

# The Evolution of Discipline-Based Art Education

---

ELIZABETH MANLEY DELACRUZ and PHILLIP C. DUNN

One of the most hotly debated initiatives in the last quarter century has been the Getty Center for Education in the Arts' proposal for reforming art education, namely, discipline-based art education (DBAE). Although the initial flurry that accompanied the Getty Center's introduction of DBAE has quieted, it is useful to examine the fourteen-year evolution of the Center's involvement with DBAE theory and practice. This article reviews selected aspects of DBAE. DBAE is discussed with regard to two broader educational reform movements: excellence-in-education and multiculturalism. Changes in thinking about DBAE are observed, followed by a brief description of two current translations of DBAE: Interrelated Arts and Interdisciplinary Units. Finally, questions about the theoretical integrity and future of DBAE are raised.

## A Climate for Reform

Reforming education occurs cyclically in the United States. The publication by the U.S. Department of Education of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 heralded the beginning of the "excellence-in-education" movement, a movement intent upon improving the quality and status of education in the United States in a threatening and increasingly competitive global community. As the question What constitutes a quality education? became the center point for educational reform initiatives, efforts toward making education more substantive and rigorous took hold. Concepts like back-to-basics, competency, and accountability became the buzzwords of the decade. The endurance of

---

*Elizabeth Manley Delacruz* is an assistant professor in the School of Art and Design, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She is the author of *Instructional Theory, Research, and Practice in Art Education: Design for Inquiry*, articles in such journals as *Art Education* and *Visual Arts Research*, and essays in several anthologies. She is also a past contributor to this journal.

*Phillip C. Dunn* is Associate Professor of Art Education at the University of South Carolina, Columbia. He has published in *Design for Arts in Education* and has designed three hypermedia software packages for elementary, middle, and high schools, titled *Curriculum Navigator for Art*.

this era of educational reform has been most atypical. The five-year time frame that normally limits wide-scale, national interests in education seemed to pass virtually unnoticed.

During this time, we have witnessed the demise of behaviorism and the ascent of cognitive science in American public education.<sup>1</sup> Over the past two decades, the focus of instructional theory and practice has also shifted from a reliance on psychology to a broader interest in philosophical, sociological, and moral concerns and issues.<sup>2</sup> These interests coincide with the emergence of a second reform movement—a movement intent upon addressing the problematic relationships between schools as public institutions and students with differing learning styles and diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

### Shifts in Thinking in General Education

Reform movements in general education reflect differences in thinking about teaching, learning, and the purposes of schooling. An emphasis on the subjective, affective elements of schooling characterized *personalistic* notions of education in the 1960s and 1970s. These notions were aligned with the humanistic psychology espoused by Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, and their followers in the 1960s.<sup>3</sup> *Behavioristic* notions, promulgated by B. F. Skinner and his followers, were also prevalent during those years.<sup>4</sup> Behavioristic tenets gave rise to curricular models that seemed to provide the kind of precision and accountability that were so much in demand. More recent thinking about education, an approach supporting a *holistic* view,<sup>5</sup> is built on advancements in cognitive developmental and cultural psychology, along with emerging postliberal theories of education.<sup>6</sup>

Table 1 highlights theoretical views of education and approaches to pedagogy and demonstrates the cyclical nature of thinking in general education. In some ways, holistic approaches seem similar to earlier personalistic conceptions of education. Like personalistic approaches, holistic education recalls John Dewey's progressive ideas<sup>7</sup> and Carl Rogers's humanistic approach to teaching; but holistic education also incorporates perspectives and research on the cultural and social mediation of knowledge.<sup>8</sup> Like personalistic education, holistic education embraces a fundamental regard for children's ways of knowing the world. What distinguishes holistic approaches is an emphasis on cognition and the construction of knowledge, a contribution credited to the work of Jerome Bruner and David Ausubel during the 1960s,<sup>9</sup> an interest in the context in which knowledge is transmitted to and constructed by students, and an interest in developing disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge that leads to an understanding of the interrelationships among all living things.<sup>10</sup>

