

Published with assistance from the foundation
established in memory of Philip Hamilton McMillan of
the Class of 1894, Yale College.

Copyright © 2002 by Elliot W. Eisner. All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations,
in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the
U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without
written permission from the publishers.

Designed by Mary Valencia

Set in Meridien type by Integrated Publishing Solutions.

Printed in the United States of America by R.R. Donnelley & Sons,
Harrisonburg, Virginia.

The Library of Congress has cataloged the hardcover edition as follows:
Eisner, Elliot W.

The arts and the creation of mind / Elliot W. Eisner.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-300-09523-6 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Art—Study and teaching—Philosophy.

2. Art and society. 3.
Art—Study and teaching—United States. I. Title.
N84. E38 2002

707'.1'273—dc21

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library. 2002005871

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability
of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity
of the Council on Library Resources.
ISBN 0-300-10511-8 (pbk. : alk. paper)
10 9 8 7 6 5

ness to accept such an opportunity as an appropriate part of one's own education. When birds have led their life in a cage, it is not difficult to understand that when the door is opened, they might not have a desire to leave.

Even when students have a hand in framing their own purposes and in forming their own curriculum activities, the teacher has a considerable role to play. Such an approach to curriculum makes greater demands on the teacher than one that is packaged by a curriculum production company. More is required if the teacher is to work more or less individually with students to enable them to think through and to plan what they are going to address in their art program. In addition, the teacher has a key role to play in calling the students' attention to qualities in the work they produce that need attention of one kind or another. The students might learn how to address certain formal relationships, technical matters, or imaginative features of their work that they had not noticed. Calling the students' attention to such matters addresses other minicurricular activities that invite students to think about the content of their work in new ways and to experiment with ways to strengthen what needs attention. Thus, curriculum and teaching merge within a dynamic context.

Thus far I have been talking about the importance of curriculum activities and the interpenetration of teaching, curriculum, and evaluation. But I have also been talking about curriculum as it pertains largely to a single content, the visual arts. Curricula need not be organized around single domains or fields of study. They can also be integrated across fields. It is to this option that we now turn.

INTEGRATED ARTS CURRICULA

The integration of the arts with other subjects can take more than one form. Perhaps the most common is to bring the arts in touch with the social studies or with history, so that when students are studying, say, the American Civil War or the Jazz Age, they also are being exposed to the painting, sculpture, music, and dance of the period.⁷ The point of such contiguity is to provide students

with a wider picture than the one they are able to secure through written materials alone. After all, it is extremely difficult to know what the music of a period sounds like without being able to listen to it, or to understand the form painting took during a particular period without being able to see it, or to experience the forms of dance or theater that were created at a particular period without images to consult. The availability of such images can enrich students' experience and their historical understanding.

At times, particularly at the elementary school level, teachers will make it possible for students to produce artwork that emulates the features of the work produced in the culture they are studying. Thus, fish measuring, say, a foot long, are sometimes used in classrooms as "plates" to be painted with ink so that paper once laid upon them and pressed will yield a fish form, scales and all. Such an activity produces "Japanese-like" images and is designed to give students the flavor of Japanese culture.

Of course, it is very easy to convert art programs into handmaidens for learning the social studies or history without providing youngsters with occasions for developing artistic judgment or securing aesthetic forms of experience that mark effective art education. It is possible to dilute art programs and to delude oneself that art is being taught when in fact there is little in the way of artistic activity going on.

To say this is not to suggest that integrated curricula cannot pay attention to both aesthetic and imaginative features and at the same time enrich historical understanding. After all, life is a multimedia event, and the meanings that we secure from life are not simply contained in text; they yield their content through a wide variety of forms. Hence, the utilization of an experientially rich array of resources for understanding some aspect of the human condition is not a bad thing to pay attention to. What must also be paid attention to is the art in the project. Simply exploring materials without encouraging attention to aesthetic matters renders them void of their artistic potential. Such practice results in integration without art.

