

Theory and (in) Practice: The Problem of Integration in Art and Design Education

Jenny Rintoul

Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between art 'theory' and art 'practice' in British art education at post-compulsory level, with a focus on the ways in which theory is framed and delivered and what this means for its integration. Drawing upon constructions of knowledge and approaches to integration as a technique and integration as a philosophy, suggestions are made on ways of organising theory in relation to studio practice. Theory is discussed here in terms of its common label in British Further and Higher Education: Critical and Contextual Studies (CCS), and particular reference is made to data drawn from research into practices of CCS on the BTEC Extended Diploma in Art and Design in 2008-10. Through the data, three dominant models of CCS are proposed and examined in order to identify the problem of integration and to make suggestions on what it means to integrate CCS in an art and design course.

Keywords

critical and contextual studies, integration, theory and practice, post-compulsory education, extended diploma in art and design

Introduction

The labels currently applied to the 'theory' component of British art education courses at post-compulsory (post-16) level include History of Art, Critical and Contextual Studies and Visual Culture; historically there have been other labels in circulation such as Complementary Studies and General Studies. These labels represent a space that is always present in post-compulsory art education but that varies from institution to institution in terms of subject content, delivery methods and identity within the course. At times, this theory component appears to merge with art practice and seems inseparable and even indistinguishable from it; at others theory is framed as a discrete subject that sits in isolation in the course, or even in conflict with it. Whether delivered in a discrete lecture theatre context, embedded in the art studio or visible in various combinations of both, the relationship between theory and studio practice is an unresolved yet long debated issue in British art education discourse.

This article examines the identity of 'theory' in art education, primarily in terms of Critical and Contextual Studies (CCS) as this is a label widely in circulation in Further Education and broadly used in Higher Education. The meanings and possibilities for 'integration' are then explored, a term and process understood as desirable within art education but lacking in clarity over how it is achieved and what it actually means in practice. This issue of integrating theory and practice in art education is part of a long trajectory of debate; there was a surge of interest in the integration of theory and practice in art education in the 1990s, during which time there was a drive for curriculum integration echoed in statements such as that of John Swift: 'we should be consciously integrating theory and practice' (Dawtrety et al. 1996, 13). Debates on integration through the nineties, however, were not met with conclusive solutions. This article draws upon discourse from this period in examining current models of integration in art education, and the persistent interest in

integration as a pedagogical tool and approach. The notion of 'integration' as an approval word can be seen in the context of wider education discourse; over forty years ago Pring (1971) described 'integration' as a term often used to describe situations or practices that are generally understood as valuable in education, but not well defined or applied. It is from this starting point that this article examines the organisation of CCS as an 'integrated' element in art education.

Background and elements of the research process

The 'problem' of integrating theory and practice emerges from the framing of these two components as binaries with discrete languages and identities. This entrenched division of 'theory' and 'practice', 'head' and 'hand', 'thinking' and 'making' has been widely discussed and challenged as artificial in art, design and craft discourse (Sennett 2008; MacLeod & Holdridge 2005; Eisner 2002). In art and design education, these divisions appear equally artificial and arbitrary, in that unlabelled or unofficial theory and studio practice are inevitably intertwined. For example, students contextualise and develop their practice and identities through researching and studying practitioners around them and before them; students theorise their work in crits, sketchbooks and in conversation with peers and tutors; and art practice itself is broader than making and broader than the visual.

The problem is not that theory and practice are inevitably polarised and therefore difficult to integrate, the problem is that there is an assumption that integration can and should be instigated and managed by deliverers and designers of the curriculum and this depends upon a common understanding of what, exactly, is being integrated. Where theory is understood as a discrete subject, the management and control of its integration in the curriculum appears plausible. Where theory is understood as embedded in practice, the possibilities for managing and controlling its integration are less clear, less quantifiable, less easy to effect. A key question in understanding the problem of integration and how to overcome it is therefore to identify the nature of the subject(s) at stake and the constructions of knowledge within this or these.

