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ABSTRACT

My dissertation examines the social and cultural discourses that articulate the identity construction of the artist and the teacher. It uniquely compares and contrasts sets of theories and cultural practices in and outside of art education, providing a broad view of learning that attends to individual differences and similarities in perceiving meaning around contemporary art and pedagogy set within social, political, and institutional frameworks.

Discourse is both socially constitutive and socially conditioned—both in the sense that it maintains the status quo and that it has the potential for transformation. By examining and questioning these discourses, I am able to reveal how knowledge is created and transmitted as a means by which to organize social institutions and to exercise power. My research functions to analyze the structural relationships of dominance and discrimination that are legitimized through language as well as practice.

My research identifies and examines existing narratives from teaching artists who primarily identify as artists, yet are struggling with the often-conflicting roles of the artist and the teacher. In particular, through Dispositive Analysis, my dissertation examines the potential conflicts that arise as contemporary art and theory challenge and conflict with the practices art teachers have developed as artists.
A dispositive is a system of knowledge that links discourse, events, and objects created by people using this knowledge. As a form of Critical Discourse Analysis, Dispositive Analysis focuses upon both the synthesis of discursive practices and their materializations. One of the contentions of my dissertation is that subjects are a materialization of discourse, thus the purpose of my research is to analyze the materializations involving the discourse of the artist/teacher and to render the power relations visible.

My research focuses on the constitution of the self/subject between artist and art educator, within discourse intimately bound up in the social and cultural, in an effort to help enrich the understanding of learning, meaning making, and the subject of and in art education. This study forces us to consider diverse conceptions of identity, rather than the preconceived subject positions that have been made available to us. A more fluid (re)articulation of these roles can have a profound effect upon the identity construction of the art teacher, and consequently the field of Art Education—particularly how we prepare teachers.
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Transition from the private to a public role for the artist
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

My artistic development was shaped by an emphasis on technical skill, mastery of craft, creative self-expression, and aesthetic formalism. Upon reflection, however, many of the discourses and practices that influenced my artistic development created a very limited perspective as to what it means to be an artist. Yet, some thirty years later, artistic practices in K–12 classrooms in the United States still tend to be confined by these same narrow perceptions and continue to be “a staple curricular component of many art education programs” (Darts, 2006, p. 11). More recently, both contemporary art and theory have challenged my perceptions as both an artist and as a teacher. Part of what I have been struggling with is how my distinct formal aesthetic training remains conflicted with my postmodern sensibilities as an educator, to which Gablik (2004) suggested that perhaps “the tension between traditional and modern values is resolved by the creation of an interesting synthesis of elements of both” (p. 136).

Reflecting on my experiences as an elementary school student, I recall a distinct minority of students who excelled in art — these were the students that were praised for their life-like representations and I remember receiving compliments when my work resembled the real thing. There was very little variety from one student’s work to the
other, demonstrating little more than repetitious behavior and stereotyped imagery. The teacher’s preference became obvious to me by the student examples she hung on the wall; her idea of perfection focused on realistic replication. I was convinced very early on that the measure of being a good artist was the ability to draw realistically. Confined by my perceptions, my experiences with my art education were frustrating because I was convinced that I could not achieve this level of artistic ability. Rather than helping to expand my perceptions and nurture my ability, many of my art classes only served to further engrain my fears and frustrations. I was often convinced that I couldn’t do something before I even tried. I resisted taking art classes throughout my public school years, partly due to my frustration over how the classes were being taught, and partly paralyzed by my own belief in an inevitable sense of failure. I stopped taking art in grade school as soon as it was no longer required.

My own attitudes and perceptions of art and artistic ability were centered upon realism, which became restrictive as both an imposed stage of development and as an aesthetic judgment. Beauty and realism were inextricably linked; attractive subject matter and realistic representation become objective grounds for judgments (Parsons, cited in Efland, 2002). Bound by this single aesthetic point-of-view, my artistic development was confined by an emphasis on developing technique and skill. Looking back, my father, himself an artist and a teacher greatly influenced my perceptions of art. His influence was not overt, yet it was nonetheless powerful. One of his paintings that captured my attention most was of a fishing rod and reel resting on a nautical map of Long Island, but it was his technical skill and ability that outshined the context and subject of the composition.
Proudly, I still have that painting hanging in my living room, yet in retrospect, the influence of my father’s realism helped to restrict my perceptions of what it means to be an artist. His was a difficult standard to live up to, a standard that was reinforced in my art classes.

My formal and technical training continued through art school. The emphasis was on technique, mastery of craft, and the formal elements and principles of art. Ironically, by the standards that the school professed I developed a certain degree of technical ability, but my art classes did very little to challenge my limited perceptions of art. While this may have helped me to learn to draw or organize a composition, it was my development as a teacher challenged these limited perceptions, and I began to question the very tenets upon which my own artistic development was based. Is the development of technical skill an adequate metric for becoming an artist? Are they still relevant in a contemporary classroom? What does it mean to be an artist and how are these perceptions manifested in curriculum and instruction?

Many things have changed since I was in elementary school. Children’s artistic development shifted toward an emphasis on the individual, and that “children might possess a form of art with its own unique properties, an art not dependent on the art of adults” (Messon, 1985, p. 362). Children were expected to rely solely on their so-called native intuition, their inner promptings, their natural sensitivity and creativeness; there was less insistence on technique, no ordered method of study (Duncum, 1982). This change in attitudes and perceptions was firmly rooted in the period of modernism. Wilson (2007) argues, “beliefs about artistic expression, spontaneity, originality, individuality,
creativity, and unconventionality—all beliefs that sustained [and defined] modern and child art through the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, have become increasingly problematic” (p. 134). Consequently the dominant discourse of modernism continues to exert a limiting pressure on the understanding of art and visual culture that are both consumed and created by students (McClure, 2011).

I recall a conversation with one of my high school students, who did not consider herself to be an artist because she thought she could not draw — at least not as well as her brother who she says is an “artist.” I had seen her sketches and the way she used thumbnail drawings to plan out things like her scrapbook, yet she remained defiant in her assertion that this “is not art.” Without knowing her brother or his artwork, this problem seemed to extend beyond sibling rivalry as she held her own ability up to a very narrow perception of what it meant to be an artist. The frustrations I saw in both the elementary and high school students I have taught and observed seem eerily familiar which lead me to examine and evaluate my own experiences; consequently, I began to question the constructed identities of both the artist and the teacher.

Art, like any other discipline, is subject to change as a function of time and space, as well as cultural and social circumstances. As such, there are inherent problems in proposing a simple and stable model. Wilson (2003) suggested that the very nature of art and the critical discourse that accompany it has “evolved from a modernist to a postmodernist ideology” (p. 108). In this sense “postmodern theory develops a deconstructive discourse theory capable of identifying and criticizing ideologies” (Agger, 2006, p. 74). Within this contemporary context, Darts (2006) advocates the development
of art curriculum that facilitates “the development of an ethic of care, thereby enabling participants to positively transform themselves, their communities and the world(s) in which they live” (p. 7). Yet, art education still tends to be dominated by a focus on skill development, or unhindered self-expression that isolates the child, and the divide between aesthetic art and a visual culture pedagogy that embrace new mediums and critical literacies persists.

As an educator, I began to explore the possibilities of how one’s identity as an artist and a teacher can be shaped from a more critical and social perspective. Yet, as an artist, I still feel confined by a distinct formal aesthetic. Rancière (2004) suggested that the notions of modernity and the avant-garde have not been “very enlightening when it comes to thinking about the new forms of art that have emerged since the last century” (p. 20). Postmodernity, as Agger (2006) described it, is theorized as a late stage of capitalist modernity and probed for its contradictions and crises … In this sense, postmodernism directly contributes to the advancement of social theory by considering the ways in which theories of modernity, including Marxism, are no longer fully adequate to understand the present. (p. 74)

At the same time, history and tradition cannot entirely be abandoned; “any understanding of contemporary art and criticism is necessarily bound up with a consideration of modernism, for modernism is the cultural standard which even today governs our conception of what art is” (Wallis, 1984, p. xii).

While I’m being critical of modernism’s privileged voice in defining the identity of the artist, I am not applying postmodern theory as anti-modernism or as a reactionary
tendency toward modernism, but rather as a critique of conventional style and prevailing wisdom. I am attempting to explore and examine the space in between in the sense that two or more ideas can occupy the same space at the same time. My critique of modernism is more a critique of an ideology, in an effort to “explain why social agents accept or consent to systems of collective representations that do not serve their objective interests but legitimate the existing power structure” (Macey, 2001, p. 75). Similarly, Rancière argued in favor of “a pedagogical methodology that would abolish any presupposed inequalities of intelligence such as the academic hierarchy of master and disciple” (Rockhill, p. 2). Attempts to dispel the illusions of a dominant ideology have resulted in a field divided into two antagonistic models. Darts (2006) alludes to the struggles that art teachers face when navigating between these opposing discourses, and while trying to integrate contemporary art and theory into institutions and social environments that are often resistant to change. He describes his efforts as going “against the grain of what [he had] experienced and formally been taught about teaching art” (Darts, p. 10). As I examine how my perceptions of being an artist have been disrupted by contemporary art and theory and reexamine my role as an art teacher, I also reflect on the struggle with my own identity as an artist, and how this effects my approaches to art education. Therefore, it is the purpose of this study to document and analyze the narrative experiences of art teachers and how they have worked through similar conflicts to transcend these tensions, and to examine the social and cultural discourses that articulate the identity construction of the artist and the teacher.
1.2 Background to the Study

Art Education at the K-12 level in the United States continues to be built upon a tradition and a history that are becoming increasingly irrelevant within a contemporary context which is being shaped by visual culture and social theory. Jackson (1999) suggested that this shift is characterized by an increase in new media, technological (inter)dependence, the rise of globalization, and that art education must change to accommodate this shift. Yet many artists and teachers continue to focus upon a “narrow understanding of artistic growth, defined to a large extent by the Western-culture-specific interpretations of what constitutes child art and by linear conceptualization of development in the artistic realm” (Kindler, 1997, p. 1). One’s identity as an artist in this context, suggests a particular form of knowledge and ability that is dominated by modernist notions of content and form, and a distinctly Western aesthetic. It has traditionally been measured by a sense of progression; “from less sophisticated to more mature art and from intuitive and naïve craftsmanship towards more thoughtful and skillful student art production” (Richardson & Walker, 2011, p. 3).

What constitutes artistry (and conversely what doesn’t) is perpetuated as social and cultural discourses that fail to challenge the elite practices of modernism. Gude (2004) argued that the modernist elements and principles of art are not sufficient for understanding contemporary art, and no longer adequate to “guide students in learning contemporary meaning making strategies” within a critical and social discourse (p. 7). Consequently, it becomes possible to (re)define artistic practices within an art curriculum that is no longer confined by an “agenda of teachable skills” (Atkinson, 1998, p. 49).
Art education in a contemporary context is centered upon critical self-reflection and starts to shift away from the needs of the individual towards those of society, with an emphasis on critical consciousness and social reconstruction; it is “rooted in belief in the transformative power of art and critical inquiry” (Gude, 2007, p. 6). Artistic identity within a contemporary, critical context attempts to break free from the constraints of this isolated view of the artist; thus relationships can be forged to cultures beyond the confines of the Western aesthetic providing a means for interacting aesthetically and critically with the world. Yet the tensions that arise between these competing discourses within K–12 Art Education in the United States continue to pose challenges for the identity construction of art teachers.

1.2.1 The Role of the Artist

I was taught that skill and craft were what defined the role of the artist. In a letter to the editor of Ornament magazine, Worden (2009) similarly defined an artist as someone with formal training and a “professional level of design and skill acquired through hard study over a long period of time” (np). She asserted that “not every maker is an artist,” rather it is a title earned. Worden boasts an impressive list of professional experience and exhibitions as an artist and extensive teaching experience, but her words serve to perpetuate and reinforce a distinct modernist ideal of what it means to be an artist. Perpetuating a similarly narrow model, Lavender (2003) argued that art education should “focus on fundamentals of compositional aesthetics” (p. 47). His comments were directed toward college art foundation classes, yet it is this same sense of isolation that
perpetuates historic and formal traditions. The standards and traditions Lavender is arguing for dictate how and what is taught in the art class, passing from teacher to pupil, “handed down from master to disciple,” sustaining these traditional practices and giving them their history (Gablik, 2004, p. 127). The emphasis on the artist serves to further engrain the notions of modernism and fails to confront or resolve the tensions that arise when the contemporary discourses—that have become so prevalent in art education—challenge the traditional criteria for defining one’s role and identity as an art teacher. Consequently, it becomes essential to explore how art teachers are working through these conflicts in the construction of their own identity.

Gablik (2004) suggested the role of the artist has become marginal in modern Western society, “not because modern art is intrinsically defective; it is because our society has divested art of all but aesthetic value” (p. 39). Artists such as Andy Warhol challenged convention and undercut romantic assumptions of the artist and Marcel Duchamp demonstrated that “the category of art was itself entirely contingent and arbitrary, a function of discourse and not of revelation” (Solomon-Godeau, cited in Wallis, 1984, p. 76, emphasis mine). Since the postmodern age, contemporary art has struggled with is its own cultural and social definition of the artist. Rather than being mired in tradition, contemporary artistic practices have embraced “the realm of discursivity, ideology and representation, cultural and historical specificity, meaning and context, language and signification” (Solomon-Godeau, cited in Wallis, p. 80). Such contemporary perspectives offer a greater range of possibilities for the articulation of one’s identity as an artist and a teacher.
My own artistic development was confined by a distinctly modernist discourse that limited and constrained my attitudes and perceptions of what it means to be an artist. One of the teachers from Graham’s (2009) study of the artist/teacher suggested in order to sustain himself as a teacher—he had to go back to his art. Conversely, the integration of critical contemporary theory from my training as a teacher has profoundly altered my perceptions of what it means to be an artist. Art education based on emergent artistic practices from a contemporary context is no longer focused on creating artists—at least not in the modernist sense—but rather shifts its focus to “expand the aesthetic field, to transgress formal closures, to steal images, to denature given signs, to question cultural myths, to problematize the activity of reference” (Foster, cited in Wallis, 1984, p. 199). In the transition beyond the confines of modernism, contemporary artists began to occupy a new terrain of consciousness. Gablik (2004) argued “the more closely we examine the pursuit of freedom in modern society, the more we come up against an unacknowledged split between our ethical and our aesthetic standpoints” (pp. 90-91). This new terrain of consciousness refers to the intent of the artist shifting beyond an emphasis on creative self-expression to emphasize the greater needs of others within a social context that gives such art its meaning beyond traditional aesthetics. This same split mirrors the tensions between formal aesthetic traditions and contemporary theory that continue to confront art teachers.

Gablik (2004) also suggested that the community artist is an example of an artist that has resisted the aesthetics demands of the marketplace and used his skills in the service of the community, arguing “any artist in contemporary society who sets out to
create values must engage actively with the outside world” (p. 63). She described this new sense of consciousness as a point of equilibrium between the aesthetic character of art and an aesthetic formalism that treats art as socially unconditioned and autonomous. Gablik further suggested that perhaps what is needed is “some sort of reconciliation—not a fixture at either pole” (p. 43). Using this as a conceptual model, what I am attempting to explore through my study, is how art teachers are resolving similar conflicts through their approaches to teaching art.

O’Sullivan (2001) offered a similar perspective in his “skirmish against representation,” which suggested a rethinking of artistic practice would include an exploration of art’s creative, aesthetic, and ethical function (p. 130, emphasis mine). Gablik (2004) also advocated for a more ethical artistic vision, founded in dynamic models of integralism, intersubjectivity, and transdisciplinarity, arguing that many contemporary artists have already moved “beyond a socially indifferent formalism… without any sacrifice at the level of aesthetic quality” (p. 43). In a contemporary context, formal definitions are not always adequate to further our understanding as to the characteristics that define one’s identity as an artist. Consequently this study proposes that we consider an open definition in which the artist and the teacher are considered a living concept subject to discussion, debate, and revision. In this sense “postmodern critical theory helps create counterhegemony by reformulating cultural practices, which have become potent forms of ideological persuasion” (Agger, p. 74). The role of the artist continues to be a pervasive and powerful image that perpetuates these ideologies as formal traditions in art making continue to shape art curriculum and instruction. As art
teachers continue to struggle through this conflict, it is essential to explore the narratives of art teachers that suggest models for resolving these tensions.

1.2.2 Artistic Development within the Pre-modernist Paradigm

Artistic development within the pre-modernist paradigm is marked not only by a mimetic orientation, but also, much as it was my experience, with an emphasis placed upon skill and technique. This empirical and analytical approach as applied to art education is focused upon the subject and the teacher, where product, fact, skill, and competency dominate (Clark, 1996). Arnheim (1997) counters the emphasis on realism, or “purely optical recording,” with the value of visual thinking, firm in his conviction that a quality art education is an “indispensable instrument for training the mind,” and not merely a vehicle for the conventions of naturalistic representation (p. 12). Yet pre-modernist ideals still pervade the history of art and the role of the artist in society. Indeed, the high art traditions embedded in Western culture have shaped not only the perceptions and definitions of art, but art education practices as well.

I was conditioned by realism; my art training focused on technical ability and mastery of craft and media. Art curriculum and instruction built upon these narrow perceptions not only limit what is taught on the art classroom, but also inhibit how art is taught. Stewart and Walker (2005) characterized formal aspects such as color mixing and figure drawing as relics of an art class from seventy-five or more years ago. Teachers often hold onto “tried and true” methods of instruction and tend to teach what and how they were taught. Instead, Stewart and Walker suggested, “old practices, language, and
vocabulary must be scrutinized for their relevance to important ideas, concepts and skills” (p. 16). As *foundations* of art, formal concepts and technical proficiency maintain a privileged voice in art education and form the basic tenets by which artistic practices continue to be defined (Kushins, 2007). Particularly in light of the prevailing influence of the modernist discourses, what are the possibilities for identity construction that are not bound by a single aesthetic or theoretical paradigm?

Michael (1980) made the argument against the pre-modernist traditions in favor of a modernist approach that focuses on creative self-expression and aesthetic art education and suggests it is unfortunate that art teachers focus on skill development and mastery of media and don’t leave room for personal expression. He is critical of the continued emphasis placed on content and subject matter, and instead, advocates for an emphasis on the formal qualities of the artwork consistent with the modernist discourse. Ironically, Michael seems to be arguing to replace one dominant discourse with another. An emphasis on skill and mastery of media (pre-modernist discourse) is built upon a single, narrow, aesthetic point-of-view. Consequently, modernism created an exclusive and privileged space in the art world, and had a similar effect on art education.

1.2.3 Artistic Development within the Modernist Paradigm

Artistic development as defined by modernist standards is less dependent upon realism; it is characterized by creative self-expression with an emphasis on the individual, and bound by the formal elements and principles of design “proffered as universal and foundational” (Gude, 2004, p. 6). Part of the problem with adhering to a universal set of
‘principles’, as Kelly (1984) warned, is that “the normalization of a mode of representation always entails the marginalization of an alternate set of practices and discourses” (cited in Wallis, p. 88).

Wilson (2007) suggested that child art and modernism have always been inextricably linked. He argued that the rules and conventions inherent in modernism continue to shape art curriculum and instruction. Wilson draws particular attention to the role of the artist as teacher and reminds us that children can be coerced to do almost anything adults want them to do, and consequently aesthetic and artistic considerations appear to take precedence over educational considerations. Consequently, Wilson made the radical assertion that “child art as we know it in the modern era has indeed ended” (p. 134).

Yet, even at the start of the new millennium, according to an NAEA survey, the elements and principles of design remain a major curriculum goal for K–12 art teachers in the United States (School Arts, 2001) to which Gude countered that she rarely sees “meaningful connections being made between these formal descriptors and understanding works of art or analyzing the quality of everyday design” (2004, p. 6). The influence of modernism also contributes to an impoverished view of curriculum and a restricted perception of art education in culture, society, and policy (McClure, 2011). Moreover, the “elite cast of modernism,” as Clark (1996) described it, draws its focus upon the gifted minority, and contributes to the isolation and marginalization of arts education (p. 28).
1.2.4 Contemporary Perspectives in Art Education

Day (1986) challenged the dominant voices within art education that continue to privilege art production and aesthetic education in the context of a contemporary art education. The emphasis on the artist-as-teacher serves to further engrain traditional foundations of art and fails to disrupt the dominant discourses in art education and challenge the traditional criteria for defining characteristics of artistic development. Contemporary art and theory are often forced to compete with modernist expectations for art making in the classroom, yet as Sullivan (1993) pointed out, the often under-utilized area of contemporary art education theory is a “central site of influence on art education where, it is argued, most of the insights needed to inform the field are to be found” (p. 5).

From a similar perspective, Elkins (2001) examined the pre-modernist and modernist histories that have shaped art instruction and how we define artistic development. These traditions and preferences have become so engrained, that even an artist “who thinks of herself as postmodern might also make judgments that depend on some very old-fashioned assumptions” (Elkins, p. 176). He argued that the modernist emphasis on formal elements and principles of art seem to foster the allusion that we are teaching more than just technique, which by itself, is marginally a question of training—“everyone with a modicum of talent can make an impeccably proportioned figure, if they are trained to do so” (p. 20). Elkins openly and academically challenges the notions that technique is an adequate metric of artistry and subsequently questions whether we are actually teaching anything in the art classroom. In my own exploration of artistic
development, I came to the realization that the very terms and ideas I am exploring are themselves are often defined solely within the context of modernism.

Elkins (2001) also suggested that to alter teaching the teaching of art, we would have to produce altered goals and ideas, create a new critical language and a different mindset, and even change our basic conceptions of art. This context includes cultural and discursive codes that shape the artist’s conceptions of identity. Yet distinctly formal terms and definitions continue to dominate as a standard by which the artist is judged and as a metric by which art education curriculum is evaluated. Significantly, a contemporary curriculum emerges from what came before it; “it affirms the choice-making capacity of individuals who select from the past those things that will best serve them as starting points for today” (Gude, 2004, p. 13).

Richmond (2009) defended postmodernism as having provided “a therapeutic and democratic re-thinking of many given assumptions and traditions, and of the ‘natural’ superior order of western culture” (p. 523). Contemporary art education has placed theory, ideas, and meaning ahead of traditions of form, skill, and self-expression that were built upon a “previously uncritical art history with its exclusive and preferred criteria of value” (Richmond, p. 529). Similarly, one’s identity as an artist or a teacher should not be restrictive, but should represent a dynamic process that moves in multiple directions offering multiple perspectives rather than perpetuating tradition. Yet how we can form a concept of that which defies definition, and of that which is so totally open that all attributes apply to it equally? The challenge, Gablik (2004) explained, is that contemporary perspectives force us “to overcome our routine responses and to develop
finer and more discriminating ones” (pg. 46). It is within this context, Foster suggested, that the role of the artist can also be re-formed, as “the values that heretofore authenticated art” are called into question and “aesthetic signification opened up” (Cited in Wallis, p. 191).

Richmond’s (2009) perception of the artist focused on skill, technique, and a distinct formal aesthetic. Also like me, he succumbed to the influences of postmodernism in his life and profession as an art educator. The “residue of postmodernism,” as he called it, is in our veins, yet while neither of us has been able to shake our modernist upbringings, he admits to still appreciating beauty “in art, nature or the urban environment” (Richmond, p. 524). As we continue to theorize the role of the artist beyond traditional aesthetic-based perceptions, it becomes harder to embrace any single paradigm and continues to be a challenge to negotiate the spaces between the competing discourses that construct the identity of the artist and the teacher.

1.2.5 Contemporary Art in Art Education

Mayer (2008) points to the multiplicity of art forms and the ability of visual culture to make visible how “cultural values and mechanisms bring meaning to perception” (p. 79). This perspective stands in direct contrast to the traditional focus on style, materials, techniques or genres of art that continue to confine conceptions of the artist. While distinct differences between modern and contemporary art and how they influence instruction in the classroom exist, there is also no clear dividing line between the two; “cultures and art traditions are always changing and influencing each other,
Villeneuve & Erickson, p. 93). Contemporary art demands that we challenge our existing attitudes and perceptions, and as artists and teachers, it becomes our responsibility to mediate the experience.

In an effort to reflect changes in contemporary art beyond the simple production of artistic objects, Darts (2006) narrative reflection serves as an exemplar of integrating contemporary art and critical social theory into the classroom as he recognized “the vital connections and possibilities that exist among art, education, culture, and society,” and the need of art education to evolve “away from an emphasis on materials, techniques and objects and towards a focus on concepts, problems, and ideas” (p. 7). Significantly, the teaching of formal skills and production remained an important component of his curriculum, yet they “did not supercede instruction in the evaluation and interpretation of artistic and everyday objects and the exploration of related sociocultural issues” (ibid).

The inclusion of contemporary art and theory into art curriculum and instruction does not necessarily represent a disjunction from history or an abandonment of previous paradigms. Instead, this represents a broader, more inclusive, contemporary context upon which to (re)articulate the identity of both the artist and the teacher.

Wilson (2008) theorized what he calls “third-site pedagogy,” as a space at the margins of traditional forms of art education “where new forms of visual cultural production and meaning are encouraged” (Wilson, 2008, p. 8). In this space, contemporary art and visual culture replace the traditional canon of historical masterpieces with “a vast range of visual objects and events that are studied in light of their meaning and social significance rather than their aesthetic value,” which demand the
inclusion of contemporary theory and new forms of pedagogy (Wilson, 2003, p. 108). Conversely, some art educators (Lavender, 2003) continue to try to keep curriculum and instruction free from the influences of contemporary art and visual culture, in an effort to maintain “predetermined bodies of art knowledge and specific art skills” that primary and secondary school students “should acquire” (Wilson, 2003, p. 112).

1.2.6 Contemporary Theory in Art Education

In Clark’s (1996) examination of issues relating to postmodernist pedagogy, Harold Pearse laments the fact that “postmodernism, even if it could be defined, cannot be easily accommodated within any existing paradigmatic structure,” (p. 24) to which I must wonder, why does it have to? In her critique of modernist influences in the art curriculum, Gude (2007) argued “elements and principles, a menu of media, or lists of domains, modes, and rationales are neither sufficient nor necessary to inspire a quality art curriculum through which students come to see the arts as a significant contribution to their lives” (p. 6), and relevance can be drawn from the inclusion of familiar objects of the everyday.

Critics continue to assail art education that moves away from its historical roots and traditions. Kamhi (2010) accuses art educators that have adopted postmodern perspectives of hijacking art education “for purposes of often-radical political indoctrination” (pg. 1). Kahmi’s mischaracterization of the contemporary context of the current discourse in art education describes the supplanting of one dominant discourse by another one; whereas a critical contemporary discourse is built upon a plurality of
perspectives. Her perspective adheres to a distinct history that remains intolerant to change, or to the criticism of the social and cultural influences that shaped those traditions. Conversely Gaudelius & Speirs (2002) advocated for the inclusion of contemporary critical theories that “work away from presenting universal understanding about the meanings and purposes of art and education” to be used as a framework for constructing the identity of the artist and the teacher (p. 1).

Some art teachers continue to identify as an artist within pre-modernist and modernist discourses, and reflect a culturally determined style that is constrained by the social influences and the adult artworlds that influence how we teach art (Pufall, 1997; Wilson, 1997, 2003; Wilson & Wilson, 1981). Such influences may be unintentional or even misunderstood, but they serve to “observe, sanction and correct how we act; they attempt to define who and what we are” (Walkerdine, 1990, p. 199, cited in Atkinson, p. 53). These dynamic forces help shape our behavior and the way we think; consequently “the notion of ascribing fundamental truth to any visual form seems naïve and uninformed” (Gude, 2004, p. 7). Consequently, constructions of identity are more likely to center on cultural codes and the subject positions made available to the artist and the teacher.

Thus, critical theory becomes a relevant context through which to question the basis of maintaining existing hierarchies, provoking liberation from a limited rationality and ushering in pluralistic perspectives. Rancière warned us, however, that critical theory seeks to maintain the hierarchies that we are being critical of; “far from advocating a populist stance and claiming to finally bestow a specific identity on the underprivileged
… the artifice at work in the discourses founded on the singularity of the other by revealing the ways in which they are ultimately predicated on keeping the other in its place” (Rockhill, cited in Rancière, p. 2).

Maintaining the strict traditions of modernism cannot sustain artistic identity; rather sustainability is characterized by change through adaptation and occasional transformation (Magis, 2010). Change is a constant force, in nature and in society, as well as in art, thus no one can sensibly give a definitive answer to questions such as ‘What it means to be artist?’ or ‘What is art education?’ By its nature art is an open ended concept that is always evolving and changing” (p. 7). And as Gablik (2004) argued, the momentum of social change has not only altered the nature of the artist, but also “the psychological drives and motivations of those who shape it’’ (p. 25). Within this same contemporary context, the discourses of the artist and the teacher have become repositories for ideas that reverberate in the larger context of our culture. Understanding this dynamic context demands that we embrace diverse perspectives and embrace new and equally diverse methods to teach, interpret, and make art by reexamining of the canonical and theoretical foundations upon which many artists and teachers base their identity.

These competing discourses within art education continue to provide obstacles for teachers. Richmond (2009) suggestd, despite it’s fluidity, “art can be seen as a distinctive form of understanding involving variously feeling, imagination, concepts, form, aesthetics, expression and the sense of sight as a way of making sense of experience” (p. 526). Through his post postmodern view of the artist, he argued, “the capacity to engage
with art perceptually and aesthetically … subversively counters the dominant means-end technical rationality of our age” (Richmond, p. 531). Within a contemporary context, identity construction is more nuanced and complex.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

One’s role as an artist has historically been defined by skill, technique, self-expression, and has been shaped by formal aesthetics. Many art teachers remain divided between maintaining traditional artistic practices and integrating contemporary art and theory perspectives into the classroom. Contemporary perspectives continue to challenge these assumptions, yet art teachers are continually faced with the challenges these competing discourses present.

The field of art education continues to theorize ways to reconsider artistic practices influenced by social and critical perspectives, but based upon my own experiences, the divide between aesthetic art and practices that embrace critical and contemporary perspectives persists. What has been missing is an examination of the narratives from art teachers as they struggle to resolve the tensions that persist between these competing perspectives. My research examines existing narratives from teaching artists who primarily identify as artists, yet are struggling with the often-conflicting roles of the artist and the teacher.
1.4 Research Questions

My goal is to understand human behaviors, motivations, attitudes and perceptions that are confined by institutional limits and shaped by social discourse; “How and what people come to know about art, inside and outside of institutions, is important in the formation of cultural identity, political economy, and individual enrichment” (Freedman, 2003, p. xii).

As the focus of my investigation into the discourse of the artist/teacher, I have chosen to analyze the Teaching Artist Journal. This is not an academic journal, as the stories are not heavily referenced. Thus the ideas presented do not conform to an established canon of literature. One could argue that these stories are less inhibited, or pure, whereas Foucault would argue that such independence does not exist and that all discourse is socially constructed. With both of these perspectives in mind, this journal becomes the ideal focus for my study in that it hasn’t been mediated by academia, yet is constitutive of the very discourse that this study is examining. Consequently, the narratives from these teaching artists demonstrate how they are making sense of, and inhabiting the subject positions that have been made available to them.

As a journal, the influence of the editor is also apparent. This is significant in that through choosing theme for particular issues, raising questions and themes for consideration, and other editorial considerations, the editor equally helps shape and maintains the discourse that is reminiscent of a distinct positioning or ideology. Several more respected academic journals offer open and direct challenges to existing pre-modernist and modernist paradigms for teaching art, yet while this journal remains
marginal in the context of higher education, it is in many ways more reflective of teaching practices in the classroom.

Utilizing Dispositive Analysis as a strategy of inquiry, this dissertation examines the narratives of artist/teachers as they negotiate the tensions between these traditional and contemporary perspectives. I will use their narratives—combined with my own experiences as both an artist and a teacher—as a framework to explore the possibilities for (re)articulating the identity of the artist/teacher focusing on these primary questions:

1. In which forms and under which conditions has the discourse of the artist/teacher come into being? And why do the tensions between these two terms exist in the first place?
   a. How is a particular discourse established and perpetuated?
   b. What ideologies (discursive positions) drive the discourse of the artist/teacher?
   c. How are discursive formations shaped and how might they be transformed?
   d. How has this ‘ideal’ been developed into a discourse? And how has this discourse become institutionalized?
2. How does the discourse of the artist/teacher affect classroom practice?
3. What is the effect of the artist/teacher discourse on the constituent character of its subjects?
   a. How does discourse create subjects?
b. How does discourse mediate the production of their stories and the formation of their identity?

c. What discernible discursive characteristics are shaping participants’ identities, courses of action, and relationships with outsiders?

d. What discourses give the artist/teacher its meaning and how does it perpetuate a status of exclusion?

4. Can a more explicit rationale for considering the subject as a manifestation of discourse be expressed?

1.5 Significance of the Study

I have discussed how a contemporary critical context can reshape the role of artist, but art teachers continue to struggle to reshape their identity. The inclusion of contemporary art and theory for both artists and teachers “makes it possible to unmask and free ourselves from existing discourses, concepts and constructions, and to move on by producing different ones” (Dahlberg, Moss, and Pence, 1999, p. 79, cited in Wilson, 2003, p. 113). What I hope to discover through my study is how art teachers are negotiating the space between these competing discourses, and the possibilities this represents for the preparation of pre-service art teachers.

It is not the intent of this study to create or outline a contemporary curriculum in art, but rather to help to build a bridge from the theoretical discourse of art education to a contemporary praxis that continues to open, challenge, reconsider and refine how we define our roles as both artists and teachers, and subsequently how we prepare future art
educators. Art education in a contemporary context addresses issues of contemporary art and theory, which conflicts with resilient institutional structures and a dominant social discourse. Consequently, as Freedman (2003) suggested, how art educators respond to such conflicts will shape the future of art education.
CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 The Artist/Teacher

The term artist/teacher typically refers to a philosophy of teaching that emphasizes the importance that “assumes art education is best when practicing artists are in charge and [that] disregards the importance of the education field” (Daichendt, 2009, p. 33). Lanier (1957), an early and vocal opponent of the concept, condemned the artist/teacher model as being inappropriate for art education, believing an artist is quite different from an art teacher. In claiming the term artist/teacher “educationally illogical,” Lanier (1959) questioned the meaning of the term, and interestingly wondered if it meant being “a teacher only of artists?” (p. 10). Lanier suggests the label artist/teacher is problematic in the sense that one does not belong to the profession of education, while at the same time, having to claim recognition as an artist to enhance the possibilities of acceptance. The status of the art teacher, he argued, already seems “inferior to that of other teachers on the same level” (1959, p. 10). Perhaps not coincidentally, the arts in general seem to have suffered from a similar lack of social recognition.

Another attitude emerges involving a similar disdain for the teacher; “a conviction that education is quite secondary, indeed perhaps even lower on the scale of cultural
values, and that art is the only worthy human activity” (Lanier, 1959, p. 10). This positions and privileges the role of the artist in a distinct hierarchical order over that of the teacher. Lanier refutes this misconception by arguing “the contribution of the art experience to the pupil’s development [should be] the first concern” as opposed to being “absorbed solely with esthetic issues” (1959, p. 10). Neither of these attitudes, Lanier concluded, “the defensive nor the contemptuous, has any place in contemporary art education. Neither does the verbal redundancy ‘artist teacher’” (1959, p. 21).

One’s effectiveness as an art teacher, Lanier observed, is often equated with one’s ability to produce art. Lanier questions whether skill or exceptional performance as an artist could insure good teaching, having argued, “to evaluate the art experience or its guidance by the teacher on the basis of the caliber of the work produced is illogical if not unwholesome” (1957, p. 27). He also argued, the “quality of student art work as a criterion of teaching skill indicates a preoccupation with the product rather than with the student. It would seem that art education still suffers from an excess of art and an insufficiency of education” (Lanier, 1957, p. 27). The artist/teacher can with the utmost sincerity and good intentions, perpetuate in the minds of young people preparing for the teaching of art, the narrow attitude that the product of the creative act which is art, is also the essence and end-all of art education. The teacher of art education must recognize that the creative act itself must be understood in terms of values which it offers to the individual. (Lanier, 1957, p. 27)

What Lanier is saying when he refers to ‘an excess of art’ is that an art education
that focuses primarily on technique and skill development as an artist does not fulfill the full potential of a quality art education. Lanier suggested, the true value of an education in the arts lies beyond the skill development of the individual. The value stems from the arts’ ability to contribute towards critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, social growth, the development of cultural understanding and appreciation, the integration of curriculum areas, and a “wealth of specific values only one of which is concerned with the development of perceptual, manipulative, or organizational skills” (Lanier, 1957, p. 27).

McCraken (1959) opposed Lanier’s view, arguing that high levels of artistic activity are essential to “an understanding and appreciation of the full dimensions of aesthetic experience as they relate to educational processes. This results in an unprecedented opportunity for enriching, rather than detracting from, the overall educational significance of art experiences” (p. 5). Emphasizing the practical over the theoretical, McCraken favored a fundamental process orientation; he advocated for a modification in approaches to art education based upon “our willingness and ability to identify and respond intelligently to the questions underlying the current focus on the artist-teacher point of view” (p. 5). The artist/teacher point of view, he argued, was a concept rather than a descriptive term derived from “an integrated reaction to two central issues of prime importance to art educators” (McCraken, p. 5). Part of the issue, from my experience, is that the roles of the artist and of the teacher have diversified to a point where they often stand in conflict with one another, and many subsequent attempts to
integrate these often diverse roles still seem to maintain a distinct preference that privileges the role of the artist.

Art teachers continue to be selected and rewarded based on their artistic accomplishments rather than based on their abilities as a teacher, is a model that continues to prevail within art education. An emphasis on the idea that an art teacher must be competent in the technical skills required to create art continues to privilege the role of the artist over that of the teacher. This fallacy suggests the teacher is unable to raise pupils to the highest human level of aesthetic expression unless the teacher is also an artist (Day, 1986). As a result, studio art continues to dominate the preparation of art teachers who become certified to teach art in K-12 in public schools in the United States.

Day (1986) offered another dissenting opinion when he suggested the fundamental problem with the artist/teacher model is that the dominant focus on the artist and art production is incompatible with the responsibilities of the teacher; consequently “art values supercede considerations about educational issues” (p. 40). A conflict emerges between the conceptual frameworks that inform the work of the professional artist and the professional teacher. This means that “studio mystique” and the “charismatic aura that has developed around the roles of the artist” continue to have a distinct allure to prospective teachers (Day, p. 39). Yet, the emphasis on individualism associated with creativity and self-expression can run counter to “educational issues such as goals for art education, content for teaching, organization of the curriculum, conceptions of the learner, the role of the teacher, and evaluation of educational progress” (Day, p. 40). This provides the basis that forms the conflicts between the role of the artist
and that of the teacher.

Not only did Day (1986) advocate for a broader approach to understanding art, he also feared that such isolationist tendencies might limit the students’ awareness of the real world of art they encounter everyday; “art from many cultures, times, and places; the contemporary world of fine and applied art” (p. 40). Day questioned whether the “inward focus of the artist on personal creative expression [is] incompatible with the outward focus on the welfare of students required of the teacher?” and whether the artist/teacher label places “more importance on the teacher rather than on the student or on the subject to be taught and learned?” (p. 41). The differences between the professions of the artist and the teacher as described by Day (1986) and Lanier (1957) have been reinforced and institutionalized; they are separated by education, philosophy, professional prerequisites, and as fields of study for higher degrees. Consequently, it becomes difficult if not impossible to integrate the concepts, resulting in an internal conflict when one individual identifies with aspects of both roles. But the notion that an art teacher, Anderson (1981) countered, “must conform and identify with only one of these fields or professions only lays the foundation for creative, intellectual, personal, and professional stagnation” (p. 45). Yet at the same time, art teachers continue to “settle into the roles previously defined for them” (ibid), or rather, as Foucault would describe it, into the subject positions made available to them.

Anderson (1981) suggested that “it is important for the art educator to examine motives and commitments before any resolution of the personal identity can take place” (p. 46). While there may be a great deal of “interdisciplinary fusion,” the problems and
practices encountered by the artist and the teacher are distinct; the “aims and purposes, contexts and modes of working, and ultimate commitments are different in each case” (Smith, 1980, cited in Anderson, p. 45). On one hand, Anderson (1981) suggests that the primary concern of the art teacher is not the production of an object, rather their role focuses on learning and cognitive processing; “Art teachers have an intellectual obligation to be knowledgeable and academically competent. They are obligated to be fluent in methods and strategies conducive to learning” (p. 45). Yet on the other hand, she insists that the art teacher must be able to “practice what he preaches,” and “insist on high performance and be able to perform to that level himself” (Anderson, p. 46). But is being competent in the technical skills required to create art, what the art teacher is, or should be, preaching? While this may be an oversimplification of the role of the artist, particular in the contemporary sense, it does highlight the different motives and commitments that Anderson described.

While Anderson reflected on the role of the artist, Smith (1980) emphasized the qualities of the teacher; “The matter of professional identity could be resolved if teachers thought of themselves first and foremost as pedagogues, as persons concerned with the art and science of teaching a given subject” (p. 10). Similarly, Lanier (1959) earlier suggested:

We will remain an immature professional area until all of us are united in the conviction that our role is separate from that of the artist. … We must believe that art education is important because of what it can contribute, in conjunction with other experiences, to the development of people (p. 21).
The identity crisis Anderson and Smith spoke of seems far from being resolved.

Szekely (1978) contributed to the debates but also professed the potential synergy between the roles of the artist and the teacher, when he suggested, “practicing and teaching art have fundamental similarities and that progress in one area generally leads to a heightened awareness of the other” (p. 17). Szekely concluded, the artist/teacher who recognizes the relationship between artistic development and growth as a teacher of art, and who continuously grows both as an artist and as a pedagogue has a great deal to offer. Therefore, an art teacher in public schools in the United States often finds it difficult to pursue his or her own artistic development due to the demands of the job, yet Szekely argued, “maintaining one’s artistic self while teaching should be a principal goal of art education. The ability to harmonize one’s creative powers in teaching and art making should be the foremost competence of each art teacher” (pp. 19-20). Many art teachers have entered the field through an initial interest in art, but this does not always equate to the desire to be an artist as the motives are often distinct.

