

SEEKING CAUSES FOR THE MARGINALISATION OF THE ARTS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Susan Goetz Zwirn
Hofstra University

This paper seeks to investigate the causes for the marginalisation of the arts in American public education. Despite growing evidence that there is a sound basis for the centrality of the arts in the education of all children, art educators are still struggling to prove the value of their field. The development of art education in a historical context will be reviewed to prove the evolution of the outsider status of the arts. The central role of the development of the field of psychology in theories of education and its strong emphasis on language will be discussed. What is the cause for the benign neglect of the arts in the efforts of most educational reformers? Is art in United States viewed as socially irrelevant? This paper will also examine the importance of the arts in education and possible avenues to further their implementation.

Introduction

The plight of the art educator has been a lonely and precarious one. Those in the arts are constantly trying to prove the right to their existence and the importance of their mission. Despite the high level of abstraction required of other subjects such as mathematics and science, it is absurd to envisage a mathematics teacher thrust into the same role, begging for a room, resources, even a position. Many art educators believe that art should be at the core of the education of every child and yet art remains on the periphery for many children. Many art educators have explored the role that art can play in the development of cognitive functioning as well as emotional and creative expression yet their work has not had much effect on the general field of education (Eisner, 1992). Here we are, today, witnessing further marginalisation of the arts as a result of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) first implemented in the USA in 2001. With districts facing the threat of lost funding if students do not achieve specific test results in mathematics and English, 22% percent of school districts report cuts in time for art and music (Cavanaugh, 2006, cited in Chapman, 2007). What has caused the disregard or passing acknowledgment that educational reformers have for the arts?

One must look hard to find a discussion of the role of art education in North American educational history by non-specialists. Although there have been some art educators working since the early days of public education, their efforts are described in books that are written for art teachers and other arts specialists. This paper will concentrate on the role that the arts have played in the set of priorities expressed by major educational influences. The glaring omission of the contributions of the arts in educational history will again be examined in a discussion of educational psychology. There is a pressing need for a revision in the writing of the history of education as a necessary step in the process of legitimatising the arts in the hearts and minds of mainstream educators. Mainstream texts on education should include the contributions of research in art education into the commonly held and accepted understanding of educational history (Carroll, 1993).

In dozens of educational psychology and reform oriented texts that I examined, the arts were missing from the indices. It is a simple fact that the arts have not been a priority on the American educational scene. Today in 2009, a student can graduate from a North American high school meeting the requirement of zero to two credit hours of arts education. In Japan, students must take five credit hours and in Germany, students must take seven to nine credit hours (Fowler, 1996: 19).

What caused this diminished awareness in education of the role of the arts in human development? This paper considers issues outside of the world of art education to seek answers, looking at historical issues that influenced the arts in education, and examining the work of some influential psychologists and educational theorists.

The neglect of the arts by educational reformers

Examination of some of the dominant ideas that have held sway on the educational landscape provides insight into the causes for the neglect of the arts in the panoply of reform movements. When the first settlers came to this land they faced a vast and undeveloped landscape. They experienced enormous physical challenges, clearing land to produce food, enduring harsh winters without protective shelter, and confronting disease and death from illness and attacks from the Indigenous population of disenfranchised Native Americans, who feared for their existence. The Native American population had a culture based on a combination of hunting, fishing, mining and agriculture. There was an exchange of knowledge that may have enabled the Europeans to survive and develop successful communities.

This exchange does not seem to have extended to art and the sharing of cultural knowledge. The settlers entered a world that they perceived to be devoid of culture. Not only did the Native Americans have a rich visual arts tradition, they enjoyed a thriving inter-related expression of different art forms that were an intimate part of daily life. Native American dance would typically combine storytelling, music, visual art and dance into one event (Sikes, 1995). Perhaps the original performance artists, Native Americans transmitted their cultural heritage through these experiences. Ironically some movements in the arts today attempt to break down the conventional barriers between art forms, in an effort to find more holistic modes of expression. However, the English colonists chose to ignore Native American values and treasures and looked to England to mimic the art they remembered.

