

DIALOGUE:
PARADIGMS & TEACHING TEACHERS OF ART

ELLEDA KATAN AND HAROLD PEARSE

For Harold Pearse, it began like this:

"Usually when one writes an article in a professional journal, it lies in a kind of indexed oblivion, or on occasion, resurfaces in someone else's footnotes. On rarer occasions, it serves to spark discussion among colleagues. Rarer still is that article which will not only provoke collegial discussion but will initiate an ongoing dialogue between the author and a colleague that will cause each to more closely examine and redefine approaches to theory and practice in the field. The latter phenomenon occurred after I wrote an article on 'paradigms' in which I described a theoretical framework for sorting out conflicting and highly value-laden approaches to regarding the world and more specifically theory and practice in art education (Pearse, 1983). The colleague who responded to the article, embracing some ideas and challenging others, is Elleda Katan. The dialogue began informally in elevators and hallways at NAEA conferences, evolved into a more formal session at a later conference, and continues . . ." [Harold's article appeared in *Studies in art education*, 24 (3), 158-163.]

For Elleda Katan, it began like this:

"In 1983, I read one of those articles that told me just what I needed to know at that moment in order to think more clearly about the issues at hand. Its title was outrageous: "Brother Can You Spare a Paradigm?"* — written, it seems, by a Canadian. The article introduced me to three of what the author called 'paradigms', and since then I've found the whole of my work dividing itself into three parts, whether it has to do with models of curriculum design or with methods of methods or with educational policy. Each topic seems to be the clearer for it, and I seem by far the smarter. So you can imagine my surprise when I returned to that "Brother" article several years later, and found that the third paradigm of this Canadian (whom I'd since come to know as Harold Pearse) hadn't anything to do with mine. Not that one was more right than the other according to some abstract measure, but that each was 'more right' in providing answers to a very different set of issues. Because of the nature of the issues that bothered me, I had been led into looking at the world of my professional practice from quite another perspective."

In 1986, Harold and Elleda met, became friends, and agreed to use their differences and their friendship as catalyst to push each further along in his/her thinking by committing themselves to an exchange of thoughts.

Their first project together was drafting, at four minutes before the midnight deadline on September 15, 1987, of a proposal for the 1988 NAEA Convention in Los Angeles

"A workshop examining the theoretical underpinnings of generic formats for art teacher education, based upon the three paradigms for knowing: Empirical-Analytic; Interpretive-Hermeneutic; and Critical-Theoretic. Particular weight will be given to the second and third orientations and their implications for social action and public policy."

After the workshop, Harold Pearse wrote out the condensed version of the original *Studies* article that he had presented.

**Paradigms Revisited:
Theoretical Foundations of Art Teacher Education**

It began with the paragraph offered at the beginning of the Dialogue [see above], and then continued . . .

I can talk about this theory, or rather meta-theory, without being immodest since it is not an original idea on my part. (And speaking of meta-theory, I've never met a theory before that I have liked so much. If you think that pun is bad, I should say that the title of the original article is "Brother, can you spare a paradigm? The theory beneath the practice.") Although I have tried to adapt the theory to the context of art education, it is twice removed from its original source, Jurgen Habermas, a scholar of the Frankfurt School. Habermas, in *Knowledge and Human Interests* (1971), describes a tri-paradigmatic framework to identify and analyze the logical structure of three basic forms of knowing that have characterized modern thought and action. The set of paradigms was adapted by the Canadian curriculum theorist, Ted Aoki and informed his teaching and writing.

I have long felt that understanding theory helps one be a better practitioner. I was attracted to this paradigmatic approach since the description of which I came to call "Paradigm II" described my

orientation beautifully. Moreover, it helped me get at assumptions underlying both my theory and my practice and what I saw going on around me in art education.

So, what is a paradigm? A paradigm is commonly described as any pattern, example, or model. Educational theorists and social scientists use the word to denote ways in which knowledge or behavior is structured and organized. In its broadest terms, a paradigm is a world view, an internally consistent orientation from which a conceptual and operational approach to functioning in the world is constructed. Usually, one does not consciously think and act from a deliberately predetermined paradigm, but when viewed from a distance, a pattern is discernible. If we can recognize the pattern and its relationship to other patterns, perhaps we can better understand our thoughts and actions. So, I see paradigms as useful tools. Such language may be mechanistic, but as we shall see, some technical knowing is necessary. The three orientations as identified by Habermas are derived from the history of philosophy but are not aligned with any one philosophic position. They are as follows:

Paradigm I : the *Empirical-Analytic* orientation [technical knowing]

Paradigm II: the *Interpretive-Hermeneutic* orientation [situational knowing]

Paradigm III : the *Critical-Theoretic* orientation [critical knowing]

Each of these paradigms presupposes a specific cognitive orientation to the world. Each represents what Habermas refers to as "interest," a unique stance with distinctive goals and values. Knowing is not neutral as we usually assume, but is highly influenced by fundamental interests.

Paradigm I: Empirical-Analytical

The concept of root metaphor, originated by Pepper (1942) as a starting point for explicating world views, is a useful one for investigating inquiry orientations. Aoki (1978) begins his description of each orientation by isolating a "root activity". In the case of the empirical-analytical orientation, or Paradigm I, the root activity is *work*, intellectual and technical work that will help to relate people to the natural world. Work is seen as a productive process that has as its basic intent a cognitive interest in the control of objects in the world. The relationship a person has with the world is one in which the two are separate and isolated. The world is an object and people act upon it. The interest, to use Habermas' term,

is in a person's intellectual and technical control of the world and in efficiency, certainty, and predictability. The knowledge forms that promote this interest are facts, generalizations, theories, and cause and effect laws. Understanding is in terms of these empirical forms of knowing. Explanation is given in causal, functional, or hypothetical-deductive statements and evaluation is means-ends based.