<i>Personalistic Model</i>	<i>Behavioristic Model</i>	<i>Holistic Model</i>
<i>Knowledge</i>		
Subjective, personalistic, child-centered. Authentic knowledge is that which is found to be personally relevant to students.	Knowledge lies outside the student and is rule governed. Acquisition of factual information and ability to make applications.	Focus on understanding structures, grasping essences and meanings. Knowledge reconstructed by students.
<i>Learning</i>		
Process of growth and development in accordance with nature (natural unfoldment). Learning is innate, activity-oriented, self-directed.	Occurs incrementally, from simple to complex, familiar to unfamiliar. Task-oriented, drill and practice. Learning viewed as behavior modification.	Learning is integrative, based on multiple cognitive and affective processes. May begin with complex, puzzling, unfamiliar information. Learning as apprenticeship.
<i>Motivation</i>		
Individuals are active, stimulus-seeking, self-directing, self-determining agents.	Learning reinforced by conditioning, including extrinsic rewards.	Learning reinforced by relevance to students' interests and lives.
<i>Purpose of Schooling</i>		
Self-actualization, personal fulfillment. Individuals discover own talents and identities. Fostering natural growth.	Effective and efficient means of transmitting knowledge to next generation. Skill building. Providing vocational training. Socialization of children.	Solving real-life problems creatively. Constructing a responsible, holistic world view. Understanding the way systems interrelate.
<i>Role of the Teacher</i>		
Guide. Attends to needs and interests of students. Provides enjoyable learning experiences. Is not prescriptive or coercive.	Authority. Manager of classroom episodes. Gives information and knowledge. Selects and organizes learning episodes.	Mentor, expert, and role model. One of many sources of information. Facilitates and orchestrates learning environment.
<i>Views of the Student</i>		
Regarded as individual rather than as a member of a class. Subjectively free and autonomous, architect of own life.	Receiver of information. Success or achievement commensurate with abilities and efforts.	Maker of own knowledge, needing structured learning experiences with teachers and more competent peers.
<i>Subject Matter</i>		
Emerges out of sympathetic interactions of teachers and students. Determined by student interests.	Subjects distinguished, taught separately. Disciplinary knowledge simplified to basic concepts and principles.	Subjects interrelate. Content for study based on current issues. Subject matter may be complex from the beginning.
<i>Curriculum Structure</i>		
Unstructured programs. Developed in concert with students rather than predetermined by school bureaucracies.	Linear sequence. Units predetermined and organized hierarchically. Patterned after structures of the academic disciplines.	Fluid or web-like. Interdisciplinary approach. Organized around events, situations, simulations, and problems.
<i>Assessment of Learning</i>		
Student and process centered. Idiosyncratic, determined according to needs, interests, and abilities of individual students. Grading minimized.	Standardized, multiple, single-occasion events. Assessments are on demand recall of discrete facts and isolated skills.	Authentic simulations of real problems. Assessments individualized, ongoing, and curriculum-embedded. Students internalize standards and self-assess own work.

Table 1. Shifts in Thinking about Education

Each of the views of education described in table 1 has contributed to the inception and evolution of DBAE theory and practice; first, as original DBAE theorists distinguished themselves from particular premises associated with personalistic and behavioristic conceptions of education, and second, as later DBAE theorists aligned DBAE theory with aspects of emerging holistic views of education.

### **The Getty Center for Education in the Arts: The Early Years**

The conditions were right in the early 1980s for a theoretical shift in art education. When J. Paul Getty died in 1976, he had left most of his estate to the J. Paul Getty Trust. At that time individuals charged with the administration of the Trust decided, in addition to maintaining the J. Paul Getty Museum, to make contributions to the arts and humanities.<sup>11</sup> The Getty Center for Education in the Arts (GCEA) was formed in 1982 for the expressed purpose of improving the quality and status of arts education in America's schools.<sup>12</sup> The stage was now set for an unprecedented infusion of energy, resources, and writings in art education, all focused on one approach, DBAE. The stage was also set for unprecedented and vehement academic debates.

#### *Anticipation and Disappointment*

Funding for arts education has never been ample in the United States, and the attention and support of the Getty Trust had a major impact. By the mid-1980s art educators tried to anticipate the Center's involvement with art education. Many failed to take into account the fact that the Center was part of a private foundation with limited objectives—and not a broad grants-making agency. When the GCEA sought to maximize its efforts by focusing on one theoretical approach, DBAE, rather than diffuse its contribution by creating a diverse range of grant categories that would fund a variety of programs, art educators supporting alternative approaches felt disenfranchised. Moreover, it was troubling for some who viewed the Getty Center as an outside entity with too much influence. To add fuel to the fires of dissent, the discipline-based approach, although not new to the field, challenged traditional practice in the schools—a fact that delighted some and infuriated others. Writings espousing the pros and cons of DBAE flooded the academic field for the next several years.

Critics charged that the DBAE emphasis on formalized structure and sequence were contrary to the unique, dynamic, and multifaceted processes of making and responding to art.<sup>13</sup> For some art educators the addition of academic content to the already crowded art curriculum was unacceptable.<sup>14</sup> Others criticized DBAE for being too technocratic,<sup>15</sup> too narrowly defined,<sup>16</sup> and too abstract.<sup>17</sup> Many of the criticisms simply reflected a resistance to

attempts to diminish the primacy of art making as the defining characteristic of art education.

#### *DBAE and Other Emerging Curriculum Reform Themes*

DBAE has been identified with the excellence-in-education reform initiative intent upon improving this nation's academic status<sup>18</sup> and economic competitiveness in the global marketplace.<sup>19</sup> But DBAE grew amidst another reform initiative with vastly different concerns. As questions about content and inquiry processes central to the disciplines were being asked and answered, other questions about the enterprise of education and its relationships to student, community, and societal needs were beginning to take form. Early criticisms of DBAE reflected an interest in these other views of educational reform—a growing social-reconstructionist educational orientation spurred on, in this context, by the then emerging multicultural education movement. This second reform movement, multiculturalism, had a significant impact on shifts in DBAE theory.