This was an inauspicious beginning for a deeply felt appreciation of art and the perception that art was essential to human society. In parts of the world with long civilisations, where people are born in the shadow of artistic achievement, art is suffused with daily life. In fact, there are many peoples whose language does not contain a separate word for art because art is so completely a part of daily existence. For example the Hmong and Arctic Eskimos (both derived from North American groups) do not have a separate word for art, and as Sikes (1995) points out in his discussion of the marginalisation of the arts in the West, many other traditions have an “integrated cultural gestalt”. The first perceived need for art education in the new America was stimulated by the need for men who could provide mechanical drawing for architects and builders. The English culture triumphed over that of many other settling cultures probably due to their superior military, great numbers and wealth. They had a sense of superiority and entitlement. Additionally, the colonists saw themselves as “agents of God’s grand design for the world.” This infusion of religion provided a “zealous sense of righteousness” (Cremin, 1976: 9)

that imbued the colonial educational undertaking with a keen sense of purpose. Most colonial English children did not attend school and most of their education occurred in their home in the nature of apprenticeships. Some homes provided tutoring and communal devotional time.

This lack of any organized concern for art is partially due to the fact that until the end of the nineteenth century, it was the individual teacher who was expected to embody the unique values of the particular community she or he served. These values did not seem to prioritise the arts. By the end of the century, a shift took place from the controlling influence of the values of the individual teacher to the more impersonal values presented in curriculum. The low regard for the arts was publicly voiced by Herbert Spencer, who had a well-documented influence on education. His four essays comprising "Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical," published in 1860, were widely read publications in which he stated that science should be at the core of a modern curriculum. Spencer's prescient predictions about the influence of a science driven curriculum paradigm for the modern world influenced the field of education, as did his theories in the fields of psychology, sociology and ethics. Spencer's self-confessed lack of schooling did not impede his sense of authority on educational issues. Spencer's well-known essay, "What Knowledge is of Most Worth?," published in 1859, clearly presents his view that the essential purpose of education should be "scientific culture" (Kazamias, 1966: 23). This essay was widely read by teachers and other educators. Spencer created a hierarchical list of the subjects in terms of their importance: science was at the top and art was at the bottom, subsumed under the category of leisure activity. Spencer's ideas held sway and as scientific rationalism became the dominant paradigm in educational circles, testing evolved as a more efficient mode of social control. Seen in this light, "Art had lost its *raison d'être* in the school" (Elfand, cited in Soucy & Stankiewicz, 1990: 119).

The scientific perspective with its penchant for efficiency seemed to have reached its apex when it was given further reinforcement by the publication of *The Curriculum* by John Franklin Bobbitt in 1918. The fact that he referred to superintendents as *educational engineers* and the school building as a *plant* was no coincidence, since he derived this factory metaphor from the influence of the values propagated by Frederick Winslow Taylor, the father of the scientific management movement. Bobbitt hoped to illuminate the new field of curriculum development through what he believed was a scientific perspective. The goal of schools was social efficiency, focusing almost exclusively on a curriculum that would train students to fulfill already existing vocations. The hoped for result was a well run machine that perpetuated the status quo and that viewed education as something that prepared students for the future. This dominant model did not stimulate a fertile environment for the arts or creative thinking.

As the social efficiency model was gaining a foothold, a man who was to become an educational sociologist at Teachers College and then the Commissioner of Education in Massachusetts, shot another arrow into the weakened image of art education. David Snedden was spurred by the desire to broaden the scope of vocational education and to further a socially efficient curriculum (Kliebard, 1995). He spent the next twenty years at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, where he carried the banner of scientific curriculum that he accepted from Bobbitt. He tried to do for school and curriculum what Taylor had done for factories and manufacturing. By the time one quarter of the twentieth century had passed, Snedden's ideas represented the dominant philosophy that guided American schools. Anyone who suspected that the arts were in for hard times had their fears confirmed with the publication of David

Snedden's essay, "The Waning Powers of Art," written in 1917. He maintained that art was primarily the product of earlier stages of human evolution and that it may not really be needed anymore (Elfand, cited in Soucy & Stankiewicz, 1990).