The experimental study, embedded in paradigm I, has long been the dominant approach to education research. Experimental control, validity, and the ability to make generalizations are emphasized, and "variables are manipulated and their effects on other variables are observed" (Campbell and Stanley, 1963, p 1). When the goal is factual and statistical understanding, and when it is necessary to know which phenomena are repeatable and predictable in order to exert control over situations and environments, this approach is realistic and effective. Indeed, its central concern is to be effective.

What would art teaching and art teacher education look like under this paradigm? To the extent that products, facts, skills, and techniques are emphasized (in other words, technical knowing), the art teacher is working from an empirical-analytic paradigm. Outcomes are looked at in terms of objects, competencies, and behavioral objectives. Just as this paradigm is the dominant one in educational research, it also tends to dominate classroom practice. Likewise, art teacher education would emphasize learning theories, techniques, and strategies. The central concerns would be control and objectivity, cost-accountability and product efficiency.

This orientation evolved from the scientific method and received its educational applications from behavioral theory. It is most effective when the objects under scrutiny will hold still and can be isolated into groups for controlled observation so some kind of treatment can be applied. The uniqueness and messiness that are inherent in lived situations tend to be diminished. However, difficulties arise because education is a social process, and children and educators are subjective, growing human beings. When we realize that our goals for teaching go beyond simple object making and that the questions we are asking go beyond simple fact finding and quantification into complex areas of human interaction, the empirical-analytic paradigm has been stretched to its logical limit of usefulness.

Paradigm II: Interpretive-Hermeneutic

The root activity of this paradigm is *communication* or, as Aoki puts it, relating people to their social world. A person's relationship with the world is reflexive — it is people-in-their-social world. This orientation originates in the philosophical stance of phenom-

enology. The interest here is in experimentally meaningful, authentic intersubjective understanding. Understanding is intersubjective in that it is one subject or person knowing another as individuals capable of experiencing the world in similar ways. It is authentic to the extent that others are not made to feel themselves as objects or things. Understanding is defined in terms of the meanings, people (or in phenomenological language, "actors") give to situations and experiences in their everyday, lived world. The knowledge form sought is situational knowledge, or the knowing of the structure of interpretive meanings. This kind of structure is referred to as the essence, ground structure, or deep structure of a phenomenon. It is the mode of knowing called phenomenological understanding.

The aim of this understanding is to get under perceived phenomena in order to directly confront the phenomena in question. It is seen as a method that would lead us to the root by moving from matters of fact to essences, from empirical to essential universality, to an understanding of structures firmly grounded. It searches for the deep structures of human events and actions to discover the rules or modes that give them order. The phenomenological researcher talks about repeatability and identity of meaning instead of generalizability, reliability, and validity. He or she thinks in terms of essences and deep structure. The words used by phenomenologists are themselves revealing (e.g., root, ground, deep, essential, presence).

An art teacher operating from a Paradigm II orientation is interested in the subjective and intersubjective meanings the work (both the artwork and the process of working) has for the individual child. Such a teacher strives for what Buber (1967) calls an I-thou relationship with a learner. The student is regarded as an authentic self. There is a primary concern with process and events. Likewise, teachers in their education are to be educated "to make their own way as persons, if not as producers; they are to be educated so that they may create themselves." (Greene, 1967, p 4). In preparing to become a teacher, not only must one understand the theory, methods, and practice of education, one must also understand oneself. The purpose is existential in that the emphasis is on the student's personal discoveries through his or her own thoughts, feelings, actions and choices. While the student learns about many things during this period, it is the learning that bears directly on one's personal orientation to teaching that is of primary importance. It is the learning that is the response to the human longing for order and meaningfulness in an dense, immediate, contingent, "absurd," world. The process is a dialogue with others and with oneself, in the world of things, people, and ideas. Greene (1973) calls it creating and choosing oneself and says that "as one chooses and becomes responsible for those choices, he or she achieves a continuity of identity and a continuity of knowing" (p 163).

The aim is to stand forth as an existing self as one teaches. The end is not the fabrication of a role or the construction of a disembodied self, but the achievement of an identity. This identity is one of self in relation to lived situations, understood, and transcended. The self-aware teacher can then give his or her own students a sense of their own possibilities as existing, conscious persons, present to themselves who can deal critically with their own realities. But what is there to ensure that what is developed in a student teacher is a critical consciousness, not merely a self-centered and adaptive one? What is there to remind him or her that teaching is a political act and that what is taken for granted in our school and community experiences must be questioned and made explicit? In order to shift into this kind of consciousness, we must shift paradigms.

Paradigm III: Critical-Theoretical

The root activity in the critical orientation is *reflection*, or the relating of people to their selves and their social world. Its fundamental interest is emancipation and improvements of the human condition by rendering transparent tacit and hidden assumptions and by initiating a process of transformation designed to liberate people. The valued people-world relationship is people-in-their-world, with their world. It is a relationship in which a person reflects on the world and acts in order to transform it. A central notion is that of praxis, the reciprocity of thought and action.

Understanding is considered in terms of reflection, and knowledge is a result of a process of critical thinking that combines reflection and action. Evaluation is considered in terms of discovering underlying assumptions, interest, values, motives, perspectives, root metaphors, and implications for action to improve human conditions. This paradigm takes meanings, the essences, and the understandings of multiple realities gained from the situational-interpretive orientation and adds the critical dimension. It probes for tacitly held intentions and assumptions, discovers implications for actions, and "promotes a theory of man and society that is grounded in the moral attitude of liberation." (Aoki, 1978, p. 63).