#### **Evolving Conceptions of DBAE**

Ron MacGregor<sup>20</sup> and Brent Wilson<sup>21</sup> observed the beginning of the evolution of DBAE in the late 1980s, noting that public school art teachers were adapting DBAE to fit their needs. Art educators at universities also redefined DBAE according to their own perspectives. By the end of the 1980s the most vehement academic criticisms of DBAE had subsided, replaced by a variety of writings that explored interpretations of DBAE theory. Finally, individuals working for the Getty Center offered varied modifications of DBAE. Variations in thinking about DBAE, offered from within the DBAE camp and indicated in table 2, point to important shifts in DBAE theory.

Many of the shifts in DBAE theory address the fundamental disciplines from which content for curricula is derived. Other changes reflect shifts in thinking about the interaction of teachers and students and the nature of creativity. These shifts, sometimes subtle, sometimes dramatic, are discussed in the following paragraphs.

#### *The Impact of Multiculturalism and Feminist Theory*

From the onset, critics depicted discipline-based art education as Eurocentric, male-dominated, misogynist, and elitist.<sup>22</sup> Indeed, the early literature advocating DBAE sent mixed messages as it dealt with concerns about certain notions of connoisseurship, reliance on a particular community of recognized experts in the art world, and limited definitions of fine art as museum art. Although the early DBAE literature clearly specified that folk art, the applied arts, and art from non-Western cultures be included as content for study<sup>23</sup> and proponents claimed that DBAE promoted egalitarian

	<b>Early DBAE</b>	<b>Contemporary DBAE</b>
<b>The Art Disciplines</b>	<p>Defined by a conceptual structure: a set of fundamental ideas, principles, and inquiry processes.<sup>49</sup></p> <p>The four disciplines of art possess their own concepts, terms, and relationships.<sup>50</sup></p>	<p>DBAE must allow for multiple perspectives on how we learn about art. Curriculum can no longer depend on traditional concepts of the disciplines.<sup>51</sup></p> <p>DBAE maintains its dynamic character because it is grounded in disciplines that are themselves constantly changing to address pluralism, politics, gender, and race.<sup>52</sup></p>
<b>Selection of Imagery</b>	<p>Drawn from landmark works recognized by experts as worthy of study.<sup>53</sup></p> <p>The claim that DBAE emphasizes Western art is true. Given our culture, why not?<sup>54</sup></p>	<p>Imagery may be drawn from the popular, industrial and applied arts, and fine arts.<sup>55</sup></p> <p>A special effort is needed to identify and select images that represent cultures that have been neglected in the past.<sup>56</sup></p>
<b>Curriculum Content and Pedagogy</b>	<p>Curriculum is made up of activities that present concepts and skills within procedures and modes of inquiry recognized as the proper practice of the art disciplines by educated adults.<sup>57</sup></p> <p>The curriculum is structured, referenced to art and the adult practitioner in each of the four disciplines, and can be assessed in ways that hold teachers accountable for their instruction.<sup>58</sup></p>	<p>Anthropology, sociology, and material culture studies provide helpful models and strategies for accessing works of art.<sup>59</sup></p> <p>The Getty Center encourages art educators to experiment in constructing their own approaches to DBAE to reflect artistic, social, and multicultural issues.<sup>60</sup></p> <p>Content-centered and child-centered approaches are not mutually exclusive.<sup>61</sup> All good teaching is child-centered.<sup>62</sup></p>
<b>Children's art</b>	<p>Untutored childhood expression is not viewed as necessarily creative.<sup>63</sup></p>	<p>Children at a very early age create a symbol system of their own. The child is encouraged to use his or her invented symbols to convey values in his or her own life.<sup>64</sup></p>

Table 2. Changes in Thinking about DBAE (Complete references appear at end of article)

aims,<sup>24</sup> critics nevertheless maintained that DBAE theory fostered limited, undemocratic notions. Much of the criticism continued because DBAE, in its early years, failed to *mandate* attention to non-European, folk, feminist, and ethnic art. Original writings in DBAE theory did not include a specific rationale to balance the study of the art of Western exemplars with the art of diverse ethnic cultural groups or to redress previously ignored artistic accomplishments and aesthetic perspectives of minorities and women.

