the organization’s policy and advocacy stance, documenting conferences and workshops, and commissioned criticism, the GCEA produced practical guides for advocacy and instructional use. These materials ranged from reproductions of art works for the classroom (emphasizing multicultural themes and women artists), planning kits for PTA involvement, to video recordings for conference presentations. Although this study is primarily concerned with written texts, the extensive use of language via other media represents more artifact information about the mechanisms practiced by the Getty during the 1980s and deserves some attention. For instance, some of the titles indicate the nature and advocacy value placed on new media: The Value of art in education (1988) [video
recording], *The Role of art in general education* (1988) [video recording], *Agenda for progress in art education* (1989) [video recording], *Education in art...Future building* (1989) [video recording].

**Discourse Context #3: 1990-2000**

**Authorities of Delimitation**

Between 1990 and 2000, the database for this study reveals 175 texts representing the social discourse on education, specifically arts education. Various registers demonstrate the level that curriculum in the arts had been institutionalized and each register reflects the relative power of influences in the discourse order.

**Situational Context: Congressional Action**

However, the national goals for education announced in 1990 by President Bush and the state governors to guide school reform through 2000, which makes no mention of arts education was, by far, pivotal in arousing constituencies interested in curriculum-based arts education. While this statement reflects the national concern for setting goals for improving educational standards, the exclusion of the arts in the core curriculum for America in 2000 reflects a national leadership still indecisive about the institutional position of the arts. Often referred to as a “wake-up” call to arts educators, this event provided a political incentive (rather than curriculum rationale) to policy action. As President Bush implements the governors’ six educational goals, “Governor Roy Romer of Colorado, Chairman of the Governor’s Task Force drafting implementation language for the six education goals the Governors had endorsed in 1989, said he would be more interested in the arts if they were an enabler and could be shown to enhance learning in other subject areas. He also told Frohnmayer that if the arts were going to compete they
would have to have definable standards and methods of assessment.” (Munley, 1999, p.83)

Despite the strong tradition of local control of education in the United States, congressional activity concerned with arts education tripled during the 1990s. During this decade, congressional action reflects the increasing visibility of arts education on the national education policy agenda and reinforces the Consortium’s work, and is even responsible for the organization’s existence. Much of the federal government’s influence is found in appropriations legislation and funding mechanisms rather than in stated curriculum ideology.

The early 1990s saw Congress very education-centered with several pieces of significant federal legislation and authorizations aimed at general education, but impacting arts education. These legislative actions including appropriations had an accumulating impact on arts education between 1991 and 1994 and demonstrate the growing influence of an arts education constituency: the *Education Council Act of 1991* (PL 102-62) concentrates on standards and testing and establishes a National Education Commission on Time and Learning, the *Higher Education Amendments of 1992* (PL 102-325) which, among many other issues, addressed teaching standards, and the *Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994* (PL 103-382) which specifically mentions “arts and civic education.” While legislation of 1994 impacting the education and arts communities was considerable on issues ranging from arts as health benefits for the elderly to arts as a tool for violent crime control and environment conservation, even more significant, five years after the first national goals consensus took place in 1990, *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*: (PL 103-227) was adopted.
Goals 2000: Educate America Act (PL 103-227) emphasized systemic educational reform, prioritized a national education research policy, and a revision of various education-related laws and policies. Also, it offered another, possibly stronger, incentive for policy action: significant federal funding opportunities were based on achieving parity with other subject areas in the core curriculum. And, parity was based on the development of national standards. The National Committee’s task was to design an ideologically consistent policy position between professional ideals and local/state practice and national goals for education in general. Additionally, as an incentive to states to adopt a standards-based approach and the eight national education goals, Richard Riley and the USDE offered planning grants to states with plans for standards implementation in place. The texts produced by the Goals 2000 AEP (approximately 100 organizations), The Goals 2000 Arts Education Leadership Fund and documents such as The Goals 2000 arts education action plan (1994), and The Arts and education: Partners in achieving our national goals (1995) promote both intrinsic and instrumental benefits for arts study.

From 1995 until the end of the decade the majority of identified congressional texts mostly represent appropriations to carry out specific curriculum projects such as the New York curriculum (PL 105-277) in 1998 and appropriations for model programs (PL 106-113) in 1999. However, the Arts and Humanities Amendments of 1997 mandated institutional changes of the NEA which gave priority to arts education in all four NEA grant categories. (Gee, 1999a, p.11) Significant for indicating the increased visibility of the arts in education, was the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act of 2000 (PL 106-533). An amendment to the congressional award act to establish a “Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Board to make
annual awards to elementary and secondary schools and students for excellence in arts education and individual interdisciplinary arts achievement” was the last major legislative text impacting arts education in this decade.

As well as increased attention to education and art evidenced in congressional reports, a significant text attesting to congressional interest in the arts and education was the White House Special Task Force Report of 1992, *Raising standards for American education: A Report to Congress, the Secretary of Education, the National Educational Goals Panel, and the American people*. Issued through the National Council on Educational Standards and Testing, it considered the need for national curriculum standards and testing in core subjects--and included the arts.

**Institutional Sites/Structures Federal Agencies (NEA, USDE)**

The Secretary’s Commission on Acquiring Necessary Skills continued a tradition of the USDE and affiliated agencies of emphasizing labor needs with *What work requires of students* (1991) and of supporting education research (with the NEA) with texts such as *Arts education research agenda* (1994). Other texts addressed the goals of education: *Building knowledge for a nation of learners* (1994, 1998), *National education goals report* (1996) with the National Education Goals Panel, *Arts education in public elementary and secondary schools* (1995); *Arts education and school improvements* (1997) and, of course, arts education assessment with *Policy statement on redesigning the 1997 NAEP; The 1997 Arts report card. Improving basic education for all learners* (1998) included the arts in the concept of “basic” and necessary education.

Positioning arts education in the institutional ideology of the NEA in the 1990s requires a perspective on the agency’s overall goals for the arts through texts such as *A
Guide to the National Endowment for the Arts (1992), America in the making: A Prospectus for the arts (1996), A New look at the National Endowment for the Arts (1997), and American canvas: The Challenge to act (1997). In an assessment of the agency’s activity during this decade, Gee critiques the agency’s instrumental world view, “art’s usefulness for societal concerns” that evolved simultaneously with the political needs of the NEA:

Cross-country arts canvasses, community focus groups, congressional lobbying, and public relations reports—these are but a few ready examples of the arts community’s fervent search for reconnection with local, state, and national leaders who appear to have abandoned support of the arts for other more pressing social and economic interests. Chastened by a decade of coniferous and slanderous charges of “elitism”—and, perhaps more to the point, a 40 percent budget cut— the NEA and other public arts agencies and advocacy groups are surrendering all remaining vestiges of the excellence agenda to the “access,” “cultural equity,” and “community service” zealots (many of whom are within their own ranks). (Gee, 1999a, p.3)

Early in the decade, with the 1990 appointment of John Frohnmayer, the agency shifts its educational focus to issues other than artist residencies: issues of long time importance to the education community such as core curriculum development, inclusiveness and diversity, implementation support, increased accessibility through state funding blocks, and teacher preparation and training. A new emphasis (possibly encouraged by the censorship controversies) was placed on developing an audience with tolerance and understanding through the arts, with leadership and creative thinking skills.

In 1990, summits held with arts educators yielded recommendations for the agency centered on national political leadership. The agency’s role in arts education, it was suggested, was to develop and advocate a national agenda, to be a source of information, to encourage cultural institutions to support school programs (and conversely, to involve teachers at the school level to support and use cultural institutions
in instruction), to support curricular models and assessments designed by educators and integrate these models into the NEA discipline programs.

New “partnerships” dominated the arts education agenda in the agency. In 1991, supported by the NEA and the USDE, the National Arts Education Research Center was created to promote the dissemination of successful teaching practices, create curricular models, foster community partnerships, and research interdisciplinary studies. Texts such as *Planning to make the arts basic: a Report to the National Endowment for the Arts on the impact and results of the arts in schools basic education grants program* (1991), *The Arts education partners grants application guide* (1991), the 1992 collaboration of USDE and the NEA sponsored Arts Partnership for Goals 2000 as well as national initiatives including NAEP arts assessment and standards projects are all indicators of an apparent shift in ideology and corresponding change in the role of the agency. The NEA-AIE funding component to state institutions for educational programs and planning grants exemplifies this trend.

Apparently, the agency was no longer interested or involved in the specifics of curriculum development and/or delivery; curriculum was acknowledged as a local responsibility to be supported, but not directed. In 1995, Doug Herbert, Director of the Arts-in-Education program of the NEA, summarized the actions of the agency in bringing “the arts into the education-reform movement of the 1990s.” (Herbert, 1995, p. 1)

Maintaining that decisions about what curriculum should be taught and how it is delivered should remain in the hands of the state and local decision makers, he saw the role of the NEA as affirming and encouraging a “concordant tone” among all sectors that “determine policy and allocate educational resources.” (Herbert, 1995, p. 2)
Certainly, his understanding of the definition of the agency role was reflected in the processes and texts of establishing the *National Standards* (1994) with text such as *Arts and the National Education Goals* (1994), and *Arts and education: Partners in achieving our national goals* (1995), supporting the NAEP Governing Board’s 1997 assessment frameworks (1993).

**The Discourse Field: Other and Opposing Organizations**

General education discourse during the 1990s produced texts continuing the debate about educational excellence, utility and standards. These issues became more institutionalized in the form of commission reports such as *Reinventing the wheel* (1992) produced by the National Conference of State Legislatures and *Raising standards for American education* (1992) by the National Council on Educational Standards and Testing. Equally, the influence of private organizations such as the Annenberg Foundation (*Citizens changing our schools*, 1999) and the Carnegie Foundation (with National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), *Breaking ranks: Changing an American institution*, 1996) must be traced through indirect means. Along with funding contributions and collaborations, the choices made by such private organizations for various economic and political reasons, for ethnographic or demographic factors specific to a prescribed organizational mission, are characterized by Hoffa (1993) as the “Filter Factor: “... such choices must properly be thought of as cultural policy decisions and, as such, they have important implications for arts educators.” (Hoffa, 1993, p. 2)

Because of its high visibility, the *National Standards* (1994) appears to unite the discourse field. However, consensus within the discourse field is not complete.
Although the AEAP has ceased to exist, its ideas are embedded in programs and documents of the NEA and related arts advocacy groups. Also still very strong, the prolific output of the GCEA continued into the mid-1990s; certainly, its impact on the National Standards (1994) is obvious. And, it continues to publish documents promoting its curricular emphasis “about” the arts: Lessons about art in history and history in art (1992) and Perspectives on education reform and arts education as catalyst (1993). But also an indicator of the blending of curricular concepts for political consensus is evident. Building on its involvement in school reform activities, the Getty’s organizational perspective broadens to include curricular learning “in” and “through” the arts with texts such as: Education reform in and through the arts (1993), Transforming education through the arts (1995), and Teaching in and through the arts (1995). As the decade progresses, the GCEA shifts its agenda to align with broader social concerns impacting schools: advocacy text of different significance dealing with technology in Future tense (1991) to The Challenge of business to arts education (1993), The Challenge of political priorities to arts education (1993), Discipline-based art education and cultural diversity (1993), Public policy and arts education (1993), and Educating for the workplace through the arts (1996). Additionally, creating a political environment conducive to consensus on curriculum policy was a significant conference and the resulting text, Arts and education: A Partnership agenda (1992) of the NEA, the GCEA, the National PTA, the Kennedy Center, and Binney & Smith. From this pivotal “meeting of minds,” a policy agenda was issued that exemplifies the discursive process. By 1997, the GCEA documented its participation in initial school reform efforts with The Quiet evolution (1997)
The professional organizations (which had sporadically come together in the past) began a significant unification in order to gain parity with other disciplines on the Goals 2000 agenda. Additionally, the power of coordinated political action is manifest in the formation of the AEP. According to David O’Fallon, “AEP Working Group formed in response to concerns from the education and arts communities about the absence of the arts from the National Educational Goals and to ensure their inclusion in subsequent education reform efforts.” (Munley, 1999, p.85) Interestingly, AEP initially was sponsored by JFK Center, The Getty, representatives from NEA, MENC, ADA, American Alliance for Theatre in Education, but not the NAEA. Its primary strategy was to tie learning characteristics or student dispositions developed in the arts to school reform.

In 1992, comprised of representatives of both advocacy and governmental agencies, The AEP Working Group produced a single text, *The Power of the arts to transform education* (1992). Eventually, as the result of the 1994 Goals 2000 Arts Education Planning Process, the AEP, now playing a different kind of advocacy role, was established formally in 1995. With the agreement of the Council of Chief State School Officers, NASAA, the NEA and the USDE, it emerged as a forum to facilitate arts education research, scholarship, collaboration and communication among many interested parties. Its strategy was to focus the discourse on art as a tool to education reform, as integral to the curriculum and, therefore, a necessary part of the nation’s education goals, *Goals 2000* (1990). The texts published by AEP addressed advocacy for implementation and research issues: *Arts and education: Partners in achieving our national education goals* (1995), and *Priorities for arts education research* (1997). By
the end of the decade, research was being used heavily as advocacy in such texts as *Gaining the arts advantage* (1999). Answering the arts community criticism that educational systems should pay for and take responsibility for arts education delivery, it simultaneously defended the position that education should not be segregated from art disciplines at the NEA. Components of this group networked in increasing complexity: for instance, the Alliance of Arts Education (the Kennedy Center, USDE), published three texts in the 1990s, all emphasizing school reform, community involvement in the curriculum, and artist-teachers: *Community arts: partnerships for education* (1992), *Arts for every kid: A Handbook for change* (1992), and *Artists as educators* (1994).

Although not prolific in text production, but involved in the educational reform effort of the standards movement, the NASAA contributed *Arts education in action* (1999), and the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies (NALAA) produced *Arts in education: From national policy to local community action* (1994), *Working relationships: The Arts, education and community development* (1995), and *Arts, education and technology: A Winning combination* (1996). Combining with the arts agency infrastructure, and representative organizations to form advocacy groups, organizations such as The ACA often supported scholarly work bridging factions on divisive issues and interests from the educational standards to the economic impact of the arts. Although its affiliation with MENC seems to have subsided in the early 1990s, it maintains a strong voice of advocacy in the arts education discourse. Supporting the standards movement, it leaned toward pragmatic and social arguments: *Measuring up to the challenge: What standards and assessment can do for arts education* (1994), *Arts education for the 21sr century American economy* (1995), and *Beyond enrichment:*
Building effective arts partnerships with schools and their community (1996). The positioning of these organizations within AEP and the ACA within Americans for the Arts reveals the strength of the infrastructure established by the NEA and its potential as an advocacy tool. Reflecting the growing influence of the business community on decision making in the arts and arts education was the work of the NCEA; two texts are significant: Advocacy through partnerships: Advancing the case for arts education (1993) and Arts education and business: Can we find a common language? (1995)

Individual Discursive Practice: On Contemporary Critical Issues

Contemporary critical response to the National Standards (1994) articulated the multiple, previously marginalized, voices in opposition to the acceptance of Eurocentric tradition in art education. By 1993, Herbert cites a “myriad of organizations, coalitions, consortia, and other such descriptions of players on the national arts education scene” and, he notes, below the confusion, “a vision and a synergy of efforts among the many players on the national arts education landscape was, and still is, emerging.” (Herbert, 1995, p. 1) This “synergy of efforts to change the policies governing the place of the arts in the curriculum” was the result of: a challenge by a collective of communities to the ideological forces underlying curriculum that maintain certain power structures within society. (Herbert, 1995, p. 1) But issues brought to the fore called for new content recognizing ethnic minorities and feminists in the curriculum, a call for substantial institutional reform of elementary and secondary education systems, a movement toward integrated approaches to curricula, and an interest in authentic assessment. But the major reservations revolved about the feasibility of implementing the National Standards (1994) based in problems such as teacher preparation in arts, federal institutional support
for arts programming (as demonstrated in national curriculum debate), and advocacy and research for curriculum development. Functioning as policy watchdogs, Samuel Hope (1993), Jerrold Ross (1994), Richard Colwell (1995), Brent Wilson (1996), Joseph McDonald (1996), and Peter London (1997) provide insight into the immediate professional reaction to the work of the Consortium and issues behind its work.

But despite the apparent rise of professional arts educators to policy arenas, Gee sees established structural and political barriers to new ideological positions in the form of “...the arts bureaucracy’s fierce hold on federal policymaking in arts education. Since the mid-’70s, all federal funds earmarked specifically by Congress for educational initiatives in the arts have been divided between the NEA and the Kennedy Center.” (Gee, 1999b, p.1) She documents the factional struggles over Senate Bill 1020 during August 1997 meetings of the NEA, the Cultural Advocacy Group and the Consortium over issues of jurisdiction, responsibility, and content in school-based arts education programming as evidence of a power struggle that has little to do with the classroom. (Gee, 1999, p.12)

**Surface of Emergence: Organization Text Production**

**Chronology and Sequence of Text Emergence**

A summary of the texts produced by the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations (CNAEA) community and the individual professional arts education associations reveals the level of activity and influence of the community was directed primarily at the interests of practitioners. The member organizations, particularly MENC and the National Art Education Association, had active organizational histories predating the establishment of the Consortium. No doubt, the professional and organizational
expertise and leadership derived from the parent groups aided the Consortium’s political efforts at its inception in the early 1990s. However, it is equally important to recognize the organizational dominance of MENC and NAEA in the work of the Consortium. In its own name, the Consortium published only a few texts related to the *National Standards* (1994).

**Ideological Streams and Political Affiliations**

By necessity, the Consortium inculcates in its policymaking the pedagogic traditions and artistic canons of its respective art disciplines. And, in a very real sense, these separate subcultures are never submerged totally in the Consortium. Despite the early movement in the 1960s in interdisciplinary aesthetic education, the process of synthesizing the diverse components of curriculum ideology of the Consortium’s members has been on-going. According to Hoffa (1996), as early as the 1978 Wingspread conference in Wisconsin, and documented in *Merging agendas for arts education* (1978), DAM’T, a group of ten delegates representing the various arts disciplines attempted a political coalition with the JFK Center, AAE. (Hoffa, 1996, p.9) Other collaborative efforts are significant: an early report on HEW-supported arts education programs, *Try a new face* (1979), and the statement combining K-12 and higher education interests, *K-12 Arts education in the United States* (1986) represent factions within a massive community attempting to resolve its issues. “The CNAEA represents a membership of over 100,000 music, visual arts, dance, and theatre educators.” (Gee, 1999a, p.20) Despite the diversity and size of the community, Hoffa (1996) maintains the common concerns and political necessity of the four organizations generated the *National arts education accord* (1991), a twenty-three point statement of “common belief, beliefs that were, quite sensibly,
extracted from existing position papers and policy documents rather than going through
the agony of divining them anew out of thin air.” (Hoffa, 1996, p.10) Assuming this
framework of common beliefs, Hoffa continues: “Then, in 1994 the Accord begat The
National Standards for Arts Education, which established ‘what every young American
should know and be able to do in the arts’ under the auspices of the CNAEA....” (Hoffa,
1996, p.10) The process of uniting The Consortium’s organizational members, its
speakers and subjects, no doubt, was slightly more difficult than Hoffa’s characterization;
after the publication of the National Standards (1994), support texts such as Vision for
arts education in the 21st century (1994) expands on the curriculum rationale, and
Perspectives on implementation (1994) outlines the advocacy areas and needs.

Text Significance and Selection

The National Standards (1994) document demonstrates a new, if temporary,
collaborative political atmosphere demonstrated first, through the successful coalition of
arts education organizations and, eventually, through funding provided to develop the
National Standards (1994) by the USDE, NEA and the NEH. Both political arenas
reacted strongly when the arts were omitted from the earlier National Educational Goals.
However, the professional arts education environment followed the prescribed procedures
as other K-12 disciplines who hoped to qualify for federal funding. Although the
complete text is clearly an outcome-based curricular implementation guideline stated as
learning standards, the Introduction and the Summary to the National Standards (1994)
are the Consortium’s clearest policy statement of educational and political ideology.
Clearly, arts education was to be “well-schooled,” not “de-schooled;” As such, the
Consortium’s agenda emphasized all art forms, traditional and non-traditional, it
returned decision making about delivery to local policy makers and the classroom teacher, it refrained from recommending specifically either content or instructional methods (although it clearly advocated for certain outcomes of knowledge and skills), and, it brought to the fore a view of the arts as a means of cultural formation (rather than as individual expression or as cultural legacy).

After the publication of the National Standards (1994), the texts produced by the Consortium (National Task Force on Implementation) are very focused on the dissemination and implementation of the specific curriculum goals and assessment rationale. Although these texts cover dimensions of curricular ideology, they focus on “opportunity to learn” standards and on teacher education and, for the most part, these texts politically reinforce the original National Standards (1994) statement. But the Vision for arts education in the 21st century (1994) is the most representative of the Consortium functioning as an advocacy group and the multiple subject voices internal to its decision making.

Grids of Specification: Explanation of Text Purpose and Function

Hoffa (1993) forewarns of the limitations of all curricular policy statements:

“...such statements can be variously useful, incidental, or irrelevant to the organization’s real activities.....they are the closest approximation to policy guidelines that most organizations ever bother to generate.” (Hoffa, 1993, p.3) In some sense, this truism applies to the Consortium and the National Standards (1994). The standards themselves clearly are a set of curricular objectives designed for implementation; their purpose is very practical rather than an exposition of an abstract theoretical construct. Likewise, the consensus apparent in the Consortium’s work seems tied to the pragmatic value of
institutionalizing the arts in the public schools. Aligned with these political goals, the text production of the Consortium is heavily focused on implementation materials, materials that address teacher preparation, facility needs, etc. which contribute to institutional efforts. Conversely, the policy rationale, set forth in the Introduction and Summary, seems to have little unity in its underlying worldview or in an agreed upon learning theory. But as the major text statement, the combined documents (the Introduction and Summary) will be used in combination for a single-text analysis.

*Vision for Arts Education in the 21st Century* (1994) seems another opportunity for the National Standards Committee to rationalize a curricular approach after the political fact. As such, this text of short essays reveals the subtextual conflicts between subjects in the discourse community; it will be used for a multitext analysis primarily to determine the level of agreement or disagreement within the organization and the role of curriculum orientations in policy making.

The audience targeted for the Consortium advocacy efforts is a diverse professional population temporarily in agreement about a few, very broad tenets. A part of a larger education policy effort, the Consortium struggles to incorporate the values, interests and beliefs of government, general education, and arts policy makers into the arts education discourse of 1994. The primary text functions to give the appearance that those tenets are compatible. The secondary texts function to answer the inconsistencies of the *National Standards* (1994) and to suggest that implementation via practitioners and local school districts is the important missing link.
Archeological Findings: Objects

Findings: Discourse Context #1

- During the bracketed period of Discourse #1 (1970-1979), text production impacting arts education policy was minimal.

- Congressional action during this period depended on previously established legislation, agencies and/or programs.

- The impact of federal agencies on arts education was sporadic and divided; the USDE offered limited consulting and funding while the NEA’s focus on art and artists minimalized agency attention to arts education programming and policy making.

- The discourse field of arts education was relatively inactive; besides a few federally sponsored projects, this period was about field building, scholarship and policy discussions sponsored by professional organizations; the general education community exhibits only a token interest in the field.

- Discursive practice or critical response of arts educators to *Coming to our senses* (1977) clearly was skeptical of the “aesthetic” focus for arts in the schools.

- As an agent of change, AEAP texts generally represented “research” reports on field work closely aligned with existing federally funded projects; they were followed closely by a series of policy implementation documents.

- However, all texts were produced within a four year period and argued for the organization’s curricular orientation and program theory through ”case study;” AEAP texts can be characterized as practical “field research.”
Findings: Discourse Context #2

- During Discourse #2 (1980-1989) the national concern for education exploded as was evidenced in text production.
- While sustaining past efforts, congressional action addressed educational issues, and infrastructure in other areas of general education.
- The fragmentation of arts education policy making continued; the USDE and the NEA retreated from agenda setting by shifting responsibility for advocacy to local and state venues and reinforcing that shift by block grants. Congressionally mandated *Toward civilization* (1988) provided an opportunity for organizational and individual discursive practice to impact the institutional bureaucracy.
- By mid-Discourse #2 discourse communities became active and established cohesive ideological and coordinated policy agendas through partnerships; advocacy organizations assumed more defined roles within the discourse.
- Critical response to *Beyond creating* (1985) was, in some ways, overshadowed and/or delayed by continued reaction to perceived government interventions.
- The GCEA, as a change agent, was prolific in text production spanning a decade; relying heavily on sponsored scholarship, its texts were somewhat limited to theoretical justification rather that procedures for implementation and its projects usually were self-contained and controlled.
- The GCEA texts are demonstrations of “theoretical expertise.”

Findings: Discourse Context #3

- During Discourse #3 (1990-2000) educational reform efforts mandated by congressional action were in progress.
• Congressional action addressing education and arts education tripled: attention to infrastructure continued, various appropriations provided incentives, and accountability issues via standards dominated the discourse.

• Federal agencies conceded curriculum and instructional decision making to local authorities and art education professionals and, simultaneously, advocating for instrumental use of arts for broader societal good.

• Also this period is about discourse field unification; the discourse centers institutional, community, organizational and professional factions on school reform issues (excellence, utility and standards). Although showing continued political strength, the earlier influence of discourse organizations such as AEAP and the GCEA remains “embedded” in text production of larger coalitions, most notably the National Standards (1994). From various “camps,” advocates for arts education unite in action rather than in text production under the AEP.

• The critical response to the National Standards (1994) was extremely politicized; professional arts educators critiqued the national, state, and local political structures shaping curricular ideology in the schools.

• Strictly defining the Consortium’s role as a change agent by their text production is difficult; much of its work was accomplished by its individual member organizations. Its consensus was ideologically broad, but fragmented, specifically the standards were defined by disciplines and policy statements were aligned with institutional requirements in general education.

• The Consortium texts were political “consensus statements.”
Meta Analysis of Model Effectiveness: Objects

A summary of tasks exemplifies the way Foucault’s methodology is to function as a workable procedural model for the formation of objects. This study identifies the forces that frame and define the arts education discourse according to discourse “registers” 1) by characterizing the disposition of government actions, 2) by examining the policy of federal institutions, 3) by profiling supportive policy communities representing the discourse field, and 4) by recognizing discourse issues and ideas used in individual practices. Once the discourse registers are identified, the limitations of the situational context on the discourse can be addressed. The organizational surface of emergence is examined 1) by identifying the relationships revealed in chronology and sequence of the organization’s publications, 2) by examining the actions, interactions and political affiliations revealed through their publications which influenced discourse ideas and policy formation, 3) by analyzing the contextual significance of the emerging arts education policy statements and advocacy texts of three advocacy communities (1970-present), and 4) by establishing the relative ideological and functional importance of texts within each organization. In the grids of specification, texts 1) are identified as texts produced by each arts education community, 2) are designated by specific “intended” usages, practices or functions, and 3) are surveyed for significant patterns in audience focus. Since the purpose of this study is to demonstrate Foucault’s methodology, all grids of specification are analyzed as organizational advocacy.

The major strength of the model resides in the translation of Foucault’s broad and vague description of the discourse horizon into institutional registers of delimitation. This approach to data or text collection insures coverage of major levels of institutional activity.
stabilizing the art education discourse. Conversely, the surfaces of emergence in this model account for forces of change; besides the organizations chosen for this study, the model can focus on other identifiable change agents: any discourse policy objects, types of texts, and dimensions of discourse activity impacting idea formation. Characterizing the many political uses of language, the grids of specification account for multiple and different functions of individual texts as discursive statements.

However, the objects model has weaknesses in its scope, text selection process, and the limitations of text analysis. All of these factors pose problems related to research effectiveness and efficiency: even allowing for a qualitative emphasis on “rich detail,” questions remain concerning how many texts can be reasonably analyzed in any study, what elements of stability in the policy environment should be included, what agents of change are the most important, and whether marginalized voices and/or activities can be identified through text production. For example, this study limited the scope of textual specification to those discursive statements dealing with policy issues, but from a discursive point of view, that is an arbitrary limitation. It even may counter Foucault’s intent. However, to examine all of an organization’s text production is impossible, probably unnecessary, and potentially presents an unbalanced emphasis on the organization within its context. Similar problems are evident in the expansiveness of texts produced by social institutions and the problem increases when the policy environment is redefined or expanded beyond the national level to examine, for instance, state and local educational “systems.”

Certainly, the criteria for text selection is hard to operationalize in discourse method generally; an underlying assumption of the theory (and model) is that all discoursal activity, “significant” or not, is “text” and is responsible for idea formation. Additionally,
the reliance on textual “evidence” focuses on what is, rather than what is not, a part of the written record. For instance, the discursive impact resulting from organizational and political alliances and negotiations is difficult to chart through a written policy texts. Also, it is unlikely that marginalized voices within the society or the policy environment will produce written artifacts recording their activity, yet their impact on idea formation may be important. Finally, theoretically, the formation model assumes relevant objects will naturally surface, but nothing insures that significant or marginalized evidence will be recognized by the researcher.

**Summary**

The function of the model and the methodology in the formation of objects is to identify the major contextual forces impacting national discourse in the arts education policy environment: Government, federal agencies, organizations and individual discursive practice represent a continuum of forces of stability and change. Specifically, in this model, the surface of emergence allows for flexibility in discourse focus, for instance, a micro level investigation of private organizations seeking change in the policy environment. The grids of specification function as an overview of text functions and production, the use of political language, and audience identification. The success of these functions provides the foundation of evaluating the objects model. The first step in Foucault’s analysis, it identifies and describes institutional structures, agents of change, and the texts they produced; simultaneously it identifies, within the discourse, the focus for analysis. While using distinct methodological lens, all other formation analysis rests on this primary data gathering and analysis.
CHAPTER 6

THE FORMATION OF ENUNCIATIVE MODES: DEMONSTRATION OF MODEL

Purpose of the Enunciative Modes Formation Model

While still descriptive, the model for enunciative modes profiles aspects of the dominant organizations engaged in arts education discourse; the model gathers three sets of significant information about the organizations through a comparative analysis of multiple texts produced by each. The model details the advocacy practices used to impact larger discourse patterns. By a close examination of the organization site (its place, its speakers, its subjects), this model is valuable in linking established external discourse patterns to the activity of organizations/institutions, and individual participates. Again, the model demonstrates the collective but unparallel discursive action responsible for idea formation.

First, this model for the place of observation analyses the way in which the discourse organization or community organizes itself: the site of its activity (where ideological rules are leveraged and where issues, problems and solutions are defined), its unique organizational structure and its characteristic decision making processes, its culture and subcultures, its collective motivations, and its major initiatives. Additionally, the model highlights the impact the organization’s role within the discursive field of other or opposing organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Observation</th>
<th>The Speaker</th>
<th>The Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, Location &amp; Issues</td>
<td>As Authority</td>
<td>As Community Delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Participation in Discourse</td>
<td>As Ideological Emblem</td>
<td>As Ideological Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Processes &amp; Structures</td>
<td>As Influence Mechanism</td>
<td>As Transfer Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Subcultures</td>
<td>Individual Credentials</td>
<td>Leadership Status within the Discourse Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership, Community Composition, Cohesion &amp; Integration</td>
<td>Knowledge of Policy Matters</td>
<td>Persistence of Ideological Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction, Assessment Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Issues Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Structure, Instruction Delivery Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World view, Educational Goals</td>
<td>Gathering, Dissimilating information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Material, Knowledge Organization</td>
<td>Policy Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction, Assessment Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Issues Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Structure, Instruction Delivery Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Credentials</td>
<td>Individual Credentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of Policy Matters</td>
<td>Knowledge of Policy Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Policy Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status within the Discourse Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility of Ideological Vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Issues Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Structure, Instruction Delivery Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World view, Educational Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Material, Knowledge Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction, Assessment Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Issues Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Structure, Instruction Delivery Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1  Formation of Enunciative Modes: Organizational Profile
Secondly, this formation model examines the manner in which a particular organization expresses its curriculum ideology through multiple texts; texts published in the organization’s name, by its designated speakers (as ideological emblems), and by subjects (as ideological agents) within the discourse community who are aligned with the organization. By examining language codes embedded in statements on curriculum policy, these concepts and concept groupings offer an aggregated view or profile of the organization/community’s commitment to a specific curricular ideology. Once the concept patterns are identified and described, they are thematically grouped and analyzed in the model as broad policy elements subject to discourse transfer. While allowing the ideas to “surface” independently within the analysis of each organization, the suggested issues of arts education curriculum might include: the organization’s world view, common program theories, educational goals/outcomes, content and/or knowledge organization, preferred instruction and assessment strategies, and program delivery. Beyond these ideas, unanticipated issues also may be revealed.

And, finally, the model for this formation model examines the speaker as an authority on policy making and as an influence mechanism: his/her credentials as a policy maker and his/her policy knowledge and skills in gathering/disseminating information, issue identification and problem definition, shaping policy, policy networking and coalition building, and policy implementation initiatives. In a similar manner, the credential and activity of the subjects can be examined individually and as representative transfer agents to the total community. Although not a part of this study, additional texts produced by the subjects outside of the organization may establish the subject’s reception, processing and means of transferring ideas. Because this study is focused to
the role of language in these processes and, ultimately, in idea formation, the
organizational use of agents (both speakers and subjects) as mechanisms of influence or
transfer policy elements also is limited to their written texts; on the speaker as an
ideological emblem and the subjects as agents of ideology.

Discourse Organization #1: Arts, Education and Americans Panel

Time/Location: Contextual Issues, Problems, Solutions

The first discourse community examined in this study contributed to and supported several earlier organizations, starting with the National Council for the Arts in Education (established in 1958), followed by the ACA (established in 1972) and, finally, the AEAP (in existence from 1974-1977). During the approximately 25-year life-span of this organization, many social movements (particularly during the 1960s) challenged societal and institutional norms and promoted individual choice and opportunity in all facets of life.

Education was no exception; schools were viewed by some critics as unnecessarily regimented and repressive, and the curriculum divorced from social realities such as the Vietnam War, poverty, and civil rights issues. The federal government began to focus increasingly on a social agenda. Also, while the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 was encouraging to educators, federally funded projects in arts education often were temporarily funded. The climate within the schools and communities was summarized by Bloom (1980):

In brief, the arts in education were regarded as superficially respectable but of little practical importance. Traditional art and music programs mainly addressed the interests and needs of talented youngsters, although those with special abilities in the arts have been, over time, an invisible minority in the schools. Persons in school systems at every level of responsibility were, and are, the products of the kinds of schooling that seemed to call for change. With little or no exposure to
the arts and only a vague understanding of their value in education, there was little, if any, public motivation to address a problem that would be complex and would be uncertain as to outcomes. (Bloom et al, 1980, p. 5)

**Organizational Discourse Role**

The “Report to the Trustees of the FDR 3rd Fund on the Arts in Education Program” was a six-year evaluation of the program. Among many other issues, the report addresses the perceived organizational role and functions of its program staff as “essentially guidance, consultation, and review–as helpful to making each project as autonomous as possible.” (Bloom et al, 1980, p.16) Bloom states: “The use of grant funds was characterized as catalytic” and quotes the report: “Since, in most cases, the sums of money involved were not enormous, it was clear that the purpose was to supply the leverage, the missing ingredient, the agent by which change could be brought about...” (Bloom et al, 1980, p.16) On the other hand, the Fund’s involvement and development of networks and temporary coalitions proved more useful in the dissemination of ideas:

These two networks are mutual support systems and function as powerful multipliers on several levels. First, they accelerate the gains being made within the individual school systems and state departments and provide reality checks through the exchange of ideas and information among individuals with similar goals and objectives. Second, both networks have reached a stage of capability and sophistication that enables them to deal with issues, consolidate their gains, and undertake special projects, with their efforts coordinated by the staff of the Arts in Education Program. (Bloom et al, 1980, p.21)

Given the limited numbers of individuals working in the field at the time, the organization often functioned as equal members in coalition projects and the program staff also played more specific leadership roles in individual projects, through publication, consultancy, and participation in conferences at all levels. However, by 1977, the Administrative Fellowship Training Program was initiated through the League
and the Coalition networks for leadership training; the purpose of the program was to meet the need for on-site project personnel with an understanding of the organization’s goals.

Although flexible in the role they played, the early evaluation report clearly revealed that an organizational strategy of intervention was in place:

...we learned that given an acceptable rationale and a plan that provides for orderly change in the educational program, parents, boards of education, and school administrators would continue to endorse, support, and strengthen arts in education programs. (Bloom et al, 1980, p. 17)

From this statement, an “acceptable” curricular rationale does not appear to be the overwhelming concern for Bloom; rather she pursued other concerns:

What procedures could be identified or developed by which schools and school districts could plan and implement arts in education programs most effectively and efficiently, so that they would become solidly institutionalized? (Bloom et al, 1980, p.18)

Organizational Structure

The JDR 3rd Fund’s position within the discourse field is characterized (in comparison with DBAE) by Efland (1990): “Unlike the discipline-oriented movement, which originated with university educators dissatisfied with the ways their subject was taught, arts-in-education originated in the world of federal agencies and private foundations.” (Efland, 1990, p. 247) The organization was closely aligned with federally funded channels of influence such as the Arts and Humanities program (AHP/USOE) and the NEA Arts-in-Education program. Such external alliances provided conduits for influencing and transferring ideas among individuals and organizations. For example, Bloom’s five-month exploratory consultancy with the Fund was a transition from her position with the AHP at the USOE. During her appointment as the Fund’s Arts in
Education Program Director, she would draw upon ideas and previous connections as she pursued new projects. The organization’s goals and its guidelines for decision making incorporated ideas that were similar to the programs of CEMREL and the NEA’s Poets-in-the-Schools in 1966. Whether AEAP influenced ideological change on established institutions or simply reinforced practice is debatable.

**Culture and Subcultures: Membership, Policy Community**

As early as 1963, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund had sponsored a panel to study the development and support for the performing arts, chaired by John D. Rockefeller 3rd. The panel published *The Performing arts: Problems and prospects* (1965). The 1965 report, although not specifically intended as a study of arts education, provided an impetus for three meetings in 1966 to explore the possibilities and problems of pilot projects in the public schools. Bloom explains the number of participants in these meetings was small, “but they represented a wide range of interests, experience, and commitment–school administrators and teachers, concerned citizens, persons associated with public and private agencies, and representatives of professional organizations.” (Bloom et al, 1980, p.4) Chapman describes the membership of the AEAP:

Without question, the most influential of these [blue-ribbon] panels was the Arts Education and Americans Panel, chaired by David Rockefeller, Jr., and including such distinguished citizens as author James Michener, Nobel Physicist Glenn Seaborg; former CBS president Frank Stranton; and Francis Keppel, Former U.S. Commissioner of Education, among others. The two-year effort of the panel was supported by a consortium of private foundations, as well as by the National Endowment for the Arts and the U.S. Office of Education. The project was initiated in 1974 at the suggestion of Nancy Hanks, then chairperson for the NEA, and Kathryn Bloom, among others (Chapman, 1982, p. 124)

Chapman (1982) explains the constituency of the organization and its composition: “The recommendations reflected the interests of the NEA, state and local
arts councils, and, most important, the constituencies that these agencies represent—namely, artists and patrons of the arts.” (Chapman, 1982, p.124) Associating itself with government infrastructures, both in art and education, the organization gained access to an established policy transfer network.