In addressing these questions, this article draws upon research from a mixed-methods study conducted between 2008 and 2010 in the UK, examining the integration of CCS in the BTEC Extended Diploma in Art and Design [1]. The study included a questionnaire survey sent to BTEC Extended Diploma art and design course managers across the UK, which generated information on the delivery and structure of CCS. The questionnaire returns highlighted a lack of consistency in CCS delivery across institutions. When CCS was labelled 'non integrated' in the survey, it was described by those institutions identifying it as a discrete subject within the curriculum. Integrated CCS appears in the survey predominantly in two ways: CCS as integrated with studio work or project briefs (at times in conjunction with a discrete lecture programme), and CCS as integrated in an unstructured manner without any formal identity within the curriculum. From this range, five case study examples were selected to reflect 'maximum variation' (Flyvbjerg 2006).

The qualitative case studies involved six visits to each of the five selected Extended Diploma courses; research methods included 'hypothesis generating' observations (Cohen et al. 2007) of CCS and studio sessions, and semi-structured interviews (Bogdan & Biklen 1992)

with course managers, staff and students. Both CCS and studio staff were interviewed; around six student participants volunteered for interview at each site and were asked to produce visual representations of the Extended Diploma course as a stimulus for discussion on the position of CCS within it. The five institutions selected for study were given the following pseudonyms: Penton (Art College), Barrinborough (Sixth Form College), Rensworth (Art College), Hillburton (FE College) and Wrickford (FE College).

Locating, and integrating, 'theory'

'Theory' was formally located in art education in the 1960s when art schools came under scrutiny with the Coldstream Reports. The quest for academic rigour in art education amongst policy makers at this time led to recommendations for an 'academic' or 'theoretical' provision constituting 15 per cent of the course, in the form of art history (Coldstream 1960, 8). These recommendations on art history provision and assessment were met with disdain by both students and tutors, leading to feelings that British art education prior to the 1960s 'did very well without theory' (Allison & Hausman 1998, 122). However, rather than 'theory' emerging in this period as an alien intruder in art and design, forms of 'theory' have always existed as embedded in, and integral to, the subject of art and design. The 1960s shift was not in the emergence of theory but in this theory becoming formalised, assessable and regulated.

Theory, when separated from the art studio and situated in an assessable field, is framed as discrete in art education. The pedagogic authority of the lecture theatre (Bourdieu & Passeron 1994) and the formal academic writing of the essay assessment, imbue theory with an identity that marks it apart from art and design practice and assessment. This distinction is evident in the ways in which students perceive CCS, across both Further and Higher level education, demonstrated in the 2008–10 (case study research).

Within the case study research, a broadly typical positive account of CCS amongst students interviewed was 'I like it because it's a breath of fresh air from the practical' (Student, Wrickford). A largely representative negative view of CCS was 'I came here to do Art, not English' (Student, Wrickford). While opinions on CCS amongst students remain divided, the commonality across data gathered in the 2008–10 study was that CCS is defined by its difference to the language and learning culture of the studio. It was perceived in the majority as distinct from, not embedded in, practice.

A concern amongst staff teaching on the Extended Diploma in Art and Design courses in this study was how to overcome the theory/ practice divide and integrate these two apparently disparate elements of an art and design course, highlighting the complexities in defining, delivering and integrating 'that tricky subject' (as described by the course manager at Wrickford) that is CCS. At Wrickford, the course manager suggested that 'Ideally it (CCS) would be integrated in everything, but I don't know how we would organise and staff that.'

Instead, CCS is managed at Wrickford in a discrete weekly lecture programme, organised by one allocated CCS tutor. In the case of Wrickford, therefore, the students are left to independently explore these connections between theory and practice rather than these links being set up in the curriculum. Some students at Wrickford excel in producing a critical

practice, where theory and practice appear to be in collaboration and dialogue. Other students, however, are unable to independently integrate theory in the studio; for these students the CCS provision remains detached and irrelevant to practice.

For parity of opportunity and access to 'theory' amongst students, there is a staff view across all five case sites that CCS is ideally integrated with studio practice, however the problem is in how to design, deliver and assess this. With the exception of Wrickford, where staff took a non integrated approach to CCS, staff across the case studies (Rensworth, Penton, Hillburton and Barrinborough) designed their courses so that CCS was integrated. From these four cases of integrated CCS, three dominant models of CCS emerged: Collaborative CCS, Diluted CCS and Dominant CCS.