The next major influence on the scene, Progressive Education, most closely associated with the work of John Dewey, seemed to offer a major opening for the arts in education. Before addressing the attempts of educational theorists to draw attention to the importance of the arts, this discussion presents another influence that served to limit an understanding of the central role of the arts. This influence, the emphasis on the role of language in human development, emanates from the fields of psychology and educational psychology.

The strong emphasis on language in learning theory

The centrality of language in thinking has been a mainstay of much psychological theory on the understanding of childhood development in this century. It is the clear preeminence of psychological theory in the minds of educators that has elevated language as the sine qua non of curriculum development. Jerome Bruner and Lev Vygotsky elevated logic and reasoning, through language, on a pedestal above other intellectual faculties, and Jean Piaget furthered the essential role of language development.

Examining the views of just some of these psychologists who have so influenced the field of education, it becomes clear that there is an undeniable emphasis on linguistic and logical-mathematical thinking. Jerome Bruner argues that the child tries to organise experience narratively on route to language acquisition. Bruner states: "This method of negotiating and renegotiating meaning by the mediation of narrative interpretation is, it seems to me, one of the crowning achievements of human development...." (Bruner, 1990: 76, 77, 80). Bruner elevates logic and reasoning, through language, above other intellectual faculties.

During the 1960s, Jean Piaget's work on the intellectual capacity of young children was at its height of influence. Piaget held that children under seven years of age were very limited in their ability to reason. Piaget considered the child as a little scientist exploring his or her world alone like a solo Columbus, uninfluenced by culture or any other contextual considerations. Perhaps Piaget was influenced by a modernist, scientific paradigm to justify his view of cognitive development as falling into neat, definable stages. Erica Burman has pointed to the hidden meanings and prerogatives that lie beneath efforts to apply *scientific* stage theory, to quantify and make known the confusing and messy business of understanding development (Burman, 1994). The creation of a system, whose steps, stages and processes are all named in advance, though neat and tidy as it may appear, creates an imaginary structure that becomes the reality for many. The 'fitting in' of humans to stages is appealing for all that it explains, but adherence to a stage theory becomes self-referential, an enclosed, systemic explanation for behavior that misses events and possibilities that are unique, unforeseeable and difficult to define or quantify. Piaget focused on the scientific and numerical competencies of the child, which he believed held the key to the intellect. It remained for the neo-Piagetians to explore domains ignored by Piaget, such as a child's emotional life and artistic development.

Children's art reveals the deep and complex meaning of personal experience that deny time and space limitations and the normally experienced chronology of events. It is curious that Bruner and Piaget rely to such a degree on language as the mode of narrative. Children's art

and children's experience of art forms in general, provide immediate opportunity to create and understand narrative in a way that has unparalleled personal significance. Words have a pre-existence; they can be found in the dictionary. Art is created from the deep well of personal experience and meaning. Art gives organisation and meaning to inert material.

If we can understand art as a type of narrative, we can appreciate it as a cultural tool for making meaning. It is mystifying that art is not mentioned in the index of most twentieth century books on educational psychology reviewed by this writer. Evidence shows that early humans created art forms of one sort or another, and we are aware that every culture has created art, whether it is called 'art' or not. Art as a cultural metaphor or expression, a material product or mark, an aesthetic response or mode of exchange has always been inextricably bound to humans' attempts to make meaning of their existence.

Lev Vygotsky, acknowledged by Bruner as a consummate genius, created a body of work that established a unique synthesis of developmental psychology and environmental factors in learning. Vygotsky, stimulated by Engel's writing on tool use, evolved a theory that posited that people develop tools to master the environment. Humans develop *psychological tools*, or signs, the most important of which is speech. Vygotsky maintained that the internalisation of speech enabled the child to develop his or her intellect (Vygotsky, 1978). He tried to show that speech facilitates thinking. Vygotsky did not appear to consider the role of signs and symbols in visual art, or how the creation of imagery in art also frees the child from the immediate perceptual field and enables him or her to create an inner dialogue.