The practical implications are significant for teachers. They suggest that as much time and attention and effort need to be de-

voted to enabling students to attend to their work aesthetically as is paid to the social studies or history material they are studying. This means helping students learn to scrutinize their work aesthetically, to make judgments about it, to acquire techniques that will make it more powerful, and to acknowledge achievement by other students in such matters. An integrated curriculum makes more, not fewer, demands upon the teacher.

A second form of integration involves identifying a central, key idea that a variety of fields would examine. Consider the idea "It is always darkest just before dawn." Assume that you're a high school art teacher collaborating with teachers of English, history, and one of the sciences. What might be done with a group of high school sophomores or juniors in discussing the meaning of this statement? How might its meaning be expressed in different subject matter forms, and how might these forms of subject matter—English, history, one of the sciences, and the arts—be related to one another to produce a work that utilizes the various fields productively? In other words, how can various fields be instrumental to the illumination of a large idea?⁸

Consider others: "survival of the fittest," "the process of metamorphosis," "the constancy of change"—the list could go on and on. Selecting an idea that is open-ended and stimulating to a group of high school students is a basis for thinking about the ways in which various fields address such notions and how those fields might be related to one another to create something that is more powerful than any single field could achieve. What needs to be kept salient in such a conception is the key idea to which works in the various fields serve as instrumentalities.

There has been a longstanding tension in the field of education between the desire to be rigorous in a disciplinary way, that is, to provide programs that initiate the young into the concepts and procedures of the disciplines taught within the school curriculum, and programs that relate field to field and are relevant to the student.⁹ Thus, a student studying biology would be expected to understand the basic concepts of biology and the procedures used for biological inquiry. The same aspirations are applied to history or to the processes of writing literature. Students are to understand

what needs attention in the construction of narrative and are to have practice in producing it.

Yet even individuals seeking to develop disciplinary rigor acknowledge that most school curricula are highly fragmented, that their parts do not fit well together, that subjects have an independent existence, and that the models that we use to plan programs are designed to produce junior disciplinarians rather than to help students understand the ways in which knowledge is integrated and how it might be used in the practical world that they will occupy. In short, we have broken Humpty Dumpty and cannot put the parts back so that they all fit together as they once did. Integration is, on the one hand, an aspiration and on the other hand a problem when one tries to maintain the "integrity" of a discipline. How one can achieve both—which, if possible, is desirable—remains to be worked out. The farther students proceed in school, the greater the separation among the various disciplines.

The practical need for time to learn is perhaps made most vivid in the acquisition of skills. It is one thing to survey the pottery of the Han dynasty, and it is quite another to have the time needed to learn how to throw a pot on a wheel. Unless there is sufficient time devoted to learning how to center a ball of clay on a potter's wheel and to pull up a gracefully formed, thin-walled vessel, students are unlikely to reach a threshold that makes it possible for them to understand what throwing a pot entails. In other words, there is an irreconcilable tension between the demands that need to be met in understanding what a discipline requires and, on the other hand, understanding its connection to other disciplines. I have no good resolution to this dilemma.

Each of the visions and versions of art education that I described in Chapter 2 has its own particular features and its own emphasis. Discipline-based art education requires attention to four domains: using the visual arts to promote cultural literacy requires a different emphasis. Developing students' capacity for creative problem-solving suggests an emphasis on certain kinds of curriculum activities rather than others. An emphasis on creative expression would lead to still other aims and activities. Each vision of art education has implications for curriculum development. We see

such differences, often in subtle form, in classrooms throughout the country. And as I indicated in Chapter 2, I do not believe that there is one sacrosanct version of art education. Different programs are suitable or appropriate for different populations and the values that the community embraces. There is no "one size fits all" curriculum for a nation as diverse and as large as ours. Intelligent curriculum planning takes into account such differences and uses them to inform its own policymaking and construction processes.

In this chapter I have been discussing curricula either as emergent processes decided largely by the teacher's assessment of what seems appropriate under developing circumstances or as planned programs that lay out an agenda over time, enabling both teachers and students to know what's ahead and what is expected. I also indicated that the latter approach to curriculum development is closer in spirit to the technocratic expectations salient in American schools today. Some people feel comfort in knowing not only the direction in which they are headed, but the precise destination. These destinations are often operationalized through standards and rubrics, two notions that I will be discussing shortly. However, it would be a mistake to conclude that what is learned in the classroom is a function only of the curriculum, whether emergent or not, and the teacher's ability to teach. Although curriculum and teaching are surely at the core of classroom life, children never learn one thing at a time. Nor do adolescents.