**The Speaker**

**As Designated Authority**

As Efland states, the Arts in Education movement “... had its origins in the Arts and Humanities Program of the U.S. Office of Education, and it centered around the career of Kathryn Bloom. Bloom was described by a former colleague, Jane Remer, as “elder statesperson” in the arts-in-education movement.” (Remer cited in Efland, 1990, p.245) Appointed by Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, Bloom’s influence on arts education began in the bureaucratic environment of Washington, D.C. with an appointment as advisor for the Arts and Humanities program in the USOE from 1962 to 1968. Subsequently, Bloom directed the JDR 3rd Fund Arts in Education program from 1968 until 1979 during the 12- year period when the Rockefeller foundation was most active in funding programs to public schools. (Efland, 1990, p.245)

**As Ideological Emblem**

As the speaker for the Fund and its supporters, Bloom is especially visible and ideologically emblematic. Interestingly, Efland points out that Bloom had supported the discipline orientation by her support of the Penn State Seminar in 1965, “…but with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, federal funding policy began to shift toward programs having a strong social agenda....” (Efland, 1990, p.245)

As her career evolved with the appointment as head of the Arts in Education Program
with the Fund, her orientation shifted away from the established academic arts education communities. Although representing diverse backgrounds, this early policy community and the approximately six members of the Fund’s professional staff (1968-1979) became aligned with an arts education perspective of “Creative self-expression [which] came into flower in the 1920s and became the dominant mode of teaching after World War II....” (Efland, 1989, p. 2) Clearly influenced by John D. Rockefeller’s personal goal to reach all school-age students and persuaded by site-based projects such as New York City’s “All the Arts for All the Children,” Bloom appears to change to a more child-oriented perspective. Hoffa (1994) comments on her change of perspective over time:

...when the climate for the fine arts—to say nothing of the climate for liberal politics—changed along the banks of the Potomac, she moved to New York, taking some of the key AHP staff along with her, to become the director of the JDR 3rd Fund’s Arts in General Education Program. It was not a bad one-two punch for a lady from the Junior League who had burst upon the national arts education scene unknown and unheralded only a few years before. (Hoffa, 1994, p.5)

By 1980, Bloom, in a short statement, “Rationale for the Arts in Education” reveals her curriculum rationale and provides insight to her symbolic role as the organization’s primary spokesperson and as a mechanism to reinforce its ideology. (Bloom et al, 1980, p. 233)

As Influence Mechanism

Generally, Bloom perceived the policy issues, problems and their potential solutions as based in attitudes and beliefs that the arts were not educationally beneficial, needed highly specialized teachers, appealed to special interests and abilities, were not supported by college and university admissions, were financially expensive, and were not supported by communities. All of these issues were highlighted against a backdrop of national education environment engaged in the “back-to-basics” movement, and, as
Bloom (1980) points out, a movement “with no clear understanding of what is basic…” (Bloom et al, 1980, p.20) The JDR 3rd Fund, under her leadership, countered with a focus on individual experiences in the arts as educational instruments in learning. Particularly between 1967 and 1979, the Arts in Education Program of the Fund sought “to discover and refine a process for making all the arts integral to the general, or basic, education of all children in entire schools and school systems.” (Bloom et al., 1980, p. xi)

The internal decision making processes of the organization were guided by a clearly established framework that rested on a social ideology with certain assumptions about the role of the arts within social and educational systems: the arts are important and needed no defense to prove the point, all arts have educational potential, community art organizations and artists should be engaged in schools, project sites should have generalizable results, “parity” within the curriculum is a goal, and projects should be funded where school personnel had a high degree of interest. Importantly, as project sites were chosen, the organization recognized that “…regardless of the quality of individual programs in the arts, the persons who administer them generally do not make policy decisions affecting the larger operation of school systems. Power resides elsewhere.” (Bloom, 1980, p. 7)

The primary task for Bloom and her staff was not only to change the prevalent ideology in the schools, but to gain access for the arts to the classroom. According to Chapman (1982), their work was “clearly intended to shape national policies;” their method was through sharing expertise and networking with individuals in prominent positions in the arts and government. Kimpton (2000) describes the contextual and,
simultaneously, the organizational culture of the community surrounding the AEAP when he says:

...arts education grew not because of a societal mandate but because of a core of aggressive, devoted, tenacious and committed advocates of largely western European cultural traditions, who took advantage, locally and nationally, of the trend in school growth and diversification, of the increasing national wealth and influence of the upper and middle class, and of the emphasis on “culture” as a sign of national maturity. (Kimpton, 2000, p.2)

While with the USOE, Bloom expanded the AHP staff and, during her tenure, implemented a series of 17 conferences on the arts between 1964 and 1966. (Efland, 1990, p. 241) Two conferences have special significance: the Seminar on Elementary and Secondary School Education in the Visual Arts (New York University, 1964) focused on improving teacher recruitment and training and The Penn State Seminar (1965) focused, according to Efland, on art as a discipline. (Efland, 1990, p.241) *An Arts in education source book: (1980), co-authored by Bloom, Junius Eddy, Charles Fowler, Jane Remer and Nancy Skuker, documents the early research projects of the organization; in many respects, it also reveals Bloom’s political knowledge and strategic skills.*

Many initiatives of the arts-in-education movement sponsored by the efforts of the JDR 3rd Fund were short-term pilot projects intertwined with local arts councils, schools and school districts, state departments of education and various research and program evaluation efforts. Supportive research included projects with the College Entrance Examination Board (to establish Advanced Placement courses in music, studio art and the history of art), with the Aesthetic Education Program at CEMREL in 1968 (to design a comprehensive curriculum often used in later projects of the Fund), with Robert Stake (to develop a bibliography “Evaluation of Arts in Education Programs” in 1972, *Evaluation in the arts: A Responsive approach, 1975*) and with John Goodlad (to support
“A Study of the Arts in Pre-collegiate Education,” *Arts and the schools*, 1979). Also in 1973, the Fund made a joint grant to CEMREL and the Asia Society. “This was a first step in developing curriculum materials based upon Asian arts and culture for use in American schools.” (Bloom et al, 1980, p.15)

Not all inclusive of the programs sponsored by the Fund, the *Arts in education source book* (1980) does record its major school project reports and representative case studies of this twelve-year period. Although many of the organization’s activities are not recorded in published texts, the *Source book* (1980) does provide many specifics of the organization’s interventions. The earliest projects, as might be expected, drew heavily upon and expanded established programs. Simultaneously, with Bloom’s appointment as Program Director, the organization began collaboration with the University City Schools, MO (1968). Referred to as the Comprehensive Arts Program, Efland suggests its recent history of commitment to change and innovation and its willingness to integrate the arts (previously taught as special and separate subjects) into its curriculum were appealing. (Efland 1990, p.245)

This initial project was followed the same year by two other grants to already established projects: the three-year collaboration with Bank Street College of Education and New York Public School 51, a program initially involving the U.S. Office of Education and later selected by the Fund for continued support. Another project was the Mineola Union Free School District in Mineola, Long Island, a program with established and similar goals. From 1965 to 1970, this program displays significant program development progressing from arts exposure, to in-school experience to an integrated arts curriculum.
According to Bloom (1980), the successes of the Arts in Education program were cumulative and resulted from “the deployment of a variety of strategies to solve the multitude of problems plaguing arts education” (Bloom et al, 1980, p.13) Smaller projects often addressed specific problems, provided a body of information and suggested solutions in achieving a district-wide program in larger school systems such as the Jefferson County School Project, CO (1970), Ridgewood Public Schools, New Jersey (1971) and the Creative Education Program in Oklahoma City (1972) sponsored by the Oklahoma State Department of Education. The Oklahoma City project was a unique community-oriented program with a major emphasis on a cooperative program of ten cultural and education institutions coordinated by the Arts Council of Oklahoma City and assisted by the Junior League of Oklahoma City.

Subsequently, following the establishment of the AEAP, the Fund (under the supervision of Jane Remer) supported the New York City Project, “Arts in General Education Program” (1974), and the development of programs based on similar guidelines in five other school districts: Seattle, Minneapolis, Little Rock, Winston-Salem and Hartford. These cities would eventually form a support network called the League of Cities for the Arts in Education (1976) coordinated by the Fund. In a similar fashion, the Fund promoted another network from established programs within state education departments; the most influential of these was in Pennsylvania in 1972. The Ad Hoc Coalition of States for Arts in Education (1972) was an outgrowth of state department work in Arizona, California, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania and Washington.
The Subjects

As Community Representatives

Voices selected for multi text analysis are from the Report series # 7-10 dealing with curriculum and program recommendations: Junius Eddy (Case for the arts in schools, 1981-#7), Ruth Weinstock (Arts in the curriculum, 1981-#8), Mary Louise Bliss (Creative collaborations, 1981-#9) and Nancy Morison Ambler and Barbara R. Strong (Arts in the classroom, 1981-#10) provide an aggregate of characteristic policy elements common in the organization’s orientation; singly they highlight traceable objects of transfer. In a similar manner, but not the focus of this study, are Judith Murphy (People and places, 1980-#1), Junius Eddy (Your school district and the arts, 1980-#2; Local school boards and the arts, 1980-#3; Ideas and money for expanding school arts programs, 1980-#4), Ralph Burgard (Method and the muse, 1981-#5; Developing financial resources for a school arts program, 1980-#6) demonstrate recurring recommended advocacy strategies.

As Ideological Agents

Worldview, Educational Goals

The curricular policy goals set by AEAP attempted to be representative and descriptive of current field practice. Report #8 documents a growing official policy in the states favoring comprehensive plans in support of arts-in-education, plans calling for “discrete subjects in the curriculum to be studied for their own intrinsic value.....,” plans calling for professional artists, students and teachers to work side-by side in the classroom and plans for the infusion of the arts into the standard curriculum. (RS# 8-5) Much of the advocacy literature, particularly the Report series (1980-1981), presents
numerous small case studies of arts education programs (private/public, school/arts organization) across the nation to verify current practice. Although each report relies heavily on individual teachers to speak from their own experience about the value of arts in the learning process, the subjects’ role in shaping the issues is clear. Although their ideas are not totally aligned, particularly regarding intrinsic and instrumental issues, the four texts examined in this study reveal a consistent emphasis on certain curricular ideas.

As might be expected with any advocacy group attempting to institutionalize a value system into the American public school systems, a strong statement of equalitarianism, of equal access to the arts undergirds the organization’s argument. Particularly, *The Case for the arts* (*Report #7*) presents the arts in the context of the existing goals and often restated objectives for general education in a democracy. Designating the arts as fundamental and recommending that “all youngsters have equal access to them,” the document refers to “the skills, attitudes, processes, sensitivities, interests, and appreciations we deem of cardinal importance to the development of educated human beings fully functioning in today’s world.” (RS# 7-6) Citing John Goodlad’s work with the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, 12 goals for schooling in a study of schooling, *What schools are for* (1979) are presented. (RS# 7-8) Aside from the mastery of fundamental verbal and mathematical skills and career or vocational training, the remaining goals are focused on molding the personal potential of the student: in intellectual development, enculturation, interpersonal relations, autonomy, citizenship, creative and aesthetic perception, self-concept, emotional and physical well-being, moral and ethical character, and self realization. Goodlad (and AEAP) accept these goals as “a sociopolitical expression of external
expectations to which school personnel presumably pay some attention and for which they might expect to be held accountable.” (RS# 7-7, 8) AEAP argues that all of these “nonacademic matters involving social and personal growth,” are goals “which seem uniquely susceptible to the kinds of teaching and learning that fall within the domain of the visual and performing arts....” (RS# 7-9) Junius Eddy refutes that art in the schools can be justified on the basis of simple enjoyment and/or as only as means to aesthetic literacy, he argues that the development of “basic skills,” particularly individual perceptual skills, is the primary goal of an arts curriculum. Succinctly, individual perceptual skills represent the key to any learning in or out of the arts.

Once situating the arts within the larger contemporary educational discourse, secondary goals for the arts curriculum become more specific expressions of this overall focus: although personal growth and development in non academic ways certainly are addressed, the emphasis is decidedly on creative issues as they are informed by perception. Reflecting a dichotomous view of human cognition, the belief is reinforced that “The arts are crucial because they help, as nothing else does, to sharpen the ability to use to the fullest one’s perceptual equipment, both sensory and cognitive.” (RS# 7-14) Art is valued as an unmediated experience; a worldview that promotes the idea that “truth” is either an aggregate of human experience or intuitive. Depending on Harry Broudy’s idea that aesthetic experience provides imagery, “the raw material for concepts,” AEAP subjects agree with Broudy that aesthetic experience is the foundation for “cognition, judgment and action.” (RS# 7-15) Acknowledging Broudy’s claims for the imagination, the argument is focused on action and the value of “creative work” to accomplish personal and social objectives. Quickly defining the established art forms
(with the help of Langer) as “perceptible forms expressive of human feeling,” the creative act (not restricted to the artistic act) is described as having a “rich cognitive base” composed of planning, sequencing, problem-solving (and problem-raising, decision making, and, perhaps most significant, “coming to understand the nature and function of art as another kind of symbol system.” (RS# 7-17) It should be noted that “critical thinking processes” or “skills” are seldom mentioned and are usually associated with personal learning dispositions and processes of personality: “adventurousness of spirit,” “willingness to strike out in new directions and take greater responsibility for individual actions and decisions,” “flexibility” and “independence.” These supposed virtues are promoted as anticipated outcomes. Therefore, the value of the arts in learning is “indispensable” and dependent on their intrinsic nature

Arts education must be valued in education first and foremost on its own varied and intrinsic merits because it is in so many ways the only means available for teaching students about, and involving them in, aesthetic literacy and creativity. (RS# 7-17)

**Content, Knowledge Organization**

The process-orientation of this educational rationale becomes clear when addressing issues of content and instructional method; the issue of “what” is taught in, about, or even through the arts is truly secondary to “how” the arts are taught. With a clear emphasis on activity, production and experience, very little effort in these texts is spent on established art forms or disciplines and their respective content; even less time is spent on contextual issues of social purpose, functions or cultural heritage. Artistic forms are very inclusively defined (visual arts [drawing, painting, sculpture, fibers], music, dance [movement], theatre [drama, puppetry], creative writing [poetry], the media, crafts and environmental design); and they are not questioned as media for organizing aesthetic
processes. The argument for arts study is focused on individual benefits: self esteem ("individual cultural history"), social integration skills in school and throughout life, personal "empathy" for and/or cultural identification with ethnic, racial or cultural groups; or on historical sources of inspiration for a student’s own creative work. (RS# 10-11) Occasionally ethnic arts (usually designated as crafts) are characterized as an experientially "vibrant" method of instruction and their study is viewed as producing desirable outcomes for a pluralistic society; used as a problem solution for difficult learning populations in certain locales is a suggested example for school practice. Only once referred to as potentially appropriate in promoting international communication and understanding, the fullest statement of usefulness of the arts in addressing any social issues is the following:

The arts offer a means of helping students identify the elements indigenous to various cultures–theirs and others. In so doing, the children find their individual and cultural pride reinforced, and gain an understanding and respect that transcend ethnic boundaries and diverse heritage. (RS# 10-11)

Ironically, the concept of “art’s for it’s own sake,” a way of making “the invisible visible,” (RS# 8-8) remains a clearly stated value throughout repeated argument for the instrumental use of the arts. (RS# 10-6, 18)

**Instructional, Assessment Strategies**

The arts are seen as a cognitive organizing principle, “a learning tool” “...to convey a sense of the organizing principles in all knowledge...” (RS# 8-8), aiding “...children’s natural impulse to create a shape for their world, to convey what they feel about it....” (RS# 7-12) Using “all their senses to perceive and understand the world,” students are imbued with “natural” artistic abilities which provides a “natural” motivation to learn.(RS# 10-6) Some service is given to critical processes/skills as a component of
aesthetic potential, but usually where expressive traits and qualities appear to enhance positively established instrumental uses across the curriculum. (RS# 10-6,16) In other contexts, expressiveness is seen as a viable solution for students struggling with the achievement demands (high or low) of schooling or the negative effects of social or institutional problems on individual self-concept; the “discipline” of expressive and creative processes is proposed as reinforcement, a remedy or a even substitute for weak critical skills.

Beyond the development of cognitive skill, the arts are presented cautiously as “highly effective supplementary vehicles” with “formidable utility” (exceeding many other disciplines) but which may or may not have a fundamental or indispensable place as an instrument in general education. Integrating the arts into everyday life in school is dependent on “certain firsthand arts experiences [which] obviously can be provided for students only through sources beyond the school house walls.” (RS# 8-16) Arts experiences are accomplished through “exposures” and accompanying methods and media: pre-and post performance discussions, master classes, related demonstrations or workshops, classroom visits, and sessions for teachers.” (RS# 9-6) An artist-teacher may be in residence on a short or long-term basis and engaged in any number of ways with the students, teachers, school and community. Assessment usually takes the form of “a culminating activity and exhibit, presentation, or field trip planned by the artist and teachers together.” (RS# 9-9) However, connecting them instrumentally with learning basic reading and math skills depends greatly on adopting a compatible program theory and structure.
Possibly, in the discussion of teaching objectives and assessment, the major questions about this orientation arise, and the connections between “substance and process” are seen as the most tenuous. Admitting that behavioral objectives in the arts may not be attainable, testable, and measurable, nonetheless, “This special attribute of the arts for transfer, crossover, and interconnection” makes them valuable as a learning strategy. This quality provides “the most convincing rationale for asserting that the arts are indeed fundamental to the educational process.” (RS# 7-23) Giving voice to one of the most contentious claims in arts education discourse, not verifiable beyond antedotal evidence (from the programs participating in the arts-in-education movement), the strategy of AEAP discourse subjects writing in the Report series (1980-1981) has been to provide an aggregate of case study descriptions and artist/teacher/administrator testimonials of classroom successes. Recommending “The combination of activities and strategic approaches merit your attention,” successes are attributed to “excitement,” “fun” and “enthusiasm” (i.e. “translates to motivation”) and offset the learning barriers (a lack of attendance and attention) introduced into an “often humdrum business of teaching and learning.”

Program Theory: Issue Identification, Problem Definition

With a tone that is concerned with “compassionate understanding,” AEAP subjects warn against schooling that does not address “crucial human purposes;” without fundamental life skills students are at-risk for functional deprivation in adulthood. As AEAP subjects continue, the arts become associated with “holistic learning” and the expansion of human “languages” for thought/communication or “expressiveness.” Subjects are aware that the fundamental learning rationale (goals) offered for the arts
curriculum (content, instructional methods) would “directly affect educational practice in some form....” (RS# 7-12) Both intrinsic and instrumental uses in the arts are manifest in the proposed program theory and structure. Although fundamental curricular components are categorized generally as academic, vocational, social and civic and as components of personal development, discourse subjects try to dispel “the categories and distinctions as mutually exclusive domains within the curriculum or the school program as a whole” (RS# 7-22) Citing Coe’s studies that claim basic skills were highest where the curriculum was widest, the texts support and strengthen his position by noting that NAEA acknowledges “a variety of appropriate rationales which may be equally viable as conceptual bases for teaching and learning in art within a given school context.” (RS# 7-13) By integrating the arts and the academic curriculum at all grade levels program structure is strengthened; the arts are more that included, they are tied to “essential goals and purposes of education as a whole.” (RS# 7-9) In the classroom, project-based and interdisciplinary themes (representing “connecting threads in the curriculum,” a “tapestry” of content which “spans all of life and touches every area of human existence” (RS# 8-6), the arts are “woven like a thread from grade to grade to buttress the understanding of standard curricula....” and address issues of long-range educational development of the student. (RS# 8-8, 17) But specifically, although the argument for the “fundamental” place (even the “centrality”) of the arts in the learning process informs the call for integrated (or ‘infused”) curriculum (in addition to “basic,” “comprehensive,” “sequential”), one additional policy piece is needed. “A strong sequential arts instruction program with practicing artist-in -residence backing up an able teaching staff–what more can students ask of their school?” (RS# 9-12)
Program Solution: Program Structure, Instructional Delivery

The instructional delivery of the arts is of primary importance in this organizational orientation. The program is focused on the “partnership” of the “professional” artist (“as a professional role model”) from outside the school with the classroom teacher. Repeated references by the subjects identify a perceived problem within the schools and suggest the teacher and artist working side by side as a solution. These proposed curriculum goals have associated “benefits” in the workplace. The subjects gingerly introduce the ideas and concerns of career development for talented students (RS#10-2), in-service training opportunities for teachers, showcasing for professional artists (providing “sophisticated showcase of talent, worthy of any first-rate box office impresario”) and audience development for the school and its community. (RS# 9-12) The subjects pose questions such as: Is the school the proper place to nurture “the voice of the individual artist?” By suggesting pragmatically that the artist in the schools can complement a teaching staff untrained in the arts, can overcome enrollment or funding inadequate to hire arts specialists, and can provide talented students with career exposure, the Report series (1980-1981) provides an overview of procedures for hiring qualified artists (“...begin your hunt for an artist as you would any other employment screening procedure.”), introduces solutions to these problems that incorporate simultaneously the belief in the “artist-teacher” as the most effective way of learning about the creative process, about communicating thoughts through imagery, about expressiveness.(RS# 9-5,21) More idealistic rationales for the “artist-teacher” in the schools are reflected in statements about the intrinsic value of providing students and teachers with “authentic immediacy” of “live” arts performance/production. From these
“artistic exposures,” uninitiated teachers, students, schools and their communities are
given access to the creative process and the personal growth opportunities it provides.
The arts and the artists unify “the overall curriculum tapestry.” (RS# 9-6) The
organization’s most obvious statement regarding who should be designated as authority
appears in Report #9; but implicit in this statement are unrecognized barriers to wide-
scale implementation.

In conjunction with more extended residencies, artists’ responsibilities may
include teaching regular classes, either on their own or as part of a teaching team; sharing
their individual creative discipline and its process by means of demonstrations or
performances with the school and larger community; conducting in-service workshops
for teachers; auditioning and conducting master classes for especially gifted or talented
students; and producing plays, staging dance recitals, conducting concerts, or mounting
art and craft exhibits by school students for their peers and the community. (RS# 9-5, 6)

Acknowledging that the student-classroom teacher relationship is “the common
denominator of American education,” the characterization of the teacher’s role certainly
is not ignored, but neither is it the positive focal point of advocacy. Continuing to address
a problem of teacher preparation in arts education, the organization recommends teams of
teachers, including arts specialists.

**Program Impact, Outcomes**

Hoping to encourage arts specialists and coordinators as resource persons, there
are numerous text references to “in-service teacher training workshops.” (RS# 9-14) In
addition to limited preparation, the implied secondary problem is the lack of teacher
“enthusiasm.” The solution is “to promote more exciting or innovative classroom
experiences” by creating teacher leadership initiatives to incorporate the arts in education movement in their school. (RS# 9-20)

In a role that provides both moral support and resources, the art and school communities are an extension of the partnership idea. Returning to the personal development rationale, underprivileged students are provided “a sensitive,” “a warmer and more humane school environment” amidst urban social problems and isolation from a larger global community “as positive outcomes of a strong school arts program.” (RS# 7-22)

The arts can help one teacher bring beauty into lives where there is little, open doors and broaden horizons, and cement a bond of mutual understanding, trust, and friendship with a child halfway across the world. (RS# 10-10)

And, as such, the schools are integral, responsible to and dependent upon larger social structures for assistance in implementing solutions. The community provides for expertise (art community, university community), for funding (school district administrators, community organizations and businesses, local arts councils, state agencies regional/national agencies) or for the dissemination of information. By making art a “part of their everyday lives and ongoing education,” audience development, showcasing for the artist and community support for school art programs are seen as mutually beneficial; a double benefit occurs if the artist is also a member of the community. Likewise, the community (often seen as intergenerational) is serviced by “free” entertainment; the audience becomes “allies,” if not full-fledged patrons....” The public relations aspects of the arts are clear: Sharing an “artist with the community-at-large can be one of the most important aspects of the residency.” (RS# 9-23)
As Transfer Mechanism

To chart the role of the subjects in the transfer of organizational ideology is beyond the intended organizational focus of this study. However, the model suggests a way to organize the extra organization activity of each subject. The texts of individual subjects could provide his/her patterns of receiving, processing, and restating the ideology in different domains (art, general education), other institutions, organizations communities, and in individual discursive practice. For instance, Junius Eddy participated in many advocacy efforts for art education over the bracketed time period. To analyze any individual perspective for change would indicate the manner in which subjects are a transfer mechanism.

Discourse Organization #2: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

Time/Location: Contextual Issues, Problems

During a time of national concern for educational standards of effectiveness and economic efficiency, the GCEA (eventually renamed the Getty Education Institute for the Arts) was established almost simultaneously with the J. Paul Getty Trust in 1982. At the inception of the GCEA, the national practice in art education was still tied to an earlier model of creative expression and exemplified by the NEA Arts-in-Education programs. However, Apple characterizes the role of the GCEA as a political response to larger societal conflicts:

The attempt by the Getty and other foundations to reorient our educational programs toward a more disciplinary, and some would argue more conservative, basis cannot be understood outside of both the larger ideological conflicts over what and whose knowledge is important in a time of crisis in authority relations in the larger society and the need for increased prestige in threatened subject areas as a result of these conflicts and economic dislocations. (Apple, 1992, p. 34)
Located in the western part of the country and removed from governmental sites and structures directly effecting the national education and arts policy agenda, the GCEA had a certain freedom to devise its own means of institutionalizing its perspective. In part, the single-mindedness of the organization established the organization in a special position as a continuing force within the school reform movement. Hoffa (1996) comments on the Getty:

Though not without its critics, DBAE is undoubtedly the most thoroughly orchestrated and broadly influential art education program of recent decades, probably because it is answerable to no authority beyond it’s own sense of what is right for its particular purposes.” (Hoffa, 1996, p. 9)

The organization’s vision, in many respects, was a return to an academic concern for cultural tradition and artistic canons and was grounded conceptually in Modernism.

**Organizational Discourse Role**

In contrast to the discourse community surrounding the Endowment which had insinuated the arts and arts education into the governmental system at the national level and attempted to normalize their ideology into social structures outside of the school, the GCEA approached its identified issues and problems through local educational systems. One of the Getty publications outlines briefly the Getty strategy for change: “DBAE has been generated from the field, funded by public and private agencies, and related particularly to art education.” (AE# 5-132) The GCEA was a catalyst for a grassroots reform, but the strength of its adherence to a specific rationale often placed the organization in the position of leadership. The GCEA provided structural support for programming which may have been more effective than its curricular rationale: teacher development for new instructional roles, program coordinators for new curriculum design and integration, involvement of district administrators and the public were intended
strategies to undergird DBAE curriculum development, both as-policy and in-use.

Funding provided for planning and communication networks between regional institutes. In addition, the organization supported systemic standards, expectations, and even regulations as other devices to encourage consistent program evaluation and student assessment. Premised on the belief that “Far-reaching educational change will succeed only when individuals work collaboratively at all levels within a change community,” the organization fostered an emphasis on leadership training as indicated by the conferences, workshops, etc and on expertise (as indicated by the involvement and organization of the academic community in formulating its policy position. (Wilson, 1997, p 17) The strategies of the GCEA brought it closer to a huge constituency of art education professionals, in the classroom and the museum, and established it as a continuing force within that specific discourse field.

The activity and commitment of idea brokers, such as the Getty Trust, in developing the discipline-based arts education approach and of policy entrepreneurs, such as NEA Chairman Frank Hodsoll, in setting out the vision contained in Toward Civilization helped construct a window of opportunity that resonated with the education reform movement of the early 1980s and that seemed poised to converge with the next wave of educational policy reform at the end of the decade. (Wyszomirski, 1997, p.4)

According to Peter Smith (1996), “…it was not until the privately funded Getty Center for Education in the Arts began that scattered attempts at art education reform did more than start with enthusiasm and sputter out in inconclusive collapses of support or interest” (Smith, 1996, p.210) He speculates: “Doubtless historians of the future will see discipline-based art education as one of the most important contributions to twentieth century American art education.” (Smith, 1996, p. 214)
**Organizational Structure**

When the J. Paul Getty Trust was established in 1982, it created the GCEA (along with seven other units intent on “making a significant contribution to the fine arts and related areas of the humanities;” it cites its activities as “...addressing the critical needs related to the presentation, conservation and understanding of art, with the objective of making a significant contribution to the fine arts and related areas of the humanities.”) (BC, p. ii) Privately supported, the Getty created its own self-contained operating environment. The organization’s internal structure included The J. Paul Getty Museum, the GCEA for the History of Art and the Humanities, the Getty Conservation Institute, the Getty Art History Information Program, the Program for Art on Film and the Museum Management Institute. Thereby, the GCEA (and art education) was embedded in the midst of several other programs within a number of subcultures. Impacting its overall decision making, such close (possibly closed) and concurrent affiliations reinforced the consistency of its ideological perspective.

**Culture and Subcultures: Membership, Policy Community**

“The Getty Foundation had sufficient funding, dedicated advocates, a goodly number of art education leaders supporting many or most of its aims, and a program convincing enough in its substance to attract considerable attention.” (P. Smith, 1996, p.214) With a more targeted constituency composed of practitioners and scholars and with the organization’s community focused only on the visual arts, no doubt, the membership was more cohesive and easier to integrate. Although the regional programs may have encouraged subcultures with somewhat differing views (some expanded their focus to the performing arts), they served as an organizational network for advocacy.
What motivated the Getty’s followers to grant it “authority” is multi-faceted. But contributing to the integration of its membership, the GCEA’s rationale was ideologically appealing in its clear-cut delineation of art content, its reliance on established traditions, and its respect for academic authority. The results, according to Wilson: “As of 1996, they [the RIGS] had served thousands of teachers and administrators from some 217 school districts in thirteen states who, in turn, serve more than 1.5 million students. They had attracted international attention and secured close to $15 million to match grants from the Getty Education Institute” (Wilson, 1997, p.10) But by 1997, despite its disciplinary approach, the Getty resembled earlier advocacy interventions in significant ways; it hoped to link educators to the art world. In retrospect, Wilson comments: “In the most effective DBAE institutes, learning takes place not in classrooms but in art museums, art centers, galleries, artists’ studios, and other authentic art world contexts.” (Wilson, 1997, p.14)

The Speaker

As Designated Authority

Leilani Lattin Duke served as director of the Education Institute for seventeen years and “exerted unparalleled leadership in advancing argument for a more substantive conception of art education.” (Smith, 2000, p.11) Although she is credited with the political knowledge and the “strategic vision, openness to the unanticipated and unflagging support” by members of her staff, according to Smith, she is identified with the “cognitive revolution;” understanding the relationship of subject matter with “psychological dynamics of knowing.” (Smith, 2000, p.11) Yet, it is usually academic art educators who are identified as articulating various aspects of the Getty’s early
perspectives: Dwayne Greer, Michael Day, Elliot Eisner, Harry Broudy, Laura Chapman, Gilbert Clark, Edmund Feldman, Marilynn Price, Ronald Silverman, Ralph Smith and Brent Wilson. Likewise, the Getty publications often quoted Robert Stake and S.M. Dobbs. As Ralph Smith explains, Discipline-based art education was not without detractors: “Part of this controversy arose from confusion as to the exact makeup of discipline-based art education and who spoke officially for the Getty organization.” “The Getty Center for Education in the Art’s vague use of language caused confusion even among its most hopeful supporters and provided DBAE opponents with plenty of opportunities for critical barbs.” (Smith, 1996, p.214)

As Ideological Emblem

Duke seldom spoke publicly for the Getty about its curriculum rationale. However, in two articles published in Art Education, “The Getty Center for Education in the Arts,” (September 1983) and “The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and Discipline-Based Art Education,” (March 1988), she explains, with emphasis, her view of DBAE:

_We believe that if there is to be a change in the way arts education is perceived and practiced in schools today, a more holistic approach to what is taught and how it is taught is needed._

(Duke, 1983, p. 6)

Secondly, she summarizes the institutional involvement in art education:

…to fostering knowledge about the arts, not only among those professional constituencies involved with studying and conserving artistic heritage, but also among individuals of all ages who constitute the audiences for the arts… (Duke, 1983, p. 6)
As Influence Mechanism

Efland explains the response of GCEA under Duke’s leadership, the perceived problems of the times: “DBAE may be seen as a response to the challenge of excellence, and like the excellence movement itself, it reiterated many of the same themes that were first sounded during the 1960s, when curriculum reforms centered upon the disciplines.” (Efland, 1990, p.253) In any case, the Getty’s solution to conditions in the schools was an arts curriculum based in traditional and rigorous academic disciplines of history, criticism, followed by aesthetics to supplement production skills. By emphasizing implementation through sequential courses of study, and systematic evaluation procedures, according to Efland (1992), the Getty “signaled the passing of a revolutionary period in educational ideation.” (Efland, 1992, p.2) By the 1990s, the Getty, however, did attempt to incorporate new evolving world views; while it maintained conservative goals and standards of excellence derived from past cultural achievements, it accommodated liberal concerns for cultural diversity.

However, once its initiatives with school districts via its regional and summer institutes began in 1987 and the organization’s partnership with the academic community and professional practitioners was secured, many decisions about DBAE theory and practice and the formulation of the Getty’s curricular position resulted from collaborative work done in on-going summer workshops. Wilson (1997) describes several initial issues that challenged the original curriculum theory: conflicts or issues which centered on artworks or disciplines, on the individual disciplinary models or holistic and integrated models, on art content or the inquiry process, on DBAE or the entire educational context. Once the membership of the community began to function as a part of the RIGS and the
Summer Institutes, varied interpretations of DBAE surfaced with the interplay of ideas.

As Wilson (1997) points out, the decision making process is “...a clear instance of practice shaping theory.” (Wilson, 1997, p. 17) As a result, many of the initial problems and conflicts evolved into a “comprehensive” approach where the disciplines became more integrated, student response and reflection were more valued, and “the content and inquiry methods from each discipline are emphasized as the needs of the artwork dictated.” (Wilson, 1997, p. 17)

Peter Smith (1996) attributes the success of the Getty to a general failure in confidence of government and school authority during the 1960s and 1970s. “This authority must be based on a widespread acceptance of the deciding person or group as authoritative (knowledgeable) and as responsible (of the highest ethical standards). This used to be vested in school administrations, but ...the status of school administrators as authoritative and responsible has vanished.” (Smith, 1996, p.214) In a special issue of the Journal of Aesthetic Education (Summer 1987), Clark, Day and Greer targeted change at the level of school programming; programming which could bridge theory to practice, scholarship to curriculum-in-use, school to community, as well as curriculum content to learner. (Smith, 1987, p.132) The founding members of the GCEA were aligned with the belief that expertise in art education existed outside of the school; the ultimate advocacy goal was to penetrate schools with a new ideology and to replace failing authority. Organizationally motivated to introduce a rationally conceived program into schools, the core leadership (board, staff, etc.) composed a community which actively defined its mission in opposition to the status quo and even earlier discipline-centered school reform efforts.
Following the Rand Corporation study, four earlier programs and the seven case studies evaluated in *Beyond creating* (1985) provided the Getty leadership with a strategy for supporting school reform. “Those “lessons” suggested that successful dissemination of DBAE would depend on grassroots initiatives led by consortia of school districts, universities, art museums, and other arts and education organizations supported, in part, by local funding sources.” (Wilson, 1997, p. 25) The first major field initiative was the Los Angeles Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts in 1983; it provided the model for the later development of the Regional Institute Grants structure.

According to Wilson (1997), the GCEA later established its Regional Institute Grant program in 1987 to support six consortia with matching funds and, besides long-term financial security, the Institute would provide national leadership. In return, the six RIGs would serve as research centers, develop curriculum and, over a five-year period, would prepare a number of school districts to implement DBAE-based programs. Wilson describes the arrangement:

As research and development centers, the regional institutes were given the latitude to create innovative and effective professional development programs; provide technical assistance, instructional materials, experts, and other resources to schools; attract and mobilize school districts as partners and prepare them in DBAE and forge strong links to their respective communities by finding local funding partners. (Wilson, 1997, p.13)

The RIGs encompassed a range of urban, suburban and rural populations across the country, they serviced varied percentages of their state’s schools and represented diverse organization structures and local affiliations: The Florida Institute for Art Education, Florida State University (14 school districts); The Minnesota DBAE Consortium, Minnesota AAE (46 school districts); The Nebraska Consortium for DBAE (Prairie Visions), Nebraska Department of Education (approximately 100 school
districts); The Ohio Partnership for the Visual Arts, The Ohio State University (19 school
districts); The Southeast Institute for Education in the Visual Arts (one of three separate
arts institutes), University of Tennessee (32 school districts); and The North Texas
Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, University of North Texas (six school
districts).

A secondary initiative of the GCEA was the Summer Professional Institutes.
Outgrowths of the RIGs, the institutes were an effort to draw school principals, art
specialists, and classroom teachers into the implementation process, particularly into

Of the one hundred individual summer institute programs evaluated between 1988
and 1995, those deemed best transported participants the farthest from their
everyday worlds and provided the most complete experiences of what it is like to
live in the art world. (Wilson, 1997, p.14)

Building on the structure of the RIGs, the early Getty initiatives transformed
themselves into another phase; as a part of a national movement for education reform, the
Getty and the Annenberg Foundation embarked on a five-year program (often referred to
as Transforming Education through the Arts Challenge) to address two remaining
problems: establishing sequential K-12 curriculum and correlating DBAE to student
achievement, both involving goals required an understanding of whole school reform.

The Subjects

As Community Representatives

Seldom speaking in its institutional voice, the GCEA engaged art education
scholars and commissioned numerous papers addressing issues in the field from a
discipline-based perspective. The Getty’s subsequent and most significant policy
statement after Beyond creating (1985) is a collection of papers by individual scholars

**As Ideological Agents**

**World view, Educational Goals**

The GCEA presents an art education curricular orientation which is a “major shift” in theory and practice in the field of art education. Its views on goals, content and instructional/assessment methods, program theory, structure, and outcomes reflect a belief that understanding in the arts is “not a natural result of maturation but is an invention of culture” (AE# 5-138). The result is that “Educational outcomes are described in terms of student learnings rather than as psychological growth....” (AE# 5-175) The emphasis is on identifying “domains of human experience” sufficiently broad to
insure a “well-rounded education...” (AE# 5-139, AE# 6-198) The Getty supporters argue the intrinsic components of aesthetic experience, “messages of human import conveyed through images,” [Goodman, Gardner] and promote “developed discrimination, imaginative power and expanded ideals” (AE# 5-145). “Educational experiences in the aesthetic domain shape perception and imagination, enabling the student to perceive meaning in contrived objects in the built environment and in natural objects.” (AE# 5-139, 7-206, 8-218) Connecting perception and imagery with fundamental human development in language, thought and feeling, this orientation proposes the visual arts as “the only adequate symbolic projection” of insights and feeling [Langer], individually and “those common to most people.” (AE# 5-140) But as might be expected, this orientation is more concerned with the primacy of learned response rather than the perceptual experience. Broudy is cited to support this position: “the art image [defined as form integrated with content existing in a cultural context] alone combines feelings and knowledge...” (AE# 5-140) The Getty subjects emphasize art must be an “essential” intervention in “the general education of all students from kindergarten through high school.