Szekely (1978) argued that the “teacher’s artistic productivity outside of the school is one of the most important preparations for the performance in class. Without support from the school, the art teacher might believe that his own creativity has little to do with his teaching” (p. 18). For example, he cited “A person who is continuously involved in creative performances can draw on the specifics of his own work and explore the problems he may have in common with other artists as well as the issues on which he differs from them” (Szekely, p. 18). He further suggested the artist/teacher should continue their own artistic development while teaching, and maintain contact with other
Szekely (1978) also suggested that the artist/teacher “perform as an artist in the school and in the community” (p. 20), but this presents a very different role for the artist. However, he still emphasized the need for an art teacher to be an artist in order to be an effective teacher; but not all art teachers identify with being an artist, as if there was a consensus as to what being an artist means in the first place. Moreover, he took the debate one step further by attempting to demonstrate how an artist’s creative talents may be applied towards teaching; the “ideal teacher should be able to recognize essential personal traits he has as an artist and explore these factors in the development of the student” (p. 18). For example, having been immersed in the artistic process, the artist can provide insight into when and where to assist students, how much help is required, and when to stop assisting, along with an innate sense of inquisitiveness, humility, and patience. The artist often faces many of the same challenges that will confront his or her students, such as “the difficult issue of beginning a creative work, of going beyond obvious solutions, of trusting one’s intuitions, or being able to take advantage of accidental occurrences” (Szekely, p. 18).

Szekely (1978) also argued it is the artist who can:

best understand that there are no uniform solutions or single answers, and that the role of the art teacher is to help students discover individual tasks and their own unique ways of working—to recognize the existence of problems and alternative paths in solving them (18).

Most of these circumstances benefit from personal experience, as the artist/teacher “may
also be perceptive and sympathetic to the struggles of the student” (Szekely, p. 19).

Furthermore, Szekely (1978) argued that the artist/teacher should be expected to synthesize and unify a personal philosophy of art teaching and art making, but do they or should they remain the same? Ultimately, he concluded, “The artist who brings total dedication to a task cannot consider his teaching and art making as separate activities or independent endeavors” (Szekely, p. 19). Part of the problem with developing a unified philosophy between the roles of the artist and of the teacher is that it is difficult to maintain a cohesive or coherent relationship between the two if one remains so fluid and unstable. Perhaps this is why the cohesion works for some and not for others, and why conflicts between the two continue to surface.

Graham (2009), as a contemporary art educator, continues to be a vocal advocate for the model of the artist as teacher, arguing that being an artist can inform the dynamic between learners and those disciplines of art in ways that allow those disciplines to be open to renovation and reconstruction. He extols the teaching artist’s ability to “question taken for granted assumptions about power, privilege, culture, habit, history, manners, and rules” (Graham, 2009, p. 86), and to create conditions for learning that encourage divergence, unpredictable outcomes, and substantial engagement with issues. I would argue that the dynamics of interaction and the learning environment that Graham described are the hallmarks of good teaching that are not exclusive to the teaching artist. Yet, at the same time, he continually mingles aspects of a modernist discourse that serve to limit and constrain what it means to be an artist; talking about having credible experience as an artist, and showing students what it means to be a real artist.
Graham (2010) conducted a study in which he examined the educational dynamic created by teachers who were also artists and explored “how teachers’ personal artistry and artistic activities beyond school contributed to their teaching in school” (p. 219). While it was clear that the interactions of the teaching artists “invigorated both the content and practice of teaching and learning,” he did not include art teachers as part of his study who were not practicing artists, non-teaching artists, or other teaching artists whose practice he deemed “unhelpful or problematic” (p. 222). Through my own experiences, I’ve have observed non-professional artists that were wonderful art teachers, and extremely talented artists that didn’t teach very well. Without sufficient negative case analysis and using seemingly selective criteria for participants, I don’t see how he can claim such a definitive causal relationship. Graham himself conceded, although the teachers’ artistic practice contributed significantly to the dynamic of the classroom, the benefits have not been the exclusive domains of teaching artists; “teachers who are not practicing artists may cultivate these same behaviors in their classrooms” (p. 227).

One of the teachers from Graham’s 2010 study suggested in order to sustain himself as a teacher, he have to go back to my art; while conversely, what I am arguing is that my experiences and background as a teacher have profoundly influenced my attitudes and perceptions about art and art education. Another of Graham’s participants cautioned that many art classrooms “gravitate towards a uniform focus on materials and techniques” at the expense of personal exploration (2010, p. 222). Another warned, “some students felt that they were trapped or restricted by their teacher’s artistic passions” (cited in Graham, 2010, p. 223), yet as Wilson (2007) demonstrated, whether
overtly or covertly, adult influences upon the students cannot be completely mitigated. Graham cited Wilson as describing “a hybrid pedagogical site where students’ expertise and artistic interests meets the teacher’s artistic interests” (2010, p. 228, emphasis mine). Wilson does not emphasize expertise and artistic interests and in fact described at length the dominant influence of the teacher’s artistic practice.

As through Graham’s emphasize upon the role of the artist, the term artist/teacher is typically used to describe these dual roles while privileging the importance of art production in relation to teaching. Such a philosophy of teaching based upon artistic practice “assumes art education is best when practicing artists are in charge and disregards the importance of the education field” (Daichendt, 2009, p. 33). Daichendt (2009) suggested that as a philosophy of teaching, the term artist/teacher should not emphasize a dual role, but rather focus on the integration of artistic practices in the classroom that “represents a more inclusive and richer understanding of the multifaceted aspects of teaching art” (p. 33).

Daichendt (2009) also argued the artist/teacher label stresses “the growing importance of teaching and the metamorphosis of the art and education fields” (p. 36), yet educational institutions continue to emphasize one over the other. Artmaking, for example “can be virtually nonexistent to encompassing the entire [art education] program” (Daichendt, 2010, p. 4). Art teachers with a dominant art training often perpetuate a particular philosophy that emphasizes production; “In essence, they learned how to draw and then they taught drawing. This type of education is concerned with artist preparation first, with teaching considered a minor or unmentioned aspect of education”
(Daichendt, 2010, p. 9). Unfortunately, many arts schools continue to follow distinct academic and professionalized traditions and guidelines that are often “transformed into formulas, which privileged the notion of producing art” (Daichendt, 2010, p. 4). Certainly not all art schools or departments function in this way, but competing and conflicting philosophies of art—as well as art education—further complicates the issue.

At the same time, Daichendt countered, many art education majors “arm themselves with a theory or a system of art education without practicing many of the experiences of art making themselves” (2010, p. 9). Such teacher preparation programs seldom engage students through the production of art or art theory; rather, they focus on pedagogical theory and aspects of teaching. Art education programs tend to rely on fine arts programs for the artistic training of their teachers, and few offer any synergy between the practices. What Daichendt refers to as a “pluralistic attitude” (2010, pp. 6-7) emphasizes that an *articulation* between the roles and philosophies may prove to be more productive.

Daichendt (2010) further argued that being an artist is more than a degree or course of study, rather, it is the way an artist views the world and how that vision has the potential to inform one’s teaching practice, yet in many cases, an individual’s identity aligns with either that of an artist or of a teacher. Daichendt (2010) maintained:

Artist-teachers are not just artists who teach; their artistic thinking process is imbedded within various elements of the teaching process. … Through this understanding of the artist-teacher, it is synthetic and interwoven, not a combination or roles defined by institutions. (p. 10)
In my experience, the roles of the artist and of the teacher have considerable overlaps in practice, yet they remain distinct in their philosophies.

Zwirn (2002) shifted the focus of the discourse of the artist/teacher as a philosophy to a sense of role and identity. She suggested one’s role is formed by the deterministic factors of a group, whereas one’s identity is shaped more by intra-psychic development. While suggesting that one’s role and one’s inner sense of self are distinct, at the same time, she articulates the two as inseparable concepts that remain in a fluid interaction throughout life. Conversely, what Foucault suggested, is that social discourse has a strong—if not dominant—hand in creating the subject. In essence, an individualized sense of self does not exist. Consequently, an individual may experience a conflict in identity as a result of the position he or she occupies within opposing discursive formations.

Such a conflict occurs when the perceived expectations of two or more roles are incompatible or when the performance of one conflicts with the other (Zwirn, 2002). The individual can seek out a new subject position that seemingly satisfies their sense of self, but the result is often conforming to one or the other. The inability to resolve such conflicts, Zwirn suggested, “may be due to persistent non-conformity, a conflict of values with the assessment of others, the pressures created by external influences, and values that are at persistent variance with internal perceptions and contradictory perceptions of self by the actor and by others” (p. 36).

Kroger (1996) suggested individuals construct their realities as a response to complex encounters and need to resolve them to return to a sense of equilibrium. It is the
individual’s inability to satisfy itself, he argued, that drives development. Conversely, as Foucault (1983) would argue, a subject position is not an individual’s idealized sense of self, but rather a socially constructed identity. This perspective suggests the conflict would arise not from their inability to satisfy themselves, but rather from their inability to conform to the expectations placed upon them. In this sense, the subject positions that are made available to us predominately shape our identity. The subject is created through the process of socialization, and as a result of sanctions for “conforming and nonconforming behavior, and by the individual’s own understanding and conceptions of what his behavior should be” (Biddle & Thomas, 1966, p. 4). The subject is shaped by the expectations applied to a person in the context of a discursive formation, which consist of narrow frameworks of rules that restrict a person’s identity.

The self, Zwirn (2002) argued, “is defined in its relationships and is particularly vulnerable to alterations in these relationships” (p. 50). This, in and of itself, makes the articulation of the artist/teacher identity problematic as the perceived expectations associated with the roles are often contradictory. The discontinuous paths of development and the divergent discourses of artist and the teacher further emphasize the alterations of this relationship.

Is it necessary to be a good artist to be a good teacher? Traditionally, artists were considered “the most appropriate persons to foster the creative capacities of the child as opposed to classroom teachers” (Daichendt, 2009, p. 37). But what is one’s artistic self? Zwirn’s study described being an artist as part of their core identity, one that is “impermeable to change” (2002, p. 8: document pages of abstract), but being an artist
means different things to different people. Whereas the debate initially centered on one’s role as an artist or a teacher, we have seen how the conflict has evolved to consider the construction of one’s identity.

2.2 The Role of the Artist

The role of the artist has continually been shaped by societal discourse, and has evolved over time in different countries to meet the needs of both culture and context. If we return to the fifteenth century, “we will not find a beginning of the construction of the artist as we know it today but rather a preexisting idea of who and what the artist is” (Soussloff, 1997, p. 6). Giroux (1995), a contemporary critical theorist suggested, “changing historical conditions often redefine and produce discourses articulating how multiple constructions of agency are figured within new forms of self-representation and collective struggle” (p. 5). It is within these conflicting ideologies that the artist continues to struggle in an effort to appeal to a wider audience that is symptomatic of a general confusion about the nature of society and where the role of the artist stands in relationship to it.

More recently, Gaztambide-Fernandez (2008) suggested that from a socio-historical point of view, “types of artists are constructed within cultural and historical conditions and that individuals are recognized as artists when they fit typologies that are culturally and historically relevant (p. 236, emphasis mine). An interdisciplinary perspective also suggests, “to focus on the discourse and rhetoric that supports different concepts of the artist to illustrate the political and ideological sources of these concepts”
Art is about different things, at different times, and in different contexts; “Disparate and contradicting assumptions about culture delimit how the artist is constructed in the public imagination” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, p. 233). Consequently, different assumptions about the role of the artist demand different criteria for discussion and evaluation.

The Catholic Church shaped the role of the artist throughout medieval Europe; the primary function of the craftsman and artisan was the creation of ritual and utilitarian objects (Herberholz, 2011). In other countries and other cultures, folk and tribal artists mastered practices, then passed on the cultural arts of their communities, “carrying on artistic traditions from generation to generation” (Herberholz, 2011, p. 18). Certain practices became accepted as “the natural and right way to do things,” and the more stable traditions imposed standards upon the artist or craftsman; the transmission of standards and traditions as handed down from master to disciple has sustained practices and gave them their history (Gablik, 2004, p. 127). Artists began to join guilds during the later Middle Ages; these guilds employed “an apprentice system to teach young males specific trades” (Daichendt, 2010, p. 31). The goal became to pass on a specific set of skills and to ensure future practice through a predetermined body of knowledge.

The academies that arose throughout Europe sought to organize theories and doctrines into a set of rules and standards in order to ensure consistency; they established the traditions that virtually every artist who entered must follow (Daichendt, 2010). The Ecole des Beaux-Arts, for example, was “an art school founded upon strict guidelines, the dedication to drawing the human form remained consistent … to promote and train artists
in a specific style” (Daichendt, 2010, p. 38). Certain practices became institutionalized, and in this way, their influence was felt at every level “providing opportunities and preventing opportunities, preserving traditions of professionalism and manipulating the machinery of success” (Milner, 1988, p. 11, cited in Daichendt, 2010, p. 38).

2.2.1 The Role of the Artist as a Skilled Worker

The role of the artist as a skilled worker is often equated with that of the craftsperson or artisan; in this view “technique itself becomes the goal, and the flashier the technique, the better the work” (Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. 55). This traditional attention to craftsmanship, teaching in the academies, and use of physical skills, all have a “natural affinity with professionalism,” and many present day artists share at least some of these characteristics (ibid). As foundations of art, formal concepts and technical proficiency continue to maintain a privileged voice in defining the role of the artist and they continue to form the basic tenets by which artistic practices are defined (Kushins, 2007). The search for a universal set of visual qualities would define “much of the accepted wisdom of modernism” (Williams, 2009, cited in Daichendt, 2010, p. 144). At the same time, these very foundations also functioned to maintain order through a distinct hierarchy as to who was considered to be an artist.

2.2.2 The Romantic Myth of Autonomous Individualism

During the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance, the Church was the primary patron of the artist. Their work was revered and their status became elevated throughout
Europe; “Kings and nobles called on artists to paint likenesses and embellish their courts. By the 17th century, court artists were given titles” (Herberholz, 2011, p. 18). The term artist became “a commodity to heighten standing and represent knowledge” (Daichendt, 2010, p. 61).

As art expanded beyond the patronage of the Church, the separation of forms distinguished the artist from the craftsperson; “Through this distinction, the painter practiced science, whereas the craftsman toiled in an unrespectable fashion” (Pevsner, 1973, cited in Daichendt, 2010, p. 35). Thus, the concept of the artist evolved concurrently with the elevation of the media (Soussloff, 1997). Since that time, “a new rhetoric of the artist as an individual with special faculties and personality traits emerged” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 240). The artist’s purpose shifted from a utilitarian to a symbolic endeavor that focused on the creativity and the self-expression of the individual. Artists became highly regarded in society and claimed a place within the upper class “as the producers of artifacts that exemplified the humanist vision of aesthetic pleasure” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 240).

The Renaissance marked another significant change in the role of the artist. Consequently, as Daichendt (2010) revealed in his historical examination of the artist/teacher, “the increased social standing and career of the artist in turn required a new type of education for the artist” (p. 35). The art academies of the high Renaissance elevated the role of the artist to that of the intellectual; “Art and the curriculum … were thought to engage the intellect first, followed by method” (Daichendt, p. 35). With the inception of Romanticism, a further shift in attention to the artist occurred, and art was
seen as the “overflow, utterance, or projection of the thought and feeling of the poet.” A work of art was ‘essentially the internal made external, resulting from a creative process operating under the impulse of feeling’” (Abrams, 1953, cited in Elkins, 2001, p. 116).

The role of the artist as a privileged individual arose during 18th century through the philosophy of aesthetics:

The notion first began to take coherent shape that creative activity … was a function not simply of the trained intellect in the service of a native wit regulated by judgment, but was also fundamentally a function of individual and therefore variable psychological response, deriving not only from universal rule but also from individual sense perception. With this realization, given its first full formulation in the Aesthetics of Kant, the path to the modern perception of the artist and his creative role was blazed. (Dempsey cited in Soussloff, 1997, p. 7)

The role of the artist became an aesthetic as well as an intellectual pursuit;

“sculpture and painting began to reflect the tastes of the upper classes, no longer merely serving utilitarian purposes, but being created to please the eye and elevate the spirit. Subject matter focused on religion, history and mythology” (Herberholz, 2011, p. 18).

Emanuel Kant viewed the artist as a genius, blessed with natural talent and the “ability to transmit laws and rules of nature through the product of his work,” yet such romantic notions of the artist could not exist without a supporting ideology (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 241). Herberholz (20110 remarked:

[Artists] earned their places in history by having new ideas, using art materials in inventive ways, selecting unique subject matter, seeing the world in special ways,
and exploring new and different materials for handling color, line and shape. (p. 18)

Such formal aesthetics continue to constitute a privileged form that, as the contemporary French philosopher Rancière (2004) argued, are prejudicially linked to a certain regime of politics that reinforced the social positioning of artists and the status they enjoyed and, at the same time created systems of exclusion.

As a system of exclusion, the “discourse of liberal humanism created institutions to legislate and control artists’ contributions to society and make judgments about which ones constitute works of genius” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 242). This underscores the struggle over what counts as culture. British literary critic F. R. Leavis argued that culture became “the purview of a very small minority on whom the discerning appreciation of art and literature depends” (cited in Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 248).

Romantic images of the artist persisted as expressed by author and critic E. T. A. Hoffmann:

The genuine artist lives only for the work, which he understands as the composer understood it and which he now performs. He does not make his personality count in any way. All his thoughts and actions are directed towards bringing into being all the wonderful, enchanting pictures and impressions the composer sealed in his work with magical power. (cited in Soussloff, 1997, p. 8)

The role of the artist as an intellectual embraced the idea that “artists are individuals with special talents whose role is to provide great works of beauty that contribute to the
civilizing project of modernity” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 239). This view of the artist placed humans at the center of history and holds that only through the advancement of their potentials can humans achieve full civilization and control nature to serve their needs. … For liberal humanists, civilization is the accomplishment of human effort and the driving force of history. (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 239) Within the modern era, the role of the artist was defined by “autonomy and self-sufficiency, and by its isolation from the rest of society” (Gablik, 1995, p. 74). German painter Georg Baselitz argued that the role of the artist is not to change or improve the world; “Society functions, and always has, without the artist” (cited in Gablik, 1995, p. 77). Baselitz\(^1\) claimed:

> the artist is not responsible to anyone. His social role is asocial; his only responsibility consists in an attitude to the work he does. There is no communication with any public whatsoever. The artist can ask no question, and he makes no statement; he offers no information, and his work cannot be used. It is the end product which counts, in my case, the picture. (cited in Gablik, 1995, p. 77)

This romantic myth of autonomous individualism has so completely structured artistic identity in the modern world and restricted the role of the artist, that the artist’s “inner consciousness is still dominated by the feeling of being independent, solitary, and separate” (Gablick, 1995, p. 78).

\(^1\) Published in the catalog of his exhibition at the Whitechapel Art Gallery in London in 1983.
Critic Hilton Kramer argued, the artist “is incapable of solving any problems but aesthetic ones,” and suggested “art is at its best when it serves only itself and not some other purpose” (cited in Gablik, 1995, p. 84). Formalists believe that “art exists solely for aesthetic satisfaction and its claim that any social, cultural, or even representational message is a distraction from art’s higher purpose” (Anderson, cited in Barrett, 2008, p. 107). This monologic view, Fraser (1989) argued, “is the Romantic individualist’s view in which … a solitary voice [is] crying out into the night against an utterly undifferentiated background” (p. 103). Against this notion that the role of the artist lies in absolute independence from the world, French writer Albert Camus argued that art cannot be a monologue; “if there is any man who has no right to solitude, it is the artist’” (cited in Gablik, 1995, p. 80).

The role of the modern artist developed around the notion of a unique and separate self, its confrontational orientation resulted from deep habits of thinking that set in opposition society and the individual as two contrary and antagonistic categories, neither of which could expand or develop except at the expense of the other. The free and self-sufficient individual has long been the ideal of our culture, and artists especially have seen themselves as quintessential free agents, pursuing their own ends. (Gablik, 1995, pp. 83-84)

This critique of modernism is more a critique of an ideology, which “pervades people’s actions, interactions, and the kinds of activities—including entertainment and creative activities—in which people engage” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 244). It
emphasizes the construction of the artist in a political context in an effort to “explain why social agents accept or consent to systems of collective representations that do not serve their objective interests but legitimate the existing power structure” (Macey, p. 75). At the same time, history and tradition cannot entirely be abandoned; “any understanding of contemporary art and criticism is necessarily bound up with a consideration of modernism, for modernism is the cultural standard which even today governs our conception of what art is” (Wallis, p. xii). Consequently, “the prevailing orthodoxy has tended to reflect the concerns of modernism, with a mix of formalist and expressionist approaches dominating classroom practice, at least until relatively recent times” (Hickman, 2005, p. 46).

2.2.3 The Artist as an Intellectual

The artist as an intellectual deals with important ideas and “investigates all areas of human knowledge” while also contributing to them (Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. 55). The danger associated with this view is that of elitism; “from the start, the mystique of modern art has always been that it is not generally popular, or even comprehended, except by the elite few” (Gablik, cited in Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. 56). This view of the artist is characterized by creative self-expression with an emphasis on the individual, and bound by the formal elements and principles of design “proffered as universal and foundational” (Gude, 2004, p. 6).

Wilson (2007) suggested that these rules and conventions continue to shape art curriculum and instruction, suggesting aesthetic and artistic considerations appear to take
precedent over educational considerations. From a Foucaudian perspective, “the artist is constituted by and constitutive of discourse” (Soussloff, 1997, p. 4). Consequently, both artists and teachers gain their identities within practices that are ideologically constructed, thus the ideal of the romantic individual remains a myth (Hickman, 2005). Similarly, Sousslof (1997) demonstrated how discursive practices shape the role of the artist and how such narratives rely “on myth as much as history to construct the artist in culture” (p. 45). Yet these romantic myths as perpetuated by discourse, Gaztambide-Fernandez argued, continue to “frame the way that artists are imagined as individuals” (2008, p. 237).

Daichendt (2010) argued that a central tenet to being an artist lies in their ability to “produce objects/concepts, and in doing so use a particular way of thinking that aided their production process” (p. 64). But ‘such ways of thinking’ are ideologically and discursively constructed; “the dominant modes of thinking in our society have conditioned us to characterize art primarily as specialized objects, created not for moral or practical or social reasons, but rather to be contemplated and enjoyed” (Gablik, 1995, p. 74). Gaztambide-Fernandez (2008) further challenged the notion of art for art’s sake, and that the role of the artist is merely to produce great works of art. Such an emphasis is inconsistent with the social character of the institutions that sanction such distinctions:

The role of the artist in society is subject to government scrutiny. Artists can do whatever they want in private spaces, but it is counter to their civilizing role to expose content that may be objectionable to the public at the expense of the state. (Gaztambide-Fernandez, p. 243)
This ideological view, he argued, “is also a thin foundation on which to theorize the curriculum of artistic education and to think through the contemporary challenges facing young artists” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, p. 238). Consequently, contemporary perspectives on the role of the artist challenge the social and institutional ideologies that continue to define the role of the artist.

It was Barthes (1977) who suggested that such a concept of the artist was no longer viable “because artists were not and had never been solely responsible for the production, the lives, or the significance of their work” (cited in Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 249). This marked a dramatic shift in attention away from the role of the artist to the role that the audience played in creating—or completing—a work of art, which no longer exalted the solitude of the creative individual. The author, or the artist, Barthes suggested, “played the minimal role of inscribing works that did not gain any significance until audiences, institutions, and historical circumstances allowed them to stand for something and to become works of art” (cited in Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 249). Contemporary artists encourage a more open experience of their art, one that allows others entry as the position of the audience shifts from passive viewer to active receiver.

The emphasis on the artist as an intellectual continues to privilege individual practice rather than collaboratively or socially engaged practices; “Autonomy, we now see, has condemned art to social impotence by turning it into just another class of objects for marketing and consumption” (Gablik, 1995, p. 74). Gablik (2004) later suggested the role of the artist has become marginal in modern Western society, “not because modern art is intrinsically defective; it is because our society has divested art of all but aesthetic
value” (p. 39). As a result, an artist’s values are often set apart from those of society, yet one of the myths about art, as Van Laar & Diepeveen suggested, “is that it is separate from ordinary human activity” (p. 2).

Similarly, Bourriaud’s (2002) theory of relational aesthetics speaks to the social environment in which people come together to participate in a shared activity. Such practices create an encounter between subjects through which meaning is elaborated collectively, rather than through passive or individual consumption. The position of the audience within the work is reconfigured around the concept of conversation rather than one of display. Consequently, “when the position of the artist is shifted from the sole creator to collaborator, changes occur in the practice of artwork that not only impact the reception of these specific works, but also have implications about the status and nature of all aesthetic practice” (Purves, 2005) p. xi). Yet, as Gablik warned, “there is no denying that the art world subtly disapproves of artists who choose interaction as their medium, rather than the disembodied eye” (1995, p. 85).

2.2.4 Contemporary Perspectives on the Role of the Artist

Such contemporary perspectives on the role of the artist are built upon expectations of challenging the public to “think in new and different ways and to inspire intellectual dialogue” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, pp. 233-234). This view of the role of the artist as “representor” emphasizes the “notion that artists are transmitters of something larger than themselves” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 250). While the artist as an intellectual “exalts the artist for transmitting the rules of the beautiful and the
sublime,” this emancipated view of the artist emphasizes their role in producing “works that inscribe political struggles over meaning and identification” (ibid).

Echoing these contemporary perspectives, Lacey (1995) detailed the transition from the private to a public role for the artist [See figure 1]. The artist in the role as
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Figure 1: (Lacy, 1995, p. 174).

experiencer, as Lacey described, is much like a social anthropologist who “enters the territory of the Other and presents observations on people and places through a report of her own interiority. In this way the artist becomes a conduit for the experience of others, and the work a metaphor for relationship” (p. 174).

In the role as the reporter, the artist goes beyond experience to recount the situation, thereby making it available to others (Lacy, 1995). In both instances, the artist is attempting to comment on the social order from an implied position of objectivity. Some artists, Lacey warned, “claim simply to ‘reflect’ what exists without assignment of value,” while those who report imply a more conscious selection of material (p. 175).

When an artist assumes the role of the analyst, “the visual appeal of imagery is often superseded by the textual properties of the work. … Their analysis may assume its
aesthetic character from the coherence of the ideas or from their relationship to visual images rather than through the images themselves” (Lacy, 1995, p. 176). It is important to recognize that the artist role as an analyst still emphasizes their role in making art, not simply ‘analyzing’ the work of others.

The artist as activist is the last step along Lacy’s (1995) proposed continuum. Through this view, the role of the artist is contextualized within local, national, and global situations, thus challenging the romantic, individualistic ideal as artists engage in the “consensual production of meaning with the public” (Lacy, p. 177). Rather than embrace the aesthetic practices of the isolated artist, Lacy argued that artists should reposition themselves as “citizen-activists” to effect social change (177, cited in Baker, Ng-He, & Lopez-Bosch, 2008, p. 292). As such, “interventionist and provocationist artists participate in a new invigoration of public space and civic discourse” (Harper, 1998, cited in Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 247). The role of the artist as activist is so “diametrically opposed to the aesthetic practices of the isolated artist,” Lacy argued, that the artist as activist develops practices not usually associated with art making (p. 177).

Such redefinition of the role of the artist calls for practices that are communal, collaborative, and interdisciplinary (Baker, Ng-He, & Lopez-Bosch, 2008). As artists engage more with the public, they assume role of sociologist, journalist, or philosopher; “Such activities position artists as contributors to intellectual endeavor and shift our aesthetic attention toward the shape or meaning of their theoretical constructs” (Lacy, 1995, p. 176). And as Gablik (2004) added, the momentum of social change has not only altered the nature of art but also “the psychological drives and motivations of those who
shape it” (p. 25). It is important to realize the considerable overlap between these different roles for the artist in that they all imply a distinct social component. It is also not a linear progression; one role does not supersede or replace another, but rather there exists multiple roles or identities that an artist can occupy.

Gablik (2004) described this new sense of consciousness as a point of equilibrium between the aesthetic character of art and an aesthetic formalism that treats art as socially unconditioned and autonomous. She suggests that perhaps, what is needed is “some sort of reconciliation—not a fixture at either pole” (Gablik, 2004, p. 43). Similarly, Gaztambide-Fernandez conceived the role of the artist as a *border crosser*, who retains a sense of the artist as an individual with distinct characteristics, but it dismisses the idea that artists are vehicles through which the rules of art are materialized. From this perspective, artists do not respond to extra-social callings to provide great works of art. Instead, their work challenges boundaries, rules, and expectations and disturbs the social order to promote social transformation and “reconstruction.” (2008, p. 244)

Consequently, as O'Sullivan (2001) argued, such a rethinking of the role of the artist would include an exploration of art’s creative, aesthetic, and ethical function.

### 2.2.5 The Role of the Artist as Social Critic

Through the role of the *artist as social critic*, art becomes “a means of human liberation, a tool in the struggles against injustice, a way to transform the world” (Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. 60). This emphasis on social relevance often conflicts with
the values and perceptions associated with other more traditional roles. Significantly, these artists seek to “create new visual languages in order to reject particular social and aesthetic conventions” (Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. 61). The role of the artist as activist, or social critic, embodies the ability “to develop the critical capacity to challenge and to transform existing social and political forms, rather than simply adapt to them” (Giroux cited in Hickman, 2005, p. 104). This marks a move, as Hickman (2005) described:

Away from attempting to understand oneself towards understanding the world, a development from creating order through to self-discovery and a turning outwards, with a concern for art as a tool for the growth and consolation of others.

Art is seen as a way of coming to terms with life. (p. 94).

Yet Hickman views this shift in the emphasis of the role of the artist as being associated with “a radical reappraisal of the whole concept of art and its contexts,” (pp. 45-46) and defends the notion that the role of the artist is “to create something of aesthetic significance” (p. 103). The artist as social critic, Kwon countered, shares a “desire to distinguish current practices from those of the past—to mark a difference from artistic precedents … deemed to have reached a point of aesthetic and political exhaustion” (p. 1).

Similarly, Gablik (2004) argued “the more closely we examine the pursuit of freedom in modern society, the more we come up against an unacknowledged split between our ethical and our aesthetic standpoints” (pp. 90-91). This new terrain of consciousness refers to the intent of the artist shifting beyond a narrow focus on creative
self-expression or conforming to the aesthetic demands of the marketplace, to emphasize the greater needs of others within a social context that gives such art its meaning beyond traditional aesthetics. This new sense of identity is both socially responsible and ethically sound, and goes beyond merely promoting aesthetic quality to contribute to the quality of life. What matters more with contemporary views of the role of the artist is to be critical rather than to be ideological.

Gablik (1995) argued for a “revisioning” of the artist’s role in our society:

Our culture’s romance with individualism is no longer adequate. My own work and thinking have led me to a field-like conception of the self that includes more of the environment—a selfhood that releases us into a sense of our radical relatedness … Connective aesthetics sees that human nature is deeply embedded in the world. It makes art into a model for connectedness [italics added] and healing by opening up being to its full dimensionality—not just the disembodied eye. (pp. 85–86)

Yet, another of the myths about the artist is that they “do not have a function, except, perhaps, to give aesthetic pleasure” (Van Laar and Diepeveen, 1998, p. 2). When artists make choices about what they want their work to do rather than what they want it to be, Van Laar & Diepeveen argued, “they assume a social role, become a particular kind of ‘social agent’” (p. 52).

Consequently, artists as social critics have assumed a variety of roles in society and have directed their work towards divergent purposes. Emphasizing a social and ethical aesthetic, Gablik (2004) suggested that the community artist is an example of an
artist that has resisted the values of the marketplace and used his or her skills in the service of the community, arguing “any artist in contemporary society who sets out to create values must engage actively with the outside world” (p. 63). The community artist demonstrates a greater critical awareness of their social role that is not the result of an autonomous, self-contained individual focused on self-expression. It is based upon a dialogical structure that is the result of collaborative and interdependent processes:

As artists step out of the old framework and reconsider what it means to be an artist, they are reconstructing the relationship between individual and community, between art work and public. Looking at art in terms of social purpose rather than visual style, and setting a high priority on openness to what is Other, causes many of our cherished notions to break down: the vision of brisk sales, well-patronized galleries, good reviews, and a large, admiring audience. (Gablik, 1995, p. 76)

The artist as social critic seeks to connect to their constituent communities through practices that create a critical consciousness and provide ideas, solutions, and structure for change to establish political, social, as well as artistic validity. In this context, as Foster suggested, the role of the artist is also re-formed, as “the values that heretofore authenticated art” are called into question and “aesthetic signification opened up” (Cited in Wallis, p. 191).

Particularly in the context of the classroom, we should look at “the social roles that characterize how artists function in society” (Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. vi). For example, one of the goals of the artist as social critic is to transform society, while others may choose to investigate the formal properties of color. Once one has examined
the underlying motivation, one can begin to understand the social function of the work and formulate criteria for evaluation” (Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. 7). As Van Laar and Diepeveen argued, all artists are engaged in social actions, yet, “as a consequence of the dominance of formalist concepts in art theory, artists have directed their specifics about art to materials and not towards art’s function” (p. 6). All activities that artists engage in “including the formal ones, imply a future social context that the artist in some ways anticipates as [he or] she makes her work” (Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. 7).

Because artists function in society in widely different ways, it is useful to examine their role as social critics, and as a means of ideological expression:

Such an awareness of art’s multiple social functions makes dialog possible, an open dialog that allows one to examine overall objectives in the light of various critical perspectives. The important thing is that the dialog is open, and not a series of clashing hidden agendas. (Van Laar & Diepeveen, 1998, p. 20).

For example, an emphasis on the roles of the artist as a skilled craftsman, an intellect, or as a social critic does not necessarily contradict one other, but they form an uneasy tension; as Van Laar and Diepeveen (1998) concluded, “because differing beliefs are an inherent characteristic of postmodern art culture, the art world is always in conflict as these views jostle for position” (p. 41). These divergent views of the artist are grounded in different cultural discourses, and “each of these discourses constructs the artist as an individual in a particular way, and … each view of the artist corresponds to specific institutions that mediate the role of the artist in society” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 235). The various roles of the artist cover a diverse range of human activities,
consequently it becomes difficult to uncover one universal characteristic that can define
its conception.

It thus becomes critical to examine the construction of the image of the artist in
culture by institutional and discursive formations. Discourse constructs diverse views that
reflect

the ontological and epistemological assumptions behind a particular
understanding of concepts such as “artist.” It determines how we speak and think
about a subject regardless of the disciplinary boundaries that frame a particular
view. This approach rejects the notion that artists are natural types while building
on the analysis of how certain constructs of the artist gain relevance in given
historical conditions. It suggests a complex interaction between historical context
and social relations mediated by power through particular discursive regimes.

(Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 236, emphasis mine)

Such discursive regimes have the power to dictate who is or is not recognized as an artist.
Different views of the artist also presume distinct roles and expectations as to what the
artist contributes to society; “In turn, various social institutions correspond to different
views and hold artists accountable by legitimating their work and mediating between
their contributions and society” (Gaztambide-Fernandez, p. 237).

From a Foucaudian perspective, discursive formations determine the role of the
artist and serve a normalizing function that supports structures of knowledge and power.
Gaztambide-Fernandez (2008) argued, “we must challenge the taken-for-granted
assumptions about what it means to be an artist and what is the role of artists in society in
order to have a more robust theoretical framework on which to think through the curriculum of artistic education” (p. 238). Such assumptions are “replaced with questions of social location, articulation, meaning, and socially bound stylistic conventions” (Bauman, 1999, cited in Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2008, p. 245). With the recognition that the discourses that shape the views of the artist are susceptible to tension, also comes the realization that such artificially and socially constructed boundaries can be crossed by destabilizing the dynamics of power that sustain them and effectively disturb the dominant ideology.

Consistent with this notion of discourse constructing identity, Zwirn (2002) suggested, “widespread opinion is that in order to be a good art teacher, one must be primarily an artist who teaches” (p. 25), yet many art teachers do not necessarily see themselves as artists. Often the term artist becomes a commodity to heighten one’s standing and is associated with a subject position thought to confer a higher level of status within society; consequently, “the art teacher may possibly feel inferior to the artist-teacher if he or she is not involved in both professions” (Daichendt, 2010, p. 64). Consequently, this dissertation examines the challenges associated with combining the roles of the artist and the teacher and the ways in which art teachers attempt to mediate these seemingly conflicting identities.

Art education students’ training as artists and as teachers are most often separate, which institutionalizes the divide between the discourses and shapes the way we prepare art teachers. Generally, the preparation of art teachers begins with the practice of art; art education students are trained as artists first and as teachers second. Given the distinction
between these discourses, “there is some evidence to suggest that they may experience contradictions in their career development that seriously impact the construction of their professional identity as art teachers of children and adolescents” (Zwirn, 2002, p. 17). Consequently, tension arises as the senses of identity these roles impart often conflict with one another.

As art students, a focused involvement in art contributes to a stable sense of identity, whereas art education majors often struggle for a positive resolution of their identity as an art teacher (Zwirn, 2002). Fine arts instructors often lack training as teachers, yet more often have active exhibition records; whereas, art educators “are often theoreticians who write and publish works about art” (Zwirn, 2002, pp. 12-13). These distinctions are reflected in how we prepare art teachers:

The art student is educated to master techniques in order to foster personal expression and encouraged to be indifferent to public opinion and true to personal convictions and insights expressed through art. On the other hand, the prospective art teacher is educated to serve public school students by making art accessible to everyone. The art student eventually specializes to develop expertise in one artistic medium. The art education student is taught how to present a broad range of media and numerous orientations and convictions towards art. (Zwirn, 2002, p. 18)

Here, Zwirn (2002) describes an artistic paradigm through a modernist view, whereas the educational paradigm described is a postmodern perspective that further emphasizes the often-contradictory nature of these distinct discourses.
The focus of the teacher is on language, psychology, and pedagogy, and in some methods classes, they work with materials and study how they relate to educational concepts (Zwirn, 2002, p. 13). These classes are significant in that this attempts to bridge the gap between the two discourses; yet “it is unrealistic of art students to believe they can simply transport their studio techniques to [classroom teaching]” (Brown & Korzenik, 1993, cited in Zwirn, 2002, p. 21). However, many art education programs rely solely on studio classes to provide this experience that generally ignores any relevance to education.

Artists often do not value or respect the field of art education, and the artistic endeavors of art education majors are often treated with condescension by their fine arts professors, which is “rather ironic, since these same fine arts professors are teaching themselves” (Zwirn, 2002, p. 9). This helps to perpetuate elitist notions of who has the right to call oneself an artist, or who decides what artistic endeavors are worthwhile, yet even “art education students and teachers who try to combine the often conflicting roles of artist and teacher can be caught in a profound dilemma” (Zwirn, 2002, p. 1). The role of the artist, at least in the classroom, often coincides with professionalism, or one’s role as an expert. This limited perception of the artist equates to an equally limiting role as a teacher.

2.3 The Role of the Teacher

The role of the teacher as expert, Shulman (1999) suggested, is a consistent theme of reform; teachers must be “well educated, especially in the subject matter content they
teach, and that their career-long professional education experiences must continue to be grounded in the centrality of that content” (cited in Finley, 2000, p. 12). In Welker’s (1992) exploration of the teacher as expert, he refers to two different aspects. One focuses on content knowledge or expertise in the field, and the other of the teacher as a professional, in the sense of pedagogical expertise. For the purposes of this study, I am emphasizing the distinction between the two. A teacher who possesses a high degree of pedagogical knowledge could certainly be characterized as an expert in the field of teaching; however, the concept of teacher as an expert, as I am applying it, focuses more on content knowledge and how it positions one as an authority. From this position of authority, the teacher adheres to an identifiable vantage point and mode of being, behind which “stands the notion that there is a right and a wrong way of doing things, that some things are true and others are false, and that it matters desperately what is done and said” (Peters, 1979, cited in Greene, 1984, pp. 56-57).

The juxtaposition between pedagogy and content knowledge reveals the conflicts over meaning, language, and representation that has become symptomatic of the larger struggle over cultural authority, “the role of intellectuals and artists, and the meaning of democratic public life” (Giroux, 1995, p. 8). The distinctions between these roles mirrors the discourses associated with those of the teacher and of the artist and the expectation that a teacher is professionally and technically competent. Inherent in the discourse of the artist/teacher seems to be the perception that an art teacher lacks the qualities or elite status of the professional artist. Yet professionalization is always about being sanctioned by someone else, or prescribing to a system of normalizing practices. The alternative, as
Greene (1984) suggested, may require the teacher to reorganize our “knowledge of the subject matter so as to increase the area of contact between that subject matter and the children’s minds” (p. 57).

2.3.1 The Teacher as Expert

On the surface, it seems reasonable to expect that a teacher possess extensive knowledge of the subjects they teach; however, two distinct disadvantages to this perspective exist. First, there are diverse perspectives for what constitutes knowledge, and these divergent perspectives have distinct implications for both teaching and learning. Secondly, no consistent relationship between teacher’s content knowledge and enhanced student learning has been established (Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2012).

The expert claims exclusive jurisdiction over a special domain of knowledge. In art, or any other subject, the teacher as an expert asserts his or her knowledge of a defined discipline that surpasses the understanding of the common people (Welker, 1992). Yet “there is little agreement regarding how much knowledge a teacher must have to teach well” (Glass, 2002, cited in Cruickshank, 2012, p. 362). One’s level of content knowledge certainly affects how and what we teach. For example, Grossman (1995) suggested:

When deciding what to teach, we are more likely to give greater coverage to areas in which we are more knowledgeable and to skip or downplay areas about which we know less… Additionally, if we are content-secure teachers, we are more likely to ask students more critical and challenging questions. (cited in
This is particularly true as a result of the studio training of an art teacher, as their area of concentration often becomes the focus of their pedagogical practice. Those who study painting, for example, often tend to emphasize that media since it is what they are most proficient in. Consequently, there is seldom any incentive for the art student to experiment with new mediums; rather the emphasis remains focused on mastering a craft and assuming the role as an expert.