Who are the critical theorists in the art classroom? They are the teachers who see learning as understanding and understanding as self-reflection leading to critical knowing, leading to action. The aim is a raised critical consciousness about the visual world linked inextricably to the social world. The method is one of deliberately relating this understanding to action in a larger community. It is not merely learning about the community or doing things in the commu-

nity. It is the effort to make problematic what is taken for granted and to make explicit and to question that which underlies our school and community experiences. Admittedly, examples of Paradigm III art teachers and art teacher educators are few. Perhaps more exist than may be immediately evident and although they exemplify this basic orientation, they may describe what they do in different ways.

My point is that whether or not it is clearly articulated, art educators, when engaged in inquiry or practice cannot help but operate out of some sort of paradigm. I have found this particular paradigmatic structure a useful one for getting a handle on how and why art educators think and act as they do. It also appears to have struck a responsive chord with Elleda Katan. She has used it as a template to examine her own conceptualization of what it is that she thinks and does as an art educator, accepting some of the precepts and rejecting others. Certain thoughts and practices can be brought to consciousness for examination and when understood and contextualized, extended and elaborated. This brief explanation and recapitulation of the three paradigms is meant to lay a foundation for furthering the dialogue between Elleda and me and as an invitation to a broader audience to join the dialectical process.

References

- Aoki, T. (1978). Toward curriculum inquiry in a new key. In J. Victoria and E. Sacca. (Eds.) *Presentations on art education research number 2, phenomenological description: Potential for research in art education*. Montréal: Concordia University.
- Buber, M. (1967). *Between man and man*. New York: Macmillan.
- Campbell, D.T., and Stanley, J. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Greene, M. (Ed.) (1967). *Existential encounters for teachers*. N.Y.: Random House.
- Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as stranger: Educational philosophy for the modern age*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon.
- Pearse, H. (1983). Brother, can you spare a paradigm? The theory beneath the practice. *Studies in Art Education*, 24 (3), 158-163.
- Pepper, S.C. (1942). *World hypothesis: A study in evidence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Our dialogue preceding the workshop had gone like this:

February 25, 1988

To Harold of Nova Scotia:

I'm feeling guilty. I have so many documents with which to orient myself to your way of thinking — "Brother can you spare a paradigm?" and "What does it mean to be a student teacher?" from a 1985 Canadian Review of AE Research. From me, you have nothing. I feel conscience-bound to send you a progress report on my thinking about our presentation together so that there will be no surprises.

Something most central: You describe Aoki as believing that the boundaries between paradigms II and III are less distinct than those between Paradigms I and II...that the transition from the second to the third is more fluid, the latter being extended from the former. Now, I remember that way back at my first reading of your article — after absorbing the amazing thought that there were these three paradigms and that I really should read this guy Habermas — I did feel that some key ingredients were missing in the description of paradigm III. My lived and unexamined experience of what you were teaching me to call "Paradigm III" was that it was as different as night from day from Paradigm II — while Paradigm I and II were really two sides of the same coin.

However, another part of me said to 'slow down'. If this Dr. Pearse said it, and it's printed in Studies, then, it must be true! If I was feeling there was such a huge difference between II and III, it must be because the whole critical perspective was so new and so fresh. I was exaggerating the meaning of the event for the rest of the world because of the way I was experiencing it inside myself.

Well. I don't know if it has to do with getting to know Dr. Pearse as 'Harold', or not . . . but as I prepare for the National Conference, I find that I really do believe in my original gut level reaction. As Aoki describes paradigm III, it *is* as an extension of Paradigm II: "This paradigm (III) takes meanings, the essences, and the understandings of multiple realities gained from the situational-interpretative orientation and adds the critical dimen-

sion". As so described, it hardly represents, as I see it, a paradigm shift. What is being attended to has changed, but not the conceptual framework within which it gains its meanings.

And what is Elleda's (& C Wright Mills & Bourdieu & others) paradigm III? If, as I just stated, "the mark of a paradigm shift is a change in the conceptual framework with which a same phenomena is viewed", then a key concept around which to distinguish paradigms is that of 'objectivity', or the preferred intellectual-social-psychological stance of the individual inquirer who would get results that count. (Now, doesn't that sound a lot more phenomenologically sensitive than the 'dominant cognitive interests' Aoki offers?)

Empirical objectivity : Through disengagement from personal and social contexts, an impersonal investigation and public evidence produces a universality of results applicable to all times and circumstances where same phenomena are investigated.

Phenomenological objectivity : Through bracketing, or the deliberate effort to set aside all ontological judgments about the 'nature' and 'essence' of things, events, etc., personal reflection and subjective-inter-subjective evidence produces a record of the mental processes of experiencing which is universal to all the times and circumstances within which self-conscious human inquiry is undertaken.

Critical objectivity : Through locating oneself within one's period and one's social group(s) and taking consciousness of the 'invisible architecture of assumptions' within those particular institutional and social contexts, one can attain a mode of control over previously uncontrolled factors in thought, the unconscious motivations and presuppositions' (Mannheim) and so an imperfect and temporary objectivity. Inquiry becomes a form of participation within a given historically changing tradition in its interrelatedness to other traditions contemporaneous to and preceding it in society. Universality in Paradigm III resides not in the results of inquiry, but in its conditions—i.e., those of being issue of a particular historical and social time within which the variety of group formations establishes the existential basis for individual thought.