Relying on Broudy’s position: “A comprehensive general education [which] prepares individuals to think in systematic ways, to view the world through the different lenses or templates that study of each subject provides,” the goal of the Getty orientation is to address the eventual needs of students for personal “enrichment” (empathy and enjoyment) as they become adults, to provide tools for understanding the intrinsic value of objects “we find perceptually interesting and attractive....” (AE# 9-227) Also, the Getty subjects maintain DBAE goals contribute to equalizing societal access to the arts.
which is “part of the goals of general education. Its position supports a democratic philosophy by equalizing access to cultural excellence through art education; “…all members of society, not only the wealthy or elite deserve access to the visual arts.” (AE# 5-165, 6-198, 7-209) Nonetheless, the Getty voices express a rising discontent with the current practices in education established over the last quarter century and propose a reform similar to earlier reforms in general education, reforms that sought to improve “the nation’s scientific, technological, and military capabilities.” (AE# 5-131). Hoping, however, to avoid some of the problems arising from the curriculum reform in the 1960s, the Getty orientation incorporated a “belated application of old ideas” and a renewed concern for educational standards. But economic and workforce needs are not ignored: reasoning that specialized art study (which may produce professional artists) and high standards among informed consumers will result in higher standards of artistic production, they conclude “They are the ones who will support art education and art in society in the future.” (AE# 5-182, 138) Beyond the pragmatic needs of the art world and its workforce, visual literacy also is seen as an instrumental life skill in developing “nonartistic skills” and solving “nonartistic problems.” (AE# 7-207)

The curricular goals of the GCEA focused on curricular issues of content and instructional methods (as opposed to delivery system). Similar to earlier academic reforms of the mid-1960s, the curriculum would be configured according to established “disciplines” or “fields of study:” a balance between aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production. (AE# 5-135, 162) Ideologically setting DBAE in opposition to a creative self-expression orientation (focused on art activity), the Getty supporters see the two orientations historically as having “fundamentally different philosophical
foundations and different psychological orientations.” (AE# 5-135,138,148,175)

Acknowledging its curriculum as content-centered and dependent on scholarly practice, the Getty supporters maintain a focus on appreciation of art, the man-made environment and nature intertwined. “The goal of discipline-based art education is to develop students’ abilities to understand and appreciate art. This involves knowledge of the theories and contexts of art and abilities to respond to as well as to create art.” (AE# 5-135)

Content, Knowledge Organization

Based on a commissioned study by the Rand Corporation, “the Getty concluded that the low status of arts education could be attributed to the traditional utilization of hands-on production activities to the exclusion of instruction in the cultural and historical aspects of art.” (Munley, 1999, p.65) This disciplinary response, therefore, deals with “(1) the conceptions of the nature of art [aesthetics], (2) bases for valuing and judging art [criticism], (3) contexts in which art has been created [history], and (4) processes and techniques for creating art [production].” (AE# 5-135, 6-203, 7-205, 207, 208, 212, 213, 214, 215, 8-217, 224, 225, 9-228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 238) With disciplinary emphasis, DBAE shifts the focus to “essential art content for educational purposes,” (AE# 5-148) and acknowledges multiple modes of inquiry and “different kinds of knowledge according to their subject matters.” (AE# 5-149, 150) Applied to a broad range of “the visual arts, including folk, applied, and fine arts from Western and non-Western cultures and from ancient to contemporary times,” increased means of multiple response to art in all of its manifestations. (AE# 5-135) The DBAE construct relies on “a syntactical structure or method of inquiry,” and “a conceptual structure,” “to derive,
validate and organize content for art learning.” (AE# 5-148) Learning becomes an on-going conceptual process of aggregating, integrating and relating “fundamental ideas, underlying principles, a recognized body of interrelated propositions and a scheme of categories by which meanings are symbolized.” (AE# 5-150, 179)

Although production is not central to instruction in DBAE, the aesthetic (direct) experience (in the making or viewing of art) combines processes of perception [physical], response [feeling] and understanding [intellectual]. (AE# 5-143, 173, 6-198, 199, 204, 7-206, 207, 208) “A sound education in art must emphasize educational goals that are intrinsic to the very nature of art itself...” (AE# 6-198) Particularly focused on the visual arts, the educational experience, “shapes” perception and imagination “enabling us to perceive meaning in contrived objects ....” (AE# 5-139, 140, 6-198, 199, 204, 9-227, 230, 230)

This orientation attempts to blend content ideas and skills outside of its strictly disciplinary definitions; through a creative synthesis, classroom production combines experience, observation and thought. (AE# 6-202, 203) Asserting that the created art image holds both feelings and knowledge, that the aesthetic experience [“discrimination, imaginative power, and expanded ideals”] is both emotion (empathy) and intellect (removed, somewhat, from everyday life) and that art is a social and cultural phenomenon (AE# 5-139, 140, 145, 6-198, 199), this orientation maintains a strong link with historical theories of art form, form seen as “holding” a “heighten” experience. (AE# 7-205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 8-219, 220, 221, 223, 9-238, 6-197, 199) An accompanying belief is that images and their direct perception “of raw visual information” are rooted “in pictorial and symbolic form” that “have profound
implications for human thought and notions of consciousness based on language models.”
(AE# 6-198) Integrating knowledge of the present, they simultaneously aid humanistic
training through reading “the record and expression of civilization,” and viewing the
“consequences of human thought.” And they serve as a cultural conduit, “the productive
management of human intelligence and creativity....” (AE# 6-197, 198, 202, 203)

Seeking “visual literacy,” well-chosen visual images (art forms) are a dominant
learning device. Relying heavily on a communications model, this position stresses
issues of visual perception and metaphor (“a store of images”) as foundational to
language and thinking skills, but as a “visual language” itself, art is “a non-discursive
symbol [image] that articulates what is verbally ineffable—the logic of consciousness
itself.” [Langer] (AE# 5-135, 139, 142, 161, 163, 6-197, 198, 202, 204, 7-206, 208, 8-
219, 223) Visual language is able “to construct, control, and develop a visual
environment that communicates a community’s values meaningfully.” (AE# 6-198, 204,
8-223)

Contextual issues are framed almost entirely as “historical” although a slight
concern for influences of social contexts and world cultures is expressed. (AE# 5-136,
162, 163, 164, 7-209, 8-218, 219) Art links a cognitive and social function for the
individual; it reflects important “lessons” about the objectives, values and conflicts
underlying individual interactions with society. (AE# 8-217, 218, 220, 9-231, 233) Art
education ties various social and cultural belief systems together and reveals a larger
“moral order.” (AE# 9-236) Particularly, the study of criticism (“concerned with art
within the context of the present”) and aesthetics (concerned with “the nature and value
of significance”) are seen as a critical thinking tool to be self-examining, instrumental in
viewing oneself as “both a constructor and a reflector of those values” in a constantly changing social context. (AE# 8-219, 220, 9-228, 230, 238)

**Instructional, Assessment Strategies**

Besides the learning of content, the Getty’s approach to instruction and assessment methods is equally systematic and emphasizes accountability issues. (AE# 5-145) Following the traditional curricula organization (“objectives, activities, organization of activities, and evaluation”), the orientation suggests “established conceptual structures, and accepted methods of inquiry.” (AE# 5-174,131,150, 7-210) The arts should be taught in a manner similar to other disciplines: “Goals, procedures, and evaluation are specific to the content of art but are consistent and compatible with those of general education.” (AE# 5-131)

However, a distinct demarcation in contextual knowledge/meaning and techniques/processes is recognized in classroom activity. “Response” is set in opposition to “Create.” (AE# 5-136, 143, 144, 162, 167, 182, 6-198, 203) When referring to the former, critical skills of description, analysis, interpretation and evaluation/judgment are the curricular focus guiding classroom instruction at all grade levels. (AE# 5-161, 6-198, 199, 203, 7-207, 208, 209, 211, 212, 214, 8-217, 220, 221, 222, 223, 9-228, 229, 231, 232, 233, 234, 237) Students (in communication and language focused activities) learn “art vocabulary,” develop “skills of categorization,” establish “aesthetic criteria” and “standards,” “write and talk,” use “verbal imagery and metaphor” and “write essays about appreciating and valuing art” (AE# 5-159, 161, 179, 180, 182, 6-203, 7-206) Within dialectical methods that “weigh competing and possibly incompatible ideas with the aim of resolving them into a coherent viewpoint,” repeated exposure to “the same images” at
different levels with the intent of presenting formal “content in increasingly meaningful, complex, or sophisticated units,” is indicative of a learning philosophy that is cumulative. (AE# 9-236, 5-170, 171, 6-203) But, equally indicative of the Getty perspective is the focus on contextual issues, issues highlighted in new media by interdisciplinary and collaborative work, attention to mass communication influences, and multicultural systems of belief in art. (AE# 5-171, 6-202, 204, 212, 8-217, 218, 219, 222, 9-231, 236, 238)

When referring to “creation,” “discovery, intuition, and originality” are key ideas to students inventing “elaborate visual images for their own expressive purposes.” (AE# 5-162) The emphasis on formal analysis of art is reinforced through the “variety of modes” (and “concepts of composition”) offered to students in fine and commercial arts and crafts. (AE# 5-164) Hoping to eliminate “a multitude of trivial, non-art activities that too often have been mistaken for art programs” (AE# 5-148) and to establish an “aesthetic attitude,” DBAE is concerned with “making, observing, perceiving, hearing listening, reading, talking, and writing about the arts—and even using the arts.” (AE# 9-233, 7-206)

Sensory observation and experience are combined with and a learned understanding of their meaning. This orientation provides instruction through conceptual tools which develops “the means to control media.” through “study and reflection” and “expressive uses of the content.” (AE# 5-148, 167, 6-198, 202, 203, 204, 7-208, 9-228, 229, 231, 232, 233, 234, 238) Stressing the impact of formal elements and structures in visual literacy (“the form of a work of visual art plays directly to the aesthetic sense, and its influence may precede, and even maintain hegemony over, conscious association,
judgment, or predisposition.”) instruction in the interrelationships of color, space, line, scale, shape, surface, and so forth...” and other “formal and associative devices” should be included in the curriculum as the “vocabulary of visual forms.” (AE# 6-198, 199, 200, 201, 204) Aligned with the rest of the academic curriculum, educationally relevant information can be collected using various assessment devices, including tests, checklists, and observations. (AE# 5-179)

**Policy Theory: Issue Identification, Problem Definition**

“Students are conceived as learners and students of art” and “Educational outcomes are described in terms of student learning rather than as psychological growth, as in Lowenfeld’s approach.” (AE# 5-175) Thus, in this orientation, growth across developmental stages is taken ‘out of the child’s mind’ and is seen as ‘existing instead in a body of knowledge’” (AE# 5-175) “Essential” implies a specific program theory: Education is related to a student’s developmental levels, but it is not a natural result of maturation (AE# 5-138, 168, 135, 136, 159, 161, 165, 167, 7-206) Based on Feldman’s work on child development [Piaget], the controlling idea is that: “...all nonuniversal artistic activity falls somewhere to the right of the regions of cultural domains and thus is dependent upon education rather than maturation.” (AE# 5-168) “It is dependent upon education that recognizes developmental stages and integrates what is known about them into curriculum planning.” (AE# 5-169, 174, 7-210) Art education or instruction is an intervention into a student’s growth and development; the program implementation should reflect this view. (AE# 5-175)
Policy Solution: Program Structure, Instructional Delivery

Seen as most valid within the context of a district program which would designate appropriate and specific criteria coordinated with the larger curriculum (AE# 5-164, 180), actual instructional and assessment methods are similar to other academic areas. This orientation relies on the “written, sequentially organized” and a well-articulated curriculum policy to insure accountability. (AE# 5-131, 135, 179) Both integral and essential, the arts are seen as a foundation for “an educated and enlightened citizenry and as a basis for advance study that marks professionals in the world of art.”(AE# 5-131, 145, 146) “Integral” implies an ideal goal for “a lifetime of study” and a practical concern for the workforce, particularly for gifted students seeking “many careers and avocations in the visual arts....” (AE# 5-145, 146) A “balanced” curriculum policy designates the disciplines as addressing various areas and levels of cognitive, social and physical maturity.(AE# 5-136, 171) While advocating that arts be included in the curriculum (a call for parity), these subjects maintain disciplinary boundaries. (AE# 5-138, 139, 151, 167, 7-206, 207, 210, 211, 8-222, 223) Integrating content and concepts between these art disciplines is considered acceptable, although almost always dependent on learning experiences with “specific pieces” of art (“placing works of art at the center of DBAE...”) to ensure a way of interrelating the ideas from the different disciplines.” (AE# 5-170) But the methods of disciplinary inquiry require separation; these methods provide “the distinctive contributions of each discipline.” (AE# 5-169, 170, 5-171)

This orientation promotes “systematic,” “regular” learning; the continuity of learning is controlled by district (rather than classroom) implementation and “accountability” is insured by art experts and specialists with administrative support.
Emphasizing classroom parity with other disciplines: “Making an entire school district the basic unit for implementation is a strategy often used for other subjects although rarely for art.” (AE# 5-177) Concern for “scope,” “articulation,” “recurring” art exposure demonstrates a focus on written policy designed by art specialists and scholarly authority as the tool to insure compliance. (AE# 5-131, 135, 136, 165, 168, 171, 176, 177, 179)

Along with “authority,” “expertise” is a significant concept in Discipline based arts education. (AE# 5-135,136) Generally, these qualities are not attributed to the student or the classroom teacher. Disavowing the earlier “teacher proof” reforms, the Getty supporters recommend, however, a “team effort by school board members, superintendents, principals and teachers to bring about changes.” (AE# 5-133,) But that team reflects a hierarchy evident in teacher-student relationships: “DBAE teachers view students as learners and themselves as instructors...” of a “body of knowledge”; access to knowledge and instruction are seen as imperative “interventions” in the student’s artistic development. (AE# 5-145, 5-175) “Teachers...are not expected to be experts in aesthetics, art production, art criticism and art history.” (AE# 5-177) Likewise, “Within the DBAE orientation, teachers of art should instruct learners about art but are not be expected to be curriculum developers. ...teachers should be provided with materials that have been designed by art curriculum specialist.” (AE# 5-176) Evaluating and adapting art curriculum to their own experience and the perceived needs of students, teachers are to use written art curricula which “frees teachers from the difficult role as curriculum developers and allows them to concentrate on providing interesting and exciting
instruction for students” (AE# 5-176, 177) and delivering “pedagogically valid critiques.” (AE# 7-211)

Art specialists at the district level are seen as the best qualified to implement appropriate program design based on age and developmental level. (AE# 5-132, 135, 177) “The professional role of art education specialists within DBAE focuses on the educational tasks of instruction [when “differentiated staffing policies” do not apply], curriculum implementation, enrichment and extension, evaluation of student achievement and program effectiveness, and often, provision of in-service instruction for colleagues.” (AE# 5-177, 178)

Scholars’ “validate” content (“the concepts, skills, information, and vocabulary at each grade level”), but specific content for classroom use is the responsibility of art educators. (AE# 5-159, 165, 179) The focus of art study is in the artistic product, not the processes. (AE# 8-225) DBAE does not acknowledge a place for the practicing professional artist in the public schools. Seeking a new “authority” beyond the general classroom teacher to reform curricular policy decision making, the Getty subjects assert that recognized art experts with highly developed discrimination, “communities of scholars or practitioners” could establish “conceptual structures and accepted methods of inquiry” and make decisions with “respect to topics such as curriculum, instruction, learning, and evaluation.”(AE# 5-131) Also, leaning heavily on the idea of disciplinary expertise of “professionals in the world of art” (AE# 5-148,164) in choosing appropriate examples of “the highest of human achievements, art works for developing a “store of images,” this orientation, shows a limited faith in the “uneducated” viewer who lacks “sophisticated judgment and critical sensitivity.” (AE# 6-199) According to Smith
(1996), this authority must be based on a widespread acceptance of the deciding person or group as authoritative (knowledgeable) and as responsible (of the highest ethical standards.)” (Smith, 1996, p.214) Communities of art scholars not only validate content and practices, as communities, they “exercise control over the professional discourse among their members. They select and edit what becomes available in journal articles, author scholarly books, and record proceedings of formal meetings.” (AE# 5-149) And, they exemplify professional standards as historians, critics, etc. (AE# 5-161, 162, 170) The role the school administration is to provide adequate resources comparable with other subjects in the curriculum, to be supportive of change, and to monitor and evaluate program success on a district level. In addition, community resources such as museums supplement learning opportunities offered by the school. (AE# 5-136, 146, 175, 178, 180)

**Policy Impact, Outcomes**

Understanding that natural development is insufficient in arts education, DBAE addresses the future needs of students collectively rather than their present individual needs: the hoped-for outcome is “an educated and enlightened citizenry,” an audience “who will support art education and art in society in the future,” and who set high standards as consumers of art. (AE# 5-138, 145, 174, 180, 182) While students are assured a “solid foundation for many careers and avocations in the visual arts,” critical reflection and philosophical inquiry for all students is promoted as a tool to “personal development and our happiness, since it helps us to clarify issues, discriminate among options, and make better decisions” (AE# 5-146, 9-230, 231)
As Transfer Mechanism

To chart the role of the subjects in the transfer of organizational ideology is beyond the intended organizational focus of this study. However, the model suggests a way to organize the extra organization activity of each subject. The texts of individual subjects could provide his/her patterns of receiving, processing, and restating the ideology in different domains (art, general education), other institutions, organizations communities, and in individual discursive practice. For instance, Junius Eddy participated in many advocacy efforts for art education over the bracketed time period. To analyze any individual perspective for change would indicate the manner in which subjects are a transfer mechanism.

Discourse Organization #3: Consortium of National Arts Education Associations

Time/Location: Contextual Issues, Problems

The Consortium had a history beginning with the establishment of the National Council of Education in the Arts (MENC, ACA) in 1958. Its member organizations had periodically come together to address policy issues across the arts disciplines. Under the auspices of NCEA, the organization produced the Philadelphia resolution (1986), The Interlochen Symposium report, Toward a new era in arts education (1987), and Concepts for strengthening arts education in schools (1988). Classifying the Consortium as a single organization may be questionable on a number of levels; Hoffa (1993) characterized its problems as resulting from an alliance of 26 organizations of disparate views. (Hoffa, 1993, p. 5)

By 1990, social and political forces were exerting considerable influence on school reform. Early in 1992 (and based on the Governor’s educational goals for America
in 2000 (1990), the National Council on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST) requested voluntary national standards and assessments in the “core” subjects including math, English, science, history and geography with “other subjects to follow.”

Momentum increased for educational reform as is evidenced in passage of Goals 2000, Educate America Act (PL 103-227) in 1990; the policy issues and problems were defined outside of the arts education discourse field. Although the arts were not included in the earlier reform recommendations of the state governors, the CNAEA was the first to respond to the passage of Goals 2000 (1990) and to receive federal funding from the U.S. Department of Education, The National Endowment for the Arts, and The National Endowment for the Humanities for the development of standards in the four arts disciplines in grades K-12. With an organizational response more political than ideological, the National Committee for Standards in the Arts approved the National Standards (1994) text. Supported by the Consortium, after two years and, on March 11, 1994, the document was presented to Richard Riley, U. S. Secretary of Education. (Music Educators National Conference, 2004, p.2)

**Organizational Discourse Role**

The Consortium was itself a coalition of the four national arts education associations, but also included a range of stakeholders concerned with education in the arts. For a limited period of time the Consortium functioned in a leadership role. While composed of several identifiable communities, Hoffa (1996) and others have noted the strands of professional goals and curricular purposes of the parent organizations

…are found hidden between the lines of the new National Standards where, for example, they assume a tripartite structure to knowledge in all of the arts–history, criticism, and performance–and that a single set of educational goals is
appropriate for all arts educators, even in the nation as culturally diverse as ours. (Hoffa, 1996, p.10)

Other long-standing positions of the Consortium’s member organizations clearly are incorporated in the Standards; they are summarized in Gee’s (1999a) analysis:

As early as 1992, the CNAEA released a statement countering the arts bureaucracy’s implied position that arts exposure equals arts education. The Consortium declared formally the need to distinguish between “curricular education” (i.e., subject matter taught sequentially within an organized program of study over an extended period of time) and “non-curricular education” (i.e., that which is achieved through random personal experience). Characteristics distinguishing school-based “arts education” from arts “entertainment,” “exposure,” and “enrichment” were outlined. (Gee, 1999a, p. 18)

**Organizational Structure**

Although produced by long established organizations with a huge national membership of practitioners, the Consortium itself was new and focused on a single project. When the CNAEA (functioning through MENC) organized the National Committee for Standards in the Arts in 1992, it “included representatives from education, business, government, and the arts.” (MENC, 2004, p.1) However, project task forces from each of the four arts organizations in the Consortium were formed to actually write the standards for their respective disciplines. Periodically, the tasks forces convened to collaborate with project directors from other subject areas simultaneously working on standards.

Already a part of a very broad-based general education initiative, and, in a effort to gain an even broader based consensus within the discourse field during 1993, the *National Standards* (1994) “were circulated to a wide audience, including selected members of the Consortium organizations, arts consultants, all participating groups, and the NAEP assessment group.” (MENC, 2004, p.2)
Culture: Subcultures, Membership, Policy Community

Although the Consortium was a loosely-formed coalition with similar concerns, it was backed by similar ideological and pedagogical traditions. On the other hand, the membership of the National Committee was composed of representatives with diverse backgrounds and understanding of the issues of arts education. In addition to a leadership with a range of ideas and agendas, Hoffa (1994) comments on the lack of cohesiveness in the discourse community, he maintains that, not only the rank and file of the arts education community, but state agencies responsible for teacher credentials were surprised by the new standards; it follows, then, that such agencies would be institutionally and ideologically unprepared to integrate the standards into current practice. (Hoffa, 1994, p.1)

The Speaker

As Designated Authority

Considering the previous marginalization of a large constituency of practitioners apparent in established federal policy and earlier advocacy (exemplified by NEA programs and the GCEA), the Consortium was faced with a problem of unifying its membership under a recognized leadership. Reaching field practitioners, working under vastly different circumstances, was, no doubt, a monumental task for the Consortium leadership. It quickly followed the publication of the standards with Opportunity to learn standards for arts education, (1995) and Teacher education for arts disciplines (1996) which began the difficult work of setting preconditions for success at the local level. The final major initiative of the decade involved the Consortium’s setting in place an evaluation mechanism. Hope (1993), as a member of the 35 member National Steering
Committee, remarks that the *National Standards* (1994) project was given additional impetus among The Consortium’s membership by plans to include the arts in the National Assessment of Educational Progress in 1996. (Hope, 1993, p.36) The diverse character of the policy community and the differences within its membership make it difficult to identify a single speaker for the Consortium. The National Committee was chaired by A. Graham Down, president of the Council for Basic Education, but the four professional organizations, Music Educators National Conference (MENC): National Art Education Association (NAEA). American Association of Theatre in Education (AATE) and National Dance Association (NDA), continued to exist as separate entities with representative speakers for each organization and their respective communities.

**As Ideological Emblem**

The focus among arts education leaders shifted away from achieving an ideological consensus. With the recognition of a political interdependence among factions, political consensus was paramount. Overcoming institutional barriers to implementation meant overriding individual curricular ideology. However, in the minds of many, John Mahlmann, who has served as executive director of both music and art education national organizations possibly was “the most influential of the four association executive directors.” (Hoffa, 1994, p.7) Mahlmann is “also both an advocate for, and the personification of, interdisciplinary thinking in arts education.” (Hoffa, 1994, p. 7) Hoffa (1994) attributes much of the success of the standards movement to an ideological consensus based in the belief that the visual and performing arts have a synergistic relationship with a knowable and teachable conceptual foundation, exemplified in Mahlmann’s approach. The Consortium’s orientation contributes to
...the effectiveness that comes from speaking with a single voice, a realization that their similarities are infinitely more important than their differences, and that the strength of numbers provided by their alliance is important in those political arenas where the counting of heads counts for much. (Hoffa, 1994, p. 7)

A continuing effort to reconcile disciplinary differences was the text “National Standards: A View from the arts education associations,” *Arts Education Policy Review* (May-June 1997). Mahlmann (MENC), Theresa Purcell (NDA), Barbara Salisbury Wills (AATE) and Thomas Hatfield (NAEA) spoke to the issues behind the National Standards (1994) from unique disciplinary and organizational perspectives.

**As Influence Mechanism**

Possibly because the Consortium did not define the problem, but was expected to respond to national school reform issues, its solution was uncertain and still debated, especially on the level of ideology. Despite the early movement in the 1960s in interdisciplinary aesthetic education, the process of synthesizing the diverse components of curriculum ideology of the Consortium’s members had been on-going, yet incomplete. In an early assessment of the Consortium’s work, Hoffa (1994) denies the lasting effect of earlier discourse streams and organizational ideologies (CEMREL, the JDR 3rd Fund, Arts in Education Projects and the GCEA’s DBAE efforts); he maintains:

…the stimulus for national standards in the arts came from outside the arts education community, and that they evolved in response to that external stimulus. In brief, no one person, no group of persons, and no professional organization from within the arts education community invented the idea of national standards out of whole cloth. It came, instead, as the result of subtle and indirect pressures originating in new federal legislation known as the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. (Hoffa, 1994, p. 1)

Nonetheless, when “the arts have been recognized for the first time as a fundamental academic subject,” the Consortium geared much of its decision making toward incorporating its practitioners into a unified constituency. (MENC, 2004, p. 1)
According to the Consortium’s advocacy, multiple drafts were revised based on responses from the field, it was hoped, that this process would ensure “the best collective thinking of artists and educators....” (MENC, 2004, p.2) Significantly, these statements reinforce no particular curriculum ideology, but they reflect the ultimate political goal of institutionalization.

Because of a lack of cohesiveness, the National Committee found standards (as opposed to curriculum) allowed room for political consensus among previously opposed subgroups, notably the practitioners accepting of the programming typical of the NEA or, conversely, the GCEA. Shifting the emphasis, according to Hope (1993), from educational theories, classroom methodology, and arguments about resources and access to less contentious and less defined issues of goals, outcomes and assessment allowed sufficient latitude for integrating the membership and achieving a consensus. Supposedly more neutral, the National Standards (1994) delineates the goals and achievement level resulting from whatever instructional method that is chosen.

Recognizing a gap between ideals embedded in the National Standards (1994) and the classroom practitioner, some policymakers proposed a need for a long-term campaign to change the way arts teachers thought about goals and purposes. However, a national consensus process would not have been possible on any level if policymakers had not acknowledged first the need for a short term initiative. Striving for a representative cross section of stakeholders in the future of students, education and the arts, Hope (1993) accounts for the Consortium’s public hearings, briefing papers, media campaigns, advocacy materials and conferences surrounding the development of the National Standards (1994). Hoffa details the campaign:
Public hearings were held in Sacramento, Albuquerque, Kansas City, and Washington, D.C.; briefing papers were prepared; press releases were issued; packets of background material were assembled; the proceedings of a national invitational conference that dealt with the “ideas and ideals behind the national standards” were published; advisory groups were convened; drafts of the standards were distributed for review; the offices of the four associations were mobilized to interpret those results; and problems of implementation were addressed by a broadly representative task force. (Hoffa, 1994, p. 2)

Retrospectively, Hoffa (1994) assesses the success of the Consortium’s initiatives in reaching the movement’s membership:

The process of developing those standards has involved a large number of individuals from an impressively broad cross section of those who have an interest in the outcome, including parents’ organizations, representatives from business, state education agencies, arts organizations, educational administrators, and a host of others. (Hoffa, 1994, p.1)

However, it is probably fair to say the voices of most practitioners in their respective disciplines continued to be marginalized in the actual policymaking process. Hoffa (1994) continues:

The range and scope of those who were involved in developing the National Standards for Arts Education, in one way or another, was indeed impressive—as it had to be to assure support for the concept from those whose backing was necessary if the standards were to be successfully implemented. The one group that seemed underrepresented in that complex and multilayered process, however, were those teachers of the arts who actually work with elementary and secondary students on a daily basis. (Hoffa, 1994, p.1)

The Subjects

As Community Representatives

Several significant secondary texts of the Consortium followed the publication of the standards explaining, expanding and/or further exemplifying the points made in the primary text. The major reinforcing curriculum policy statements of the Consortium were: Setting the record straight (1994) and Arts education statement of principles (1999); other documents such as The Opportunity to learn standards for arts education
(1995) and *Teacher education for arts disciplines: Issues raised by the National Standards for arts education* (1996) addressed supportive delivery system standards. But the most extensive expression of the consensus of the discourse community were companion texts: *The Vision for arts education in the 21st century* (1994) and *Perspectives on implementation: Arts education standards for America’s students* (1994). Certainly, as is evidenced by the many participants in these texts, the Standards Committee involved “respected individuals from a variety of backgrounds who are interested in arts education, including nationally recognized educators and artists.” (MENC, 2004, p.2) The National Committee, chaired by A. Graham Down, was composed of Ann Lynch, Richard S. Gurin, Joseph W. Polisi, Arturo Madrid, Libby Chiu, and Leilani Lattin Duke. Gene Carter, Jeanne Rollins, Mary Maitland Kimball, Lin Wright, and Paul R. Lehman represented the various disciplines on the Standards task forces. From Education, Business, and the Arts, Diane Ravitch, Louise Miller, Jeremiah Floyd, Robert Lynch, Janie Ruth Hatton, and David O’Fallon.

**As Ideological Agents**

**World View, Educational Goals**

Issues of “quality” and “excellence” vie with “identifying important and diverse purposes of art” in the secondary texts supporting the *National Standards* (1994). (NS# 9-30) Attempting to reconcile groups with “very strong and perhaps unbending perspectives,” different theories and purposes, the text calls for unity in educational purpose. A range of arts education goals in cognitive training, individual self actualization, cultural tradition, adaptation to social needs and social improvement goals are expressed simultaneously with the hopes that the standards will clarify an overall
educational “purpose.” (VC# 15-561, 9-68, Q/A-18, 19) In an effort to achieve consensus, the participants limit or avoid dealing with curriculum content or instructional strategies straightforwardly: “Theoretically, curriculum and instruction can be whatever we want them to be as long as students make progress towards the goals that have been established.” (VC# 8-29) Ironically, one discourse subject reveals: “I don’t think there is a national consensus yet about what arts education is for. If we can formulate a common position within the education community, then we can take it to the general public.” (VC# Q/A-71)

Rhetorical references to “higher values,” the “deeper meaning” in human experience derived from the arts are prevalent. (VC# p. vii, Q/A-17, 10-33) However, themes of individual expressiveness, personal identity and self-esteem, wholeness and/or emotive rationales are few. Broadly stated, the value of the arts to the individual is in “the quality of each person’s life when well taught,” in the student’s motivation and skills for life-long learning, and in adapting socially in everyday life, particularly through effective communication.(VC# p. vii, 9-30, 31, 11-38, 14-51, 15-56, 4-9, 3-6, 9-31) Effective personal expression/communication and involvement in “positive and self-satisfying activities” is tied to a sense of achievement. Together these skills alleviate larger problems in society; without an opportunity to learn in the arts, the student is denied “the chance to develop their individual wholeness and endangers their future and that of our society.” (VC# 14-51, 53, 16-58, Q/A-17) Instead, art is viewed as a collective human experience and the subjects clearly favor the arts as a tool for social improvement and cultural expression.
Themes of cultural tradition are modified to reflect and reinforce multicultural values; arts are presented as a means to cultural literacy. (VC# p. vii, xii, 5-10) The “aesthetic” concerns are not as valued as the critical concerns; a value still is placed on historical and aesthetic legacy and its impact on students’ lives, but the cultural parameters (and the accompanying aesthetic criteria for judgment) are greatly expanded beyond the “Euro-American” tradition. (VC# p. vii, 2-4, 4-8, 11-36) Along with providing students with the critical skills to “deconstruct” historical and cultural contexts, “...we are talking about the need to make the historical experience and cultural expression of American populations that have been central participants in the evolution of American society...a formal and integral part of the American experience and culture. ...we are talking about the equally important yet significantly different challenge of incorporating into American society and its institutions peoples and groups from throughout the world who bring with them ways of being and doing, values, and beliefs that are sometimes in conflict with those that inform American society.” (VC# 5-11, 11-38)

With some attention paid to improving the national economy in a global marketplace, strengthening national identity and global awareness, and providing a more informed and technologically trained workforce, again, cultural diversity (“the melting pot,” the “mosaic”) defines America’s identity and is the driving force behind the goal of “cultural literacy.” (VC# 2-4, Q/A-20, 9-30, 10-33) Domestic social issues are focused on multiculturalism and/or cultural diversity and social problems. (VC# p. ix, 2-4, 3-5, 6, 5-11, 11-36, 14-53) But achieving consensus on a multicultural “core” and the “tensions of norms and variations” is seen as a monumental political task complicated with intertwined issues of censorship and social problems in the schools: drop-out rates,
poverty, drugs, and crime (VC# 1-3, 4-8, 5-10, 14-51) Nonetheless, to understand and appreciate a multicultural society, students must understand the arts as a reflection of culture. (VC# 3-6) But social and cultural change requires more than acknowledging multiple ethnic populations; it involves the recognition of traditional arts (and their continuing transformations) as well as the “fine” or “popular” arts. (VC# 5-11)

“Educational standards and curriculum must grow with the art form as the art form grows with the society.” (VC# 11-39)

The arts, then, are the “core” of all cultures, not an elitist activity. (VC# 14-53) Instead, excellence, no longer associated with class distinctions, is insurance for access and equity (VC# 7-16) “Students need to become both culturally literate and critically literate....” (VC# 11-38) If well-prepared, “Attitudes and values are achieved as by-products of an instructional program.” (VC# 12-41) On issues of community harmony, educational access to all children and social equity, the arts encourage the transmission of values from one generation to other, hopefully, not only the appreciation of art, but the personal valuing and sensitivity to others as well. (VC# p.vii, ix, 1-3, 2-4, 11-36, 8-29)

But other dispositions and uses (with stronger ideological implications) include:

“imagination and creativity, substance, focus, point of view, excellence, and hard work and effort.” (VC# 7-16) Finally, the subjects emphasize artistic strategies for both the critical and creative aspects of cognitive training. (VC# Q/A-19, 14-51, 53, 15-56)

**Content Material, Knowledge Organization**

Acknowledging different disciplinary histories and tradition, promoting a “parity of esteem” in the schools, and equalizing the “sense of cultural importance,” the discourse subjects focus on “What is the content?” and second, in reference to
achievement, “How good is good enough?” (VC# p. viii, 1-3) “Indeed, the standards are designed to avoid dictating the kind of curriculum or the teaching method that should be used by any teacher or group of teachers.” (VC# p. xii) Although warning that the content and, particularly, instructional methods too often “become secular religions–fundamentalism of their own....,” the standards, according to some discourse subjects, clearly emphasize “function over method” and “content over process.” (VC# Q/A-19)

While ultimately content and instructional strategies are the province of local teachers and decision makers, the standards are premised on an agreed upon knowledge base. (VC# 15-55, Q/A-70) At least some members of the National Committee hoped: “If we keep the standards focused on substantive content, and don’t present them in a way that imitates a particular method of organizing and presenting that content, then we will have created an umbrella under which proponents of various methodologies can continue to pursue the goal of student learning using their own favorite means.” (VC# Q/A-19)

Content material in the National Standards (1994) is organized by established and specific art disciplines: “The standards for the arts are significant...because the very act of their formulation acknowledges the fact that dance, music, theatre and the visual arts are an essential part of the curriculum.” (VC# p. xi) Tensions surrounding content definition among supporters are evident occasionally: “There is clearly an inherent overlapping in the arts disciplines.... The standards call for such connectedness.....” (VC# Q/A-24) Yet, simultaneously, concerns about the “integrity” of individual art forms and about generalizing on the arts also was evident: “How will we teach about the richness of these discrete yet intertwined traditions without trivializing them by focusing on their exotic dimensions or without falling into the black hole of explaining every individual
manifestation?” (VC# p. xii, 5-10) Similar issues “correlating” the arts disciplines and “integrating” the arts into larger social change issues (similarities/differences, inclusiveness vs. elitism, pluralism vs. particularism, traditional vs. innovative arts and the impact of technology) still surface in the text. Beyond stating that “...students need to know the particular discipline before they can integrate it with anything else,” no consensus about how either process reinforced learning is apparent. (VC# 5-10, 6-13, 14, 15-56)

But substantive content supported by the standards is seen as a way of breaking down internal content barriers between disciplinary history, criticism, studio, etc. and encouraging integration of thought about the “base” discipline. (VC# 9-30, 31) For example, “Drama is the base discipline, but the media for its transmission have exploded, and we are certain that more will be created within the decade.” (VC# 11-37) Clearly justifying the formal disciplines as an organizing principle, many voices promoted the disciplinary integration of “aesthetic theories, a history, and a literature” as sustaining art production and art production, because it is grounded in active learning theory, provides the ultimate construction of knowledge: “How can we steer the field away from focusing on [theatre] acting and yet keep the active learning thrust of creation and performance?” (VC# 11-36, 37) Another indicator of a reemerging performance emphasis: “I feel that over the years the music education curricula have too heavily emphasized theory and philosophy. I suggest that schools consider more practice.” (VC# Q/A-70) But, for the most part, “common content categories,” “major ways to organize and understand and explore instruction in the arts” are reminiscent of earlier visual arts models such as DBAE rather that “arts in the basic curriculum.” (VC# Q/A-45, 73, 14-54,) For instance,
with an emphasis on aesthetics as a key to cultural diversity in the arts: “Forms and styles of dance help define particular societies and periods of history and contribute to the broad body of cultural knowledge. The cumulative knowledge of dance is a history of the world and its peoples.” (VC# 10-32, Q/A-20) But an expanded understanding of knowledge, skills and techniques derived from the older visual arts model combined with drawing “a better connection among the arts, the mind, and civilization,” art production increasingly is characterized as an “intellectual process of making things new or making new things.” (VC# Q/A-19, 20, 73)

Instruction, Assessment Strategies

Although the secondary texts assume art forms are highly motivational, engaging and easily adapted to different learning styles because of their “hands-on,” “directed” qualities, the instructional and assessment activities suggested to the classroom teacher imply skill development strategies. (VC# 2-6, 4-8, 9-31) Responding, reflecting, applying, however, are articulated as “a synergistic relationship, rather than a cause-and-effect relationship....” (VC# Q/A-44) At the center of these activities is an experiential component, student experience that allows access to new ideas through “the texture of creation.” (VC# 4-8) Perceptual skills, now combined with critical analysis (historical/cultural, theoretical and critical), are defined as learning “to see first,” developing “a keen sense of observation.” (VC# 6-14, Q/A-19, 20, 23, 11-38) “And these perceptions were philosophical ideas as well as visual ones.” (VC# Q/A-23) In terms of perceptual skills, “…the arts [are] central to all other learning, and seeing, hearing, feeling, touching, all of that kind of sensory perception [is] the key to education of the students.” (VC# Q/A-24) Also “intuing,” a semi-perceptual skill developed via
experiences, is included in this “baseline entry level into arts education” which is “predicated on our senses.” (VC# Q/A-44, 18-67)

Likewise, “Cognition plays a central role; we must realize that subtlety and complexity continue to be important considerations and remember that complex thinking involves the capacity to remain flexible.” (VC# 8-29) Defining the artist as “intellectuals who are stimulated by an acquired set of principles,” the cognitive is described as both critical and creative, and involving physical, emotional and cultural understanding. (VC# 18-66) Certain student behaviors repeatedly are enumerated. For instance, as an educational process and a mode of learning, dance (including media technologies) provides effective and rigorous instructional strategies leading to intellectual flexibility, organizational and sequencing skills, teamwork, creative thinking, imagination, innovative problem solutions, learning quickly, communication and metacognitive skills (VC# 3-6, 7, 4-8, Q/A-23, 9-30, 31, 10-32, 33) Cognitive goals are “realized through comprehensive study that enables students to develop visual and other perceptual skills, to create visual works that effectively express their own thoughts and ideas, to understand various cultures and historical relationships, and to critically evaluate and judge the visual products that influence their daily lives.” (VC# 9-30) Ultimately, the focus on cognitive skills, becoming critically literate and creative, supports integrated curriculum and for correlating essential art elements with study in and outside of the arts; the hope is to encourage higher levels and more effective communication of student thinking. (VC# 9-31, 11-38)

Interestingly, the text provides few references to affective skills or emotional expressiveness; most are linked to the empathetic or collaborative roles of actor and
audience in theatre production or to depositions toward human or cultural tolerance. But similar ideas are discussed as “creation/performance” or are cloaked in repeated references to “communication” or social skills. (VC# 3-66, 14, 11-37, 38, 39) Often aligned with higher level symbolic and metaphorical languages, the arts [theatre] provide “a metaphor for society and helps us make meaning about what it is to be human” and [dance] “... can serve as both a lens for perceiving and a language for communicating.” (VC# 10-32, 33, 11-36, 37, 38, Q/A-44) The task for student communicators “is not to reproduce efficiently, but to energize their commitment to the experience—to personalize their view of art and present it effectively to others.” (VC# 4-8) Simultaneously, students need “To develop a vocabulary to articulate their thoughts and feelings....to articulate a response [as an audience member] to the event.” (VC# Q/A-24)

**Policy Theory: Issue Identification, Problem Definition**

In making recommendations for program structure in the schools, the discourse subjects are clear on one issue: “We have to find out how to infuse the curriculum with the arts.” (VC# 18-64, 65) Although many practical means are suggested in keeping with school reform in general, “parity” is seen as the major political leverage. The arts in the curriculum and arts educators sought to be “equal partners” and have “parity of esteem” with other subjects named in the National Goals for Education, as a substantive and rigorous field of study, as having “the same sense of cultural importance.” (VC# 1-3, 7-15, Q/A-17) All of the arts should be a part of the “core curriculum by design, not by default.” (VC# 10-34) Also, the subjects expressed clearly that the arts should be taught as a part of a “basic” education. Asserting that the arts “teach ideas and skills not taught by any other subject in the curriculum,” the subjects maintain that the art disciplines, are
“fundamental and essential” to any child’s education. (VC# 7-15, 11-36) The problem for the National Committee was to come to a consensus about what “...art content and achievement... is essential to the well-being of all students...” (VC# 9-31) Once “specific” criteria is described (a major policy goal for the Committee), the arts could be taught sequentially and in a developmentally appropriate manner (VC# 10-33, 34, 11-39).

**Policy Solution: Program Structure, Instructional Delivery**

Agreement is strong regarding the value of all the arts (each for its own materials and methods) and a comprehensive arts education; an education in all of the arts (defined by the established arts disciplines) is also agreed upon. Access to some arts, such as dance and theatre, and the availability of trained specialists posed implementation problems; the subjects had no immediate solutions. Another issue surrounding a comprehensive curriculum is student choice. Should students have a choice to specialize in certain art disciplines, especially at the high school level? Many of these issues, issues related to instructional choices, are left unresolved.