As an expert, a teacher may be able to generate more interest and enthusiasm for what they teach, and provide more intimate knowledge of a subject for his or her students. Yet research seems to consistently indicate that knowledge of the subject is important but not sufficient for effective teaching (Graeber, 1999; Heritage, Kim, Vendlinski, & Herman, 2009; Peart & Campbell, 1999; Public Agenda, 2004, cited in Cruikshank, et al., 2012). Despite its obvious advantages the teacher as expert has distinct limitations. For example, if the teacher as expert possesses the responsibility of authority, then students often become dependent upon them for answers. It also makes it inconceivable that the teacher would be in a position to learn. When the credentials of the expert become a mask for special privilege, Welker (1992) argued, it “can be asserted only at some damage to a more public, inclusive, and moral understanding of a teacher’s practice” (p. 2). According to Welker, an expert is nothing more than the consummate individual, that personage whose social status is primarily determined by an exclusive competence, marked as much by its removal from the broader cultural landscape as by its technical and specialized
focus. Within the language of expertise itself resides little imperative for bridging the gap between the private world and the public, little warrant for balancing the appeal of personal reward with the social good. (p. 124)

In this sense, knowledge presumes a certain range of skills and proficiencies. Such an emphasis on principles fundamental to a particular discipline serves to maintain and privilege the discourse. Consequently, the authority one professes seems to appear within “concentric circles of influence and opinion (the cultures of the school, the school district, the surrounding public, the state and federal governments)” (Greene, 1984, p. 56). As part of the social discourse, the school represents a complex structure that is bound by “the pressures of the community, the expectations of the parents, and the responses of the students” (Welker, p. 50).

This emphasis on the teacher as expert suggests a lack of participation with the wider public and perpetuates an elite class of specialists that has continued to hinder the advancement of the arts in education. The teacher as expert promotes elitist conceptions of knowledge that, “in the guise of an ideology of professionalism, serve to close off academic institutions from the wider community” (Welker, 1992, p. 121). Welker also argued, “teacher dominance of any type has drawbacks. It stands in the way of the natural independence, intelligence, and creativity of the child” (p. 73). The teacher as expert also echoes “the modern tendency to retreat into the private logic of self-interest” (Welker, p. 125). In this context, knowledge becomes the province of the elite. The ideas and beliefs that constitute knowledge represent a conventional wisdom born of a particular time and place that dictate acceptable patterns of behavior. Consequently, some art teachers
continue to profess and perpetuate the elite status of the artist as the expert teacher. In many ways, the art teacher seems to be caught in between the grade school emphasis on pedagogy, and higher education that seems to value expertise in a particular field.

Conversely, Greene (1973) argued that the role of the teacher has evolved such that traditional wisdom, “so long depended on to assure continuity, [has begun] to seem irrelevant” (p. 100). The learning process should not be purely passive and abstract; rather, “it should be self-directed, dynamic, social; it should involve challenging, lifelike situations; it should build on young people’s tendencies ‘to make, to do, to create, to produce, whether in the form of utility or of art’” (Dewey, 1961, cited in Greene, 1973, p. 100). The notion of the artist/teacher seems to be predicated on the notion of the teacher as an expert, yet, in few subjects, is the quality of a teacher measured by their ability in their discipline outside of the classroom.

Without specific pedagogical training, art teachers often revert to the way they were taught, and studio classes seldom offer any pedagogical insights. Consequently, this view doesn’t allow for a balance between individual development and “those moral values that form a sense of cohesion in community life” (Welker, 1992, p. 128). I believe that this is exactly what the artist/teacher concept attempts to address, however, it remains a distinctly hierarchical discourse. The teacher as expert seems intent on preserving the status quo, which only serves to hinder “those who might intervene to alter it and create it anew” (Welker, p. 127).

Art teachers, in particular, lack prestige, perhaps, because as experts, they are not seen as ordinary people; “a fault partly caused by a narrow social and intellectual training
that tended to isolate them from the rest of the community” (Welker, 1992, p. 52). The emphasis on technical knowledge has been used as the basis for a teacher’s professionalism, and “used to promote the place of teacher education as a separate and distinct discipline” (Welker, p. 86). This creates another divide as pre-service art education programs align with either the departments of art or of education; whereas Welker argued, “teacher education should be the domain of the entire university” (p. 86).

Conservative perspectives have generally supported the role of the teacher as expert “because it argues for increased technical skills and understands the moral, social, and political concerns of education as depending more on a uniform cultural competence than on matters of social awareness and critical reflection” (Welker, 1992, p. 104). Conversely, contemporary theorists such as Greene and Giroux had begun to question the idea of expertise as being an “abandonment of moral and social responsibility for the patriarchal language of technical competence” (cited in Welker, p. 12). And while the dominate voice of the expert shapes and controls the discourse of their field, the institutionalization of the expert by the school “with its increasingly set curriculum, stricter grading, incredible amounts of testing, is already a vast machine to shape acceptable responses” (Goodman, 1964, cited in Welker, p. 69). As a result of the emphasis on an elite understanding of practice, “concepts of education that tied social and political reform to the direct participation of the community soon lost currency and effect” (Welker, p. 35). Critics such as Giroux, Welker (1992) explained, sought to establish a new sense of instructional authority and an ethic that might reclaim for educators whose sense of citizenship, character, and democratic activity not
prone to chauvinism, nationalism, or forms of economic oppression … It attempts to honor an openness and spirit of inquiry that does not implicitly or explicitly limit discussion to procedural and technical concerns that seemingly have been stripped of all moral and social import. (p. 125)

As Giroux (1988) argued, reliance upon the views of the expert hides the fact that knowledge can be used as a form of social control by creating a limited understanding of the world that limits students ability to question that view or incorporate their own lived experiences. Giroux, a critic of expertise, was an advocate for teachers to engage students in the critical analysis that exposes the links between knowledge and power. Expertise can create passive consumption and “erect social barriers to personal responsibility and to democratic imperatives for public judgment and action” (Welker, 1992, pp. 123-124). In this sense, expertise goes beyond establishing competence or professional status, rather it indicates a sense of authority, power, and control.

2.3.2 Knowledge as Power

School is often spoken of as a democratic institution, as the key to equal opportunity and to success, and even as a means to weaken the practice of privilege. Yet, as Welker (1992) argued, schools also function to sort out and select those destined for elite professions. From this point of view, “schools may serve less to destroy classes of professional elites than to create them” (Welker, p. 7). Few would argue that the teaching profession has ever risen to such an elite status. Yet, being positioned as an expert, it would appear, gives a teacher more credibility, and as such, gives them more influence.
From this perspective, expertise moves beyond competence and content knowledge to focus on power and authority in our interactions with one another. The teacher as an expert thus involves “the claim by a body of specialists to competence and exclusive jurisdiction over a certain field” (Welker, p. 8). Through a defined discourse, they are able to dictate what constitutes knowledge within a particular field. The belief in such a cultural elite dictates, among other things, “who should rule by pointing to the advantages of technical competence and formalized training” (Cubberley, cited in Welker, p. 23).

This also sets distinct borders of exclusion that serve to restrict and confine practices through the oppressive manipulation of knowledge and discourse. As Welker (1992) suggested:

Culturally, expertise can become part of an epistemological foundation that would legitimize and canonize dominant forms of expression to the detriment of other voices and minority points of view. Experts, therefore, become not only recipients of a credentialing system that would reserve for them the highest social and economic positions, but also judges of what constitutes worthy art, literature, and music. In short, they become caretakers of the ‘appropriate’ ways to understand the world. (p. 115)

In this sense, expertise becomes part of the social discourse that reproduces traditional and hierarchical structures. In this manner, subject matter becomes a discursive formation through which knowledge functions in “the service of elite groups who can control information resources or define what counts as legitimate cultural expression” (Welker, p. 102). What I am suggesting is that the pedagogical practices of teaching can be utilized
to challenge the discourses of the artist that adhere to guiding structures and traditionally fixed referents. Such overly determined constructs of knowledge that position the teacher as an expert leave little room to explore the multiple roles and functions of both the artist and the teacher.

2.3.3 The Changing View as to what Constitutes Knowledge

Contemporary challenges to the role of the teacher as expert are predicated upon differing views as to what constitutes knowledge. They mark a shift away from the view of knowledge “as an objective or imperial truth, to a conception that is personally or socially constructed,” and that all knowledge is conditional and problematic (Finley, 2000, p. 12). Knowledge, Finley suggested, “is no longer considered a commodity that one dispenses to learners, but rather, as something that individuals construct and create from their own experience with materials, ideas, text, other individuals, and so on” (p. 19). Consequently the role of the teacher should not be limited by standards of practice based on detached reason and professional autonomy. As Welker (1992) argued, “knowledge had become fragmented and that no one would be able to master all the relevant information that one needed” (p. 2).

The realization that knowledge is socially constructed has profound implications for both teaching and learning, particularly in the sense that there is less reliance on a predetermined and hierarchically arranged body of knowledge. Freed from the constraints of authority and expertise, knowledge becomes less hierarchical, “and less dependent on a detached and calculating rationality” (Welker, 1992, p. 132). For teachers who have
shifted to this view of knowledge, student learning has more to do with understanding concepts and being able to use their understanding to solve problems. As Greene (1973) argued:

[The individual] can no longer simply accept what is transmitted by ‘experts’ and feel he is properly equipped to interpret the world. He cannot even rely on the authority of accumulated knowledge or the conventional wisdom on which so many people depend. (p. 8)

This changes, not only how the role of the teacher is viewed, but approaches to professional development and pre-service teacher education. Rather than trying to define truth conclusively, Greene (1973) suggested that the role of the teacher would be to “build a multifaceted stock of knowledge, a multiplicity of constructs he can use to order his experience” (p. 108).

Knowledge is more than a body of facts or skills. Contemporary educational perspectives advocate approaches to teaching based on constructivist ideals that depend less upon the transmission of teachable skills. Pedagogy, Giroux (1988) argued, is not “something one does to implement a preconstituted body of knowledge” (p. 119). Rather it creates the means through which to interact with a changing environment, and allows the teacher to break free from conventional thought and institutional restraint. This perspective offers a direct challenge to teacher education based on a specifically defined knowledge base, and advocate “a philosophical critique of all knowledge systems that preclude change and variety on the basis of predetermined understanding and conclusions” (Welker, p. 104). The role of the teacher thus becomes to give up his or her
claim to authority and the desire to establish a fixed, universal, and transcendent reference point upon which to ground knowledge.

2.3.4 The Teacher as a Professional

The teacher as expert relies on a technical understanding of practice that restricts the province of professionalism and its subjective dimension. The idea of the teacher as a professional has less dependence on the technical abilities of the teacher and focuses more on developing an understanding of effective practice. This change in focus is critical of expertise in its self-interested form. It remains open to alternative realities through the understanding that knowledge is not fixed or constant, but rather conditional, relative, and problematic; “Under this view teachers must come to face realistically the limits of their expertise and authority as they relate to a proper understanding of the teaching craft” (Welker, 1992, p. 111). In this context, the role of the teacher is to explore ways to overcome “the excessively technical and dominant concept of the teacher as expert” by understanding the role of the teacher in a more cooperative and interactive manner (Welker, p.13).

Few would argue, Welker (1992) suggested, “that the occupation of teaching ever reached the status of the more privileged professions” yet this constituted a distinct effort to assert education as a specialized practice (p. 46). Efforts to professionalize the field were also grounded in the prevailing notion of science, and the notion of “commonly held, empirically derived, and rigorously grounded practices and principles of pedagogy” (Welker, p. 59). Even this perspective of teaching felt some resistance as less tangible
abilities such as interpersonal skills became consistently favored over pedagogical knowledge.

2.4 The Changing Role of the Teacher

As Cruickshank, et al. (2012) argued, most teachers seem able to combine content knowledge and pedagogy:

Knowledge of the subject and of learners helps make the teacher more aware of the misconceptions students are likely to have or develop about the subject. Knowledge of pedagogy and of learners allows the teacher to select and implement instructional alternatives that can best address students’ misconceptions. Thus, effective teachers are knowledgeable about their subject and how best to help the individual students in their classes come to understand it appropriately. (p. 362)

Resultantly, the emphasis in education has begun to be considered more as a process than as a product, as expertise alone fails to take into account many of the mediating structures that determine learning.

The role of the teacher as expert has become contingent upon power, whereas contemporary ideas about teaching suggest we surrender it. Contemporary conceptions of teaching embrace plurality, “bringing recognition and respect to the many areas of understanding that should comprise the human conversation” (Welker, 1992, p. 102). Contemporary perspectives on teaching have evolved to include “the vision of the teacher as a learner, as a thoughtful practitioner, as a creator of knowledge” (Finley, 2000, p. 12).
Rather than disseminating prescribed knowledge, the role of the teacher creates an environment that allows children to discover and solve problems on their own through an emphasis on “the active role of the learner in building understanding and making sense of knowledge” (Cruickshank, et al., 2012, p. 278). Similarly, Lieberman & Miller (2000) described the new professional teacher as “researchers, meaning-makers, scholars, and inventors, [that] establish a firm professional identity as they model the lifelong learning they hope to infuse in their students” (p. 52).

As a discourse, education is equally a function of time, place, and circumstance; “it inevitably reflects … the experiences, the condition, and the hope and fears, and aspiration of a particular people or cultural group at a particular point in history” (Counts, cited in Welker, 1992, p. 28). The conflict between the conforming forces of the institution and the creative forces of the individual emphasizes the adaptations that teachers had to make given the particular social situation (Waller, cited in Welker, p. 50). The teacher freed from the dominant discourse of technical expert and having surrendered a position of authority, provides wisdom through social insight as a result of his or her personality and character.

Other contemporary conceptions, as informed by constructivism, describe the role of the teacher as a collaborator, a coach, or a co-learner “rather than as a conduit of knowledge in a teacher-centered classroom (Finley, 2000, p. 16). Similarly, the notion of the teacher as a facilitator implies that the teacher is actively engaged in learning, as they attempt to create circumstances that enable students to construct understandings for themselves.
Welker (1992) suggested an alternative conception for the role of the teacher as a transformative intellectual, which captures “the social and political dimensions of this responsibility as well as the intellectual facilities required of the profession” (p. 135). The clash of the discourses of the artist and the teacher also stem from the artist’s role as a seer that comments on the social order, and the teacher who is in the position of doing its bidding. The notion of the transformative intellectual suggests that the role of the teacher has an active public dimension that is connected with political and social interests. Thus, the role of the teacher is no longer an exclusive enterprise left to the autonomous judgment of a specialized group, but rather affirms “the fluid bond between the nurturance of the individual and the enrichment of the community as a whole” (Hartfield, 1995, p. 77). Regardless of the level of skill and knowledge, Welker concluded, the role of the teacher requires an unavoidable connection to “both the wisdom and the needs of the common people. To keep that connection alive is critical for the teacher as well as for others who make a living by their special knowledge” (p. 137).

Much of the artist/teacher literature seems to emphasize ways to maintain an artistic practice while teaching, which maintains a privileged position of the artist over that of the teacher. In an attempt to reconcile the differences, Zwirn (2002) argued for “the construction of a professional art teacher identity involving the vitality of art teaching and knowledge of the discipline” (p. 3).
2.5 Conclusion

Zwirn (2002) pointed to the different paradigms of the artist/teacher and the teacher/artist, and how the difference in the first word signifies the individual’s primary identification. And, as she suggested “there are some individuals who have balanced both careers of artist and teacher, and others who have integrated artistic behavior as a model for teaching” (Zwirn, p. 17). As played out in Lanier (1959) vs. McCraken (1959), it’s not just how or in what order these paradigms are combined, it’s the conflicts that arise as a result of the distinct discourses that shape one’s sense of identity as an artist or as a teacher. As Zwirn acknowledged, “the power and meaning behind the words ‘artist’ and ‘teacher’ reveal enormous cultural baggage and frame the teachers’ self-image and role concept” (p. 17, emphasis in original).

Zwirn’s (2002) study relied on role concept theory to emphasize “the controlling power of the social environment and how the individual is shaped by the roles of others and his/her perception of her own role and consequent behavior” (2002, p. 11). Similarly, applying Foucault’s analysis reveals the distinct discursive formations that shape our perceptions as artist and teacher, and the conflicting sense of identities that often arise. While not everyone perceives these discourses to be disparate and contradictory, it has been my personal experience that my identities as both an artist and as a teacher are the product of separate and distinct discourse in both theory and practice.

Even when art teacher education programs prioritize the artist/teacher model of practice, the reality of the practice in public schools in the United States does little to support the integration of these practices. Artists who become teachers in public schools
are often expected to adhere to an existing curriculum model (Zwirn, 2002), perhaps because they are not seen as having undergone the same pedagogical rigor as *other* teachers. While at the same time, other “teachers are not generally regarded as having the creative gifts, or the mystique of artists” (Reitman, 1990, cited in Zwirn, 2002, p. 3). Zwirn further argued, “identifying a meaningful career entails knowing which path best suits one’s needs and interests” (2002, p. 41).
3.1 (Re)articulating the Identity of the Artist/Teacher

I am both an artist and I am a teacher. But what troubles me is that these two aspects of my identity don’t always get along. I find they often lie, at least for me, in distinct opposition. I find that one problematizes the other; instead of my art informing my teaching, for example, I find that my teaching often challenges my perceptions of what it means to be an artist.

The roles of the artist and the teacher have often been in opposition. More recently, much of the literature regarding the artist/teacher identity seems to focus on creating a synergy between the two, but at the same time, the discourse maintains a privileged position for that of the artist. It remains a distinctly hierarchical relationship. I am more interested in the conflicts between the two, and what sense can be made of this as an antagonistic relationship, and perhaps explore why these tensions exist in the first place? Significantly, this dissertation explores the tensions that arise as contemporary art and social theory challenge and often conflict with the practices art teachers have developed as artists. So I began by looking for a theoretical framework that would allow me to analyze the discursive formations from which the identities of the artist and the
teacher have emerged, in an attempt to make sense of the tensions between the two. By integrating a critical social theoretical perspective, this research examines the social and cultural discourses that articulate the identity construction of the artist and the teacher.

3.2 Why social theory?

The emphasis on social theory in educational research began in the 1980s, as historical, economic, and sociocultural forces produced behaviors “that were too subtle and complex in their dynamics to be experimentally manipulated and quantified” (Dressman, 2008, p. 3). Rather than driven by numbers or the search for quantifiable truth, social theory describes a broad range of “philosophical, economic, historical, linguistic, social-psychological, and literary arguments” in response to a period of great social, technological, and political change known as modernity (Dressman, pp. 3-4). The subsequent rejection of modernist ideas about language and writing stems from the belief that they are “shared tools for transmitting ideas from one individual’s mind to other individuals’ minds with little or no distortion” (Dressman, p. 16). Postmodernism contributes to the advancement of social theory by reformulating cultural practices, which, as Agger (2006) suggested “have become potent forms of ideological persuasion” and by “considering the ways in which theories of modernity, … are no longer fully adequate to understand the present” (p. 74). Whereas the Frankfurt theorists were dismissive of popular culture, postmodern critical theory focuses on forms of popular culture “as a region of political contest and ideological manipulation” (Agger, p. 75).
Conversely, Habermas (1984) defended the underlying values of modernity while acknowledging that not all of its aims had been fully realized, but because of its rejection of rational standards for critique, he contended that postmodernism did not constitute a significant advance of historical development and could not offer effective forms of radical social criticism (Agger, 2006; Surber, 1998). Yet as Agger (2006) countered, critical theory’s emphasis on ideology, consciousness, and culture was enriched by postmodern theory and the integration of postmodern concepts reinvigorated the ideal of radical social change. Postmodern critical theory enhances Habermas’s theory of communication by establishing the concept of discourse and by recognizing it as a contested site of power; it becomes imperative “to make sense of the insidious, almost invisible nature of ideology today” (Agger, p. 96). Interpretive tools such as Critical Discourse Analysis are effective at bringing hidden assumptions to the surface, and challenging the ideologies that are ingrained in the discursive fabric of everyday life.

In context of this study, social theory is used as more than just a critique of modernism. Instead, it is used to critically examine the discourses that have become so seductive that they effectively limit our ability to imagine or explore alternative visions, or allow the individual to resist the available subject positions that restrict and constrain identity. Critical social theory allows for the consideration of alternative visions that embrace diverse and multiple perspectives that allow the individual to resist the available subject positions that restrict and constrain identity—these are the qualities that make social theory “a powerful research tool within educational contexts” (Dressman, 2008, p. 5).
Social practices, in this context, also have the potential for becoming routinized and mechanistic—and significantly, “the more tightly that categories and strictures of objectivity are applied within social and political realms, the more dehumanizing outcomes may become” (Dressman, 2008, p. 4). Consequently, artist and teacher identities are constituted as these discursive formations dictate how they are to be treated—and how they are to behave. Dialog and open exchange allow the individual to (re)consider or (re)articulate an identity that challenges the often single, authoritarian voice that is preserved in discourse.

People’s use of language extends beyond mere conversation; Foucault’s notion of discourse described the “patterns of exchange in language and concepts at societal, cultural, and ultimately historical levels” (Dressman, 2008, p. 28). Discourse for Foucault, became an almost supralinguistic force that “permeated every aspect of people’s lives, was virtually inescapable, and through which the power to control and channel the thoughts, desires, and actions of individuals was disseminated” (Dressman, 2000, p. 31). Social discourse determines what is valuable as it “mediates its power and control through institutions and elites who ‘are charged with saying what counts as true’” (Foucault, 1980, cited in Dressman, 2008, p. 5). Foucault (1977) argued, for example, that discourse determined who was normal and who was deviant in society, and that this logic was disseminated through social and institutional practices “meant to discipline and control the masses both physically and mentally by rewarding consistency, or normality, and punishing or otherwise remediating deviance” (Dressman, 2008, p. 31). Such socially sanctioned distinctions described the differences, for example, “between sanity and
insanity, health and sickness, and normative and deviant (criminal) behavior” (Dressman, 2008, p. 43). Consequently, the free choices that people make “are governed by a logic of which they are little aware … [and also limit] the social and cultural parameters of individuals’ aspirations” (Bourdieu, cited in Dressman, 2008, p. 43).

Foucault (1980) argued that discourse has the power to shape people’s behavior and is disseminated through uniformity of both language and practices. The uniformity, ritual, and tradition that is inherent in social practices account for stability and continuity, thereby limiting the prospect for humans to exercise any creative agency in articulating their own identity. Thus discourse dictates and defines the roles of the artist and the teacher. The purpose of applying social theory, in this context, is to look for discursive practices that limit our perceptions in an effort to suggest “resources for resisting, and in time changing, the normative structures of societies” (Dressman, 2008, p. 44).

Subjectivity refers to how individuals view things through their own perspective, it involves an individual’s interpretation of conscious feelings, beliefs, and desires, and how they make meaning from experience (Kuhn, 2010). Subjectivity involves a degree of self-awareness, while at the same time there are unconscious constraints that limit one’s ability to understand their own, or others’, identity. What I am trying to demonstrate is how social and cultural discourse can shape, constrain, and often conflict with an individual’s perspective. At the same time, interpretations of these experiences are unique and only available to the subject themselves; thus, “subjectivity is the ground on which identity is constructed” (Kuhn, 2010, p. 800).
Since the time of the Enlightenment, the conception of identity “has been taken to define the very core or essence of our being, and to ground our experience as human subjects” through an emphasis on origins, continuity, tradition, and timelessness (Hall, 1992, p. 275). The subject refers to someone who is under domination or one who owes allegiance to a particular ruling power, and is subject to its laws and regulation. Through a positivist perspective, the individual was a universal and timeless subject that became the foundation for all thought and action. Yet modern discourses mark a decisive shift regarding the concepts of identity and the subject, suggesting that identity is historically, not biologically defined; “Since the modern subject emerged at a particular time (its ‘birth’) and has a history, it follows that it can also change and, indeed, that under certain circumstances we can even contemplate its ‘death’” (Hall, p. 281). The death of the modern subject marks a significant passage beyond the formation of identity based a single, unified subject to a contemporary conception that explores how multiple perspectives can coexist.

The history of the subject that Hall (1992) refers to marks a shift in the way the subject and identity have been conceptualized in modern thought; from the conception of the subject as self-conscious and responsible agent to the radical de-centering of the subject as a discursive figure; from its birth as a sovereign individual to its death as the result of owing its existence entirely to the social order. Modern conceptions of the subject ran counter to the empiricist view of the knowing subject; “the subject is the result of social and cultural determination, and any individual contribution stems from the self-disciplining impulses that humanism has taught them to internalize (Allen, 2000, p.
This led theorists such as Foucault and Hall to question the validity of the modernist conception of the human subject, and to re-conceptualize the subject as being socially bound to the extreme that the individual, in essence, no longer exists.

The Enlightenment subject was built upon an individualistic conception of identity. Such an individual was endowed with the capacities of reason and consciousness that unfolded throughout a person’s life. This unified and coherent individual was conceived based on certain fixed capacities tied to “stable moorings in traditions and structures” (Hall, 1992, p. 281). This essential center of the self is what defined a person’s identity. Through this stable sense of identity and place, the subject was also thought to be singular, distinctive, and unique.

John Locke defined the individual as an identity that remains continuous and unchanging, and of a particular place and time; “as far as this consciousness can be extended backwards to any past action or thought, so far reaches the identity of that person’” (cited in Hall, 1992, p. 283). The concept of the sovereign individual and a new sense of consciousness stressed a “personal existence over and above his place or function in a rigid hierarchical society” (Williams, 1976, p. 135). An individual was thought to be capable of making their own decisions, and with this came the responsibility for their own thoughts and actions. Thus, the individual was “freed from dogma and intolerance, before whom the whole of human history was laid out for understanding and mastery” (Hall, p. 282).

Descartes, who focused on the dualism between ‘mind’ and ‘matter,’ thus placed the mind at the center of the individual subject, “constituted by its capacity to reason and
think” (Hall, 1992, p 282). The subject was reduced to its most essential elements, as a unified entity that could not be further divided. This conception of the “rational, cognitive and conscious subject at the centre of knowledge” has since been known as the Cartesian subject (ibid). This conception of the modern subject became embedded in the practices and discourses of modernity. Whereas Descartes’ dualism tended to separate the individual from society, the field of sociology presents an interactive conception of the identity and the self. A social conception of the subject emerged along with the rise of the social sciences, which provided “a critique of the ‘rational individualism’ of the Cartesian subject” (Hall, p. 284).

Postmodern discourses of identity have fragmented and dislocated the modern individual as a unified subject, challenging the metanarratives of modernity, and the irrational attachments to its roots and traditions. Subsequently, cultural theorist Stuart Hall (1996a) described identity as being formed “at the unstable point where the ‘unspeakable’ stories of subjectivity meet the narratives of history, of a culture” (p. 115). This creates the possibility for new constructions of identity that can dislocate or contradict each other, that cut across settled constituencies both within the individual and in society. Consequently, no single identity or metanarrative can assimilate all the different identities into one, and particular attention must be paid to how the conflicts between these different subject positions are negotiated.

Hall’s conception of identity (1990, 1992, 1996c) focused on dissolving barriers of difference, disrupting continuities, and the comfort of traditions. This reconception of self-identification built upon the notion of resistance contests the modernists’ attempt to
settle the contours of identity, and thus “expose its closure to the pressure of difference, ‘otherness’ and cultural diversity” (Hall, 1992, p. 307). The conception of the subject changed to suggest its formation is also the result of social discourse, and “the individual came to be seen as more located and ‘placed’ within these great supporting structures and formations of modern society” (Hall, p. 284).

3.3 Sociological Conception of Identity

The basic premise of the sociological subject suggests that identity is formed in the interaction between self and society that reflects the growing complexity of the contemporary world. It suggests that the individual is not autonomous or self-sufficient, but rather formed “in relation to ‘significant others’, who mediated to the subject the values, meanings and symbols—the culture—of the worlds he/she inhabited” (Hall, 1992, p. 275). Human beings act in and toward the social world; “its people, situations, social roles, goals, ideas, institutions, and material things—on the basis of meaning” (Hewitt, 2010, p. 806). Meaning, in this sense, is not fixed or immutable, but rather arises out of the process of social interaction. These interactions are conducted both in cooperation and sometimes in conflict with others. Meanings are modified or transformed through a continuous interpretive process in which the self-reflective individual plays a significant role (Denzin, 1992; Hewitt, 2010).

Meaning is a social and an individual phenomenon that shapes the conduct of the individual as well as that of others. People produce their situated version of society through mediated interactions that connect one person to another. Recurring meanings
and practices personalize the social structure, and when these practices are captured in
social texts or discursive practices, they shape “the myths, beliefs, desires, and ideas
people have about the way things are and should be” (Denzin, 1992, p. 29) This
interactive sociological model suggests that the subject still possesses an inner core or
essence, and argues that it is formed and reshaped through a continuous dialog and stable
reciprocity between the individual and the outside cultural worlds (Hall, 1992). Yet, as
Denzin (1992) suggested, “the histories that individuals make are not always of their own
making,” people are often constrained by the constructions they inherit from the past (p.
24).

Essential to this model is the interaction between the individual and society as we
project ourselves into cultural identities at the same time that we internalize their
meanings and values. Thus our subjectivity aligns with the objective places we occupy as
the subject becomes sutured to social and cultural discourses, “making both reciprocally
more unified and predictable” (Hall, 1992, p. 276). Established meanings provide a
framework for interaction, but the process of interaction often yields fluidity and change;
“people form their conduct as they interact with others … construct lines of conduct for
themselves, and influence the conduct of others” (Hewitt, 2010, p. 807). Through this
process new meanings emerge as individuals adopt new symbols while transforming
others. These symbolic interactions are mediated through the process of communication
through which “meanings are defined, in part, by the systems of ideology and power in a
particular social order” (Denzin, 1992, p. 27), and in turn, as I will demonstrate, they are
maintained and enforced through specific communication systems or discursive formations.

3.3.1 The Post-Modern Subject

As modern societies became more complex, individuals acquired a collective and social form consistent with the subject positions made available to them. Conversely, the post-modern subject is conceptualized as “having no fixed, essential or permanent identity” (Hall, 1992, p. 277). Whereas modernity defined the social sphere through the process of ordering, classification, rationalization, and differentiation, the postmodern subject is described by such terms as reflexive and flexible. The subject is becoming fragmented, composed sometimes of several, often contradictory or unresolved identities; “as the systems of meaning and cultural representation multiply, we are confronted by a bewildering, fleeting multiplicity of possible identities, any of which we could identify with—at least temporarily” (Hall, p. 277). As a result, people are supposedly freed from typical social roles and are able to “achieve a constructed quality to a person’s identity, rather than an ascribed one” (Woodward, 2010, p. 478).

The postmodern is characterized by resistance to traditional social structures, entrenched knowledge-power relations, and the application of standards and boundaries that allowed for the formation of cultural canons and collectively agreed cultural norms (Woodward, 2010). As a result, the process of identification through which we project ourselves into our cultural identities, Hall argued, “has become more open-ended, variable and problematic” (Hall, 1992, p. 277). Consequently, the post-modern subject
struggles through the contradictory dialogs of power and resistance, of refusal and recognition. Identity thus becomes a complex unity which is formed in relation to a whole set of other narratives and discourses. It is through Foucault’s social construction of the subject together with Hall’s conception of identification that the potential for rearticulating the artist/teacher identity through radical re-conceptions of subjectivity and resistance emerges.

3.3.2 Foucault’s Conception of the Subject

Foucault (1983) argued that the subject has been socially and politically constructed, and is the product of the relationship between power and knowledge that confine the subject’s perceptions within traditional and established forms of thought as defined by culture and custom. Foucault rejected the conventional conception of the subject as an individual that is self-aware, autonomous and capable of choosing how to act. Autonomy, in this context, deals with personal freedom, or the liberty to follow one’s own will. Such an independent person can determine their own lives for themselves by way of reason, and is free from the authority of others. To be autonomous, in a Foucauldian sense, is the outcome or effect of some form of social construction or discursive formation; the subject is not free but rather one who is governable by the normalizing attributes and characteristics as dictated by the laws and principles that govern human conduct (Foucault, 1995/1977). Through this perspective, we socially construct the identity of the artist and of the teacher by dictating the traditions and practices that govern their subjectivity.
Foucault argued that the belief that personal autonomy in modern times is liberating was a mistake; “Autonomous people are the result of constitution, both social and personal but this presupposes considerable unfreedom” (cited in Marshall, 1996, p. 109). Foucault’s (1970) technologies of domination elaborated how the individual became attached to specific identities that could not be changed and maintained the status quo (Lemert & Gillan, 1982). Foucault (1983) conceived the subject as 1) subject to someone else by control and dependence, and 2) tied to his own identity by consciousness or self-knowledge. Both meanings, according to Foucault, “suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to” (p. 212).

Much of Foucault’s early work (1978a, 1995/1977) focused on exploring the different modes by which human beings are made subjects. The first mode includes the objectification and categorization of the subject through what he called dividing practices (Foucault, 1983) that dictate the discourse by which, for example, someone is considered to be an artist. These practices are essentially modes of manipulation that combine the mediation of science and the practice of exclusion through which human beings are given both a social and a personal identity. These techniques of domination have long been applied to populations and groups defined as marginal (Foucault & Rabinow, 1984). In this sense, Foucault saw identity as a way of exerting power over the individual that prevented them from moving beyond fixed boundaries.

In his later work, Foucault (2010/1983) became more focused on questions concerning the subject, even going as far as giving the subject “a certain reflexive awareness of his or her own conduct” (Hall, 2001, p. 79). Significant in the case of this
study, Foucault (1984) articulated another mode of objectification called *subjectification*, which concerns the ways in which human beings turn themselves into subjects. Through this mode, Foucault focused on isolating the techniques through which a person initiates an active self-formation. This self-formation has a long and complicated genealogy that characteristically entails a process of self-understanding that is mediated by an external authority figure and takes place “through a variety of ‘operations on [people’s] own bodies, on their own souls, on their own thoughts, on their own conduct’ (Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, p. 11).

Foucault (1983) sought to study the way in which an individual turns him- or herself into a subject, or, more specifically, how they “have learned to recognize themselves as subjects of [discourse]” (p. 208). By discourse, Foucault was referring to “a group of statements which provide a language for talking about—a way of representing the knowledge about—a particular historical moment … Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language” (Hall, 2001, p. 72). Statements provide a certain kind of knowledge about things, they become the rules “which prescribe certain ways of talking about topics and exclude other ways—which govern what is ‘sayable’ or ‘thinkable’ about them at a particular historical moment” (Hall, 2001, p. 73). These statements are precisely what discriminate the traditions and practices that shape the discourse of the artist/teacher.

Foucault expanded the definition of discourse beyond being purely a linguistic concept. The production of knowledge and meaning, according to Foucault, is created not through language, but through discourse (1970; 1972a). For Foucault, discourse consists
of both language and practice; “it attempts to overcome the traditional distinction between what one says (language) and what one does (practice) … It also influences how ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others” (Hall, 2001, p. 72). Foucault acknowledged that things can have a material existence in the world, but argued that nothing has any meaning outside of discourse (1972a). As Hall explained, Foucault’s concept of discourse “is not about whether things exist but where meaning comes from … physical things and actions exist, but they only take on meaning and become objects of knowledge within discourse” (2001, p. 73).

Foucault’s radical decentering of the subject as the source of meaning does not entail the destruction, or death of the subject; rather, as Hall (2000) argued, the centering of discursive practice “cannot be fully accomplished without complementing the account of discursive and disciplinary regulations with an account of the practices of subjective self-constitution” (p. 26). Foucault (1994) attempted through his later analysis to describe the conditions through which the relationship between the subject and the object are formed and or modified, “insofar as they are constitutive of a possible knowledge” (p. 632). The premise behind his shift in thinking, Han (2005) argued, “is that objectification and subjectification are mutually dependent, both for their existence and to be understood” (p. 177).

Foucault directed his analysis toward the constitution of individuals as social subjects. What is significant about Foucault’s analysis of the subject is that he produced a genealogy of the modern subject in which he isolated what he called disciplinary power. Disciplinary power concerns the surveillance and regulation of the individual; “its sites
are those institutions which developed throughout the nineteenth century and which ‘police’ and discipline modern populations” (Hall, 1992, p. 289). Foucault’s (1977) analysis of disciplinary power focuses on its effects as a form of discipline which individualizes the subject according to strict rules and regulations that serve to regulate and normalize activity and behavior according to the social body.

Structures of power become institutionalized through social structures such as the school; they are enforced through discursive formations and practices that exercise power over the individual, thereby preventing them from moving beyond fixed boundaries. Such mechanisms of power produce forms of knowledge that reinforce social discourse. Discourse, in this sense becomes “a way of constructing meaning which influences and organizes both our actions and our conception of ourselves” (Hall, 1992, pp. 292-293) as, for example, either artist, or teacher.

3.4 Discourse

Foucault (1972a) defined discourse as a “group of statements that belong to a single system of formation” (p. 107). Statements provide a certain kind of knowledge about things; they become the rules that prescribe certain ways of talking about topics and exclude others. Discourse constitutes the laws defining the social conditions of acceptability, which endow it with considerable stability (Bourdieu, 2006/1991). Discourse, as a social practice, shapes how people “interact in the task of making and inferring meaning” (Jaworski & Coupland, 2006, p. 4). More precisely, Foucault
(1996/1971) defined discourse within the context of social relationships, and its link to desire and power:

> In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality. (p. 239)

Discourses such as “economics, medicine, grammar, the science of living give rise to certain organizations of concepts, certain regroupings of objects, certain types of enunciation, which form, according to their degree of coherence, rigour, and stability, themes or theories” (Foucault, 1972a, p. 64). As the principle control over its production, each discourse establishes the requisites for the construction of new statements within its narrow confines, while resisting knowledge beyond its margins. Discourse determines the conditions of its application by imposing rules and regulating access; each in turn, “fixes limits for discourse by the action of an identity which takes the form of a permanent re-actuation of the rules” (Foucault, 1996/1971, p. 248, emphasis mine). These groups of statements, or discourses, provide the language for talking about and representing knowledge about a particular historical moment. Foucault (1970) theorized that all periods of history have distinct conditions of truth that constitute how knowledge is legitimated through discourse. He argued that these conditions have changed over time, in sudden, discontinuous shifts, and that each articulation of a statement is distinct in time and has its own spatio-temporal individuality.
Foucault’s (1970) analysis of discourse attempted to define the conditions that enable statements to exist, and to explore “the rules that come into play in the very existence of such discourse” (p. xiv). His work was intended to uncover the consequences of the transformation, as he saw it, in the field of historical knowledge and to question the teleologies and totalizations that legitimize discourse and empirical forms of knowledge (1972a). His analysis extended beyond how effects of truth are produced within discourses to include an examination of the mechanics of power that shape and reinforce them. As a means of power, discourse creates a system of exclusion, “a historical, modifiable, and institutionally constraining system” (Foucault, 1996/1971, p. 241). Such a system of exclusion delineates who is, and consequently who is not, an artist.

Hall (2001) described discourse as being, “about the production of knowledge through language” (p. 72), yet Foucault (1970; 1972a) argued that the production of knowledge and meaning is created not just through language, but also through discourse. Discourse refers to language in use which structures “areas of knowledge and the social and institutional practices which are associated with them … both reproducing and constructing afresh particular social-discursive practices” (Candlin, 1997, cited in Jaworski & Coupland, 2006, p. 2).

Not limited to the use of language, discourse reflects the social structures in which it was acquired as well as reproduces the very structures through which it was created. Discourse, as a social practice relates to Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus*, which represents “the group norms or dispositions that people have internalized whose task is to regulate and generate their actions (practices), perceptions and representations of individuals, and
to mediate the social structures that they inhabit” (Jaworski & Coupland, 2006, p. 475). Discourse allows people to express their points of view and their value systems, “many of which are pre-structured in terms of what is normal or appropriate in particular social and institutional settings” (Jaworski & Coupland, p. 6). Like many other systems of exclusion, discourse “rests on an institutional support: it is both reinforced and renewed by whole strata of practices, such as pedagogy” (Foucault, 1996/1971, p. 242).

Discourse dictates degrees of competence, which are also acquired in a social context through practice and “the practical mastery of a usage of language and the practical mastery of situations in which this usage of language is socially acceptable” (Bourdieu, 2006/1991, p. 485). Discourse provides the individual with a sense of how to act and respond, it “orients their actions and inclinations without strictly determining them. It gives them a ‘feel for the game’, a sense of what is appropriate in the circumstances and what is not, a ‘practical sense’” (Jaworski & Coupland, 2006, p. 475). Even the word of the law, Foucault (1996/1971) argued, “could no longer be authorized, in our society, except by a discourse of truth” (p. 242). For Foucault, a discourse of truth was not about analyzing the internal or external criteria, or “to recognize whether a statement or proposition is true or not,” but rather to consider truth-telling as a specific activity or role within discourse.² Foucault (1972a) acknowledged that things can have a

² Concluding remarks by Foucault during a course of lectures at the University of California at Berkeley, Oct-Nov., 1983.
material existence in the world, but argued that nothing has any meaning outside of discourse.

Discourse, through a Foucauldian perspective, is explicitly linked to power; subsequently discursive processes are involved in the legitimation of ideology. Ideologies, Hall (2006/1981) argued, “do not consist of isolated and separate concepts, but in the articulation of different elements into a distinctive set or chain of meanings” (p. 396). They function by constructing individual and collective subject positions of identification. Tensions arise when ideologies are transformed through social practices and political struggles that create new meanings; “breaking the chain in which they are currently fixed and establishing a new articulation. This ‘breaking of the chain’ is not, of course, confined to the head: it takes place through social practice and political struggle” (Hall, S., 2006/1981, p. 397).