When Vygotsky extols art, as in his essay, "The Psychology of Art" (1971, written in 1925 and first published 1965) he is first referring to literature as the ultimate art form; again linguistic and not visual. We know that Vygotsky appreciated art. He wrote, "Without art, there can be no new man" (Vygotsky, 1971, cited in Ross, 1992: 523). But in examining his understanding of drawing, we see an effort to comprehend visual art in pictorial or narrative terms only. It is true that a child sometimes tells a story in his or her drawing, but this is only one of many possible motivations. We should not assume that speech is the only primary symbolic system. If speech was the wellspring of all sign systems, the artist would not endure the often arduous life of deprivation and struggle to create art; to create that which cannot be said by the mere manipulation of words.

Attempts to assert the importance of the arts in education

It was the movement of Progressive Education, in part reacting to the regimentation of the scientific management practices that offered some possibility for the arts. John Dewey's work is most closely associated with progressivism. Dewey viewed the child as a growing organism that was ever developing intelligence, or growth, through the stimulation of culture. Dewey believed that schools should practice the democratic ideas they espoused. The "whole child" was to be considered and learning situations would be created to promote experiential learning. During the peak of progressive education (1920-1940), guided by Dewey's ideas, there was an opening for the arts. With Dewey, the arts had, at last, a brilliant champion who was a philosopher and educator to a general audience. He wrote:

To think effectively in terms of relations of qualities is as severe a demand upon thought as to think in terms of symbols, verbal and mathematical. Indeed, since words are easily manipulated in mechanical ways, the production of a work of genuine art probably demands more intelligence than does most of the so-called thinking that goes on among those who pride themselves on being 'intellectuals' (Dewey, 1934: 46).

In his work, *Art as Experience*, Dewey (1934) strives to make aesthetics basic to education. Another book, *Education Through Art*, written by Herbert Read and originally published in 1943, shares the same goal: to place art at the center of education. Although neither theorist, Dewey or Read, presents concrete curriculum design methods, both point to the implementation of aesthetic education as crucial to experiential learning, enculturation and a developed perceptual sensibility. Read was keenly sensitive to the science-art dichotomy that had evolved at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century and which he roundly rejected. He wrote, "Art is the representation, science the explanation—of the same reality" (Read, 1943: 11). Read drew attention to the importance of children's art. He believed that one goal of education should be to prevent the child from losing the innate ability to symbolise through visual imagery. It was imperative for creativity to thrive, not only for the sake of individual well-being but also for collective social harmony. This concern for the health of the social group to which the individual belongs echoes John Dewey's concern for the vitality of the community and its democratic ethos. Read's thesis of *Education Through Art* is expressed as follows:

... the general purpose of education is to foster the growth of what is individual in each human being, at the same time harmonizing the individuality thus educed with the organic unity of the social group to which the individual belongs (Read, 1943: 8).

The philosophic basis of Read's ideas was Platonic idealism. It is interesting to note that both Dewey and Read claim that their beliefs were anticipated by those of the philosopher Plato. The thesis is that art should be the basis of education (Read, 1943: 1). Read maintains that Plato's thesis had lain dormant for twenty-four centuries only to be rediscovered by twentieth century psychologists. In searching for an explanation as to why Plato's idea about the significance of the arts in education was not seriously considered until the present century, Read suggests that "...so firmly have the opposed concepts of logical reasoning and intellectual science gripped the world..." (Read, 1943: 61) that art was rendered unimportant. He also points to the iconophobic bias that is a part of the Judeo-Christian tradition, which evolved from the Commandments and the fear of return to paganism and idolatry stimulated by the visual image of man. The strength of the 'ethical dogmatism' emanating from these concerns was such as to prevent the revival of the arts during the Renaissance from overturning the teachings from the Church with regards to education. Although there is some mention of the arts, the humanist tradition extols rationalist learning and relegates the arts to recreational activity. Clearly, the growth of the division between the visual arts and the perceptions of 'real learning' that develops in North America had a long evolution.

To fathom why the ideas of the social efficiency experts took root in contrast to the complex and subtle ideas of John Dewey and Herbert Read, one must look beyond these developments as merely the result of the ideas of a few prominent men. History evolves from a complicated web of inter-relationships between the ideas of leaders and the will and interests of the people.