Relying on the argument that each art discipline promotes common, but also different skills, integration was viewed as characteristic of the art processes and, therefore, made collaboration within the arts very possible. (VC# 11-38) The subjects clearly state: “Integration is not using one subject to teach another.” (VC# 6-13) “Rather, integration implies a combination of knowledge and skills to put things together in a true mixture. In order for this exercise to be meaningful, students need to know the particular discipline before they can integrate it with anything else” (VC# 6-13, 14) Defined as “when students can be taught to relate one area to another to reinforce the learning
process,” integration is seen as helping students to make meaningful connections and to focus on higher levels of thinking. (VC# 6-13, 9-31)

On the other hand, the use of arts in combination with other subjects posed problems; a limited “correlation” is recommended. (VC# 6-13) An obvious concern surfaced: “…cross disciplinary approaches have a tendency to water down the arts and to lessen the energy of the individual art form” (VC# 6-13) Although the distinction between integration and interdisciplinary education is discussed, it seems “no conclusive end” is reached (VC# 6-13) Overall, large interdisciplinary ideas are discarded in favor of content categories more related to the arts specifically. (VC# Q/A-45,73) “If we want to develop creative thinking, not simply as a creative process but as intellectually-based work, then we are talking about integration from a different base, an artistic base rather than a technical one. This requires studying the arts and integrating them according to the nature of the arts, not according to the nature of the other disciplines.” (VC# Q/A-73) Committee members conclude that “to facilitate and enrich the teaching of other subject matter, they [the arts] must be taught for their innate value as well.” (VC# 6-14)

Recognizing the nature of local educational “systems,” the subjects concede decision making authority for arts education delivery to the classroom teacher and the arts specialist. With emphasis on professional development as a part of school reform, they also recognize that “…without the classroom teacher there will be a lot of students who will never have that in-depth exposure to the arts.” (VC# Q/A-22, 15-55, 17-61) The standards are seen as a major, but indirect, contribution to any reform effort in the classroom; the content standards insure a place for the arts in the school curriculum and the achievement standards insure the level of competency.
However, some participants have obvious misgivings about leaving instructional strategies in the hands of classroom teachers. “...I think we have to be extremely careful not to use rhetoric or craft policies that send the message that just anybody can teach the arts.” (VC# Q/A-22) Another concern: “First, we need teaching capacity. Professional development. The preservice and the in-service development of teachers. If we do not have teachers who fully understand what it is we’re reaching for and are trained to create the atmosphere in which the student has the opportunity to learn, we’re not going to make it.” (VC# p. vii, 8-29, Q/A–22) Concern that integration in the arts, for instance, would require both cooperative planning and/or retraining of teachers was “troubling” for many participants. (VC# 6-13). Other issues are: teacher understanding of certain academic disciplines (such as aesthetics), a corresponding lack of access to adequate training for preservice teachers in higher education, the increasing amount of work imposed on preservice teachers by state mandates, the attraction and retention of competent classroom teachers and art specialist to the field, the lack of certification in some states for some disciplines (notably dance) and alternative certification for artists and, finally, pressures for “viewable” and “competitive” production activities on the part of administrators and the public. (VC# Q/A-20, 21, 22, 10-33, 34, 11-36) These barriers and, generally, the value system that surrounds teachers as decision makers are unresolved. (VC# Q/A-71) Understanding that the success of the standards rests on their acceptance by arts teaching professionals and that they will need “rewards’ and “recognition” as well as institutional and public partnerships and support, it is suggested that teachers should accept the responsibility for leadership, for translating theory into practice and professional improvement initiatives. (VC# Q/A-72, 74)
Although noted that teachers with a four-year degree were thought competent to implement the standards, “new partnerships are absolutely essential.” (VC# 17-61, 62, 19-69) Along with collaborations (in research, professional training and increased institutional standards) between higher education and the public schools, the plea resurfaced for the “artist/teacher” or artist participation (from a “host of professionals available, and often as many as 85 percent of them are unemployed), and the arts specialist as a resource for teachers. (VC# 15-56, 57, 18-65, 66, 17-61, Q/A-70, 78) Although clarifying the artists in the schools is no substitute for a planned, sequential curriculum, several participants maintained: “I think the artist should be remembered and designed into this project all the way through, because there is a vitality that comes from the working artist being in the school.” (VC# Q/A-78) “The Standards represent an opportunity to forge an alliance between the artist and the arts educator.” (VC# Q/A-78) Even though art specialists were deemed very necessary for resources and assessment criteria, no policy recommendations followed the statement: “Qualified people simply don’t exist.” (VC# Q/A-73, 74, 81)

But a stronger strain is present advocating the standards as a document “that unites the arts professionals, the art education community, and the advocates for the arts education community...” and provides a foundation for advocacy strategies at the local level “where the real power is located.” (VC# Q/A-17, 14-54, 15-57, 16-59, 17-61) Arts councils, organizations, community organizations and artists are enlisted in various advocacy roles. (VC# 17-60, 62) Advocacy, then, must encompass “a multilevel approach for building support” that is centered on “a horizontal and a vertical advocacy campaign....” (VC# 17-62) Partnerships of “team players must be achieved among groups
that have disagreed in the past” because each one of those groups has its state information network, and each one of those groups has its national service organization.” (VC# 17-61, 62) But, rather than promoting instrumental skills, underlying the advocacy is a new message: “If anything, we probably are the most viable of the disciplines because we incorporate and digest every aspect of life.” (VC# 18-66)

“The education people receive is always placed in a context of local values.” (VC# Q/A-71) With this understanding of the policy environment, the standards place a strong emphasis on local curricular and program rights and responsibilities to address the specific needs of their students. Stressing that the standards are voluntary and suggestive, rather than prescriptive, the document also addresses the accompanying role of accountability and over site. (VC# 11-38, 39, Q/A-45, 17-61)Within a context of national school reform, the standards are expected to impact all aspects of the field: transform curricula, national and state assessments in the arts, teacher education, teacher certification, college entrance requirements, high school graduation requirements, and state curriculum guidelines for vial and performing arts…” (VC# 7-15) “Embracing a vision of what arts education can be rather than reinforcing what already exists,” the standards communicate how the arts and the standards are a tool for local, site-based school administrators and that the responsibility of school boards is to make the arts more accessible and incorporate arts education into board adopted educational goals. (VC# 7-15, 9-30, 10-34, 14-52, 16-58, Q/A-75, 14-53)

Placing faith in the grassroots tradition of the local public school “system” and the professionalism of the “local players,” local government and business, school personnel and arts organizations in conjunction with state boards of education are given a general
over site responsibility. (VC# 17-61, 62, 18-65, 67, 19-68, 17-62, 15-55, Q/A-74)

However, the acceptance of the standards by politicians, policymakers and stakeholders (students, parents, and the general public) is a political problem rather than a curricular one. (VC# 13-49, 7-15, Q/A-25, 15-55, 18-65, 19-68, Q/A-70, 74, 77)

Policy Impact/Outcomes

The Standards are a starting point in terms of overall school reform desired by the public and parity sought by arts educators. School reform, systemic change starting with school improvement, (VC# p. ix, 3-5, 7-15, 13-49, 9-30) is voiced as changing the “status quo” and aspiring to “world-class” excellence; the idea of accountability creeps back into the debate on education reform. (VC# 11-36, 12-40, 41, 16-58, 18-65, 66, 67, 10-34) Several important issues emerged about their implementation. Importantly, standards are defined as goals, expectations or outcomes. “For example, what we’re calling standards are called outcomes by some school districts and some state department of education. Others call them expectations, or objectives or something else.” (VC# 12-41, p. vii) Part of an accountability effort, this orientation is about justifying the arts within the policy environment; standards accommodate a national testing trend and “parallel a national testing program....” (VC# 8-29, 11-39) “In this country we tend to teach what we test, so that it’s very important that the arts become part of the regular schedule of assessments that are administered by the National Assessment of Educational Progress....” (VC# 13-49) The anticipated impacts hoped for by the discourse subjects were positive; little time was spent on unanticipated or negative consequences of standards or testing on the classroom. Standards equated to achievement (competence or excellence) (VC# 9-30)

“The standards are not to recycle mediocrity in the way so many minimum competency
testing experiments a decade ago did, we must aim at least at the ceiling, if not at the stars.” (VC# p. viii, Q/A-21)

Measurability continued to be an anticipated policy implementation barrier. (VC# Q/A-46) Tempering the testing emphasis, but citing the positive effects of arts involvement on standardized test scores, developmental appropriateness of the standards occasionally is questioned. (VC# Q/A–23, 14-53) Additionally, the issue of norms and variations arise; applied criteria and its usage remained unanswered. (VC# 5-10) The consensus was, however, “If we continue using the existing tests, the new standards will not survive.” (VC# 13-49) Priorities about inclusion and exclusion of idiosyncratic biases is an obvious problem in setting the content standards and translating them into performance or achievement standards (VC# 12-40, 41) A positive impact of high performance would result in improved standards of delivery, both in schools and systems (with professional development) is the primary curricular decision maker, and, with parity in the schools, an increased cultural literacy and understanding of diverse cultural values and beliefs are the anticipated outcomes or benefits to American society. (VC# 8-29, 12-41, 45, 15-56, Q/A-71)

As Transfer Mechanism

As stated before, to chart the role of the subjects in the transfer of organizational ideology is beyond the intended organizational focus of this study. However, the model suggests a way to organize the extra organization activity of each subject. The texts of individual subjects could provide his/her patterns of receiving, processing, and restating the ideology in different domains (art, general education), other institutions, organizations communities, and in individual discursive practice. For instance, Junius
Eddy participated in many advocacy efforts for art education over the bracketed time period. To analyze any individual perspective for change would indicate the manner in which subjects are a transfer mechanism.

**Archeological Findings: Enunciative Modes**

While responding to different contextual authorities of delimitation as discussed in the formation of objects, each organization developed unique characteristics as agents of discursive change. In part those characteristics are evidenced in text production. However, an in-depth understanding of internal functions reveals the way the organization expresses itself in the specific discourse.

**Findings: Discourse Organization #1**

- AEAP’s intent was to penetrate school settings indirectly through established government structures.
- It participated in loosely formed networks of government agencies and local school districts; the organization of AEAP was integrally involved at the leadership level with federal agencies and private foundations.
- It functioned as independent conduit for information about arts education programs and sought to use funding as leverage.
- The AEAP core membership was drawn from a range of elite citizens; its constituency was artists and patrons of the arts.
- Kathryn Bloom, as a career bureaucrat in USDE and later with the JDR 3rd Fund, increasingly was influenced by social equity movements in education and the dominant creative expression rationale of the 1920s.
• Bloom identified the major issue as centered on the educational benefit of the arts, defined the problem as insufficient evidence of the instrumental value of arts in the learning process, and purposed increased individual experience and school access as the solution.

• Likewise, the subjects of the AEAP were composed of career bureaucrats and arts advocates. The concepts found in the AEAP Report Series (1980-1981) center on development of sensory perception as the key to learning, they favored art as aesthetic experience over “hard” content or “contemplation,” performance or production as participatory learning and authentic assessment strategies.

• Additionally, all the arts are valued as instrumental in teaching other subjects, are reinforced by the artist as the ultimate teacher of the creative process and are most effective when the ultimate outcome is building individual student self-esteem.

Findings: Discourse Organization #2

• The GCEA sought professional reform in art education and the schools in general.

• As a catalyst for reform it depended on scholarship from the field of art education, it provided leadership training, and multi-level funding and resources.

• The GCEA was supported by a complex, self-contained private foundation; it functioned within the limitations of the larger institution.
• The Getty core membership was drawn primarily from the academic community; it focused on visual art education specialists and scholars.

• Leilani Lattin Duke, as a director for a private foundation, focused most of her efforts in the responsible management of the foundations funds to achieve goals unaddressed by other organizations.

• Under her leadership, the GCEA identified the major issue in the field as a lack of academic and intellectual standing, defined the problem as the need for excellence and rigor in teaching art, and it proposed a disciplinary approach parallel to other academic areas.

• The subjects of the Getty were composed of academic art educators and art specialists. The concepts presented in the Getty commissioned texts, *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, reflect a belief in cultural intervention in student maturation, in knowledge organized through established disciplines of history, aesthetics, criticism and studio, critical activities and assessments (using representative ideas and images) as learning strategies, in the arts disciplines as independent of other disciplines, but integral to a comprehensive, sequential and written curriculum, in curriculum decision making in the hands of scholars and experts rather than classroom teachers, and in an anticipated outcome of a “well-rounded” adult audience capable of a learned response is the anticipated outcome.

**Findings: Discourse Organization #3**

• The Consortium was a coalition representing a collective political need.
• It functioned to align the respective disciplines with a politically viable agenda. As a large community of shared values and beliefs, it generated a perceived interdependence among the larger “systems” of government, general education and its professional membership for funding and for political support.

• The Consortium was an outgrowth of the four professional associations; it core membership was composed primarily of members of the National Arts Education Associations, but it represented a population of practitioners from diverse pedagogical traditions.

• A Graham Down, John Mahlmann, Theresa Purcell, Barbara Salisbury Wills, and Thomas Hatfield all functioned as speakers at one time or another for the Consortium or its member associations. Most active of the leadership, Mahlmann, adhered to an underlying belief that the arts have a synergistic relationship with more inherent similarities than differences.

• The Consortium responded to the issue of school reform in general education, it defined the problem as a need for professional and political consensus and it proposed standards as the solution.

• The subjects of the Consortium were composed of diverse fields: academe, general education, art world representatives and policy makers. The concepts presented in Vision for Arts Education in the 21st Century promote the established arts as a collective expression of cultural values, a content derived from the tradition of individual and/or collective arts, learning strategies focused on critical thinking skills learning as
“constructed” in any and/or all arts. Supportive ideas are: the arts should be integrated with each other based on commonalities, but their individual tradition, content and pedagogy should remain intact and appreciated in their own right. The instrumental use in interdisciplinary or cross disciplinary ways by the local classroom teacher should not be valued above their intrinsic value.

Meta Analysis of Model Effectiveness: Enunciative Modes

The model of enunciative modes functions to profile the organization 1) by position in the history of the discourse, 2) by its unique role in the discourse field, 3) by its characteristic structures and decision making processes, and 4) by its internal cultures/subcultures and supportive membership. The speaker is characterized 1) by identifying him/her as a designated policy authority, 2) by explaining the significance of his/her role as a ideological emblem of the policy discourse, and 3) by demonstrating the speaker’s major advocacy initiatives as a delimiting and defining force on discourse ideology. The organization’s ideological and policy perspective is analyzed through texts produced by representative subjects. The subjects are discussed 1) as representatives of the discourse community, 2) as recognized agents of an ideology revealed as a collective voice, and 3) as the receivers, processors, and transmitters of language codes embedded in policy statements.

The major strength of the model is its expansion of Foucault’s concept of the institution as a discursive stabilization factor to a model of the organization as a change agent. By advancing the original mode of inquiry to include specific needs of the discourse field, the model increases the usefulness of the method and the relevance of the theory to
research. The significance of Foucault’s “place of observation” as an element in idea formation and decision making is equally valuable at the organizational level. Likewise, policy making processes seen in proximity to resulting organizational activities offer a clearer view of the role of organization mechanisms in institutional policy decision making. Similarly, the close examination of processes of choosing and designating roles for speakers and subjects has particularly interesting implications for policy formulation. While the limitations of this study do not allow a full demonstration of these processes, they could expose the “personality” factor, that is, the individual expertise, ideology and influence impacting external and political practices, power structures, and, of course, the ideological bias of the immediate community. Finally, a major benefit of this model is the design and use of multi text analysis to reveal the aggregate of voices involved in organizational discursive activity; it serves to verify the range of the ideology as well as internal agreement and disagreements, consistencies and inconsistencies within the community.

The model of enunciative modes, however, needs continued refinements. In many cases, organizational texts, regardless of specification, provide little or no information relevant to internal organizational activities. In order to obtain such information, more traditional research practices would have to be employed: interviews, survey, etc. However, secondary documents such as private documents, personal correspondence, etc., while providing information, do not reflect clearly relationships in the discursive field, relationships so important to Foucault’s theory.

Similarly, tracing and documenting the external impact of organizational activities, speaker and subjects presents another kind of difficulty. Beyond identifying their names as contributors, tracing the impact of a speaker’s skill and influence in the work of coalitions,
partnerships, etc. is very difficult. Likewise, because most speakers operate in the realm of activity, textual information about their ideology and the reaction of community members to their leadership are scarce.

A similar problem exists in documenting and tracing the transfer of ideas through subjects. The number of subjects involved in an organizational membership or community is large and, therefore, difficult to trace beyond the multi text analysis. Yet, tracing subjects as they receive, process, and transfer information would focus more clearly on idea formation as process. A final weakness in this model demonstration is the use of Foucault’s “perceptual process” in the multi text analysis. Instead of aggregating “voices” around emerging and similar concepts, a comparison of individual subjects may be more fruitful in identifying ideological conflict in discourse “dispersion.”

**Summary**

The formation of enunciative modes model and methodology function to chart the roles and the relative power of individual subjects, speakers, and the organizational or institutional constituency in determining the ideology, the established organizational position and activity in the discourse field, and its common mechanisms in the influence and transfer of ideas. Specifically, this study profiles three organizations emerging in different time brackets, but, unlike established government institutions, each reflects a different culture advocating a different change and reform agenda. The community’s choice of speaker and representative subjects along with their method of engaging in the discourse community allows a micro-level observation of idea formation behind discourse activity.
CHAPTER 7

THE FORMATION OF CONCEPTS: DEMONSTRATION OF MODEL

Purpose of Concept Formation Model

The analysis of the discourse narrows considerably with the formation of concepts; and this formation model is considerably more interpretative than previous levels of analysis. Focused on a single, but primary curricular policy statement from each dominant organization, the data collected verifies the ideological framework revealed in earlier formations. This model analyzes and explains the conceptual relationship between the organization’s ideology and its expression through language. Besides providing an in-depth view of the community’s ideological world view through a primary policy statement; the model establishes internal consistency of the text (the enunciative series), its appropriations from and accommodations to outside forces of the present and the past (forms of co-existence), and the mechanisms of language most typically used in establishing the organization’s position in the discourse (procedures of intervention). Most importantly, the model provides a meticulous system for cross checking the role of language in idea formation. Conceptual analysis demonstrates how idea formation can take place within the limits of one text; simultaneously, it demonstrates how policy is incrementally changed and reformulated through language usage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of Succession (Rhetorical Schemata)</th>
<th>Forms of Co-Existence (Discoursal Schemata)</th>
<th>Procedures of Intervention (Influence/Transfer Mechanism)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Enunciative Series</td>
<td>Conceptual Dependence</td>
<td>Policy Formation: A Recreated Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Dependence</td>
<td>Conceptual Order</td>
<td>Discoursal Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Order</td>
<td>Fields of Presence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Presence</td>
<td>Field of Concomitance</td>
<td>Rhetorical Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Memory</td>
<td>Fields of Memory</td>
<td>Discoursal Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Implication
- Description
- Reasoning
- Generalization
- Specification
- Hypothesis, Verification
- General Law, Application
- Assertion, Critique
- Attribution
- Articulation
- Designation
- Derivation
- Experimental Verification
- Logical Validations
- Repetition, Acceptance
- Analysis of Error
- Analogical Confirmation
- General Principle, Premises
- Transferable Models
- Higher Authority
- Genesis
- Filiations
- Transformations
- Continuity
- Historical Discontinuity
- Characteristics of a Period
- Rules of Formal Construction
- Internal Configuration of Text
- Interference between Different Texts
- Rewriting, Transcribing, Translating
- Approximation of Statements
- Transfer of Applications
- Systematizing
- Worldview
- Problem Definition
- Program Theory
- Educational Goals
- Program Design & Delivery
- Curriculum Content
- Instructional, Assessment Strategies

Table 7.1 Formation of Concepts: Explication of Policy Statement
The textual analysis of policy texts rests on several assumptions or principles: “for any text a plurality of readers must necessarily produce a plurality of readings” (John Codd, 1988, p. 239) According to Stephen Ball (1994), “They [policy texts] are typically the cannibalized products of multiple (but circumscribed) influences and agendas. There is ad hocery, negotiation and serendipity within the state, within the policy formulation process.” (Ball, 1994, p.16) Despite these elements of chance, the policy text is significant because its form “holds” patterns of meaning and these ideas have consequences beyond the obvious and stated purpose. Ball describes the function of the policy text: “Policies do not normally tell you what to do; they create circumstances in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed, or particular goals or outcomes are set.” (Ball, 1994, p.19)

First, the forms of succession present a “perceptual” recreation of the policy text; the intention of this process is to establish the rhetorical elements embedded (consciously or unconsciously) in the policy statement; this task functions is to “fix” temporarily the perceptual impact on the reader or researcher. The model closely exams the rhetorical scheme of the text: the formal presentation of argument through inference/implication, reasoning, generalization, specification, etc. and the dependence of the argument upon hypothesis, verification, critique/general law, application, etc. The model also relies on Foucault’s “Order of Things” (1970) to clarify the level and relative significance of rhetorical functions by attribution, articulation, designation, derivation. The rhetorical scheme describes (in narrative form) the formal argument, its meaning, and its functions. Overall, the rhetorical model seeks significant patterns internal to the text to reveal the community’s ideological constructions.
Secondly, the forms of co-existence model, then, traces these identified ideas to other discourses. These tasks reveal the degree of dependence of the organization on established forms of knowledge organization and rhetorical devices in the discourse field. Using the initial analysis of rhetorical schemes, the model examines the text for discoursal patterns. The model looks for influences on organizational argument beyond the text; references to external discoursal activity such as experimental verification, logical validations, acceptance of tradition, authority, or the mistakes of other or opposing agents, arguments from other dissimilar discourse domains, that is, confirmation by analogy, general principle, transferable model, higher authority, and arguments of the past demonstrating filiation/genesis, transition/transformation, or historical continuity/discontinuity, that is, concepts found outside of the present discourse field and yet privileged in the text as valuable.

Finally, the procedures of intervention identify the rhetorical structures and correlate them with mechanisms of discoursal interventions. The model compares common text structures (characteristics of a period, rules of formal construction, appropriation of formal characteristics, internal configuration) with common language interventions (rewriting/transcribing/translating, approximation of statements, application transfer, systematizing) to identify concept change. As Foucault contemplates the structures and mechanisms that are responsible for discourse influence on and/or transfer of concepts, he focuses once again on usage, relationship, and the process of recreating via reorganizing knowledge. These elements of discourse create and recreate a perceptual process, and, in that process, a new policy statement is formed.
Discourse Text #1

Coming to our senses: The Significance of the arts for American education (1977) was very visible and one of the first curricular policy positions to be published on arts education after a number of significant political, bureaucratic and, finally, legislative actions that favored curriculum improvement in general education. Published by the AEAP almost 12 years after the establishing law for the National Endowment in 1965 (PL 89-208), it advocated and clarified the need for increased attention to arts education. Presented to Congress without prior review by representatives from the four professional art education associations, it reveals a curricular rationale that would continue to be a force within the field until the end of the century. An extensive text, it references superficially the major social and political concerns of its time and, in a limited way, the curricular issues within general education as well. Finally, the text offers a complete explanation of a dominant ideological position of this time.

While most advocacy organizations are promoting some sort of school reform, the way in which they conceptually defined the problem(s) is unique depending on the “the organization of the field of statements where they appeared and circulated.” (Foucault, 1972, p.56) While the AEAP text covers all aspects of arts education, its chapters focus on the arts in K-12 school curriculum. The chapters examined for curriculum orientation in this study are the “Introduction,” “The crisis and the hope,” “The arts: A better primer for our children,” “Creative energy and the adolescent,” “The arts at home in college,” and, “Analyzing the present, mapping the future.” However, only the chapter “The crisis and the hope” is used to create the enunciative series and analyze conceptual dependence.
Forms of Succession: The Rhetorical Schemata

The validity of these enunciative forms as a reflection of the organizational bias, their significance established through their use in argument (dependence) and, finally, the function in the perceptual process are, of course, qualified by the subjective interpretation of the enunciative series itself. Nonetheless, a summary of the AEAP’s argument appears to emphasize reasoning, but with little reference to factual or descriptive information. As might be expected, the meaning of the enunciative form is dependent on a structure of hypothesis and verification. However, either through generalization based on the application of general law or specification based on assertions from outside criteria, the text is highly dependent on levels of interpretation. A perceptual “reading” might be as follows.

Immediately addressing its primary concern, Coming to our senses (1977) opens with an image of people communicating through words alone, “a mindless mouth.” (CS, p. 3) Without benefit of gesture, facial expression, vocal rhythm or pitch, the text suggests the quality of daily life in the human condition is emotionally deprived: “No emotion. Simply a procession of sterile symbols on a paper tongue.” (CS, p. 3) Related ideas emerge quickly. Perception and communication are described as fundamental life and learning skills. The arts are dependent on non-verbal information received and communicated “through our eyes, our ears, our skill, and our palate.” (CS, p. 3) Functioning within all of these perceptual realms, the arts, then, are “ideal vehicles for training our senses, for enriching our emotional selves, and for organizing our environment.” (CS, p. 3) The text relates perception and the construction of reality: “Our environment is what we make it. And how we shape it depends upon how we perceive
it.” (CS, p. 3) Schools and cities are presented as “testimony to our general
‘senselessness’.” (CS, p. 4) Social institutions, particularly schools, have become
“fearful, gray fortresses” (CS, p. 4) that threaten to “homogenize our thoughts.” (CS, p. 5)
And our cities, “gridwork[s] of dismal frontage and automotive clamor,” (CS, p. 5)
produce “Grayness and tension.” (CS, p. 5) Devoid of or threatened by cultural
differences, the individual is deprived of experiential diversity.

As the initial ideas cohere conceptually, the broad social problems are set aside as
running too deep for the “speakers.” The text presents educational institutions not as the
cause of “social gloom and distress,” but as a reflection of the problem. (CS, p.6) “The
roots of grayness and tension run deeper than this Report, which does not pretend to be a
blueprint for schools or for society.” (CS, p. 6) But one symptom of the problems facing
the greater society is addressed: The “official segregation of art from life in America”
(CS, p. 6) causes the arts not to be viewed “as part of everyday living nor as a legitimate
part of education.” (CS, p. 6) “...this segregation is unnatural ... art is indivisible from life
and education.” (CS, p. 6) As educational themes emerge and theories are proposed, “The
Panel supports the concept of “basic” education, but maintains that the arts, properly
taught, are basic to individual development since they “more than any other subject
awaken all the senses—the learning pores.” (CS, p. 6)

Combining three conceptual systems, the text aligns with the “basics” movement,
expands the “literacy” argument beyond word usage and views the arts as grounded in
“ways of knowing For instance, the arts are wrapped in the “basics:” “We endorse a
curriculum which puts ‘basics’ first, because the arts are basic, right at the heart of the
matter.” (CS, p. 6) Still focused on quality of life issues, individual benefits of personal
discipline and an understanding of “overall excellence,” the text offers secondary benefits. (CS, p. 7) Although less emphasized in the text, the individual is motivated to participate and/or be involved in community activities, derives “enormous pleasure” from the entertainment value of the arts, and develops transferable skills enabling interdisciplinary learning. (CS, p. 7) The interdisciplinary “strategy” is to “raise the level of awareness, discipline, elegance, rigor, pleasure, appropriateness; and to establish a consistent concern for quality in the life of the student...in such a way that the question of art never comes up.”(CS, p.8) Proposing an educational solution based “in,” “about,” and “through” the arts, the text reinforces the “direct creative and re-creative experience–learning in the arts–is of unique educational value.”(CS, p. 8) “In” the arts is inclusive of “about” the “rich world of sensation, emotion, and personal expression.” (CS, p. 8) And the student is motivated “through” a respect for “a disciplined approach to learning.”(CS, p. 9)

Aside from direct artistic experience, the text advocates for the transferability of aesthetic and ancillary skills as “basic” to the process of learning. Identifying its thesis as aligned with the Massachusetts Board of Education’s goals: “Without the basic learning skills–the capacity to receive information through the senses and to interpret and respond to that information in various ways, the process of learning cannot take place.” (CS, p. 9)

Although the scope of arts education as it exists in the general society and in educational institutions is an indication of a life-long learning process, the text focuses on public schools “because that is where most young people are.” (CS, p. 10) The final solution proposed by the text identifies a discourse alliance. Calling for an integration of many facets of the society (schools, colleges, communities, government, arts
organizations), broad “philosophical, substantive, structural changes” are recommended. (CS, p. 10) Based on NEA estimates of professional expansion of artists simultaneously occurring with “arts education...struggling for its life,” (CS, p. 11) the text suggests: “We have a profusion of superb artists, arts institutions, technology, and manifold cultural tradition: all the ingredients. The schools and their neighboring arts resources must be intertwined.”(CS, p. 11)

**Forms of Co-Existence: The Discoursal Schemata**

**Field of Presence**

Emphasizing that “no single model works for all,” the text credits many individual schools with excellent programs and describes “a variety of successful experiments.”(CS, p. 10) The “Plan of Research” covers elementary, secondary, college and community educational efforts. The data is collected from site visits, panel discussions, interviews, witness testimony and statistics. Secondary data is collected from “basic literature,” state information, “exemplary” programs and statistics. Sixteen school districts (both elementary and secondary schools) were studied in an effort to measure the following major areas: philosophy and goals, staff qualifications and performance evaluation, program and staff development, scope, content and teaching approaches, sources of support, number of personnel and staffing patterns, nonschool resources, program evaluation and strategic planning. In addition to the *Coming to our senses* (1977) text itself, nineteen research reports were generated by the project supervised by six research specialists.

Logical validations were derived from “the testimony of witnesses and staff at Panel meetings; selected works already published; and materials specially generated by
staff, consultants, and witnesses.” (CS, p. ix) In the “Introduction,” the curriculum rationale relies heavily on textual reference to its own panel to reinforce its position. John Culkin (media studies), Patsy T. Mink (panel member), Ray Eames (designer/filmmaker). Similarly, Panel interviewees, witnesses, and notable figures in general education and the arts give testimonies which are sprinkled throughout the text: Ray Perotti (American Crafts Council), Doreen Nelson (panel witness), John Edward Ryor (National Education Association), Martin Engel (National Institute of Education) and many others.

In an analysis of state level support for arts education, the text presents three in-depth cases; the structures, processes and the contributions of the governor, the legislature, the department of public instruction, the art council and arts education conferences of Michigan, North Carolina and Washington are scrutinized and compared in depth. Admitting the “The gulf between policy and practice is often wide,” the text traces the source and reliability of funding and the strength of its constituency in influencing the state policymakers. The Panel presents the advantages of the NEA influence via the creation of the arts council infrastructure and, eventually, the implementation of the Artists-in-Schools program. In addressing the use of local, state and federal resources, research of existing programs serves to validate the Panel’s recommendation for a state level focus. (Edward Hamilton).

Drawing upon the Panel’s parent organization, the American Council for Arts in Education (ACALE), founded in 1959, certain controlling ideas in the text can be traced to earlier policy streams. Additionally, the comments of the panel witnesses such as Kathryn Bloom provide a link to earlier concepts, particularly the blending of art for “its own sake” with attention to “how these subjects can meet broad education goals.” (CS, p. 212)
Other repeated policy motifs emerged from traditional attitudes and practices: programs must be built on available community resources (Scott Thomson, National Association of Secondary School Principles); must use “natural advantage” areas that “can be done and done well” (Jerome Hausman, College of Art and Design in Minneapolis), and must focus on classroom learning (Kathryn Bloom).

Analyzing errors of the past: “The image of American society as inhospitable to things of the spirit and the arts was, then, evident in 1835. It is not hard to conclude that education—which, as we have seen, was firmly supported by that time—would reflect that inhospitality, and perhaps be (almost too paradoxical to contemplate) actually anti-intellectual.” (CS, p. 28) Repeating the many artistic accomplishments and developments which “took place outside our educational establishment,” the text emphasizes: “But our schools took no notice.” (CS, p. 33) American society is presented as consumed with nation-building, scientific and industrial revolutions, and a series of wars, economic disruptions and social upheavals. Even with an increasing attention by the federal government to art (Works Progress Administration) and to education (National Defense Education Act), the text presents American society as always postponing attention to its spiritual need for the arts, its people who created indigenous arts and, particularly, the development of its children’s sensitivity to the arts. Acknowledging that change in any policy environment comes slowly, a recurring theme throughout the text is that teachers are poorly prepared and resistant to educational change.

Field of Concomitance

The Panel’s 25 members were selected “not for their professional experience in the field of arts education, but for their concern about the arts, their concern about
education, and their concern for the way Americans live.” (CS, p. viii) From this statement, it follows that analogic confirmation from and the influence or transfer of principles or premises from many other discourse fields is present in the resulting text: the members are “representatives of the arts, education, mass communications, labor, arts patronage, government, and other fields.” (CS, p. viii) Noticeably, art educators are missing.

In order to understand the contemporary policy environment, The Panel looks at principles, practices and impacts resulting from previous policy structures and processes on arts education; it looks at “the historical threads and present policies, as well as the constraints on those policies, which emanate from government—first federal, then state, then local governments.” (CS, p. 217)

Also, it looks for transferable models: The text cites other cultures (France, Indonesia, Nigeria and Japan) as models for integrating the arts in life and education. Closer to the American experience, two obvious models of reform are cited for inspiring reform in arts education. The first model is aligned with the underlying belief in the “community.” Defined primarily as those “who share common social characteristics, norms, and values” as well as geography, community is viewed as the major untapped resource for artists and educators; the text points to the advantages of regional arts councils, models derived from European examples and programs designed “to institutionalize the culture of the masses.” (CS, p. 187) Downplaying the critical or aesthetic judgments, multiple examples of already established community art centers (“non school” arts resources), are described for their social value. “Who should teach the arts? “How shall the arts be taught?” These questions are the crux of the ideological
position of the text: “Teachers who work in the classroom and who have been trained as educators often believe that they alone know the best kinds of activities for instruction, especially for younger children. However, many artists feel the arts can be taught best by those who know the arts best—those who produce them.” (CS, p. 189) Junius Eddy is quoted: “...neither professional teachers nor professional artists have an absolute monopoly on the best ways to teach the young.” (CS, p. 194) Ironically, in support of community art resources, he cites as a benefit one of the major concerns of educators: “...these centers reduce the need to “enrich” the regular curriculum.” (CS, p. 194) A second potential model comes from earlier federal reforms in science and physical education and art. With a “nudge from Sputnik,” the science education reform of the 1950s and with a “lateral pass from the Kennedy clan, the nation reaffirmed that physical education was essential,” (CS, p. 11) Also, the National Endowment’s success in promoting the professional arts organization and artists implies a better model or rationale for arts education.

Seeking justification for its argument in higher authority, the panel cites the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Board of Education (September 1971), one of its strongest resources for its curriculum rationale. Claiming that “These are not new ideas,” it establishes its goals as fundamental to a larger general education discourse, of the present and the past. (CS, p. 9) However, in an examination of government impacts, The Panel’s report repeatedly emphasizes the antipathy of educators toward the arts until after 1962 when the Arts and Humanities Program within the Office of Education “was established to develop programs and activities aimed at improving arts education at all educational levels.” (CS, p. 219) Citing pivotal political events occurred within a year
(the Kennedy administration, the Heckscher report, and the appointment of Francis Keppel as Commissioner of Education and Kathryn Bloom as director of the AHP) the text demonstrates the need for “a higher authority” to reform the field.

**Field of Memory**

Linking early education policy with protestant religious beliefs and “democratic and republican theories,” the text charts an antipathy in the relationship between the arts and education. Education was an instrument to disseminate the Protestant work ethic, a blend of vocation or calling, work, material reward and spiritual salvation. The arts were not affiliated with either the institutionalization of education or government. The American Enlightenment introduced a new perspective, a belief that reason was the key to “perfectibility” in man and “the effective working of a free, democratic society.” But as the text points out: To the historian of education, all this is most heartening. To the art historian, it is considerably less so.” (CS, p. 27) Evidence of arts activity is presented as sporadic and existing outside of any social organization; it’s filiations were divided: American arts serviced the utilitarian and decorative purposes; the American “elite,” on the other hand, looked to England for cultural products.

Clearly, the curriculum rationale and program theory presented in the text have roots in the community arts movements in the twentieth century and before. Apprenticeship programs, appreciation programs, cultural identity programs, therapeutic programs, leisure-time activities and quality-of-life programs incorporate the arts into everyday life of all age groups and, as such, provide resources and models for institutional learning. Most of these program are defined by an instrumental purpose and function through some form of direct experience, either in creating or responding; as such
they exemplify the Panel’s concern for sensory stimulation through the arts, minimizing
the negative effects of institutional teaching and learning and using the arts
instrumentally “to counter the disjunction between art and life....” (CS, p. 182)

Finding its incentive for reform in the development of the federal government’s
role in arts and education in 1962 (legislation, agencies and programs), the text assesses
general policy weaknesses resulting from the low priority given to education within HEW
and a lack of a coherent philosophy guiding federal policymakers across numerous
“education” agencies and programs. However, aligning with the successes of the NEA,
state art councils and the local programs supported through this infrastructure, the text
suggests the resistance of educational professionals can be overridden by participation of
the concerned citizen. In a similar promotion of political action outside of the
educational system, local councils and municipal arts organizations are seen as political
leverage to impact the schools. Supporting community resources as an alternative to arts
education, the text quotes the mother of Margaret Mead: “I wanted my daughter to have
an education, so I kept her out of school.” (CS, p. 195) The text continues with rhetorical
questions: “Is the job of integrating the arts into education on a nationwide basis too big
for the schools” Can the Schools alone provide the right environment? If not, where do
we turn?” (CS, p. 195)

With the legacy of CEMREL, Arts-in-Education of the JDR 3rd Fund, the Alliance
for Arts in Education (and the Kennedy Center), and the NEA Artists-in-Schools
program, the Panel views itself as part of a transformation in the field of arts education.
Previously existing as two distinct cultural streams (education and arts), it is “...not until
the last thirty of the three hundred years do we see sure signs of the two lines converging,
of conscious effort to move the study, practice, and appreciation of the arts from the periphery of the educational experience toward its center.” (CS, p. 47) Nonetheless, the text presents arts education as gaining continuity and strength from the arts embedded in communities and sustained by interested patrons; discontinuity with the educational system offers many policy barriers that must be overcome.

**Procedures of Intervention**

**Rhetorical Practices and Discoursal Mechanisms**

Rhetorical structures often are inseparable from the details of discoursal mechanisms in a given text. Therefore, this study combines the analysis of their interaction. Additionally, as Foucault makes clear, “These procedures are not in fact the same for all discursive formations....” (CS, p. 58) But identifying the dominant rhetorical and discoursal interventions and categorizing them by their textual function discourse-by-discourse provides another dimension of understanding policy formation or a recreated unity.

The comprehensive nature of this report may result from the Panel’s recognition of its pivotal position as one of the first research documents of its kind in arts education produced by an advocacy organization. Yet, the text applies a somewhat traditional research format. With a rather impressive list of “Resource persons” and “selected” bibliography, the text systematizes the discourse field, offers significant insight into individual and organizational participation by transcribing discourse field activity, reviews the characteristic research and criticism of the period, and reviews the background of government sponsored legislation and agency activity typical of the period. Supported by 15 grants from government and private sources, the 25 member
Panel credits only four individuals as project staff. However, transcription or approximation of 313 resource persons who gave testimony before the Panel, who were interviewed by staff members, or who participated in special meetings is incorporated in multiple ways throughout the text.

With well over 300 pages, *Coming to our senses* (1977) offers many possibilities of categorizing rhetorical examples. But it overall formal construction follows a typical pattern of argumentation despite its apparent intent to present research results. Although the text combines historical, interview/testimony, and survey techniques, the research questions are narrowly defined to certain, it would appear predetermined, issues. As a result, the text relies on a translating process to make the necessary connections between the broadly-stated thesis and the research results. Similarly, even factual historical and survey data is organized and presented with interpretative side commentary to connect it to certain conclusions which are not always self-evident. And, clearly, the selections from interviews and testimony are chosen and applied within the context of persuasive argument.

Summaries and interpretations of referenced reports and research projects are obvious areas in the text to examine for ideologically influenced ideas. In “Summary of questionnaire responses: sixteen school districts,” the categories themselves are indicators of the overall intent of the Panel. The text systematizes narrowly defined areas of school responsibility: by priority of goals, staff qualifications and performance evaluation, program and staff development, apparent scope, content of program and teaching approaches in the arts, sources of support, number of personnel, staffing patterns of music and visual arts programs, nonschool resources, evaluation of programs, existing
programs—their strengths and problems, improvements, innovations, and future plans. With a similar focus, 19 research reports were prepared for the final project; their summaries represent examples of rewriting and restating mechanisms. Six reports present research on existing curriculum theory and practice at various grade levels, 5 reports focus on improving teacher personnel, 5 reports explore nonschool policy arenas as resources for improving in-school programs and 3 report interviews of leaders in education, art and art education, on-site interviews and questionnaire responses from school personnel.

After the introduction of its speakers, the text presents its problem definition and problem solution or thesis. The Panel confines the “problem” to the school and, therefore, the “solution” can be sought outside of institutional learning. Before going forward, it presents a focused historical summary of the traditions and political factors resulting in the contemporary policy environment for arts education. Taking an all-encompassing perspective on arts in society, the Panel, nonetheless, targets certain topics for examination: age group (children), funding source (public), location (schools), target group (amateurs) and learning experience (participation). Three extensive sections deal with the curriculum and the Panel’s recommendation according to levels of schooling: the primary grades, the secondary grades and higher education. With “Powers behind the curriculum: teachers, artists, administrators,” the text begins to evaluate the program structure and delivery of the institutional curriculum. Broadening its focus to the art traditions and resources within communities, the advances of technologies and, finally, the growing support mechanisms of federal, state and local governments, the configuration of the text pulls the institution of schooling into a larger policy context, and
insinuates new criteria should be applied. By doing so, the final recommendations reflect, not only an educational world view and/or the curriculum rationale on content and instructional methods, but also a social and political perspective on the purpose and function of art.

Case study examples of successful programs (most referenced as NEA Artist-in-Schools programs) incorporating the Panel’s recommendation is the most common discursral practice; the text attempts to substantiate its position through sheer accumulation of examples. Transferring application of short descriptive accounts of programs, grouped according to various arts, levels of schooling, duration and degree of integration into the curriculum, the cases are presented as vignettes connected and interspersed with persuasive commentary (the use of quotations from panel members and outside authority) in a semi-dramatic structure. Another example of transfer application: although this study is concerned with text as policy statement, it should be noted that *Coming to our senses* (1977) makes extensive use of imagery (photographs, paintings and visual culture, poetry, cartoons, newspaper clippings) about the positive effects of art and the negative effects of schooling on students.

**Recreated Unities: Idea Formation**

Via rhetorical structures and discoursal mechanisms (mechanisms such as rewriting, transcribing, translating, the approximation of statements, transfers of application and new forms of systematizing and organizing ideas), a distinct perceptual process is created in *Coming to our senses* (1977). The ideological and functional policy “objects” can be traced from one policy statement to another within the discourse field, and are used to construct a distinctive belief system in *Coming to our senses* (1977) The
text identifies the major problem as: the quality of daily life is emotionally deprived and
the ability to organize our environment is diminished because “...American education
exaggerates the importance of words (over senses) as transmitters of information.” (CS p. 3)

Other conceptual groupings selected as nodal points in this study are centered on the
need for sensory training, developed perceptual ability, experiences in individual
communication skills and individual emotional fulfillment through expressive activities.
These purposes are related to statements of art function: Art expands sensory experiences, multiples “ways of knowing,” develops a non-verbal literacy parallel to other necessary tools in the learning process, offers transferable skills to other forms of learning and insures individual emotional health.