3.5 Ideology

Ideology is the conventional wisdom that exists in many cultural discourses and is born from everyday experience. Produced and reproduced by various sources of hegemony, ideological deception became immobilizing as it became impervious to social critique and served to infuse the individual with a sense of society’s inertness and inevitability (Agger, 2006). Hegemony is “the unquestioned dominance of conformist ideas that reproduce the given society. At the time of Marx, the new social system was supposed to satisfy the needs and the desires of the individual, but instead formed
mechanisms for manipulation and control, resulting in the “division of society into competing and mutually hostile classes based on human exploitation” (Surber, p. 135).

Capitalism increasingly manipulated class-consciousness after World War I, and the advance of Marxism from early to late capitalism was “conceptualized in terms of growing state involvement and more insidious forms of ideology” (Agger, p. 82). In late capitalism, everyday life is permeated with discourses and texts that both divert people from their alienation and portray the world as rational and necessary” (Gramsci, cited in Agger, p. 81). The challenge thus becomes to “uncover and demystify reification,” and to reveal the dominating influences that restrict people’s everyday experiences and activities, or, as in the case of this study, to explore the value systems inherent in art curriculum and the discourse of the artist/teacher.

Cultural homogeneity became seen as “the blurring of cultural and class distinctions and the eradication of genuine individual spontaneity through the leveling of taste to an innocuous least common denominator” (Surber, p. 140). Perhaps the eradication of genuine individual spontaneity is a bit extreme, yet it is necessary to acknowledge that ideology has a profound influence in shaping both discourse and practice. The theorists of the Frankfort School argued that ideology became routinized in “everyday life through various cultural discourses and practices that suggest the inevitability and thus rational conformity” (Agger, p. 83). When individuals became integrated into the existing system of production and consumption, and their attitudes and perceptions conformed to the biases inherent in that system, the universal thought and behavior resulted in what Marcuse (1964) referred to as a condition of one-
dimensionality. Without oppositional elements, society becomes assimilated through a soft form of totalitarianism that is increasingly able to deflect and absorb critique (Surber, 1998).

In one of the first modern re-conceptions of the subject, Althusser (1971) argued that the subject is an effect of ideology, and its identity is shaped by conditions that are not of his or her own making. Even the idea of oneself, as a subject or as the author of your own identity, is an illusion fostered by ideology. The subject formed on the basis of cultural totality is thus contingent on the effects of society. Whereas Marx suggested that ideas reflect the dominant interests of society, Foucault opposed theories of ideology that “tended to reduce all the relations between power and knowledge to a question of class power and class interests” (Hall, 2001, p. 75).

Relations of power, Foucault (1977) argued, “are not localized in the relations between the state and its citizens … and they do not merely reproduce, at the levels of individuals, bodies, gestures, and behavior, the general form of the law or government” (p. 27). Power, from Foucault’s perspective, does not radiate downward, but rather through a capillary movement “it permeates all levels of social existence and therefore can be found operating at every site of social life” (Hall, 2001, p. 77). Such sites include the classroom and the social discourses that shape the content and practices within them. These meticulous rituals or micro-physics of power connect Foucault’s (1977) theories to the localized tactics and mechanisms through which power circulates, as opposed to the grand narratives and strategies of power embedded in theories of ideology. Power at these lower levels is not merely reflective of a dominant ideology, but rather becomes localized
in the body and in forms of behavior (Hall, 2001). Such power is evident in the traditions that frame the discourse of the artist/teacher.

Foucault (1983) suggested, “it is not power, but the subject, which is the general theme of my research” (p. 208). But his discussions of the construction of the subject are inextricably linked to aspects of power, as he argued that the individual is the result of the relationship between power and knowledge. Throughout his work, Foucault has continually explored “the shifting ways that the body and the social institutions related to it have entered into political relations” (Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, p. 10). What Foucault (1983) is questioning are the ways in which knowledge circulates and functions, as well as its relationship to power. He saw knowledge “as always being enmeshed in relations of power because it was always being applied to the regulation of social conduct in practice” (Hall, 2001, p. 75). Hall (2000) pointed to Foucault’s shift from an archeological to a genealogical method as being crucial in placing an emphasis on the effects of power on discourse, and how discourse itself becomes both a regulative and a regulated formation.

3.6 Discursive Formations and Practices

A discursive formation refers to a historically and culturally specific set of rules and social conditions, which require and permit particular forms of discourse and knowledge. The rules by which it is governed “are immanent in a practice, and define it in its specificity” (Foucault, 1972a, p. 46). As a body of knowledge, it is presented as an
authority recognized by public opinion. Through his analysis, Foucault (1972a) attempted 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 schematic contents, and constitute
partial organizations among themselves. (p. 60)

Statements that refer to the same object, support a similar strategy, or share a
common political drift or institutional pattern belong to the same discursive formation
(Foucault, 1970). Discursive formations shape social actions as disciplinary techniques
that are materialized through discursive practices that, for example, seem to be
perpetuated through the discourse of the artist/teacher. Discursive formations become
institutionalized practices for organizing and regulating a subjects’ conduct according to
those ideals, and through these forms of power the constituted subject gets caught in the
processes of objectification and constraint. A discursive formation is categorized by a
distinct group of individuals or experts. Only after a certain formation is put into practice,
Foucault (1983) argued, could an appropriate subject appear:

This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes
the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own
identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others
have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects.
(p. 212)
For Foucault (1972a), it is only within discursive formations that meaning is created; meaning constituted by all that is said, and by how statements “divided it up, described it, explained it, traced its development, indicated its various correlations, judged it, and possibly gave it speech by articulating, in its name, discourses that were to be taken as its own” (p. 32). Foucault sought to analyze the whole discursive formation to which a text or practice belongs. Foucault (1980) also reminds us that power can also be productive; “it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms of knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be thought of as a productive network which runs through the whole social body” (p. 119).

A discursive formation does not occupy all the terrain available to it within its system of formation, consequently its enunciations and its concepts remain incomplete (Foucault, 1972a). During periods of transition, in particular discursive formation such as that of the artist/teacher, the “social formations themselves may be an ‘articulated combination’ of different modes with specified, shifting terms of hierarchical ordering between them” (Hall, 1996b, p. 39). The identity of the artist/teacher, for example, is often reinforced through a discourse of artistic traditions that adhere to distinct and often such hierarchical preferences. What changes, Hall argues, are not the elements themselves, but rather they way they are combined and articulated.

3.7 How is power exercised? What are the effects of power on the individual?

All discursive formations and practices are caught up in the interplay of knowledge and power, and knowledge, once linked to power, “not only assumes the
authority of ‘the truth’ but has the power to make itself true’ (Hall, 2001, p. 76, emphasis in original). Knowledge linked to power through disciplinary practices regulates the conduct of others, which questions the status of the individual and ties them to their identity. The subject must still “submit to its rules and conventions, to its dispositions of power/knowledge” (Hall, 2001, p. 79). Knowledge, Hall (2001) argued, does not function independently from power; “It is put to work, through certain technologies and strategies of application, in specific situations, historical contexts and institutional regimes” (p. 76).

Similarly, the identity of the artist/teacher, as articulated through much of the K-12 art education in the United States, continues to be defined by a narrow emphasis on craft and skill, by the alluring freedom of self-expression, and by the elements and principles of design. It is reinforced through a discourse of artistic traditions that adhere to distinct preferences and subsequently categorize who is considered an artist and who isn’t. Discursive formations act on the body to classify and objectify individuals; “but insofar as these objective classifications are adopted and accepted by individuals so their selves are also constructed” (Marshall, 1996, p. 96). Yet, as challenges to existing art educational paradigms continue to emerge, tensions arise as the discourse of the teacher often diverges from the practices and the traditions we are taught as artists. What happens as the individual struggles to identify between opposing or divergent discourses that attempt to claim or classify the subject is the focus of this study.

As a means of power, discursive formations and practices modify the actions of others. They are enforced through discourse, which is the means by which people’s abilities and resources, relationships of communication, and power relationships are
adjusted to form regulated systems for controlling behavior. Foucault uses the term discipline to capture the aspects of power/knowledge that are normally hidden or masked, both in the context of a subject area and its conceptual structure, and to describe subjection and social control (Marshall, 1996).

In an educational setting, “activities are broken down into stages so that particular skills, abilities or capacities can be developed in a given time through constant exercise” (Marshall, 1996, pp. 95-96). What activities are appropriate will depend upon the knowledge of people and processes associated with the discourse of that course of study with each stage, hierarchized into small steps of development (Foucault, 1995/1977). The effects of this power as exercised through knowledge establish distinct patterns of expectations for behavior, or what Foucault refers to as normalized individuals.

Disciplinary power also exerts itself within the individual. Inherent in what Foucault (1978b) referred to as the *technologies of the self* is the belief that it is possible to tell the truth about one’s self, that this truth can be discovered through the self examination of one’s consciousness. In speaking the truth, an individual reconstructs the experience by adopting new descriptions and practices. Through the performative function of language, the subject is controlled as the experience is reinterpreted through discourse; subsequently, “classifying people as being of certain kinds leads to particular individualized programmes for people so they become normalized” (Marshall, 1996, p. 103). For Foucault, Marshall argued, the notion of independence was false; the individual cannot deliberate independently upon the laws, because they have in part constituted by them.
Identity, for both Foucault and Hall, is seen as a complex unity that forms in relation to a process of socialization and signification, and through which lives are ultimately described as products of discourse and narrative. Identity is “the site of agency and attachment that energizes us to participate in the making of our own ongoing histories, the construction of our continuously unfolding worlds, now and in the future” (Ang, 2000, p. 1). Hall suggested identity is not as much a question of who we are or where we come from, but rather what we might become. Foucault (1972a) argued that subject positions are defined by the situation that is possible for individuals to occupy in relation to various discourses. For Hall, identity depends on how we conceive ourselves as active, changing subjects, and the ways that one generates meaningful links between “how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves” (1996c, p. 4). Hall’s (1996a) conception of identity insists on difference and on the fact that every identity is placed and positioned within a culture, a language, a history—and the discourses that construct or narrate them. These narratives are socially constructed through discursive formations that shape identity:

Cultures provide prefabricated narratives for hooking up the events of our lives… as agents in our own construction, we choose available cultural stories, apply them to our experiences, sometimes get stuck in a particularly strong narrative, often operate within contradictory implied narratives, and sometimes seek stories that transgress the culturally condoned ones. (Richardson, 1997, p. 181, emphasis mine)
But like everything that is historical, identities undergo constant transformation; “far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous play’ of history, culture and power” (Ang, 2000, p. 1). Consequently identities, Ang suggested, “may be very subjective instruments, or discursive conduits, through which we may shape and construct our futures” (p. 1) enabling us to become political agents in the sense that we not only adopt the subject positions that are available to us, but we perpetuate them.

Hall extended the dialog of identity beyond the confines of culture to consider the ability of people to constitute themselves psychically, thus requiring new subjectivities that acknowledge self-reflexivity. By identity, Hall is referring to the processes that constitute and continuously reshape the subject within the social and cultural world. He described identity as the meeting point between the ideological discourses which “speak to us as social subjects, and … the psychological or psychical processes which produce us as subjects which can be spoken” (Hall, 1995, p. 65). The counteracting tendencies of the individual create a new conception of identity to counter the discourses of domination and the grand narratives that constituted the language of the self. Consequently, it becomes difficult to understand identity without considering both the individual and the social aspects of its formation.

In one sense, any unconscious thought or desire that surfaces becomes consumed by the symbolic, but the ability to turn inward, so to speak, constitutes the difference between objective and subjective formations of identity in the sense that it challenges the individual to recognize and examine the discourses that surround and shape them more
critically. The difficulty lies in the notion that once spoken—which is the only means by which we can articulate such psychical processes—those words are lost to us and become part of the discourse that such self-reflexivity seeks to counter.

Hall does not seek to restore the notion of identity as a unified essence with an inner truth that can be discovered, but rather describes identities as points of suture or temporary attachment to emphasize the constant transformations that make us who we are. Identity, in this sense, is not fixed or unalterable, but is necessarily contingent:

You only discover who you are because of the identities you are required to take on, into which you are interpellated: but you must take up those personalities, however temporarily, in order to act at all. Identities are, as it were, the forms in which we are obliged to act, while always knowing that they are representations which can never be adequate to the subject processes that are temporarily invested in them. (Hall, 1995, p. 65)

Similarly, Althusser's (1971) notion of interpellation involves the process of interaction with a given ideology through which the individual is recruited and transformed into a concrete subject; it is “a discursive process in which individuals were hailed, or called to, as someone with a particular role” (Dressman, 2008, p. 42). Althusser conceived the subject as being constitutive of a particular ideology, and, much like Foucault, as an effect of social relations. Hall does not challenge the idea that individuals are already interpellated by ideology as subjects, but rather suggests that something within the individual allows them to embrace it, or, as in the context of this study, resist it.
In a contemporary sense, identities are never unified or singular, rather they are increasingly fractured and fragmented as they are subjected to a radical historicization. Through a constant process of change and transformation, they are “constructed across different, and often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and positions” (Hall, 2000a, p.17). Foucault offered a radically historicized notion of discourse through which meaning and truth are constructed within a specific historical context. Significant to his theory are the breaks and ruptures in discourse from period to period, and from one discursive formation to another, with no necessary continuity between them. Tensions arise when we attempt to accept the trans-historical continuities. What makes constructions of identity of the artist or teacher so difficult is the “acknowledgment that a different discourse or episteme will arise at a later historical moment, supplanting the existing one, opening up a new discursive formation … to regulate social practices in new ways” (Hall, 2001, p. 74).

Foucault (1970, 1972a) concerned himself with the regimes of power and knowledge that permit certain statements to emerge and be legitimated as truth. As he explored issues of the subject and its relation to power, he suggested, “we need a historical awareness of our present circumstance” (Foucault, 1983, p. 208). Subjects that operate within the limits of the discursive formation, or the period and culture, come to personify the discourse “with the attributes we would expect these subjects to have, given the way knowledge about the topic was constructed at that time” (Hall, 2001, p. 73). Identity, Hall (2000) argued, emerges “within the play of specific modalities of power, and thus are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are
the sign of an identical, naturally constituted unity” (p.17). The premise that Hall puts forth is that identity is formed as the result of individual interactions with power and is not necessarily dominated by it. At these points of difference and exclusion, resistance creates the possibility for alternate conceptions of identity formation beyond the available subject positions presented within a dominant ideology.

3.8 Identification

Hall (2000a) suggested that rather than abandoning a theory of the knowing subject, a reconceptualization of the subject in a displaced or decentered position should be made in an attempt to rearticulate the relationship between subjects and discursive practices upon which questions of identity recur. Hall (1992) speaks of *identification* as an on-going process of identity construction:

> Identity arises, not so much from the fullness of identity which is already inside us as individuals, but from a lack of wholeness which is ‘filled’ from outside us, by the ways we imagine ourselves to be seen by others. (p. 287, emphasis in original)

What Hall is describing are the effects of social discourse that shape our identity by internalizing a sense of desire as dictated by the other. In the context of this study, this provides the means by which to focus not just on what people say about themselves, but on how their desires reflect the discourses that surround them.

*Identification* is a relational process through which one ascribes him or herself to a social group that attaches meaning to itself in ways that mark that group as distinctive.
Whereas identity tends to focus primarily upon the individuals, “theories of identification generally stress the ways in which members of a group have a tie that establishes attachment to, similarity to, or shared values with a collectivity” (Simpson, 2010, p. 353). Identification is a means of “imposing an imaginary coherence on the experience of dispersal and fragmentation” (Hall, 1990, p. 224).

As Althusser (1971) suggested, “ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence” (p. 153). These world outlooks we live as truth are shaped by religious, ethical, or political ideology, yet what Althusser argues is that these world outlooks do not correspond to reality and remain largely imaginary. Yet while they constitute an allusion, we accept that they make an allusion to reality, “and that they need only be ‘interpreted’ to discover the reality of the world behind their imaginary representation of that world” (Althusser, p. 153). For Althusser, the essential point is that we interpret this imaginary transposition and represent our real conditions of existence in an imaginary form. The problem that Althusser points out, or the question that he posed was, “why do men ‘need’ this imaginary transposition of their real conditions of existence in order to ‘represent to themselves’ their real conditions of existence?” (p. 153).

One answer suggested that these images were forged as beautiful lies “in the belief that they were serving God,” when in reality, they were crafted by the political concerns of “a small number of cynical men who base their domination and exploitation of the ‘people’ on a falsified representation of the world which they have imagined in order to enslave other minds by dominating their imaginations” (Althusser, 1971, pp.
153-154). A second cause, Althusser (1971) suggested, is no longer the active imagination of priests and despots and their active imagination upon passive victims, but rather “the material alienation which reigns in the conditions of existence of men themselves” (p. 154). In other words, man self-imposes an alienated representation of his condition because these conditions of existence are themselves alienating.

Such ideologies are shaped and determined by social formations, institutions and educational systems that help to construct peoples’ identities—they permeate every aspect of our social being through pre-defined ideas about gender, class—and even what it means to be an artist or a teacher. These ideas become so ingrained in our everyday practices that, consequently we lose any sense of individuality when we adhere to the subject positions made available to use. They become institutionalized through education in the form of curriculum and instruction. Althusser described these social institutions as Ideological State Apparatuses whose primary function he argued, “was to habituate individuals to self-identify and so behave in ways consistent with the subjective role they were needed to play within a capitalistic society” (Dressman, 2008, p. 42). For Foucault, the influences exerted by such social forms of subjectivity were not as overt or insidious, yet were nonetheless powerful.

Identification allows for the subject to “come upon a scene and to be capable of recognizing something as similar to itself [that] implies that its self and its other already conform to some preestablished norms of recognizability” (Butler, 2000, p. 34). Such common origins with another person or group, or with an ideal, create a closure of solidarity and allegiance established on shared characteristics (Hall, 2000a). In this sense,
an individual’s identity becomes a positional and a political one. In essence, people become active agents not of themselves, but of the discourses they have adopted and come to represent. Yet, when identifying as an artist or as a teacher, the meanings associated with each role often conflicts. Hall described this process as being incomplete; it cannot be won or lost, sustained or abandoned, but rather remains provisional, conditional and contingent.

A discourse of the self is constructed “in terms of ‘others’ who are identical with it in terms of the reduction to the most abject characteristic” (Aronowitz, 1994, pp. 205-206). Consequently human consciousness has been stripped of its autonomy. As identities are constituted through a relationship to a collectivity or a discursive formation, a process of subjection through which the individual is identified as a subject to the discursive formation occurs. As an ongoing process, identifications “are increasingly reconstituted, and, as such, are subject to the volatile logic of iterability. They are that which is constantly marshaled, consolidated, retrenched, contested and, on occasion, compelled to give way (Butler, 1993, cited in Hall, 2000, p. 29). Identification is a process of articulation but, like all signifying practices, it is subject to the play of difference.

3.9 Discourse of the Other

The discourse of the Other creates an “unconscious structure that determines people’s social position and regulates their relationships without their being aware of it” (Homer, p. 35). As our identity develops, through the course of socialization “the body is progressively overwritten with signifiers; pleasure is localized in certain zones, while
other zones are neutralized by the word and coaxed into compliance with social, behavioral norms” (Fink, p. 24). A discourse of the self is only possible in terms of the Other, as others determine exactly who and what we are:

> We are born into this circuit of discourse; it marks us before our birth and will continue after our death. To be fully human we are subjected to this symbolic order—the order of language, of discourse; we cannot escape it, although as a structure it escapes us. As individual subjects, we can never fully grasp the social or symbolic totality that constitutes the sum of our universe, but that totality has a structuring force upon us as subjects. (Homer, p. 44)

The subject positions that are available to us consist of “hierarchical relations in which certain perspectives are imposed upon objects by artistic perception so that some emerge as more significant than others” (Aronowitz, 1994, p. 55). While the ‘law’ is not always reflected in our consciousness, the discourse of the Other maintains a firm grip on identity:

> No man escapes the punishment of their censure and dislike, who offends against the fashion and opinion of the company he keeps, and would recommend himself to. Nor is there one of ten thousand who is stiff and insensible enough, to bear up under the constant dislike and condemnation of his own club.” (Locke, 1959, *An essay concerning human understanding*, cited in Aronowitz, 1994, p. 193)

Locke offered an early dialectical theory of socialization through which the self is constituted by both the human consciousness and the constraints of the external environment and pressures of conformity. Identity, in this sense, does not rely solely on
innate principles of the individual, but rather is confronted by the rules and regulations of divine and civil law resulting in the creation of a social self. Psychoanalysis later expanded upon this formulation of the problematic of the human psyche in terms of the conflict between individual and society (Aronowitz, 1994).

More simply, Lacan’s use of the term subject refers to the individual, or human being. In his later work Lacan distinguished between three kinds of subject and focused primarily on the personal subject “whose uniqueness is constituted by an act of self-affirmation” (Evans, 1996, p. 195). In the context of this dissertation, this definition is relevant for discussing the formation of identity and the development of a greater self-awareness. The individual becomes the site of conflict between his/her own developing sense of self-consciousness and drive, juxtaposed against the dominance of the Symbolic and the discourse of the Other. My inclusion of the work from a psychoanalytic perspective is not intended to depart from the theoretical framework that I have established, but rather as a means to demonstrate the evolution of thought regarding the subject.

References to language and the Symbolic dominate Lacan’s concept of the subject, yet the process of symbolization is anything but natural. As Žižek (1999) argued, the order of the signifier is defined by a vicious circle of differentiality. It is an order of discourse in which the identity of each element is overdetermined by its articulation, in which every element ‘is’ nothing more than its difference from all others, without any grounding in the Real. (p. 25, emphasis in original)
Greene (1995) argued that social interests create the value of who we are while screening out “the faces and gestures of individuals” (p. 11). She also suggested “if teaching can be thought of as an address to others’ consciousness, it may be a summons on the part of one incomplete person to other incomplete persons to reach for wholeness” (Greene, p. 26). Teaching and learning confined to the Symbolic and the discourse of the Other privileges certain forms of knowledge and understanding, and “can actually be an obstacle to knowing ourselves and others” (Ellsworth, cited Tavin, 2009, p. 8). The Symbolic speaks the language of the Other; it comes with “rules, exceptions, expressions, and lexicons” (Fink, 1995, p. 14). At the extreme, this law or language of the Other can be viewed as “a foreign element inopportune foisted upon or grafted onto an otherwise wholesome human nature” (Fink, p. 7).

The relationship between self and Other remains “fundamentally conflictual,” as the individual is “caught in reciprocal and irreducible dialectic of alienation” (Homer, 2005, p. 24). Lacan recognizes two moments of alienation. The first occurs through the mirror phase and the formation of the ego. The second takes place as the child enters the Symbolic, and it is through language that the subject is created. Eventually, the image constructed by the Symbolic is what dominates our social construction of reality and identity. As the individual strives to affirm his/her identity, the struggle between desire and recognition persists. This dialectical process links the ego to more complex social situations inherent in the Symbolic. One of Lacan’s significant contributions to contemporary cultural studies is through his “shift in the use of psychoanalysis from interpreting the content of individual texts to analysis of how our subjectivity and identity
are constructed through the structure and form of texts” (Homer, p. 27). Lacan’s shift in emphasis seems to critique the structure and form of texts as being socially mitigated and constructed, particularly in the context of language and subsequently in the context of subjectivity and identity.

As Homer (2005) explained, “we are born into language — the language through which the desires of others are articulated and through which we are forced to articulate our own desire” (p. 44). The subject is built upon both their social reality as well as their individual identity, but the individual is largely ignored within the confines of the Symbolic. We want to believe that we are in control, “yet at times something extraneous and foreign speaks” (Fink, p. 4). Our desire becomes inextricably bound up with the discourse of the Other, we can only express our desire through language and it is through language that desire comes into being. Language not only gives us our voice, it helps shape it; “the Other confers upon the subject its symbolic mandate, as it is through the desire of the Other that the subject’s own desire is founded” (Homer, p. 73). In this sense, the Other “can be seen as insidious, uninvited intruder that unceremoniously and unpropitiously transforms our wishes” (Fink, p. 6).

Perhaps nowhere is the discourse of the Other more dominate than in curriculum and instruction, which “focus on the conscious mind, the acquisition of knowable knowledge, and an attempt to understand conceptual systems of cognition that construct different ways of knowing” (Tavin, p. 4). The Symbolic dictates our consciousness and invades our subconscious as the discourse and desire of the Other around us becomes internalized (Fink, 1995). The individual, when confronted with the desire of the Other,
“tries to verbalise this desire and thus constitutes itself by identifying with the signifiers in the field of the Other, without ever succeeding in filling the gap between subject and Other” (Verhaeghe, cited in Homer, p. 74). According to Žižek:

The act of conferring a symbolic mandate which, by naming me, defines and fixes my place in the symbolic network. The hysterical question thus articulates the experience of a fissure, an irreducible gap between the signifier which represents me and the non-symbolized surplus of my being there. The hysteric embodies this ontological question: her/his basic problem is how to justify and account for her/his existence in the eyes of the Other. (p. 29)

In this sense, one can never proclaim their individuality because they are a product of it. Only through resistance or critical self-reflection can we expect to exert any authority over identity.

This gap is the site upon which the subject can be rearticulated through the integration of personality and self-awareness that the Symbolic no longer dominates. As long as such a gap remains, we are forced to pursue our desire and shape our identity within a socially constructed reality (Stavrakakis, 2007). “What if,” as Freud suggests, “instead of focusing solely on what knowledge we can know and acquire, we consider ‘activities of our minds [that have] been withdrawn from [our] knowledge and from the command of [our] will’” (cited in Tavin, 2009, p. 4).

A lack exists because the subject is unable to restore or recapture his/her ‘wholeness’ because of the dependency on, and the limitations of, language and speech. The dislocation of identity stimulates the desire for “a rearticulation of the dislocated
structure, stimulating… becoming the condition of possibility for human freedom” (Stavrakakis, p. 54). Žižek (1999), on the other hand, suggests one of the more radical dimensions of Lacanian psychoanalysis states the “unconscious is defined as the ‘discourse of the Other’” (p. 28, emphasis in original). Accatino suggested this lack is “an embodied metaphor for absence, inadequacy, and denial, for the frailty and increasing worthlessness of images, their gradual loss of meaning, the impossibility of using them to present the reality they stand for—and our own ability to see” (cited in Walker, 2008, p. 5).

Desire and the unconscious are structured upon this fundamental lack; “desire, therefore, is always the manifestation of something that is lacking in the subject and the Other — the symbolic order” (Homer, 2005, p. 72). We are constantly striving to live up to someone else’s expectations, yet the desire of the Other remains beyond our grasp. As Fink (1995) argued, there “remains something that the subject can recover and thus sustain him or herself in being, as being of desire,” (p. 61) and what remains is the objet petit a, or the object cause of desire. This suggests a hole in the Symbolic, a gap in which it no longer dominates the discourse:

As soon as we recognize that it is precisely and only in dreams that we encounter the real of our desire, the whole accent shifts radically. Our commonest everyday reality, the reality of our social universe in which we play our usual roles as decent ordinary people, turns out to be an illusion resting on a specific ‘repression’: on ignorance of the real of our desire. This social reality then
becomes nothing more than a fragile symbolic tissue which can be torn at any
moment by the intrusion of the real. (Žižek, 1999, p. 21)

The analogy can be made that the Symbolic represents the social articulation of
identity, and that desire and jouissance are essential psychological components for better
understanding ourselves. While recognizing the dominant voice of the Symbolic has a
profound influence on how and what we think, Lacan articulated its inability to
adequately describe the human condition. The idea becomes to attempt to articulate an
identity beyond the influence of the Other, or at least not dictated by it. And in its place
create a renewed emphasis on the individual and the recreation of identity by providing a
glimpse of what may be possible at the intersection between the individual and the social
domain. The subject positions available to us are already shaped in the language of the
Other, but such a rearticulation of identity would allow us to consider multiple discourses
in the construction of the subject, rather than one being merely subservient to the other.

3.10 Difference

Hall (2000b) suggested that the construction of identity involves a struggle for
meaning through which individuals constantly reproduce and reconstitute how they
understand themselves in relation to others—not through opposition, but through
difference(s). There are critical points of difference, Hall (1990) argued, “which
constitute ‘what we really are’; or rather—since history has intervened—‘what we have
become’. We cannot speak for very long, with any exactness, about ‘one experience, one
identity’, without acknowledging the other side” (p. 225). Identity is constructed through
difference and “it is only through relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, to precisely what it lacks, to what has been called its constitutive outside that the ‘positive’ meaning of any term—and thus its ‘identity’—can be constructed” (Hall, 2000b, p.17, emphasis in original). Subordinate groups are not always reconstituted in the image of the dominant formation, but rather, as Hall (1995) argued, “hegemony is an authority which can be constructed only by continuing to recognize difference” (p. 69). The boundaries of difference are more than mutually excluding categories as they are “continually repositioned in relation to different points of reference” (Hall, 1990, p. 227). This sense of difference challenges the fixed binaries that stabilize meaning and representation and, by encompassing additional and supplemental meanings, “disturb the classical economy of language and representation” (Norris, 1982, cited in Hall, 1990, p. 229).

3.11 Articulation

Articulation can be described as a linkage, yet in this sense the unity that it forms is not that of an identity, where one structure perfectly recapitulates or reproduces or even ‘expresses another; or where each is reducible to the other; or where each is defined by the same determinations or has exactly the same conditions of existence; or where each develops according to the effectivity of the same contradictions. (Hall, 1996b, p. 38)

Such an articulation forms a complex unity between often-dissimilar structures built upon relations of dominance and subordination. Social formations, particularly in periods
of transition, “may be an ‘articulated combination’ of different modes with specified, shifting terms of hierarchical ordering between them” (Hall, 1996b, p. 39). For example, individuals are constituted as subjects through a process of subjection in which they are identified as subjects to the discursive formation, which “become a priori categories which individuals seem to occupy in unproblematic fashion” (Hall, 2000b, p. 23). Hall (2000b) argued that Foucault, while offering a formal account of the construction of subject positions within discourse, failed to fully articulate why certain individuals occupy some subject positions rather than others. Hall suggested that Foucault began to realize that it was not enough for discourse to “summon, produce and regulate, but there must also be the corresponding production of a response (and thus the capacity and apparatus of subjectivity) from the side of the subject” (2000b, p. 25).

What Hall (2000) attempted to theorize were the mechanisms through which individuals as subjects identify with the positions to which they are summoned, “as well as how they fashion, stylize, produce and ‘perform’ these positions” (p. 27). But even this remains temporary as individuals remain in a “constant, agonistic process of struggling with, resisting, negotiating and accommodating the normative regulative rules with which they confront and regulate themselves” (Hall, 2000, p. 27). Hall refers to the meeting point between the discourses and practices that construct the social subject, and the processes that produce subjectivities as a point of suture. This articulation, as described by Hall, involves “the suturing of the psychic and the discursive in their constitution” (2000b, p. 29). An effective suturing, or articulation is not a one-sided process; rather it requires the subject to invest in the position. Hall uses the term articulation to indicate the
linkage between the discursive and the psychic. Yet, although they are connected, they are not the same; “The unity formed by this combination or articulation is always, necessarily, a ‘complex structure,’ a structure in which things are related, as much through their differences as through their similarities” (Hall, 1996b, p. 38).

Identities are thus points of temporary attachment to the subject positions, which discursive formations and practices construct for us; they are “the result of a successful articulation or ‘chaining’ of the subject into the flow of the discourse (Hall, 2000b, p. 19). Hall (2000b) suggested that Foucault’s later work recognized “the existence of some interior landscape of the subject, [and] some interior mechanisms of assent to the rule” (p. 26). Foucault (1978a) critically added an emphasis on the practices that allowed individuals to decipher, recognize and acknowledge themselves as subjects of desire, “bringing them into play between themselves and themselves a certain relationship that allows them to discover, in desire, the truth of their being, be it natural or fallen” (p. 5).

McNay (1994) criticized Foucault for neglecting to analyze the precise nature of the relations between discourse and the social positioning of individuals, and for failing to explore the issue of how individuals come to occupy certain discursively constructed subject positions. Foucault’s method of archaeological analysis, he charged, “can explain the construction of discrete subject positions within discourse but it offers no explanation of the social context in which these positions are embedded and which govern how they are filled” (McNay, 1994, pp. 77-78).

Foucault (1972a) emphasized that subject positions are produced within discursive formations according to “rules of formation and ‘modalities of enunciation,’”
yet while he offered a formal account of the construction of subject positions within discourse, he neglected to analyze “how the social positions of individuals interact with the construction of certain ‘empty’ discursive subject positions,” thereby reinscribing the tension between the subject positions and the individuals who occupy them (Hall, 2000, p. 23). The notion of agency took a pronounced position in Foucault’s (1978b) work as he began to consider the practices of freedom and resistance. The consequence of this new emphasis on the practices of freedom prevents the subject “from ever being simply a docile sexualized body” (Hall, 2000, p. 13). What we see through Foucault’s rethinking of the categorization of the subject, is a (re)construction in which “each subject must, without any support from universal rules, build his own mode of self-mastery; he must harmonize the antagonism of the powers within himself — invent himself, so to speak, produce himself as a subject, find his particular art of living” (Zizek, cited in Butler, 2000, p. 31).

To elaborate upon Foucault’s theory of how individuals are drawn into discursive formations, Hall (2000b) argued for the necessity of theorizing “an account of how subjects are constituted … in reference to historically specific discursive practices, normative self-regulation and technologies of the self” (p. 27). In response to Hall’s challenge, Butler (2000) began to explore “the complex transactions between the subject, the body and identity, through the drawing together in one analytic framework insights from a Foucauldian and a psychoanalytic perspective” (Hall, 2000, p. 27). Psychoanalysis seems to offer a perspective that extends beyond appearances to validate “the concept of
a substructure whose specifications are not available to the senses” (Aronowitz, 1994, pp. 46-47).

Butler (2000) reveals the underlying psychic structures that allow the subject to be linked to the outside world, while at the same time functioning independent from it. Questions of identity, she argued, cannot be restricted to “that of how a subject comes to accept or refuse or even ‘work through’—in the sense of ‘overcome’—certain social positions, cultural norms, or political identifications, since certain kinds of acts put the status of the subject into crisis,” but rather they must include an exploration of the mechanisms of its self-constitution (Butler, 2000, p. 33). The inclusion of Butler’s work is again, not intended to shift my emphasis toward psychoanalysis, but rather as a means to extend Foucault’s thinking and address some of the criticism towards his notions of the subject. Her framework offers a means to consider the subject in its tenuous relationship with available socially constructed positions, one that recognizes the self-constituting subject in its struggle against the conditioning norms and aggrammatical styles that constrain its emergence.

Butler (1993) suggested there might be a way to subject psychoanalysis to a Foucauldian redescription:

[Her text] accepts as a point of departure Foucault’s notion that regulatory power produces the subjects it controls, that the power is not only imposed externally but works as the regulatory and normative means by which subjects are formed. The return to psychoanalysis, then, is guided by the question of how certain regulatory
norms form a ‘sexed’ subject in terms that establish the indistinguishability of psychic and bodily formation.’ (cited in Hall, 2000, p. 28)

Following the logic of Foucault’s technologies of the self, Butler (2000) suggested that “the subject is itself constituted through the embodiment of certain norms that establish in advance and with considerable social force what will and will not be a recognizable subject” (p. 33). What is significant about this particular blending of theories is that it allows for a (re)articulation of the artist/teacher identity, not solely on the social construction of the subject, but rather through radical (re)conceptions of subjectivity and resistance. Not only does it become important to examine how individuals are led to practice, but through this study, it also becomes significant to explore how subjects come to resist practice and their ability to diminish the power and normativity of one socially constructed discourse over another.

Such power, Butler (2000) argued, does not only exist in exterior relations; “it is not as if the ready-made subject meets its limits in the law, but that the limits that the law sets decide in advance what will and will not become a subject” (p. 32). Significantly, power is reconsidered to no longer function strictly in a unidirectional fashion, but rather as “an antagonistic struggle that takes place between free individuals” (McNay, 1994, p. 12). The differentiation of the individual “as they attain the status of the subject,” involves their “insertion into grammars of bodily action and speech” (Butler, 2000, p. 34). The subject, Hall (2000) argued, invests in the position; consequently this juncture—or suture—should be thought of as an articulation rather than as a one-sided process.
Such a (re)consideration focuses upon the complex interactions between the subject and identity drawing upon both the analytic framework from Foucault, and the practices of self-production and articulation detailed by Hall. What I am suggesting, is that the articulation between the artist and the teacher does not necessarily express or mirror each other, but rather that tensions may arise precisely at this point of intersection as a result of its distinctly hierarchical relationship. What arise from these points of tension are changes in the articulations of the self, and the relationship between the unconscious and the discursive formation.

Foucault (1983) described struggles against domination and subjection, and against forms of exploitation, subjectivity and submission. These struggles stand in opposition to representations imposed upon people, and are the result of an opposition to the effects of power that is linked to knowledge, competence, qualification, and the privileges associated with them. What I am theorizing is the subject position of the artist/teacher as an articulation of contradictions through which one is not directly reduced to the other. Foucault reminded us that these encounters are not necessarily always violent ones—instead he described the exercise of power as a way in which certain actions modify others. The opposite pole can only be passivity, but what we must remember is that the other does not remain passive; rather it “resists our interpretations, eludes them, and affects us in turn” (Falzon, 1998, p. 38).

All these struggles revolve around issues of identity. Through Foucault’s social construction of the subject together with Hall’s conception of identification, the potential
for rearticulating the artist/teacher identity through radical re-conceptions of subjectivity and resistance emerges:

Human beings are unable totally to master their surroundings, and they remain subject to historical change and transformation … Although various forms of social order are imposed on human beings, they are not content simply to reproduce the forms of life in which they exist. They are able to resist, to transgress imposed rules, create new forms of thought and action. (Falzon, 1998, p. 10)

An articulation between dissimilar structures creates the possibility for establishing a relationship to the norm that is neither an act of acceptance or refusal, but rather exposes “a vexed relation to a set of norms, ones that not only call into question the fixity of the norm, but underscore the difficulty of working it, rendering it malleable, and working it through, turning it into something else” (Butler, 2000, p. 33). This analysis of discourse includes stories of individuals who have constructed identity in opposition to normative and socially discursive practices. Stories like these become important because they represent challenges to the normative practices that have become institutionalized and legitimated through curriculum and instruction.

Foucault was also criticized for his emphasis on disciplinary practices that, McNay (1994) argued, ignored “the everyday activities of individuals who resist, in a mundane and invisible fashion, the normalizing pressures exerted over their lives” (p. 102). Foucault’s technologies of the self, together with his earlier work, describe the ways in which a subject is constituted as an object of knowledge, together with a
reconceptualization of subjectivity through which individuals come to understand themselves as subjects. This enabled Foucault, McNay conceded, “to conceive of individuals as active agents with the capacity to autonomously fashion their own existences” and further enabled Foucault to articulate a theory of resistance “which is situated in the interstices of power relations, at the level of individuals’ daily practices” (p. 7).

3.12 Resistance

Hall and Foucault both explored the resources of resistance “with which to confront the fragmented and pathological ways in which that experience has been reconstructed within the dominant regimes” (Hall, 1990, p. 225). The solution, for Foucault, seemed to be an active form of resistance against conservatism or preservation of tradition, in which the individual works “to refuse ascriptions, to push limit situations, to explore the Other” (Marshall, 1996, p. 108). Central to Foucault’s (1977) theory is that wherever there are forces of domination, there are also equal opportunities for resistance; one cannot exist without the other, rather they form “a network of relations, constantly in tension” (p. 26). Resistance is the animating principle, the driving force of dialog out of which new social forms emerge; it serves to transgress imposed limits to create new forms of thought and action. Tensions also arise when these forces are suppressed.

Foucault (1983) suggested an alternative means through which to investigate the links between rationalization and power which consists of “taking the forms of resistance against different forms of power as a starting point” (p. 211). His strategy of antagonism
uses resistance as a catalyst to locate and reveal power relations, the methods used, and their point of application. Power relations, in this sense, are defined through a series of oppositions. The main objective of these oppositions, or struggles, is to attack forms of power. The notion of relations of power also presumes the opportunity for dialog and resistance. In order to understand what power relations are about, Foucault (1983) suggested, “we should investigate the forms of resistance and attempts made to dissociate these relations” (p. 211).

Creative transgressions, for example, are practices that do not conform to any pre-existing principles, but rather serve as a transformative process against prevailing values and forms (Falzon, 1998). Dialog, as another form of resistance, entails reciprocity that involves an active interaction between the individual and the social world. This changes the dynamic of the encounter because, as Falzon (1998) described, “dialog necessarily involves a mutual interplay between the participants, as opposed to a one-way imposition of one upon the other” (p. 7). Falzon argued that dialog, “functions to assist contemporary forms of resistance, the contemporary challenges to prevailing social arrangements, and hence is instrumental in promoting continuing dialog and social transformation” (p. 6). Such interactions, in a Foucauldian sense, allow us to reconsider subjectivity through a fundamental encounter with the other, as opposed to being “trapped in our own history” (Foucault, 1983a, p. 210). Such a discourse of resistance becomes evident in the narratives of the art teachers that are struggling between the social and cultural discourses that articulate the identity construction of the artist and the teacher:
People criticize instance of power which are closest to them, those which exercise their actions on individuals. They do not look for the ‘chief enemy,’ but for the immediate enemy. Nor do they expect to find a solution to their problem at a future date (that is, liberations, revolutions, and of class struggle. (Foucault, 1983, p. 211)

Hall attempted to (re)consider issues of identity by extending Foucault’s notion of subjectivity through the suturing of the psychic and the discursive in the constitution of the subject:

People retain strong links with their places of origin and their traditions, but they are without the illusion of a return to the past. They are obliged to come to terms with the new cultures they inhabit, without simply assimilating to them and losing their identities completely. They bear upon them the traces of the particular cultures, traditions, languages and histories by which they were shaped. (1992, p. 310)

Thus, we become able to constitute ourselves as new kinds of subjects that enables us to discover new places from which to speak.