Data examples

At Rensworth, the problem of integrating CCS was addressed through integrated delivery on one specific day per week:

"For clarity we deliver CCS on one day. So for the students it's very clear that Nigel and Peta are practitioners, or studio staff, but that they work with me as CCS tutor on a Monday; Monday is CCS day. So we have tried to integrate it in that way – and the students work (on Mondays) in the studio so they see the dialogue between CCS and practice." (CCS tutor, Rensworth).

Although this 'dialogue' is managed on a contained formal CCS day at Rensworth, there appears to be informal integration occurring throughout the course. According to students:

"Monday is research day, the beginning of the week. But tutors talk to us about other artists and theories and ideas at all different times... There can't be (just one member of staff attached to CCS) because everyone needs to do that. If you don't research artists your work is not going to make sense; if you don't have that you don't have ideas and you don't have a final piece. I don't think you can have practical without theory; but maybe you can have theory without practical if you're doing something like art journalism." (First year student, Rensworth).

Rensworth is an example of what is here termed Collaborative CCS, where students perceive CCS in collaboration and dialogue with studio practice. The CCS day at Rensworth renders theory accessible and embedded in the studio; this appears to empower students to forge links between theory and practice elsewhere in the course.

While 'theory' at Rensworth is formally integrated on one specific day per week, there are other cases where there are attempts at full integration across the whole course. At Penton, for example, CCS is fully integrated so that there is no specific 'theory' or CCS space in the curriculum:

"History and Contextual (CCS) is in every area (of the course) as far as I'm concerned, and I try to bring it in in sneaky ways so they don't see it as 'oh no we've got to do the history and theory now and we hate writing'." (Course Manager, Penton)

In response to this 'hidden' CCS, students express confusion: 'I like to know what it (CCS) is, separate to my art work. As it is now, everything is getting mixed up' (Student, Penton). In this model at Penton, CCS becomes diluted and lost within the course; for first year students in particular, there is confusion over how to make sense of and locate CCS within the

course. Despite staff intention, CCS at Penton becomes invisible and diluted in studio practice, rather than in dialogue with it, and is here termed Diluted CCS.

As well as at Penton, Diluted CCS provision is evident at Barrinborough where there is no formal or discrete CCS provision until the end of the last semester in year one, when the students write an essay. At Barrinborough, there is a staff view that theory should not be dominant over practice:

“It is important that CCS is not over-emphasised in the studio, we don’t want the students to be put off by theory, or to find it too dominating. So we don’t formally teach it and then when it comes to assessment we look for evidence in student work”. (Tutor, Barrinborough)
When asked how they would describe CCS, students responded: ‘dead... art is creative but writing an essay kills you off’ (Student, Barrinborough).

For students at Barrinborough, CCS is associated with essay writing rather than theories, ideas, concepts and histories, and is thus defined by its assessment. As well as the essay assessment, staff track evidence of CCS across studio work so that CCS is integrated throughout the course. However, the students are not aware of any specific CCS provision other than essay writing. There is a staff fear at both Penton and Barrinborough that CCS will become ‘too dominant’ over practice if it is over-emphasised in the curriculum, and it is a Diluted CCS that emerges at these two sites.

At Hillburton, CCS is heavily weighted in the curriculum compared to the other four sites, and this model is here termed Dominant CCS. There is a discrete weekly lecture programme as well as CCS integrated throughout the course. There is a staff view that CCS is significant and important, but that the lecture programme structure is set predominantly in order to meet the requirements of the syllabus:

“If I could integrate it (CCS), if the syllabus was not so prescriptive, I wouldn’t teach it separately at all. I would have it completely embedded in their practical projects; to a large extent this happens already but we also have to have this separate thing (lecture programme). I think the students are more likely to have the incentive, to undertake the research, to be interested, if its (CCS) related to their printmaking project, their graphics project, and so on.” (CCS tutor, Hillburton)

With CCS delivered in lecture format and in studio workshops, some students perceive a dominance of ‘theory’ and research:

“I do find that a lot of the time we are getting ideas from research and we’re not coming up with our own ideas. It’s very research and theory – based. It all has to relate to research and theory.” (Student, Hillburton)

Students make reference to the integrated CCS throughout the course as being theoretically rigorous to the extent that it dictates practice.