The test for whether these represent three substantively distinct paradigm orientations would be whether

the definitions of 'work' and of 'communication' and of 'reflection' change according to the paradigm within which one works. I think that they do.

Ah, well It seems to me as if I've been trying most of these last years to clarify the difference between the phenomenological and the critical. Teachers College was a phenomenologist's paradise, what with Maxine Greene, Justine Schorr, Dwayne Heubner. While I took most of Maxine's and Dwayne's courses, their ideas always left me frustrated. There just did not seem to be the necessary linkages between their theory and my school practice. I'm really delighted to be forced to use the next weeks as a house cleaning of my mind.

Looking forward to seeing you in LA. Take care,
Elleda Katan

March 29, 1988

Elleda M' Dear :

Thank you for the progress report on your thoughts . . . I like the way you outline your encounter with the theory I elaborated and how the notions meshed (or didn't) with your already well-developed intuitive theory of art education from the critical perspective.

My first thought is that maybe the best way to introduce the session is an account of our initiation to these ideas and our sense of discovery on finding the paradigms . . . Then outline the three paradigms.

I see from glancing at the proposal that we are presenting this meta-theory as a theoretical foundation for art teacher education programs, so will keep that in mind and try to relate my examples to teacher education . . .

The last ten minutes could be where we can argue the validity and usefulness of the model. Does each paradigm represent a distinct world view or is one an extension of the other? Maybe your critique will explode the model so that it is unrecognizable. At least let's hope (and aim) for something fuller than what I started with. Looking forward to seeing you in L.A. Harold Pearse

and the dialogue following the workshop . . .

July 1, 1988

Hi, Harold!

I am just reading your condensed version of the Three Paradigms article. You do write with such an easy grace.

Had a thought though . . . Could you provide scenarios, course sequences, bibliographies, projects, organizing concepts which distinguish your art teacher educa-

tion program from one built upon an empirical model ? For instance, I remember an NAEA workshop that you gave with Nick [Webb] in which you had had your students do a rather unique form of research. . . was it their own art as a child? . . . something deeply responsive to a phenomenological sensibility and treating a range of imagery not conventionally attended to within an art school.

Also, I'm sure that the way in which you introduce yourself and have your students get to know each other is distinctive. For instance, I remember a former student of yours talking about a coffee corner at Nova Scotia and its role in supporting a special ambience within the program.

I ask you this both because that's what I want to talk about, and because I think that that's just the form of linkage that is so sadly missing within our professional dialogues and research.

Whew. The air is thick with honeysuckle. Thunder's on the sky's edge. Humid. Salt. Trees waving at me to come outside. Love it, Elleda

July 12, 1988

Dear Elleda :

Thanks for the note. . . . I like your suggestion of including concrete examples of "organizing concepts" that characterize the kind of art teacher education program I favour. . . . The way I would like to approach it though is to wait until I see yours and then try to work in my examples in a way that would parallel yours . . . In the meantime, I will be thinking of examples and making notes — maybe even a draft.

Hoping to hear from you soon, Harold

July 25, 1988

Dear Harold:

Lordy. More words from Leda ! As you can probably guess, I'm chugging along on the critical segment of our duet. I just realized that something amusing is happening as I develop it. I thought I'd share it with you, both as a progress report and also possibly to see if you would like to play along with it.

In redrafting my talk into a paper, I'm picking up with some measure of concreteness on the issues that

kicked me into critical gear in the very phenomenological milieu in which I received my education and began my teaching within higher ed. As a result, the paper is becoming anecdotal, a auto-biographical account, somewhat mythologized into ideal types. I find myself learning and teaching myself a lot of fascinating things as I rethink my past from my present day perspective. Hummed along on that track for a few daysand then felt I should step back and look at the whole and see how what I was doing fit together with your piece.

I was surprised to see how autobiographical my paper had become!

Now, the two people who have best modeled for me the autobiographical mode are you and Amy [Brook Snider]. In a sense, it's one of the gifts of the phenomenological sensibility, and you two have been the vehicle for bringing it into my practice. Without the work done with you, I doubt that I would have entered into the format for this article with anything like the same comfort and ease.

And yet what an irony, for what did I find when I reread your article? While your style is wonderfully informal, and while you declare your allegiance to Paradigm II quite frankly — and in so doing, you distance yourself from academic formality and objectivity — you offer no personal history! How about it? What were your issues with the empirical mode of practice? Why did you reject it? In what ways did the interpretive mode resolve them? Did you do your education studies within an empirically dominated program ? Or was your training, like my own, essentially within a phenomenological ambience ? One that for you made sense . . . while for me, it didn't ?

If so, how interesting. Why would that be? What forces would lead a same social role in one rather than the other direction. For instance, is it important that my background is art history, not studio? That I taught elementary in the '60s and in Manhattan, not high school in the 70s in Nova Scotia? That I'm a woman and mother and more readily fulfilled by the idea of a career as school teacher. Would this be less likely to be true for a male? Could all this add up to my being more deeply/existentially school teacher/educator rather than, as you are, professor/artist ? Or was all this determined at the oedipal level — the which is hardly appropriate for discussion within a professional journal?

Well the questions are all lopsidedly my own. Do they engage your interests at all?

Another surprise. In writing along, I realized that the catalyst for much of my first thinking about the education of teachers was the student teaching seminar, and the, to me, curious role played by the professors in responding to the problems of the student teachers in the field. Then I remembered your article in the *Canadian Review of AE Research* in '85. There also you reflect very deeply upon the exchanges within the student teaching seminar. Clearly, in some way, it was a catalyst for you also, no?