In response to these criticisms, the Getty Center undertook several initiatives: (a) a general acknowledgement (in professional and theoretical writings) of the need for more diverse programs of study; (b) an attempt on the part of the GCEA directly to involve feminists, multiculturalists, and other critics in the development, refinement, and modification of DBAE theory toward multicultural aims; (c) the publication of numerous papers and curriculum resources dealing with diverse artists and issues in the arts; (d) the appointment of Thandiwee Michael Kendall, an African-descended woman, to replace Phillip Dunn as Program Officer when he returned to his position at the University of South Carolina; and (e) financial and institutional support for the development and dissemination of pedagogical approaches to multicultural DBAE practice in conferences, preservice education programs, and in professional teacher summer institutes. The Third National Issues Seminar, devoted exclusively to the topic of cultural diversity, signalled a significant shift on the part of the GCEA toward multiculturalism. Recent writings from the Getty indicate a continued interest in the development of multicultural art educational approaches and curriculum materials. Dwaine Greer, originator of the phrase "discipline-based art education" and one of the founders of DBAE theory, recently observed these shifts in thinking toward broader cultural and social frameworks:

DBAE *now* seems to define art more broadly, includes the art of other cultures, seems to no longer promote only the 100 canons of art made by dead white Euro-American males, seems to embrace the "popular arts" as worthy of serious consideration, no longer equates aesthetics only with aesthetic experiences and responses, realizes the limitations of aesthetic scanning, acknowledges that art has social content as well as form, and is tolerant of contributions of feminist scholars.<sup>25</sup>

Despite overtures toward multiculturalism on the part of DBAE advocates and the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, some critics continue to maintain that DBAE theory fails because it does not take a more proactive stance on social and economic issues central to ethnic and multicultural concerns.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, although some DBAE proponents support the adoption of pluralistic aesthetic perspectives in selecting works of art worthy of study, they have not necessarily endorsed a social reconstructionist view. Ralph Smith argues in favor of "the disinterested study of art" (that is, a nonpoliticized art education),<sup>27</sup> and Elliot Eisner warns that an approach

linked to the reconstructionist social and cultural agenda may make art education a “handmaiden to the social studies.”<sup>28</sup>

#### *Contributions from the Field*

Art educators in the field have suggested many ways that discipline-based art education could better integrate multicultural and feminist concerns.<sup>29</sup> Many have considered the manner in which the parent disciplines could be redefined: focusing on how art criticism and aesthetic inquiry might be practiced to encompass multiculturalism,<sup>30</sup> or considering the manner in which art history, art criticism, and aesthetics might incorporate processes and concepts central to feminist inquiry.<sup>31</sup> Some art educators now acknowledge the compatibility of multiculturalism and DBAE, observing that both movements seek to broaden the curriculum to include the study of the social and contextual parameters of art.<sup>32</sup>

#### *The Relationship of DBAE Theory to Postmodern Perspectives: Redefining the Nature and Structure of the Disciplines*

Many art educators, both DBAE supporters and former critics, now agree that the four foundational art disciplines central to DBAE are informed by and derive their content from such fields of inquiry as anthropology, psychoanalytic theory, political science, women’s studies, and material culture studies. Graeme Chalmers argues that as history, criticism, and aesthetics have adopted social and economic frameworks, so must DBAE.<sup>33</sup> But Karen Hamblen wonders whether such permutations of DBAE theory are actually “discipline-based.”<sup>34</sup> No matter how one might answer such a query, what has become evident is that many art educators no longer view “the disciplines” as necessarily distinct; rather, they observe that poststructural, eclectic, and interdisciplinary views flavor thinking in many fields of inquiry.

#### *DBAE and the Child-centered Curriculum*

Early writings about DBAE, both pro and con, differentiated DBAE from Viktor Lowenfeld’s notions of child-centered pedagogy. This is unfortunate, because DBAE should be seen as an extension and refinement of some of Lowenfeld’s insights. Lowenfeld advised teachers to encourage children to attend to life experiences and to cultivate their sensitivity toward the things around them.<sup>35</sup> Lowenfeld also advised teachers to attend to children’s needs and interests, warning that it is difficult to put ourselves in the place of a child, because to do so incorrectly assumes that we can know a child’s thoughts, feelings, and perceptions.

Art educators still have a lot to learn from the work of Lowenfeld. Some of his ideas inform DBAE practice; other beliefs and recommendations promulgated by Lowenfeld and his interpreters are held by few, if any, art



educators these days. In any case, we are all better teachers when we remember, after Lowenfeld, that knowledge alone does not make people happy; a balance of intellectual and emotional growth is necessary to adjust properly to this world.

*Making Art: Creativity and Pedagogy*

The issues of studio time and creative self-expression were particularly problematic in the early DBAE literature. Posing itself in opposition to the popular creative self-expression orientation of the 1950s and 1960s, Clark, Day, and Greer argued that creative self-expression programs, even with the addition of some art history and criticism for enrichment or motivation, were inadequate. DBAE theorists called for more time and focus on the teaching of concepts and inquiry processes central to art history, criticism, and aesthetics, arguing for a comparable concern for each of the four parent disciplines. A more balanced curricular approach among the four disciplines translated, literally, as less studio.