As challenges to existing educational paradigms continue to emerge, the purpose of this study is to explore new regimes of discourse that allow for the reconstitution of the self/subject between artist and art educator, as intimately bound with contemporary social and cultural discourse. Such contemporary discourses allow for the reconsideration and rearticulation of the artist/teacher identity. Some identities, Hall (1992) argued, gravitate towards tradition:
attempting to restore their former purity and recover the unities and certainties which are felt as being lost. Others accept that identity is subject to the play of history, politics, representation and difference, so they are unlikely ever again to be unitary or ‘pure,’ (p. 309)

By exploring new ways of articulating the different parts and histories of ourselves through the realization that we are always in a transition to becoming something else, it becomes possible uncover new ways of negotiating the tensions between the two.
CHAPTER 4 — METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The discourse of the artist/teacher presents the possibility for synergy between often-divergent roles, yet this point of articulation creates a subjectivity that remains fluid and unstable. Foucault underscored the idea that certain subject positions constrain identity by limiting conceptions of what is possible. This study suggests that the discourse of the artist/teacher is similarly constrained by traditional perceptions of the artist and the teacher as the critical and social perspectives that provide the basis for many art education programs often conflict with the historical and formal practices that remain at the core of artistic training.

As agents in our own construction, we often choose available identities and become seduced by a particularly strong narrative. From a Foucauldian perspective, this study explores the discursive and non-discursive practices that shape the identity of the artist/teacher as a manifestation of discourse. This study examines the discourse of the artist/teacher through a dispositive analysis that goes beyond a focus on language in use to include an analysis of practices and materializations as aspects of discourse (Wodak, 2009; Jäger & Maier, 2009). A dispositive is a system of knowledge that links discourse,
events, and objects created by people using this knowledge. As a form of Critical
Discourse Analysis, Dispositive Analysis focuses upon both the synthesis of discursive
practices and their materializations. Jäger & Maier (2009) focused on such
materializations as objects or material products and actions created on the basis of
knowledge, whereas it is the intention of this study that subjects are also a materialization
of discourse. I am not examining this discourse from a historical perspective, nor even in
a sense of defining what an artist/teacher is, but rather exploring the underlying
assumptions and ideologies that propel the discourse, revealing how they are manifested
in practice and what kind of subjectivities they create.

A dispositive analysis begins with the analysis of existing texts; yet it extends
further to analyze non-discursive practices. For the purposes of this study, I will begin
with existing texts, then extend my analysis to subject narratives to provide the basis for
an exploration of non-discursive practices as well as a consideration of the subject as a
materialization of discourse. Yet when analyzing materializations, as Jäger & Maier
(2009) suggested, no explicit methodology has been developed. A Foucauldian discursive
analysis goes beyond the examination of particular texts to explore how subjects have
been constituted “in various systems of thought and bodies of knowledge that are
intimately connected to systems of social control, domination, and, more broadly, the
exercise of power” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 73). It is upon this perspective that I contend that
the subject can also be analyzed as a materialization of discourse. Therefore, as an
extension of my analysis, it is the intention of this dissertation—in connection with this
research project—to devote time and space to develop an explicit reasoning regarding
methodology and thus further promote the development of dispositive analysis that encompasses an examination of the subject as a materialization of discourse. Finally, this study seeks to address the question of how the discourse of the artist/teacher functions within the larger context of art education.

4.2 Foucault’s Methods and Strategies of Analysis

Discourse can be defined by the totality of interactions within a certain domain. This includes not only the traditional aspects of language in use associated with discourse analysis, but the practices and materializations of discourse as well. Subject positions are limited by the conditions and the rules of their existence, and are maintained and reinforced by an often-complex ensemble of regulated practices. There exist criteria for individualizing discourses that adhere to distinct linguistic systems, and that shape “the identity of the subject which holds them together” (Foucault, 1991a, p. 54). Foucault’s strategies of analysis utilized these criteria to characterize discourse and the conditions of its emergence, to define the rules that govern it, and to expose its boundaries. His strategies map the subject positions transcribed by discourse and the system of their formation that challenge the idea of a sovereign subject.

Discourse can be characterized as “an institutionalized way of talking that regulates and reinforces action and thereby exerts power” (Link, 1983, cited in Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 35). Foucault’s analysis questioned such discursive assumptions, and challenged individual will by demonstrating “how every utterance is an utterance within a specific discourse to which certain rules of acceptability apply” (Andersen, 2003, p. 3).
His tactics expose the law of existence of statements, the conditions of their emergence, and their correlation with other events or discourse. Often, the principles of exclusion and reduction are the most familiar and visible (Wodak, 1996). Foucault could thus distinguish the limits of discourse and exposing the boundaries that define the field of possible objects, and the roles occupied by the speaking subjects. Foucault also explored the possibilities of transformation, reminding us “each discourse undergoes constant change as new utterances are added to it” (1991a, p. 54).

What individualizes a discourse are its criteria of formation; a distinct set of rules that govern all its operations, it concepts, and theoretical options. When the researcher can define such a set of rules, it is what Foucault (1991a) referred to as a discursive formation. The criteria of transformation is when one is able to define what new rules of formation come into effect, or what internal modifications have been possible within the confines of a discourse. Changes within a discursive formation affect, amongst other things, the limits and forms of the sayable, the constituted domain of discourse, and the subjects that inhabit them. This establishes what individuals have access to a particular discourse, and how this relationship is institutionalized through tradition and pedagogy.

Foucault also established criteria of correlation, “which define and situate it among other types of discourse,” and the institutions and social relations in which it functions (1991a, p 54). This emphasizes the struggle for control between divergent concerns as the discourse is deployed within a practical field of study; the boundaries are also measured by the intensity of the resistance.
A Foucauldian analysis inquires about the discursive forces that cause particular subjects to emerge, and demonstrate, consequently, how identities are constituted through a series of exclusions. An analytical line of questioning emerges by which the researcher not only questions practices within a field, such as the practices of the artist or the teacher, but also questions the emergence of statements, and the problems, arguments, themes, and interests they represent (Andersen, 2003). Consequently, through an analysis of the discourse of the artist/teacher, certain questions emerge; when one speaks of the artist or of the teacher, what is one speaking of? Particularly in a context such as that of the artist/teacher through which often divergent roles and identities conflict, how might these conceptions change when they are articulated together?

Foucault (1972a) privileged the statement, not as a linguistic unit like the sentence, but as a function; as a function, the statement creates a special mode of existence which enables “groups of signs to exist, and enables rules or forms to become manifest” (p. 99). Both language and behavior are clearly embedded in discourse through social, situational, structural and cultural factors that determine communication (Wodak, 1996). As such, the statement can be recognized, isolated, and analyzed for how words as well as practices intersect and become invested with particular relations of power.

Foucault made a distinction between the statement and the discursive formation. The statement is the smallest unit of discourse extracted from “the simplest inscription of what is said” (Deleuze, 1986, p. 15). They are “the words, phrases and propositions which resolve round different focal points of power … set in play by a particular problem” (Deleuze, 1986, p 17). According to Foucault (1972a), “a statement can be
defined as a statement only if it is integrated into operations or strategies in which the identity of the statement is maintained or effaced” (p. 100). The statement creates subject positions that can be occupied by individuals; “subjects do not stand outside of the statement; conversely, the statement articulates the space and possibility of subjects” (Andersen, 2003, p. 11). Consequently, Butler (1997) suggested that, “[o]ne ‘exists’ not only by virtue of being recognized, but, in a prior sense, by being recognizable” (cited in Graham, 2005, p. 8, emphasis mine). The discursive formation renders its subjects visible. The question thus becomes, which statements must be held by an individual for that individual to become the subject of the statement? In the analysis of the artist/teacher, what does this individual look like and how do we begin to recognize them? What are the limits that shape and define them?

Deleuze (1986) described the intrinsic properties that constitute a statement; it “does not derive in any sense from a particular state of things, but stems from the statement itself” (p. 8). A statement does not exist independently of its time, place, and materiality; it needs to be analyzed “in its appearance, as it emerges, and cannot be reduced to expressing anything other than itself, such as, for example, the intention of the statement, the context, the concern or the meaning of the statement” (Andersen, 2003, p.10). Consequently, Foucault’s analysis focused on questions such as “Why did this and not another statement occur in this place?” (Andersen, 2003, p. 31)

Discourse analysis consists of an analysis of the statements that enunciate “subject positions, discursive objects, conceptual relations and strategies” (Andersen, 2003, p. 13). The statements that I am looking for are within the discourse of the
artist/teacher are the ones that function with constitutive effects to describe artistic
behavior and practices, and speak into existence the artist/teacher as a recognizable
subject of discourse. For the purposes of this dissertation, I am seeking to establish how
such statements, as a function of dividing practices, “enables [the subject] to appear … to
be placed in a field of exteriority” (Foucault, 1972a, p. 50).

The goal of discursive analysis is to reveal the discursive formations that describe
when a number of statements form a system of dispersion, or reveal a regularity “between
objects, types of statements, concepts, or thematic choices” (Foucault, 1972a, p. 38). A
regularity can be defined as a discursive formation when

The dominance and dispersion of such statements privilege a particular
constituting field of power-knowledge which not only prepares the ground for the
practices that derive from such statements but also disguises the exclusionary
logic of such practices by rearticulating the conditions of exclusion. (Graham,
2005b, cited in Graham, 2005, p. 11)

The discursive formation thus becomes a system of dispersion for statements, and it is the
regularity of this dispersion of statements becomes the focus of discourse analysis. This
form of analysis seeks to locate a particular family of statements by identifying the words
and actions encapsulated by particular practices as a recognizable object of scrutiny
(Graham, 2005).

Practices are equally discursive; “Actions can be attributed to subjects or systems,
or they can attribute them to themselves in the process of constructing a response of
liable self” (Andersen, 2003, p. xvi). The disciplinary properties of discursive practices
within socio-political relations of power demonstrate how discourse works not only to produce meaning, but also particular subjects “upon whom and through which particular relations of power are realised” (Luke, 1999, cited in Graham, 2005, p. 4). In this sense, Foucault went beyond simply being critical “to reveal and undermine what is most invisible and insidious in prevailing practices” (Ball, 1995, cited in Graham, 2005, p. 4).

To analyze regimes of practice is to examine conduct that has “both prescriptive effects regarding what is to be done (effect of ‘jurisdiction’), and codifying effects regarding what is to be known (effects of ‘veridiction’)” (Foucault, 1991b, p. 75). For example, in *Discipline and Punish* (1995/1977), Foucault (1991b) sought not to write a history of the prison as an institution, but rather of the practice of imprisonment to show its origin or, more exactly, to show how this way of doing things – ancient enough in itself – was capable of being accepted at a certain moment as a principal component of the penal system, thus coming to seem an altogether natural, self-evident and indispensable part of it. (p. 75)

To gain a better understanding of the practices involved, Foucault focuses on the question, how does one punish?

Similarly, in *Madness and Civilization*, “rather than asking what, in a given period, is regarded as sanity or insanity, as mental illness or normal behaviour, [Foucault] wanted to ask how these divisions are operated” (Foucault, 1991b, p. 74). As stated in Foucault’s (1991b) analysis on prisons:

[His] target of analysis wasn’t ‘institutions’, ‘theories’ or ‘ideology’, but practices – with the aim of grasping the conditions which make these acceptable at a given
moment; the hypothesis being that these types of practice are not just governed by institutions, prescribed by ideologies, guided by pragmatic circumstances – whatever role these elements may actually play – but possess up to a point their own specific regularities, logic, strategy, self-evidence and ‘reason’. It is a question of analyzing a ‘regime of practices’ – practices being understood here as places where what is said and what is done, rules imposed and reasons given, the planned and the taken for granted meet and interconnect. (p. 75)

Foucault also demonstrates how discursive practices can be taken out of a specific context or the discourse in which it was created to become generalized and made available as logic to a multiplicity of discourses. What others see becomes taken for granted; “it ontologises the administration by reducing it to a certain form of reality that is unquestionable” (Andersen, 2003, p. xii). However, Foucault (1972a) emphasized that discursive formations are essentially incomplete; they do not occupy all the possible volume available to it as a result of strategic choices.

The way in which a discursive formation comes into being is of primary significance to discourse analysis; however, discourse analysis must have well-defined criteria for the indication of discursive formation in order to be considered as part of the critical discussion (Andersen, 2003). Discursive formations create principles of determination that either permit or exclude a certain number of individuals within the rules of its own formation. Discourse sets its rules of selection or acceptability which not only exclude themes, arguments and speech positions from the discourse, but also produce outsiders, denounce groups of people as sick,
abnormal or irrational, and grant other groups the right and legitimacy to treat these people (for example by imprisonment or therapy). (Andersen, p. 3)

Such limitations are often expressed by strategic decision, and address how individual discursive formations come into being in relation to other discursive formations. The process often involves a battle or competition, or sometimes “a mutual constitution between different discursive formations” (Andersen, p. 16).

Foucault’s analysis attempted to expose the ideological functions of discursive formations in an effort to expose and modify them. This is accomplished by interrogating discursive formations to reveal which types of enunciations are implicated as particular subjects are formed.

Foucault attempted to disturb “the taken-for-granted and allegedly self-evident character of our interpretations of ‘subjects,’” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 73) such as the role of the artist, or the role of the teacher. The aim of Foucault’s analytical strategy was to “query the discourses and practices of the present by referring them back to the hegemonic conditions under which they have been established, which also includes pointing out ruptures in the grounds on which strategies, institutions and practices are shaped” (Andersen, 2003, p. 20).

Such an analysis is conducted “not in terms of the subject as the transcendental source of events, but rather in terms of the constitution of the subject within a historical framework” (McNay, 1994, pp. 108-109). It can also be used to demonstrate, for example, how the discourse of the artist/teacher repeats and renews issues of control and expertise, which have obtained a specific definition and elaboration within discursive formations and practices. Foucault’s approach gives insight into the regiment of disciplinary forms, and explores how different discursive formations
and discursive strategies are shaped and transformed. Its aim is to criticize pre-determined notions of continuity and rupture, and to examine the effects of past traditions that play an active role in animating the present (Anderson, 2003).

Discursive formations involve the subjecting of the individual. Whereas archaeological analysis reveals the way in which subject positions are created, the emphasis of self-technology analysis is the inquiry into the way the subject is claimed by a particular discursive formation. Specifically, this analytic strategy examines “the technologies available to an individual’s manifestation of itself as subject” and the relationship between the individual and available subject positions (Andersen, 2003, p. 24). Foucault (1995/1977) demonstrated that technologies of the self allow for individual’s to influence the operations that shape and maintain their own identity with a view to self-control and self-awareness; however, he makes a distinction between two different discursive demands. The first, Subjection, is when an individual is claimed by a specific discourse; they are “offered a specific position in the discourse from which one can speak and act meaningfully in a specific way” (Schmidt, 1990, cited in Andersen, 2003, p. 24). The second, Subjectivation, is when the individual has not only been made a subject, but when demands are made on the individual to take an active role in assuming the available subject position. Thus, subjection “signifies the space where one receives oneself, whereas subjectivation signifies the space where one gives oneself to oneself” (Schmidt, 1990, cited in Andersen, 2003, p. 24, emphasis mine). In this sense the experience becomes transformative in that the passively receiving individuals cross the line from subjection to subjectivation, thereby becoming active in their own self-creation
Having succumbed to a particular discourse and its practices through a process of ongoing subjugation, “individuals not only come to occupy spaces in the social hierarchy but, through their continual subjugation, come to know and accept their place” (Graham, 2005, p. 10). Discourse thus isolates the individual from the masses through procedures of normalization. Once constituted as a subject, “individuals can be dispersed into disciplinary spaces within [a] grid of social regularity” (ibid).

For the discourse analyst, the challenge becomes to clearly define which form of subjecting applies. Equally significant is how this particular difference is articulated and brought to attention by the subject. The researcher must also “apply a concept of self-technology that is as empty as possible and then to imply the conditioning as part of the analytics itself” (Andersen, 2003, p. 106). Foucault did, however, establish minimum criteria in order to employ this form of analysis; the objectification of the self, self-directed activity, and that the self-directed activity has an end purpose or goal (Andersen, 2003).

4.3 Dispositive Analysis

Foucault underscored the idea that certain subject positions constrain identity by limiting conceptions of what is possible. Such conceptions are bound and reinforced through discourse. Discourses do not exist independently; rather they are elements of dispositives. A dispositive “is the constantly evolving synthesis of knowledge that is built into language, action and materializations” (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 57, emphasis mine). It is constituted not only by language in use, but also by non-discursive practices or
events that are indicative of a particular discourse (which are formed by decisions, which are implementations of this knowledge), as well as by objects or materializations (which are created by people using their specialist knowledge) of the discourse and associated practice. Thus, a dispositive analysis is derived by examining discursive practices (*language and thought*), non-discursive practices (*actions*), as well as materializations. The aim of the dispositive analysis is to identify the knowledges and critique how they are connected to power.

To expose and explore the connections between discourse and power, it becomes necessary to first examine how discourses and reality are connected to each other through the formation of identity. “The assignment of meanings,” Jäger & Maier suggested, “includes very tangible physical acts … People moreover learn the conventions of assigned meanings through language, which helps them to interpret reality in the way it has previously been interpreted by others” (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 39).

Foucault conceived of the dispositive as a means to construct a deeper analysis of the historic and current reality. A dispositive analysis examines how the assignment of meaning creates reality and shapes identity. Jäger & Maier (2009) suggested that the bond between the elements of the dispositive exists in the form of human actions, “which connect the subject and the object, symbolic reality and material reality” (p. 42). Actions of the subject are meaningful because they are based upon thought and consciousness, thus the challenge of analysis is not merely a linguistic one. Since knowledge is the basis for action, we should thus be able to consider the actions of the subject within a dispositive analysis.
In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault utilized the theme of the prison as a means through which to explore the notion of the modern self, and critique the “idea that we have an intrinsic personality that is at once original and capable of being improved, that there is an interior realm where we can ‘find’ ourselves” (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 30). Foucault has long been critical of the ways in which the self’s desires are socially conditioned, and contaminated by cultural politics that have been organized along the lines of identity and claims for self-expression. He contended that the notions of individuality have become standardized forms of social behavior, thus, the body becomes a field of power invested by power relations.

Foucault argued “we can only explore the landscape of social power by investigating the construction of embodiment, the ways in which subjectivity is tied to the body as well as the mind” (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, pp. 35-36). The coercion of the body is perhaps difficult to see, but Foucault sought to uncover the strategic alignments between discourse and subjectivity whereby the body becomes subjugated and turned into an object of knowledge. For Foucault, knowledge and power are intertwined. When Foucault is talking about knowledge and power, he is referring to a socially constructed and implicitly disempowering system of knowing things (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011).

Discourse—and its associated practices or manifestations—becomes a way of exercising power and are consequently bound up with political struggles. Foucault’s examination of the socialized body thus explores how it becomes caught up in a system of subjection, and the ways in which the subject consents to be ruled. Consequently, *the subject can be examined as a materialization of discourse*, since the subject can come to
embody the cultural codes and socialization processes which determine acceptable and conventional forms of behavior.

Foucault’s dispositive analysis uncovers how new technologies, practices, and institutions are linked together as functional elements of a discursive formation; it focuses upon “the interconnections between different discourses, institutions, practices, self-technologies, tactics and so on, within a particular period” (Andersen, 2003, p. 27). Discourses are intertextual, they are “are always related to other discourses, synchronically and diachronically” (Fairclough/Wodak 1996, cited in Wodak, 1996, p. 11). Consequently oppositions are formed, a ‘statement always defines itself by establishing a specific link with something else that lies on the same level as itself … almost inevitably, it is something foreign, something outside” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 11).

This analytic strategy also serves to examine how discursive or technological elements are generalized in a schematic that develops a strategic logic, and “how different logics deflect each other within the same apparatus” (Andersen, 2003, p. 30). Similarly, it is my contention that there are many different logics at play when we consider the articulation between the discourses of the artist and the teacher. Different elements are often combined in a variety of ways that require different types of analysis that explore different practices and issues (Graham, 2005). Like Foucault, I wish to explore the differences strategies inherent in the discourses of the artist and the teacher that are “mutually opposed, composed and superposed so as to produce permanent and solid effects which can perfectly well be understood in terms of their rationality, even though they don’t conform to the initial programming” (Foucault, 1991b, pp. 80-81). In
the case of the discourse of the artist/teacher, it becomes a process of analyzing the multiplicity of practices that constitute the discourse and what people do with words to create and structure meaning, not as an institutional fact or ideological effect, but rather as a means of examining the existing practices, their relation to one another, and ultimately their effects on subjectivity. Or, to borrow from Foucault, “It’s a matter of shaking this false self-evidence, of demonstrating its precariousness, of making visible not its arbitrariness, but its complex interconnection with a multiplicity of historical processes” (1991b, p. 75).

4.4 Methods of Analysis

The purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of subjects that identify as artist/teachers, and to critically examine the assumptions and ideologies that shape their personal artistic practices as well as their classroom practices. This research will be conducted through qualitative methods, more specifically, it will utilize dispositive analysis as a means explore the discursive and the non-discursive practices associated with the discourse of the artist/teacher, as well as to consider an explicit rationale for considering the subject as a materialization of discourse.

4.4.1 Scope of Analysis

The discourse that delineates my scope of analysis is that of the artist/teacher. As demonstrated by Daichendt (2009, 2010), it has evolved to become a distinctive discourse
worthy of examination. The interaction of these roles and the entanglement of these discursive positions will be the focus of this study. I will identify different discursive strands that have constitutive effects in shaping the discourse of the artist/teacher. The concept of the discursive strand is similar to the more abstract notion of discourse. Discourse, as described by Foucault, exists at the level of statements, or énoncés, whereas by contrast, discursive strands “are conceived of at the level of concrete utterances (énonciations) or performances located on the surface of texts” (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 46).

The initial step in my research will be a discursive analysis of the Teaching Artist Journal. This will reveal the language used for constructing accounts and articulating meaning that take into account both the substantive as well as the performative aspects of the discourse. Started in 2003, this journal represents a space to develop a common goals and vocabulary, to articulate common practices, instill camaraderie, and to create “a dialogue about the ways that institutional goals influence our artistry” (Booth, 2004, p. 139). The discourse of a particular site or institution establishes conditions of possibility that frame both the conceptual and visible limits for storytelling: “such preferences continually come into play as individuals fashion accounts” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 34). The Teaching Artist Journal is indicative of how stories are organizationally sanctioned and become part of a more broadly emulated discourse, and provides insight into the conditions of narrative production.

Rather than simply claiming that status or power control what people say or do, it is the intention of this study to demonstrate “how narrative resources, preferences, and
entitlements are brought to bear interactionally to enact the narrative ‘power’ of influential or privileged social actors” such as the artist/teacher (Mehan, 1979, cited in Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 53). Being an edited journal, the textual consistency is significant in shaping the discourse. Consequently, the influence of the editor(s), what they choose to include, and what they perhaps leave out, and what discursive criteria is used in the process is equally of significance to this study.

I will identify relevant articles through a keyword search and initial review of the abstracts. A structural analysis of these relevant articles will reveal common themes, attitudes, behaviors, and practices. A more in-depth detailed analysis will reveal not only their language in use, but will also reveal knowledge in use. This annotated list will also include notes about topics covered in the articles, any specific characteristics, editorial characteristics, and requisites for inclusion for the sections, issues, or journals in which the articles appear. This first step of analysis is designed to roughly capture the characteristics of articles on particular aspects of interest, and to identify “the use of collective symbols, the argumentation, the vocabulary and so on, and to identify which forms are typical” (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 54). This outline can then be utilized to identify typical articles and suitable for a more detailed analysis.

A discourse—such as that of the artist/teacher—typically encompasses various sub-topics. The next step will be to identify these subtopics, or discursive strands and fragments, and summarize them into groups with common language or discursive positions; for example, those that consider the artist/teacher as a unifying subject position. The development of strands or fragments should be an iterative process to keep
the researcher from choosing too few, or being too particular with his or her criteria. Each discursive strand will be analyzed to address questions such as which fragments are focused on, which ones are neglected, and what sub-topics are conspicuous by their absence (Jäger & Maier, 2009).

The next step in analysis will be to identify discursive entanglements. A text generally contains fragments from various discursive strands, and these strands are usually entangled with each other. A statement in which several discourses are entangled is referred to as a discursive knot (Jäger & Maier, 2009). For example, the discourse of the artist/teacher, as Daichendt suggested, represents an opportunity for synergy, or conversely as Lanier and McCracken suggested, remain diametrically opposed. But it is precisely the entanglement of the discourses of the artist and the teacher upon which this study focuses upon. This sequence of these steps may be modified as the analysis progresses, or repeated as necessary; “In these cycles of analysis, connections between different levels of analysis are discovered, interpretations are developed and weak arguments are discarded” (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 53).

4.4.2 Detailed Analysis of Typical Discursive Strands

A more detailed analysis of what have been identified as typical discursive strands will first cover context and include justification for its selection. Questions to be addressed follow this modified outline as suggested by Jäger & Maier (2009). They include:
1. Context
   • Why was this article selected?
   • Why is this article typical?
   • Who is the author?
   • What is his or her position and status?
   • What are his or her special areas of coverage?
   • What was the occasion for the article?

2. Surface of the text
   • What are the headings and subheadings?
   • How is the article structured into units of meaning?
   • What topics are touched upon in the article?
   • What discourse strands is the article a fragment of?
   • How do these topics relate to each other and overlap (entanglements of discourse strands)?

3. Rhetorical means
   • What kind and form of argumentation does the article follow?
   • What argumentation strategy is used?
   • What logic underlies the composition of the article?
   • What implications and allusion does the article contain?
   • What collective symbolism is used (linguistic and graphic)?
   • What idioms, saying and clichés are used?
   • What are the vocabulary and style?
• What typical vocabulary is used?

• What subject positions are mentioned, and how are they portrayed (persons, pronouns used)?

• What references are made?

• What sources of knowledge are used?

4. Content and ideological statements

• What concept of the artist does the article presuppose and convey?

• What concept of the teacher does the article presuppose and convey?

• What concept of art education in general does the article presuppose and convey?

• What concept of society does the article presuppose and convey?

5. What are other peculiarities of the article or aspects that make it distinct?

6. What is the discursive position and overall message of the article, what does it imply? What effect does this text have on future of discourse?

Such a structural and detailed analysis will be able to expose the underlying ideologies that appear to be shaping the discourse of the artist/teacher.

4.4.3 Synoptic and Diachronic Analysis
Together with my findings of the structural analysis, the aspects of this detailed analysis will form a general interpretation of each article, thus forming the basis for my synoptic analysis. Foucauldian discourse theory seeks to analyze the constitution of the subject “in its historical and social context from a diachronic (i.e. longitudinal) and synchronic (i.e. cross-sectional) perspective: who was conceived of as a subject at a particular point in time” (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 38). In my synoptic analysis, a final assessment of each article’s discursive position can be made as a result of comparing how the structural analysis and detailed analysis relate to one another. From a diachronic perspective, the next step is to examine with what frequency particular groups of subtopics appear, and address questions, such as how subjects take up these positions at distinct points in time, and how they relate to particular discursive events (Jäger & Maier, 2009). This process will attempt to further analyze this discursive strand to uncover and summarize the positions and ideologies that underlie it.

4.5 Reconstructing Knowledge

As outlined by Jäger & Maier (2009), my dispositive analysis of the artist/teacher will include reconstructing the knowledge that is built into its discursive practices, thereby detailing significant aspects of the dispositive. I will also reconstruct the knowledge built into the non-discursive practices that are equally constitutive of discourse. It is my intention through this study to look beyond the traditional focus of text-based analysis to explore the mechanisms that provide interactional space in which discourse takes shape, and in turn influence the practices of the artist/teacher. The form in
which this knowledge occurs is manifest in observable behaviors. Within a dispositive analysis, the task becomes to reconstruct the knowledge, as aspects of discourse that enable and accompany these practices (Jäger & Maier, 2009).

Beyond the use of language, it is the intention of this study to understand how discourse works in practice; to systematically consider the communicative mechanisms, circumstances, purposes, strategies, and resources inherent in the discourse of the artist/teacher that provides them with a distinct vocabulary for making sense of their classroom and artistic practices. It is not only important to trace what speakers do with their words to produce particular effects, but how they are reinforced through their actions; “It constructs a gaze, which has implications for actual practice” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 169). The goal of analysis is to take into consideration the discourse that conditions their practices, and look for the codes of conduct that are actively and continuously constructed. This study will examine how, through distinct practices, the artist/teacher performatively produces and reproduces shared worlds of meaning. This study will examine the knowledge in use that allows the artist/teacher to convey who and what they are and explain why they act the way they do, and to consider the way the they use these accounts to explain, justify, or otherwise offer understandings of their own and others’ conduct (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009).

Non-discursive practices or actions can be observed and described, thus reconstructing such knowledge generally results in texts. Consequently, a dispositive analysis translates non-discursive and materialized knowledge into discursive knowledge. Rather than utilizing my own ethnographic observations, the analysis of artist/teacher
narratives will allow me to examine how the artist/teachers’ are constructing linkages between discourse and practice. Thus it becomes significant to explore what language they use as well as what knowledge they employ.

4.6 Artist/Teacher narratives

A person’s story reveals how they came to his or her knowledge, and how that knowledge is communicated, preserved, and legitimated through discourse. Narratives about an artist/teacher’s experiences can be read to disclose the ways they have been socialized to accept reality as defined for them by a socially constructed discourse, and also to show how different discursive resources are employed to activate their stories. By examining the stories of self-identified teaching artists from the Teaching Artist Journal, I will uncover the patterns, themes, and discursive threads that illustrate how theoretical and social discourse shapes experience, and how subjects come to embody these positions. In the context of this study, I will also analyze the story lines that illustrate the larger social and theoretical contexts from which they are drawn.

Through dispositive analysis, linkages are drawn between what is said and done, and together can be elaborated into a more meaningful whole. A detailed analysis of the artist/teacher narratives will reveal how performances and practices orient themselves to distinct discursive strands through the realization that codes, like other standards, are enmeshed in practical actions. In an attempt to complete a more robust, dispositive analysis of the artist/teacher, I will also examine the non-discursive practices of those that identify as artist/teachers. Rather than recruiting teachers to tell their stories through
interviews, this study will analyze teacher narratives from the *Teaching Artist Journal*. What is unique about these stories is that they portray a conscious consideration of how discourse is activated and put into practice, and how these practices are discerned, defined, and responded to through discourse. Contributors are not required to be previously published or experienced writers. While the stories are not peer-reviewed, as with most journals, each article is subject to several rounds of revision by a single editor. The authenticity of their stories is conveyed through the actual circumstances and sentiments of the individual telling the story, yet at the same time reveals how “formalized categories are used to ‘certify’ or ‘authorize’ descriptions and accounts within and beyond the work setting” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 165).

Perhaps less academic in nature, these narratives tend to be more descriptive than analytic. The stories describe what is important to the teaching artist about their work and emphasize the practice of teaching and making art; thus making linkages between the discourse of the artist/teacher and their practices. In their words, the journal represents “a growing community of teaching artist practice where we speak specifically and concretely about what it is we do and the circumstances that impact our teaching” (ALT/Space: http://tajaltspace.com/Contribute).

Most of the contributors are self-identified as artist/teachers and are actively involved in defining the field. How practitioners define what it means to be a ‘teaching artist’ will be one of the topics explored in this study. People’s stories document their everyday practices. Discourse has a way of influencing and shaping these stories in its own terms; consequently, their accounts are a significant focus for analysis. Their
narratives reveal how they make sense of the discourse of the artist/teacher, particularly as it relates to influencing their practices in the classroom. Rather than being guided through the interview process, these narratives allowed them to strategically construct their accounts and organize their experience in the process. Working with narratives as text, the storytellers’ performances may seem scripted, yet “the boundaries and organization of these texts and scripts are produced through the continuing work of storying everyday life” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 40).

Narratives are generally recorded, transcribed, and analyzed as texts. The analysis of non-discursive practices more typically stem from the ethnographic observation of participants by the researcher. These notes from observation are also transcribed into texts, which are then subjected to analysis. Similarly, this study relies upon texts for analysis of non-discursive practices, yet they are derived from narrative descriptions produced by the subjects themselves. Such narratives offer “accounts that are less apt to be formulated in the terms and constructs provided by researchers” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 38). I will use these found narratives, and subject them to the same detailed and structural analysis as described previously in this chapter.

On one hand, this diminishes the contextual knowledge gained through observation, but on the other, it reveals more how the subjects make sense of their individual experience. The narrating subject is enmeshed in a distinct social world, thus similarities can be discerned in otherwise diverse stories. They also reveal what criteria they use to describe the process, and how well their stories do or do not adhere to a distinct discursive strand. A strong correlation between practice and discourse can be
established by examining the distinct vocabulary and justifications they utilize in describing their own practices.

As Foucault (1996/1977) would argue, discourse is not produced or maintained individually; rather, “meaning is constructed at the confluence of sites of narrative production and the work of situated storytellers, listeners, and readers” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 197). Subjects use what language and elements of discourse are experientially available to articulate their inner lives and social worlds. Members of an occupation share skills, orientations, objectives, and outlooks that provide common interpretive tools for making meaning (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009). Narratives will often times spread from one to another; and while not identical, each storyteller will incorporate the vocabulary, themes, codes, characteristics, and other aspects of an emerging discourse into their own. Such codes come into effect as a regulating force, which are used to guide continued social interaction. The storyteller is not just making meaning from his or her own experiences, but is also sharing their understanding of the discourse as a whole. Therefore the researcher can discern the big stories with a constant eye toward their individual articulations, and what aspects of discourse they integrate into telling their own stories. When analyzing these narratives, it becomes my role as a researcher to look within the stories for traces of discourse that inform them as they emerge, and “to concentrate on the ways in which they interpret their experience” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 56).

Common characteristics are discernable in their stories; certain discursive strands recur providing a common narrative direction. These narratives embody an active process
of elaboration that reveal how individuals in a common circumstance would meaningfully story their lives; yet at the same time, they are tacitly persuasive, “since they always advocate a particular version of reality that is related to what is at stake for storytellers in the circumstances” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 32). Consequently, as much as these stories are reflective of discourse, they can equally be analyzed to consider what effect they have on constituting and reinforcing discourse.

By examining these artist/teacher narratives as an extension of discourse, this study will reflect on the stories and experiences that have influenced their current artistic practices in the classroom, imagine possibilities for the future, and explore how certain themes and strands begin to form patterns and story lines that illustrate the larger social and theoretical contexts from which they are drawn. It is through critical self-awareness and narrative reflection that these influences are brought to the surface to be revealed and challenged. While not all stories are organizationally sanctioned, or become part of a more broadly emulated discourse, they do figure in constructing one’s identity and the development of one’s status (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009).

4.7 Knowledge in materializations — the Subject as a Materialization of Discourse

Subject positions exist only insofar as people, who are themselves constituted by discourse, assign them meaning. If the same meaning is no longer assigned to a subject, the subject loses or changes his or her identity. It thus becomes mixed with other meanings or ceases to be valid. A discourse position describes the ideological position
from which subjects interact with discourse. The subject is exposed to discourse that shapes their ideological position or worldview. Such discursive positions also “contribute to and reproduce the discursive enmeshments of subjects (Jäger, 1996, cited in Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 49).

Jäger & Maier’s (2009) descriptions regarding knowledge in materializations, as an aspect of dispositive analysis, focused primarily upon objects as materializations of discourse. Yet, a discourse can also have a strong hand in shaping a distinct role, identity, or subject position. A subject position describes the ideological position from which an individual interacts with discourse. The subject becomes enmeshed in a particular discourse that shapes their reality and their worldview. Conversely, such subject positions also “contribute to and reproduce the discursive enmeshments of subjects (Jäger, 1996, cited in Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 49). My examination of subject narratives will explore how the details of performativity are reflective of discourse as evidenced in their stories as well as in their practices. By discourse, I do not simply a text as narrowly defined, but rather refer to “the ensemble of the phenomenon in and through which social production of meaning takes place” (Laclau, 1980, cited in Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 42). Dispositive analysis goes beyond the study of language in use in an attempt to more fully understand the production, substance, and implications of discourse. As Jäger & Maier (2009) described, “everything in human consciousness is discursive”, and subjects continually draw upon this constituted knowledge that is evident in non-discursive practices and materializations (p. 45). Thus the purpose of this dissertation is to reconstruct the tacit knowledge that embodies the discourse and shapes the identity of the artist/teacher.
The subject comes to embody the discursive positions made available to them through the way they view themselves, through their performativity and how they present themselves to others. Their stories are thus analyzed for the way they embody discourse and provide a rationale for their who and what they are. For this aspect of my dispositive analysis, my focus will be upon how discourse influences the way artist/teachers articulate their identity, and how, utilizing elements of discourse, they actively shape their stories to fit the circumstances. While discourse is not formally imposed, its language becomes so pervasive that an individual’s experiences come to be articulated in specific terms. Narratives draw upon discourse to consistently articulate a model in a recognizable form. By examining the discursive characteristics of their stories, I will also look carefully at the social dimensions of discourse, and how shared resources of rhetoric and narrative are deployed to generate recognizable subjects. I will examine how the artist/teacher constructs their identity narratively and consider how their stories create the illusion of agency.

Discourse provides a distinct language utilized by storytellers to shape their own accounts, roles, and identities. These accounts, roles, and identities, in turn, exemplify and reinforce discourse. Additionally, my analysis will include an exploration of how these narratives function to establish, maintain, and reinforce this subject position, and consider how storytelling constructs the social form. Everyone is influenced by his or her own biases. The narrative reality they construct “tells the story of a social world with its own rules of description and narrative preferences … that privileges particular accounts
and disparages others” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 16). Often, at the same time, this inevitability of positionality limits one’s ability to ‘see’ alternative perspectives.

Jäger & Maier’s (2009) relied upon prior knowledge, and textual descriptions as the focus of their analysis of objects as materializations. This step of analysis becomes an extension of my analysis of the artist/teacher narratives—as practitioners who identify with this subject position—as available texts for structural and detailed analysis. I will examine their stories that they have written to reveal the discursive conventions and linguistic resources available to them. What I will be looking for in this aspect of my analysis is how discourse establishes codes of conduct, creates linkages between power and knowledge, and how it shapes identity. Jäger & Maier (2009) suggested the researcher extend his or her knowledge by “drawing on the pertinent literature, and by questioning users, producers and other persons who are experts on the materialization in questions” (p. 59). Much of the literature, for example, describes not just the practices of the artist/teacher, but focuses upon role and identity, and what it means to be an artist/teacher. What I have established through my review of the relevant literature, is to reveal how previous research has already “discursified the materialization in question” (ibid). I have explored narrative as well as academic accounts that “produce subjects, texts, knowledge, and authority,’ especially in relation to other social activities and circumstances” (Briggs cited in Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. xv).

My analysis is limited to textual by-products; however, these stories, particularly when exploring issues of identity, are significant in that they reveal how these individual’s make sense of their own experiences. All elements of dispositive analysis are
bound by language in use. What takes this study beyond a discursive analysis of the artist/teacher is linking knowledge to actions (non-discursive practices) and to explore how actors construct their identity along the social dimensions of discourse (materializations). By incorporating the artist/teacher narratives, my methods of analysis involve “the close scrutiny of circumstances, their actors, and actions in the process of formulating and communicating accounts” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 22). While Jäger & Maier (2009) emphasized that the meaning of materializations are not fixed, each of the meanings associated with the knowledge embedded in these discursive strands are strongly tied to distinct power relations. One of the primary purposes of this study is to render the power relations manifest in the materialization of the subject of this discourse visible. What subjects say and how they use language as they describe and articulate their identity will be particularly significant in revealing these power dynamics.
CHAPTER 5 — DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

5.1 Structural Analysis

Rather than conducting a detailed analysis of each article, I will begin by providing a general introduction and structural analysis of the journal as a whole. Then I will provide a detailed analysis based upon the different discursive strands extracted from all of the volumes and issues of this journal that fell within the scope of this analysis. Wherever practical, I have used the author’s words, rather than my own summaries, to be able to communicate the values they expressed, as well as using their words as a means of analysis of the language in use that is representative of the discourse.

My structural analysis included a review of the authors and abstracts of every article and feature from nine years of the Teaching Artist Journal. Based upon my general research questions, I searched for and identified articles that addressed the question, “Why does this conflict exist in the first place?” From a Foucauldian perspective, I also searched for articles that addressed issues of identity and subjectivity, particular in how the authors described themselves and their practices. The initial questions I utilized upon beginning my structural analysis included;

— What are the characteristics of the teaching artist?

— Identity: How do they describe themselves?
—How do they describe themselves as an artist?
—How do they describe themselves as a teacher?
—How do they describe their practices?

My structural analysis also revealed recurring themes that I identified as additional discursive strands that were relevant to my analysis of identity and subjectivity. The discursive strands included:

—Are these characteristics unique to the teaching artist, or are they signs of good teaching?
—How has teaching affected them as artists?
—Who should teach art?
—Professionalism
—Legitimacy
—Formal Certification as a Teaching Artist
—Resistance
—Teaching Artist vs. Art Teacher
—Reclaiming One’s Artistic Identity
—The Role of the Teaching Artist

These strands were significant in that they raised issues and questions that the journal was addressing regarding the role and identity of the teaching artist. Subsequent analysis focused upon a detailed analysis of all the articles identified and categorized according to the relevant discursive strands. From a Foucauldian perspective, the recurring themes represented by these discursive strands formed the bases for the regulating practices that
contribute to the discourse, particularly with regard to the formation of a distinct and recognizable subject. These collective reflections were representative of a discourse promoting the role and identity of the teaching artist. These narratives represent different versions and different visions of who they are, where they come from, where they are going, and who they might become.