The conditions of teaching and learning in a classroom or in a school are a function not only of the curriculum and of teaching practices, but of the entire cognitive ambience of the classroom and the school. The social conditions, the prevailing norms, the comments and attitudes of peers, the organizational structure of schools, the hidden messages that are conveyed to students in evaluation and testing practices—these also teach. Indeed some scholars have concluded that these teach more powerfully than the curriculum and the forms of teaching students are afforded. Students live in an educational world. Indeed, by law they are required to be in school during the better part of their childhood. The culture that is developed in schools and classrooms constitutes a way of life. I also indicated that "culture" can be conceived of as

a medium for growing things. In the biological sense, cultures are used to grow organisms. In schools, the culture is used to "grow children," and the pace and direction of growth are influenced by the features of the environment in and through which they live. Thus, a comprehensive understanding of what students learn in school requires considerably more than attention to curriculum and teaching practices. It also requires attention to the hidden messages, values, and ideas that are conveyed tacitly if not explicitly by fellow students and teachers in the classrooms in which students spend so much time.¹⁰

These hidden messages are referred to by some writers as the implicit, in contrast to the explicit, curriculum. Other writers refer to them as the hidden curriculum of classrooms and schools. One wonders about the extent to which such curricula are in fact hidden. Students seem to understand quite well what these covert messages are and to adapt accordingly.

What is the place of the arts in the school curriculum or in the classroom's curriculum? How does it compare in importance with other fields of study? How much time is allocated to the arts in schools? When are they taught? Are they electives, or are they part of the core curriculum? Are grades in the arts taken into account by selective universities in calculating grade-point averages? Does the school publicly acknowledge, as it does in athletics and some of the sciences, students who are excellent in the arts? These questions and more need to be addressed to get a comprehensive picture of the culture of schooling as it bears upon the arts.

One last concept is crucial to thinking about curriculum matters in relation to what children learn. The formal program of the school, the program that is planned, taught, and graded, constitutes the school's *explicit curriculum*. This curriculum consists of the subjects that virtually everyone acknowledges are being taught in one way or another. This is the curriculum for which teachers are hired, grades are given, records are kept, and the like.

Classroom ambience, school norms, modes of assessment, and the like teach not explicitly, but implicitly. Thus, we not only have an explicit curriculum in schools, but also an *implicit curriculum*, and it is the implicit curriculum that endures while sections of the

explicit curriculum change over time; a unit on printmaking in the visual arts or the westward movement in social studies is here today and gone tomorrow. The features of the implicit curriculum continue.

But there is also another curriculum, one that is paradoxical: the *null curriculum*.¹¹ What is not taught can be as important in someone's life as what is taught, whether explicitly or implicitly. The null curriculum constitutes what is absent from the school program, what students in schools never have the opportunity to learn. When the arts are absent or taught so poorly that they might as well be, students pay a price. Acts of omission can be as significant as acts of commission. Thus, in thinking about curriculum development or curriculum reform we should think about the explicit curriculum, the implicit curriculum, and also the null curriculum.

Of course not everything can be taught, and hard choices have to be made. What those choices are with respect to the arts is, perhaps, the most telling indicator of their significance to those who make educational policy.

CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES

The formulation of curriculum objectives is an effort to describe what a student is to know and/or be able to do with respect to some body of content at the end of some designated instructional period. Objectives describe *intended outcomes*. The effort to specify objectives in curriculum planning was initially a reflection of a desire to make planning rational by indicating what its goals would be. In the early 1920s in the United States, an educational administrator by the name of Franklin Bobbit was particularly instrumental in developing the idea.¹² As he saw it, and as others did after him, each unit of instruction was to have one or more objectives, and the journey through the curriculum was a journey intended to make it possible for students to achieve those objectives. At the end of schooling, a student would have mastered hundreds of objectives. Bobbit had over seven hundred in his book.

The dominant idea is that it is important to know what students