One of the problems is that this paper is so interesting, I'm going to be hard put to ever call it finished. In a big measure, it is my life. I enclose a sketchy outline . . . mostly so that I will be forced to write it before the mail goes out . . . but also to indicate to you where I am at. Take care, ...,Elleda

The draft of Elleda's article that was enclosed:

It began with the paragraph offered at the beginning of the Dialogue [about the world being divided into three parts, although, because of the nature of the issues at hand, Elleda's definition of the third part or paradigm is quite dissimilar from Harold's], and then continued. . . .

"What were my issues? Well, central was the fact that as a longtime school teacher teaching for the first time within the university setting, I felt myself to be a stranger in a strange land. Until then, my experience had been inner city Manhattan, in elementary, pre- and after-schools, during the progressive resurgence of the 60s. Now, I found that I had left the ferment of social and political experimentation in schools and their communities for an institution little interested in community and intellectually superior to social imagination. From highly collaborative projects, I now worked within a ceaseless competition. From contents integrated around student and social well-being, I now worked within content areas serving their own elaboration. Not least, that which I valued most in myself as a professional educator was demoted to "personal style" and "techniques"; that which I valued least — student projects in education research and artmaking — were sent out for publication and hung up on gallery walls.

Now, like any of you reading this piece, I'd spent a number of years as a university student, so it wasn't all totally unexpected. However, I'd done that late in life and after hours. It had been experienced as little more than a gray necessity between my childrens' bedtime and my own. Now, as a "professor," I had to live

out my meanings within the institution. At first glance, this seemed easy enough. My colleagues were delightful — witty, wise, lively, subtle, sensitive, creative. They were people that I loved to call 'friends', and who greeted me the same. Alike, we read Dewey, valued community and ate quiche. And yet, that which most troubled me was invisible to them. That which they thrived upon was for me problematic. When I declared my commitments, they called me 'dreamer' or 'drudge', 'structure freak' or 'missionary'. They'd hug me and continue on as if I'd never spoken. Clearly they were possessed of an expectation of their world and of their work which made or left harmonious just that which for me was conflicted and which made 'opposite' that which for me was "the same." What was it?

Well, Harold's article didn't give me *that* answer. What it did give me with those three paradigms was a publicly labeled name and place for my alienated and isolated condition. I understood Paradigm One, or the empirical-analytic orientation, to contain the vast majority of educator-technicians against which my colleagues along with a large number of other art educators protest. Paradigm Two, or the interpretive-hermeneutic orientation, contained my wonderful but confusing colleagues in art ed. My Paradigm must then be Three: The critical-theoretic orientation. At last, a label, and it was the equal of the group that dominated my field. I was no longer an odd ball. That I didn't really know what this paradigm was, other than that it seemed a piece with the progressive education within which I had learned my practice, mattered less. I'd been given the courage to get on with it. With time, I would learn.

The Strange Land

The Student Teaching Seminar:

My first sense of a useful direction for my work within the university came from the student teaching seminar. Wonderfully, the full art ed faculty (all three of us) shared in the teaching of the seminar and in the supervision of the student teachers. Thus those who had designed the preparatory content met weekly with the students who took it into the field. Fueled with coffee and donuts, the spirit was supportive and generous. A collaborative community within the remorseless competition of higher education. A center for ideals within a number-crunching bureaucracy. The language was playful, personal, humorous, poetic. I felt blessed. It was a grand space to get one's sea legs as a first-time professor and an ideal place to evaluate the art ed program in terms of the social reality it served.

Or so I thought.

My sense of possibility was tempered by an exchange during the first session. The student teachers had arrived with the glazed eyes and fixed smiles many of us saw in our own mirrors after our first five days of internship. After warm-up chatter, one colleague launched discussion with the question: "What small thing have you been able to do in this first week in the schools in order to

change in some measure the atmosphere and attitudes of the institution?" Utterly stunned, I asked him what he'd changed about the university in the recent past. He seemed to find my question as inappropriate as I did his. How could two people be so far apart? I looked anxiously for the answer in the months that followed.

Each week the student teachers came back from their internships, often discouraged, sometimes feeling betrayed: their students tore up art projects; principals complained of noise; teachers patronized the specialists. How could a generosity and a commitment such as theirs be received with such indifference? How could an activity so central to their own well-being not be important and valued by others? My colleagues provided a strong shoulder and a good ear. Their questions moved the student teachers to reflect upon their experiences and to enter into the feelings of their students. The conversation was gentle, supportive, sensitive, a slow sifting about and returning, always reaching out for and eventually regaining equilibrium. However, there was little reference to past course work and how it might inform present actions. No reference to the future possibilities served by the projects in hand. Instead, we seemed to be nestled within a permanent present; to be spectators, not participants in the world; to be judges, not partners with the schools. The result was that the student frustration with their internships was seen not as reflecting upon an art education program in need of change, but as confirmation of the inadequacy of the larger world to the art programs qualities. I ended up asking myself just who was being served by this community and these ideals. Was it the larger public good or group therapy? Were these the issues of American education or of the well being of specialists? If the latter was true, it became important to figure out whether there really was any role here for someone imbued with the '60s vision of changing society through its schools. Would this protective posture prove too strong and too necessary to its proponents? Or could the very genuine individual generosity and love for the arts and for children be opened up and connected to socially responsive goals?