**Discourse Text #2**

Only two years after Leilani Lattin Duke announced the formation of the GCEA at the NAEA conference in Detroit in 1983, the text, *Beyond creating: The Place for art in America’s schools* (1985), was published. Against a backdrop of national concern for educational standards (and the limitations of the “basics” solution), the GCEA responded to the school reform movement (reflecting “a renewed American spirit in the ‘80s”) with an arts curriculum based in traditional and rigorous academic disciplines of history, aesthetics, and criticism to supplement production skills. (BC, p. iv)

The text addresses issues effecting student learning in art, its workplace utility in the society (including the value of a discipline-based curriculum as means for achieving a place for the arts in America’s schools). *Beyond creating* (1985) is a collection of papers by individual scholars and researchers whose views are aligned with the institution’s perspective. The text intersperses institutional positions on arts education reform with
scholarly or critical “Perspective.” Ernest L. Boyer, William F. Kieschnick, Elliot W. Eisner (with the conclusions of The Rand Corporation) are speakers for broad issues of educational values and political interests in education. Also, “sketches” of seven selected school districts are included which exemplify the issues, problems and successes of translating the theoretical ideal into practice and of making recommendations for an orderly program initiation, implementation and maintenance scheme. Typical of the Center’s dependence on authority, over “100 art education experts” were asked to identify model programs adhering to the “theoretical ideal” and prominent researchers Brent Wilson, Elliot Eisner, Robert Stake, Marjorie Wilson, and Michael Day presented these case studies. (BC, p.24) The GCEA acknowledges the diverse ideas represented in the studies: “These statements and sentiments vary widely, and not one among them presents the best or the definitive argument.” (BC, p.13) Those aggregated ideas do, however, reinforce the organizational perspective and are traced through four sections specifically “authored” by the GCEA: The “Introduction,” “Art is Fundamental,” “Learning art: Sketches of Art Education in America’s schools,” and “Critical Elements in Changing Art Education.” Two sections are chosen to present the enunciative series: “Introduction” and a portion of “Art is Fundamental.”

**Forms of Succession: Rhetorical Schemata**

The validity of these enunciative forms as a reflection of the organizational bias, their significance established through their use in argument (dependence) and, finally, the function in the perceptual process are, of course, qualified by the subjective interpretation of the enunciative series itself. Nonetheless, a summary of the GCEA’s text appears to emphasize reasoning, with little reference to factual or descriptive information. As might
be expected, the meaning of the enunciative form is dependent on a structure of hypothesis and verification. This text makes significant use of implication. However, either through generalization based on the application of general law or specification based on assertions from outside criteria, the text is equally dependent on levels of interpretation.

Granting that “Art belongs to everyone” because it stimulates “very personal meanings,” the text, nonetheless, limits or qualifies the value and uniqueness of individual response. (BC, 2) Individual response depends on an understanding of art (achieved through education) and a student’s understanding depends on an acquired knowledge and training in critical skills. With a definite bias against the minimalism of the “basics” movement (defined as the three R’s), the text sees such restrictions in reform efforts as “a paradox,” as robbing students of “humankind’s highest achievements,” and, in the process, denying them preparation for “all of life’s experiences.” (BC, 2)

Dispelling the notion that “art education lacks fundamental importance,” its inclusion in the curriculum is linked to abandoning current instructional strategies; strategies that convey, exclusively, the idea that “people need little or no formal education to experience, comprehend, and create art (BC, 2) The text asserts that the dichotomy between art and traditional academic courses must be abandoned, while traditional courses “stress thought, reason, and ideas, art courses have sought traditionally to engage children’s imaginations, feelings, and emotions.” (BC, p.3)  Viewing art as “a repository of culture,” the study of art is a principal means of understanding human experience and transmitting cultural values.” (BC, 2) By understanding art’s cultural and historical significance, art education “enables people to appreciate and understand
mankind’s highest artistic achievement.” (BC, p.4) This statement depends on several tenets: a preconceived standard of excellence, the belief that understanding is a precondition of “appreciation.” And, finally, that “innovative thinking and problem solving,” both perceptual and analytical abilities,” are the end result of an intellectual focus in art study. (BC, p.4)

Despite the many negative indicators to the opposite in the schools, “Art is Fundamental” (BC, p.10) because it is one of three ways humans collectively document their lives. (Boyer cites deeds [acts], words, and images) “Creative Intelligence,” described as the use of these multiple means of expressing “thoughts and feelings,” is the process of developing “their [students] minds and intellectual capabilities.” (BC, p.11) The text reasons that the more “kinds of knowledge” presented and the more “ways of knowing” used in the curriculum, the more likely students will fulfill their “fullest potential.” (BC, p.11) The arts are collectively seen as various ways of experiencing or knowing that ultimately contributes “to an understanding that is unique and different from that gained through verbal and written language.” (BC, p.11) For this reason, the arts, specifically the visual arts, must be considered integral to the learning process.

**Forms of Co-Existence: The Discoursal Schemata**

**Field of Presence**

“The Center demonstrates the Trust’s commitment to fostering knowledge about the visual arts among individuals of all ages, as well as among professionals dedicated to the study, research and conservation of works of art.” (BC, p. ii) This statement hints at the fields from which the organization draws its ideas and values and the character of its advocacy. Although accepting some practices or ideas of other fields such as education
and business, academic disciplines, art traditions are foundational to the Getty rationale. Through its own speakers such as Harold Williams and Leilani Lattin Duke, the GCEA also references and repeats established and traditional views from other areas in the professional art and academic world; it aligns its educational rationale with values, beliefs and perceived intellectual processes accepted by these fields.

In addition to these academic associations, a study of the Rand Corporation, “noted for its excellence in research,” is another way in which the Getty offers logical validation for it recommended curriculum. Although not acknowledged in the text as a commissioned project of the Getty Trust, the Rand report is credited indirectly with the establishment of the Center, as the incentive for the search for model schools presented in Beyond creating (1985) and, then, the Getty claims “With the findings of this study, the GCEA’s policymaking is further informed.” (BC, p. iv) A rewriting of the Rand report, a text report summary, claims that the rationale had been supported for the last twenty years by leading art educators. Yet, based on the summary, it appears the Rand report itself does not address the Getty rationale itself; the report’s focus is implementation. The dominant issues addressed in the report are advocacy directed at all audiences and dealing with structural reform, the design and support of model programs, professional development and research and the development of a knowledge framework (organization and theory) to guide DBAE practice. Also, validating research initiated in 1981 by the Getty, the text refers an early “series of surveys of art education in the United States;” but the text does not identify this survey as the work of the Rand Corporation. (BC, p.2)

The presentation of seven experimental programs by noted researchers in art education is a clear attempt to offer experimental verification of the value and feasibility
of the Getty’s rationale. However, described as a year-long examination of “the substance and quality of public school arts education programs, particularly those in the visual arts,” this is a search for selected schools that would supply evidence to substantiate a predetermined point of view, a view offering a specific problem definition and program solution. Controlling for geographic and economic diversity, the study documented perceived problems and successes, both in the curriculum and program implementation. Characterizing these selected programs as “pioneering efforts to break with tradition” and complimenting school personnel for the “openness, cooperation and enthusiasm” in providing thorough and accurate information, the Getty often critiqued these chosen school programs as still insufficient and teacher concerns or criticisms about DBAE unwarranted.

The Getty position is further defined as it attributes error to previous rationales and practices impacting the schools. Attributing the weakness in visual art education to the traditional art education networks and traditional curriculum emphasis on “fostering creative expression and developing artistic skills,” to a growing emphasis on the “basics” movement, and to continuing attitudes among the public that art is a “frill,” the Getty defines itself in opposition to the status quo.

Field of Concomitance

The three “perspectives” offered in the text are examples of the manner the GCEA uses authority and commentary from other discourse domains. Drawing upon Ernest Boyer (“Art as language: Its place in the schools”) and William F. Kieschnick (”The Signals of art to the workplace”), the text relates analogous activities and general principles between the larger discourses of general education and of the business world.
Not totally aligned with the Getty’s perspective, both Boyer and Kieschnick’s articles refer to other curricular orientations. Boyer argues that art is “basic” because it is an image-based, non-verbal language. In addition to communication benefits, Kieschnick argues “intellectual and practical” benefits to “the receiver” or audience; these instrumental benefits transferred into the workplace support innovation and the capacity to deal with ambiguity. Elliot Eisner (“Why art in education and why art education”), on the other hand, argues the arts as having intrinsic values not found in other domains, values that represent the highest of human achievements. He argues that such values must be accessible to all students within the society and to the individual student in order to develop unique mental skills. Such a large task in a society, he concludes, must be the responsibility of public schools. The inclusion of these discourse streams and perspectives is an important attempt at consensus building.

The Getty may not disagree entirely with these perspectives, but its advocacy goals are more directed. Ultimately, the text seeks models among established art education programs across the country, not from other or unrelated domains. However, with a decidedly intellectual (possibly elitist) point of reference, quotations are inserted throughout the text of higher, but sometimes unrelated authority; highly visible artists, politicians, scholars and intellectuals (and educational reformists) support and define the Getty perspective. Peppered throughout the text are isolated quotes of a diverse population: philosophers such as Alfred North Whitehead, politicians such as Scott Matheson, John F. Kennedy, artists such as Georgia O’Keeffe, Andrew Haiskell, Paul Strand, Arthur Mitchel, Bob Dylan, Ansel Adams and critics and scholars such as Lewis Mumford, Suzanne Langer, Barbara Tuchman.
Field of Memory

As the first publication of the organization, the GCEA had very little institutional memory regarding art education to inform *Beyond creating* (1985). With a few specific references to the immediate past of arts education, it affiliates its position with global traditions of academe and the art world; these fields provide the “genesis” for arts education. The document arises in a period of rapid, on-going transformation in the field of art education. This text is groundwork for changing the direction of the curriculum; and later, exemplifying a social and historical discontinuity, the Center, ironically, identifies its role as aligning the field with an established art discourse. Continuity with preceding art education discourse definitely is not the Getty’s goal.

Procedures of Intervention

Rhetorical Structures and Discoursal Mechanisms

Ironically, the text has many characteristics of the “non-academic” publications of the period; it is a compilation of visual and language texts ordered and sequenced to communicate a given perspective in different dimensions and levels. Reminiscent of “coffee table” publications, the text (particularly in “Art is fundamental”) applies colorful, art-related objects, children’s art, cultural artifacts, “fine” art and “blocked” quotes from a range of prominent intellectuals, etc. to the written justification for art education.

In addition to this textual collage of loosely related ideas, *Beyond creating* (1985) is formally constructed argumentation supported by authority, survey and case study summary. Following a “Forward” by the president of its major funding source The J. Paul Getty Trust and a “Preface” by the director of the GCEA, Leilanni Lattin Duke, the
text of approximately 75 pages presents its argument in three short expository sections. Credit for the second, “Art is fundamental,” is given to 11 well-known art education scholars. This section describes and explains the four traditional academic disciplines or conceptual groups as they are regrouped for their respective roles in a DBAE curriculum. The “Introduction” and the policy recommendations, “Critical elements in changing art education,” it must be assumed, are the work of the GCEA staff. The first section is a short rewriting and restating of policy rationale: theory into practice, a one paragraph summary of the Getty’s research “findings,” and enumerated factors and phases involved in implementation. The second section, while offering “a change in perspective” (particularly in regard to academic rigor, etc.), articulates a call for advocacy, but transfers its routine application by redesignating roles of art advocates, district or outside resources, teachers/principals, art specialists. Community or parents are not mentioned specifically.

Unique in its internal configuration, the text intersperses authoritative essays or “perspectives” after each stage in the argument presentation. However, the case studies or “sketches” of selected school programs observed break this pattern early in the text. Collectively, they represent approximately one-third of its length and are data filtered through scholarly perspectives of five authorities. However, the format and the intent of these summaries appear predetermined, and, reflect an application of accepted ideas to a new situation. In this respect, the text exhibits a reorganization of concepts, a new systematizing of knowledge. In contrast, the 5-page conclusions and implications of the Rand Corporation, according to the GCEA, drew many of its own conclusions from its cross-site analysis. The Rand report is presented last in the text with a disclaimer:
“However, the Getty does not necessarily endorse or agree with all of the Rand conclusions presented.” (BC, p.74) Additionally, the briefness of the report summary (an approximate reflection of the original report) and its positioning at the end of the text diminishes its importance and impact, reducing it as a valid or normative statement or a statement of “actuality.”

The resulting overall statement in Beyond creating (1985) is made by the association and accumulation of ideas rather than by a linear argument. These sections interjected within the text serve different but reinforcing functions. Although the underlying premises of the three “perspectives” are not always coordinated, they provide additional layers of theoretical justification; major (and often controversial) issues such as “art as another language,” “art as transferable skills” and “art develops human capital” are described to dispel resistance to or to build support for art education in general. None of these pieces offers more than a statement of opinion, nor do they actually indorse DBAE. The ultimate rationale for their inclusion must be sought outside of the text itself in the authority and reputation of the speakers. In contrast, the short characterizations of seven school districts clearly apply DBAE as unstated program evaluation criteria to “found” situations. Only one instance is noted where the case studies impacted the “theoretical ideal” is significant: “When the Center’s art educators began studying the programs in these districts, the definition of discipline-based art education was (and is) still evolving. Since then, the Center has added aesthetics to its definition.” (BC, p.25)

While reflecting a deliberate inclusion of programs for geographic and economic diversity, a common format for these case studies includes demographic data on the district, academic goals, graduations requirements and achievement levels of students in
the general curriculum, staffing and scheduling patterns, funding and community support for the arts. Implicitly controlling the data, each study ends with questioning a practice or assessing some element of the policy environment for its potential or its weakness for continued growth toward a substantial model of DBAE. Based on these assessments, the GCEA identified and clarified critical elements for change, in other words, recreated a discoursal unity.

Finally, the Rand report summary (an approximation of itself) speaks only to expanding the knowledge base for art education; it does not recommend DBAE specifically in this text, but designates the conditions in order for DBAE to be successfully implemented: it suggests the need for more information and theoretical research, additional, well-developed models, professional training in DBAE and advocacy for the idea in and outside the field. The report summary conceptually systematizes its recommendations into broader categories applicable to any reform rationale.

**Recreated Unities: Idea Formation**

Again, the text structures produced from discoursal mechanisms create a perceptual process in *Beyond creating* (1985). And the recreated unities represent ideological and functional policy “objects.” Ultimately, these objects “define” the major “problem” in *Beyond creating* (1985) as the “low status” of art as a field of study; the lack of intellectual respect for the field is the result of a narrow content base which limits expectations for students to understand “the cultural and historical contributions of art or how to value, analyze, and interpret works of art.” (BC, p. iv) Other conceptual groupings selected as reference points in this study are centered around “creative intelligence” and
its need for increased kinds of acquired knowledge (with an emphasis on visual ways of knowing), a developed intellectual understanding as a precondition of aesthetic response and appreciation, learning experiences that reinforce cultural contexts, legacies and transmission, and higher expectations for achievement according to a preconceived standard (scope and depth). These purposes are related to statements of art function: Ultimately, art produces an adult population and audience for the arts who will think creatively, but critically. Art knowledge expands intellectual understandings, and, with equal expertise and effectiveness, can parallel and complement other learning areas in the curriculum.

**Discourse Text #3:**

The *National standards for arts education: What every young American should know and be able to do in the arts* (1994), was a joint project of professional organizations of the four arts disciplines: American Alliance for Theatre and Education (AATE), Music Educators National Conference (MENC), National Art Education Association and National Dance Association (NDA). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* (1990) promised parity with other academic subjects on the condition that standards could be developed; it provided an incentive (inclusion in the national education agenda) and a focusing device for action (the creation of “standards”) by the Consortium of National Arts Education Association. The text is organized around the lengthy “Introduction,” the dance, music, theatre and visual arts disciplinary standards, and a shorter restatement of curricular values in the “Summary”. While the development of “standards” is the focus, the curriculum policy recommendations, a multi-faceted arts curriculum rationale in the schools, is presented in the “Introduction” and “Summary”
examined in this study. The virtues of arts education presented in the text are thought possible through goal standardization in the curriculum. Clearly (even without benefit of extensive analysis), a hybrid text, it reveals continuing policy “streams” or political trends evident since *Toward civilization* (1988). Many of the conceptual forms and their functions remain intact from earlier discourse texts. But strongly motivated to achieve political consensus, the organization often presents conflicting ideas/perspectives and/or unresolved issues. Consequently, the flow of Foucault’s “perceptual process” in this text often is disjointed. The “Introduction” is chosen to present the enunciative series.

**Forms of Succession: Rhetorical Schemata**

The validity of these enunciative forms as a reflection of the organizational bias, their significance established through their use in argument (dependence) and, finally, the function in the perceptual process are, of course, qualified by the subjective interpretation of the enunciative series itself. Nonetheless, a summary of the Consortium’s argument appears to limit reasoning; it makes minimal reference to factual or descriptive information. As might be expected, then, the text is highly dependent on levels of interpretation, on either generalizations (the application of general law) or specifications (assertions based on outside criteria). Secondary, meaning of the enunciative form depends on a structure of hypothesis and verification.

Within the first six paragraphs of the “Introduction” to the *National Standards* (1994), a flow of multiple, interrelated idea fragments are presented that describe the functions of the arts in human experience. This first section, “Discovering who we are” serves as an overview of ideas that will emerge and be developed (with different emphasis) in the text. Gradually, with some effort, the ideas are related to an educational
purpose and/or function. This text rhetorically reflects the varied characteristics and conflicts of the discourse that produced it.

At the outset the text presents images of nomadic people singing and dancing that associate the arts as integral to human survival. Because humans “have an abiding need for meaning” and because “the arts have described, defined, and deepened human experience,” people “create art to make these connections.”(NS, p.1) Because art functions to “make connections” and create meaning, the arts also function as a device for generational continuity and for coping with social change. With images of humanistic and historical continuity, the arts are presented in epic dimensions as the “deepest rivers of continuity,” as the forces connecting, equipping, and pursuing existential questions: “Who am I? What must I do? Where am I going?”(NS, p.1) Through psychological devices, the arts enable the individual to answer such questions and, thereby, identify with the collective experience. In “What benefits does an arts education provide?” the text claims the arts “cultivates the whole child” via kinds of literacy and cognitive training (i.e. “intuition, reasoning, imagination, and dexterity” leading to expressive and communication skills). (NS, p.2) Offsetting the dominance of linear and sequential patterns of thinking “that separate the experiencing person from what that person experiences,” the arts offer cognitive balance. (NS, p.2) They “cultivate” and “trust” experiential data; they maintain the holistic connection between the person and the experience.

Also the arts are presented as integral to social change. By stimulating cognitive processes or “ways of thinking,” the arts are seen as promoting both individual and social reflection: “The arts have been a preoccupation of every generation precisely because
they bring us face to face with ourselves and with what we sense lies beyond
ourselves.” (NS, p.1) The arts promote competence and motivate all students to learn
through the examination of cultural legacies, of social diversity issues, of the values
inherent in the activities of everyday life and through the exercise of problem solving
skills (with “expressive, analytical and developmental tools” of art), through critical
thinking about cultural “products and issues,” through effective self-
expression/communication and decision making. Both the intrinsic nature and
instrumental uses of art contribute to its value; one allows the student to respond to a
“transcending dimension of reality” and the other develops personal skills and self-
esteeem necessary to make progress in other school disciplines, to meet the needs in
everyday life and the requirements of the workplace. (NS, p.3)

Again, seen as embedded in human nature, the arts are presented as part of daily
life, “often so deeply or subtly that we are unaware of their presence,” they are not easily
recognized. (NS, p.1) Examples given are on both pragmatic and transcendental levels.
References are to individuals by daily occupation assumed to be estranged from the arts:
the office manager “who has never studied painting, nor visited an art museum,” the
mother “who never performed in a choir,” the teenager who is a stranger to drama,” and
the couple “who would never think of taking in a ballet.”(NS, p.1) Social examples are
found in environmental and architectural design, in industrial and economic force, and in
entertainment. Many examples of art value (intrinsic and instrumental) are translated into
personal daily purposes and operations: they create cultures and build civilizations, they
encourage varied ways of knowing or cognitive systems, they provide personal
fulfillment and quality of life, they develop personal dispositions for a successful
adaptation to varied social environments and they convey that “each person has a responsibility for advancing civilization itself” through constructive use of his/her skills. (NS, p.1) “For all these reasons and a thousand more,” the arts are to be valued for themselves. (NS, p.1) Because they are fundamental in achieving “the fullness of our humanity,” they are “inseparable from the very meaning of the term “education.” (NS, p.1) At this point, the text defines the arts as basic knowledge and skills.

Finally, whether in pursuit of a meaningful life or earning a living, “to construct a vital relationship with the arts” requires “discipline and study” “as with any other subject.” (NS, p.1) Additionally, to insure both knowledge and skills sufficient to sustain students in a lifelong engagement in the arts, the arts must “speak powerfully to two fundamental issues that pervade all of education–quality and accountability.” (NS, p.5) Sequenced, comprehensive “work, practice and study” in the four arts disciplines to produces an arts literacy which can be assessed authentically on a student-by-student basis is the goal of the National Standards (1994). Equally important, the text looks to the past and the future by emphasizing cultural and historical heritage (with a focus on the global and the universal) and intellectual methods and higher order thinking skills supported by advancing technology.

**Forms of Co-Existence: The Discoursal Schemata**

**Field of Presence**

Although the National Standards (1994) were produced by established organizations each with a large membership of practitioners, the Consortium itself was new and focused on a single project; classifying it as an organization, that is, a discourse community accepting of the same tradition, authority and critique may be questionable.
But traceable policy premises from these preexisting professional associations are implied throughout the text. Clearly identifying with the normative values and rhetoric of the field of general education, the arts are viewed as “inseparable from the very meaning of the term education,” are synonymous with discipline and study, and hold implicit standards. The possibility that the arts may be used negatively is not considered.

An occasionally used rhetorical device, the text presents a few social functions for the arts, but implies there are many more. Yet actual textual reference to previous or current organizational practices for logical validations is a rare occurrence in the National Standards (1994). A notable reference documents the contribution of art education assessment techniques (portfolio review and auditions) to other content areas and “informs the perspective of the National Assessment of Education Progress....” (NS, p.11) Although not supplying a great deal of specific data itself, the text reminds practitioners: “As in any area of curriculum, tests and other measures used in assessing students in the arts should be statistically valid and reliable, as well as sensitive to the student’s learning context.” (NS, p.11) As with issues of instruction, no specific recommendations (beyond “a broad range of performance tasks”) for assessing the standards are offered. (NS, p.11) Furthermore, generalized statements implying experimental verification are referenced in non-identified studies; for example, the following statement is evasive and close to being misleading: “Further, numerous studies point toward a consistent and positive correlation between a substantive education in the arts and student achievement in other subjects and on standardized tests.” (NS, p.2)

Using inclusiveness as an advocacy technique, the text usually avoids defining its position by analysis of previous error. Besides the general criticism that public schools
lack “rigor,” a notable exception is a strong stance against “The argument that relegates the arts to the realm of passive experience for the majority, or that says a lack of “real talent” disqualifies most people from learning to draw, play an instrument, dance, or act, is simply wrong.” (NS, p. 4) Clearly promoting a sequential curriculum, the text takes a strong stand against substitutes to consistent study and practice: “while valuable, a once-a-month visit from an arts specialist, visits to or from professional artists, or arts courses for the specially motivated do not qualify as basic or adequate arts instruction.” (NS, p.11) In regard to national policy, the text favorably positions the United States as unique in the industrialized world because it does not have a national curriculum, because the National Standards (1994) speaks of “competencies” (not a predetermined course of study), and because state and local decision making is respected. The National Standards (1994) are presented as a framework or mechanism to insure national results.

Field of Concomitance

The arts are justified as integral to everyday personal, institutional, and societal functions. Analogic confirmation of art ideas and values presented in the “Introduction” is made by referencing examples of everyday life skills of the individual; the office manager, the mother, and the teenager. But in a less abstract manner, other policy practices within general education are cited to reinforce or legitimatize the standards. Besides a long list of endorsers, supporters, the on-going affiliation of the National Committee’s members and other Goals 2000 standards committees provide an extensive reservoir for borrowed policy ideas The most obvious example of this conformity is the format of the actual standards themselves: conformity to grade levels in sequencing, parallel distribution by art form, organization of competencies according to the
recommendation of “the arts education community, nationwide...,” the division of the standards by content and achievement and by levels of achievement (proficient and advanced).

Always emphasizing the social and historical function of art and art education and the importance of the collective human experience, the text also references general principles in other fields of study on several occasions: overlapping principles from child development theory, from multicultural studies, from science and technology, etc. But, in keeping with a holistic perspective, the broad statement of necessary knowledge and skills learned through experiences in the arts reflects a model for arts purpose and function similar to or derived from humanistic studies.

Certainly, the organization of the National Standards (1994) according to art fields (visual art, dance, music, theatre) transferred an established model from art world practice. Emphatic statements throughout the text reference the “the individual integrity” of the art forms, as models of subject matter, skills, knowledge and techniques: “A basic intent of the Standards is that the arts be taught for their intrinsic value.” Educational standards are an overarching “literacy” model, offering “basic points of entry into the study of the arts disciplines.” (NS, p.8) This newly created model expands art education beyond the arts into various instrumental uses in instruction. While the National Standards (1994) do not deal with instructional issues, the text confirms arts principles as tools for correlations and integration in learning.

Borrowing models from the professional art world, the political power and authority influencing the field of art education shifts away from the academic community. But simultaneously, the policy formation process includes deliberate
attempts to establish art educators as the final authority for policy in the field. While recognizing that arts education needs community resources and support, the text advocates the “rights and responsibilities” be returned to the classroom practitioner in areas of instruction, in establishing guidelines for sequential curriculum and in the consensus-building process. Policy formation processes are calculated to insure a “review of state-level arts education frameworks, standards from other nations, a succession of drafts by the arts education community, as well as consideration at a series of national forums where comment and testimony were received.” (NS, p.7)

Citing federal law, the passage of Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1990) (Title II) to support education standards is one example of appealing to higher authority in related domains. Using the criteria set forth by the National Education Standards Improvement Council, the text encourages standards that are internationally competitive, reflect the best knowledge of teaching and learning, and are developed through a broad-based, open adoption process. Additional influence in concomitant fields is evident in the NEA and the NEH grant process during 1992.

Field of Memory

The epitome of discoursal “borrowing,” the text incorporates general education perspectives from early in the century with more recent ideas that had grown out of “educational outreach” programs of the 1970s and beyond. Closely associating itself with the continuing effort of “the education reform movement of the last decade,” the National Standards specifically focus on one “crucial element” of achieving “a world-class education.” Specifically mentioning the “reform context,” generated in the 1980s with the
publication of *A Nation at risk* (1983), the text is a continuing response to the six national education goals announced in 1990 and, finally, the call for standards in *Goals 2000*.

Despite its organization according to art forms, probably the most significant characteristic of the actual standards themselves is the underlying dependence on the academic model of DBAE. Ironically, denying that every student should acquire the same artistic values, the text enumerates the understandings to be derived from specific questions, understanding that reflect the earlier disciplines of DBAE: What are the arts? How do artist work and what tools do they use? How do traditional, popular, and classical art forms influence one another? Why are the arts important to me and my society?

The *National Standards* (1994) reflects an on-going transformation in the schools’ role in social reconstruction; the text reiterates arguments for democratic access to educational benefits for all students, for attention to students with special learning needs and for students of diverse socio-economic and ethnic groups. While broadening a concern for student populations, the text also broadens the definition of arts in general to include ethnic and popular art forms and expands the audience role from a passive to an active engagement, from receivers of culture to participators making “their own contributions to the nation’s storehouse of culture.” (NS, p. 4)

In a concerted effort to establish a broad based political consensus, the text literally lists diverse curriculum policy ideas from previous time periods and educational rationales. Cognitive training, self-expression, cultural legacy, workplace and life skills and social improvement theories are streams of curricular philosophies incorporated in a summary of benefits. The text also argues both intrinsic and instrumental values for the
arts. All-inclusive goals expressed in familiar “catch words” and phrases (such as “personal fulfillment” and “fully lived”) from several generations of art education literature surface in the statement of promised outcomes of the National Standards (1994). (NS, p.5) Unfortunately, the text has limited success in integrating these ideas into a new paradigm, of establishing a sense of continuity. The implied justification is these varied “features” will “produce continuing streams of creative solutions” in an ever changing policy environment; “…even though the substance of each of the arts disciplines will remain basically constant, the changes created by technology, new cultural trends, and educational advances will necessitate changes in the Standards as well.” (NS, p. 6)

The reform or transformation implied by the Standards is in the institutionalization of the arts, not in curriculum content, instructional method, etc. Obviously accepting the complex and diverse structures and systemic policy environment of local school districts, the text still proposes “to change education policy at all levels, and to make a transforming impact across the entire spectrum of education. With teachers as leaders in the process, implementation calls for the engagement of an all-inclusive group of stakeholders.

Procedures of Intervention

Rhetorical Practices and Discoursal Mechanisms

The National Standards (1994) text uses a variety of thinly-veiled mechanisms to create a curricular policy statement; the resulting rhetorical characteristics create a new curricular perspective to generate discourse change. The text redefines the field and reconceptualizes arts education policy in the broadest terms in order to accommodate politically the largest audience.
Hoffa (1993) delivers a provocative (if not always balanced perspective) on policy language of those professional organizations that would eventually produce the National Standards (1994). Many of his observations about the strengths and weaknesses of policy statements reveal characteristics of the period. With reference to the Philadelphia resolution (1986), an advocacy statement developed by the NCEA which included the four national arts education associations, the GCEA, ACA and “a mixed bag of other arts organizations,” Hoffa characterizes the group effort:

The resolution itself addresses a broad range of issues in milquetoast language that is a mile wide and an inch deep and that studiously refrains from binding anyone to actually do anything that is specific or concrete. Groupspeak such as that in the Philadelphia Resolution may be the inevitable result of trying for consensus from such a diverse group and, indeed, the resolution seems calculated to gore no one’s favorite ox....” (Hoffa, 1993, p.5)

About a year later, DAM’T produced The National arts education accord; according to Hoffa, the document was more successful because it served as a joint policy statement as well as advocacy. Although writing before the National Standards (1994) were produced, Hoffa, no doubt, would have seen them as consistent with earlier policy statements and his earlier statement:

The overriding problem facing those who would seek coherent and useful policy guidelines in arts education is not the paucity of such statements but their superabundance and the imprecise language with which they propose unarguable generalities. The writing of policy statements in arts education has, in fact, become a game without rules that almost anyone can play and one in which there is little to deter the inept, the self-serving, or the self-appointed. (Hoffa, 1993, p.6)

In the attempt to achieve some unification of form, the National Standards 1994 model seems to be transferred from and aligned with the on-going process of other Disciplinary standards committees. Establishing rules of formal text construction (in this case, for transferable models) is a good example of Foucault’s “procedures of
intervention.” The advantages for the art education statement is the appearance of parity; if the arts curricular policy could textually conform to the formal constructs of other disciplines such as math, science, etc., deal with and provide answers to the same “authorized” educational policy issues, and provide a “road map” to equal benefits in implementation, eventually, it is hoped, it would achieve equal acceptance in the classroom. But the disadvantages of such textual procedures reside in frameworks based on generalizations which may or may not reflect the “actual” and substantive issues of the field, either of the practitioner or of the policymaker. Such procedures may have been what Hoffa (1993) had in mind regarding earlier arts education associations policy statements: “Even the most casual reading of such material reveals so much ambiguity and rhetorical overkill that it is difficult to determine whether it was intentional or merely the result of thinking in groups and writing in committees.” (Hoffa, 1993, p. 3)

The intent of the text appears totally persuasive in nature. It is divided into three sections that indicate the policy priorities: the societal virtues and functions of arts, the individual benefits from arts education and a summary of contextual education policy issues, problems and their solutions. Reinforcing the Consortium’s world view and emphasizing goals/outcomes, these sections each have a prescriptive quality that focuses on the end results for students collectively. By translating into similar formats many viewpoints, the explanation of the rationale often degenerates into bulleted “to know” or “to do” lists. While the text maintains the standards are technically “voluntary” and “are intended to create a vision for learning, not a standardized instructional system, the regrouping of concepts from a world view to standards, from goals to outcome statements is insufficient to cover the attempted “regulation.” Much harder to trace are the ideas and
concept relationships that have been lost or marginalized in the still larger process of restatement; the previously accepted statements of validity, norms and realities.

The text offers little or no specific substantiation for its position outside of listing its 61 endorsers, 30 supporters and 32 National Committee members; it attempts status by association. These professional organizations are characterized as “joining” the Consortium in “promoting the vision of K-12 arts education” and supporting “the goals and ideals implied in the National Standards for Arts Education.” (NS, p. 8) The text provides no clues as to the extent of agreement or disagreement from these diverse groups. Indeed, with the exception of a few contextual references to reform catalysts such as A Nation at risk (1983) and Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1990), the text cites no authority outside of itself, no research of any kind, and no bibliography of scholarship in the field. Even with the National Committee’s elaborate plan for an open political process, it is not clear from the text how extensively art educators in the field actually contributed to the National Committee efforts. Critics such as Hoffa (1994) have questioned the depth of participation:

The range and scope of those who were involved in developing the National Standards for Art Education, in one way or another, was indeed impressive—as it had to be to assure support for the concept from those whose backing was necessary if the standards were to be successfully implemented. The one group that seemed under represented in that complex and multilayered process, however, were those teachers of the arts who actually work with elementary and secondary students on a daily basis. (Hoffa, 1994, p. 2)

The National Standards (1994) text is not an attempt to champion a “rational” policy or a curricular ideal; it makes no effort to clarify the problem and find new or adaptive solutions. It defines the policy problem technically and offers a technical solution. Its function is to document a political consensus in a discourse field.
Recreated Unities: Idea Formation

The conceptual groupings found in the “Introduction” and “Summary” of the National Standards (1994) text and secondary texts of the Consortium provide multiple examples of discourse process. However, the recreated unity rests on problem identified as: without the meaningful connections provided by the arts between the individual and the collective experience, culture will not survive. Other conceptual groupings selected as conceptual reference points in this study are, educationally speaking, seldom distinct; they blend cognitive, emotional and spiritual abilities of an individual student encourage adaptive skills that maintain social institutions and generational continuity and facilitate social change, and promote survival through environmental and economic prosperity. Art purposes are related to statements of duality and center on multifaceted functions: Art gives individuals cognitive and emotional balance, integrates the individual into a collective experience, and contributes to cultural preservation and renewal. Art, by definition, is educational; it is characterized by knowledge, skills, and disciplined behavior.

Archeological Findings: Concepts

The rhetorical and discoursal schemata of concepts for all organizational texts allows for conclusions about concept and concept grouping usage in discursive activity; demonstrating the relative importance of specific textual forms, meanings and functions and their derivation from discourse practice.
Findings: Discourse Text #1

- In *Coming to our senses* (1977) the most common conceptual strategies identified in text form was interpretative in nature, through both generalizations and specifications.

- The dominant type of dependency between conceptual form and function was based in assertion and critique and usually was related to the categorical order of derivation, a borrowed construction.

- Together, they record the “perceptual process” and document the subtle shifts as meaning is constructed in the conceptual dimension of the discourse text.

- The appropriation of curricular policy ideas which co-exist with the AEAP text relies on witness testimony from diverse members of society, state level case study and antidotal school reports, and the organizations past positions on arts education.

- Collectively, these sources claim the attitudes in American society as responsible for culturally failing its children.

- As its diverse membership provided an inherent analogic confirmation from other fields, the panel focused on general policy principles, problems and practices, and on identifying models solutions from other cultures, community programs, and other reform movements.

- The Panel concluded that the authority from general education combined with federal intervention was needed.
• AEAP relies on the social/historical past of America to justify its position for arts in education.

• Unaffiliated in the past with educational institutions, the genesis for arts education is community-based and integrated into daily life; the organization proposes to transform the schools to this model.

• The rhetorical structure most common in Coming to our senses (1977) is associated with the “research report;” nonetheless, it can be characterized clearly as argumentation.

• Once the problem is defined and a solution offered, the text configuration intersperses report and case study summaries (rewritings, approximation of statement) to defend its position.

• The essence of the recreated discursive statement centers on the educational importance of “ways of knowing” through sensory perception, emotional experience, and expressive communication skills; art is a means to developing these transferable skills.

Findings: Discourse Text #2

• In Beyond creating (1985) the conceptual strategies appear divided between purely interpretative and argumentative.

• The dominant type of dependency between conceptual form and function was balanced between hypothesis/verification and assertion/critique.

• Functioning in between designation and derivation to create the “perceptual process,” and to document the subtle shifts as meaning is constructed in the conceptual dimension of the discourse text.
The GCEA draws its evidence from professional art experts and academics, professional research organizations, and its own sponsored case studies.

It sees the problem in art education stemming from the art education and education profession itself. As such, its text makes token references to figureheads in general education and business to confirm the importance of art; art education is presented as a means to an end.

Excellent models of art education are sought, almost as a “needs assessment.” Higher authority, within this text, refers to acclaimed artists and other individuals representing the power structures. The GCEA affiliates its art education position with global traditions of academe and art; art education is derived from or is an extension of these larger discourses.

Although the Getty looks to past traditions, it is a part of a transformative movement which seeks to provoke discontinuity.

The rhetorical structure most common is characterized as argumentation, however, the non-linear argument is presented, ironically, in a nonacademic format resembling a “coffee table” book.

Formally constructed around an explanation of its disciplinary theory and suggestions for policy implementation, the text “layers” or “collages” its predetermined criteria with references to authority, the Rand survey and seven case studies.
• The essence of the recreated statement centers on “creative intelligence” through academic interventions, through increased expectations in critical learning skills and through articulated standards of excellence.

Findings: Discourse Text #3

• In the *National Standards* (1994) the most common conceptual strategies identified were interpretative, particularly specifications.

• The dominant type of dependency between conceptual form and function was assertion/critique and was usually related to the order of derivation.

• Together, they record the “perceptual process” and document the shifts as meaning is constructed in the conceptual dimension of the discourse text.

• Besides the actual disciplinary guidelines, the Consortium accepts the framework of values common in general education; it seldom attempts to validate its position from specific practice or identified research.

• With a major effort to achieve consensus, the text does not analyze previous error, but attempts to present perceived weaknesses as strengths. While the Consortium rhetorically relied heavily on abstracted examples from everyday life to confirm its perspective. Also, the text draws models from other humanistic disciplines; the formation of curricular ideas is guided by those overarching ideas.

• It appeal is for federal government intervention of the federal government clearly is an appeal to higher authority.

• Past school reform efforts and multiple orientations impact the Consortium’s text; the text sends a somewhat mixed message: continuity
(regardless of its curriculum base) must be maintained as schools are transformed.

- Motivated by promised federal support for schools with standards and an established framework, the *National Standards* (1994) is a composite of many rhetorical structures blended with little discrimination; it is a technical response to an immediate goal.

- Likewise, it represents argument that is based in imprecise language and common generalities in the professional discourse.

- Following the established format for the standards process, the text addresses social, individual and policy areas in a persuasive and prescriptive manner; yet, it cites no authority, research, scholarship or even an identified constituency.

- The recreated statement is focused on unifying “dualities” in the human experience through blending the cognitive and emotional, through the individual and the collective, through cultural preservation and renewal.

**Meta Analysis of Model Effectiveness: Concepts**

The procedural tasks of the forms of succession function to 1) identify the order and sequence of conceptual unities as they appear in the policy text, i.e. how these systems are “ordered and deployed” to form a curricular policy statement, 2) to describe the manner in which concept groupings depend upon one another, and 3) to demonstrate how groups of conceptual statements are of relative significance. The forms of co-existence are explained 1) by identifying the conceptual groups present in the text which have been drawn from the discourse field of arts education, 2) by demonstrating
analogous concepts in different discourse domains of validity, normatively or actuality, outside of arts education, and 3) by showing the legacy from previous discourses in current discourse. The procedures of intervention are explored 1) by revealing various established formal conventions for designating meaning in concept groups, 2) by discussing the associated mechanisms and interventions used to convey the conceptual groupings and, 3) by describing the newly created conceptual unities.

The major strength of the model and the methodology is that it constantly monitors both internal (rhetorical) and external (discoursal) political influences on the “perceptual process” of the reader and anticipates their impact on the “recreated unity” (idea formation). The model and the methodology account for the sender/receiver duality; analysis is based on the sender’s text, but the actual analysis is on the “perceived” text of the receiver. The model relates the textual form of the sender’s discursive statement to the meaning derived by the receiver and demonstrates the complexity of ideas constructed between the two perspectives. Conversely, it traces the appropriated elements of argument from other discourses, other discourse communities, and past discourse. Detailed knowledge of the discoursal context and appropriated arguments are necessary to recognize powerful influences on the sender and the receiver. Finally, the model clarifies the techniques of argument (internal and external to the text) present in socially accepted language structures and interventions in the conveying and forming ideas.