It may be that the perspective of the social efficiency experts reflected the priorities of North Americans to a greater extent than the priorities of progressive educators. For the arts, this preference did not bode well. The success or failure of particular movements is inextricably bound to the history of a country: its habits, its perception of reality and its understanding of what constitutes knowledge and progress. North American parents were not, nor are they now, storming the schools demanding the arts for their children. It is not enough to blame the priorities set by the Industrial Revolution in the United States. The Industrial Revolution swept Europe and then Asia, as it did USA. Why did this model prove particularly damning for the arts in North America?

Another philosopher and aesthetician, Susanne Langer wrote, in 1941, a survey of philosophical tradition from pre-Socratic times. Her position held that the emphasis on science that developed in the nineteenth century abrogated the significance and meaning of values related to truth and beauty that had held dominance for so many centuries. Langer noted the paradox inherent in the attention granted to mathematicians. Empiricists claimed to be looking for the hard facts and yet the mathematics specialists they admired dealt with abstract symbols. In *Philosophy in a New Key* (Langer, 1957), her hypothesis is that humans manifest a need to symbolise and thereby invest meaning in their lives. Although Langer is ignored by many philosophers and did not attain a permanent university position, Howard Gardner suggests that her legacy may transcend her time. To Langer, Gardner attributes legitimisation of a scholarly interest in symbolism and the arts (Gardner, 1982: 54).

This question is taken up later in the century by the philosopher, Maxine Greene, who many consider the heir to John Dewey's philosophical positions. Greene laments the lack of concern about a sense of community and the concomitant public debate that such a sensitivity would stimulate. She notes that there are no unified efforts to create what Dewey called an "articulate public." She agrees with Dewey's assertion that to be free exists "Not because of what we statically are, but in so far as we are becoming different from what we have been" (Dewey, 1960: 280, cited in Greene, 1988: 3). For Greene, freedom requires an "opening of spaces as well as perspectives" (Greene, 1988: 5), and depends on a sense of possibility, the ability to imagine betterment and growth. To encourage freedom, Greene believes that education should focus on the imagination, as well as reason. The creative imagination frees the intellect and inhibits or prevents the deadening power of dogmatism. She powerfully points to the arts and literature as a catalyst to awaken this power to imagine and reflect, as essential components to her idea of freedom and, therefore, education. For Greene and for Dewey, this freedom requires a commitment to the public realm. Greene asks, "What is left for us then in this positivistic, media-dominated, and self-centered time?" (Greene, 1988: 55). One avenue that Greene illuminates as a means of reasserting a personal, reflective sense of self, a way to make meaning out of the impersonal, is through an aesthetic appreciation, a deeply personal encounter with art forms that allow meaning that would be inaccessible any other way.

The arts promote a *wide-awakeness* (Greene, 1978), which Greene perceives to be at the heart of life with meaning, lived among a community of peers. Greene's broad philosophical grasp, which reaches into the humanities and rests on historical precedent, presents an interdisciplinary understanding of culture and history as well as philosophy. She grabs the baton from Dewey and runs with it to the closing bell of the twentieth century. What we need is a bigger crowd at the finish line.

Another champion of the arts has emerged; this time from the field of psychology. Howard Gardner's theory of intelligence provides further hope for the mainstreaming of the arts in education. Gardner hails from the academic tradition of the other psychologists discussed; and in fact, his teaching of Piaget's theory of development at Harvard University was a stimulus in the development of his Multiple Intelligence Theory (MI). Gardner's research indicated to him a contradiction with Piaget's idea that major milestones in different domains develop at the same time. Also, Gardner maintains that Piaget believed that he was studying the field of cognition and intelligence when, in actuality, he was studying an aspect of it: the scientific arena, particularly in relationship to mathematical competence. The evolution of Gardner's theory out of this scientific, rational, modernist paradigm gives his work a certain legitimacy in the eyes of educators since it harks from a very familiar tradition. His research revealed contradictions, not only with aspects of Piaget's theory, but also with fundamental aspects of accepted Western views of intelligence.