Early DBAE advocates further argued that untutored childhood expressions were not necessarily creative.<sup>36</sup> Some distinguished children's artistic endeavors from those of professional artists, characterizing children as neophytes and their unschooled creative acts as mundane or banal, while recognizing world-class artists as extraordinary and their works as examples of socially significant creativity.<sup>37</sup> In addition, DBAE supporters criticized the manner in which studio art programs were conceptualized and taught throughout the country. Central to their argument was the claim that many of the studio activities in which students were engaged during their art lessons were without substantive content.<sup>38</sup> Dwaine Greer observed that studio teaching prior to DBAE bore little resemblance to the "cold, focused, and detached wrestling with the medium that many artists use to characterize their studio efforts."<sup>39</sup> Jean Rush argued for more direct teacher involvement and coaching and less emphasis on individuality. Rush recommended that teachers predetermine aesthetic problems to be pursued by students and then look for predictable conceptual consistencies in the images produced.<sup>40</sup>

Professional journals and conferences were inundated with negative reactions to these kinds of recommendations. Critics characterized DBAE as overly academic, anticreativity, and antithetical to the fundamental nature of art itself. While academic debates ensued in the presses, however, it was art teachers in the field who offered the greatest resistance, refusing to de-emphasize art making and creative self-expression as the primary curricular focus of their programs. In response, DBAE advocates softened their stance, reiterating an often overlooked point made by Clark, Day, and Greer in 1987, that "balanced" doesn't necessarily mean equal time, and that studio production and creativity could be the dominant feature of a DBAE program as long as content from the other disciplines was given

adequate treatment and effectively integrated with production activities. As DBAE theorists translated their program into models for practice, it became evident that instruction could emphasize art making, creative self-expression, and individuality and still be discipline-based.

### **DBAE in Practice: Teachers Constructing Curriculum**

While academic debates over DBAE have resulted in a refinement and modification of DBAE theory over the years, it is the practice of DBAE by teachers that has brought about the most significant changes. Although DBAE, as it was originally defined in the 1980s, prescribed a particular approach to art education with specific characteristics and limitations, there are now probably about as many versions of DBAE as there are teachers constructing and revising curricula. Two contemporary adaptations of DBAE theory, discussed in the following sections, illustrate its malleability and expanding nature.

#### *Interdisciplinary Adaptations: Discipline-Based Arts Education*

Current adaptations of DBAE theory include efforts to expand and interface the visual arts with content related to music, dance, and theater programs, as is done in South Carolina at the DBAE: Integrating the Arts Institute.<sup>41</sup> At the South Carolina Institute, teams of arts teachers work together to develop complementary units of study, organized in a variety of ways around selected works of art that deal with central ideas: themes in the humanities, concepts (including, but not limited to, design concepts), social and environmental issues, great eras, artists, or cultures.

The term "integration" (again) has become a topic of interest in educational circles.<sup>42</sup> Infusing the general curriculum with the arts has been tried before, without much success. Equally unsuccessful were past efforts to interrelate the arts with one another. These initiatives suffered a lack of integrity, due to efforts to lump everything together. In discipline-based arts education, as defined at the South Carolina Institute, the fundamental foundations of each of the unique art disciplines are respected rather than subjected to an attempt to fuse the arts together in a generalized aesthetic education approach.<sup>43</sup> Encouraging teams of art, music, drama, and dance specialists to use the tenets of discipline-based art education to interface their unique, separate, but mutually supportive art areas offers potential for improving the collective position of each of the arts.

#### *Other Interdisciplinary Adaptations: Holistic, Thematic, Interdisciplinary Units*

Another adaptation illustrating how far the concept of DBAE has expanded and evolved has been pioneered in recent years at the Getty-sponsored Florida Institute for Art Education. The Florida Institute is organized around the construction of interdisciplinary curriculum units called CHATs.

More specifically, a CHAT (comprehensive holistic assessment task) is a thematic instruction/assessment unit focused on a central work of art and developed with multidisciplinary connections. CHAT developers (teachers attending the Florida Institute) select a single work of art and design a series of related multisession lessons organized around that work of art. The meanings or content of the central work of art become the organizing theme of the unit. Each CHAT unit includes curriculum-embedded assessment tasks that take place in a variety of ways: discussions; descriptive, interpretive, reflective, and critical writings; art making; and the development of process folios. Both teachers and students, at various times throughout the unit, reflect upon and evaluate the nature and quality of student work.

What is particularly noteworthy about the CHAT is the fact that the theme of the unit is then related in a series of lessons to content drawn from a variety of disciplines from both within and beyond the visual arts, including social studies, geography, literature, poetry, history, music, science, and math. A CHAT unit is designed to (1) help students acquire knowledge and skills in art history, art criticism, art production, and aesthetics, and (2) help students explore conditions of the human experience from personalistic, community, multicultural, and global perspectives. Additionally, a CHAT unit is supposed to help students develop critical thinking and writing skills, foster an appreciation of their own cultures and the culture of others, enhance their abilities to work cooperatively with others, and foster sociability, self-management, and self-esteem.