The University Preparation:

The more I listened to the conversation of the seminar sessions, the more the betrayal seemed to lie less with schools and more with the knowledge that the student teachers brought to them. All they knew of art media were the scatter shot learnings from their studio classes. Some knew high fire clay and Raku traditions. None knew low fire technology and faience ware. Some knew engraving and Rembrandt's exemplars. None knew relief print and Hiroshige. Now, abruptly, all of our student teachers were obliged to learn all the media of the school art room and under pressured conditions. There was no time to relate schoolroom technologies to the knowledge acquired in the university studios — and so it went largely unused. Further, they had all been taught art history as a succession of western styles, realized, predominantly, within painting. They knew little of the art histories of the non-paint media nor of the art concepts they were now teaching. Again, no time now for research — so history was excluded or trivialized. And their few courses in the

humanities were so disparate and specialized. They provided no foundation on which the group could build toward a common understanding of the visual culture of America. Their immediate concern had to be the material culture of the Hammet's catalog. The result was an instructional content so one-dimensional that it excluded the meanings of most students; so subjective that it ill served a public education; so elitist it ignored the values of the community; and so technical it drew little of the student teacher's artistic sensibility into play.

The Art Education Preparation:

And what of the two art education courses that these students had shared? The function of such courses should be, shouldn't it, to bridge the gap between the knowledge of the university and the work of being schoolteacher? Clearly, the courses had nourished a spirit of mutuality and trust. Equally clearly, there was little reference to their content. Readings in Lowenfeld were the grand exception. Students remembered him gratefully. They were thrilled to discover in their student's art projects the developmental stages he described. They seemed to welcome some form of pattern to their work. The professors, on the other hand, referred repeatedly to the bountiful and distinguished literature listed in the bibliography for the introductory course, History and Theory of Art Education. Quotes were dropped into the anecdotal discussions of the seminar like inspirational milestones, recalling qualities of "I-thou" communication, of creative inspiration, of artistic experience, and so reaffirming a common ground in ideals.

And the Methods and Materials course? At most, there were references to techniques found in the readings. Otherwise, the course seemed to have been a miscellany of administrative strategies, how-to recipes, union speakers, inspirational books, and case histories, all offered at a level too particular to generalize readily to the internship situation. Absent was systematic study of instructional designs, of teaching practices, or of educational goals — in a word, the structures that mediate between theory and practice. Such matters, said my colleagues, reduce learning to a social determinism and art to a formula. The spontaneous, the intuitive and the unpredictable get scheduled out and the very special gift of the arts — that creative encounter which makes of each individual a whole — is lost. Art becomes indistinguishable from other areas of instruction. In place of such studies, my colleagues seemed to have an unspoken faith that 'METHODS, semester two' would offer the techniques to bring some form of idealized 'ARTISTIC EXPERIENCE, semester one' to any and all students, whether child or adult, whether compelled or self-selecting, whether of our culture or of another. And their faith was nourished by the fact that their way was the way that it was done everywhere else.

Strange Land Inverted

Inversion:

Such had not been the case in the schools where I had worked. There, we repeatedly challenged “the way that it was done” — especially when that way was our own. We’d schedule ourselves the time to surface from day-to-day pragmatics in order to check out our program activities against changing contexts and stated purpose. When the process of stepping back and taking perspective proved difficult, we’d play out an exercise we called “Inversion,” one in which we’d try to visualize a teaching practice that was the mirror opposite to our own. The first efforts were always banal, but with the whole group working together, we’d slowly unpeel the layers of assumptions that habit made invisible. By engaging everyone who participated in the teaching practice, there would develop a spirit of common cause which would extend from our meeting back into the classroom. I was tempted to suggest the same exercise to my colleagues. However, their interest in alternative schools did not seem to translate into an interest in alternatives to their own practice. So, for a first time, I played out the exercise alone: What *would* be the teacher education program that was as opposite as possible to the one just described?

Abstract ↔ Commonsense:

What if a program did not begin with theoretical ideas as authored by singular individuals in isolation from their practices? What if instead of Plato, we began with the practices and theories of the class participants themselves, both teacher and students, their values, skills, interests, experiences, but mostly, with their passions. What if we then pushed ourselves to continuously broaden our sphere of consideration in a movement away from self-expression and towards group action; beyond individual concerns and towards public problems; away from the private creativity of the artist and towards the institutionally and intellectually complex creativity of the teacher. Periodically, we’d revisit those dimensions of our individual lives which hold a high vitality in order to integrate them into the new understandings. Thus they would be personalized and held responsive to qualities of passion, of empathy, and of insight. Rather than begin in a strange place which with further studies becomes familiar, we’d begin with the familiar and build slowly towards the strange.

Ideal ↔ Concrete:

What if a program did not promulgate an ideal, born on poetic imagery and rooted in subjective and individual experience? What if instead, it began with a comprehensive and concrete inventory of the art skills and knowledge needed to be an art teacher in the schools in the present? If it then studied those media and concepts and modes of art as components within the richest and broadest network of connections:

connections reaching out into the world surrounding the students, their schools, the larger community, the biosphere; connections extending back to the moment when humans first felt the need to which that activity was a response; connections into the major forms of cultural elaboration that that activity has known in human history? And what if the key resource for this research was seen as a collaboration between professors of art, school teachers and university students towards the “best” solutions serving a shared social role? Rather than begin and end with the ideal, begin with the real and build towards the “best” possibilities for that social role within the varied contexts within which it must function in the here and now.