The adaptation and application of Foucault’s theory in this policy model is less successful than other formations in gathering new or significant insight. Although it may be more usefully applied to different kinds of political documents, the detail of rhetorical analysis seems unnecessary for curriculum policy statements which, on a textual level, are
relatively transparent and simple. On another level, the enunciative series appears to be a technique to aid the receiver (or researcher) in identifying his own bias in reading the text, in recognizing the rational or irrational argument behind ideas being communicated and, therefore, in demonstrating how bias is constructed and perpetuated in the discursive process. Yet, this explication of textual concepts has no clear means of assessing the accuracy, complexity, or the significance of these interdependent processes. Obviously, the “perceived” argument has itself undergone an intervention; it is an “approximation” of the original. In short, once acknowledging that these biases exist, it is difficult to establish their specific importance to the discourses studied. And while Foucault’s intent may be for the receiver to recognize his/her bias, the purpose for the “forms of succession” remains unclear. Finally, while demonstrative of the influence of established language form and the processes of appropriation in discursive process on idea formation, the technical analysis of text and language structures and mechanisms is detailed beyond the needs of policy analysis.

**Summary**

The formation of concepts model and methodology function to uncover relationships of concepts in the process of idea formation within a single text. Foregoing a strict language “system” approach, the model reflects Foucault’s broader interest in the comparison of multiple, often dissimilar, dimensions in analysis. Through a detailed examination of rhetorical and discoursal mechanisms present within a single text, the model examines the written text for evidence of conceptual consistencies or inconsistencies. It accounts for these consistencies and inconsistencies by identifying the “perceptual” bias of the reader and formal “language” interventions responsible for ideational reformulation.
CHAPTER 8

THE FORMATION OF STRATEGIES: DEMONSTRATION OF MODEL

Purpose of Strategies Formation Model

The formation of strategies is concerned with discursive choices (both ideological and functional) of organizations based on the possibilities within their discourse. While dependent on the identification and description of text sources (objects), the analysis of the organization/community disposition (enunciative modes) and an interpretation of its ideological perspective revealed through language (concepts), the model promises a rationale for discursive action across several dimensions. Through intertextual analysis, the strategies formation, using indicators ("nodal points") from previous formation analyses, contrasts the organization’s discursive choice on the discourse field (points of diffraction), and compares the organizational text with the texts of other/opposing organizations or related discourses (points of determination) to establish the impact of the discourse field on discursive choice. Intertextual analysis in this model recognizes and identifies how the ideas and functions coexist, circulate, transfer, and modify themselves in relationship with non-discursive social limitations; limitations of stable factors of institutional structures, limitations of disciplinary or professional boundaries, and limitations of social or cultural belief systems. Because policy exists in a broader context than one social “reality,” “...we [in this study, arts education policy makers] are..."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points of Diffraction (Discourse Coincidence)</th>
<th>Points of Determination (Other Discourse Domains)</th>
<th>Authority of Function (Societal Constraints)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points of Equivalent Choices, Reasons, Mechanism</td>
<td>Points of Incompatible Choices, Reasons, Mechanisms</td>
<td>Points of Systematization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>Modes</td>
<td>Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Complexity</td>
<td>Environment Constraints</td>
<td>Outside Regulation &amp; Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological Conflicts</td>
<td>Formal System (Art Education)</td>
<td>Analogy, Opposition, Complimentary Delimitation (Art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Model (General Education)</td>
<td>Other/ Opposing Domains in Art Education</td>
<td>Avoidance of Choices, &amp; Reasons in Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art General Education</td>
<td>Modes</td>
<td>Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Social, Economic, Political</td>
<td>Institutional Local Control, Systemic Diversity</td>
<td>Professional Availability, Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>Contextual Institutional Professional</td>
<td>About Art, Artists, Artistic Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Education, Learning</td>
<td>About Art Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1 Formation of Strategies: Assessment of Policy Choice
enmeshed in a variety of discordant, incoherent and contradictory discourses....” (Ball, 1994, p.23) Despite this confusion, this model culminates discourse analysis in an attempt to disentangle idea formation, the interactive functions of the policy community through an analysis of policy decision making strategies.

As a primary goal for this study is to demonstrate Foucault’s mode of inquiry, the text selection has been broad and categorical in nature. Texts are selected for analysis that represent advocacy organizations in general education, in professional art education, and in art that were active at the time that the primary text examined in this study was published. The art world influences are represented by texts published usually within a three-five year period of the primary text; they represent available and accepted ideas of organizations with associated, but not identical political interests. Additionally, in order to trace possible influences of the primary text on the process of institutionalizing the arts within general education, the texts representing general education advocacy have all been published after the primary text. As the focus in the procedural tasks continues to shift, the role of various organizations will be viewed through various lenses.

First, based on “points” gathered previously on ideology and function, the points of diffraction model determines if the organizations consistently address the same issues with similar (equivalent) or contradictory (incompatible) impact on the discourse field. And, the model determines the points of systematization of these choices; for instance, it focuses on factors of policy complexity, implementation constraints of the organization, technological resource limitations, political, bureaucratic, economic, or ideological conflicts. By eliminating those choices made for apparently similar reasons, the model
finds only the disjuncture in choices; choices apparently dependent on the unique characteristics of each organization.

Secondly, the points of determination model assesses the rationale for choices made by organizations responding differently to the same discourse possibilities: By positioning the organization in a “constellation” of discourses: the other or opposing organizations are identified as formal, self determining systems such as art education, as analogous, opposing, or complimentary to other discourses such as the art world, or as a model or example of a larger discourse such as general education. Additionally, by exploring the “principles of possibilities” demonstrated by these other discourses and by identifying the reasons for avoiding certain discursive choices, the model tasks compare the organization’s choices with texts from the discourse field. The model functions to demonstrate the power (the stronger determinants: of advocacy, of larger or related discourse, of conditions of discourse, etc.) behind policy choices and their reasons.

Finally, the authority of function considers and accounts for the non-discursive, but established social beliefs, norms, practices in both discursive choice and mechanisms. Through an understanding of the constancy of societal practices, the model accounts for on-going contextual, institutional, and professional “problems,” “rules of appropriation,” and “idealizations.” The model seeks to understand the importance of these influences on art education discourse.
Discourse Field #1

Points of Diffraction

Points of Equivalent Choices

The AEAP was characterized by many choices compatible with status quo: these choices represent the acceptance of certain organizational practices, ideas and strategies reinforcing institutional continuity and stability. Since the choices of most concern to this study are those dealing with curriculum rationale and function, a summary of those dominant “stabilizing” elements (equivalent choices) in policy formation are summarized.

In regard to curricular values and concepts, the AEAP designates sensory training, perceptual proficiency, individual communication skill and individual expressive competence as basic values. Although the concepts are now expanded and altered to serve as tools in the learning process, these concept groups are excepted ideas from earlier progressive education movements, arts educators such as Lowenfeld and the arts themselves. With a focus institutional schooling overall, these ideas are now employed to make learning experiences more pleasant through exposure to the arts. Likewise, integrated curriculum occasionally was practiced. However, integrating the arts into all learning processes was an effort to work with established institutional practice and provides another stabilizing factor for the arts within the general curriculum.

Although its activities reveal a more organized and concerted effort for advocacy in arts education. The manner in which the organization articulates its ideology and its advocacy techniques generally was not new or unexpected. A key to the organization’s strategy, AEAP networked through established school programs and within federal
agencies; for instance, the organization served as a member of national level coalitions, linked its activities with other organizations and functioned collaboratively with school systems. Recognizing established power structures, it established “unparallel” links and connections between prominent stakeholders and policy makers in and out of education. Again, within the framework or “social agenda” of public schools and the contemporary trends in federal funding to education, many of its ideas were drawn from policy practices outside of the school environment and put to different use by the organization.

**Points of Incompatible Choices**

The AEAP (as is true with most “new” voices entering a discourse field) was characterized by many choices incompatible with the status quo: these choices represent the “new” ideas or the “new” use of change mechanisms (strategies) inherent in the organization’s position. Since the choices of most concern to this study are those dealing with curriculum rationale and program function, a summary of those dominant “change” elements (choices incompatible with existing discourse field) in policy formation will be summarized.

The discursive subgroups are contrasted with the discourse field (and within the primary text itself) for incompatible choices, particularly choices that distinguish this organization as pivotal in the formation of new policy approaches. The AEAP’s most obvious contribution to curriculum concepts was in unifying previous concepts in a plan of institutionalizing the arts in public schools. Central to that unification was the belief that all arts are designated as having a similar foundation (an aesthetic approach); building on the CEMREL concept that the arts could be integrated, the idea was expanded to see the artistic and creative process, experientially, as parallel to learning.
These ideas have a “new” use; they link art and learning functions. Reinforcing the idea of each art as a complementary “ways of knowing,” the arts were associated with the work of school. Based on that assumption, the arts had potential as a learning instrument in non-artistic, interdisciplinary study. Although not new in artist training, apprenticeships and “learn-by-doing” were new to the public schools. But advocating for a curriculum rationale heavily dependent on skills atypical in the classroom teacher required a new “artist-teacher” rationale.

Although private foundations had been involved in supporting the arts on a national level, the local school districts and state departments of education had not received the same attention from outside forces. Funding coming from outside of government to independent school systems was problematic. After its preliminary projects, the organization typically turned much of its advocacy away from the schools and sought support from arts professionals and experts in many fields.

Another new and similar strategy for impacting the school was the manner in which the organization distributed its resources to accomplish its curriculum goals. Again reaching beyond the schools, the organization addressed new audiences, different segments of the local and state population (outside of educators) that held power. Over a 12-year period, it quietly funded beginning projects and, finally, organized its advocacy campaign through printed publication aimed at the general public.

**Points of Systematization**

Systematically, AEAP strategies attempted to reintegrate the arts and arts experience into the social fabric through all available social institutions, including schools. Funding to local districts, collaborations with state departments of education,
and coalitions with federal agencies and national arts advocates, the AEAP mounted a top-down, outside-in effort to include the arts world (artists, art organizations, etc.) in education. While the ideas about art and its values were not complex, the recommended use of outside personnel, the artist-teacher, constrained teachers, schools and institutions from wide-spread acceptance. Professional concerns of teachers, consistent availability of artists, school and school district accountability were potential barriers. Conflicts over curricular ideology were not a major issue.

Points of Determination

Three documents were simultaneously published with *Coming to our senses* (1977) that represent the various relationships in the discourse field. In the first, art education is a formal system including “other discourses ...with various semantic fields...” (Foucault, 1972, p.66) First, *Try a new face: A Report on HEW-supported arts project in American schools* (1979) offers an opportunity to establish the position of the professional associations in the discourse field. Secondly, through the Alliance for Art Education’s *Toward coordinated federal policies for support of arts education* (1977), arts education is seen as somewhat analogous, sometimes in opposition, but mostly complementary to the arts world discourse. And thirdly, arts education is seen as one model of learning among several making up a general education perspective: *The Arts in education: Research report* (1978) by the National School Boards Association (NSBA) exemplifies that relationship
Economy of Discursive Constellation

The Professional Organizations

Throughout the 1970s, the advocacy work of arts educators was limited and dispersed between scholars, researchers, and practitioners; they were often isolated within the school or university environment and had little disciplinary cohesiveness. Notable research exceptions were CEMREL and SWRL (The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory) funded by the U.S. Office of Education (AHP) and NEH; primarily the product of academics (such as Barkan, Chapman, Kern, Madeja, Eisner, Efland), their advocacy through research evaluated and attempted to position “aesthetic” content in school curriculum through a variety of projects and programs: projects in curriculum development, administrator training, art and aesthetic content, teaching methods. Exploring the parallels between the scientific disciplines, scholars such as Manuel Barkan launched the idea that “...though the arts lack the formal structure of the scientific disciplines, its activities are nevertheless disciplined....” (Efland, 1990, p. 242) On occasion, CEMREL members made recommendations on the NEA’s arts in education programs, but apparently with little impact.

An awareness of policy issues impacting arts education was evident in NAEA as early as its Report of the commission on art education (1965); the Commission published a second Report in 1977. On the other hand, MENC was an active advocate in seeking out other support groups, but its early text production was not geared toward policy statement. Based on results of CEMREL’s work and a concern that the NEA’s involvement in arts education was only evident when the professional artist was benefited, the four arts disciplines (with funding from the USDE and support from AAE)
convened the Arts Advocacy Project in early 1976. The strategy behind the five seminars was to seek support from other educational groups outside of the arts who were involved in education policy. The strategic recommendations from these meetings were tentative, but significant: arts organizations (DAMT) should formalize their relationships in order to become more visible, the arts collectively needed to better integrate their goals with each other, school personnel, and the arts community, while maintaining a school orientation and continue to seek some “multiplier device” to reach the general public and decision makers. A year later in 1977, The Assembly of National Arts Education Organizations took place. Three years later, again with the help of the USDE, the four associations would set forth preliminary goals based on current field practices in the arts in *Try a new face: A Report on HEW-supported arts projects in American schools* (1979).

**Alliance for Arts Education**

Formed in 1973 by USDE and the JFK Center for the Performing Arts, the AAE (the educational arm of the Kennedy Center) is a national coalition of approximately 40 independent nonprofit state organizations. It espouses the following mission:

"Recognizing that the arts express the essence of civilization and nurture the highest aspirations of the human spirit, the Kennedy Center AAE Network is dedicated to the support of policies, practices and partnerships that ensure the arts are woven into the very fabric of American education." The Alliance is clearly an advocacy group committed to establishing the arts (using arts education as one tool) on the national art and education agenda. In 1976 it was instrumental in bringing together major education advocacy organizations (NAESP, AASA, NASSP, CCSSO, and NSBA) and arts education associations (NDA, MENC, ATA, NAEA) to assess policy issues in the field. After
jointly sponsoring these five seminars (recorded in *Arts education advocacy*, 1976), it became an active facilitator on a national level. Through initiatives such as conferences, published texts, and the dissemination of information on the field showing model programs for integrating the arts, the organization sought to merge existing policy agendas and advocated to strengthen the position of the field within the federal bureaucracy. Although its speakers, primarily Junius Eddy, had strong ties to other advocacy organizations such as AEAP, it collaborated with known art educators (Howard Gardner, 1973; Harlan Hoffa, 1977). Early in its history, with the publication of Gardner’s *Art education and human development* (1973), it aligned its philosophy with a cognitive argument for arts in education. Since the 1970s, its efforts continue to address issues and implementation barriers to arts in the curriculum with a policy strategy that upholds the instrumental advantages of the arts to other aspects of the curriculum and, later, to total school reform. A text representative of their work is *Toward coordinated federal policies for support of arts education: a Position paper of the Alliance for Arts Education*. (1977)

**The National School Boards Association**

Founded in 1940, the National School Boards Association is a not-for-profit federation of state associations of school boards. It represents the school board perspective before federal government agencies and national organizations that affect education and it provides information and services to state and local school boards that will aid in policy decision making. “NSBA advocates local school boards as the ultimate expression of grassroots democracy.” (National School Boards Association, 2004, p.1)
With a mission to foster “excellence and equity” in public education through school board leadership, NSBA

…supports the capacity of each school board--acting on behalf of and in close concert with the people of its community--to envision the future of education in its community, to establish a structure and environment that allow all students to reach their maximum potential, to provide accountability for the community on performance in the schools, and to serve as the key community advocate for children and youth and their public schools. (Website)

Currently, NSBA represents approximately 95,000 local school board members governing 14,890 local school districts. With its mission and the size of its membership in mind, it is significant that, of the many issues and constituencies addressed in its policy statements, only three major texts dealing with arts education have been produced by the organization during its existence and only one during the 1970s, The Arts in education: Research report (1978). However, organizationally, it has been a willing and supportive participant in initiatives of the arts education associations (such as proceedings published as Arts education advocacy, 1976) and other arts advocacy initiatives of federal agencies and state networks.

Principles of Possibilities

TEXT: Try a new face: A Report on HEW-supported arts projects in American schools (1979)

Without question the HEW’s interest centered on the arts as “vehicles, as motivational or learning tools, to achieve objectives in various “nonart” programs under the HEW triad--Health, Education and Welfare.” (TNF, p. v) Composed of 25 “case studies” (by six arts educators Eddy, Hoffa, Fowler, Chapman, Little and Gary), the study identified these programs as meeting HEW’s “broad and diverse” goals and explored ways “they advance and complement HEW priorities.” (TNF, p. v) Reflecting the
worldview or “new face” of arts education under federal guidance, this report demonstrates the intent of its HEW funding such as the Administration on Aging, the National Institute of Mental Health, the Social Security Act, the Professionals Development Act, the Career Education Act, the Older American Act and a myriad of programs focused on children and education.

Referencing the earlier recommendation for a cohesive ideological position in Arts Education Advocacy (1976), the project (within the framework of HEW objectives) defines the policy problem as a need for new approaches to learning in the arts compatible with broader education objectives. Beyond the general student population, the project was intent on including programs addressing a range of special needs groups. Programs are specifically designated and evaluated by their potential to solve problems of students who are culturally disadvantaged, handicapped, or need career education. For example, “Career education projects lead to those with strong Artist-in the Schools elements.” (TNF, p. viii)

One of the indirect results of the study was an evident concern for developing a more refined program evaluation and research strategy, a legitimate way of comparatively observing and presenting programs such as the IMPACT interdisciplinary approaches with programs stressing the “basics.” Although working out a research strategy conducive to advocacy, the overall outcomes hoped for appear to be issue identification, problem definition, and setting policy parameters. Also the need for language clarification was evident; “arts in education,” “arts education,” “aesthetic education,” “arts in the schools” were recognized as aligned with particular advocacy groups and positions. Other desired outcomes are varied; the text notes that the most
successful programs observed offer certain supportive practices starting with a desire to strengthen the grassroots support in the community-at-large, including arts specialists more closely involved in all school projects, and advancing the research methods for program evaluation. However, if the text still reflects uncertainty on many policy issues, it states a definitive position for a democratic, “arts-for-everyone” approach and for the schools as the major institution for safeguarding a democratic society:

...arts educators are frequently impatient with a government dedicated to equality that adopts a patronizing approach to artistic endeavor. Convinced that if there is to be Federal support for the arts it should build the base for a truly American culture rather than prop up imported institutions of other lands and other times, they voice strong expressions of frustration, if not outright dissatisfaction. They see millions of dollars for resource personnel (professional artists) but tiny grants to develop plans so that they may be used effectively. They see the unique American experiment in building a democratic culture frustrated by bureaucracy and by congressional committees or national panels that have no expertise in the field. (TNF, p. 4)

In regard to supporters of school programs, the report continues: they “have seen the lion’s portion of Federal support in terms of both finances and social philosophy going to the other camp, the frustration is hardly surprising.” (TNF, p. 5)

The curriculum content is not designated. Maybe it was assumed to be arts disciplinary in nature, however, a concession to the instrumental use of the arts was obvious, but the text emphasized the “knowledge that the creative process...is the really important thing.” (TNF, p. 2) “Defense of arts programs by what it does for improving learning of the basic subjects is probably to be expected in today’s education climate, but one does not get the feeling that these arts educators have sold out to the Philistines.” (TNF, p. 2) Instructional and assessment strategies were stated in broad terms; the text focuses on the integration of learning, learning by doing, learning dependent on
“...patterning, dramatizing, the early development of symbol systems....” (TNF, p. 3)

Concerning issues about the nature of student learning, the report addresses student learning with research questions as yet unanswered: “What is the proper relationship between student improvements in cognitive fields and increases in ability to think creatively?” (TNF, p. 2) “Is learning in the arts different ... from other more cognitive types of learning?” (TNF, p. 3)

Issues of program design and evaluation, instructional delivery and adequate teachers, funding, all issues dealt with in Coming to our senses (1977) two years earlier, are responded to in this report, but with a different intent. In a mode of inquiry rather than certainty, when the text comments on the need for research on program evaluation and confesses: “A strong aura of insecurity characterizes this report whenever it deals with evaluation” (TNF, p. 2) Based on a certain intuitive understanding, the text supports a shared responsibility for curriculum planning between classroom teachers and arts specialists. Although recognizing that critics of arts education in the schools “frequently complain of the level of artistry of the teachers,” the report suggests that “all is not sweetness and light” in the observed Artist-in-Schools programs. Urging the support for better teacher preparation: “Possibly, funding agencies such as the National Endowment for the Art should be concerned more with inspiring the artist that exists in teachers than in paying artists to try to be teachers....” (TNF, p. 4)


In 1977, the AAE assisted by the National Arts Education Advisory Panel (an ad hoc group of “the nation’s arts education leadership”), published Toward coordinated
federal policies for support of arts education (1977). Predominantly composed of
“federal agencies which administer visible legislative programs in this field,” private
foundations, congressional interests, universities, state and local arts councils, community
arts programs and AEAP members, only four professional association members
concerned with arts education (out of 31 members) sat on this panel. Directly
commending the AEAP, the Panel accepts unquestioningly their basic justification for the
arts and arts in the schools. Endorsing three underlying principles of the report (the arts
are central to individual learning and lifelong experiences, the arts deserve parity as a
basic curricular component, arts educators must draw “heavily” upon resources outside of
the schools), the National Arts Education Advisory Panel (NAEAP) “stands solidly
behind the vast preponderance of recommendations which have resulted from AEA’s
research and deliberations.” (TCFP, p. 4)

In response to criticism offered in Coming to our senses (1977), the policy problem
addressed in this text is identified as “the dispersion of responsibility and duplication or
fragmentation of effort among those Federal agencies which administer the major
legislative programs in arts education.( TCFP, p.5) Citing incremental legislative and
agency policy as responsible for the lack of a program rationale, goals and objectives, the
NAEAP assesses that communication mechanisms among all stakeholders must be
improved. Intent on rectifying the policy problems of the past, the text points to several
reasons for problems in the field. Citing the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities
(which has only an indirect mission toward arts education), the text claim the Council
“has never made arts education an area of special concern.” (TCFP, p.14) But, about the
greater responsibility for the lack of progress, the NAEAP is quite clear: “…it cannot be
denied that arts educators themselves, as well as their community-based allies, have failed to articulate clearly what it is they are really about.” (TCFP, p.13)

Characterizing itself as “the catalyst for the stimulation of crucial new legislation affecting arts education, rather than reacting individually after the fact to legislation which is initiated elsewhere,” NAEAP, nonetheless, clearly promotes the educational goals of the established programs in existence since the mid-1960s at the federal level. (TCFP, p.5) “Promising to do better,” the panel hopes to unify the policies of individual federal agencies in a coordinated effort to support and disseminate those same mandated programs.

In regard to curriculum content the panel was quite aware of the political problems of designating specific curriculum content: “The development of new kinds of curriculum materials would seem to be essentially (and quite properly) a state and local matter.” (TCFP, p.40) Yet, it promised support for research in this area: “No national curriculum can or should be promulgated in the arts or any other field of learning, but most of the other fields have, over time, developed a wide range of curriculum materials.” (TCFP, p.40) No doubt aware of the influence of federally endorsed research, its suggested models were CEMREL’s aesthetic approach and Harcourt Brace Janovitch series, Self-expression and conduct: The Humanities. Underscoring the need for experiential learning in instructional and assessment strategies, the NAEAP reinforces the AAE and the AEAP preference for learning in the arts as skill development. Beginning the process of redefining the cognitive with an affective component, the panel calls for assessment research aimed at measuring aesthetic sensitivity, expressive ability, creative development and attitudes and values.
Expanding on the same notion, the panel hopes to encourage extensive development in program design and instructional delivery through in-service training for non-arts teachers; thereby, using the arts processes to acquire new teaching skill and styles. Conversely, arts specialists would be drawn out of a singular arts discipline into a broader aesthetic awareness. But the panel views the artist as the ultimate teacher and educational catalyst in student learning, improvement of the teaching force and school change. As such, it reiterates its support for the concept of the NEA’s Arts in Education program leadership. Fully supportive of the NEA (developing “a wide cadre of professional artists who can work effectively in school situations”), the USDE (training professionals to deal with “larger sociological problems of contemporary schooling”), and appreciative of the practical know-how derived from the school-based projects funded by the JDR 3rd Fund, this text advocates for policy processes and strategies that build on existing strengths of federal programs, utilize community-based arts resources, involve all school personnel, communicate with school boards and school community; in other words, addressing problems from a top-down, outside-in approach to classroom planning, instruction and assessment. It also implies model program evaluation may be an important realm of responsibility for federal agencies with would fund and set criteria based on existing programs.


Even with the work of federal agencies preceding and during this decade, the NSBA’s marginalization of the arts is not unique among advocacy groups in general education at the national level. Despite the fact that *The Arts in education* (1978) was an outgrowth of five seminars sponsored at the initiative of the four professional arts
education associations and a host of groups representing general education, NSBA’s report, issued the year following *Coming to our senses* (1977), is, for all practical purposes, a digest of the AEAP publication. Understandably, its organizational concerns are defined by general education needs. Similar to arts advocates, the arts are viewed as a possible model for solving problems beyond the arts themselves. NSBA borrows and condenses from the AEAP text three purposes and functions of arts in education: art as “basic” to individual development, as “unique ways of knowing,” and as providing motivation, discipline and pleasure.

Although citing the extreme conservatism of the American public as the primary barrier to the advancement of arts education in the schools, the NSBA report targets more specific systemic problems as well: again, it seems, adopting attitudes and beliefs from *Coming to our senses* (1977), the report targets poor teacher preparation and the division of students into unjustified learning categories: creative participates (gifted and talented) versus future audiences as it’s major concerns. With little hesitation, the organization accepts the AEAP report solutions: to increase individual student creativity and self-expression at all levels, to accept popular and ethnic arts within the curriculum, to stimulate a new awareness of community institutions as arts education resources and to promote an interest in interdisciplinary training, particularly among the arts. Again, with several reservations (voiced by Elliot Eisner), NSBA recommends the Artist-in-Schools program of the NEA as aligned with the social objectives and education goals of the USDE aimed at children of low-income families, of minority and racial groups, with disabilities, and at creating employment of artists.
Similar to AEAP, NSBA does not advocate specific content; it only recommends “creative work” be made available to all students at every level. With little discussion of the relative merits of different arts education goals, the NSBA refers to the work of federally sponsored CEMREL and SWRL in art curriculum development. Similarly, in regard to instructional and assessment strategies, NSBA reiterates the call for learning through sensation, emotion and personal expression.

On many issues of program design and instructional delivery, the organization offers little in the way of its own or a new perspective. NSBA concurs with AEAP that the continued relaxation of school organization, increased student alternatives in both content and structure and the integration with community institutions will be conducive to the growth of arts programs. Only footnoting occasional recommendations of NAEA, MENC, NDA and the National Council of Teachers of English, NSBA states the need for artists-teachers, arts specialists, and artist-administrators in the schools.

**Principles of Exclusion**

A major exclusion in *Try a new face* (1979) is the heavy emphasis on sensory training and the importance of individual perceptual skills. Shifting the emphasis from emotional fulfillment through expressiveness, the text seeks connections (via research and evaluation) between art study, student motivation and new learning approaches. Skeptical about promising instrumental outcomes, the text withholds absolute judgment on the effectiveness of arts study as a solution to broad social problems. Deliberately distancing itself from the AEAP, “The Steering Committee of this project agreed that no recommendations should be made; no conclusions drawn.” (TNF, p.1)
Other non-curricular issues reveal opposition to the policy position of AEAP. The professional organizations, as might be expected, are decidedly supportive and optimistic view of about the potential of public schools and their ability to offer excellent programs in arts education. Drawing its “case studies” from programs identified by the “farflung national networks provided by the professional associations,” the text implies its sample may have a different or less bias perspective from that of the AEAP project. Clearly, while both texts advocate for access to the arts for all children, there is a different understanding behind “arts for everyone” and arts for all “individuals.” This distinction is most evident in the open criticism of the NEA’s segregation of teacher-artists from artist-teachers and the call for clarification of politicized language.

Rather than excluding elements of the curriculum rationale of Coming to Our Senses (1977), Toward Coordinated Federal Policies for Support for Arts Education (1977) proposes to be complementary and supportive of the same view. Claiming the lack of a consistent rationale from arts educators, this text appears to accept the core beliefs in aesthetic, self expression and experiential value of arts education. In an effort to make arts central to individual and lifelong learning, the process of the definition of concepts continues; the most obvious change is the further blending of the “cognitive” and “affective” domains. Moving away from ideas of sensory and perceptual training per se presented in Coming to our senses (1977) as a curriculum rationale, this text is more cautious; it accents the need for assessment research in sensitively, expressiveness, creativity and attitudes.

Overall, this text narrows its immediate focus to the problems (the dispersion of responsibility for action) of the federal agency efforts in arts education. In regard to other
policy issues, most of the problems and a set of standard solutions are transferred from *Coming to our senses* (1977): the need for parity in curriculum, the inclusion of art organizations as resources, the involvement of community school boards, and increased program evaluation. But, by distilling the original ideas, the course of the discourse is modified or changed as well and the advocacy becomes more polarized around policy beyond curriculum.

Significantly, although the NSBA’s *The Arts in education* report is almost verbatim the AEAP report, it restricts its report to 11 out of 15 recommendation categories that are of “more interest and urgent concern to school board members...,” members charged with rationalizing the arts in the social context of schooling. (TNF, p.31) Although interested in the social benefits of the arts curriculum as it addresses problems of the disadvantaged or the workforce needs of artists, the NSBA selects those issues from *Coming to our senses* (1977) primarily concerned with instrumental uses of the arts to meet educational objectives. Strangely enough, the text does not question how the AEAP’s curriculum rationale furthers either the learning process or its own social purposes. Provided the curriculum is inclusive of all ethnic traditions, the claims that the arts motivate, discipline and give pleasure are sufficient and self-evident.

School policy issues surrounding the curriculum are a different matter. By eliminating visual images, historical and higher education references and, particularly, the non-school art education opportunities of the original report, the NSBA text also changes the ideological focus and reestablishes inadvertently the importance of both institutional schooling and the classroom teacher. These changes reflect a total school approach rather than a strong support for the arts. Agreeing that schools need to
reorganize in many areas (i.e. relaxed scheduling, increased student alternatives, etc.), unlike the AEAP report, the text conveys a sympathetic emphasis on the constraints of institutional schooling, the economic limitations of the 1970s and the “conservative” nature of the public. These predispositions seem to guide selective discoursal decisions. Although an apparent duplication of the original discursive statement, the NSBA’s “rewriting” of the original text is an example of Foucault’s view of the unintentional nature of discoursal process.

**Authorities of Function**

**Non-discursive Practices**

Art education policies from 1971-1980 changed to accommodate several contextual variables: fewer resources, social problems, technology, global perspectives, decrease in leisure time (Werner, 2000, p. 2). During the 1970s, two additional identifiable economic and political strains or world views effecting general education also effected arts education; issues of economic “value” increased as the nation experienced deteriorating economic conditions raising accountability issues in social institutions. Simultaneously, the major concerns were a lack of accountability measures or reforms, the declining test scores from 1964-1970, and a liberal reaction against conservative values dominating the society and the schools of the 1950s. The response to these issues was twofold: art advocates sought to reform the schools by infusion of the arts and artists: from a historical perspective, Efland (1990) gathers the strands of the arts-in-education movement and the work of the AEAP from the “counterculture” and the “‘me’ generation.” of the 1950s. (Efland, 1990, p. 244) Conversely, according to Efland (1990) art educators attempted to “distance themselves from the anti-intellectualism
associated with creative self-expression” with the acceptance of behavioral objectives and the inclusion of art and music in a movement toward national assessment in education that began in 1974. (Efland, 1990, p. 244) A paradigm shift about the nature of student learning begins; the importance of individual expression and art experiences vies with learning interventions. Art education communities, identifying more with established institutional schooling, seek aid through funding and research from federal and state education agencies.

Rules of Appropriation

Laura Chapman (1982) believes that ideas incorporated in the national policy in the arts during the 1970s have been transferred into and have weakened arts education curricular policy:

Most of them [current arts education policy statements] are the legacy of an arts-in-education movement spanning about fifteen years and encompassing a variety of interconnected programs, many of them federally supported. The concepts behind this movement have been widely disseminated and have been incorporated into the operations of advocacy groups and agencies whose work in arts education is not dependent upon federal funds.” (Chapman, 1982, p. 115)

Through federal funding and the arts infrastructure of federal, local and state arts council and parallel education agencies, the support of institutions and organizations has been successfully leveraged for funding and ideological acceptance. Often without professional alternatives in research, theory, curriculum models, or established practice, practitioners were not aware of or willing to counter the influence of large social institutions. As the arts had little or no institutional status, the appropriation of ideas from outside of the school, and the use of artist-in-residence initially were not regarded negatively by policy makers. Similarly, artists who participated in residence programs and had no accountability issues did not see potential problems. Scholars, such as
Chapman, anticipated the long-term consequences. With a focus on the student’s best interest, the possibility of increased motivation, and solutions to social problems impacting learning, many schools were opened to outside help.

**Idealizations**

In the 1970s, the idealization of art and education exerted non-discursive authority on discourse strategies were: the value of art was tied to individualism, was seen to have a therapeutic function for the student and artist and was instrumental in improving quality of life through individual skills in perception, emotional expression, and enhanced communication. As such the arts served a broader educational ideal: education, concerned with a process of the “present,” developed the potential of one student at a time, motivated “reluctant” students suffering from varied social and institutional problems, and to reintegrate learning, the student, and the school into a healthier society. The concept of “basic” implied those activities which were “essential” in achieving these ideals.

**Discourse Field #2**

**Points of Diffraction**

**Points of Equivalent Choices**

Conceptually, that part of the Getty vision that reinforced cultural contexts, legacies and their transmission was not particularly new to academe or K-12 education. Stressing cultural continuity over creative production, however, led the GCEA to value the past as it lives in the present. In many respects, “creative intelligence” is more about understanding the processes of change and continuity (a common approach in humanistic study) than about art meaning per se. interestingly, a reliance on academic models led the
GCEA to narrow its perspective to the established field of visual arts, a choice that predates CEMREL and the “aesthetic movement” in arts education.

Functioning outside of the education “system” as a catalyst was becoming a routine advocacy practice for private foundations and organizations. The organization accepted the established school structures and learning theory; its goal was to give parity to the arts within that environment. In this respect, the GCEA was not innovative. The GCEA’s “pilots” ultimately were similar to other educational “pilots” in design. The organization funded promising school projects in order to gather research on best practices and models, but also to promote its ideology among recognized professional experts and practitioners with influence on or the responsibility for program implementation.

**Points of Incompatible Choices**

Within the “discursive subgroups” of objects, modes, and concepts, the GCEA was characterized by several choices (“new” policy elements) incompatible to the discourse field. Not totally new, but new for art education, the GCEA articulated a curricular vision aligned with established academic institutional models. Again, much of what was innovative about the conceptual formation of the GCEA was borrowed from fields related, but not the same as K-12 arts education, primarily from art and humanities. In a field that had been dominated by individual self-expression, the Getty insisted on the need for increased kinds of acquired knowledge. Acquired knowledge, in turn, trained the intellect and was a precondition of aesthetic response and appreciation. Aesthetic and artistic response required educational intervention, an intervention institutionalized to develop a critical adult population generally, but for art in particular. Parallel with the
idea of institutional learning as a societal obligation came a preconceived standard for higher expectations in achievement commensurate with a position parallel and complementary (not instrumental) with other learning areas in the curriculum.

The manner in which the GCEA distributed its resources, patterns of emerging activities and texts, reveal new approaches to institutionalization: a tightly controlled grassroots campaign to involve practitioners through conferences and workshops, a focus on leadership training and expertise, intervening and bridging the professional gap within the profession (higher education and K-12 practitioners), a sophisticated use of newer media for advocacy purposes, and the production of materials intended for use in the classroom. The organization’s goals were structured to develop a leadership community within the field and to defend its curricular rationale. It focused on expertise and authority within the field (combining scholars and practitioners in leadership roles) as a means to gather prestige for its ideas, but selectively used research and criticism outside of the field to underpin its advocacy. Focusing on visual arts alone, the organization was able to draw on strengths of all programming affiliated with the Getty such as museum education; it depended on very little collaboration with other advocacy organization until the 1990s.

**Points of Systematization**

Systematically, the GCEA strategies attempted to install and to gain parity for the arts and arts study in institutional schooling, and, ultimately to create a more literate adult population or, particularly, an adult audience for the arts. Through funding and sponsorship to DBAE model projects, providing research and expertise from the field of art education, creating teacher leadership skills to extend the influence of their rationale,
the GCEA hoped to stimulate a grassroots movement of art education practitioners and scholars, and to mount a top-down, outside-in effort to include the arts world (artists, art organizations, etc.) in education. A very clearly stated rationale, it was, nonetheless, complex as a guide to K-12 learning; its primary constraint was in teacher preparation and, to a lesser extent, the established academic and school district bureaucracy to accommodate the Getty’s hierarchy of experts. Its challenge was to convince the professional classroom teacher of the significance of a disciplinary approach.

**Points of Determination**

Drawing again from arts education, arts advocacy, and general education, the following texts, published simultaneously with *Beyond creating* (1985) are examined: *K-12 Arts education in the United States: Present context, future needs* (1986) of the professional associations, *Can we rescue the arts for America’s children?: Coming to our senses 10 years later* (1988) published by ACA, and *Arts, education, and the states: A Survey of state education policies* (1987), a text of the CCSSO.

**Economy of Discursive Constellation**

**The Professional Organizations**

Increasingly throughout the 1980s, the arts education professional associations (specifically MENC and NAEA) became active advocates for arts education through policy texts addressed to their individual memberships. Sponsoring research and scholarship that attempted to gather data on the state of the field, both organizations surveyed existing practice in the states (NAEA, 1986; MENC, 1988). NAEA continued to develop a “culture” of policy awareness (NAEA, 1989). Texts were on topics such as curricular excellence (NAEA, 1986), curriculum rationales, and model initiatives
(NAEA, 1989) were rather restricted to the fine arts. MENC, on the other hand,
advocated in a broader arena; their advocacy approach sought ways of integrating the arts
into general education “systems.” (MENC, 1985) Collaboration between MENC and the
ACA (NCEA: National Council for Education in the Arts) which occasionally included
NDA and NATE signaled an increased need for and understanding of political strategy
by the professional community.

The Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education joined these efforts. Its
mission was primarily to address art education issues in the higher education
undergraduate curriculum. However, many of its publications took a broader
perspective; overall, it was concerned with the structure of the arts in America, teacher
education, and the effects of arts advocacy on the arts in elementary and secondary
education. In 1988, after the publication of Beyond creating (1985), the Working Group
published an example of this interest: Arts education: Beyond tradition and advocacy: A
View of elementary and secondary education in the arts (1988).

Two conferences highlighted the growing unification of the professional
associations and their individual communities: The 1986 Philadelphia resolution that
attempted a cross-disciplinary definition for arts education and the 1988 Interlochen
Symposium. Just prior to the Philadelphia conference, major arts education associations
for both K-12 and higher education (with the exception of ATA or AATE) joined “to
gather in one place many of the ideas that have evolved during the last decade regarding
the current context for local, regional, and national decisions about K-12 education in the
various arts.” MENC, NAEA, NDA, the National Association of Schools of Music
(NASM), the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), the National
Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) and the National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD) presented “a briefing paper” for a discourse community seeking a stronger political agenda. “The major purpose is to explain in some detail why professional teachers of the arts disciplines (a) have continued to deal with increasing problems of justification for rigorous, sequential arts instruction, and (b) have lost no small amount of control, or even influence, in certain strategic policy forums.”

**American Council for the Arts**

A nonprofit organization primarily concerned with advancing the arts, The ACA became very active in promoting arts education during the 1980s. Its goals are to influence local, state, and national arts organizations, government agencies, business leaders, philanthropists, and educators and, thereby, to gain national visibility for the arts. The organization supports a range of organizational goals for art through arts education: artist training, arts participation “beyond the classroom” for under serviced groups, arts education through school reform, community involvement in arts education through partnerships, the instrumental use of arts education to meet economic and workforce needs, and expanding arts education through the dissemination of research (as a form of advocacy) to aid decision makers. In an occasional partnership with MENC (NCEA established in 1958), the organization used a common advocacy approach of funding publications by available scholars and researchers (Fowler, Pankratz, Mulcahy, McLaughlin, Balfe, Cherbo-Heine) to relay its policy positions. When the AEAP ceased functioning in 1987, it transferred its library and republication rights to the ACA, In 1988, ACA, published *Can we rescue the arts for America’s children?: Coming to our senses 10 years later* (1988) as a companion to the republication of *Coming to our senses*
In 1996, the organization merged with the NALAA to become Americans for the Arts.