Many CHAT units have been developed by teachers attending the FIAE. As DBAE is translated by these teachers into CHATs, certain aspects of DBAE theory, as originally posited in the mid 1980s, have been dramatically modified: the CHAT model does not rely exclusively on the four parent art disciplines in defining content for study; students spend a great deal of time studying, discussing, and writing about things other than art (geography, history, literature, science, and math); the requirement for a rigidly prescriptive, hierarchical sequence of instruction has been replaced by a series of individually made teacher-designed grade-level units that are thematically related throughout a district-wide program of study; and the CHATs reflect an interest in developing attitudes and competencies extrinsic to the study of art for its own sake (self-esteem, sociability, civic responsibility). Interesting things have happened to DBAE on its way to the classroom.<sup>44</sup>

### **Who Owns DBAE?**

Each of the adaptations and modifications of DBAE theory and practice discussed throughout this article has contributed to an expanding concept of DBAE and to ways it can be tailored to fit the needs of individual school districts and classrooms. What is unclear at this time is the degree to which

DBAE has been assimilated into the field of art education. Has the field truly assumed ownership of the DBAE approach, including responsibility for its exploration and refinement? Have we reached a state where DBAE has achieved a critical mass of teachers who would continue to expend their best efforts in the classroom assimilating and developing DBAE theory into practice, in the absence of funding from the Getty Center? Has DBAE changed the field as much as the field has changed DBAE? The answers to these questions really speak to the nature and evolution of any theoretical approach.

### The Future of DBAE and Art Education

Dwaine Greer maintains that the responses of DBAE supporters to many of the original objections and the resulting refinements and additions to DBAE ideas provide impetus for the continued development and implementation of discipline-based art education in our nation's schools.<sup>45</sup> Indeed, Karen Hamblen, an early critic of DBAE, now observes how the *look* of DBAE has changed, as it incorporates the concerns of the field.<sup>46</sup> But how far can a particular theory be redefined or modified and still maintain its fundamental tenets? And will DBAE continue to change with the field of art education as art educators begin to embrace a growing interest in environmentalism? As Ralph Smith points out, the notion of a theory of art education implies a set of coherent and systematic ideas about the nature and purpose of instruction in the arts.<sup>47</sup> Can DBAE theory satisfy its critics, continue to change with the times, and still maintain its coherence?

Some art educators believe that as the Getty Center modifies its positions, DBAE loses its distinctive definition and focus. Has DBAE theory, in broadening its parameters, in allowing for diverse interpretations and adaptations, and in accommodating shifts in thinking about teaching, learning, and the art disciplines, reduced its potential for promoting curriculum reforms toward its original ends? The answers to these questions really depend on how one views theories—as static frameworks or as dynamic sets of propositions, provisional but still stable enough to guide practice in a meaningful, coherent manner. Certainly, DBAE theory *has* changed from what it was when first introduced in the literature in 1984. But perhaps more fruitful questions need to be asked. What is current practice in art education? In a recent study conducted by Sandra Mims and Louis Lankford, elementary art teachers reported that art history, criticism, and aesthetics, collectively, comprise 35 percent of their instructional time, and that 11 percent of their budgets go to nonexpendable resources such as slides, videos, reproductions, and books.<sup>48</sup> We still don't know much about the manner in which art history, art criticism, and aesthetic inquiry are taught in America's schools. Which artists, cultures, and thematic emphases comprise

instructional programs in art history, criticism, and aesthetics? What are students expected to know and be able to do in each of these curricular areas? An in-depth study of public school art teaching is needed at this time.

Some conditions that surround the DBAE movement and the field of art education remain exceedingly positive, while others are clearly problematic. While the future of art education seems unsettled, the potential for making important changes exists, as DBAE assumes an interdisciplinary stance and as it interfaces with multicultural educational theory and a renewed interest in the integrity of children's lives. Whether DBAE theorists will incorporate emerging ecocentric views of art education, as they have multicultural frameworks, remains to be seen.

Regardless of which side of the DBAE issue one falls, the flurry of point and counterpoint that has surrounded the DBAE agenda provided a level of discussion and debate that has energized and invigorated thinking and scholarship in art education. This alone has been a most significant contribution to the field of art education.