‘Theory’ as Collaborative, Dilluted and Dominant CCS

Collaborative CCS is theory taught within practical projects and in the studio, facilitating, underpinning, informing and supporting art practice. This model is evident at Rensworth and is perceived as a successful and desirable model of integration by staff across all sites, occurring where theory is in collaboration and dialogue with art practice. At best Collaborative CCS renders theory accessible and practice informed.

Diluted CCS represents a reduction in CCS content through a focus on technical studio practice over critical theory; it is a type of CCS that occupies a marginalised, hidden and inferior identity and position within the course due to it being lost in integration. Diluted CCS occurs when CCS provision is dispersed through the curriculum without discrete management, such as at Penton and Barrinborough, resulting at worst in a curriculum that is confusing and ambiguous.

Dominant CCS represents attempts to integrate CCS by designing briefs and units around theory and academic writing to the extent that CCS overshadows and surpasses the position of art practice. This model is evident at Hillburton and occurs when CCS is awarded a high proportion of space in the curriculum and a central space in studio briefs. In this model, there is the potential for a shift away from studio practice and towards theory, academic writing and visual analysis. Threats of 'academic drift' (Ecclestone 2000) in art education, where 'the essential function of art education is the analysis and understanding of visual culture, relegating the creative experience to secondary level' (Aguirre 2004, 257), are a concern for staff experiencing or fearing Dominant CCS such as at Penton and Barrinborough.

The 2008–10 case study research indicated that attempts at integration result in varying levels of success, often resulting in Diluted CCS where 'theory' is less visible, less rigorous, and difficult to assess. Although the Collaborative CCS model was perceived as the most desirable, the ways in which this model can be achieved was not clear amongst those aspiring to implement it. It is apparent that there is a desire for integration; the assumption that integration is valuable is widespread. What it means to integrate and how this can be achieved is ambiguous, however, resulting at worst in students experiencing either a weak and diluted theory provision, or one that oppresses and overshadows practice. This question of how to achieve integration, combined with the residing view of integration as desirable, echoes Pring (1971) and demonstrates the persistence of this problem of integration.

Constructions of knowledge

When theory is delivered and assessed as CCS in a non-integrated manner, typically in a lecture theatre context with an essay assessment, it fits with an education system that is product based and that focuses on linear and codified 'knowing' rather than on the unpredictability, risk and 'not knowing' art and design. When CCS is isolated rather than integrated, it makes for clear management and organisation, crudely reducing the relationship between CCS and studio practice to an academic/vocational and head/hand divide, so perpetuating the arbitrary theory/practice binary. Where these terms are recognised not as polarised but as integrated, co-dependent and supporting one another, there is scope for students to achieve critical, informed and intuitive creative practice.

Brighton (1994, 34) suggests that art is a 'theoretical, intuitive and material activity', supporting the view that theory and practice, concept and material skill, thinking and making, are interconnected. Through repeating the integration of these elements, Brighton suggests that 'intuitive practice' is achieved. Rather than intuition being understood as

innate and untutored, therefore, Brighton implies that 'intuitive practice' is the product of the sophisticated skill of integration. According to this understanding, 'intuitive practice' can be understood as occurring through the production of tacit knowledge (Polanyi 1969), that is, knowledge that is difficult to codify and that is the manifestation of integrating theory and practice. This could be a useful way of understanding means for students to achieve a critical and informed creative practice.

Brighton's notion of 'intuitive practice' is part of a trajectory of discourse on theory in practice, including corporeal theory and notions of 'thinking-in-making' (e.g. Meskimmon 2004), as well as the previously cited writings of Eisner (2002), MacLeod & Holdridge (2005) and Sennett (2008). These ideas are rooted in the understanding of theory as embodied, attached, responsive to practice and with potential to be reformed, rather than theory as fixed in an abstract detachment from practice. This opens questions on how knowledge can be understood and classified, and what this means for integration. A re-visiting of earlier debates where 'art education is a discursive practice (where) tutoring people in making art is tutoring people in ways of thinking about art' (Brighton 1994, 37) offers a basis from which to develop this discussion on knowledge and what this means for integrating CCS.