In his desire to understand learning and human development, Gardner has studied children and the arts in depth (Gardner, 1980). He understands the central role of production in any art experience. Additionally, Gardner has been deeply involved with the issue of assessment because of his understanding that it is not enough to teach through the different intelligences, as students need to be provided with modes of assessment that permit them to demonstrate their mastery of subject matter through these intelligences. Gardner's theory of MI, based on current understanding of the brain, particularly the knowledge that each area has a separate neurological system, demands a broader view of intelligence. By highlighting the role of the other intelligences in cognition, Gardner provides a convincing rationale to integrate diverse art forms into the core curriculum and to teach the arts as valid, even *core* subjects in their own right.

Conclusion

Western art educators tend to value individuality over community and historically Western art educators make presentations to professional peers rather than engaging in conversations with the larger field. This situation is due to a myriad of reasons, not least of which is the traditional tendency of Western artists to prize each individual's uniqueness and to emphasise the importance of a rich and developed inner life as a wellspring for artistic creation. Such involvement with the individual, and art educators' tendency to conduct an academic dialogue within the confines of the field of art education, have further isolated the arts from mainstream educational concerns.

The roots of this thinking run deep: most Western art educators have been trained in the tradition of an individual-based approach which views the teaching of art as a route to some sort of self-actualisation and psychological integration. These concepts are basic tenets in the work of the art educators Lowenfeld and Brittain (1987), whose text *Creative and Mental Growth*, now in its eighth printing, has largely influenced a generation of art educators. This focus on the individual's psychological and emotional growth coupled with the modernist, Western tendency to prize individuality has coalesced to remove art education from a social, political and cultural context and thus rendered it socially irrelevant in the eyes of many Americans. Prizing individuality is a hallmark of the modern artist and, by extension, the modern art educator. Some artists are drawn to the field of art education because of the independent nature of the art teacher. This penchant towards individuality has had many positive results for creative teaching; however, it has not exactly propelled art educators and the advocacy of

arts education into the limelight of the broad field of education. As already noted, mainstream texts prepared for prospective teachers tend to ignore the role of the arts in development. In the field of the arts, those advocates who are writing on the subjects developed in this paper appear almost exclusively in arts-related journals. The foregoing discussion does not imply that the art that is thriving in museums, galleries and theaters is perceived as socially irrelevant. The attendance to these cultural institutions has increased significantly in recent decades. With the public's appreciation of art at record levels, one is again provoked to question why art has been left at the sidelines by educational policy makers.

If art educators hope to bring their case to these decision makers, they must move beyond dialogue with their own colleagues and into the wider arena of educational debate. It has been noteworthy and revealing that almost every article written on the subject of the marginalisation of the arts discovered by this writer during research appeared in specialty, arts-related magazines: even the articles which called particularly for an understanding of the arts by general educators in other fields (Carroll, 1993; Donmoyer, 1995; Fowler, 1996; Sikes, 1995; Walsh, 1993). This preaching to the converted will not serve to arouse a sense of urgency in policymakers who are besieged on all fronts with the interests of diverse educational constituencies. In particular, the call for classes in computer technology seems to be especially strident from many groups, including both teachers and parents.

What is it exactly about the American people and its history that has allowed the marginalisation or even elimination of art from schools? Unlike our European, or African, or Asian counterparts, the Americans of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries did not grow up in the shadow of cathedrals, or sculpture, or as a part of a tradition of performance art, or amidst beautifully hand-crafted objects. Ignoring Native American art or marginalising it as 'primitive', the early settlers built communities that were a reflection of styles remembered. Their pride of place and community may have been based on many noble attributes: physical beauty, political and religious freedom, land to farm and own, but it was not based on a love or appreciation of art as it has been in older civilizations. An acknowledgment of the hold and influence of educational history in the United States is important in trying to understand why the arts have not been considered a vital educational strand.

A concern of equal importance is the bias towards language development, which has been a mainstay of psychology and teacher education. Language educators have been very successful, in recent decades, in convincing teachers that language arts must be integrated with all other disciplines. Their central argument, which echoes views by Bruner and Vygotsky, is that language is the basic element of thought and that language is the main mode of curriculum transmission. Both the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the American Association for the Advancement of Science's reform document *Science for All Americans* (1989) have clearly stated the central position of language in the learning of their subjects. Additionally, the whole language movement has furthered its cause throughout elementary school curriculum by advocating the role of language skills in other academic areas (Donmoyer, 1993).