#### NOTES

1. John Bruer, *Schools for Thought* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994); Jerome Bruner, "Vygotsky, a Historical and Conceptual Perspective," in *Culture, Communication, and Cognition: A Vygotskian Perspective*, ed. J. V. Wertsch (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985).
2. James A. Banks, "Multicultural Education: Characteristics and Goals," in *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*, ed. James A. Banks and Cherry McGee Banks, 2d ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1993), pp. 3-28; Jennifer M. Gore, *Critical Pedagogies* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
3. Abraham Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York: Reinhold, 1968); Carl Rogers, *Freedom to Learn* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969).
4. B. F. Skinner, *The Technology of Teaching* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968).
5. We have taken and modified the term "holistic" from a paper written by Douglas Blandy and Elizabeth Hoffman, "Toward an Art Education of Place," *Studies in Art Education*, 33, no. 1 (Fall 1993): 22-33. Blandy and Hoffman use the phrase "holistic world view" (p. 28) to describe a shift in thinking about educational goals, arguing that individualistic and community issues and concerns must be broadened to a concern for our use of and relationship to the constructed and natural environment. Although environmentalism is not the defining characteristic in our definition of holistic education, a holistic approach to education requires an ecological mind set that regards all parts of a system as interdependent.
6. Chet A. Bowers, *Elements of a Post-Liberal Theory of Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1987).
7. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1916).
8. Derek Edwards and Neil Mercer, *Common Knowledge, the Development of Understanding in the Classroom* (New York: Methuen, 1987); James V. Wertsch, *Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

9. Ralph Smith, "Problems for a Philosophy of Art Education," *Studies in Art Education* 33, no. 4 (Summer 1994): 253-66.
10. Blandy and Hoffman, "Toward an Art Education of Place," p. 28.
11. Stephen M. Dobbs, *The DBAE Handbook: An Overview of Discipline-Based Art Education* (Santa Monica: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1992).
12. Leilani Lattin Duke, "The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and Discipline-Based Art Education," *Art Education* 41, no. 2 (March 1988): 7-12.
13. Judith A. Burton, Ann Lederman, and Peter London, eds., *Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art Education* (North Dartmouth: Southeastern Massachusetts University, 1988); Jerome A. Hausman, "Another View of Discipline-Based Art Education," *Art Education* 40, no. 1 (January 1987): 56-59.
14. Erik Forrest, "The 'Innocent Eye' and Recent Changes in Art Education," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 19, no. 4 (1985): 103-13; Kenneth Lansing, "Art and the Child: Are They Compatible?" *Studies in Art Education* 28, no. 1 (Fall 1986): 11-16.
15. Robert Bersson, "Why Art Education Is Neither Socially Relevant Nor Culturally Democratic: A Contextual Analysis," in *Art in a Democracy*, ed. Douglas Blandy and Kristin G. Congdon (New York: Teachers College Press, 1987), pp. 78-90; Karen A. Hamblen, "An Examination of DBAE Issues," *Studies in Art Education* 28, no. 2 (Winter 1987): 68-78.
16. Hausman, "Another View of Discipline-Based Art Education."
17. Helen Muth, "A Commentary on DBAE," *Art Education* 41, no. 3 (May 1988): 19-22.
18. Ralph A. Smith, "The Changing Image of Art Education: Theoretical Antecedents of Discipline-Based Art Education," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 3-34.
19. Elizabeth M. Delacruz, "Revisiting Curriculum Conceptions: A Thematic Perspective," *Visual Arts Research* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1990): 10-25.
20. Ronald N. MacGregor, "A Summary of Ronald N. MacGregor's Address," in *Issues in Discipline-Based Art Education: Strengthening the Stance, Extending the Horizons*. Proceedings of an invitational seminar sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (Santa Monica: Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988), pp. 41-44.
21. Brent Wilson, "A Summary of Brent Wilson's Address," in *ibid.*, pp. 61-65.
22. Karen A. Hamblen, "What Does DBAE Teach?" *Art Education* 40, no. 1 (January 1988): 23-35; Barbara W. Huber, "What Does Feminism Have to Offer DBAE: Or So What if Little Red Riding Hood Puts aside Her Crayons to Deliver Groceries to Her Mother?" *Art Education* 40, no. 3 (May 1987): 16-41.
23. Gilbert A. Clark, Michael D. Day, & W. Dwaine Greer, "Discipline-based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 129-93.
24. Ronald H. Silverman, "The Egalitarianism of DBAE," *Art Education* 41, no. 2 (March 1988): 13-18.
25. W. Dwaine Greer, "Developments in Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE): From Art Education toward Arts Education," *Studies in Art Education* 34, no. 2 (Winter 1993): p. 94.
26. Peter Smith, "Multiculturalism's Therapeutic Imperative," *Visual Arts Research* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 55-60.
27. Smith, "Problems for a Philosophy of Art Education," p. 264.
28. Elliot W. Eisner, "Revisionism in Art Education: Some Comments on the Preceding Articles," *Studies in Art Education* 35, no. 3 (Spring 1994): 190.
29. F. Graeme Chalmers, "How Does DBAE Respond to Cultural Diversity?" in *Discipline-Based Art Education and Cultural Diversity*, Proceedings of a national invitational conference sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (Santa Monica: Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1993), pp. 26-27; Paulette Spruill-Flemming, "Pluralism and DBAE: Towards a Model for Global Multicultural Education," *Journal of Cross Cultural and Multicultural Research in Art Education* 6, no. 1 (1988): 64-74.