The thinking, talking and making that occurs in the studio represents an integrated structure of knowledge that is in dialogue with practice. As a consequence, this form of knowledge becomes difficult to codify, potentially resulting in an 'intuitive practice' based on high levels of criticality and creativity. Codifying this knowledge and disconnecting it from practice (Ryle 1949) obscures the development of 'intuitive practice' based on tacit knowledge which evolves from sophisticated integration. The delivery of CCS as a discrete element of an art and design course where CCS is tightly classified and framed (Bernstein 1971), supports such codifying typical in the Dominant CCS model.

Where CCS is more embedded in studio practice, knowledge is typically more tacit. In this, studio practice becomes the site for knowledge integration and demonstration, much like the ideals for Collaborative CCS. Tacit knowledge is developed and evidenced in a more holistic and less quantifiable way than codified knowledge and does not fit so neatly in to a linear and product-based assessment system. It is difficult, therefore, to achieve in practice as the staff in the 2008–10 research project highlight. To examine the possibilities for integration within the current assessment-based system, it is useful to turn to identifying whether CCS occupies a discrete knowledge system or is part of the knowledge system and discipline of art and design.

Conceptualising integration

If CCS and studio practice are perceived as two distinct knowledge systems that cohabit within one course, integration can be best understood as a tool or technique to be applied in varying forms and levels. When CCS is perceived in this way, it might appear in the course as a lecture-based history of art course, with a discrete knowledge system, assessment procedure and delivery technique. If, however, CCS and studio practice are two parts of one discipline so that both are embedded within the subject of art and design as one knowledge system, integration can be understood as absolute in that there is nothing but integration.

This form of CCS is embedded in the process of creative practice, forming the research base to studio projects, and contextualising, informing and supporting practice in ways that are not always quantifiable or codifiable.

When CCS is understood as a discrete knowledge system, integration is a technique; when CCS is understood within one knowledge system that studio practice also inhabits, integration is a philosophy. The approach to integration as a technique, where discrete knowledge domains are in collaboration, lends itself to a discussion on different levels and models of integration which is akin to Jacobs' (1989) view of integration. The approach to integration as a philosophy, where knowledge is unified, rejects subject specificity and hierarchies of knowledge, akin to Beane's (1997) 'genuine integration'. These are therefore epistemologically disparate approaches; recognising the approach that is most fitting at each institution or amongst staff within each course provides a starting point for the possibilities and potential for integrating CCS.

In the approach to integration as a technique, it is useful to note that Jacobs recommends a 'solid grounding' (Jacobs 1989) where a subjectspecific programme is followed by an integrated approach to learning. In a two year art and design course, this might translate as a history of art and design and an introduction to critical theory in the first year in a lecture theatre format. In the two year Extended Diploma in Art and Design course this could be tailored to meeting the criteria for the compulsory unit 5 'Contextual Influences in Art and Design'. Following this first year, CCS might be integrated with studio practice whereby students independently explore some of the 'solid grounding' covered in the first year in relation to their own practice. In the case of the Extended Diploma in Art and Design, unit 5 criteria might be met in this less structured and more personalised way, or it might be that the formal CCS assessment is confined to the first year of study. This second year is reminiscent of the Collaborative CCS that staff in the 2008–10 research recognised as desirable and yet difficult to realise in terms of assessment and delivery.

Such a structure sets a solid academic or theoretical grounding in the first year. This notion of instilling a strong theoretical grounding, followed by an integrated approach later in the course suggests that there is a body of knowledge that is necessary to impart prior to students learning in a less linear manner. It privileges certain knowledges that have come to be accepted as 'the rules' that are essential to 'master', something which does not fit with Beane's (1997) idea of 'integration'.

In the approach to integration as a philosophy (Beane, 1997), CCS would not be identifiable as a discrete element within the course and there would not be a distinct body of knowledge to impart in a linear manner. The course might be studio-based and holistic, where the assessment of CCS is managed through staff identifying examples of CCS throughout each student's practice, and collating these examples for assessment. Rather than the student producing discrete CCS work for assessment, such as an essay or presentation, the staff would identify examples of CCS when assessing the students' studio practice. The risk here is that Diluted CCS occurs, confusing for assessment as well as for students' critical skills.