The Council of Chief State School Officers

The Council of Chief State School Officers is a nationwide nonprofit organization. The organization is composed of public officials (superintendents or commissioners of education) of state departments responsible for elementary and secondary education in the United States, the U.S. extra-state jurisdictions, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity. The CCSSO has four divisions that provide technical services, professional development and administrative advice to the state departments: The Division of Advocacy and Strategic Alliances strengthens partnerships with other organizations, the U.S. Department of Education, congress and the administrative branch. “This division serves as CCSSO’s voice to ensure the vision of the organization is of high priority.” (Website) However, not until 1985 with the publication of Arts, education and the states: A Survey of state education policies (1987) was the organization’s voice heard regarding arts education. However, when the organization published this text, it signaled a proactive assessment of arts education; the text (and a companion report Options and opportunities in arts education: Selected programs and projects, 1987), is the result of the Council’s Arts and the Schools Project survey sponsored in part by the NEA, the USDE, and The Rockefeller Foundation.
Principles of Possibilities

TEXT:  *K-12 Arts Education in the United States: Present Context, Future Needs*  
*(1986)*

While addressing social, political and policy realities, the text reinforces a values-based framework and invites into an expanding discourse community all those who contribute or are involved with “the direct provision of regular, curriculum-based education in music, art, theater, and dance in elementary and secondary schools.” (AEUS, p.1) Calling for consensus on basic professional values, this text recommends to the art education discourse community the qualities and skills it must develop as an advocacy community in order to sustain its core values, to transcend current adversities, and, by influencing policy, to become in the future “a force to be reckoned with in the process of cultural formation.” (AEUS, p.32)

This text acknowledges the impact on arts education policy of general conditions in K-12 and the social and political context of schools. But the policy problem in the field is identified as the professional community’s failure to oppose the values behind the misguided advocacy and political agendas in arts and education. Nonetheless, this document’s intent is to be self-examining; to “look analytically at the roots of our dilemmas, the options we have, and the opportunities for improvement available to us.” (AEUS, p.3) Accepting responsibility for what has not been done in the field to provide a consistent and even delivery system for the arts disciplines, it identifies the solution: arts educators must establish a common philosophical base for arts education, they must use this value-based system as a basis for policy development, they must develop “rational” yet diverse mechanisms for addressing the problems in the field, and they must become
“more effective in damage control in situations where our fundamental values are challenged.” (AEUS, p.3) In all cases, “values” and “reason” must provide a check on policy development.

In regard to a philosophical framework, this document articulates a somewhat new argument: Education is the “progenitor of civilization” and in the shape, scope and philosophy of the connection of education to culture is the future context of arts education. The “larger business” of the arts education community is “cultural formation,” and its ability to intervene “positively” in the lives of individuals defines its success. Educational goals and policy outcomes are based on a basic decision between two approaches: “One involves providing a continuous invitation to the individual to develop his or her understanding by enlarging his or her personal knowledge. The other involves constant attempts to wed the individual to the mass through psychological action.” (AEUS, p.4) The latter option is defined as the “mass dichotomy” of passive audience development and artist training; the former is a philosophy that educates all individuals in knowledge and skills and fuses intellect and emotion. “The fundamental purpose of arts education is to enlarge the number of active participants in the art forms, not just the number of passive spectators.” (AEUS, p.24)

Regarding curriculum content, the arts disciplines “for their own sake” are defended in this text against their ornamental or instrumental uses, uses that interfere with public understanding and support of their cultural importance. Whether used as ethnic symbols, entertainment or educational tools, a significant distinction is deemed lost, the loss is of a “higher order of intellectual content [which manifests] itself in [a] skillful use of the art form.” (AEUS, p.6) However, an “excellence” bias qualifies the choice of
content: the selection of content centers on “...techniques and traditions of art forming the highest intellectual heritage of civilization.” (AEUS, p.24) The arts taught to the level of excellence that produces ever-increasing skill and knowledge is the educational goal; convincing the public at the local level of relevance the arts to important human values is the advocacy goal and making this rationale operational is the policy goal.

Protecting the “life of the mind” from the “techniques of promotion” is the controlling theme in the text. The advocacy movement is targeted as a major adversity: “This concern is based not simply in instincts for preserving jobs, but in a serious intellectual difference about appropriate balances in the mechanism for cultural formation in a free society.” (AEUS, p.10) Translated into instructional and assessment strategies, the guiding principle in classroom choices is: any perspective that leads to “literacy” or “...the ability to use the skills, media, instruments, and processes required to express oneself in that art form.” (AEUS, p.23) An underlying assumption is that “literacy” is the natural outgrowth of “artistic objectives” inherent in the acquisition of these skills and that literacy of this sort “mandates” the solution of intellectual problems. (AEUS, p.23)

A rising sense of threat is inherent in the tone of this text, particularly in the defense of the existing teacher workforce and teacher preparation in higher education, of the curriculum-based structure in and out of the public schools, of the policy effectiveness of professional arts education organizations, and the viability of supportive industries. In addition to the broad issues of values, demographics and economics, the text puts most of the blame for declining effectiveness in art education programs on the advocacy movement in all of its forms: The arts council system, private sector advocacy
groups, federal government interventions, professional and teacher participants and uninformed citizens who are vulnerable to the media, celebrity, wealth, and power.

**TEXT: Can We Rescue the Arts for America's Children? Coming to Our Senses 10 years Later (1988)**

A sequel to *Coming to our senses* (1977), the text supports the overall view of the role of the arts in education expressed in the original text and particularly the program concepts of the NEA. With a bit of revisionism, the text credits the *Coming to our senses* (1977) with emphasizing “the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor development.” While the original text does refer to “unique ways of knowing,” its massive number of examples or case studies emphasizes production. Still an adamant statement of necessary reforms, this text reflects a more practical approach; the intervening ten years have brought clarification to some educational issues, an awareness of many insurmountable institutional and systemic barriers to implementation of the AEAP original recommendations and the recognition of immense limitations resulting from social and economic problems.

This text identifies the problem as “a basic contradiction between the importance of the arts in society and the lack of importance accorded the arts in public education.” (CWR, p.4) It targets attitudes prevalent in institutional schooling as the source of negative or detrimental images of the arts. Citing John Goodlad, the reason for this contradiction between society and the schools is the institutional classification of arts as manual activity that does not lead to broader understandings; conversely, the public designates schools as a place for developing the mind for more important vocational goals.
Particularly interesting, *Can we rescue the arts for America’s children?* (1988), published simultaneously with *Beyond creating* (1985) and the NEA report *Toward civilization* (1988), reflects a new wave of school reform and links the future of the arts in schools with general education goals; particularly evident in the work of Goodlad, Boyer, Carnegie. Reflecting on the systematic dismantling of arts in the schools during the previous 10 years, on issues of inconsistency of access and anti-equalitarianism, the text counters with equality of opportunity as a policy argument. Specific outcomes such as new school policies guiding graduation and other curricular requirements, funding and status are viewed as practical necessities; policies that impact “academic emphasis” and “excellence” through an improved teaching force take on a more intense meaning in the 1980s environment of general reform. But similar to *Coming to our senses* (1977), this new text also elaborates on how the arts may instrumentally address the huge social problems impacting students. As a solution to this problem, the text clarifies a communication theory of arts as symbol systems, it uses Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences (based on his research in cognitive psychology), and links these ideas in a cognitive training rationale. By demonstrating the relationship of the arts to language and combining emotion and thought, a new understanding of “cultural literacy” evolves that makes the arts more compatible with the institution of schooling and presents a new advocacy argument.

As an indicator of political need for consensus, this text, while clearly advocating for its own established ideology, is a call for the field to achieve “consensus about the goals and objectives and develop a more unified voice on both the national and local levels.” (CWR, p.95) “These basic issues pervade the whole operative structure of art...”
While continuing support for comprehensive arts programming, the text, nonetheless, applauds the Artists-in-Education program of the NEA for encouraging the presence of art forms not provided by many schools in the regular curriculum. A follow-up statement, however, shifts emphasis from the original text by reinforcing the idea of sequential curricula in all art forms, all cultural traditions; selectivity based on “excellence” and “degree of abstractness” or difficulty.

By incorporating the work of Howard Gardner, the text promotes the instructional and assessment ideas based on individual differences; children learn in different ways and must be instructed and assessed accordingly. An extension of the multiple intelligences idea, the text addresses straightforwardly argues the creation over the appreciation argument.

In regard to instructional delivery, the text calls for clarification in practice of roles and responsibilities of classroom teachers, art specialists and artists, this text rethinks and reevaluates policies surrounding the use, training and accountability of the classroom generalists as competent teachers of the arts. Citing “failed” efforts such as the Getty and the recommendations of the Interlochen Symposium, the text concludes that classroom teachers “are generally not effective in assuming full responsibility for an ongoing, sequential arts program.” (CWR, p. 56) As a result, the role of art specialist has, in this text, been expanded to include “cultural coordinator, supervisor, demonstration teacher, curriculum developer and coordinator, and in service educator, as well as arts teacher” plus a new role of “arts education management.” (CWR, p. 57) Still defending
the artist as the ultimate authority on the creative process, the realization that the policy environment of the public schools requires more consistency than the artist is equipped or trained to provide and that effective program design cannot be maintain by dependence on the artist workforce is a marked concession from the original text.


While voicing a concern for curricular goals and current educational issues in the field, the text reflects the general education community’s greater interests and responsibility for particular policies guiding program implementation (graduation requirements, testing, state funding and instructional issues), particularly as they effect the formulation of new policies at the state level. Candidly recognizing that any policy formulation must incorporate diverse world views and beliefs in its purpose for education in order to gain systemic acceptance, the text enumerates its concern for three broad goal categories: cultural understanding, communication skills and self-expression.

With an implicit understanding that many of the difficulties inherent in institutionalizing arts education derive from policy which has an unclear problem definition, the CCSSO sets forth to gather data on commonly held belief systems in and on the field. Therefore, the problem as defined by the CCSSO has to do with a lack of knowledge about specific policy barriers to implementation (particularly the impact of testing, graduation requirements, data collection, course expansion and, of course, funding). Research becomes the primary solution recommended by the text. But the forthcoming recommendations demonstrate, once again, that the problems are multiple, broad, uneven, complex, systemic and are not responsive to a single solution.
Although borrowing from earlier texts (even the inclusion of a Historical Background drawn almost directly from AEAP’s report), the goals of the CCSSO’s survey were to obtain baseline data and pointing to policy and administrative solutions rather than to endorse a specific educational or curricular agenda. In addition to inclusion within the formal goals and state assessments for general education, the report recommends policy outcomes that are, at this point, long-standing in the field and general education: the sequential K-12, competency-based arts curriculum for all arts subject areas. Two additional recommendation areas deal with teacher competency and one solution (reminiscent of *Coming to our senses*, 1977) is to develop cooperation and collaborations for arts programs beyond the schools.

When the organization does address curriculum content, the CCSSO clearly references the GCEA’s *Beyond creating* (1985); the first of its recommendations is that arts education be established as a “core” within the curriculum as “the study of the historical, creative, aesthetic, critical and productive elements....” (AES, p.34) Nonetheless, while suggesting the value of both common intellectual and aesthetic qualities, the report maintains the overall perspective of *Coming to our senses* (1977): “Individual disciplines [visual arts, music, dance, theater and creative writing] teach distinct skills and bodies of knowledge....” (AES, p.10) Recommending a “well-rounded” arts curriculum and “academically sound” programs, the text reiterates the experiential virtues of the arts in society and upholds the value of creative activity in the classroom.
Principles of Exclusion

Differences are more obvious than similarities between the views of the professional associations in *K-12 Arts education in the United States: Present context, future needs* (1986) and the GCEA’s response to the same discourse field. Generally concerned with misguided advocacy, the text rejects the visual arts bias and pursues a value-based rather than a discipline-based curriculum. From this position, many of the Getty choices are excluded: the goal of creating a knowledgeable audience is replaced with impacting individual lives, setting a standard for collective or mass response is countered with active intellectual and emotion participation, disciplinary and rational learning objectives are supplant ed with artistic objectives, intrinsic in creation. Overall, this text rejects the GCEA’s focus on established art and the preservation of culture at the expense of cultural formation; cultural stability and continuity are underlying principles in the Getty that are secondary to proactive efforts at social reform.

Standing behind a new “cognitive” construction based on a blending of the rational and the emotive found in all arts, *Can we rescue the arts for America’s children? Coming to our senses 10 years later* (1988) deflects the impact of the Getty report by claiming that a view of the arts as cognition did not exist a decade earlier when *Coming to our senses* (1977) was published. This text maintains “coming to our minds,” advocated by the GCEA, is a narrow reaction formation, not the solution to problems in arts education. In opposition, this text suggests: “We now promote the arts (and the senses) not as separate worlds, but as neglected components of the larger world of reason. That is a considerable and startling change and it could prove to be an effective wedge in opening the higher-echelon doors of education.” (CWR, p.70) The text holds to
instructional strategies based in individual creation over disciplinary content, to instrumental value of the arts rather than as a separate means of learning, and to active student engagement as opposed to appreciation. In keeping with its organizational roots, the text is opposed to the GCEA’s insistence on programs integral to the established curriculum and its preference for “experts” represented by academic credentials over the practicing artist. It counters with several concerns: arts educators may be selling their souls “in the name of academic respectability,” may be deepening the divide between “the intellect and emotions,” and may be contributing to the institutional problems underlying the school reform movement. (CWR, p. 64)

In *Arts, education, and the states: A Survey of state education policies* (1987), the CCSSO acknowledges the GCEA report, but blends the DBAE approach into an arts disciplinary approach; DBAE was seen as indicative of improved academic standards, but organizing knowledge around subject areas was an established institutional practice. Goals of cultural understanding, communication skills and the arts as self-expression were well established rationales and common practice in schools and society; although not generally disagreeing with DBAE principles, the text is not aligned on specifics with the Getty rationale. Many of the issues presented by the Getty were precursors of school reform (an indirect criticism of the work of CCSSO) and complicated already difficult problems (teacher competency, for instance) and compounded other policy problems of implementation mentioned above, the primary focus of CCSSO. Finally, the political association of the CCSSO with the NEA, USDE and the federal infrastructure, no doubt, created a bias for the status quo. In short, the CCSSO was not interested in curricular
reform or the concerns of the art world, but improved implementation of existing programs.

**Authorities of Function**

**Non-discursive Practices**

During the 1980s, political issues and curricular policy “streams” become increasingly “confused” according to historians (Efland, 1990; Smith, 1996). Raskin (1986) describes the political climate during this decade as

...a breakdown of the largely liberal consensus that guided a good deal of educational policy since World War II. Powerful groups within government and the economy have been able to redefine, often in retrogressive ways, the terms of debate in education, social welfare, and other areas of the “the common good.

(Raskin, 1986 IN Apple, 1992, p. 38)

Continuing and expanding on the public’s concern for competitiveness globally, educational institutions were critiqued for on-going ineffectiveness and inefficiency. Along with institutional parity for the arts, the major concerns were for rigorous curriculum policy, developmentally consistent, integrated and sequential district programming and specialists for supervising the classroom implementation. Neither school improvement, professional preparation and development, nor student learning is seen as a naturally occurring process; the solution for all problems requires an orchestrated intervention from all stakeholders. Art education communities, in seeking institutionalization for the arts, were faced with the limitations of schooling; but the reaction was attributed to many of these problems to an incomplete curriculum with “soft” standards.

**Rules of Appropriation**
According to Hoffa (1993), ideas about the arts appropriated by the education community and incorporated in statements of curricular policy or purpose were “not subject to the same kind of public scrutiny as those of the federal government, nor are the activities of most professional groups in arts education subject to the same sort of political pressure as is the Endowment.” (Hoffa, 1993, p.4) By the 1980s, the visibility of federally supported programs increased general awareness and critique of their effectiveness in art and art education and, ultimately, over site by congress through the mandated NEA study, Toward civilization (1988). With this political window, the GCEA recommendations, which initially received adverse reaction to DBAE, were appropriated indirectly into federal policy. According to Smith (1996), the reaction to the Getty might be traced to a “tactical blunder” in Beyond creating (1985) which labeled the schools as having “virtually no substantive programs in education in visual art.......” (Smith, 1996, p. 214) Nonetheless, their message was received through a less abrasive government policy statement, was disseminated through established programs and infrastructures, and simultaneously received the legitimacy of government backing. In any case, the Getty’s call for reform stimulated art education professionals, particularly academics, to respond strongly. Little attention was given to the short-term impact of DBAE on student learning or the acceptance of this organizing principle by students.

**Idealizations**

In the 1980s the idealization of art and education exerted non-discursive authority on discourse strategies. Of particular influence was the value placed on art as a means of preserving cultural traditions via cannons established by experts, as a constant reminder of the highest of human achievement, and serving as a cultural conduit from the past to
the future. The importance of the contemporary artist and student were diminished; the strengthening of institutions contributing to cultural preservation was primary. The educational ideals presented the past artistic achievements as standards for learning, knowledge organization as the key to cognitive understanding, and collective cultural pride (along with the challenge of “excellence”) as a motivation to learning. The ultimate goal of education is the informed adult audience.

**Discourse Field #3:**

**Points of Diffraction**

**Points of Equivalent Choices**

The CNAEA appears to have been influenced by many and diverse contemporary curricular and art theories and practices. Representing these multiple and blended concept groupings, the *National Standards* (1994) leans toward a holistic rationale reminiscent of much earlier times; its educational purposes incorporate prevalent ideas of cognitive and emotional skills, bridge individual and collective experience, and contribute to cultural preservation and cultural formation. Again, art is defined broadly as a total educational process characterized by integrated knowledge, skills, and disciplined behavior.

The Consortium accepts the power of locally controlled school districts. While accepting the diverse content and instruction delivery of multiple systems, it also endorses an imperative for institutional standards and assessment. Possibly, the *National Standards* (1994) can be viewed as the professional associations taking control of an inevitable “negative” in order to turn it to a “positive” in implementation, and, in the process, maintaining some value-based tenets of the field. By clarifying what students should know and be able to do allows practitioners a voice a need for classroom
assessment as well as evaluation standards; the coordination of the *National Standards* (1994) with NAEP is an example of that intent at a national level.

Finally, the *National Standards* (1994) text consistently represents four well-established organizations all drawing upon separate and unique experiences with educational institutions, particularly public schooling. Each organization represented is defined by a distinct pedagogic tradition, accepted artistic canon, an organizational history and a specific community size and disposition.

**Points of Incompatible Choices**

When examining the *National Standards* (1994) against coexisting discourse field texts, new conceptual constructions are few. However, the combination of concepts does produce a new discourse unity; a unity when compared to other and opposing discourse texts, represents choices previously considered incompatible. Simply because the *National Standards* (1994) represents many past and conflicting curricular rationales, the positions of its community appear motivated by political, rather that curricular issues.

The textual output of the Consortium represented “new” patterns in a limited number of areas. Some changes resulted simply from being a combined community; although the collaborations had been attempted previously, now a formalized network of communication is established. As a combined community, the advocacy potential of reaching a huge audience of practitioners and reaching into the local classroom (as opposed to functioning only in private foundations or in the higher reaches of bureaucracy) had profound possibilities for reform on many levels.

Another “new” and different aspect for policy formation for the Consortium was an available policy “window;” an opportunity not present to earlier discourse
communities. Indeed, that window precedes and solidifies the organization itself.

Equally unusual, the Consortium itself is rooted in a “single project” orientation rather than a single perspective. Apart of a larger effort brought about by the standards and assessment movement, the organization was required to be inclusive, at least temporarily. Besides including different curricular rationale from within the professions, the larger political framework required a text reflecting a balance of “voices,” which allowed all advocacy organizations and groups to claim credit for the ultimate achievement.

**Points of Systematization**

Systematically, The Consortium strategies attempted to establish the arts on the national education agenda, to create a political consensus (at least temporarily), to provide a model for policy making at the state level and, ultimately, to gain parity for the arts and arts study in local school districts. The curricular rationale is more politically that educationally important. As a policy statement is confused rather than complex. It offers more rhetoric than substantive guidance to implementation. Because the standards are voluntary, the constraints to implementation are not as obvious. The barriers to implementation are the problem of local authorities. As advocacy, the text offends no one; it promises everything.

**Points of Determination**

Drawing again from arts education, arts advocacy, and general education, the unification of the arts professions, the broader ideological influences, and the momentum for educational reform are reflected in the following texts: the *National arts education accord* (1991), *The Power of the arts to transform education* (1992) by AEP, and *Transforming education through the arts: Proceedings of a special hearing on arts and*
Economy of Discursive Constellation

The Professional Associations

The 1990s was a decade of partnerships, collaborations and coalitions at all levels in the “discursive constellation.” Outside of the professional associations, few single and independent professional advocacy organizations in arts education were evident; however, the opportunity for cross influences and the transfer of policy ideas was obvious in the collaborations of private and public agencies, in academic and governmental efforts, and in business and general education policy projects. Among the merging interests of professional art educators and government was the National Arts Education Research Centers. Co-funded by the NEA and the USDE, the Center functioned at two sites: New York University and the University of Illinois (Champaign-Urbana). Most of the publications derived from these centers were teacher projects and research papers and sporadic contributions of individual “experts” addressing curriculum policy issues. Status of arts education in American public schools (1991) is an example of the data gathering research of the program, the publications Toward a plan for cultural literacy: Partnerships for arts in the schools (1988) and Cultural literacy and arts education (1987) reflect a broader interest, an interest in “culture” replaces the narrow concern for the arts or even aesthetics. Certainly, this broader definition is cast with public policy concerns in mind.

In the form of research and advocacy, the members of the Consortium (MENC, AATE, NAEA, NDA) increased independent and joint efforts during this decade. Prior to
the National Standards (1994) and a series of joint texts clarifying ideological issues and suggesting necessary preconditions for implementation (1994-1996), both MENC, but particularly NAEA, positioned themselves within the school reform movement. After the National Standards (1994), each organization turned their energy toward implementation efforts. But the most momentous advocacy development (and text) well may have been the 1991 National arts education accord (1991). Designating themselves as “the national voice for arts education in the United States,” three of the four associations (excluding the NDA) issued specific and detailed beliefs, objectives and policy positions impacting K-12 practice. But institutional policy is not a curricular rationale; The Arts education statement of principles (1999) would take still another decade.

Arts Education Partnership

Stemming from Goals 2000 Arts Education Planning Process in 1994 and notable among new collaborations, the AEP was established in 1995 through a cooperative agreement among the Council of Chief State School Officers, the NASAA, the NEA and the USDE. Reflecting its origins, the organization is strongly focused on the National Standards (1994) as a mechanism for promoting the arts in the core curriculum. Additionally, “research” has become another device to convince the public and general education of the efficacy of the arts in learning. With a clear strategy to link general education and arts organizations through partnerships and establish influence with state and local government, AEP was supported by national education, arts, business, philanthropic and government organizations. Blending multiple purposes under a generic academic and social development rationale, it reinforces curricular consensus.
Noticeably missing from its initiatives were any direct organizational ties to professional arts educators.

**National Conference of State Legislatures**

- Founded in 1975, the National Conference of State Legislatures, a nonprofit, bipartisan organization, serves the legislators and staffs of 50 states, commonwealths and territories. Its objectives are to improve the quality and effectiveness of state legislatures, to foster interstate communication and “to ensure states a strong, cohesive voice in the federal system.” (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2004, p. ii) The organization is intent on limiting federal intrusion on state legislatures across the country. Possibly for this reason, it has shown an unusual degree of interest in arts education as it has become more visible on the national agenda. Along with a concern for arts funding and historic preservation, the group maintains a website database specifically dedicated to “Arts Education Policies in the States” including college entrance requirements, state standards and assessment measures, legislation, and certification and professional development requirements for teachers. Despite its activity and interest in the field, this national organization has produced only a few texts addressing arts education policy *per se* to inform the decision making of its members; its “advocacy” is based on dissemination of information to its members rather than support for a specific rationale.

**Principles of Possibilities**


“Responsible efforts” to include the arts as at the core of basic education, set the tone of the text. Restricting their definition of arts to ”include only music, the visual arts, theater and dance,” the text narrows its scope to define specific curricular purposes:
“Other courses, including some that may include the word ”arts” in their titles, serve
different education purposes and should not be permitted to satisfy requirements in the
arts.” (NAE, p.2) With a new slant, the argument returns to a position that trades on the
value of arts-for-their-own-sake, a value with educational benefits only when respected
each in its own domain.

The overall definition of the problem as presented in this text resides in the
multitude of institutional barriers to the specific needs of arts programming. More than
advocating for a particular curriculum content or instructional method, the text views the
school as the policy environment that needs the most change. It justifies these changes
not only for an improved arts curriculum, but for an improve system of practices in
education as a whole. Noting the adverse effects of outside-of-school forces as well, it
encourages responsible advocacy and policy involvement by art education professionals
to achieve reform. But cooperation is sought in the broader policy arena as well. The
most significant political and policy statement may have been the request for the NEA to
use “the professional standards established by the national associations to guide and
direct its programs which support the arts in the nation’s schools.” (NAE, p.17)
Secondly, the Accord (1991) makes another bid for parity in national policy decision
making; it requests representation for its members on the National Council on the Arts
and NEA committees and panels “whose actions bear upon arts education in the schools.”
(NAE, p.17)

Very detailed curricular objectives are articulated in terms of what the student
should be “able to do” and are listed in order to be succinct and cohesive: to exercise
creative abilities in the arts, to use the vocabulary of the arts, to respond to the arts on all
levels, to be acquainted with all forms, to understand the many functions of arts, to make aesthetic/critical judgments and to be life-long supporters of the arts. Clearly, “...the primary purpose of instruction in the arts is to enrich and enhance the lives of all students.” (NAE, p.4)

Likewise, very detailed in-school policies are addressed: parity in academic credit in all circumstances, recognition of out-of school activities as extensions of in-school learning, minimums in instruction time, opportunities “for performance and/or studio experience” in all forms, etc. (NAE, p. 6) These specific requirements are correlated with larger student outcomes: providing breadth and depth in the curriculum, identifying and developing talents, enhancing person worth and self-esteem, providing opportunity for success, improving school environments, etc. Social outcomes are listed also: attending to multicultural needs, serving special and diverse population needs, providing sufficient course offerings and availability, incorporating arts related to contemporary American life. All of these educational and policy goals are a response to institutional barriers; by identifying what should not happen, a “correct” rationale is implied.

While reinforcing the teacher’s ultimate responsibility for the selection of instruction materials, the text urges discretion in content, but little more. However, the organization takes a stand on integration (or correlation) of the arts: the arts may be used to facilitate and enrich the teaching of other subject matter, however:

the arts must maintain their integrity in the curriculum and be taught for their own sake as well...The use of the arts as an instrument for the teaching of nonartistic content should in no way diminish the time or effort devoted to the teaching of each of the arts as distinct academic disciplines.... (NAE, p.14)

Many recommendations for instruction and assessment are embedded in the clarification of appropriate scheduling, supplies, equipment, facilities, teaching loads, etc. For
instance, the arts should not be taught as extracurricular activities, as mini-courses of six to ten weeks, by teachers who have over five preparations per day, in inappropriate spaces. In response to issues of evaluation, the text is emphatic: trained art educators should be involved in all aspects of evaluation (student learning, teacher competency, or program effectiveness). Particularly, the Accord calls for immediate reinstatement of the arts in NAEP.

Reiterating that the goal is a “balanced, comprehensive, sequential, substantive, and rigorous program in the arts” taught by “qualified art, music, theatre, and dance teachers, the text reinforces the arts disciplines as the curricular unit. And, it defers to the individual professional association for standards in implementation of programs. Outlining the need for trained classroom teachers, arts specialist, the text also states professional training and in-service enrichment for any teacher, specialist, supervisor, or administrator whose decisions impact the arts curriculum. On a related issue of educational and artistic credentials, the Accord (1991) recommends cultural institutions to complement school program, “but they cannot substitute for or be allowed to replace such programs.” (NAE, p.15)

TEXT: The Power of the Arts to Transform Education (1992)

The AEP Working Group, with representative speakers from the Kennedy Center and The Getty Trust, exemplify the on-going political consensus impacting curricular rationales. More specifically, this text has many ideas that will be expressed (sometimes in identical language) two years later in the National Standards (1994). The arts are “forms of understanding” and “ways of knowing” that are valuable in and of themselves; secondarily, they are important to the process of education, excellence in education, and
effective school and education reform. Within this context, the arts are one of many tools for teachers as well as students to increase understanding of human “civilization,” the forces of “culture,” and the “universal language” necessary to engage individually and fully in these larger processes. Assuming a holistic approach to learning, specifically referencing Gardner’s multiple forms of intelligence, the student and teacher, the school community, the society, etc. are provided “a ready way to formulate relationships” and make sense out of “a complex world not easily defined in discrete subjects.” (PATE, p.10) Transformation of teaching and learning to accomplish individual engagement in the social fabric is an indication of “excellence.”

No longer is the policy problem defined just in terms of arts education. Once again, the arts have an instrumental use, but this time to address, not just in the classroom and the school, but the “culture” of a national “system,” and all the “systematic” forces that impact it negatively. Broadening the strategy and utilizing the arts in the larger task of transforming education, this text recommends the transformation targets: “excellence,” the teaching and learning process itself, the structure of a comprehensive, systematic, general education reform, and the active participation of art educators, artists, and arts organization at the local, state and national reform efforts.

Seeking national visibility and national commitment, four major goals represent a strategy for full inclusion of the arts: the establishment and funding for a National Center for the Arts in Education, the transformation of teacher education (both pre-service and in-service), the inclusion of the arts in the National Education goals and subsequent coordination of curriculum standards and assessment processes, and continued formation of partnerships at all levels. The ultimate policy outcome is a highly visible national
network of arts education interests that parallel the education system and draws all interested parties under the same political, if not curricular, ideology. Educationally speaking, this text shifts the dialogue away from the values-based discussion of arts education rationales to establishing a consensus on standards-based evaluation and assessment guides for implementation.

The curriculum content in this text is aligned with curricular purposes in general education as a whole: concern for diversity, cultural literacy and communication (through the arts as a “universal language”), and essential cognitive training (through unique “ways of knowing” and “forms of knowledge”). Endorsing the established “subject” orientation as parallel to multiple “intelligences,” content is organized by arts disciplines [visual art, music, dance, theater and creative writing] rather than DBAE.

In regard to instructional and assessment strategies, the text stresses the critical skills of creating and performing, understanding, perceiving, responding and judging. The text attempts to blend the intellectual, emotional and physical and blur the distinctions of individual and community function of the arts. Nonetheless, the evident bias toward “active” and “involved” learning and teaching experiences overshadows the “disciplinary” or academic emphasis. Again, because of its holistic orientation, it is assumed that instruction in the arts will lead naturally to interdisciplinary connections, but the instructional goal aims at even expansive connections with civilization and culture.

Although not limiting instructional strategies, recommended program design reinforces comprehensive, systemic education reform and translates to the infusion of the arts disciplines across the already established graded system. And instructional delivery
issues deal with the “transformation of learning and teaching” of “classroom teachers, specialists and artists as educators,” not school organization. The inclusion of “artists, other arts professionals and arts organizations” and community representatives is strongly encouraged. The policy statement is influenced by the recognized benefit to the national workforce and to the need to succeed in a global market.

**TEXT: Transforming Education through the Arts: Proceedings of a Special Hearing on Arts and Education Reform in the States (1995)**

Despite the organization’s apparent concern for limiting federal involvement in state policy, the text, produced as a part of a the fifth national invitational conference sponsored by the GCEA, favors the perspectives of federal agencies (USDE, NEA), federally supported programs and related arts advocacy groups sustained by the arts infrastructure of the NEA (NASAA, NALAA, AAE, AAA). In the text, the framework of ideas reflects on the general education goals of the USDE expressed in *Goals 2000* (1990) and the specific arts-in-education goals of the NEA. Of lesser importance is the voice of general education at the state level. Finally, although the four national arts education associations present the contributions of the arts to the reform agenda, those contributions are tailored to the established framework of the report.

The framework guiding *Goals 2000* (1990) (and, therefore, the federal agencies etc.) target social problems as they are manifest in the social institution of schooling: lack of school readiness, dropouts, competency in core subjects, professional teacher development, workplace dispositions for a global economy, safety in the schools, and parental involvement. For all of these, the arts are proposed as either instrumentally helpful or a solution, “the means out of mediocrity.” (TEA, p. 15)
The USDE calls for the establishment of standards for skills, information and individual student dispositions, involvement of home and community, recognition of the arts as part of the core curriculum and school improvement. The NEA reiterates additional themes incorporating the arts as solutions for broader social problem: the arts are basic to the curriculum, a means of improving teaching and learning, necessary to achieve higher standards within schools and are a means for artists and arts organizations to help connect communities to the schools in a meaningful way. Upon these social and educational goals, the unified efforts of the USDE and the NEA formed the Goals 2000 National Arts Education Action Partnership composed of over 100 national organizations. Nonetheless, only the arts education associations identified the multiple and many policy changes (outside of, but impacting the schools) necessary to attain these goals. This text represents clearly an inside-outside conflict in problem identification; the solution resides in the power of the majority to impose its perspectives on the minority, in this case, the minority will implement the policy.

Occasional references are made by the federal and arts agencies to “the value of different cultures,” Project Zero, communication and technical skills, the five “essential” art disciplines only hint at suggested curriculum content. However, while often in a defensive tone, the arts education associations make clear the connection between art content (not special projects, activities, contests, or processes), student art learning (not special events, teaching techniques, exhibits, art media, or resources) and art education (not art enrichment, exposure, or entertainment). (TEA, p.31)

Basic literacy in the arts is an understanding of and ability to work with artistic elements and structures in each discipline. Such literacy is grounded in the study of the language and grammar of each art form as these are related directly to creation, performance, or exhibition.” (TEA, p.31)
Additionally stating with reference to history, literature and analysis of the arts, “While study in the arts disciplines may enhance other skills, encourage personal development, or lead to a stronger economic base for professional presentation of the arts, these are not and should not be the primary reasons for their study.” (TEA, p.31)

Occasionally, in the short statements of the arts education associations, they reveal accepted instructional and assessment strategies and the way they may accommodate the general goals: for example, a theater representative notes dramatic play, multiple senses and intelligences, the collaborative nature of the art form and the subject matter of the “human condition” are in keeping with general education goals. Art educators refer to cultural literacy, but emphasize that instructional strategies must evolve from “how students learn;” therefore, the text returns to themes of individual expression combined with “high-order, integrated skills.” While the goals behind the National Standards (1994) are voluntary, it is clear from this text their generality will be used to mold the resulting state, district curriculum frameworks and classroom instructional and assessment strategies. Ultimately program design and instructional delivery is circumscribed.

Around the USDE and NEA framework, the NCSL text supports (through the voices of national arts advocacy groups) an education agenda focused on the inclusion of local and state artists and arts organizations in school reform. While recognizing “... that a great many decisions will ultimately be made locally, all partnerships and advocacy “...must be directed toward the final outcome of affecting local decision making.” (TEA, p.15) The language of the text, particularly the transcription of arts organizations, reveals the arts advocacy predisposition: “Arts education is an investment in the development of
both future artists and audiences.” (TEA, p.15) “Goals 2000 also offers nonprofit arts institutions an opportunity to cultivate tomorrow’s audiences. To ensure vital support for our nation’s cultural institutions....” (TEA, p.18) “The development of the partnerships among local, state, and national levels is recognized as an essential strategy for successful education reform.” (TEA, p.16)

Adhering to a multi-purpose approach to the arts, strategies for advocacy and implementation, not curriculum or education goals, are addressed succinctly by members of national education associations (CCSSO, NSBA): Use the mandated involvement of state legislative members, maximize and create funding incentives where ever they occur, encourage local ownership of change, review policy impacting school programs in the arts.

**Principles of Exclusion**

Because the *Accord* (1991) addresses school policies and practices rather than content and instructional method, there are few direct areas of overlay with the *National Standards* (1994). Because the *National Standards* (1994) rationale is stated so broadly and the *Accord* (1991) is so specific, it is hard to identify too many disagreements between the curricular beliefs espoused in the two documents. But several different political or factional positions are present. The *Accord* (1991) focuses on the “integrity” of individual arts disciplines and diminishes the focus on instrumental uses which are foundational to many of the social goals of the *National Standards* (1994). Overall, the major differences reside in the tone of the text; the *Accord* (1991) is considerably more aggressive about arts education professionals setting the agenda nationally. Unlike the *National Standards* (1994), it is not conciliatory in any way.
Again, *The Power of the arts to transform education* (1992) has few areas of strong disagreement with the *National Standards* (1994). While the *National Standards* (1994) attempted to avoid controversial topics surrounding implementation, this organization and others in the contemporary discourse were anticipating both curricular and political barriers. This text does not deny the generic, highly rhetorical academic and social development rationale offered in the *National Standards* (1994); but the text does view the value of the arts as their contribution to social processes and institutional reform: reform in legislation, in centralized government influence (or control), in teacher education, in standards and assessment.

The lack of discrepancies between the various texts within the discourse field is an indication of a consensus of some sort; however, the depth of that agreement is questionable. As the various advocacy texts presented here reveal, the all-encompassing world view of the *National Standards* (1994) simply postpones decision making about controversial topics. Possibly, *Transforming education through the arts* (1995) demonstrates most clearly that the political antipathies of the discourse field are still alive and those disagreements have little to do with arts curriculum and a lot to do with factions seeking to maintain or gain power. The major difference represented in this text maybe that all factions are contributing to the same text.

**Authorities of Function**

**Non-discursive Practices**

The social, political and economic issues of the early 1990s including various social equity and accountability issues were reflected in the increasing emphasis on school reform: issues such as multiculturalism, technological development and student
assessment dominated the social and educational discourse. While accountability for student learning was driven by a continued concern for workplace needs; technological training and resources in the educational setting were viewed by many as a panacea for many school problems. Due to the diversity of locally controlled school systems, a rising concern for uniform quality and accessibility confirmed the need for a national assessment. Three major concerns were repeated in the discourse: equity in school funding, the lack of institutional facilities and adequate teacher preparation. Although not a particularly new idea, mandated testing was a negative driving force behind various initiatives which sought better ways of engaging students in the learning process through varied interdisciplinary or holistic approaches to learning and by acknowledging and linking the student with his “real” world experiences. Art education communities found themselves increasingly drawn into the persistent problems of general education; art education professionals sought ways in which arts education could address the issues and problems defined by national school reform efforts and, by doing so, to insure an institutional position for arts education in the curriculum.

**Rules of Appropriation**

The institutional limitations on transfer diminish during the *National Standards* discourse. The dominance of the GCEA shifts to an assortment of separate, but not necessarily dissimilar communities. New coalitions with the business community (such as the NCEA), partnerships with private organizations (such as the Anneberg Foundation) and ideological mergers with government programs such as the JFK Center), temper the earlier polarization of ideas. In order to protect core values and the rights of local schools, professional art educators placed few limitations on the transfer of curriculum policy or
pedagogy: artist, scholars, practitioners, policy makers were all participants in formulating the National Standards (1994). As Hoffa (1993) suggests: “...arts educators must adjust to the values and interests of two quite separate worlds. They are a part of both the education establishment and the arts community, even though they are also separate from both worlds in some important respects.” (Hoffa, 1993, p.3) Beyond a focus on goals and outcomes inherent in the standards themselves, students as a factor in the successful appropriation of ideas about learning were minimalized.

**Idealizations**

In the 1990s, the idealizations of art and education which exerted non-discursive authority on discourse strategies were: Art expressed collectively a generation’s understanding of itself, had a broad aesthetic function to help individuals understand an ever changing society through constructive learning experiences, and should be valued intrinsically and instrumentally for its role in cultural formation. The student was the primary artist. As such the arts served a broader educational ideal: education, concerned with the future, should provide stability in social change, should replace false “dualities” with a holistic approach to learning, should blend conceptually the many contradictions in theory and practice present in the discourse field. Idea formation is directed at merging of belief systems and policy formulation increasingly is driven by political necessity.

**Archeological Findings: Strategies**

**Findings: Discourse Field #1**

- The AEAP accepted many contemporary practices, ideas and functions from the discourse field: The “progressive,” child-centered focus on expressiveness, the school as a democratic institution, and the acceptance
of established programs, federal agencies and the dominant power structures deciding contemporary trends.

- The work of the AEAP incorporated change elements: an aesthetic approach to the arts was combined with artistic “ways of knowing” and was seen as instrumental and integrated to student learning in and out of the arts.

- Also new, it proposed, as a private organization, to intervene in public schools using experts outside of professional educators; organizationally, it pioneered “unparallel” coalitions of stakeholders.

- Conflicts over curricular ideology were not a major issue for established school personnel.

- Its ideas about art and its values were not complex, the recommended use of outside personnel (the artist-teacher), constrained teachers, schools and institutions from wide-spread implementation.

- Funding to local districts, collaborations with state departments of education, and coalitions with federal agencies and national arts advocates, the AEAP mounted a top-down, outside-in effort to include the arts world (artists, art organizations, etc.) in education.

- A monumental task, AEAP strategies attempted to reintegrate the arts and arts experience into the social fabric through all available social institutions, including schools.
• The professional arts education associations, AAE and NSBA formed the constellation of other/opposing discourse organizations surrounding AEAP.

• The possibilities within the discourse were created by AEAP itself and centered on issues: a focus on individual affective learning, all art forms as interdisciplinary “ways of knowing,” intrinsic or instrumental use of the arts, the community and artist-as-teacher as primary resources.

• Political differences, however, between professional art educators (who did not validate the AEAP report, but called for further research) and other factions within the discourse field were clear: on the role of government intervention, the NEA and state/local arts councils, and advocacy techniques. The debate expanded beyond curriculum to policy issues involving institutional reforms.

• The strongest non-discursive authorities of function impacting the discourse field were a strained economic situation, increased concern for institutional accountability and decreasing student performance on high-stake testing. Because the arts had little status in the schools, practitioners and administrators were willing to accept without question the ideas and funding of federal programs, state and local councils and private foundations. Because these programs did not challenge the ideology behind core values in the profession, contemporary idealizations could be maintained; and the programmatic suggestions seemed beneficial to all concerned.
Findings: Discourse Field #2

- The GCEA accepted many traditions from the authority of academe and the art canon; it sought parity for art in status and in the established school structure. It built on advocacy practices such as the school pilot program, the traditions of teacher preparation and professional development. As a private foundation embedded within a complex of organizations, it sustained a certain distance from the grassroots movement it encouraged.