These discursive strands were also chosen because they emphasized aspects of the dispositive that included language (thought), actions (practices), and materializations—in this case, how their narratives aligned or resisted the general discourse. The discussion and analysis of these discursive strands was generally organized by these three categories, as well as to construct a cohesive and progressive research narrative. When people choose to identify themselves in terms of a specific role, it is often because it aligns with a particularly strong narrative within which they can identify. Within each discursive strand, I looked for both how these stories formed a consistent narrative that could contribute to the constitutive characteristics of the teaching artist. Competing versions of history are about power and who shapes the discourse, as well as revealing voices of dissent and resistance.

5.1.1 Why was this journal selected? Who are the editors/authors?

In the words of the founder and the original editor, The Teaching Artist Journal represents “the voice of Teaching Artists” (Booth, 2003, p. 131). Booth also revealed, “most of our writers have never written for a journal before” (2004, p. 211). Yet, at the
same time, many of the brief author biographies that accompany the articles include descriptions that use adjectives such as “expert” or “master.” Many of the articles represent both common and diverse characterizations of teaching artist practices (Erickson, 2003), while focusing upon establishing “a new standard of professionalism for this burgeoning field” (Reeder, 2009, p. 244, emphasis mine).

Consequently, this journal was selected to examine the narratives of self-identified teaching artists as a means to explore how they are employing and shaping the discourse, and to uncover the discursive positions and ideologies that establish and perpetuate this particular discourse. I am organizing my analysis by the relevant discursive strands I have identified through my review of nine years of the Teaching Artist Journal. This includes questions raised throughout the journal as they pertain to my research questions.

5.1.2 What are the goals and objectives of this publication?

The goals and objectives include the journal’s contribution to the professional development and professionalization of the teaching artist, and to “advance the field of teaching artistry” (Reeder, 2008, p. 150). Lichtenstein (2009) explained the goal of this publication was to create a dialog amongst like-minded people as a means to legitimize the work of the teaching artist “against the backdrop of larger social, cultural, political, and educational issues” (p. 156). Yet this emphasis is indicative of a struggle for legitimating both the discourse and practice.
Referring to professionalization as a “national trend” (Booth, 2003, p. 131) suggested a societal barrier to artists teaching which the journal presents as an opportunity to legitimate the field, as well as revealing some voices of resistance. Interestingly, the discursive strand of resistance is directed toward the credentialing and certification as teachers, at the same time that professional practice is utilized to differentiate themselves as artists.

Part of the role of the journal is to contribute to this dialog, and to provide “a forum for sharing ideas and advancing teaching artists’ knowledge and skills related to the arts, education, and teacher professional development” (Duma & Silverstein, 2008, p. 124). Booth defined “dialogue” as finding shared meaning through words that together establish “solid stones of understanding to place at the foundation of our burgeoning profession” (2004, p. 211), which suggests a normalization or standardization of principles and practices.

5.1.3 What implications and illusions does this journal contain?

In another reference, Booth suggested “a plan to standardize TA practice (the strength of which is its creative individuality)” (Booth, cited in Norman, 2004, p. 212, emphasis mine), yet the notion of ‘standardized practice’ juxtaposed against ‘creative individuality’ seem contradictory in nature. Other language references documenting best practices and the ability to “articulate our work clearly and consistently” (Ponder, 2004, pp. 113-114, emphasis mine), with the purpose of utilizing intentional dialogue to clarify
“our collective pedagogical and aesthetic intentions” (Lichtenstein, 2009, p. 156, emphasis mine) equally suggest a normalization of practices.

5.1.4 What subject positions are mentioned and how are they portrayed?

The most prominent subject position evident in the Teaching Artist Journal is obviously that of the teaching artist, in schools as well as in museums and community settings. There are also discussions regarding the “teacher,” particularly in the context of arts advocacy and arts integration. But perhaps most curious is the absence of the voice of the art teacher, or arts specialist. The most prominent subject position in terms of analysis is that of the artist.

5.1.5 Content and Ideological Statements

The Teaching Artist Journal, as described by Hunt, Sansom & Smerdon (2004), “is the only professional journal in America for artists of all disciplines, who are also dedicated to teaching” (p. 228, emphasis mine). It has often been argued within the context of this journal that the professional artist is best suited to teach the arts. The rationale basis for this argument is based upon the intimate connection to their identity as an artist:

I find that even some extraordinary Teaching Artists, doing remarkable work in dance, don’t know of the knowledge about dance that has developed outside university dance departments. They need to keep abreast of what is learned about
their art form as it continues to connect to the larger body of knowledge about
dance in the education world. (Hanna, 2004, p. 105)

This emphasis upon the role of the artist begins to establish a distinct hierarchy that
persists throughout the journal.

5.2 Detailed Analysis

5.2.1 What are the characteristics of the teaching artist?

What distinguishes a teaching artist? Often times, even in the context of this
journal, the term teaching artist is used at different times to refer to “classroom teachers,
arts specialists, teaching artists, higher education faculty, and members of arts and
cultural institutions who provide arts instruction” (Reeder, 2008, pp. 147-148). Since the
Lincoln Center Institute first coined the term teaching artist in the early 1970s, there have
been attempts to quantify “the unique characteristics necessary for artists who choose to
work in educational settings” (Reeder, 2009, p. 14).

Teaching Artist is the term generally used in the United States to describe
“professional artists who spend a percentage of their time teaching in educational settings
such as schools, community centers, etc. to meet curriculum goals or other learning
goals” (Hunt, Sansom & Smerdon, 2004, p. 228). As a practice, teaching artists initially
appeared in the schools as a response to the marginalization of arts education in public
schools; in an effort
to preserve some semblance of the arts in the schools, principals started to expand the stand-alone field trip to Carnegie Hall or the Metropolitan Museum of Art, for example, by asking artists from the cultural institution to come to the school and prepare the students for the concert or exhibit. (Cohen, 2005, p. 45)

On the surface, the teaching artist would appear to possess the best qualities of both roles, including “some type of formal training and professional practice in their respective art form “as well as ‘some type of training in educational pedagogy’” (Larson, 2004, p. 13). Practitioners would generally be agreed to be “accomplished artists in their field(s),” and provide expertise in teaching that includes organizational abilities, people management, knowledge of organizational systems (e.g. schools, prisons, park districts, etc.), ability to teach (to transfer knowledge to others governed by age, gender, physical, cultural, and brain development considerations), and knowledge about current trends in the organizational system into which they are hired.

(Erickson, 2003, p. 141, emphasis mine)

Teaching artists are “artists of all disciplines—in dance, music, theater, visual and folk arts, writing and electronic media—who balance the two careers of art and teaching” (Editorial note, cited in Hunt, Sansom & Smerdon, 2004, p. 229, emphasis mine). This dual role, as it is described, demonstrates a “demand for artists with an ‘expanded array of skills’” that encompass both advocacy and education (Market Demand, 2004, p. 117, emphasis mine). Yet, the emphasis of the discourse continually seems to turn toward one’s identity as an artist, one who better understands the creative

Montalvo\(^3\) described teaching artists as “professional artists who concurrently dedicate themselves to arts education, with both artistic and educational skills, teaching within and beyond their artistic discipline” (Shepherd, 2007, p. 255). To emphasize a distinction, Upitis defined artists as “those who identify art making as their primary vocation, and artist-teachers as those who are active in art making with a primary vocation as teachers” (cited in Brown, 2007, p. 67). Although there is an added emphasis upon teaching abilities, the emphasis of being a ‘professional artist’ resonates.

Throughout the pages of this journal, the teaching artist is continually described as “a practicing professional artist, with many of the skills and sensibilities of an educator, who collaborates with certified teachers to design and implement units of instruction aimed at engaging students in learning in or through the arts” (Norman, 2004, p. 218). The word professional serves as both an adjective and a noun, and, according to the OED describes senses relating to or derived from (the conduct of) a profession or occupation, and/or as one engaged in a profession, esp. one requiring special skill or training; belonging to the professional classes, in contrast to an amateur. Whereas certified, as an adjective, refers more directly such skills as affirmed or attested.

A teaching artist is expected to possess a high knowledge of art form, and ideally demonstrate “mastery of and ability to explain relevant historical, cultural and societal contexts of art form” (Norman, 2004, p. 219, emphasis mine). Their level of professional

\(^3\) An arts organization near San Jose, CA that sponsors a Teaching Artist Fellowship.
experience as an artist is established by achieving “a high degree of recognition (e.g.; nationally or internationally) and possess[ing] an extensive portfolio” (Norman, 2004, p. 219). Even a cursory analysis of this literature reveals a distinct emphasis and/or bias towards one’s identity as an artist.

Continual references to “the work of artists who teach” (Reeder, 2011, p. 116), and the ability to “think like an artist” (Ruppert, cited in Reeder, 2010, p. 41) also sets the stage for the ideological argument as to whom is best suited to teach the arts. No one seems to be arguing against the value of an extensive content knowledge as an attribute for a teacher, but a very distinct argument, as I will explore, has been fashioned for the preference of the artist as a professional. One program hired five teaching artists “because of their professional experience in art … and [their] interest in teaching” (Betts, 2008, p. 267). This suggests that teaching artists are valued more as artists than as teachers. As such, this ideal becomes more firmly entrenched as it not only defines the characteristics of the teaching artist, but by driving the discourse that shapes and maintains the subject position. By limiting the possibilities, or the articulation of these roles, the discourse mediates the formation of their identity.

5.2.2 Identity: How do they describe themselves?

In Zwirn’s (2006), she described her male subjects as having expressed a strong sense of themselves as artists; “Many achieved this sense at a young age and sustained it tenaciously, whether or not circumstances allowed them to create art. For these individuals being an artist was natural and innate” (p. 169). Other subjects throughout the
journals exhibited a similar predisposition toward their identities as artists: “A Teaching Artist is always balancing two roles, and I had to tip my balance from the T side to the A side” (Wood, 2005, p. 7). Hartenstein described how his definition of being an artist has evolved:

In art school (college) we were told that ‘Art is what artists do.’ I now think that art is more closely related to ‘who we are’ than ‘what we do’ and that as young minds grow and acquire skills and knowledge, being an ‘artist’ is something that is essential to being a person. (cited in Alexander, 2005, p. 90)

5.2.3 As an Artist

Artists are a recent phenomenon in K-12 public education in the United States; “over time, they have acted as performers, demonstrators of their craft, and mentors to those with talent” (Remer, 2003, p. 69, emphasis mine). This suggests both a distinct role of the artist as a teacher and for arts education in general. It also begins to make a distinction between the teaching artist and the arts specialist—or what we might more familiarly refer to as an art teacher.

In the context of forming their identity, the term artist often assumes a dominant role, one that can have a significant influence on one’s teaching practice. Erin Tapley, an Associate Professor of Art Education describes herself as “an active exhibiting artist who teaches all students using a studio approach” (2004, p. 24). A significant number of teaching artists identify as “an artist, first and foremost” (Zwirn, 2006, p. 169), or as an
artist “who sometimes works with kids in schools” (Erickson, 2003, p. 135). Artists become teaching artists “with the strength of their art behind them” (Smerdon, cited in Hunt, Sansom & Smerdon, 2004, p. 230). As artists, they “devote their lives to a particular form or discipline” (Gunn, 2005, p. 122) and exhibit “a depth of talent that comes from a life of practice and discipline” (Fitzhugh & LaPadula, 2004, p. 42).

The Teaching Artist Journal emphasizes this aspect of their identity through language that echoes the almost mythical qualities associated with artists. Part of what they are seemingly trying to establish is that not everyone can be an artist; consequently, this same exclusory illusion affects how one approaches the teaching of art:

The real skills cannot be taught; artists have to have the potential to do this kind of work, and we try to nurture their inclination to go deeper. (Rhodes, cited in McCaslin, Rhodes, & Lind, 2004, p. 148)

The Teaching Artist Journal speaks of developing the “students’ abilities to identify, speak, and write about the universal themes contained in the work they create,” and learning “how to articulate how they use their art form” (Gunn, 2005, pp. 122-123, emphasis mine), which emphasizes very formal qualities for the teaching of art. Admittedly,

defining what artists do and why they do it is never easy. When one is presented with an artistic challenge, there is a tendency to look at the self, the materials, the parameters, the audience, and the purpose as elements thrown into the mix. In other words, these components can be looked at separately and then together. (Hochtritt, 2007, p. 194, emphasis mine)
Considering the aspects of one’s identity as both an artist and a teacher has most often been articulated as separate:

One’s identity as an artist can be powerful and domineering:

For many years I used to believe that there was no way to get to anywhere as an artist if it wasn’t through doing the specific thing an artist designates to oneself when one becomes art conscious. There is an unwritten law that states that artists must make their art to validate their claim to the professional title. I was trained as a studio painter, and for many years after I left school I felt that if I stopped painting or dedicated less time to my studio practice that it would disqualify me as an artist. (Lucero, 2006, p. 93)

Shepherd (2007) described three kinds of teaching artists. The largest section lying at the base of his pyramidal model consists of “artists who are skilled in their art form” (p. 253). Not only is the identity as an artist dominant, no mention of one’s role as a teacher is even mentioned. The next section above the base characterizes teaching artists as “artists who are skilled in their art form” but who can also work well with young people in educational settings—perhaps either teaching their art form or integrating their art form with another subject area” (Shepherd, 2007, p. 253, emphasis mine). Here, the duality of the role emerges, yet the primary identification as an artist remains evident.

Shepherd (2007) continued to ascend up the pyramid to describe smaller and smaller percentages of teaching artists who, in addition to their artistic ability “excel at teaching young people” yet continually refers to them as “artists” (p. 253). Often, artist’s teaching practices reflect they way they were trained. For one to assume the role of the
artist in this sense takes years of training and refinement of technique often associated with MFA programs whose primary goal is to train artists. One of the requisite requirements of the teaching artist seems to be their “demonstration of continued growth as an artist” (Barrett, 2003, p. 200, emphasis mine).

5.2.4 As a Teacher

As an educator, Powell (2006) argued, “the Teaching Artist must be prepared to teach with knowledge and skill in curriculum and pedagogy while giving serious consideration to her own teaching philosophy” (p. 279). Yet this aspect of their identity continues to be dominated by the discursive characteristics that emphasize one’s role as an artist, as in “artists who teach” (Erickson, 2003, p. 142, emphasis mine). Ironically, one’s abilities as an artist don’t seem to be supported or valued in a teacher. As one teaching artist recalled;

I was told: “You are too good to be a high school teacher.” Then in college: “You need to be an art professor.” When I graduated I realized that I did not know all the range of opportunities to teach and work as a teaching artist. (cited in Barniskis, 2011, p. 202)

Many teaching artists don’t initially go to school to become teachers, rather their focus and their training was on becoming an artist:

I see myself primarily as an artist who creates work, but teaching definitely has become and is becoming a bigger part of my life. Initially, 10 years ago, teaching was an opportunity to make money—it was an opportunity to support myself. But
then I realized teaching was more rewarding than just a paycheck. (Loney, cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 172)

Many artists initially struggle as teachers; “I am not deeply versed in all the various philosophies and pedagogies that have informed the current educational system in the United States” (cited in Barniskis, 2007, p. 159). A prominent discursive strand that has emerged from this journal has been the need and support for professional development, with an emphasis towards “artists who need to acquire (or have already) the skills of teaching in educational settings” (Sansom, cited in Hunt, Sansom & Smerdon, 2004, p. 229). At the same time, as teachers, they are often urged “to be working artists staying connected to their artmaking” (Rhodes, cited in McCaslin, Rhodes, & Lind, 2004, p. 146), but are there other ways to stay connected that provide more synergies between these roles?

The lack of an overarching definition or characterization of the teaching artist does make describing, supporting, and strengthening the practice a challenge, yet perhaps the diversity of meanings and terms reflects the enormous diversity and vitality of work of both artists and teachers, and the range of learning and the many purposes served.

5.2.5 How do they describe their practices?

Artists often start out teaching the way they were taught: ‘Because we teach artistic technique and model hard work and discipline, teachers start to teach art as an artist would, and students understand that achievement in the arts is attainable through work and discipline” (Gutiérrez, cited in Treichel, 2008, pp 55-56).
Larson & Perlstein (2003) are amongst those who believe that teaching artists have a distinct expertise that is unique within art education. They argued that teaching artists “know how to merge their aesthetic and their educational or social aims” as well as being able to recognize “the aesthetic tastes of one’s population” (Larson & Perlstein, 2003, p. 146). They also suggested that another core skill of the teaching artist is their sensitivity to the population with whom they work, and their ability to match “their curriculum to the developmental needs of the populations they serve” (Larson & Perlstein, 2003, p. 147). While an aesthetic sensibility would arguably be unique to the artist, the ability to relate educational experiences to the lives and needs of the students certainly is not. Perhaps the emphasis upon sound pedagogical practices is indicative of the continued struggle of the teaching artist for legitimacy in the classroom.

For example, Brownlee (2003) suggested, “deeper engagement is observed when youth integrate the arts and academic learning” (p. 83). The studio habits of mind; engage and persist, envision, express, observe, reflect, and stretch and explore (Hetland, Winner, Veenema & Sheridan, 2007), are characteristics the teaching artist may recognize from their own artistic practices and, in turn, may incorporate them into their teaching practices. Yet these “inclinations,” as Rabkin suggested, “are general cognitive capacities that can be profitably applied in any classroom, not just the art studio” (cited in Hornbacher, 2008, p. 238).

Brownlee also suggested “the artistic experience allows youth to create, perform and respond. Even the act of watching or listening to an artistic event requires some involvement from the audience, whether it is an emotional response or making meaning.
of what one is experiencing” (2003, p. 84). He also argued, “the arts are inherently about activity, energy, action, meaning, connection, decision making and reflection” (Brownlee, 2003, p. 84), but he is starting to drift into a more general argument regarding how the integration of the arts engages the student in the learning experience as opposed to demonstrating the unique characteristics of the teaching artist. He continued to try and demonstrate how what is happening in the arts classroom might promote a higher level of engagement:

> When the artistic process is coupled with a safe and secure learning environment with Teaching Artists who are sincere and supportive, the result is youth who are deeply engaged with learning new skills and growing in unique and profound ways. (Brownlee, 2003, p. 85)

But aren’t creating a safe and secure environment, or having a sincere and supportive teacher indicators of good teaching practices in general? Brownlee emphasized promoting student engagement through active, experiential instructional approaches, demonstrating respect for learners, individual instruction, encouraging individual expression, multiple instructional deliveries including demonstration and modeling (cited in Franklin, 2005), amongst others, yet again, these emphasize pedagogical practices, not artistic ones.

The presence of an artist in the classroom has the potential to make a great impression on the students; it allows them “to see their mentors as artists who struggle with techniques and ideas, just as they do” (Tapley, 2004, p. 23). The significant distinction to be made with this statement is that the discourse of the teaching artist often
portrays the artist as an export, or as a master of their craft—wherein lies the danger of presenting material and practices that are beyond the developmental abilities of the children.

Rhodes suggested the art form could be used as “another way to teach curricula … to reach students who may not learn well using only the traditional classroom methods” (cited in McCaslin, Rhodes, & Lind, 2004, p. 146). This perspective clearly establishes artistic practices as pedagogical tools, yet still serves more to justify the presence of the artist in the classroom rather than addressing the conflict between roles.

Wasserman (2003) suggested that the learning experience can be made more meaningful by a teaching artist who “engaged the students kinesthetically as well as intellectually” (p. 104). While such instruction can enhance the learning experience by appealing to diverse learning styles, again, this is hardly unique to the teaching artist.

In this excerpt, Saraniero (2004) argued that teaching artists facilitate learning through problem-solving:

So often our work as Teaching Artists is exactly this—asking students to address a problem or issue, either individually or as a group. Teaching Artists have a wealth of experience in this area. When we are successful, we have not led our students to a specific answer or solution. They have found it themselves. …

Teaching Artists do not prescribe solutions—they search for them. (p. 178, emphasis mine)

On one hand, while differentiated learning and problem-solving are valued aspects of instructional delivery in any classroom, the realities of standards and testing diminish the
integration of these strategies into the classroom. On the other hand, Saraniero’s emphasis on experience continues to emphasize the teaching artist as a practicing professional. While a professional practice arguably can bring different and dynamic perspectives to the classroom, these teaching strategies are not unique to the artist or the art classroom.

Conversely, in the same article, Saraniero also suggested, “good teaching is not always about imparting knowledge. It is often about discovery and hard work” (p. 179, emphasis mine). Here, she is emphasizing the teaching aspect of the teaching artist, rather than the dominant emphasis on their role as an artist—as well as deemphasizing their role as an expert, which is often a focal point of differentiation.

Powell (2006) recalled a report that stressed employing an expert pedagogy, “which takes advantage of constraints, affordances, prompts, cues, scaffolding, metaphoric roles for the educator, and classroom norms” (p. 276). But the emphasis on being an expert either as an artist or as a teacher, limits the role of either—and certainly as an articulated identity—to a distinct conception of teaching and learning.

Artists, Fitzhugh & LaPadula (2004) argued, are able to “illuminate the human condition—the politics, the social climate, the economics of current thought, and the emotions behind it all” (p. 41). Yet they don’t present a convincing argument that this falls beyond the purview of the art teacher. In making her case for the artist, Treichel (2008) argued that what makes the teaching artist unique is not only that they make art, but they also “have a deep understanding of art” (Treichel, 2008, p. 58, emphasis mine).
While it is not clear what constitutes a deep understanding, this continues to position the artist as an expert, which in turn narrows the role of the teacher.

Others have suggested some unique qualities that the artist can bring to their teaching. Brownlee (2003), for example, described what the teaching artist does “intuitive,” and suggested as a consequence, “the field has not created an overall scheme or framework that explicitly states or describes much of the cognitive and meta-cognitive processes at work in creating and responding to art” (p. 81). While this begins to describe how aspects of the artist’s process might be integrated into the classroom, the desire to create such a framework is a significant discursive strand throughout this journal.

Lichtenstein (2009) suggested that the artist “can seduce teacher and students into world of art making” and is able to demystify “the artistic experience” (p. 162, emphasis mine). This statement, however, continues to focus on artistry and a narrow perception of the artist that can serve to perpetuate a status of exclusion. Later, Lichtenstein points to the teaching artists “role in making communication audible and visible” (2009, p. 162). This clearly creates a link between the practices of the artist, and the diversity of learning styles that are indicative of diverse instructional delivery. Similarly, Reeder (2009) alludes to the teaching artists integrating “creative engagement as an instructional method” (p. 245). Yet neither of the statements seem to indicate practices that extend beyond the ability of an art teacher.

In attempting to illustrate the distinction, Springgay also argued that it is important for teaching artists to be practicing artists;
They bring this passion and *lived experience* with them into the classroom. Often art educators, although committed to the arts, are removed from the daily “being” of artistic creation, and thus art education becomes something distant, “out there,” and separate. Instead, Teaching Artists are in the midst of art, and they bring this aspect of their lives into the teaching practice. (cited in Barrett, 2003, p. 200, emphasis mine)

While *passion* is a trait that many teachers share regardless of subject or discipline, *lived experience* is perhaps unique, but is the lived experience as an artist relevant to a general arts education, or does it suggest a more specific role emphasizing one’s training as an artist? Perhaps the relationship between the roles is more complicated than that and is also contingent upon experience both as an artist and as a teacher. Echoing a common sentiment, Ortiz (2011) referred to bringing his “different point of view as [an artist]” to the classroom as a point of differentiation (p. 108). What this statement—and others like it—convey, still represent the identity of the artist as the dominate construct, whereas other narratives are constructing a distinct perspective that articulates aspects of the artist and the teacher in a more integrated role.

Jaffe (2008) suggested, “part of the *artistry* of TA-ing to know how to critique and provoke in ways that create rather than limit possibilities for students” (p. 258, emphasis mine). While he is using characteristics of the artist to describe the practices of the teaching artist, the continual emphasis upon *artistry* refers to a specific role for art education that focuses on a distinct and singular notion of the artist. The frequent use of
the term illustrates the development of common vocabulary that suggests a pattern that continues to shape the discourse.

Tapley (2004) argued:

All art students should gain some experiences that more accurately reflect the lives of professional artists such as: what is it like to be self-propelled? […] What is it like to be in the constant company of art-minded people? How do artists teach themselves to become better at their objectives and techniques? How do artists regenerate and share their creative spirit? (p. 21)

The notion of reflecting the life of artist equally suggests an emphasis towards training as an artist, but then Tapley elaborated more specifically on some of the experiences that may be more applicable to issues of teaching and learning.

Similarly, Kotler (2004) advocated for teaching artists “to think critically about their approaches to the art form and how they can draw upon these approaches in the classroom” (p. 82). While this line of thinking might suggest more unique characteristics of the teaching artist, they aren’t well represented through these narratives. I would also argue that even these characteristics might be contingent upon the unique combination an individual possesses as both an artist or a teacher—otherwise this would suggest that all artists would be effective teachers. Norman (2004) also alluded to the combined characteristics of the artist and the teacher; “The Teaching Artist makes learning come alive by engaging students in the art form and allowing them to experience the creative process” (p. 217). Here, the emphasis on experiencing the creative process is decidedly
within the realm of the artist, yet the ability to make learning come alive could be attributed to many teachers.

Weiss (2006) described a particular distinction of the artist as their ability to bring “a practitioner’s eye to the job” (p. 25). On one hand, the possibility to integrate the experiences and practices of the practitioner into the classroom is a quality unique to the arts—yet these stories don’t fully articulate why that is important. Graham (2009) observed “how some teaching artists engender a classroom dynamic that can transform the mundane traditions of school into something more meaningful, interesting, and relevant to the lives of students and teachers” (p. 86), which, on the surface points to a quality that is not necessarily unique to the teaching artist. But he elaborates and contextualizes more specifically how the teaching artists can accomplish this by again, more closely articulating the practices of the artist with those of the teachers:

Artists create difficulties everywhere because of the way they prize authentic experience and resist explanatory systems or social structures that render students and teachers as passive receptacles of prepackaged knowledge. (Greene “Landscapes of Learning”, cited in Graham, 2009, p. 86)

But here, perhaps, is the most complete and compelling articulation of the unique attributes that the teaching artist can bring to the classroom:

Teaching artists model a fundamental learning disposition—that thoughtful investigation of matters of personal concern leads to satisfying learning experiences that is at the heart of lifelong learning. Does that mean that teaching artists are diminishing the integrity of the art they teach? Not at all. In fact, they
may capture the dynamic of creating a work of art even more fully than fine teachers in studio classrooms. Teaching artists, like many contemporary artists, bring powerful questions and experiences from the broader world and from the lived experience of their students into the classroom. And engaging the world is every bit as intrinsic to the arts as is engaging the material, tools, or techniques of the art form, as intrinsic as envisioning and planning, reflecting, or exploring.

(Rabkin, cited in Hornbacher, 2008, p. 240)

What is particularly compelling from Rabkin’s narrative is his use of language, and how he is able to draw parallels with a common vocabulary. For example, the thoughtful investigation of matters artfully describes practices that can be attributed to both the artist and the teacher, and clearly demonstrates the relevance to the classroom. And at the same time, the emphasis shifts towards the unique characteristics of the teaching artist rather than focusing solely on the identity of the artist alone.

It has often been suggested that teaching artists have unique distinguishing characteristics:

They are inquisitive—they want to know what works in the classroom and, more important, why it works. They are analytical—they examine their teaching process so they can explain it clearly to non–arts teachers. They are self-aware—they honestly assess their strengths and weaknesses. They are reflective—they try to understand the variables that make one lesson work better than another. They are supportive—they know how to set up an environment to promote risk taking. They are firm and consistent—they know how to set clear expectations and are
skilled at classroom management. They attend to detail—they know the clearest language to use and how each word choice affects student understanding and their subsequent work. They are creative—they seek new solutions. They are articulate and responsive—they know how to pose and respond to questions, how to lead discussions, and how to give feedback. They know how to engage students in talking about what they learned and the process they used. (Duma & Silverstein, 2008, p. 120)

This list of attributes focuses less on content and more on how it is presented. It suggests, as Lichtenstein argued, that “[teaching artists] have ideas about how people best teach and learn” in addition to knowledge about art and art making, and stresses their ability to animate those ideas (2009, p. 156).

Booth (2005) professed that teaching skills enrich the relationship of the teaching artist to their students because they are able to:

- refresh our creative foundations because we are alive to process, risktaking and the power of choices and mistakes; provoke deeper questions of ourselves and our artmaking; circumvent cynicism because we foster and witness awe, wonder, and the raw power of artistic engagement on a regular basis. (p. 3)

Yet rather than simply exposing the attributes and the mythical qualities of the artist, he begins to emphasize the pedagogical practices together with the artistic ones, suggesting it is perhaps not the teaching artists characteristics solely as an artist, by rather the unique articulation of the two combined.
5.2.6 Are these characteristics unique to the teaching artist, or are they signs of good teaching?

Hetland (2009) described her observations of one teaching artist requiring students to do what artists do:

Students practiced speaking clearly in their roles; they found ways to use expression to inhabit and convey their characters; they projected in order to be heard; they memorized so that they could act unencumbered.” (p. 37)

While we might think of developing craft as intrinsic to the arts, “these qualities can exist anywhere” (Hetland, 2009, p. 38). The prolonged engagement and the persistence that this fostered, Hetland conceded, are qualities of good teaching in any subject:

We need to argue that it is these qualities—intrinsic to the arts—that are valued in every domain but not necessarily taught in those subjects in school. That’s what makes the arts such potent resources for teaching valued dispositions—what the arts teach well is not used uniquely in the arts but is valuable across a wide spectrum of contexts. (2009, p. 38)

Perhaps in defense of learning that goes on in the classroom, Wallace (2005) described play as a meaningful learning experience enhanced through art:

Playfulness is not just an extra ingredient to “spice up” a lesson; it is a way of thinking, being, and perceiving. It is more a philosophy of mindfulness than a method of teaching. Play brings a certain degree of variability and risk, and we must sensitively negotiate these aspects in order to maintain the trust and comfort of our students and partner teachers. Because not all play proves constructive, we
must be ever vigilant to ensure that it leads to richer thinking, learning, and perceiving. (p. 252)

Oreck (2005) suggested:

For students to do their best, they must be fully engaged in interesting and satisfying artistic experiences. This is the primary challenge to the validity of any arts assessment. If the artistic experience is not engaging and authentic, then the students’ responses are unlikely to be artistic. (p. 223, emphasis mine)

Students tend to be more engaged when any learning experience is interesting and satisfying, not just artistic one’s. While Oreck is assigning validity to the assessment, on a deeper level, he is establishing validity based upon the authenticity of the artistic experience. It is not clear on what basis he is making the claim of authenticity, but in the context of his conversation regarding teacher and artist collaborations, one can only conclude that he is using this to establish the differences between the artistic capabilities of the artist and the teacher.

Teaching artists, Brown (2007) argued “understand the importance of developing a learning relationship with teachers and students” (Brown, 2007, p. 67). In this sense, the art classroom, indeed, is different from a typical classroom:

The heightened engagement and deep learning that often happens in [the teaching artist’s] classrooms is linked closely with the level of community the students feel with each other and with the artist, just as it is in the studio classrooms. These overt efforts to build community and trust cultivate a learning disposition that recognizes the cognitive advantages of multiple perspectives, imaginations, and
group energy harnessed to the same material. (Rabkin, cited in Hornbacher, 2008, p. 241)

Shepherd (2007) questioned to what degree teaching artist skills were the same as teaching skills. At the same time, he wondered if such lists of the qualities and capacities for the master teaching artist were perhaps asking too much of these artists, because they were being asked to be experts in two fields. This idea of being an expert offers a limited perception of the artist or the teacher.

Franklin (2005) created such a list in an effort to identify the kinds of teaching and planning skills that should be encouraged in the professional development of the teaching artist. His list included student engagement indicators, instructional indicators, the creation of integrated units of study, classroom management, assessment, encouraging and supporting student participation, curriculum development skills, and more. Whereas Shepherd suggested that perhaps this may be too much to ask of the teaching artist, I would agree with Franklin that these are essential components for anyone engaged in a teaching and learning environment. But as to Shepherd’s original question as to whether these capacities were qualities of a good teaching artist, Gerth responded, “most of these were just traits of good teaching, period” (cited in Shepherd, 2007, p. 257). While these narratives, perhaps, start to examine some of the unique aspects of learning that occur in the art classroom; they fall short of distinguishing the practices of the teaching artist as unique.
5.2.7 How teaching has affected them as artists

The discourse of the teaching artist has extensively examined how the arts can reform education, boost economic development, expand social justice, and enhance our everyday experiences, yet little has been done to explore how teaching impacts the development of the artist. Reeder (2007) compiled the following list based upon her interviews with teaching artists; indicating specific areas of growth in the artistic practices of teaching artists that they attributed to their work with students:

When we use our artistry to teach:

We have stronger sense of our origins and life experience.

We are more frank and inquisitive about the process of discovery.

We fine-tune our expertise and develop fluency and dynamics in our media.

We understand the role of our art in the world of other artists.

We are driven to sustain art in a global community.

We use our artistry to reflect on, and transform our culture. (p. 16)

Significantly, these characteristics are not limited to one’s artistic practices, but also describe pedagogical practices as specific to teaching in the arts. This suggests a more dynamic interaction between one’s role as an artist and as a teacher. As one teaching artist reflected; “When these elements of my artistry are engaged in the process of teaching I feel more relaxed and confident and there is less conflict between my artist self and my teacher self” (Ely-Harper, cited in Reeder, 2007, p. 17).

While teaching artists continue to struggle with maintaining their artistic identity, the conflict is often shed within the confines of the classroom; “students see you as an
artist whether you feel ready for it or not” (Reeder, 2007, p. 17). Teaching in the classroom also requires a greater diversity of artistic experiences, and as Reeder suggested, this compels art teachers to continually develop their content knowledge. The ability to shed one’s label as an expert in the classroom can be a powerful learning experience for both the teacher and his or her students. Another teaching artist suggested that as a result of her teaching, she has become more of a risk-taker in her own rehearsals and performances as she works to develop and refine her own craft (Ponder, cited in Reeder, 2007). In essence, she has begun to practice what she preaches, or challenging herself to do much of what she is challenging her students to do. As Coulter reflected; “Working with kids continues to inspire me to push and stretch beyond my comfort level in my own art making, because that’s what I’m asking them to do” (cited in Treichel, 2008, p. 58).

In similar study, Upitis reported that the teaching artist’s “skills in arts making were sharpened through [teaching] experience, and new ideas about approaching their arts form were discovered” (cited in Brown, 2007, p. 68). This, in turn, also helped teaching artists to broaden their communication skills as they related to their own art forms (ibid). Often, teaching artists revealed a new found respect for the work that teachers do including classroom organization and management. At the same time, as a direct result of working with teachers and students, they also developed new skills that extended their artistic practices in “unique and exciting ways” (Brown, 2007, p. 69).
There were other teaching artists that indicated there was little or no change to their artistic practices, which Upitis attributed to the large differences in the nature of their personal work and the work they do in the classroom:

This understanding within the research study rings true for many artists and artist-teachers because what is done at a personal level is just that: “personal.” Although all experiences affect our being and may become more obvious in art-making, as interaction in educational partnerships increase over time the personal arts making process can still be removed from the work being done in the educational partnership. (cited in Brown, 2007, pp. 69)

In discussing the characteristics of the teaching artist, Graham (2009) suggested that many artists who enter the classroom as teachers “are skillful and conversant within languages of visual expression and encourage playful divergence, flexibility, and unforeseen outcomes among their students. Art, for them, is a way of understanding and seeing that allows the ordinary to become special and meaningful” (pp. 88-89). What these particular narratives suggest is that perhaps the distinctions between the roles and the practices of the artist and the teacher are not that distinct.

5.2.8 Who should teach art?

During the 50s, visual arts and music instruction was offered by specialists in secondary schools, and generally by classroom teachers in elementary schools; whereas, professional artists were often called upon to “deliver services such as in-school auditorium ‘performances’ or lecture demonstrations” (Remer, 2003, p. 71). Through the
influence of arts organizations, artists began to take a more active role creating 
instructional experiences in museums and classrooms, which lead to an emphasis upon 
“classroom management, lesson planning, and collaboration with the classroom teacher 
and arts specialists” (Remer, 2003, p. 71).

In the 60s, the emphasis of the teaching artist was to “provide authentic, quality 
‘enrichment’ in the school curriculum” (Remer, 2003, p. 73, emphasis mine). Coming to 
Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education (1977) recommended 
including artists in all aspects of education, and a later report, Can We Rescue the Arts for 
America’s Children? (ACA, 1988) suggested, “the schools, alone, cannot assume the full 
burden of educating children in the arts and [made] the case for artists and community 
resources” (Remer, 2003, p. 75). Thus the differentiation between the teaching artist and 
the arts specialist was drawn.

Many have suggested that teaching artists bring to the classroom nuanced 
qualities “that few others can” (Saraniero, 2004, p. 177), and the skills required to be an 
effective teaching artist “are unique, highly developed, and particular” (Johnson cited in 
Erickson, 2003, p. 136). But the narratives that comprise this discursive strand throughout 
the journal tend to advocate more for the inclusion of the arts in general, and characterize 
practices that are more indicative of good teaching.

Norman (2004) described the arts specialist as “a Visual Art, Music, Dance, 
Theater or Creative Writing Teacher who is certified to teach” (p. 218). Significantly, at 
no time does she use the term artist, which underscores the debate as to who is best suited 
to teach the arts—the professional artist or the certified teacher. Yet in both instances, the
case for legitimacy is based upon their claim of professionalism. Hetland (2009) referred to the teaching artist as possessing both “enthusiasm and expertise” (p. 34). Enthusiasm, I would argue, would be considered a more universal intra and interpersonal trait that quality teachers possess, while expertise continues as a prominent theme, employed primarily to distinguish one’s practices from that of the art teacher.

Teaching artists have sought to distinguish their teaching practices from that of the art teacher or art specialist in an attempt to address the issue regarding who is best “equipped, entitled or appropriate to teach the arts” (Remer, 2003, p. 70). Sansom stressed that teachers “need support from others with specialized knowledge in (the arts), while at the same time, artists need to acquire skills of teaching in educational settings” (cited in Hunt, Sansom & Smerdon, 2004, p. 231). She clearly acknowledges the need for the teaching artist to develop his or her pedagogical skills, yet understates the significance of the contributions of the art teacher. Conversely, Norman (2004) suggested the teaching artist might be inspired “by the ongoing arts instruction being provided by certified arts specialists in schools” (p. 218).

Powell (2006) argued “the Teaching Artist opens doors into new and unique ways of thinking, teaching, and learning in the classroom” (p. 279). If we are able to make such a distinction between pedagogical and artistic practices in the classroom, then are the characteristics if the teaching artists significantly different from that of the art teacher or specialist?
One could argue that a standards-based curriculum has little relevance with the lives of students. Conversely, an aspect that may make the role of the teaching artist more unique and compelling is creating a curriculum that is, as Shepard (2007) suggested, centered on creativity and curiosity, fueled by passion and personal voice, not limited to the usual boxes life offers. Students will use the artists’ lives as research and will explore their own creative and expressive impulses [...] that emphasize personal voice and curiosity across the curriculum [...] that address the big questions of life, and work with the resident artists to research these questions, as examples of creative people who live inquiry-based, idiosyncratic lives that are constructed upon very different lines. (p. 255, emphasis mine)

While perhaps illustrating the strengths and/or unique characteristics of the teaching artist, Shepard’s language continues to reflect a distinct emphasis upon the artist. Such an emphasis—even on a single word—as a discernable discursive characteristic, has a profound and limiting effect on the articulation of the subject.

Another teaching artist suggested “that some of the liberty, joy, and lifestyles of artists are still an important part of the work” (Shioya, cited in Reeder, 2010, p. 40). She advocated for teaching artists to be “responsible to education,” while at the same time recognized that often the reason that they are invited into the classroom is that they do not have the same constraints as the teacher; “we are not required to follow certain guidelines, we retain some of the freedom that is missing in learning” (cited in Reeder, 2010, p. 40).
Graham (2009) believed the teaching artist provided “an antidote to overly prescriptive curricula by making spontaneity, imagination, and creative production a central part of teaching and learning” (p. 93). I find this statement to be somewhat contradictory in its suggestion that what the teaching artist provides somehow stands outside or apart from curricula, yet simultaneously should be positioned at the center of learning. I would argue that this continues to stress the separate nature of the discourses. Interestingly, Cruz (2009) pointed to the teaching artist as providing a positive role model, yet in the context from which it is taken, it insinuates that they still emphasizing the role of the artist. Anton pointed to the perceived conflict between the arts and academic learning, then redirected the argument when he suggested that perhaps you do not need an artist in the room to provide an arts education; rather ‘you can have a teacher who brings the arts to a classroom” (cited in Barniskis, 2011, p. 202).