Approaches to integration and to knowledge formation within art education can be examined also in relation to discourse on creative writing. Tom Grimes states that 'until craft is mastered, imagination is useless, largely inapplicable abstraction. Mastering craft gives the writer access to the fullness of his or her imagination because it gives the writer the ability to deploy and apply it.' (Grimes 1999, 26–7).

Whilst the linear model of a subject-specific and non-integrated 'solid grounding' is advocated by curriculum theorists (e.g. Jacobs 1989) and creative writing theorists (e.g. Grimes 1999), there are both curriculum theorists (e.g. Beane 1997) and creative writing theorists (e.g. Ostrom 1994) who propose a more holistic model. Ostrom states that 'it may well be that (so-called) imaginative writing has a greater role to play in (so-called) basic and first-year writing; one old assumption is that students had to master skills before they produced literary art, but increasingly it seems as if the connections among skills, mastery, creativity, and so forth are more complicated and less linear than we have assumed'.

Ostrom is arguing for the integration of different forms of writing in the first year course, rather than the separating of these forms into a linear structure of delivery that provides the 'rules'.

There is scope to take Ostrom's (1994) suggestion and propose an alternative to both Jacobs' (1989) model of solid grounding, and Beane's (1997) model of complete integration. A third model, almost a reversal of Jacobs' suggestion, would be one where integration occurs initially, and then a subject-specific approach is taken later in the course. The 'integration' followed by 'subject-specificity' model can be delivered in a two year art and design course such as the Extended Diploma in Art and Design, and there is also scope for such a structure over a three year degree course where the first year delivers an integrated theory provision, or integrated CCS to use the label widely in circulation.

This third model might mean that CCS is taught in an integrated manner in year one, and in the second year the teaching of CCS continues and students are introduced to CCS as a more independent academic discipline. Integration, in this sense, is a means to access knowledge and is based on CCS as embedded in studio practice. Rather than a focus on curriculum, the focus here could be on the individual student, in keeping with the ethos of the art studio. In this model CCS in the first year of study can start with 'the choices students have already made' (Wilson 2003) in terms of their practice, rendering CCS relevant and integrated with the individual student from the outset, rather than being based on imparting knowledge that is tightly controlled. This then sets up a dialogue so that the CCS informs and develops practice through this more 'intuitive' way of working that is akin to the Collaborative CCS model that staff in the 2008–10 research described as desirable.

Organising integrated CCS

If acknowledging integration as a philosophy, the issue of the whole curriculum, the learning site and all those involved in it, is inevitably at stake. Beane's (1997) genuine integration would require, on the art and design course, a whole team interested in all areas of the art and design course, and a non-hierarchical approach to each of these areas. In fact, it would suggest an end to specialisms, which is interesting in terms of the rise of collaborative

notions of creativity (Sawyer 2006), and the increased hybridising of art and design specialisms to create interdisciplinary artists and designers. In a multi-referential climate, there is scope for the different disciplines to cohabit and hold a dialogue to the extent that the boundaries between them overlap or, in a more integrated manner, blur.

Integration as a philosophy has the potential to support a CCS that occurs informally, consistently and organically as an integrated part of the whole art and design course. This studio-based CCS is potentially so integral to students practice that students may not apply a term to this exercise of talking and thinking about other artists and theories to develop their own practice. However, approaching integration as a philosophy risks at worst a Diluted CCS where student practice lacks criticality and where theory is diluted, difficult to assess and lost at a distance from the studio rather than embedded in it.

CCS has its own unit or module title and assessment criteria, inviting the approach that integration is a technique to be implemented in the curriculum in order to accommodate its difference from practice. As previously suggested, this difference is more evident in conventions of assessment and delivery, such as the essay and the lecture, than in the theory itself. Rather than attempting to break down differentiation within a system that maintains subject boundaries and discrete assessment, perhaps this difference is useful, even necessary for, as Bernstein argues, knowledge boundaries (and with that subject boundaries) are not only 'prisons', but also 'tension points condensing the past and opening up possible futures' (Bernstein 2000, preface). These tension points, between knowledge systems, theory and practice, learning cultures and learning sites are all points from which art education can evolve.