Absolutes ↔ Alternatives:

And finally, having dropped the notion of art education as a single ideal, isolated from the other content areas of formal education and from the informal arts experiences of the young, we’d be open to the study of the many arts educations that exist within our society. Most immediately, there are the several art educations within the university — studio, craft, design, architecture, media — the structure of their content differing with their respective positions within the hierarchy of occupations. At a step more removed, there are the art educations of the schools — preparatory, parochial, vocational and public — each inflected towards the place within social hierarchy of their student populations. Yet another step further and less formal, there are the quilt workshops of the Womans Guild; the historic house tours of the Wellesley Club; the wet canvas how-tos on public TV; the shipyard apprenticeships; the pick-and-glue of the pre-schools, each reflecting the ideals of distinct social groups, ethnic traditions, and gender models. From there, we’d build backwards to the origins of each practice in history, and sideways towards an ecology of the art educations which sustain our contemporary society. The educational imagination fully exercised, we’d be equipped to debate the possibility of alternatives, wouldn’t we, both to those educations and for that society in the future? Rather than a singular art education which under certain limited conditions succeeds, the notion of alternative art educations which, where knowingly formed and re-formed, are not only successful within a variety of contexts, but can influence those contexts and the social conditions within which they take place.

Ah-h-h-h. There it was. A grand reversal! It brought me back home. Back to the notion of education as a grand experiment with the teacher at the creative center, rather than education as the perpetuation of the predefined with the teacher as the technician applicator. Back to the notion of collaborative projects between the members of one generation attentive to the well-being of a future one, rather than the competitive mastery among individuals of predefined career skills. Back to an education in service to a society that not only changes but has as its ideal, those changes which would render it more fully a democratic. This in the place of a therapeutic subgroup operating within an endless and self-serving present. This was what I would be about! What was I to do? A reversal in the head — and in one head alone — is not a program in education. How to begin to carry these values into an educational practice within the strange land in which I now worked, and in which

I seemed to work alone?

There was more, but Harold wrote back

January 23, 1989

Dear Eileda:

I've finally had a chance to read through your article . . . My only reservation is that perhaps it is too mammoth — did you say, you were going to write a book? I . . . suggest that you end after page 7 because I think the main point has been made.

I have slightly reworked my part to include examples from the teacher ed program within which I work to illustrate Paradigm II. However, I don't want to be too heavily autobiographical or long since I want my part to serve more as background and as introduction to your paper.

You know, after reading your description of how your approach to art teacher education has evolved, I'm even more convinced that these paradigms work. Your notion of art education as a "grand reversal" which questions the taken-for-granted established order and emphasizes the social context of art, education, teachers, learners, and schools sits squarely in what I understand to be the Paradigm III camp. I think that the short comings and limitations which you allude to have more to do with my sketchily inadequate description of the Paradigms than with a weakness in the model.

Hope to hear from you soon. Harold

Harold's "slightly reworked part" is the following paragraph, to be added to the Paradigm II section of the original paper

The art teacher education program with which I am presently involved displays many of these features. Throughout the program the students, in their roles as student learners and student teachers, must keep journals as a vehicle for recording their encounters with ideas, individuals, groups, and situations, and for reflecting on how new experiences relate (or do not relate) to the existing fabric of their emerging world as art educators. This self-dialogue is buttressed by interaction with other students, faculty and cooperating teachers — all colleagues. It is no coincidence that what a visitor to the Art Education Division first notices is a pot of freshly brewed coffee. The next is probably the area with comfortable chairs and a coffee table littered with magazines and journals, where students and faculty (sometimes its hard to tell them apart) gather and converse. He or she will probably also not miss the posters listing the upcoming events for the "Art Education Common Hour," a weekly Friday noon

opportunity to share lunch and listen to and debate with a speaker or workshop leader — as likely to be a student colleague as a visiting 'expert'. All of this and more contributes to the creation of an environment in which the student teacher can feel his or herself being an active participant in the process of becoming a teacher.

August 18, 1989

Dear dear Harold:

I've allowed an awful time lapse in our dialogue. I am sorry. I've been developing those post-page-7 pages. As you anticipated, the whole is getting far too long and cumbersome to be a part of anything called "a dialogue". Somehow though, the work I've been doing seems important in getting to a good place from which to contribute a next step in our conversation.

And WHAT a strange place I find myself in!

Basically, I would characterize it as this: Ideas, procedures, concerns that originally appeared to me as merely interesting, playful, provocative, colorful, I now see as methodological imperatives, with ethical and political significance.

For instance: When I first began teaching at the university level, I saw my job as that of tightening up on the slack management of my colleagues. When I first played out the teaching-teachers inversion, I saw it*as a neat intellectual puzzle, capturing many ideas in few words. In the same spirit, when I wrote you that paradigm III was "as different as night from day from paradigm II — while Paradigm I and II were really two sides of the same coin," I thought that I was talking only about intellectual systems.

But no longer. Not at all!

After a year of reading critical theory and reflecting back upon progressive teaching practices, the 'TRUTH' left the pages and entered into my interpretation of lived events — i.e., the relationship between patterns of action and systems of thought is integral and very political. I didn't just differ from my university colleagues in temperament or teaching style. We differed over the 'best' distribution of and authority over cultural knowledge, and hence over the nature of the social order we would serve. That teaching-teachers inversion wasn't

just a neat puzzle. It profiled a covert agenda within institutionalized university practices to subvert democratic possibilities within our public education. And paradigm I and II are two sides of a same coin, because neither recognize the political content in intellectual and social processes, and therefore both fail to lay the critical foundation for social change: however differently each inhabits the status quo, both leave it untouched. Paradigm III, Ellred/CWMills/ Gouldner/Mannheim-version, on the other hand, does, and it does it by asking very tough questions about oneself and about one's practices.