- The work of the GCEA incorporated several change elements: through a disciplinary approach to the arts it promoted an educational intervention; it believed that acquired knowledge and standards of excellence would produce a culturally literate adult population. It proposed the visual arts would achieve parity with other subjects in the schools through a sequenced curriculum. Its strategy was to serve as a catalyst for a grassroots movement among experts and practitioners in art education.

- Systematically, the Getty’s challenge was to convince the professional classroom teacher of the significance of a disciplinary approach, previously not an accepted approach for arts study in the K-12 environment and, likewise, changing the classroom focus to a more literate adult population or, particularly, an adult audience for the arts was difficult.

- The GCEA strategies attempted to install and to gain parity for the arts and arts study in institutional schooling; the complexity of installing a parallel curriculum and programming in schools was a huge undertaking.
• Through funding and sponsorship to DBAE model projects, providing research and expertise from the field of art education, creating teacher leadership skills to extend the influence of their rationale, the GCEA hoped to stimulate a grassroots movement of art education practitioners and scholars to implement programming to include the arts world (artists, art organizations, etc.) from a bottom-up, inside-out effort in education.

• The professional organization, ACA and CCSSO formed the constellation of other/opposing discourse organizations surrounding the GCEA.

• The possibilities of discourse field were increasing; they centered on issues such as: cultural formation vs. legacy, instrumental vs. noninstrumental strategies, creation over appreciation, professionalism: the classroom teacher competency (and the art teacher’s viability) vs. the consistency of the artist as teacher, professional core values vs. “misguided” advocacy, individual cognitive/affective skills vs. cultural literacy and the institutional parity of school arts, the role of arts in school reform and in solving social problems.

• The GCEA rationale was resisted in all sectors: the professional organizations opposed the content-focus vs. student focus and all of the instructional decisions leading from that perspective; the ACA maintained an instrumental rationale with the artist as expert; the CCSSO maintained the status quo was acceptable, but simply needed improvement.

• The strongest authorities of function impacting the discourse field were on-going insecurities about the country’s ability to sustain its position as a
world power; along with global competitiveness in business and science, concerns about cultural and educational institutions were examined critically. Social institutions at all levels resisted critique and any appropriation from outside sources.

**Findings: Discourse Field #3**

- The Consortium accepted most of the practices of the contemporary policy environment: preexisting learning theories, content choices, and instructional/assessment practices of the many local systems were accepted without question. Similarly, the traditions of pedagogy of the four art fields were not challenged.

- The Consortium offered very few new conceptual constructions to the discourse; although it advocated for standards, it made no recommendations on curricular function in the schools. The major contribution it made to the discourse field was in the political unification of the four arts disciplines; stimulated by a policy “window,” it achieved a new political consensus.

- Systematically, The Consortium strategies attempted to establish the arts on the national education agenda, to create a political consensus (at least temporarily), to provide a model for policy making at the state level. As advocacy, the text offends no one; it promises everything.

- As a policy statement it is confused rather than complex. It offers more rhetoric than substantive guidance to implementation.
• Because the Standards are voluntary, the constraints on implementation are not as obvious. The barriers to implementation are left to local authorities.

• The professional organization, AEP and NCSL formed the constellation of other/opposing discourse organizations surrounding the Consortium.

• The Consortium rationale had little for other/opposing factions to contradict. The debate was moving away from curricular concerns toward political consensus, however, the issue of professional core values and authority remained a strong statement of the professional organizations. Most factions, including the GCEA, rallied around a holistic approach to curricular goals in order to achieve political consensus.

• The strongest authorities of function impacting the discourse field were social equity and accountability issues manifest in multiculturalism, technology development and student assessment. Willingness to appropriate educational policy solutions paralleled a postmodern tendency to remove barriers in idea formation and an openness to blend ideas. Similarly, an interest in “holistic” perspectives gained favor whether in the form of curriculum orientation, political consensus, or social unity.

**Meta Analysis of Model Effectiveness: Strategies**

The formation of strategies model functions to assess the results of the previous three formations as they reflect the interaction of the discourse field. Points of diffraction within the primary text are analyzed 1) by correlating the equivalent choices in the primary text with various discourses in a field, 2) by discerning the choices advocated
within the primary policy text that impact the discourse field, and 3) by identifying themes or theories of discoursal choice. Points of determination are examined 1) by framing discoursal choices according to their role and relative importance in the discourse field, 2) by outlining the possible choices open to policy makers within the discourse field, and 3) by determining the reasons for excluding certain discoursal choices. Authorities of function describes the themes and theories of discoursal choices impacting and impacted by 1) by the non-discursive social circumstances, 2) by the restrictions of appropriation allowed within the situational context, and 3) by rules of accepted social ideals.

Again, the strength of the model is that it assesses policy choices from multiple perspectives: organizational choices that are “old,” which maintained the status quo or discursive stability (even for “new” reasons) and those choices that were “new,” “innovative” and representing forces of change. By a cross section of the discourse field with other domains, it summarizes the possibilities of discursive choice, assesses the dominant issues impacting policy choice, accounts for the reasons choices are accepted or rejected, and the strategies or mechanisms most commonly used to obtain or maintain power.

Still, there are areas where the model remains an unclear guide to analysis. Guidelines for “incompatible” choices, necessary distinctions in comparative analysis, are unclear when operationalized; although it appears Foucault is attempting to demonstrate how contradictions between formations may exist, the level and criteria of contradiction is unclear. Similarly, determining the difference between totally “new” ideas and “old” ideas requires an in depth knowledge of the discourse field (and previous discourse); for example,
distinctions between “old” or “equivalent” ideas and “old” ideas for “new” reasons are important to understand his “play of dominations,” but these distinctions are not provided by Foucault. Equally unclear are the guidelines for deciding the societal issues delimiting discursive choices; the model suggests broad areas pertinent to general educational discourse, but, again, a means of identifying representative texts (related to arts education) from these non-discursive domains is left unresolved.

Summary

The formation of strategies model functions to document discursive “choice.” While the word may imply a conscious decision, Foucault’s views on subjectivity would counter that idea; discursive influence and transfer are both intentional and non-intentional, as are the resulting decisions. Discursive choice, the apparent “reason” for choice, and the mechanisms used in decision making are cross referenced within the model. First, the model identifies the organization agreement or disagreement with the status quo, and then the model compares organizational documents and documents produced by other or opposing organizations and domains within the discourse field to find “disjuncture.” Also noting the non-discursive delimiting factors on discourse function, the model seeks to reveal the “direction” of influence and transfer as an indication of discursive power.
CHAPTER 9

A GENEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Purpose of the Genealogical Interpretation

To identify political power and influence in an individual discourse statement is the ultimate purpose of Foucault’s archeological procedures. To compare discourses over time, however, is the purpose of his suggested genealogical interpretation. Foucault maintained that the understanding of social practices and their meaning within a discourse is found in the play of discoursal dominations and discontinuities. The goal of genealogical interpretation is to identify changes in political power from one historical “bracket” to another or, more importantly, to assess the “disjunctures” created, or, in this study, the causes and consequences of policy choices.

Employing the same idea found in the formation of strategies, Foucault investigates the utility of discoursal discontinuity, of genealogical “rupture,” to critically assess the significance of discourse change over time. Foucault states:

...discontinuity is one of those great accidents that create cracks not only in the geology of history but also in the simple fact of the statement: it emerges in its historical irruption; what we try to examine is the incision that it makes, that irreducible–and very often tiny–emergence. (Foucault, 1972, p. 28)

Using “nodal points” from earlier formation analyses, Foucault’s technique of “shortened vision” and discourse “alignment”/“disjuncture” are used to highlight
discoursal patterns appearing across bracketed discourse periods. Although Foucault does not state that these “nodal points” link historical periods, his implication is, nonetheless, that such identifiable points provide the basis of comparison between any discoursal conditions of possibilities. Likewise, they provide themes or rationalizations for any discoursal choice; in short, the discourse “patterns” behind the organization’s discursive choice, rationales for choice and mechanisms of choice form typologies of policy function. By placing the specified characteristics of policy discourses side by side, the respective discourses are presented in sharp relief; no longer looking for evolutionary origins, Foucault first identifies “sameness” and, secondly, he charts “disjuncture” or “rupture.” For Foucault, such rupture is indicative of a change in power.

Overtime, the incisions reveal change in belief systems, in power structure, in dominant processes, and in the social forces impacting decision making. Based on the procedural categories for the collection and treatment of data inherent in the archeological analysis in this study, a genealogical interpretation of the bracketed discourse periods identifies similarities and differences in arts education policy discourse from 1970 to the present. Additionally, this genealogical model interprets ideological or functional choice in policy making, organizational reasons for these choices and the organizational mechanisms contributing to or responsible for changing belief systems, norms and practices within the field of arts education field

**Discourse Disjuncture: Objects**

Situational context # from 1970-1979 and organizational emergence (evidenced in text production), represent common disjunctures and obvious incisions in discourse. Although the discourse field is dominated by AEAP’s *Coming to our senses* (1977), its
impact on the larger situational context is minimal. Closely aligned with federal agencies and producing a landmark “research” document in the field, it, nonetheless, made little immediate impact on other or opposing communities or practitioners.

Conversely, the situational context from 1980-1989 and organizational emergence (evidenced in text production), represent different disjunctures but obvious incisions in discourse. The conditions of the situational context had much to do with the Getty’s organizational success in institutionalizing its ideology. An examination of the discourse registers reveals the GCEA’s emergence as a change agent into the discourse field was closely aligned with national concern for educational issues in general. Although it did not appear to impact immediately the congressional mandate producing Toward civilization (1988), by the time that study was published, the Getty’s influence on idea formation in the NEA policy statement could be seen. But the organization built upon these conditions; the sheer volume in organizational text production served to energize the discourse community, and critical response to its texts and curricular orientation appears well orchestrated by subjects of the Getty’s ideology.

Situational context from 1990-2000 and organizational emergence (evidenced in text production), represent many disjunctures and obvious incisions in discourse. The Consortium was a community that responded to established authority within the situational context; as a part of a larger congressional concern for school reform. CNAEA followed the dictates of the USDE along with other disciplinary fields. Besides the production of the National Standards (1994) document, the CNAEA expended most of its resources on coalition building rather than text production. Its purpose was singular: to
unify politically the diverse arts disciplines and their educational communities in support of one policy concept, standards.

**Discourse Disjuncture: Enunciative Modes**

The common disjunctures in organizational sites, leadership (speakers) and followers (subjects) evidenced in the organization’s collective publications are significantly reflected in organization composition, ideology and mechanisms of influence and transfer.

Discourse organization #1, AEAP, as a private organization, was composed of stakeholders from outside of the schools, it functioned as a core member of a policy community. Its leadership identified the primary issue as arts access in the public schools, the problem or barrier as the professional school personnel themselves and the solution proposed was outside intervention of art supporters and artists as teachers. Its subjects, usually career bureaucrats and arts advocates, supported arts as individual expression and their instrumental use in learning.

Discourse organization #2, the GCEA, also a private organization, was composed primarily of art education academics and specialists, served as a catalyst for school reform. Its leadership identified the primary issue as the status of the arts within the schools, the problem as ill-defined expectations and standards and the solution proposed was the imposition on the curriculum of the traditional art canon via academic discipline. Its subjects, usually academics and art specialists, supported disciplinary organization of knowledge with a learning focus on cognitive training.

Discourse organization #3, the Consortium, primarily composed of national arts education professional organizations and arts advocates working with government
agencies, was a political coalition. Its leadership identified the issue as parity among other fields in the curriculum, the problem as a need for political unity in support of the field, and the solution it proposed was parallel standards to other fields seeking a place on the national agenda. Its subjects, a diverse population of art and education advocates, supported multiple and diverse ideologies at the discretion of local schools, but under the umbrella of standardized learning goals and outcomes.

**Discourse Disjuncture: Concepts**

Discourse Text #1 is founded on generalizations and prescription; it is dependent on assertion derived from many sources. The discoursal schemata, based on testimony from various facets of society, posit art education (and art) based in a social/historical problem requiring the use of integrative and anagogic models from the society, i.e. federal intervention. Processes of textual intervention can be characterized as meta research attempting to promote multiple “ways of knowing.”

Discourse Text #2 is founded in argumentation; it is dependent on presentation of hypothesis with verification via considerable assertion and critique. It functions at the level of concept grouping and borrowing. The discoursal schemata, confined to specialized population of art and art education experts, propose an art world model with art education as a means to those values. Processes of textual intervention can be characterized as informal, layered presentation of argument attempting to promote “creative intelligence.”

Discourse Text #3 is founded on specification or prescription; it is heavily dependent on assertion and critique and concept borrowing. The discoursal schemata, draws from a broad base of general education and arts practitioners, overall models from
the humanistic approach of general education reform and multiple art education orientations of the past 30 years. Processes of textual intervention can be characterized as a persuasive, hyperbolic language of the field reflecting a focus on art as a means to integrated human experience.

**Discourse Disjuncture: Strategies**

Discourse field #1 strategies of stability maintained common ideological positions, established programs and a focus on the role of schooling in a democracy. Strategies of change promoted instrumental use of the arts, integration of the arts in the curriculum and use of outside personnel. Professional concerns of teachers, consistent availability of artists, school and school district accountability were potential barriers. Overall, there was little policy activity in the field on the national level except for AEAP; their recommendations were the discoursal possibilities. The discourse is marked by conformity; most other organizations posed limited or no opposition to the basic message of the organization except for concern of the arts education professional community for better research. The dominant authority of discourse function during this time period was the economy; issues of value and efficiency dominated the discourse.

Discourse field #2 strategies of stability maintained artistic and academic values, upheld school curriculum and structure, and formal practices of teacher preparation and development. Strategies of change promoted focus on disciplinary learning, parity through a sequenced disciplinary curriculum, professional advocacy and private interventions to achieve “excellence” in the field. A very clearly stated rationale, it was, nonetheless, complex as a guide to K-12 learning; its primary constraint was in teacher preparation and, to a lesser extent, the established academic and school district
bureaucracy willing to accommodate the Getty’s hierarchy of experts. The discourse is marked by conflict; increasing discursal activity brought forth opposition to the Getty’s proposals from all sectors. With the exception of an agreement on “excellence,” most maintained support for some aspect of established curriculum and classroom practice. The dominant authority of discourse function during this time period was the global competitiveness; issues of cultural dominance and institutional excellence dominated the discourse.

Discourse field #3 strategies of stability supported existing ideologies, school practices, and arts pedagogies. Strategies of change promoted a focus on art study integrated in the classroom, conceded local control over curriculum and programming, and established the arts on the accepted national education agenda. The curricular rationale is more politically than educationally important. The discourse is marked by consensus; discourse activity was focused on points of agreement. Professional core values and professional authority over curricular decision making replaced concerned for curricular orientation. The dominant authority of discourse function during this time period was institutional reform; issues of practicality and consensus dominated the discourse.

**Genealogical Findings: Policy Discourse Results 1970-2000**

In summary, curriculum purpose (i.e. learning goals, instructional methods, and outcomes) are seen as political instruments. Federal power increasing sought to intervene in educational decision making with the help of private advocacy organizations. Despite the elaborate attempt to bring rationally conceived orientations concerning educational virtue, effectiveness and efficiency to the discursal process, coalitions within the
discourse field (including business interests) blur curricular rationales or disregard them entirely in favor of political strategies and goals. Based on this discourse sample, the function of curriculum ideology was to promote policy debate and to stimulate political action.

**Meta Analysis of Interpretation Procedures**

The genealogical procedures are 1) to examine significant forces (based on designated “nodal points”) impacting discourse choices, reason for choices, and mechanisms for choices revealed in statements of policy overtime, 2) to “shorten the vision” between these representative discourse statements of each discourse period, 3) to demonstrate alignment or disjuncture of discourse “nodal points” and, thereby, 4) to reveal the role of idea formation in policy formulation. While Foucault maintains that this kind of comparison does not enable us to say “who told the truth, who reasoned with rigor, who...was closest to a primary, or ultimate, destination...,” it does reveal the extent to which situations were about “the same thing.” (Foucault, 1972, p.126) Through genealogical interpretation, this methodology addresses the issue of transferable discourse “rules.”

The major strength of Foucault’s method for genealogical interpretation is it is directly related to a strong theoretical framework specifically aimed at discerning the ahistorical nature of idea formation. The procedures, although not as detailed as those found in the archeological model, provide an organized system of comparison of ideas impacting policy processes in different times, places, and environments. Characteristic of Foucault’s mode of inquiry, the repetition of tasks (rather than the results) potentially
leads to a general understanding of the early stages of policy formulation, possibly a typology of policy function.

The weaknesses of the genealogical interpretation are linked to the weaknesses of the archeological model; as might be expected the interpretation is dependent on the quality of the information upon which it is based. Likewise, the methodological problems inherent in the archeological model surface again in the genealogical interpretation. For instance, the lack of definition of concepts such as “nodal points” proves crucial in the process of comparing different bracketed discourse. Finally, the extent of comparison poses a problem. Foucault is quite clear that each discourse should be examined and described individually and should not be held to predetermined categories. Genealogical interpretation, and its inherent search for similarities and disjuncture in discursive choice, reason and mechanisms of choice, verges on a classification process.

Summary

The function of the genealogical interpretation is to compare regularities and disjunctures between “bracketed” discourses, to identify new information on forces of stability and change, new understanding of organizational function, new insight into language function in idea formation and new patterns of strategies in discursive choice. By juxtapositioning these dispositions of each discourse through Foucault’s “shortened vision,” disjunctures within each discourse field are revealed; choice, reasons for discursive choice and mechanisms behind discursive choice are made transparent.
CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

In an effort to evaluate the relevance of Foucault’s discourse theory for understanding the relationship of idea formation in arts education discourse to national arts education policy formulation, this study presents three levels of evaluation (and criteria) to answer the research question: 1) the procedural model is evaluated on its effectiveness and efficiency (functional strengths and weaknesses) in revealing or verifying discourse information and/or mapping discourse relationships, 2) the mode of inquiry is judged against generally accepted qualitative research criteria, and 3) the relevance of Foucault’s theory is assessed according to its implications for the arts education profession and policy making, and 4) its adaptability to varied research needs within the arts education policy environment.

The Effectiveness of the Procedural Model

Although recognizing the nature of policy research is always concerned with the instrumental benefits, this study only explores fundamental research goals, that is, the opportunities provided by Foucault’s work for increased understanding of policy decision making. It is limited to a translation of abstract ideas of inquiry into concepts relevant to idea formation, ideas which may contribute to policy formulation. The model designed for this study is not a research instrument per se; at best, it is a guide to creating one. Likewise, the discourses analyzed in this study are, in fact, only a demonstration of the organizing
principles behind Foucault’s methodology and the kind of data potentially revealed by such inquiry. Generally, establishing theoretical relevance depends 1) on the model’s potential in developing more refined research instruments, 2) its appropriateness to policy research in arts education, and 3) its consistency with Foucault’s own mode of inquiry. An evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of each formation model against its particular function (discussed as a meta analysis in each formation chapter) suggest that the models, with continued refinement, have much potential for documenting early stages of policy formulation, is conceptually compatible with research needs of arts education policy, and is consistent with the aims and goals of discourse theory.

The Research Values in Foucault’s Mode of Inquiry

Although clearly within the realm of qualitative inquiry, Foucault does not reject the imposition of ideals or criteria of quality for his mode of inquiry. While acknowledging that language does not correlate directly to reality, that reality has many dimensions, and that reality is subject to multiple interpretations, he, nonetheless, embraces the idea that reality may be viewed indirectly through many lenses, albeit “darkly.” The documentation suggested by his mode of inquiry might indicate “reality,” if not, “truth,” is knowable.

In an attempt to answer the primary research question, that is, to address Foucault’s “relevance” to national arts education policy, general ideals for research are addressed throughout this evaluation: such ideals, according to Seale (1999), are characterized as “principled, methodic and systematic.” (Seale, 1999, p.33) In particular, Seale (1999) advocates for ideals that promote an awareness of methodological “consequences;” these ideals are implied in the secondary research questions for this study: Does the methodology (and the model) offer a plausible means of explaining the relationship of idea formation to
curriculum policy discourse and formulation? Does the methodology (and the model) provide understanding of idea formation, and its relationship to policy formulation when applied to other contexts and cases? Does the methodology (and the model) provide for a focused examination and corroboration of discourse processes related to curriculum policy formulation? Does the methodology (and the model) account for researcher bias? Are the method and the model consistent with each other and with Foucault theory and mode of inquiry?

Therefore, this study proposes guiding principles for naturalistic inquiry as they are defined by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and explained by Seale (1999). Extrapolating from conventional methodologies and adapting ideas, they codify four distinct values compatible with an evolving qualitative tradition: 1) Credibility, 2) Transferability, 3) Dependability, and 4) Confirmability.

First, “credibility” should replace “truth value.” As Seale (1999) explains:

Through prolonged engagement in the field, persistent observation and triangulation exercises, as well as exposure of the research report to criticism by a disinterested peer reviewer and a search for negative instances that challenge emerging hypotheses and demand their reformulation, credibility is built up. (Seale, 1999, p.44)

This process of on-going observation, verification and adjustment to new evidence is foundational to Foucault’s methodology. Extremely focused on detailed documentation, the methodology continuously cross references discourse dimensions where idea formation occurs. Besides changing its perspective with each formation, the model alternates and adjusts its view between registers of power, between internal and external ideals, between discursive activity of institutions, organizations, etc., between formal and contextual data gathering, between macro and micro level analysis (ranging from individual discursive
practice to the non-discursive authority of social practices, appropriation and idealization), and, likewise, its genealogical model examines the ideological and functional components of idea formation in time. Certainly, the constant and vigilant search for disjuncture and inconsistencies is an effort to “adjust” the researcher’s understanding of the phenomenon examined as new information is revealed. This study concludes that, with the full engagement of the researcher and the research community, the methodology (and the model) offers a credible, a plausible means of explaining the relationship of idea formation to curriculum policy discourse and formulation.

Second, “transferability” should replace “applicability.” Again, Seale (1999) explains that random sampling and probabilistic reasoning can be abandoned “by providing a detailed, rich description of the setting studied, so that readers are given sufficient information to be able to judge the applicability of findings to other settings which they know.” (Seale, 1999, p. 45) Although Foucault does not outline descriptive categories of ideas and concepts, he does provide for procedural categories to direct, redirect and direct again the researcher to different sources of information, ideas, and relationships. For instance, within the four dimensions of idea formation proposed by Foucault, he suggests approximately nine procedural categories for data gathering; within each of these categories are 2-3 detailed orientations or perspectives to view the materials found. Although the methodology produces an abundance of “rich detail,” it is detail derived from an extremely well-organized research process; the repetition of the data collected and discourse patterns found in this study are indicative that transferability to other research areas is possible. This study concludes the methodology (and the model) can provide understanding of idea
formation, and its relationship to policy formulation when applied to other contexts and cases outside of art, art education or education.

Third, “dependability” should replace “reliability.” Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest outside “auditing” of the processes and decision making in the use of qualitative research methodology. The very assumptions underlying Foucault’s theory propose that discourse research is ultimately dependant on procedural dependability, that is, repeated tasks, not on replicated findings. Data collection and analysis depends on an open-ended, but organized, case-by-case investigation of the discourse phenomenon. However, nothing prevents or discourages outside auditing of conclusions reached through this method. For example, for the purposes of demonstration in this study, the researcher was aware of the historical and critical research that documented the same material, although through other methodological means. Certainly, not a “fool-proof” auditing procedure, it provided certain checks on Foucault’s and the researcher’s bias. Ultimately, for this study, this auditing procedure is in hands of the research advisors. This study concludes that the methodology (and the model) allows for a focused examination and corroboration of discourse processes of curriculum policy formulation through repeated procedural tasks.

And, fourth, “confirmability” should replace “neutrality” or “objectivity.” Through various exercises in reflexivity, Seale (1999) suggests “a provision of a methodological self-critical account of how the research was done…. ” (Seale, 1999, p.45) Foucault’s mode of inquiry provides for reflexive opportunities and exercises to check the researcher’s understanding of his/her own involvement in the research process. Most notable is the technique of the recreated “perceptual process” used in this model to establish the ideological “form” of the texts. The researcher is ask to provide a record of his “reading” of
the text, and then to examine it for its enunciative form, its apparent meaning or
significance, and its complexity of thought. While the text is the basis of the recreated form,
the researcher can not escape his/her own words, interpretations, and understanding of the
text in these tasks. Ultimately, the researcher views him/herself inside of the research
process, as a participant in idea formation and as a contributor to the “recreated unity.”
Therefore, this study concludes the methodology (and the model), in a very unique way,
accounts for researcher bias.

**The Implications of Foucault’s Discourse Theory**

While the effectiveness of the model and the research values of the method are the
primary evaluative criteria in this study, the implications for curriculum and policy study
also are an important aspect of evaluating Foucault’s theoretical relevance.

**For Art Education Research**

The value of discourse analysis to curriculum study is in its close
examination of the way ideas are formed and reformed in the field of arts education. It
clarifies this process in several ways. discourse analysis 1) identifies the sources of
political power behind various educational ideologies and/or discourse mechanisms
shaping the profession, 2) charts the range of ideological paradigms (internal and external)
impacting the profession, 3) aids understanding of the circumstances under which ideas,
values, and beliefs within the profession form and emerge, 4) identifies and addresses how
the profession defines and expresses itself through collective action and 5) explains why
curriculum decision making often appears inconsistent and contradictory.

As shown be this study, power is exercised through the legitimacy of
government support (NEA, USDE), the funding and prestige of private foundations (JDR
3rd Fund, The J. P. Getty Trust), or through the collective power of professional alliances
(CNAEA). Although limited in some ways by its dependence on text production, the
method and the methodology account for both the stabilizing and change agents internal
and external to the profession; these forces are most obvious in the discursive activity of
individual critics who maintain the issues of the field before the public, of organizations
that advocate for reform, and of institutions at all levels that restrain excessive change.
This study concentrates on national organizational power exerted to change the status quo,
but the model could focus as easily on other power sources within the discourse, including
non-discursive factors. For example, the model would be equally valuable in tracing the
policy making impact of the NEA or USDE, the national education associations, the
advocacy of art organizations, or the collective power of state or local boards of education,
community groups, practitioners.

Discourse analysis charts the range of ideological paradigms (internal and external)
impacting the profession. The method and the model clearly are aimed at revealing
ideological bias wherever and at whatever level it exists; attempting to identify hidden
concept groupings is evident in the analysis of various text function (institutional rules,
sponsored scholarship, curricular guidelines), the ideological characterizations of both
speakers and subjects (professional leadership, organized advocates, constituencies), and the
in-depth language analysis of the of idea formation in pivotal actions or texts. Although this
study is limited to idea formation processes that potentially led to national policy
formulation, in many respects, the model could reveal more about the dominant ideologies
in the field by examining a broader range of texts such as state and local curricular
guidelines, adopted textbooks, etc.
The methodology and the model are designed to aid understanding of the circumstances under which ideas, values, and beliefs within the profession form and emerge. Repeatedly, the model cross references on-going activities in social, political, and professional domains. Each model, while representing a different dimension of discourse, also internally establishes the relationship between the realms of ideology and political action; “the circumstances” of the emergence of a specific idea grouping is made clear from the beginning. In this study, the organization’s ideology is contextualized within the government action, the speaker and subjects are contextualized within the “place of observation,” the language or rhetorical schemata is presented simultaneously with discoursal schemata, and organizational choice is viewed against choices of multiple agents in the discursive field. In this respect, the models are of particular value to arts education research because, as a relatively small field, it seldom is self-defining or insulated from its context. As is demonstrated by the national standards movement, major changes in this relatively small field depend on larger movements within a school, a district, a state, or the nation. No doubt, a clearer understanding of the forces impinging on profession values would be possible if this study was focused on the activity of the professional organizations or the activity of practitioners at the various levels (as opposed to private foundations).

The model and methodology identifies and addresses how the profession defines and expresses itself through collective action. Providing an example of ideological concepts operationalized in decision making in general, the model views multiple mechanisms that contribute to professional definition. Most notably, the model is concerned with discourse text production, organizational alliances and allegiances, language usage, and group decision making. But while specific modes of expression are addressed in the organizational profiles
of three organizations in this study, modes of expression are important in other model tasks: the text functions in the objects analysis, the enunciative series in the perceptual process of concept analysis, and, of course, specific discursive choice or decision making in the strategies analysis. Each of these research tasks can reveal how what is said and what is done by professional membership may be different, how personal and professional ideals constantly are reinforced or undermined by professional actions (or vise versa), and how that expression impacts policy making processes. Although this study limits its view of the profession to the arts education professional organizations, this model could be used effectively to examine closely the role of professional membership in creating its policy environment.

Finally, all of these issues are investigated by the model and methodology to explain why multiple curriculum orientations exist simultaneously in the field, and why agreed upon professional ideals are not always reflected in art education policy or its discussion. Although Foucault’s archeological method is more about gathering data than answering questions of this nature, with the understanding such a research approach can provide arts educators, they may devise better ways to integrate what they value into a political process; discovering what is “policy manipulable” (Hass & Springer, 1998, p. 30) For instance, particularly as the model for strategies suggests, understanding what types of policy choices, reasons for policy choices and mechanisms for implementing policy choices are more likely to impact policy formulation is of major importance in the field. Without doubt, this same assessment of professional advocacy must take place over and over as the professional community and policy makers contemplate and formulate policy in the many and diverse educational “systems” in the country.
The value of discourse analysis to policy research is, in part, its concern for policy function. As it maps conceptually the policy environment, it provides a useful typography of discursive and non-discursive interactions between conflicting social and political processes and institutional structures, between agents or interventions of stability and change and, between the many functions of political language. Potentially, a typology of policy function emerges.

Similar to its implication for professional arts education, a major value of the model and methodology for policy analysis resides in its identification of the sources of political power. Particularly obvious in the identification of government authorities (Congress and federal agencies), other politically stronger or larger domains of influence (Art and Education) and, of course, the non-discursive societal restrictions on accepted ideals, practices, rules of appropriation and transfer on policy making. Because of the organizational focus of this study, many of these areas are not developed beyond the point of summary; the development of any one of these areas could add new knowledge to the field of policy making in the field. Although there are studies in the field of arts education that document the events of the NEA, USDE and their interactions with Congress, most are historical research; they are primarily concerned with compiling and interpreting a historical timeline. Munley (1999), for instance, gathers textual information from the Congressional Information Service (CIS) to trace, in a linear fashion, the development of the NEA arts education policy. While very helpful, it offers a narrow perspective of power structures at work in the discourse; Foucault’s approach potentially offers 12 views.
Corresponding to power sources, the model and methodology describe the contextual and institutional processes that encourage or impede policy action. As discussed above, the analysis of objects in this model documents obvious federal government action in policy formulation; a more in-depth study of the relationship of agency structures and processes is not a part of this study. However, even outside of the federal system or the organizations examined here, this model and methodology offer many opportunities to calculate the impact of processes and structures within the policy realm: the model can be adapted to examine the relationship between the NEA/USDE and state agencies (arts councils, departments of education), state agencies to local school districts, and even the relationship of a school district to its constituency. All of these relationships would provide a view of established structures and processes impacting issues of arts education.

By charting the occurrences of action, interactions and, indirectly, lack of actions, the model and methodology reveal the role of leadership, the culture of constituencies, and the nature of their interdependence in the collective act of policy making. Unlike other discourse theorists, Foucault’s interest in the institutional impact on the individuals who exist within it makes this model and method particularly useful in understanding the negotiations behind decision making. Steinberger (1999) characterizes the individuals, negotiations, and policy making:

The implications are that each policy is likely to have different meanings for different participants; that the exact meaning of a policy then, is by no means self-evident but, rather is ambiguous and manipulable; and that the policy process is—at least in part—a struggle to get one or another meaning established as the accepted one. (Steinberger, 1999, p.223)

The model addresses ideological associations and political alliances, the interdependence of community roles, and the on-going appropriation between discourse
domains. Whether the actions are of influence or transfer, discourse analysis can follow (if not document) the negotiation behind policy formulation and policy change and/or reformulation. The model and methodology account for intentional or unintentional appropriation, for conceptual or practical policy elements, and for similar or dissimilar policy use. Because Foucault allows for comparisons across unparallel phenomenon, his methodology contributes a new dimension to policy transfer research.

The model and methodology clarify the function of ideology through analysis of political and policy language mechanisms. Repeatedly, the model and methodology juxtapose rhetorical systems against their discoursal function. Through this process, Foucault removes from analysis many negative connotations of deliberate political manipulation often found in criticism; he demonstrates that language is ideology itself, and because of the discoursal process, its “meanings” are difficult to control. Similarly, Steinberger (1995) relates the difficult to discern role of ideology in policy making:

Efforts to define and redefine policies are not…simply matters of strategy or distortion; they are in fact unavoidable if policies are to be at all relevant and meaningful. This, of course, implies also that various participants will define a single policy in various ways not simply out of tactical or prudential considerations but, rather, because of contrasting perspectives or world view. (Steinberger, 1999, p. 226)

Discourse analysis offers policy makers an increased understanding of the work they do on many fundamental levels: policy language, although often simple and apparently transparent, sustains constant intervention, the ideas behind the language repeatedly are transformed, and, consequently, policy is reformulated. According to Foucault, language function is never the only factor impacting our thinking or our actions. The model and method can identify (on a case by case basis) the major factors contributing to policy ideas and potential barriers to policy acceptance.
Policy research, understandably, leans heavily toward instrumental goals. And, in so far as possible, the model and the methodology are premised on providing good intelligence to formulate policy. The intelligence in this model is limited to discursal relationships manifest in four dimensions. However, although idea formation and function dominate this study, the model and the method also account for existing policy and policy objects evident in their formulation.

**Recommendations for Discourse Research Method and Model**

The next step in refining this model and methodology would be to provide a more detailed instrument design based on selected model procedures; at that stage, the potential for the model and Foucault’s method could be fully realized. For example, some text explications within the model lack focus; their value would be enhanced with a consistent instrument. Secondly, although Foucault resists typologies and categories as a starting point in inquiry, he always is confirming and reconfirming patterns of functional relationships in his methodology. More specific data gathering would allow for more reliable typologies of policy function to emerge. Despite the qualitative nature of the method, by exploring the potential for established tools and creating other instruments tailored to the suggested model, quantitative components could reinforce the “rich description.”

However, in order to build an instrument, the translation of each procedural task into policy related ideas deserves refinement, both expansion and focus, in order to achieve the potential effectiveness of the method and the efficiency of the model. There are still ambiguities in the model impeding both the archeological analysis and the genealogical interpretation of the arts education policy discourse field. For example, in order to expedite the objects analysis, the model could be improved with additional criteria refining the
distinction between all tasks: the delimitation registers, the organizations’ activities and
texts, and the textual specifications. The modes analysis needs a clear textual means of
gathering organizational data, identifying the significant roles of speakers and tracing the
impact of subjects outside of the organization. Language plays a very significant role in
identifying discourse ideology, purpose and function. Therefore, the concepts analysis
requires a more in-depth study of language function appropriate to Foucault’s theory. Janks
(1997) indicates the significance of textual analysis and summarizes the need for precise
tools for assessing language as it functions in concept formation,

When the sign is unstable it is possible to see the workings of ideology. Ideology is
at its most powerful when it is invisible, when discourses have been naturalized and
become part of our everyday common sense. ...By being there, it and the other
available discourse constitute our identities and our constructions of the world. In a
time of change, new discourses become available offering us new subject positions
from which to speak and read the world. The conditions of text production and text
reception are gradually transformed. (Janks, 1997, p.341)

Recommendations for further refinement and/or modification to mechanical
procedures and practices are dependent on some reassessment, translation, and organization
of policy concepts. Continued definition, description, and designation of both curricular and
policy concepts would address several weaknesses in the model. For instance, clarification
of language, especially evaluative terms such as “equivalent” or “incompatible” pose
problems in identifying texts, organizational functions, and the ideas which become the
“nodal points” of interpretation.

More insight could be culled from each component of his mode of inquiry. While
incredibly rich in ideas, Foucault’s explanations of inquiry procedures are often abstract, are
expressed in deliberately obtuse language, and are lacking examples to guide the researcher.
Certainly, every precaution has been taken to represent Foucault’s work accurately, yet the
possibility of misinterpretation is possible, particularly in understanding the unstated reasons behind his recommendations. For example, if certain weaknesses in the conceptual mapping or translation of the methodology were “corrected,” then identified “weaknesses” in the model may be eliminated.

And, a careful rereading and clarification of Foucault’s theoretical concepts is a reasonable recommendation for further research; in no way does this study reflect completely the nuisance of his ideas and his understanding of discourse phenomenon on a philosophical level. For example, the area where this study provides the least guidance, either in procedures developed or clear linkage to theory, is in the genealogical interpretation. Foucault’s guiding concepts need clarification and continued definition in terms of his ahistorical theory, particularly the suggested mechanisms of “shortened vision,” the degree of “disjuncture” and the range of “nodal” points. In addition to defining what may be considered a “nodal point,” a consistent, more precise procedure for sorting “nodal points” must be designed and incorporated in the archeological process before genealogical interpretation begins. As with most qualities of discourse, these principles exist simultaneously and require a system for disentangling their different dimensions for a clear analysis. Despite these areas of concern, this sample interpretation is consistent with the Foucault’s overall theory and offers a means of highlighting the invisible processes and the opaque language forces in policy formulation over time.

This study is another step in the theory building process. Although fundamental differences exist between quantitative theories in the policy transfer literature and discourse theories, further comparison between the two approaches to discern where they coincide on a theoretical level would be beneficial. Focused on both how and why policy is formulated,
different approaches may be complementary in providing alternative theoretical choices open to the researcher. New knowledge is acquired when information is organized around new principles; new patterns emerge and, as Steinberger (1995) concludes,

…the typologies show that conflict or disagreement is not limited to the issue of scope, of public versus private, but may also include an entire range of other questions dealing with political impact, economic impact, motive, relationships to basic values, etc.” (Steinberger, 1995, p.226)

Similarly, from a historical perspective, Efland seeks a similar theoretical understanding within arts education: “These [typologies] might enable us to identify the social basis for the cycles of change, and to see these transitions in terms of underlying ideological issues in contention with each other.” (Efland, 1989, p.5) Foucault seeks patterns in cycles of change; therefore, further research to explore the link between Steinberger’s typologies, Efland’s historical method and discourse “patterns” is a reasonable goal.

The Relevance of Foucault’s Work to Arts Education Policy Research

Finally, the relevance of Foucault’s discourse theory for understanding the relationship of idea formation in arts education discourse to national arts education policy formulation is it offers 1) a model that is functionally useful, 2) a method that has valuable research qualities, and 3) it has many implications for curriculum and policy research. Yet, its relevance remains relative to other research needs or goals in the field: the need for quantitative data, the focus on particular types of relationships, the acceptance of the methodological construct to the research field and, of course, the relevance of Foucault’s theoretical premises to the researcher’s views.

Nonetheless, Foucault’s theory, mode of inquiry and, the policy model for this study stress interrelated and relevant research themes recurring in arts education policy generally.
Certainly, other research approaches are concerned indirectly with idea formation and its impact on all aspects of human action. For instance, through a historical lens, Efland describes indirectly the creation and recreation of ideas in art education:

...the major transitions in art education follow similar patterns, that is, each has its revolutionary phase, then, a normal phase where practices become standardized, ending with a phase of orthodoxy where the ideas of the movement become unquestioned beliefs.” (Efland, 1989, p.2)

Efland functionally defines paradigms in the field: “a system of ideas, principles, concepts, doctrines, and approaches which form the understandings possessed within a field of knowledge that form the basis of its work.” (Efland, 1989, p. 4) He understands the significance of historical “disjuncture:” “Eventually enough anomalies or inconsistencies are found resulting in the need for a new theory; hence a revolution!” (Efland, 1989, p.4) He acknowledges the need for “pattern” in human action; Efland (1989) maintains: “though history does not repeat itself, we are inclined to make comparisons.” (Efland, 1989, p.6)

Summary

All inquiry is by definition a form of discourse analysis; and “... all research consists of a reading and rewriting” of a series of texts from a particular historical and epistemological standpoint. (Shapiro, 1981, p.164) The intellectual interests, ideological beliefs and values of the researcher not only influence the choice of the research topic or question to be investigated, they also influence all the choices made throughout the study. The most controlling influence is the choice of methodology; often a reflection of the researcher’s view of the world, it guides subsequent research decisions and ultimately impacts the research results. In this study, discourse methodology and the development of a model for policy research represents the researcher’s desire to design and experiment with alternatives for creating new knowledge about the formation of ideas impacting
policy processes. Likewise, the choice of Foucault’s mode of inquiry as a strategy reflects the researcher’s interest in the linguistic strategies of institutions and organizations impacting arts education policy, particularly, the ways in which these strategies shape ideas. But more importantly, the researcher seeks, as Shapiro points out, “a higher level of abstraction, one that permits us to go beyond the linguistically reflected power exchanges between persons and groups to an analysis of the structures within which they are deployed.” (Shapiro, 1981, p.162)
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