5.2.9 Why does this conflict exist in the first place?

As O’Fallon (2006) described, the discourse of the artist/teacher deals with two elemental forces, “the need to make art and the drive to learn” (p. 77). The combined roles of the artist and the teacher, for many, create a conflict between finding time to create art and the challenges of negotiating the classroom:

When I started teaching in 2000, all I wanted to do was quit. I wanted to be in the studio. While working as a teacher, I would daydream about the studio. My thoughts were not so much about the work I was making in the studio, just about the chance to be in the studio. I suppose I thought that if I was in the studio, I
would make more work, which would lead to more ideas, which would lead to more work, which would validate me as the artist I went to college to become! Teaching, a profession that puts a heavy demand on an artist’s time, demanded that the best hours of my days be sacrificed to it. Despite the strain that teaching had become on my studio practice, I tried to resist altering my course as a studio artist, regularly reminding my students and their parents that I was an artist and had quick intentions to move along. My understanding of the situation narrowly relied on this cliché: Those who can, do, and those who can’t, teach. The implied decentralized, collaborative, and nonegotistical culture of teaching had no place in my overly romanticized, heroic understanding of the truth-seeking studio practitioner. (Lucero, 2006, p. 93)

The balancing of one’s identity as both an artist and a teacher continues to be a major challenge for many, as reflected in the many studies and surveys described throughout the journal, and there is clearly not a consensus “about which way the scales should tip” (Erickson, 2003, p. 142):

Some of the respondents felt that once an artist makes the choice to become a TA [teaching artist], teaching becomes the focus. One TA adamantly stated that ‘most individuals generally lose most or all connection with professional pursuit of the art form once they begin teaching.’ Other respondents, however, said the expectation for balance is imperative though difficult. (cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 142)
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Further demonstrating the difficulty in balancing these roles, another respondent even wondered, “are we just a group of struggling individuals who care passionately about our respective art forms and also desire to teach” (cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 143). Many teaching artists stress the need for stability between the roles they inhabit, and that the more successful one is navigating these roles, the more successful they will be (Erickson, 2003).

For teaching artists that identify as artists before teachers, their conflict is often logistical with a focus towards “where and how they would create” (Zwirn, 2006, p. 169). One teaching artists from Chicago, for example, “talked about how staying connected to her art practice once she was out of art school was difficult” (cited in Barniskis, 2011, p. 260). This sense of balance is different. It doesn’t speak to a sense of creating a sense of identity that shares aspects of both roles; rather, it suggests a struggle to balance one’s time as an either/or proposition in which the individual slips back and forth between roles—which can cause resentment when one role doesn’t allow time for the other.

The tensions also surface in how artists and teachers view each other. As one teaching artist reflected; “Artists often view teachers as ‘intermediaries,’ or ‘bridges’ to some artists, ‘partners’ or ‘co-teachers’ to others. One artist describes herself as ‘the intuitive one,’ while her teacher partners are usually ‘linear’ or ‘sequential thinkers’” (cited in Burnaford, 2003, pp. 169-170). Another described the artist as one who “draws out,” and the teacher as one who “puts in” (cited in Burnaford, 2003, pp. 169-170). This perspective suggests divergent philosophies and practices about the nature of both teaching and art making.
Betts (2008) described a professional development workshop in which a student teaching artist also participated in the classroom with both the teaching artist and the classroom teacher. As he remarked, “not all the teaching artists were enthusiastic about having another ‘student’ in their lab. Some were worried about not knowing what to do with ‘another body that might not know any more than the kids,’ as one teaching artist put it” (Betts, 2008, p. 270). Betts also noted, “at first some of the teaching artists felt that [the student teaching artists] had been foisted upon them” (Betts, 2008, p. 274). Perhaps, as the teaching artist remarked, the classroom teacher feels an equal struggle for inclusion:

I’m also feeling kind of uncomfortable right now. Sitting in the corner and writing this reflection, I don’t know how the teacher feels about this. It might be uncomfortable for him. This is an issue to be brought up in one of those Thursday meetings. We certainly need to clarify what our role is here. (cited in Betts, 2008, p. 274)

In an effort to explore the relationship more closely, Ponder & Kissinger (2009) surveyed both teaching artists and art teachers that worked collaboratively. One art teacher responded, “she appreciated the presence of another artist and the arts being brought into the spotlight—she felt supported in working toward a common goal” (Ponder & Kissinger, 2009, p. 45). Clearly here, the art teacher is identifying as an artist as well, yet the teaching artists often seek to claim this title as a means of distinction.

Further fueling the tensions, some of the art teacher thought that the teaching artists should accommodate their classroom practices, while one teaching artist suggested
that the art teacher’s role should primarily be a disciplinary one; “keeping order during
the work and offering another pair of hands” (Ponder & Kissinger, 2009, p. 45). This dual
resentment was reinforced by art teachers who felt that teaching artists were invited into
the school due to something lacking on their part (Ponder & Kissinger, 2009). But
equally, as he demonstrated, when all parties show a willingness to learn and to help
others, the issues of conflicting roles can be resolved.

As many of the narratives from the journal reveal, the conflict often arises when
these roles are interpreted as separate and unequal, or as one aspect of the teaching
artist’s identity dominates the other:

The fatigue and stress that this balancing act brings on the artists often makes
them less than 100% in one or more arenas of their artistic life. Somebody is
going to lose out on an optimal experience with this artist, and that could be the
people attending the evening performance, or it could be the students in the
classroom. (Egan, cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 141, emphasis mine)

Even when talking about finding a balance, the emphasis on one’s identity as an artist is a
prominent strand of discourse. There are those (McCraken, 2009) that also felt that the
presence of the artist, and the focus upon artistry, had positive effects in the classroom.
Similarly, as Graham (2009) suggested, several significant things happened when he
assumed the role of the artist in the classroom:

First, I demonstrated the process of trial and revision that goes into making a
painting. Things can go wrong and I was still learning by painting. Second, I
established my willingness to work alongside my students and be more than the expert critic. (p. 90)

Graham’s perspective emphasizes the individual teaching artist shifting roles as perhaps the circumstances in the classroom demand, but this still treats the positions as separate and distinct. Often times in the classroom, different people inhabit the different roles. For example, one arts organization philosophy is that

the artist is present in classrooms as an artist first and that a student’s encounter with a working, professional artist is valuable in and of itself. The teaching and learning happens through the facilitation of artistic process, led by the artist with the support from the classroom teacher (cited in Lichtenstein, 2009, p. 159, emphasis mine).

At no point in this description do they even use the phrase, teaching artist, and the artist again, is cast in a distinctly dominant role. In this instance the roles don’t seem to converge; but rather to collide causing a conflict of priorities and methods:

Artists struggled to maintain the integrity of their own interests and questions while negotiating the desires of the teachers, whose expectations varied. Artists also reported the experience of competing with their teachers for time, often feeling a shortage of it when trying to make curricular ties. (Lichtenstein, 2009, p. 160)

At the same time, the teaching artist often faces institutional resistance when addressing the multiple identities they negotiate. As one teaching artist expressed the challenges associated with “bringing one’s artistic self into an institution, perhaps a college or
university, that might be more rigid in its expectations of what scholarship should look like” (cited in Braniskis, 2001, p. 260).

Whereas the *Teaching Artist Journal* seeks a unified concept of the roles that comprise the identity of the teaching artist, they often continue to directly contradict one another: “There were times when the teaching artist in me was nodding and agreeing while the musician was going “now hold on just a sec …” (Bertles, cited in Barniskis, 2010, pp. 58-59). As this passage suggests, the artist and the teacher come from very different worlds, engage in different practices, and utilize different languages:

In the world of schools, there is also a language for insiders. Teachers have words, phrases, and acronyms (many acronyms!) to describe their work. That language is often very different from that used by Teaching Artists coming into the school. And, even more intriguing, each seems to have very specific ways to describe the other. In fact, artists and teachers seem to view each other, in many cases, as very much ‘the other.’ (Ball & Cohen cited in Burnaford, 2003, pp. 168-169)

Much of the discourse of the artist and the teacher continues to be marked by division and separation. The seeming rigidity of the discourse is directly reflective of a lack of understanding to the multiple and changing roles of both the artist and the teacher. The predominance of the use of language that reflects the divergent nature of these roles continues to cast them as separate and distinct. The challenge becomes not how to maintain this dichotomy as a means to clarify these roles, but rather how to effectively
bridge the divide to (re)articulate these roles that comprise the identity as an artist/teacher.

5.2.10 Professionalism

The lack or recognition for the field and legitimacy for the work of teaching artists are recurring issues that have surfaced throughout the narratives represented in the *Teaching Artist Journal*:

There is a consistent call for respect for what Teaching Artists actually do and are capable of doing. Some referred to respect as credibility, others expressed a desire for appreciation. Teaching Artists want to be regarded more seriously by both those in the arts and in education, on the local, state, regional, and national levels.

(Barrett, 2003, p. 197)

Consequently the *Teaching Artist Journal* has established itself as a vocal advocate for professional growth and the credentialing of artists who teach by creating “a formally recognized profession with established competency levels, and norms of practice, memberships and benefits” (cited in Barrett, 2003, p. 200). Yet there appears to be little consensus on how to establish standards as a field, and the subsequent subjects the discourse creates.

The emphasis upon the *artist as professional* prevails as a dominant discursive strand that shapes the identity of the teaching artist. Artists working in partnerships with schools have existed for some time—often in cities where there is often less money for the arts—and sometimes in schools that have other art teachers or specialists (Hanley,
cited in Sinsabaugh, Kasmara & Wienberg, 2009, p. 95). Yet artists have typically been denied leadership roles—particularly in schools—because they are seen as not having sufficient training in education. Many in charge of hiring teaching artists have raised similar questions as to the legitimacy of the practice as a profession because many artists “do not distinguish this work as a priority in their professional life” (Erickson, 2003, p. 136). Conversely, many certified arts specialists are not considered on par with artists if they are not practicing professionals.

Serig (2011) mentioned his concern regarding the professional development for classroom teachers, seemingly referring to their lack of understanding of the depth and complexity of artistic learning. Yet at the same time, the focus on pedagogy as an aspect of the professional development for the teaching artist points to a similar lack of balance between these roles.

Many narratives suggested that the professionaization of teaching artists would be significantly improved if they “more adequately trained to work within educational institutions” (Barrett, 2003, p. 200). It is widely agreed, “a Teaching Artist needs some type of formal training and professional practice in their respective art form,” as well as “some type of training in educational pedagogy” (Erickson, 2003, p. 136). One teaching artists remarked that she “saw the credential as a “seal of approval,” indicating an artist had certain skills and knowledge. She was sensitive to the lack of teaching preparation, fearing that untrained teaching artists in schools give the trained ones a bad name” (cited in Saraniero, 2009, p. 242). The journal’s emphasis on professionalism attempts to counter this perception by establishing one’s credibility as a teacher as well as an artist.
This underscores the tensions that arise as teaching artists attempt to strike a balance between one’s multiple identities as an artist and teacher, along with the demands of the profession.

In an effort to “upgrade the positions” of teaching artists, contributors to the journal are attempting to articulate “what the practitioners view as the qualifications, skills, knowledge base, commonalities, and training required for the specialty” (Jones cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 136, emphasis mine). The notion of upgrading the position plainly speaks to the claim for legitimacy; whereas, the emphasis on qualifications and skills, and describing the role as a specialty continue to be dependent upon establishing one’s self as an expert. Professionalism is always about being accepted by someone else and submitting to an established screening system. A profession “is not recognized in our world as valid unless there is a set of standards designed by those in the field” (Jones cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 136, emphasis mine). This emphasis on recognition creates further tension as individual articulations of identity compete or conflict with professional obligations and the subject positions made available to them.

Many teaching artists stressed the need to create a set of standards that encompass art form expertise and educational practices (Erickson, 2003), yet the language used does not convey such a balance. The sense from these narratives is that they are claiming a professional status as artists, while professional development seems more directed toward claiming legitimacy as teachers. Subsequently, the tone and rhetoric of the discourse still seems to favor one’s identity and status as an artist.
5.2.11 Legitimacy

Some teaching artists have come to appreciate “the subtle but significant ways that classroom teachers can encourage creative thinking and artistic development in their students,” as well as “the unique educational benefits arts teachers bring to education, as well as the challenges arts teachers face in defining and establishing their essential role in education” (Purnell, 2005, pp. 259-260). Teaching artists, not unlike art teachers and even teachers in general, remain in a constant struggle to establish their own worth, and the perception of teaching artists “as service providers rather than [as an] educational resources” persists (Remer, 2003, p. 70). Many of the narratives within this journal described a field that continues to struggle to legitimize itself. Burman (2010) suggested “teaching artists embody two of the lowest positions in the national agenda for professionals. He says that education still holds a very low status in the scale of public and private funding, and that the arts are even lower” (cited in Reeder, 2010, p. 177).

It has been suggested that the creation of licensure, certificate, or accreditation programs would strengthen the credibility of the work of teaching artists:

I think that artists overall would benefit from improved public perception, not just as flaky people who go out and do things and will maybe get a real job when they grow up. But for people to see what artists do as an invaluable contribution to society. (Ford cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 177, emphasis mine)

Yet even when arguing for legitimacy as a teacher, the discourse of the teaching artist continues to emphasize the artist as one’s primary identity.
The narratives often return to the issue of certification, and gaining respect and legitimacy in the classroom:

If the term ‘Teaching Artist’ is to mean something in the world of professions and jobs, then there will have to be training, professional development methods and some kind of certification showing that the artist has attained at least minimum proficiency in the classroom. Such an artist should understand the state standards, should know the Essential Toolkit and should be at home in the ecology of the everyday school environment. In other words, the artist should be qualified.

(Wood, 2005, p. 10)

One teaching artist “would like to see artist educators complete a year’s study of education following a college degree. The study would not focus upon methods courses, but would include intellectually challenging courses in the philosophy of education: in educational theory, that is, the sociology and anthropology of education, urban education, cultural foundations of education, cultural studies and education; and in the history of the artist in K-12 education taught by an experienced art educator” (Davis, cited in Barrett, 2003, p. 200). Another teaching artist suggested integrating more educational and developmental theory into BFA programs, thereby “creating opportunities for those artists who may make education a part of their careers to understand the fundamental links between artistic and educational theory and practice” (Jencks, cited in Barrett, 2003, p. 200). But beyond a professional development workshop or seminar, where does one go to earn their credentials and gain expertise managing the learning environment?
In one sense, such programs already exist in the form of art education and teaching certificate programs in colleges and universities. Yet this often creates an institutional discourse that further separates the discourses of the artist and the teacher. In my experience, for example, art education programs rely heavily on fine arts programs for content knowledge, and the art education curriculum tends to focus more on methods and pedagogy, yet these students don’t tend to develop professional practices as artists. Conversely, BFA and MFA programs focus primarily upon one’s development as an artist—and this distinction appears to contribute to the teaching artists primary identity as an artist. At the same time, MFA programs offer little in terms of educational training—even for those that go onto to teach.

Arts organizations and institutions have continued to explore partnerships with colleges and universities in an effort “to prepare teachers for careers in education and offer professional development taught by ‘master’ or seasoned artists for other artists” (Remer, 2003, p. 76). But this still emphasizes a dichotomy and seems to fall short of striking any kind of balance between these roles. These two distinct and divergent pathways for both the artist and the teacher contribute to maintaining the divide between what have become separate identities, yet at the same time, as I will discuss later, suggest alternative considerations for the preparation of both teaching artists and art specialists.

5.2.12 Formal Certification as a Teaching Artist

The notion of formal certification for teaching artists is a recurring theme. Although met with some resistance, the general consensus is toward creating a “dual
certification in the art form and in education” (Erickson, 2003, p. 139). This is largely how colleges and universities already function; relying upon fine arts instruction for content and education coursework for teacher training, yet they all too often still function independently from one another. At the same time, this perhaps suggests the greatest potential for the field of art education to affect change, as Egan suggested, by creating more integration and dialog “between schools and departments of education and those focused primarily on artist training” (cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 139).

But we have been down this road before. This is a familiar dialog between departments of fine art, education, and art education that don’t seem to have resulted in a successful or satisfactory outcome. In 2003, the Arts Education Partnership hosted a forum on Partnerships Improving Teaching in the Arts; the goal of their project was to help “pre-service teachers, generalists, arts teachers and Teaching Artists build all of the skills required now by arts educators” (Massie, cited in Jones & Massie, 2004, p. 202). Their strategies included bringing education faculty from colleges and universities into professional development programs for both teachers and teaching artists, as well as “actively bringing the term Teaching Artist into the general language of arts in education partnerships” (Massie, cited in Jones & Massie, 2004, pp. 202-203). Whereas the emphasis on the term teaching artists perhaps still bears a resemblance to a distinctly different ideology, they seem to be creating an environment in which both enter on equal footing, and have created an opportunity where both can benefit from interacting with the other. Some arts organizations, such as the Kaplan Center for Educational Drama seem to
have had some successes in this area, perhaps because they are not fighting entrenched roles or turf battles within tradition-laden academia.

5.2.13 Resistance

Whereas many of the narratives advocate that teaching credentials would make a difference in how teaching artists are perceived as a profession, there continues to be voices of doubt and resistance:

Artists need to know about pedagogy and curriculum—I’m not saying they need to get a teaching certificate—but understand about developmentally appropriate pedagogy and what makes for a good curriculum and lesson plan and classroom management. I don’t want artists to have to become certified teachers—that’s missing the purpose—but they need to be knowledgeable about educational issues and practices in order to be successful. (Costantino cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 136)

At the same time, many teaching artists expressed little interest in earning a teaching credential:

I wish we saw the work we do as part of a field, and I wish stories from the field were passed down from one generation of Teaching Artists to the next. I don’t think, though, that institutionalization, certification, or quantification pave the path toward my desire. (Tannenbaum, 2006, p. 249)
While one teaching artist suggested “there should not be a credential for teaching artists” (cited in Saraniero, 2009, p. 241), others said they would pursue such a credential, even though they did not clearly see how they would benefit from one:

Do you think it would make a difference to schools, to a TA’s career, if an artist came with a certificate that meant: this is an artist who knows how to work in schools, how to deliver to students, keep the classroom under control, make learning meaningful, and has *credentials as an effective artist in their field.*

(Erickson, 2003, p. 175, emphasis mine)

This further emphasizes the desire for legitimacy, yet it also adds to the discourse that these roles are separate and unequal when perhaps we should be looking more towards what they have in common. Should the discourse continue to emphasize the artist as a professional, or advocate for the effectiveness of the teaching artist in the classroom?

Commentaries that suggest teaching seems to be viewed by artists as something that can easily done without pedagogical training, or that perhaps some artists think educational coursework is unnecessary tend to over simplify this perspective. While these particular references offer resistance to the idea of certification for the teaching artist, a deeper reading suggests that the reluctance is not toward establishing credibility for teaching artists, but rather against applying credentials from another field; “If we are on the brink of becoming a recognized profession, then do we need a set of standards … designed by Teaching Artists and affirmed by those in a position to hire them?” (Erickson, 2003, p. 137). As an alternative, Erickson (2003) suggested the development of standards created in *cooperation* between teaching artists and those that hire them, and
overseen by a National Association. This, in part, is an attempt to recognize the needs of
the teaching artist as a profession, as well as establishing their unique contributions to the
classroom and to the field of education.

5.2.14 Teaching Artist vs. Art Teacher

In a survey conducted by the Government Accountability Office (GAO),
principals explained “they were losing positions for specialists and they were looking to
the teaching artists and cultural organizations to fill the positions” (cited in Reeder, 2010,
p. 43). Yet at the same time, Ruppert suggested that arts and cultural organizations were
also experiencing a loss of teaching artists, and perhaps “wrestling with the arts specialist
versus teaching artist question may not be necessary” (Ruppert, cited in Reeder, 2010, p.
43). Conversely, I would argue, this presents an even greater need and a significant
opportunity in how we readdress the divide, particularly in regards to art education.

While teaching artists often refer to pushing the “boundaries of a discipline to
produce new and innovative work,” they are still bound by an emphasis toward
developing a sense of expertise and a set of specialized skills, which, as Alexander
expressed, have the most direct connection to the work of teaching artists” (cited in
Barniskis, 2010, pp. 60-61). What has not emerged from the discourse of the teaching
artist at this point, is an articulation of roles that pushes the boundaries and practices of
the teaching artist. Addressing these possibilities will have significant impact on how we
prepare artists and teacher to occupy this role.
When discussing those who teach art, the *Teaching Artist Journal* makes the distinction between classroom teachers, arts specialist, higher education faculty, “and members of arts and cultural institutions who provide arts instruction” (Reeder, 2009, p. 21). For the most part, when referring to “teachers,” the journal is speaking of classroom teachers generally working in collaboration with teaching artists. Surprisingly, the perspective that is often missing is that of the arts specialist, or what we might more commonly think of as an art teacher. The distinction between the teaching artist and the arts specialist also seems to depend on one’s role or primarily identifying as an artist. As Daichendt (2009) described, a group of art educators started referring to themselves as artist/teachers because “they feel that being an artist is central to facilitating the artistic experiences of children. This was in contrast to classroom teachers with little background or experience producing art” (pp. 219-220).

As previously discussed, Lanier (1959) condemned the term because he believed that being an artist “was something quite different from being an art teacher” and that the term implied “the inferiority of the teacher as compared to the artist” (cited in Daichendt, 2009, p. 220). As a subject position, it make the supposition that an art teacher should also be a professional artist, yet as Daichendt countered, “as a concept, it reinforces the importance of creative activity by the teacher for his or her profession,” and reconsidering the term in this context shifts the emphasis toward the craft of teaching (2009, p. 220).

Daichendt (2009) suggested a more nuanced understanding of the roles:
Artist-teacher (as a term) is problematic because in its terminology it implies that artist-teachers can do what they teach (as opposed to art teachers who can not) and emphasizes the importance of art production (compared to art history, aesthetics, etc.) in the classroom. These assumptions are questionable because primary and secondary school art curriculums are broad in scope. Furthermore there are no expectations regarding art production for art teachers at this level compared with colleagues at the post-secondary level. … Second, an increasingly “professional” identity in art and education is currently and increasingly associated with the terms teaching artist and artist-teacher. In contrast … classrooms modeled after authentic studio life and the application of artistic aptitudes in educational contexts suggest a bridging of the roles of artist and teacher embodied in a philosophy of teaching art rather than less concerned with roles and definitions. (p. 225)

One’s identity as a teaching artist is largely dependent upon their background, and where their personal educational and artistic focus lies. This, in turn, suggests alternative pathways for the professional development of the teaching artist, and for the pre-service art teacher.

5.2.15 Reclaiming One’s Artistic Identity

Regional arts councils in New York State that argued, “artists became less productive or creatively successful when they participated in educational partnerships” (cited in Reeder, 2009, p. 21). Yet this suggests a role for the artist that remains separate
and distinct from that of the teaching artist, while trying to reestablish or maintain one’s artistic identity continues to be a persistent discursive strand. The notion of reclaiming one’s artistic identity reveals the conflict between one’s artistic identity and that of the teacher. As the conflict between these roles intensifies, the desire to reclaim or rediscover one’s artistic identity surfaces: “As I witness my own struggle to affirm my *artistic identity* while teaching, I wonder how the *artistic passion* of other teachers might be nourished” (Silverman, 2006, p. 26, emphasis mine).

Burnaford described five stages that teaching artists experience while negotiating the demands of these dual roles; “as classroom managers, curriculum designers, and learning assessors” and “as artists manipulating paint, creating character, and finding voice” (cited in Silverman, 2006, pp 26-27). In an effort to reclaim their artistic identities, teaching artists struggle to; unlock creativity while missing their artistic self, reinvent work habits, become absorbed in the creative process, communicate about a work, and expanding perception (Silverman, 2006).

Examining the narratives on educators that are struggling to reclaim their artistic identity provides insight into how their construction of identity conflicts with the subject position available to them. As Silverman (2006) suggested in his article, *Cross-dressing: Educators as artists*, “Each of us confronts our commitment to take ourselves seriously as artists” (p. 28). The desire to reclaim one’s artistic identity is particularly apparent in the narratives of many teaching artists: “I realize that I really was missing my artistic self, and that I don’t want the more technical aspects of this project to overwhelm my artistic interests!” (cited in Silverman, 2006, p. 28). He suggested that teachers should confront
their self-perceptions; and that “all of us courageously face another side of ourselves or at least one that has not had enough airtime in recent years” (Silverman, 2006, p. 28, emphasis mine). This particular discursive strand emphasizes the duality of the roles of the artist and the teacher, and the struggle for dominance of one over the other.

What these particular narratives suggest is that they had to surrender their artistic identity in the first place, rather than integrating aspects of both. The subsequent resentment and “fear of losing tabs on my ego identity” (cited in Silverman, 2006, p. 28) further escalates the tension between these roles. Significantly, during the process of reclaiming one’s artistic identity, what happens to their identity as a teacher? What Silverman suggested is that teaching artists attempting to reclaim their identity as artists are then able to move to a more sophisticated level of creative inquiry through “absorption in art making and engagement with the Critical Response Process” (2006, p. 31). The struggle is further complicated when our own desires are confronted by the expectations of others; “All of us come face to face with not only our individual benchmarks of excellence, but those of society as well” (Silverman, 2006, p. 31). This emphasizes the struggle between the identity one wishes to create for one’s self, and the subject positions made available to us.

5.2.16 The Role of the Teaching Artist

The unique nature of the teaching artist has been examined extensively throughout the many years of this journal, particularly as we are reminded that there is no such thing as a “teaching scientists” or a “teaching mathematicians” (Reeder, 2010, p. 31).
In attempt to further explore issues of identity, Rabkin conducted a survey through which he asked teaching artists directly, “What role do you want to play in public education?” (cited in Reeder, 2010, p. 39). This same question constitutes a significant discursive strand to be examined.

While continuing to explore the best practices that characterize the teaching artist, Rhodes proposed we “go back again and ask the question: What are we trying to do?” (cited in McCaslin, Rhodes, & Lind, 2004, p. 141). Booth (2004) suggested the role of the teaching artist is to “guide all people in discovering their artistic competences and satisfactions, and to engage anyone (from child to artist to dubious accountant) in the relevance of artistic experience to their lives” (p. 75, emphasis mine). Oreck (2001) also emphasized the teaching artist’s role in identifying students’ artistic abilities. Such awareness, he suggested, “was found to be the single most powerful motivation for teachers to use artistic approaches in their teaching practice” (cited in Oreck, 2005, pp. 225-226), yet this emphasis can have a wide range of effects. Whereas the notion of making relevant connections between art experiences to individual’s lives is an inclusive one, the reference to artistic competences, or talent and ability that emphasize craft and technique all too often serve as points of exclusion.

And then there are some teaching artists that don’t see any conflict at all, and profess a narrower view for the role of the arts distinct from education:

I deliberately separate learning from schooling. In my view it is not the purpose of the arts and not the role of the Teaching Artist to serve the institution of schools.
It is our purpose to serve the human spirit, that essential vital core in each person.

(O’Fallon, 2006, p. 77)

O’Fallon further suggested learning in schools has a distinct function, which differs from that of an arts organization, arguing, “they will differ because they serve different ends” (2006, p. 78). Jaffe (2010) argued that a primary function of the teaching artist was to help students “gain more control over their medium” (p. 76). Yet these statements serve to maintain the distinct and separate nature of the discourses that inherently collide when the artist also chooses to teach.

The prominence of mastery and artistry throughout the discourse, as Harris (2008) advocated, lead to an acknowledged goal “to develop exceptional levels of performance in a select few rather than to provide a degree of knowledge about a few domains and merely acceptable levels of skill to many, which is mostly the goal of our general education systems” (p. 215). This statement—similarly to O’Fallon’s—not only seeks to define a distinct role for that of the teaching artist, but also segregates the role of the arts from education.

Reeder (2011) also emphasized teaching craft and technique, yet she also included “creativity, compassion, and interconnectivity” (p. 185). While the focus on artistry is still evident, she also seems to be opening the door a bit to the broader purposes of an arts education. Such a broader perspective was offered by Browne, who stated, “the goal of a teaching artist is to engage almost anyone in arts experiences” (cited in Reeder, 2010, p. 178, emphasis in original). Similarly, Jenkins offered, “if the arts are made more accessible in the classroom, if the arts are made more tangible by fostering real hands on
arts experiences in schools, then much more value will be added to the arts in our culture” (cited in Reeder, 2011, p. 190, emphasis mine). There is the continuing reference to an arts experience that seemingly can only be offered by a professional practicing artist. What is also evident in this series of statements is the hand of Reeder, who as editor, seems to be attempting to steer the discourse if not in an entirely different direction, then perhaps towards a more inclusive dialog.

In a much earlier edition of this journal, it was suggested the role of the teaching artist is not to teach the “craft of their art to those who want to be similar artists,” but rather to engage “the public to meet specific learning goals, and [to work] with general education students in schools to meet various curriculum goals—thus opening up their art form for non-artists” (Editorial note, cited in Hunt, Sansom & Smerdon, 2004, p. 229, emphasis mine). These perspectives appear more inclusive of students, as well as of the artist and the teacher—yet they still remain in stark contrast to the dominant emphasis on the artist.

Brownlee (2004) drove the wedge deeper; again, emphasizing the teaching artist “must be an artist first and must bring a sense of artistry and aesthetics to their teaching” (p. 78). Both artistry and aesthetics are recurrent themes that suggest a specific role for the teaching artist that is dependent upon their identity as an artist. Barniskis (2011) referred to the teaching artists ability to relate to the students as artists, and to helping them “to develop their ideas and voice as artists” (p. 264, emphasis mine). This also suggest a distinct role for the teaching artist, but is this a unique quality to the teaching
artists, or does it merely serve to attempt to distinguish their practices from that of the art teacher?

Oreck (2005) argued that one of the primary goals of the teaching artist is to increase “appreciation for and understanding of artistic abilities” (p. 225). Johnson (2004) similarly argued that the role of the teaching artist is to improve the quality of student artistic work, and to polish the “artistic performances of children” (p. 85). This was important, Johnson went on to suggest, not just to enhance the artistic experiences for the children, but rather to honor and reinforce the teaching artist’s own artistic abilities. While discussing the role of the teaching artist, Powell (2004) proclaimed, “the artist’s role is to provide arts experiences beyond those that the school staff can provide” (cited in Ingram & Powell, 2004, p. 193). I have consistently noticed that while many teaching artists are discussing their practices, even in the classroom, they often still refer to themselves as *artists*. Additionally, in this case, both the language and the statement create a dissonance between the roles in which they are trying to bring together.

Again, the emphasis returns to one’s identity as an artist:

Teaching Artists […] should be among the best *artists* in the community with a desire to communicate something about the essence of their art form. They should be attracted by the opportunity to share their delight, knowledge and experience as artists with young people (Norman, 2004, p. 217, emphasis mine).

This displays a distinct hierarchy that is also suggestive of the teaching artist’s role that emphasizes artistry. While many teaching artists openly embrace this perspective, it also serves to limit the perceptions of both art and the artist. This focus and ideology becomes
institutionalized as arts organizations “set out to create a process that would help define and focus attention on artistic abilities and characteristics” (Oreck, 2005, p. 221).

Renzulli equally advocated for an emphasis upon giftedness, and suggested “artists strongly endorsed the relevance of this conception for the arts” (cited in Oreck, 2005, p. 222). Effective teaching practices are often differentiated to accommodate a diverse range of learners; whereas, a focus on the gifted and artistic abilities effectively excludes many children.

This subject position is predicated upon the relationship between the expert and the novice. In this case, the teaching artist is the expert “with the technological skills and art experience” that leads a group students, as apprentices, “through the basics of their craft” (Betts, 2008, p. 270). Yet this, as through my earlier exploration of the roles of both the artist and the teacher, are not as fluid, or open, to diverse conceptions of these roles, both separately and together. Consequently, the discourse accepts new individuals that are drawn to a fixed subject position, and thereby reproduces itself.

5.2.17 Teaching Artistry

The journal often refers to “teaching artistry” and the development of standards regarding its practice (Rhodes, cited in McCaslin, Rhodes, & Lind, 2004, p. 148), which in turn, reinforces the prominent discursive strand of the artist. Artistry, as a noun, refers to the work of an artist, artistic characteristics, artistic ability or execution (OED). Developing one’s artistic abilities tends to focus upon learning techniques, building skills, understanding concepts, and learning to use materials and tools effectively (Gunn,
The TAJ suggested that teaching artistry involves the students experiencing the authenticity of the art form (Norman, 2004). Teaching Artistry also involves “creation and development and expression” (Saraniero, 2004, p. 178). Formal aesthetic language such as form, composition, balance, and rhythm are pervasive and serve as catalysts to propel the discourse (Silverman, 2006, p. 31). As a standard of practice for the teaching artist, it involves demonstrating their “artistic virtuosity, knowledge of the history and aesthetics of their art form, and the capacity to engage students” (Norman, 2004, p. 219). But much as with the artist, it is difficult to characterize and confine what the role of the teaching artist is:

It is interesting to witness the ebb and flow of language as we try to establish, both on the local and national level, a vocabulary for our work as TAs. My TA experience is filtered through the lens of aesthetic education, a practice shared with several institutes but unfamiliar to many TAs of different programs. Like art itself, teaching artistry comes in many forms and is beautifully diverse and individualized. It defies a standardized format, but there must be common threads woven throughout our differing patterns of practice. (Roche, 2005, p. 263)

Yet the desire to define and characterize remains a distinct set of practices is a common discursive thread throughout the journal:

TA and teaching artistry: HAH! If anyone can come up with a concise yet thorough definition of these two terms, encompassing the diversity of the work we all do, the field will forever be in your debt. As we gather at conferences, read and write articles for the TAJ, and establish a national forum for online
discussions, we may be able to collectively create a universally accepted
definition of teaching artistry and its components. With a common vocabulary and
an agreement upon what elements are essential to the work of all TAs, we can
share the essence of our work more widely with those who are unaware of it. In
time, when we tell someone “I am a Teaching Artist,” they may recognize, and
truly understand, what that is. (Roche, 2005, p. 264)

When emphasizing artistic ability, “the depth of knowledge” and the mastery that must
accompany it (Kelin, cited in Reeder, 2008, p. 149), these elements of discourse serve to
perpetuate the image of the teacher as expert.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Whose voice is being left out?

As I have revealed, the dominant voice throughout the discourse of the teaching
artist is that of the artist. While the artist takes the leading role, the majority of the
narratives that address teaching do so from a pedagogical and professional development
perspectives, yet in these cases, the conversations regarding teaching, collaboration,
integration, and advocacy, overwhelmingly focus upon the classroom teacher. Somewhat
surprising, the significant voice that remains absent from this discourse is that of the arts
specialist or the art teacher:

We glibly refer to artists who teach as Teaching Artists; where is the language for
teachers who are artists? What do we call them? Often, there are music or visual
artist specialists working in a building where there are also visiting Teaching Artists. Those in-school specialists are rarely called ‘artists’, are they? In fact, the word ‘specialist’ is a very different term—seems to derive more from medicine than from art. Where did that come from? And yet, many of these certified classroom music, art, drama, and dance teachers perform regularly in theater troupes, symphony orchestras, or community bands. Many regularly exhibit their artwork in local or national galleries—or perhaps in the local community centers. Are they not ‘artists’ too? Where is the language that accommodates that dual role—of music teacher and musician. (Burnaford, 2003, p. 169)

Similar arguments have been made. Gee suggested that many full-time art teachers have credible experience as artists (cited in Graham, 2009, p. 86). Daichendt (2009) also professed that art teachers were often “established artists in their own right” (2009, p. 220). Zwirn’s study revealed the desire and struggle for the art teacher to maintain their artistic identity artists (cited in Graham, 2009, p. 86). Graham (2009), in his consideration of the unique qualities of the teaching artist, argued that the artist’s role was still the primary one:

The fact that some full-time art specialists are also artists influences how they understand, interact with, and teach within their discipline. Being an artist can inform the dynamic between learners and the disciplines of art in ways that allow those disciplines to be open to renovation and reconstruction. (p. 88)

Graham’s (2009) study addressed how teachers who were also artists engendered the educational dynamic in the classroom. While he included *full-time arts specialists*, it
was their status as an artist, rather than as an art teacher, that he continued to use as a point of differentiation:

The teacher who is also an artist embodies this resistance by transforming the educational dynamics of school learning. Some teaching artists, including full-time art specialists, enable the emergence of complex learning environments that invite collaboration and intense interaction with the disciplines of art and art-making. Their classrooms are characterized by hospitality toward students, spontaneity, playfulness, and a spirit of inquiry. These teachers create conditions for learning that encourage divergence, unpredictable outcomes, and substantial engagement with issues that are important to both teachers and students. The teacher who is also an artist can transform the way that learners interact with the teacher, with the subject, and with the learning environment. (Graham, 2009, p. 86)

While these stories and statements reflect the few instances that these role of the art teacher has been addressed, they interestingly apply the same standard of professionalism, that of the artist who performs regularly, or exhibits their artwork to establish a sense of credibility to teach art. They equally make the assumption that it is the artist who should teach art.

Howard alluded to the collaborative nature of the teaching artist; suggesting teaching artists are not outsiders or “substitutes in the generic sense, but the natural allies of teachers, arts specialists, principals and students in the struggle for deeper artistic experience and learning” (cited in Jaffe, 2007, p. 83). Much is made throughout the
journal of teaching artists working with classroom teachers to integrate art into the curriculum, but the voice of the art specialist remains decidedly absent.

5.3.2 Bridging the Divide

Particularly with in the context of professional development, there seems to be an effort to bring together “a commitment to artistic excellence paired with know-how about engaging kids in art” (Treichel, 2008, p. 53). Weiss (2006) suggested that the solution might lie in finding ways “to bring teachers and artists together to work out the delicate dynamic of team teaching” (p. 24). Yet a significant aspect of the conflict stems from different roles and separate priorities, and this does not address the multiple identities that create a conflict within the subject.

Teaching artists often lead fragmented lives and, as Lichtenstein (2009) argued, teaching artists often have to “assuming multiple roles and identities depending on context and circumstance” (p. 158). O’Fallon (2006) concluded that these “multiple definitions and multiple purposes may be developed into strengths if we keep looking more deeply into the fundamental nature of arts and learning” (p. 77). It is clear, he concluded, that teaching artists need “a knowledge base and skills set specific to education goals, as well as their art form’s skills and knowledge” (O’Fallon, 2006, p. 79), but as long as the discourse speaks of these in different terms, they will continue to remain distinct and separate.

Yet even through such efforts, as best it seems as if the discourses of the artist and the teacher are treated as separate yet equal. What has not yet emerged within the
discourse of the teaching artist is an articulation of identities that allows both to exist in the same place at the same time. The solution lies deeper than this; we must first reconcile our inner selves with the unconscious drives that shape the discursive positions made available to us in an effort to make ourselves whole.

5.3.3 Why is it a struggle to integrate the artist’s life into a teaching role?

One of the persistent barriers to integrating the artist’s life into a teaching role is how the role of the artist has been pervasive in shaping the discourse. Jenkins described the challenged many teaching artists face, as well as offered some similar thoughts towards a solution:

We live with two identities: one as and artist, and one as an educator. At times, I have felt torn between the two worlds and have strived to find connecting points, so that my whole career, both as an artist and as an educator, will make sense and will produce a sense of flow. To that end, I have taken a big picture view of my artwork and teaching, seeing them both as part of a larger whole. This has nurtured and sustained my creativity and has opened my teaching career to many invigorating unforeseen opportunities. (Jenkins, cited in Reeder, 2011, p. 246)

Jenkins also offered some insights as to how to negotiate the conflict:

Seek out connections between your art form and the curriculum. What are the different cognitive, mental, physical, and emotional skills that your art form promotes and develops? Identifying these connections will give your teaching
work more meaning and relevance to yourself as an artist, as well as enable you to articulate its value to educators. (p. 246)

Jenkins’ narrative provides more of a focus on how one role affects the other instead of blending diverse aspects of one’s identity, and even the title of his article (Nurturing the “Artist” in the Teaching Artist) still reflects an adherence to a dominant ideology.

Sansom argued that to establish and maintain high quality teaching of the arts “requires sound aesthetic and artistic knowledge and practice brought about through partnerships between educationalists and artists” (cited in Hunt, Sansom & Smerdon, 2004, p. 232, emphasis mine). Her language equally draws attention to artistry and the professionalism of the artist, at the same time as professing a bridge between the roles. But her suggestion of partnerships is directed toward people with different roles, rather than resolving the conflicts that arise within the individual trying to embrace both identities.

Some arts organizations, such as Center for Community Arts Partnerships at Columbia College Chicago, are strategizing ways for teaching artists to recognize “the ways in which best practices in teaching and learning are already embedded in artistic processes” (Lichtenstein, 2009, p. 158). Similarly to the studio habits of mind (Hetland, Winner, Veenema & Sheridan, 2007), they advocate a more complex and dynamic process that emphasizes artistic practices that are pedagogically valuable:

We need to encourage artists to develop emergent curriculum that embraces high quality artistic skill building and deeply engaging big-idea exploration of ideas that transcend disciplines. The imagination is a bridge between the two. We cross
back and forth over this bridge in an ongoing collective effort to communicate, cope with, celebrate, and transform humanity. (Lichtenstein, 2009, p. 158)

She suggested, “as artists get more comfortable with their “teacher-selves,” they can coach teachers to become more comfortable with their “artist-selves,” finding common ground between the two” (Lichtenstein, 2009, p. 159). Booth (2005) painted a similar picture:

No, we are not exactly arts teachers. No, we are not “only” artists. We are both; our skills live “in between.” Both/and, not either/or. Both artist and educator, and often both at the same time. There is an educator’s heart and understanding in our artistry, and there’s an artist’s imagination and dynamism in our educating. In both/and we trust. (p. 3)

This blending of practices, as Lichtenstein and Booth described them, still express an either/or proposition, allowing the two to co-exist, yet not truly unifying a sense of self that focuses on them becoming comfortable with themselves as a teaching artist.

5.3.4 What goals do the artist and the teacher have in common?

Bruning argued that artists’ skills are relevant and purposeful in the classroom: The ability to quickly acquire and apply new knowledge and the know how to apply twenty-first-century skills—problem solving, communication, teamwork, technology use, innovation, critical thinking, collaboration and project
management/ leadership. These skill sets are the same skills artists use in their creative process and creation of artistic work. (cited in Reeder, 2011, p. 121) By extension of this same argument, one could argue that the teacher already possesses the skills that the artist brings to the classroom. Another teaching artist admitted he “would like to see less of a distinction made between teaching and art making” (cited in Barrett, 2003, p. 200). At the same time, many teaching artists have become “more conscious of, and sensitive to, the needs and struggles that educators face in their daily practice” (Upitis, cited in Brown, 2007, p. 69).