Language is clearly not the sole medium for symbolic thought. Besides numeration, the symbolic system for mathematics, imagery is another key symbol system that has served humanity quite effectively since its inception. Unfortunately, our language bias has limited our appreciation of the role of imagery and symbol formation. It is imperative to make an understanding of the

role of symbols and imagery in cognition a fundamental aspect of teacher education if we can realistically hope for a more essential role for arts in education. The theoretical foundation that psychological theorists such as Piaget, Bruner, and Vygotsky provide is a powerful justification for the central position of language development.

Although major theorists, such as the philosophers Dewey, Read, and Langer, the psychologist/social scientist, Gardner, and the art educator, Eisner, have convincingly explored the essential place for the arts in human development, their arguments have basically echoed within the walls of the field of art education. Art educators must reject their isolation as individuals and the marginalisation of their field. The case for the role of the arts in education must be taken to the streets! In this case, to Main Street and in the field of education, Main Street means university departments of education and psychology for teacher education programs, it means central educational organizations, it means mainstream journals and magazines and today, with NCLB, it means the federal government. NCLB reflects a "...federal preference for curricula that marginalizes studies in the arts and humanities in favor of the sciences, with reading and mathematics positioned as the most essential tools for academic learning (Chapman, 2007: 35)". This test approach to teaching (referred to as drill and kill) hides in guise of the seemingly noble call for academic excellence. Sadly, it is continued dominance of the factory model of education that has always been ascendant on the American scene that has denied many American children a balanced model of learning that embraces the arts, the humanities and the sciences. The case for the uniquely human process of artistic development and its crucial role in the lives of children must be understood and valued by all concerned with education. The full development of children, emotionally and cognitively, and the persistence and flowering of cultural understanding depend on our efforts. Hopefully, in this postmodernist and globalised era, the scientific method and the factory model that have largely shaped educational practice will lose their grip on curriculum design. This may be a propitious time to reassert the essential role of art in the lives of children, in the role of learning, and in the world we envision for the future.

References

- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- Burman, E. (1994). *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology*. New York: Routledge.
- Carroll, K. L. (1993). Taking Responsibility: Higher education's opportunity to affect the future of the arts in the schools. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 95, September/October, 17-22.
- Chapman, L. (2007). An Update on No Child Left Behind and National Trends in Education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 109, September/October, 25-36.
- Cremin, L. (1976). *Traditions of American Education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as Experience*. New York: Perigee Books.
- Donmoyer, R. (1995). The Arts as Modes of Learning and Methods of Teaching: A (borrowed and adapted) case for integrating the arts across the curriculum. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 5, 14-20.
- Eisner, E. (1992). The Misunderstood Role of the Arts in Human Development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(8), 591-95.
- Fowler, C. (1996). *Strong Arts, Strong Schools*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, H. (1980). *Artful Scribbles*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1982). *Art, Mind and Brain: A cognitive approach to creativity*. New York: Basic Books.
- Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of Learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The Dialectic of Freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kazamias, A. M. (Ed). (1966). *Herbert Spencer on Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958*. New York, Routledge.
- Langer, S. (1957). *Philosophy in a New Key*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Lowenfeld, V. & Brittain, W. L. (1987). *Creative and Mental Growth (eighth edition)*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Read, H. R. (1943). *Education through Art*. N.Y.: Pantheon Books.
- Ross, M. (Ed.). (1992). *Art and its Significance*. Albany, N.Y.: State University Press.
- Sikes, M. (1995). From Metaphoric Landscapes to Social Reform: A case for holistic curricula. *Arts Education Policy Review* 96, 4, 26-31.
- Soucy, D. & Stankiewicz, M. (Ed.). (1990). *Framing the Past: Essays on art education*. Reston, Va.: National Art Education Association.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman (Eds.). Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, D. J. (1993). Art as Socially Constructed Narrative: Implications for early childhood education. *Arts Education Policy Review* 94(6), July/August, 18-23.