30. Kristin G. Congdon, "Multicultural Approaches to Art Criticism," *Studies in Art Education* 30, no. 3 (Spring 1989): 176-84; Lynn Hart, "Aesthetic Pluralism and Multicultural Education," *Studies in Art Education* 32, no. 3 (Spring 1991): 145-59.
31. Sally Hagaman, "Feminist Inquiry in Art History, Art Criticism, and Aesthetics," *Studies in Art Education* 32, no. 1 (Fall 1990): 27-35.
32. Vesta A. Daniel and Elizabeth M. Delacruz, "Art Education as Multicultural Education: The Underpinnings of Reform," *Visual Arts Research* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1993): v-ix.
33. Chalmers, "How Does DBAE Respond to Cultural Diversity?" pp. 26-27.
34. Karen A. Hamblen, "Neo-DBAE in the 1990s," *Arts and Learning SIG Proceedings Journal* (The American Educational Research Association) 10, no. 1 (1997): 138.
35. Viktor Lowenfeld, *Your Child and His Art* (New York: Macmillan, 1954).
36. Clark, Day, and Dwaine Greer, "Discipline-Based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art."
37. David Pariser, "The Role of Creativity in DBAE," in *Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will it Take?* Proceedings of a national invitational conference sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (Santa Monica: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1987), pp. 80-83.
38. Lattin Duke, "The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and Discipline-based Art Education."
39. Greer, "Developments in Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE)," p. 96.
40. Jean C. Rush, "Coaching by Conceptual Focus: Problems, Solutions, and Tutored Images," *Studies in Art Education* 31, no. 1 (Fall 1989): 46-57.
41. DBAE: Integrating the Arts Institute is an independently supported (no Getty funding) summer curriculum development institute now in its fifth and final year of operation. Phillip Dunn and Elizabeth Delacruz are codirectors of this institute. Readers may request additional information about the work done at this institute from either author.
42. Two recent papers articulate the aims of interrelated arts education: Phillip C. Dunn, "Integrating the Arts: Renaissance and Reform in Arts Education," *Arts Education Policy Review* (Washington, D.C., November-December, 1994); and Greer, "Developments in Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE)."
43. Readers interested in interrelated arts education may wish to compare the thematic approach preferred by Delacruz and Dunn (briefly described in this paper) with the conceptual approach articulated by Greer in "Developments in Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE): From Art Education to Arts Education."
44. Phillip Dunn was faculty at the Florida Institute for Art Education in 1991. Elizabeth Delacruz is currently a consultant to the Institute. Readers may obtain more information about the program from the Department of Art Education, M. C. H. 123, Florida State University, Tallahassee Florida, 32306.
45. Greer, "Developments in Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE)," pp. 93-94.
46. Hamblen, "Neo-DBAE in the 1990s," pp. 132-41.
47. Smith, "The Changing Image of Art Education," p. 19.
48. Sandra Kay Mims and E. Louis Lankford, "Time, Money, and the New Art Education: A Nationwide Investigation," *Studies in Art Education* 36, no. 2 (Fall 1995): 84-95.
49. Clark, Day, and Greer, "Discipline-based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art," pp. 130-31, 148-49.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 135, 150.
51. Mary Ann Stankiewicz, Comments given in the seminar proceedings of the invitational conference, *Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE*. (Santa Monica: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1989).
52. This is an indirect quote and an observation made by Jean Detlefsen in her response (p. 91) to a paper delivered by Michael Day, "Cultural Diversity and Discipline-Based Art Education," printed in *Discipline-Based art Education and Cultural Diversity*.

53. W. Dwaine Greer, "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study," *Studies in Art Education* 25, no. 4 (Winter 1984): 212-18.
54. Elliot W. Eisner, "Discipline-Based Art Education: Its Criticisms and Its Critics," *Art Education* 41, no. 6 (November-December 1988): 7-13.
55. Dobbs, *The DBAE Handbook: An Overview of Discipline-Based Art Education*, pp. 32-33.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
57. Greer, "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study."
58. Stephen M. Dobbs, *Research Readings for Discipline-Based Art Education: A Journey beyond Creating* (Reston, Va.: National Art Education Association, 1988).
59. Dobbs, *The DBAE Handbook: An Overview of Discipline-Based Art Education*, p. 83.
60. Phillip C. Dunn, "Discipline-based Art Education: A Response from the Center," in *Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE*, p. 83.
61. Francis F. Thurber, Comments given in *Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE*, p. 5.
62. Phillip C. Dunn, "Back to the Future: A Provocative Look at DBAE" (Keynote address, Colorado Art Education Association Annual Convention, October 1989).
63. Clark, Day, and Greer, "Discipline-Based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art."
64. Michael Day, "Cultural Diversity and Discipline-Based Art Education," comments given in *Discipline-Based Art Education and Cultural Diversity*, p. 38.