Korn-Bursztyn (2003) challenged teachers and teaching artists to think about their work differently, and to think about teaching, education, and the culture of schools. Perhaps, they should start thinking about themselves differently as well. Overwhelmingly, teaching artists see themselves as artists first. Throughout the narratives, they often refer to themselves as artists, but perhaps it’s time to start identifying as a teaching artist, encapsulated elements of both roles, rather than continuing to pit one against the other.

Love (2006) sought to blend aspects of art, pedagogy, and teaching philosophy, but in relationship to an aesthetic education. Whereas her notion seemingly embraces characteristics of both roles, it equally narrows the perception of both the arts and the artist. Many teaching artists have come to realized that “artists, who clearly grasp […] that how they teach, as well as what they teach,” is an important factor for their success as teaching artists (Franklin, 2005, p. 152). Throughout this particular discursive strand, the most prominent voice is that of the artist “whose practice combines equal parts art
and education and whose vision is to share their tandem skills with people of all ages” (Thompson, 2011, p. 50), but this perspective does little to address the conflicts that created the conflict in the first place.

Most of the narratives in the Journal focus upon the divide between the roles of the artist and that of the classroom teacher in the context of content expertise vs. pedagogical knowledge. What has largely been absent from the discourse are discussion of the inherent conflict between teaching artists and art teachers, yet the distinction largely falls along similar lines. Sharing his frustration over an issue that seemingly would have common ends, Ruppert advocated for coming together as a larger field through an inclusionary dialog as opposed to an either/or conversation (cited in Reeder, 2010). Such a dialog, as Browne argued, creates a space through which to “connect disparate ideas, and a means to realizing and assessing goals from both the artistic and educational points of view” (cited in Reeder, 2010, p. 180).

Many narratives encourage “arts educators and teaching artists to engage in reciprocal reinforcement of learning across the school” (Reeder, 2010, p. 40). One teaching artist came to recognize the teacher’s ability to recognize the parallels between her artistic practices with those of the classroom; and described the integration of these two roles as an *elegant fit* as she worked to “better understand the interface between [her] art form and the learning process” (Marshall, 2009, p. 228). While this potentially represents a harmonious instructional relationship between the artist and the teacher, the challenge remains to come to a similar harmony within the individual subject.
One teaching artist described her professional development experience through an arts organization:

My training at the Kaplan Center has provided me with both a solid background in my art form and with a clear pedagogy that informs my practice. How has this made me a better Teaching Artist? First, I believe I now achieve much higher artistic and educational outcomes. Second, I now see those outcomes as *inextricably intertwined*. I achieve high artistic success by providing my students with a learning environment that supports their artistic growth, I achieve high educational success by providing my students with an artistic environment that is ripe with opportunities for learning. In other words, *I have infused my pedagogy into my art form.* (Larson, 2004, p. 19, emphasis mine)

This is one of the few instances that I have encountered a narrative that describes a truly unique, and truly integrated identity that suggests the discourse of the teaching artist presents a false dichotomy.

5.3.6 The False Dichotomy of the Artist and the Teacher

The discursive strand of “artist first, then teacher” has, according to Reeder (2007), been a common theme in terms of professional criteria for “certified arts specialists, college professors, and ultimately Teaching Artists” (Reeder, 2007, p. 19). Whereas I would agree that it has been maintained as a distinction for college professors, and most certainly a prominent aspect of discourse throughout this journal, I would disagree that it has been as significant for the certified arts specialist—particularly as this
journal has worked to establish the professionalization of the artist as a distinction between the teaching artist and the art specialist.

Yet, in a more contemporary sense, Reeder acknowledged that the discourse has made a decisive shift to “question the notion that teaching takes us out of the studio” (Reeder, 2007, p. 19). Consequently, I have examined the conflict and its roots, yet what surprising has arisen from a few of the narratives is the notion that the distinction is artificial:

When I was a grade school and high school art teacher, my classroom doubled as an art studio after hours. When the students were dismissed for the day, I was left to myself and found time to concentrate on my own ideas. This was important to me as a schoolteacher and artist. I found the process of painting or drawing after a full day of teaching revitalizing, and it reminded me of why I taught. It was years later, as a graduate student studying Art Education, that I first came across the term artist-teacher. It was used in artist statements in exhibitions by graduate students and as a means of establishing oneself as both an artist and a teacher in conversation. The term struck me as unusual because, after all, isn’t an artist-teacher the same thing as an art teacher? Didn’t art teachers also make art? Certainly a fine-arts background was important, but this redundancy did not make sense and seemed to be a fancy facade. When individuals referred to themselves in this way I chalked it up to creative marketing and an attempt to inflate self-importance. (Daichendt, 2009, p. 219)
This extended narrative from Daichendt suggested that divide between the roles of the artist and the teacher is indeed, a discursive one.

When asked to respond to the question, What is a teaching artist?, McCann (2003) offered:

A theater artist is an artist who creates theatrical experiences. A visual artist is one who creates visual experiences. Musicians create musical experiences, dancers create experiences of physical movement, and writers give us experiences with language. These art forms are all clear to us. They all carry the term ‘art’ because, regardless of the discipline or medium, they all share the process of creating a work that tells, in some way, a story of human experience. (p. 134)

For the first time, we are starting to see the emergence of a common language that addresses the practices of both the artist and the teacher, not one of credibility or professionalism, but rather one that focuses on creating experiences.

What McCann suggested is that the artist can create a learning experience as a work of art. Suddenly, he professed, when we view the teaching of art “regardless of the primary discipline used by the artist, as an art form in its own right—can we begin to see and define our work in all its complexity” (McCann, 2003, p. 134). He is attempting to create a portrait of those who teach art as a unified identity that might allow aspects of both the artist and the teacher to occupy the same space at the same time. Much as in my own experience, he attempts to create a portrait of those who teach art as a unified identity that might allow aspects of both the artist and the teacher to occupy the same space at the same time—effectively blurring the distinction between these roles:
True artists who bring the tools of their primary discipline together with a set of ideas (curriculum), a group of individuals (teachers and learners) and a variety of environmental factors (the learning space and its contents) to create truly transforming works of teaching art. (McCann, 2003, p. 134)

Erickson (2003) took this progression of thought a step further when he suggested the classroom represents a blending of art and learning that combines one’s artistic identity with their educational identity, creating “a whole new symbiosis […] where two seemingly diverse living organisms coexist for the benefit of the other” (p. 140). Unless we treat our teaching, he continued, “as a genuine artistic discipline,” we are unlikely to overcome the perception that we’re merely doing discipline-specific temp work’’” (Wallace cited in Erickson, 2003, p. 136). Suddenly, the divide looks very different. The emphasis is no longer on the desire to reclaim one’s artistic identity, but rather how to come to terms with diverse aspects of one’s identity that are thrust into a dynamic tension:

I became involved in arts education during this early period. I didn’t really understand what it was, but I sensed the combination of artistic, pedagogical, social and political ingredients that I was searching for. Teaching alone wasn’t artistic enough. Designing costumes alone (though I loved it) did not satisfy my desire to be more centrally useful to my community. (Cohen, 2005, p. 46)

Perhaps being an artist and being a teacher are not necessarily contradictory at all; perhaps the challenge is for both artists and teacher to think about their work differently.
Silverman (2006) expressed the familiar dilemma that we all must address, regarding how we each resolve the pluralism of visions and the multiplicity of realities that comprise our identity:

As a new college graduate, I was convinced that I had to choose between being an artist and being a teacher. After some years as a studio artist and then further years as a teacher, I slowly came to the realization that the two can coexist. Now, in the humble position of working with current and future classroom teachers, I want to instill in them the belief that artist and teacher are not mutually exclusive, and that they give strength to each other. (p. 26)

It has been suggested that the most successful teaching artist scenarios are when the roles and responsibilities of the artist and the teacher are completely blurred, and, as Betts (2008) described, the multiplicity of skills and experiences require “a balance between aesthetic, technical, and pragmatic considerations” (p. 273). Hochtritt (2007) described teaching and artmaking as very similar activities; “The artist/teacher may have something planned, but when other materials or people come into the picture what occurs is a collaborative transformation of ideas and meanings” (p. 197). Yet, when striving for a balance between artistic life and teaching life, what often appears is not a sum of the two parts, but rather two distinct elements that often conflict as one essentially loses its identity to the other. Rather, what a few of these narratives suggest, an alternative point-of-view has emerged that suggests these roles can “coexist in a tension that is at once restless and harmonious” (Jaffe, 2009, p. 3).

One teaching artist, for example, came to a comparable realization:
It dawned on me that I had to merge the art and the science of teaching. There had to be a balance and appreciation for both. I realized that without striking a balance between the art and science of teaching, I would end up superficially entertaining my students, and not providing them the quality of education they deserve. (Cruz, 2009, p. 148)

Similarly, Yantis argued, a different approach to this dichotomy-based argument would be “to explore a fractal view of these two perspectives and see them as branches of the same creative stream,” rather than to remain stuck “in the dominant paradigm of “winner/loser,” one that is quickly losing its luster and attractiveness” (cited in Aprill & Schroeder-Yu, G, 2006, pp. 161-162).

Serig (2008) described a homospatial perspective that allows two elements to share the same space. Thus the interaction of different aspects of one’s identity may synthesize to create a third, rather than one remaining dominant and controlling the other. This does not represent ambiguity, or the “undecidability about which of several determinate meanings is appropriate,” (Hausman, cited in Serig, 2008, p. 47), but rather a more open-ended, dynamic perspective that allows for multiple articulations of identity.

As Larson (2004) remarked, “I now see that these identities are intertwined: my capacity to serve my students is measured not only in my mastery of skills, but also in my capacity to listen, my capacity to manage conflict, and in my capacity for compassion, confidence, and humor” (p. 19, emphasis mine). The emphasis takes a decided shift from reclaiming one’s identity as an artist, to finding a sense of balance that enables teaching artists to connect their creative work to the classroom. Not only is there a need to improve the
teaching artists collaborative and pedagogical skills, Johnson suggested, but it is also important for them to find a way to connect “their own artistry with their Teaching Artistry” (2004, p. 85, emphasis mine). Here, the teaching artist begins the process of actively looking for ways to bridge the gap between what they know as artists and what is required in terms of the educational setting, and in essence, beginning to forge an identity as a teaching artist, rather than one or the other.

Similarly, the Teaching Artist Journal strived to refine its language, and “propose answers to the questions that plague us when we find we use different words for the same thing. As we blend our historically separate opinions, we must clarify our language to unify our voices where we authentically can and to harmonize where we differ” (Booth, 2005, p. 219). The emphasis on harmony speaks to the same issue, yet the discourse largely clings to a distinct ideology that serves to limit the possibilities. Weida (2011) recognized that various art educators “locate themselves within the realm of schools as well as the art world, as part of dual, eclectic roles as artist-teachers and teaching artists” (p. 145). He also realized that overlapping and layering the various roles and identities of the artist and the teacher can blur “the boundaries of artistic, educational, and personal space” (Weida, 2011, p. 154). Perhaps, as Weida pondered, if we are willing to embrace fluidity, we can begin to (re)articulate the role of the teaching artist for those who do not fit neatly into a single model of working.

Such “hybrid practitioners of art and education,” as Rabkin described them, have begun to explore how their teaching and artistic practices are related (cited in Reeder, 2009, p. 20). Lucero’s (2006) narrative represents such a synthesis of identity:
Whenever I have the opportunity to make a work, be it a lecture, exhibit, performance, or article, I try to put myself in a position where I can collate all the different things I’m currently working with, all the stuff I’m collecting, and some unexpected interruptions, into something that can address the needs of that particular work. (Lucero, 2006, p. 93)

Lucero no longer maintains the distinction between his teaching and his artistic practices; rather all of his work coalesces into a single mode of thinking and being;

I’d like to think that each individual’s trek to the realization of everything’s potential duality is a personal experience that comes with time. [...] I can say that my transition to this way of thinking, although forced by my circumstances, makes perfect sense because I don’t feel like I’ve compromised the integrity of what I was looking for when I was adamantly pursuing a studio practice. I’m still researching the same things. I just have different mediums. (Lucero, 2006, p. 94)

His progression of thought, and of identity, entails a consideration of the artistry of the teacher from a distinct pedagogical perspective. He started from a similar place a many teaching artists, as I have revealed through this analysis, and their struggle to reclaim his artistic identity, but by reframing his perspective more as perhaps on of artistic integrity. He was able to envelop both his artistic and teaching practices into a dynamic interchange that is no longer bound or limited by a single subject position:

Somewhere along the way I imagined a painter’s body with eyes that couldn’t see and a body that had no ability to hold or manipulate tools, like brushes or paint. Would this type of paralysis stop the artist from working? It occurred to me that
becoming a teacher and having a family created a similar type of stillness in the body that made the work. It incapacitated the seeming self-government of my time use. It made me do what I could never do in the studio: live with others. (Lucero, 2006, pp. 94-95)

Suddenly, as Lucero described, the studio no longer bound his practices, yet as his role as an artist embraced the interruptions of life and the conflicting demands of his role as a teacher; “I need not be desperate that my teaching practice does not allow me the time to create in the studio because I can also say that the classroom can be the work” (2006, p. 95).

Lucero described the sense of being freed from a discursive position that limited the possibilities of his practice:

In some way this makes me feel like the most powerful artist on earth, and it liberates me from the pressure of making work, which had turned into the worst kind of labor and the labor of being a technician an artist (repeating) the same gesture to the point of immobility. (2006, p. 95, emphasis in original)

The narratives throughout this journal of ten described the unique aspects of the teaching artist, and more specifically how being an artist effects one’s practices as a teacher, yet here, Lucero looked at it from a different perspective, and addressed how embracing his identity as a teacher influenced his teaching practices:

Ironically, having understood my place outside of the studio has actually strengthened my studio practice. Occasionally, without me looking for it, I have an opportunity to be in the studio. When this chance is afforded to me, I find that I
don’t linger in the studio the way I used to. I can work nonstop. Strangely enough, there is no shortage of ideas. *I make work in the studio that is related to the work I make in the world, not the other way around* (Lucero, 2006, pp. 95-96, emphasis mine).

His struggle was not to reclaim his identity merely as an artist, nor was he trying to defend his artistic abilities as a teacher. What he was able to articulate was a fluid sense of self that embraced such ambiguity. His teaching practice became his artistic practice; all the elements of teaching practice became a performance, through which the goal became to create works of art that teach. Significantly, this (re)articulation of identity is no longer prescriptive, nor does it adhere to a rigid and singular subject position; rather the dynamic interaction of the roles leaves open the potential for increasingly diverse conceptions of identity. Hudson (2006) similarly pointed to the moment when the lines blurred, and teaching became her art, and her students became the subject of her art (cited in Reeder, 2007).

Reeder (2011) offered an equally dynamic perspective:

I am still invested in those essential layers of the teaching artist ecosystem, but my stance as teaching artist who uses her pedagogy and practice for research places me in a wonderful borderland that allows me to work the *hyphens* between artist–learner–teacher—researcher … and all of the other artist things that we become as we navigate the uneven terrain of the arts and learning.” (p. 243, emphasis in original)
The inclusion of the researcher and the learner stretches the possibilities further as Reeder’s comments reveal the potential for a more dynamic sense of identity. Interestingly, while the sense of conflicting roles has been a recurrent theme, this sense of hybridity has been a more recent discursive strand within the journal.

While much of the work of the teaching artist has the potential to be organic and indefinable, the subject position remains distinct and serves to confine one’s identity between distinct boundaries. Yet, as Reeder pointed out, “the power to imagine and craft inventive solutions to every single unique situation does encourage us to avoid defined spaces” (2011, p. 243). Her reference to inventive solutions seems to focus upon practices in the classroom, yet it clearly points to how such perspectives towards practice—as an element of the dispositive—help to synthesize new identities. It is significant that this transformation of the discourse is so closely related to how individual’s have been able to (re)articulate their identity between traditionally opposing roles. The majority of these perhaps more progressive narratives come from more recent issues of the Teaching Artist Journal, which perhaps suggest a more malleable discursive position.

The processes of learning and teaching, Kosmala & Imas (2011) argued, are more “about relationships that require spaces of fluidity of a more unanticipated kind. In such spaces, it seems more feasible to co-construct a participative dialogue” (p. 45). Perhaps, as Reeder (2007) concluded, “lines have been drawn where lines really don’t exist” (p. 19). There seems to be an emerging discursive strand that allows for reflective reconsideration of the subject as the materialization of discourse, and the possible exchanges between the multiple identities that comprise the role of the artist and the
teacher, one, that if nurtured, could have a profound and productive influence upon the field of art education. This involves the exploration of new territory in the field, and positions one’s artmaking practices in a context wherein they are designed to reflect and inform pedagogy, and vice versa.

5.4 Conclusion

McCall & Simmons (1966) suggested that the individual might be the primary author of his or her own identity. While they argued that “personal elaborations of these conventional contexts are exceedingly important,” they also conceded that in most cases, they represent “variations on culturally established themes” (p. 70, cited in Zwirn, 2002, p. 37). Similarly, Foucault (1983) suggested that identifying with a role, rather than being an indicator of individuality, is merely adopting the subject positions that are available to us. Subject positions and their accompanying discourse establish the criteria for evaluating an individual’s performance.

Zwirn (2002) argued “there are fundamental similarities between the role of an artist and an art teacher, and growth in one role aids the progress in the other” (p. 31), yet the tone and tenor of her argument still seem to privilege the role of the artist. She examined how experienced art teachers have constructed a sense of identity as artists and teachers. Yet the discourse of the artist/teacher seemingly constructs a discourse that fails to examine its own values, beliefs, and ideological construction. Through a more critical form of pedagogy, Giroux (1995) suggested that the role of the teacher is to defy “the specialized, parochial knowledge of the individual specialist, sage, or master ideologue”
At issue is the necessity to develop a collective vision that articulates the relationship between the artist and the teacher. What I am suggesting is a (re)articulation of the role through a more complex representations of identification reflects a broader vision of both the artist and the teacher.

Rather than to maintain the privileged voice of the artist, Giroux (1995) advocated for the construction of diverse critical public spheres by a revitalized sense of pedagogy; “this means understanding pedagogy as a deliberate attempt on the part of cultural workers to influence how and what knowledge, identities, and social relations are constructed within varied sites of learning” (p. 8). The goal thus becomes to articulate an identity that crosses “the semi-permeable barriers between whatever we might characterize as collective realities and their individual expressions as they exist in the particularities of our lives” (Hartfield, 1995, p. 77). Such a fluid articulation offers the possibility for diverse points of view; “all the contradictions, all the varied and multifarious subject positions we like to consider” are thus revealed, exposed, and embodied with no singular collective representation (duBois, 1995, p. 19).

There are multiple discourses within the paradigms of the artist and the teacher that don’t always fit so neatly together. How individuals resolve their sense of identity when confronted by conflicting discourses has distinct implications for how we continue to prepare art teachers. Admittedly, the conflicts I have described don’t always exist, as one’s role as an artist and philosophy as a teacher often coincide. But establishing and maintaining a relationship between the discourses of the artist and the teacher becomes problematic because it only works when the two positions are synonymous.
CHAPTER 6 — REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Reflections

Art education students’ training as artists and as teachers are most often separate, which further define and divide the discourses that persist in the way we prepare art teachers. Consequently, tension arises as the senses of identity these roles impart often conflict with one another. Generally, the preparation of art teachers begins with the practice of art; art education students are trained as artists first and as teachers second. Given the distinction between these discourses, “there is some evidence to suggest that they may experience contradictions in their career development that seriously impact the construction of their professional identity as art teachers of children and adolescents” (Zwirn, 2002, p. 17).

Artists often do not value or respect the field of art education, and the artistic endeavors of art education majors are often treated with condescension by their fine arts professors, which is “rather ironic, since these same fine arts professors are teaching themselves” (Zwirn, 2002, p. 9). This helps to perpetuate elitist notions of who has the right to call oneself an ‘artist,’ or who decides what artistic endeavors are worthwhile. Yet even “art education students and teachers who try to combine the often conflicting roles of artist and teacher can be caught in a profound dilemma” (Zwirn, 2002, p. 1).
Through a Foucaudian analysis, this dissertation sought to uncover the productive tensions that exist as art teachers attempt to negotiate within such contradictory implied narratives.

6.1.2 The effect of the discourse on the constituent character of its subjects

Wodak (1996) suggested that discourse does ideological work through particular ways of representing which reproduce unequal relations of power. The link between discourse and ideology in turn reveals how one particular discourse or discursive formation can stand in conflict with another. A power relationship can only be articulated when the two elements are indispensable to one another, yet when the one over whom the power is exercised is thoroughly recognized as a person who acts and invests in the subject position, a whole new field of responses, reactions, results, and possibilities may open up.

Through careful consideration of how ideology works to create and maintain an asymmetrical suturing of dissonant and often-contradictory subject positions, I have demonstrated the effects of the artist/teacher discourse on the constituent character of its subjects. Yet such an ideological struggle equally has the potential to form a creative or productive tension through which alternative articulations of identity may arise. Not all teaching artists experience their lives as inherently contradictory and fragmented, which in many ways can be attributed to the discourse itself as it works to conceal and naturalize these dissonances. Yet, at the same time, the discursive space in which to construct alternative identities is just beginning to emerge.
As reflected in my personal experiences, I expected to explore separate and often contradictory discursive strands that perpetuate the fragmentation of the subject. The discourse of the artist/teacher has become distinct and institutionalized, and the continued fragmentation of the discourse serves to deny the subject the opportunity to articulate his or her identity as an art teacher. How art education continues to address the fragmentation of the subject will have a profound effect upon the context of teacher preparation, particularly as one’s identity as an artist maintains a privileged voice.

Such tensions, or ‘disorders in discourse’ exist as a result of the “gaps between distinct and insufficiently coincident cognitive worlds […] They are traceable not only to the use of unfamiliar professional or technical jargon, but also to the immanent structure of the discourses themselves” (Wodak, 1996, p. 2). My analysis of the discourse of the artist/teacher described the underlying mechanisms that contribute to those disorders in discourse that are embedded in this particular context. When these disorders or distortions arise, understanding becomes the exception, while misunderstanding and conflict becomes the rule.

Similar to Foucault, I have challenged the position of the discourse of the artist/teacher as a neutral position; discourse does “not simply elucidate the world but establish regimes of knowledge and truth that regulate our approach to ourselves, each other and our surroundings respectively” (cited in Andersen, 2003, p. 3). What the discourse of the artist/teacher provides is a means by which an individual can show his or her allegiance towards a particular way of being, and generally, any narrative dissonance is overshadowed by the credentialing and institutional functions that are being served.
Yet what I didn’t expect to find was the emergence of a discursive strand that demonstrated a productive suturing of the roles of the artist and the teacher. Not just a balanced approach, but rather a more integrated and fluid sense of identity that allows for the existence of multiple subject positions occupying the same space at the same time constructively. This most directly serves as both an opportunity for the field, as well as provides a focus for future research.

Despite the constraints of the subject positions made available to them, I have encountered many art teachers that have successfully resisted these socially constructed identities as artists with a strong sense of themselves as teachers. They demonstrated an ability to subvert the coherence and fixity that are seemingly embodied in the discourse of the artist/teacher, and were able to rearticulate the relationship through contemporary revisions of subjectivity that “offer the possibility of making and remaking your self within a living, changing tradition” (Ybarra-Frausto, cited in Hartfield, 1995, p. 78).

Foucault underscored the idea that certain subject positions constrain identity by limiting conceptions of what is possible. What I am suggesting is that the discourse of the artist/teacher does not apply radically new meanings, but rather maintains a hierarchical relationship based upon power and knowledge. Yet the identities of the artist and the teacher are often revealed to be not necessarily autonomous and separate, but rather appropriate, rework, and often subvert one another through a series of unique stylizations. This study revealed the relationship of the artist and the teacher, not only as a productive one, but equally as a catalyst for new combinations and new possibilities for (re)articulating the relationship between the two.
Subjectivity continues to be the site of our consciousness, but it is far from being a fully independent entity, as it remains “bound up by the structures and discourse of institutional and interpersonal order, power and ideology” (Jaworski & Coupland, 2006, p. 394). Subject positions are formed in through the interactions between the self and the context in which the subject operates; in the process, “discourse [and competing discourses] constitutes not only identities, but also social relations and categories, and other aspects of people’s social lives” (Jaworski & Coupland, 2006, p. 391). While acknowledging the necessary fictional nature of the modern self, and that subjectivities continue to be fabricated discursively, the opportunity for the field of art education lies in its recognition of the subject from a more individual or localized basis. Consequently, the struggles or tensions that exist between these two identities suggest the emergence of new meanings by de-centering the subject into numerous subject positions.

Foucault’s conception of the discursive subject provides the basis for considering the subject a materialization of discourse. Together with Hall’s notion of the individual investing in the subject position allows for a (re)conceptualization of subjectivity through which individuals come to understand themselves as subjects, and reveals diverse and dynamic ways of thinking about our identity as art teachers that avoid such a restrictive binarism. In a contemporary context, such interactions constitute a transformative process. It is through discourse, Jaworski & Coupland (2006) suggested, “that ideologies are formulated, reproduced and reinforced” (p. 473), but it is through individual articulations of identity that allow the subject to make sense of his or her own experiences, and allows them to question constructed identities and subjectivities.
6.2 Recommendations

The *Teaching Artist Journal* initially created a space for dialog between the artist and the teacher without challenging either to sacrifice their particular identities. Such a binary approach also tends to focus upon the tensions that persist between them, forcing one to make a choice thereby limiting the possibilities. At the same time, it failed to recognize that there might be only partial or temporal understandings of identity, and perhaps, never a complete homogenous one. What has emerged from this dissertation is that the artist/teacher identity is shaped by colliding realities that requires a more careful (re)consideration through mediated interaction. This shift entails changes in how we conceptualize identity, specifically, how we think about it, talk about it, and how we prepare art teachers.

This dissertation also demonstrated how the discourse of the artist/teacher can be challenged or disrupted by the discourse of contemporary art and theory. Breaking down this false dichotomy involves strategically framing conversations to illuminate how diverse categories of identity intersect with and produce one another through a nuanced and critical understanding of context, social relations, and power. It requires us to gain a better understanding of the many ways we can identify how our subjectivity affects what we come to know, and to accept the realization that the identities of the artist and the teacher are irrevocably intertwined and interdependent.

While distinctly theoretical in nature, the implications of this dissertation can have a profound effect on practice—particularly on how we prepare art teachers. This study
has been a very personal reflection as I have often struggled to resolve the tensions between the pre-modernist and modernist predilections of my training as an artist that and the contemporary art and critical theory have were part of my training as a teacher. As such, being a teacher has influenced my practices as a artist, and vice versa— but what has emerged has not been a fixed or determined sense of identity, but rather a more dynamic articulation of identity that allows for fluidity and transformation—one that is not determinant upon a fixed, or even binary referent.

The ways in which this philosophy of teaching and learning is realized in my classroom is through the incorporation of contemporary theories and practices that advocate the integration of broader perspectives such as multiculturalism, visual culture, service-learning, and community-based art education. My philosophy embraces an active public dimension as well as an intellectual one. This framework captures what I believe integrate essential qualities of both the artist and the teacher, while addressing the complex, multifaceted, and situated nature of knowledge. My role as an artist and as teacher attempts to bring this philosophy to life in the classroom.

This study is not intended to be prescriptive, but rather serves as a means to illustrate the possibilities. Similarly, the Teaching Artist Journal seems to have evolved in its representation of the teaching artist as it more recently began to offer increasingly diverse conceptions of practice. I have come to the conclusion, at least in the context of articulating my own identity as an artist and a teacher, that the distinction is no longer relevant, yet, as was evident throughout the pages of the journal, significant tensions persist—and the distinctions throughout the discourse remain resilient.
I’ve often had people at conferences at which I have presented on the roles of the artist and the teacher ask me which is better, or which did I choose—but they decidedly missed the point. Some artist/teachers have done an admirable job of balancing the demands of both roles, but in terms of identity construction, haven’t progressed beyond vacillating between the two. The significance of this research lies in the stories from those art teachers that have gone deeper, and successfully articulated an identity that allows both to shape their identities and influence their practices.

What I have been able to conclude for myself is not a sense of finding a balance between the two, or of reclaiming one aspect of my identity from the other, but rather to articulate a space through in which the two shape and challenge each other and are allowed to exist and flourish at the same time. A discursive formation does not occupy all the terrain available to it within its system of formation, consequently its enunciations and its concepts remain incomplete—it is only when we challenge the constitutive nature of discourse through a critical perspective that we can propel the discourse forward, or consider more open and fluid conceptions of identity.

Precisely because there is preexisting and institutionalized cultural reasoning surrounding the identity formation of the artist and the teacher, my dissertation set out to question such constructed identities and subjectivities. The next step, and the basis for my continuing research, would be to consider how such diverse articulations of identity affect pedagogy. It will involve creating a thoughtful pedagogical response to more open and fluid conceptions of identity that represent the multiple directions in which our roles and identities continue to evolve. Curriculum development and instruction in art have
been particularly slow to change. The models adopted in arts education are often the least likely to transform social and political conditions. Curriculum and instruction has been traditionally defined by the process of exclusion, yet Art Education should not only be available to the talented few, but rather should foster an understanding of art as a determinant of what it means to be human.

Consequently, a contemporary art education would include critical analysis and present students with alternative models of expression and representation, rather than reinforcing the notion that identity is an uncontested terrain. Such pedagogy would cross disciplines with little regard for previously established boundaries. While such a call for a more cohesive blend of art as pedagogy is not new—teaching art through the lens of visual culture, for example, has gained primacy in art education, interdisciplinary pedagogy, and curriculum development—yet Art Education, in practice, often remains stuck in a mode of thinking that separates analysis from production, and thought from action. Subsequently, there seems to be a tremendous opportunity to enhance and develop courses and programs that blend artistic and pedagogical practices.

As I have been working through these tensions on a theoretical basis, I have come to embody this perspective in my own teaching practices. Or rather, I found the conceptual framework through which to (re)consider my own identity as an artist and a teacher, and that explains why I teach the way I do. At the same time, it forces me to critically challenge the discourse that limit the possibilities. Significantly, this allows for more fluid articulations as the context and circumstances require. For example, when I teach technology in art education, I find myself in the position of having to surrender my
authority as an expert through the recognition that my students are often more versed in technology and new social media than I am. This forces me to reconsider my role as a teacher through a decidedly more constructivist point-of-view. It requires recognition that learning is not confined by an agenda of teachable skills, thus my pedagogy is grounded in problem-solving and critical reflection. In my classroom, poising questions becomes more important than providing answers. In this context, my role as a teacher is to guide students who are actively engaged in discovery, become active participants in their own learning, and who become empowered to make meaning of their own experiences.

Moreover, my responsibility as a teacher is to create a learning environment that includes a more diverse range of student interest and abilities.

My attitudes and perceptions about art and education changed as I became engaged in Community Arts and Service-Learning, which provided a focus on my emerging understanding of the intertwining aesthetic and social implications of arts practices. Classroom practices are thus challenged by the discourses of contemporary art and theory, and predicated upon changing roles for both the artist and the teacher. Consequently, “learning experiences should be created for students so that they experience arts education not only as the creating of art, but also as an inclusive experience creating collaboration between people” (Schroeder-Yu, 2006, p. 163).

Community Arts provoke a deeper understanding of the purposes of art, and how they can be utilized as an effective tool to catalyze social change. This sense of community connects the philosophies of art and education to the larger sphere of social justice. This is based upon the perspective that “What we do is less important than the
fact that we share and interact in respectful and supportive ways, and always keep an open mind to new experiences, ready to adjust in ways that will be most supportive of the individuals with whom we are working” (Kelin, 2008, p. 106). In other words, it is important to respect the characteristics of a place in order to have a place in it. In this context, the role of the artist and of the teacher becomes to emphasize arts ability to be both an object and an act, and to start utilizing art as a trigger for experience. These experiences are now longer based from the sole perspective of the artist, but rather are designed to give students and members of the community the power to use their own voice through expression and storytelling.

Part of my responsibility as a teacher is to provide spaces in which students might learn how their perspectives position them in the larger world. For example, contemporary art and critical teaching practices share an interactive set of principles and practices that are valuable to the teacher, but are predicated upon expanded perception of both art and art education. Such a philosophy shares a new visual language through gestures that both form and inform. They embrace an active vocabulary that is designed to engage, to interact, to exchange, to connect, to communicate, to question, to interrogate, to resist, to question, to provoke, to instigate, to enable, to negotiate, to participate, to collaborate, to reciprocate … to transform. They share an interactive set of principles and practices that are valuable to the teacher, but are predicated upon expanded perception of both art and art education.

Community Arts are connected to socially engaged practices that are designed to broaden our perspectives of art by challenging the existing narratives of both the artist 
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and the teacher. Their purpose is to identify and investigate generative themes within a community, to celebrate and commemorate life experiences of a community, to interact positively within the community, and to create a sense of community. Pragmatically, this can be achieved by utilizing art to engage youth, to develop an active citizenry, and to promote the connections between art and life through interactions in public space. What we can hope to achieve is to empower students to analyze how art making practices shape their own sensibilities and those of the communities in which they live.

Consideration of diverse contexts allow for equally diverse articulations of the multiple roles that can be inhabited by both the artist and the teacher that are not depend upon a fixed binary or a narrow perception of these roles. Such a (re)consideration of identity construction could translate into tactical strategies that can be implemented both inside and outside the classroom to substantively address the needs of today’s and tomorrow’s students. A contemporary curriculum built upon these expanded perspectives would continually emphasizing student-centered learning, and push for truly integrated and interdisciplinary models of learning, and illuminating multiple perspectives regarding the identity of the artist and the teacher at the core of curriculum and instruction.

Art Education, in this context, raises philosophical issues and questions, and it attains value, purpose, and meaning from the personal, social, and cultural dimensions of life. I believe this contemporary perspective not only elevates the significance of the role of art education, but also helps foster a learning environment focused on the lives and the learning needs of the student. My continuing research will work to integrate this
philosophy into art education curriculum in an effort to (re)contextualize the narrative of teaching and learning.

This study is not intended to create an outline for a new curriculum, but its implications towards the praxis of art education are distinct. Whereas, as I have argued, the distinction for many presents a false dichotomy in the formation of identity, the institutional dichotomy remains distinct. The implications go beyond the premise for interdisciplinary studies, or a deeper integration of departments of art and education. Rather the evolving discourse reveals the need to nurture the development of blended practices that allow for more dynamic articulations of identity.

One of the struggles I face as I integrate diverse conceptions of the artist and the teacher into my curriculum is that they function largely in isolation as other art and education classes adhere more closely to traditional and historical paradigms. The more diverse articulations of these roles are often not reinforced in departments of fine arts, education classes, or even in the classrooms in which we place student teachers. So, what might this contemporary perspective look like in the broader context of curriculum and instruction, and teacher preparation? It would include more diverse teaching and learning environments that require an equally diverse range of roles. Equally, it would consider how such diverse roles would (re)contextualize teaching and learning. It would integrate professional development opportunities for teachers that are consistent with what we are teaching our students. The possibilities remain open, but the one characteristic that they all share is none of them are contingent upon a narrow conception of what it means to be an artist or a teacher.
From a theoretical perspective, future research regarding the identity construction of the artist/teacher should shift from the larger field of discourse, to the more personal narratives of those that have come to embody such practices. Not just in the sense of the personal published reflections that appeared in the Teaching Artist Journal, but more specifically with the individual narratives that have emerged to resist the constrains of the discourse, and have successfully rearticulated their identity as an artist and a teacher.

From a pragmatic perspective, additional research should then explore how such diverse articulations of identity affect pedagogy. It is through Foucault’s social construction of the subject together with Hall’s conception of identification that the potential for rearticulating the artist/teacher identity through radical re-conceptions of subjectivity and resistance emerges. A more in depth examination of these individual stories would also provide more direct implications for alternative practices.

6.3 Limitations of the Study

Diversity statistics and information regarding the background for the authors included throughout the journal were limited. Many of the sections within the journal (i.e. Research Review, Newsbreak) did not provide information regarding the contributors. Most of the featured articles did include short biographies for the authors. These included affiliation (i.e. institution or organization) and generally gender could be inferred (small photographs were often included). Interestingly, many of the author descriptions included adjectives such as “leading” or “master” to amplify their status as a teaching artist, which prompts one to consider who is motivated to write for this journal?
Individuals associated with higher education were frequent contributors to the journal. While some held, perhaps as expected, degrees in art education or the fine arts, others held degrees in Creative Management, Quantitative Research, Language, Reading, and Culture, Educational Psychology, and Anthropology. The overwhelmingly majority of the contributors that identified themselves as teaching artists were from arts organizations, for example, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the Lincoln Center Institute, and the Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education (CAPE). Others were affiliated with state arts councils, performing arts centers, and artist-in education programs. Several identified themselves as directors or coordinators of education within these organizations.

The two voices that seemed to be most prominent were those of individuals whom identified most strongly as an artist, and those who embraced the identity of the teaching artist. The prominence of the discursive strands of professionalism, advocacy, and professional development (advocacy and professional development were beyond the scope of this study) further indicate a strong desire to develop legitimacy for the teaching artist as a professional identity. The inclusion of the biographies and the listing of the contributor’s credentials further reinforced the emphasis on legitimacy. These factors served to limit the diversity of the study sample, yet at the same time, helped define the parameters of the discourse.

My reliance upon these existing texts successfully limited my own biases as an artist, a teacher, and ultimately a researcher. Equally, they revealed the perspectives and influences of the editors in shaping of the discourse, but in either case my analysis is
limited by the confines of the text. While I was able to successfully develop a rationale for the consideration of the subject as a materialization of discourse, and demonstrate the effects of discourse on the constituent character of its subjects, as a distinct methodology, it remains incomplete. Expanded research that would further consider the subject a manifestation of discourse would demand more ethnographic methods such as observation and interviews.

One of the limitations inherent in dispositive analysis is the insufficient conceptualization of discursive practices, non-discursive practices and materializations (Jäger & Maier, 2009). By limiting my analysis to existing narratives, I am limited in terms of the text available for analysis. A single text has minimal effects, which are hardly noticeable and almost impossible to prove (Jäger & Maier, 2009). Yet by extending my analysis to eight years of the journal, I am able to examine a more complete discourse that reveals recurring contents, symbols and strategies, and therefore has sustained effects; thereby revealing a constant repetition of statements. Additionally, non-discursive practices can be observed and described, which limits me to a textual analysis, but the problem isn’t purely a linguistic one.

According to Jäger & Maier (2009), in order for a researcher to gain a better understanding, as I have done, they can draw upon existing texts such as the *Teaching Artist Journal*, which in this case represents the practitioners’ literature. The researcher can then rely upon more ethnographic methods such as interviews and observations, which this study does not include, but which may be applicable for future study. Jäger & Maier (2009) also suggest that “a large part of knowledge is only available to people in
their practices [...] In other words, people will know more than they can tell” (p. 59).

This further limits my study by relying strictly upon existing narratives. Another option Jäger & Maier (2009) suggest is to rely on participant observation to reveal such implicit knowledge and make it explicit within the research. The researcher can also extend his or her knowledge by questioning subjects and experts within a particular discourse. These were also beyond the scope of my methodology.

6.4 Conclusion

The identity construction of the artist/teacher must be dialectically engaged, not separated, in order to strengthen and enrich each other. It should allow for new ways of seeing, expressing, and representing oneself through artistic production, critical reflection, and social dialog. We must continue to expand the field to imagine alternative ways of being through a qualitatively different universe of discourse and action, and no longer take for granted that existing social structures are fundamentally unchangeable. If we remain impervious to other possibilities, we become trapped in a very limited world. To do so requires stepping out of the cultural context of the classroom and into the expansive sphere of social life to disrupt and challenge the dominant and normative practices that continue to limit one’s identity as an artist or a teacher.

This study provides an overview of alternative discourses—generated from within the field—that will play a role in how it might be reconsidered. My dissertation examines the social and cultural discourses that articulate the identity construction of the artist and the teacher. It uniquely compares and contrasts sets of theories and cultural practices in
and outside of art education. It provides a broad view of learning that attends to individual differences and similarities in perceiving meaning around contemporary art and pedagogy, set within social, political, and institutional discourses. What has emerged is a framework for careful reconsideration of the practices of the artist and the teacher, one that articulates a sense of art as pedagogy. What is required is a careful consideration for how the field of art education might nurture new and diverse articulations of identity. Reflecting upon my own experiences has provided me a personal perspective to formulate and articulate my own identity as an artist and a teacher. For me, that means to challenge what I believe, to be open to change, and to explore new ways of making sense of experience. A successful learning environment goes beyond the mastery of learning in a specific discipline to critically examine diverse perspectives and the context that shapes them.

Social discourse has the ability to shape and confine one’s identity, just as cultural norms and behavior shape the perceptions of what it means to be an artist and a teacher. Yet a more fluid articulation of identity demands diverse perspectives and equally diverse forms of pedagogy. Recognizing the effects of social influences upon identity I also have the responsibility to critically examine the cultural practices that shape curriculum and instruction. Approaching art and education from a critical perspective allows me to understand human behavior, motivation, and uncover the hidden assumptions and ideologies that shape attitudes and perceptions about one’s identity as an artist and a teacher.
Art and education, I believe, are uniquely suited for this encounter, not from a position of power or authority, but rather by creating multiple perspectives and reference points from which to make meaning of our experiences. Consequently, my research, particularly in the context of teacher education, embraces a plurality of ideas while raising a critical consciousness. It recognizes that there are many areas of understanding that comprise the human conversation, while respecting the idea that many voices may lie in opposition to one another. Only through the convergence of ideas can constructive dialog exist.

Through integration of such diverse perspectives, this study can help to enrich the understanding of learning, meaning making, and the subject of and in art education, and complements other research involving pedagogy, curriculum, and artmaking practices for the contemporary classroom. I believe my interest in rethinking art education practice in light of contemporary theory and artistic practice demonstrates forward thinking and a willingness to take on new perspectives to the field of Art Education.
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