Within the current system, there is the possibility for an integrated first year that is managed by staff, affording students the opportunity to see theory as embedded in practice. Rather than a 'solid grounding' in the subject (Jacobs 1989), this proposed model provides students with a solid grounding in the methods of integration, through examples of the integration of theory and practice managed by staff. Following this, students embark more independently on a discrete CCS programme that they integrate autonomously, based on the methods learnt in the first year. This sets theory and practice up in dialogue, and at best this leads to Brighton's 'intuitive practice' and tacit knowledge production that feeds a rigorous critical and creative practice. Amongst the debate over theory and practice in the 1990s, Wilde suggested:

'Artistic work is the very contrary of theory ... Thus there is some antipathy between art practice and cultural theory which must not be resolved by attempting to direct the practice through the terms of the theory.' (Wilde 1999, 52)

Rather than being dictated or led by the terms of the theory as Dominant CCS threatens, or the theory being marginalised or diluted in the course as Diluted CCS represents, there is potential for art practice to be viewed more holistically as a multitude of shifting dialogues in collaboration, of which Collaborative CCS is a part.

Notes

1. The BTEC Extended Diploma in Art and Design replaced the BTEC National Diploma in Art and Design in September 2010. It is a British pre-degree and post-compulsory education qualification, most usually studied by 16–18 year olds.

References

- Aguirre, I. (2004) Beyond the understanding of visual culture: a pragmatist approach to aesthetic education, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 256–69
- Allison, B. & Hausman, J. (1998) The limits of theory in art education, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 121–7
- Beane, J. A. (1997) *Curriculum Integration: Designing the Core of Democratic Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1971) On the classification and framing of educational knowledge, in M. Young [Ed.] *Knowledge and Control*. London: Macmillan, pp. 47–69
- Bernstein, B. (2000) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (1992) *Qualitative Research for Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1994) Language and relationship to language in the teaching situation, in P. Bourdieu, J. C. Passeron & M. Saint Martin, *Academic Discourse: Linguistic Misunderstanding and Professorial Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 1–34
- Brighton, A (1994) Art education and the scrutineers, in P. Hetherington [Ed.] *Artists in the 1990s: Their Education and Values*. London: Tate Gallery Publication, pp. 34–8
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007) *Research Methods in Education*. Oxford: Routledge
- Coldstream, W. M. (1960) *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education (First Coldstream Report)*. London: HMSO
- Dawtre, L., Jackson, T., Masterton, M. & Meecham, P. (1996) *Critical Studies and Modern Art*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Ecclestone, K. (2000) Bewitched, bothered and bewildered: a policy analysis of the GNVQ assessment regime, *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 15, No. 5, pp. 539–58
- Eisner, E. (2002) *Arts and the Creation of Mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006) Five misunderstandings about case-study research, *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 219–45
- Grimes, T. (1999) *The Workshop: Seven Decades of the Iowa Writers' Workshop*. Los Angeles: Hyperion

Jacobs, H. H. (1989) *Interdisciplinary Curriculum: Design and Implementation*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

MacLeod, K. & Holdridge, L. (2005) Related objects of thought: art and thought, theory and practice, in M. Miles [Ed.] *Innovations in Art and Design – New Practices New Pedagogies: A Reader*. Oxford: Routledge. pp. 143–53

Meskimmon, M. (2004) Corporeal theory with/in practice: Christine Borland's winter garden, *Art History*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 442–55

Ostrom, H. (1994) Introduction: of radishes and shadows, theory and pedagogy, in W. Bishop & H. Ostrom [Eds] *Colours of a Different Horse: Rethinking Creative Writing Theory and Pedagogy*. Urbana: National Council of Teaching English, pp. xi–xxiii

Polanyi, M. (1969) *Knowing and Being*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Pring, R. (1971) Curriculum integration, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 170–200

Ryle, G. (1949) *The Concept of Mind*. London: Hutchinson

Sawyer, K. (2006) *Explaining Creativity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Sennett, R. (2008) *The Craftsman*. London: Penguin

Wilde, C. (1999) Theory in the education of the fine artist, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 49–53

Wilson, B. (2003) Of diagrams and rhizomes: visual cultural retreat, *Studies in Art Education*, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 191–2.