What kind of questions am I talking about? Well, in my introductory paragraph, I wrote that one theoretical orientation is not more right than another "according to some abstract measure, but that each is 'more right' in providing answers to a very different set of issues." That's true as far as it goes. However, if one would work within the critical orientation, it is only a first step. To become socially, and not just personally, responsible, one must move into an empirical mode of research, and (1) take consciousness of the period and social groups within which one took on identity, and within which one's issues were framed and labeled 'issues;' (2) identify the 'invisible architecture of assumptions,' both cultural and social, which characterize that group at that time in history; (3) and then, extrapolate the political and ethical implications of carrying the found values into the practices of other groups, or, in the case of educators, of bringing those values to bear in the formation of the generation to come. In other words, that which is neither more or less right in terms of affirming an individual identity, becomes most emphatically more or less right when brought into public and professional practices which would shape a society.

And the role of theory and paradigms in all this? Once again, critical theory recognizes that, like any social product, theory serves the interests of the social groups that generate it. It's an instrument by which they act within and upon the world around them, opening up understanding in ways which maintain the authority and autonomy of the theory-makers. And the social group for whom theory is the weapon of choice = that class of folk called 'professors.' Does this mean that they/we use it *against* other social groups in order to preserve the authority of their/our own class? Yes, indeed it does! But

not always. There are good guys/gals and bad guys/gals in every crowd. However, to discriminate the socially good from bad, we must accept that theory can be a weapon *against* as much as a weapon *for* the good of the larger society; and then examine it not only for its logical coherence and expressive power, but for the politics embedded within both its intellectual and social processes.

For example, let's take "The Paradigm Professors" — Habermas/Aoki/ et al. There are two questions to ask: How did they reduce critical theory to a subset of interpretive theory? And why?

How? They replace the concept central to the critical orientation of 'ideology' [or intellectual systems as weapons for social interests] with 'paradigms' [or logically coherent patterns devoid [like 'scholarship'] of contextual specificity]. Thus they protect intellectual activity from the tarnish of a political agenda.

They label the activities which distinguish the three paradigms — work, communication, reflection — 'interests,' and then give as the definitions for those three activities [which like all activities are shaped by the interests they serve], definitions which serve reductive technocratic elitist interests. For instance, "work" is not understood as the many ways in which humans engage with their world in order to sustain, explore, express, change their life within society — a definition which opens outwards towards the largest possibilities of cultural adventure. Instead, 'work' is presented as 'a cognitive interest in the control of objects in the natural world' — and thus is reduced to an intellectual technology, or a science. Having performed the traditional academic inversional flip, the Paradigm Professors have tucked out of sight the role of collective self interest. [Universities, where knowledge is organized around the object studied — life, nature, social institutions — rather than around the social interests that knowledge serves, are of course doing this all the time.]

They divide the world in two parts — WORK vs COMMUNICATION/ REFLECTION, thus maintaining intact the dualisms foundational to the domination of experts, a domination that depends upon convincing everyone of the superiority of those who think/express over those who merely work; of the scholar/artist over the layperson; of the education professor over the school teacher; of the theorist & of theory over the practitioner & of action.

They construct a model in which the empirical, the

Interpretive, and the critical are presented as either/or choices organized around cognitive 'interests', thus blocking from recognition the fact that a socially responsible theoretical practice must complement phenomenologically vivid detail with an equal empirical attention to political-economic and social-structural developments.

And why do this? Reducing critical theory to an add-on to the Interpretive orientation drains it of the potential to raise troubling questions, questions that would make problematic the authority of the theorist. [It's the theoretical correlate to the social reduction performed in every art teacher education program that I know; where the social role of teacher is reduced to an add-on role to that of artist. While the theorist does this reduction through concepts, higher education does it through an institutional structure whereby only students screened into studio art programs can elect to become teachers.]

So now : Do you see what a strange place I am in? This way of thinking raises serious questions for me about the social and political role of an art education field that exists isolated within art colleges from the central issues of a compulsory public education within a democracy. More and more, the field of art education appears to me to have performed historically the role of a therapeutic interlude within a society that refuses to take responsibility for itself, that hides from the implications of its commitments.

What on earth does one do with such a perception? Who on earth wants to hear it? Why do I need to ever have such thoughts?

But, to get back to our dialogue. You must hear in all this that I really do disagree with you and that the fault is not in the sketchiness of your descriptions. I hope you also hear that the disagreement is a professional and not a personal one. I worry that that may not be clear. I find that frequently those colleagues who are drawn towards the Interpretive mode, are also those individuals who equate agreement on ideas with affection for each other; disagreement with dislike — a conflation of the subjective into the objective at the level of psyche and of theory.

What you should hear is that it is only as we do love and respect each other that challenging dialogue can occur, dialogue which challenges our weaknesses as well as profiles our strengths. For me, that is why I need friends like you and groups like the Caucus: to help me stay sane while wandering off into strange places. Having

a very specific and kind and witty friend to which to address all of this allows it to happen.

On rereading our correspondence, I also realize that we haven't really had much of a dialogue. It's understandable. You've only had bits and drabs of my thoughts to respond to and, for the most part, I haven't been all that clear to myself. I hope that this last contribution offers a clarity and a development which will invite your response. Does it respond to your invitation to "explode the model so that it is unrecognizable"? Will you abandon the decision "to serve more as background and as introduction to [my] paper" — especially now that that paper has outgrown the format of dialogue, or, to put it more positively, has taken the form of background for letters from Elleda to Harold of Nova Scotia. Love

Elleda K.

And then, because it was getting into the month of October and into the deadline for the Journal of Social Theory in Art Education, Harold & Elleda agreed to type this up and send it out, all while understanding that the dialogue was by no means ended.