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The philosophical premise of knowledge existing per se is adopted and against this the nature of the arts in education is both examined and critically appraised. The art and crafts area of the curriculum is determined as the particular locus for investigation and the general picture of arts education in secondary schools is portrayed. The concept of the creative arts department is defined and its evolution is compared with curricular development in other subject areas. Three main types of creative arts department are identified and examined: art and design, expressive arts, and creative arts. Each is evaluated and comparisons are drawn between them.

Reasons for the formation of the groupings are outlined and evaluated and the basis on which such groups have traditionally been formed established.

Each of the arts subjects is individually delineated and areas of commonality, relationships between the subjects and also their particular and significant differences are outlined.

It is suggested that the creative arts group may be the most justifiable and productive group and the possible bases on which such a group might be formed are described and appraised. The Phenix Realms of Meaning, Hirsts Forms of Knowledge, and the H.M.I. Areas of Experience represent useful criteria and their specific relationship to the arts is outlined. As no single unifying factor is considered to be sufficiently and universally acceptable as a basis for group formation, a group of criteria including affect, aesthetic considerations, experientiality, skills acquisition, creativity; expression, symbolism and social considerations is suggested as being a viable set of criteria.

The nature and individual contribution of each of the arts subjects is examined and a core of subjects having adequate commonality is established by referring to all the groups of criteria previously mentioned.

A group composed of art, music, dance, drama, the crafts and possibly design emerges as a justifiable core. Because of their concern with attributes which are outside the orbit of the core group, neither homecraft nor physical education can be justifiably included. Integration as a concept is examined and it is felt that it may be inappropriate or in its purest form, too strong...
for effective use in relation to arts subjects. Variable interaction in which a group of closely conceptually related subjects come together only as and when necessary is suggested as being a more acceptable form of liaison. It is stressed that only subjects which have a considerable degree of commonality should even be considered for any form of liaison.

The practical implications of variable interaction and of the creative arts department in the secondary school are outlined and examined.

It is suggested that when variable interaction is established between a group of arts subjects which have areas of real commonality the resultant experience may well be of greater educational value than that which was formally afforded by the arts subjects acting as discrete areas.

Providing that essential subject differences are recognised and safeguarded, it is believed that the whole experience provided by programmes of variable interaction between the arts may well be greater that the sum of the constituent parts.
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The rapid and pervasive advances in the development of science and technology which have taken place during this century have had a profound effect upon our society. It has become increasingly necessary for virtually all of it's multifarious facets to at least acknowledge and accept what has become a rapid and relentless progress. Much of society has, however, had to do considerably more than this, and fundamental re-thinking, re-structuring and radical changes of emphasis have taken place.

In an era of such massive technological development there is a great danger that those aspects of society which are not in the vanguard of such progress may well be swept aside in it's wake.

It is particularly important that culture and the arts should not become underestimated or undervalued for although, obviously they cannot remain untouched by the spearhead of technological advancement, they are not as radically and fundamentally affected by it's progress as are industry and the economy.

The need to reaffirm their value and unique contribution to the development of the individual becomes particularly important as does the need for society to hold fast to it's cultural and non-utilitarian attributes in order that it should not degenerate into a robotic anonymity.

Whilst utility and economy are obviously vital and fundamental aspects of any society, it is culture and the arts which provide quality and richness of experience.

The reappraisal of these cultural attributes can be effectively achieved through a sympathetic curriculum and schools can do much to redress any imbalance caused by society's overemphasis on one particular aspect.

There has been considerable curriculum development during this century which has led to a widening and deepening of experience, understanding and knowledge. The challenge, effects and opportunities provided by the technological revolution have created exciting and unique learning situations for all subject areas, particularly in terms of resources and teaching strategies.
Whilst the genus of this curricular development may be essentially of a scientific, economic or industrial nature, it's catalytic effect has led to the whole curriculum being examined in the light of these rapid changes in society itself and in it's needs and demands.

Automation of industrial processes and the concomitant shortening of the working week increases the need for concern with contemplative and non-utilitarian issues and accentuates the importance of culture and the arts both in society and in the education of it's members.

During the second half of the twentieth century, there has been a growing acceptance of the unique nature of the arts and along with it, a much greater acknowledgement of the distinctive contribution which they are able to make to society through the curriculum in the secondary school.

This is a relatively recent development which has it's roots in the 1930's and which has only achieved recognition and widespread acceptance since the early 1950's. In this relatively short time it has however had considerable and fundamental effect on the development of the curriculum in secondary schools. In particular it has affected the development of the arts in general and the visual and practical arts subjects in particular.

The realisation of the importance and unique nature of the particular forms of knowledge and experience which can only be provided through subjects such as art, woodwork or music, has led, in the majority of schools, to an increased provision in terms of staff and resources and to the acceptability (albeit to a greater or lesser degree depending on the particular school) of the arts subjects as being of comparable importance with the traditionally accepted academic subjects.

This development has led to the fairly widespread practice of the grouping together of formerly discrete subjects, to the creation of new, and often large departments which have comparatively wide subject responsibility or to the introduction of new subject areas, such as design. Where this has occurred, the attendant and necessary innovations have become contentious issues which require the most careful delineation, appraisal and justification if they are to be accepted and successfully implemented into the curriculum.
Many of the myths and unsubstantiable claims surrounding the working together of arts subjects need to be dispelled and laid to rest in order that their real value may be clearly seen, evaluated, appreciated, and effectively utilised. It must be clearly established whether the experience gained through some form of liaison between the arts is fuller or better in some way than that formerly provided by the individual subjects working in isolation. If there are grounds for some form of working together between arts subjects then the ways by which this can best be achieved, and the choice of subjects to be involved are two major issues which have to be resolved.

Traditionally there have been problems, even with those creative arts departments which can be considered to be successful, which devolve from the nature of the liaison itself, from the selection of subjects to be included and from the establishment of common criteria on which the liaison should be based.

When these philosophical issues have been satisfactorily resolved, creative arts liaisons can still fail because of practical considerations. Unless the staff involved are completely committed even the most justifiable and theoretically sound programmes will not achieve anything like their potential. Where innovation is superimposed on unsympathetic teachers who may not have the ability or desire to rethink and adapt, the result may well be counter-productive for not only will the liaison fail, but by abandoning previously-used strategies, the learning which they were able to facilitate will also be lost.
The present patterns of secondary school curricula tend to assume understood traditions and owe much to the historical growth of the individual subjects which they directly reflect. They also mirror very strongly the teacher training courses which have tended to produce teachers unable to teach anything other than their own specialism.

These factors in combination have led to the maintenance of the status quo and the acceptance and perpetration of the curriculum as we know it without too much radical change.

Against such strong antecedents, major and fundamental curricular change is a far from easy task. Whitfield (1971) sees the present school curriculum as an amalgam derived from haphazard subject additions and he maintains that subject based curricula can never be comprehensive with respect to knowledge. He sees the areas concerned as too numerous for inclusion in anything other than small portions of general education.

This may well represent too radical a view, is more in sympathy with the sociological rather than the philosophical view of knowledge, and may not be particularly relevant to the current discussion. Before considering the problems relating to the arts area of the curriculum the base on which such curricula may be built must be established. Although clear-cut delineations are not always possible or desirable, the arguments relating to problems in education in the arts may well be more clearly and concisely examined and evaluated if the idea of education aiming to produce the liberally educated person is accepted rather than other possibilities, such as education for vocational or child-centred ends.

Education is constantly changing, and is a relatively young phenomenon, for only during the last one hundred and fifty years has the idea of education for all been widely accepted.

Depending on the viewpoint adopted, whether psychological, sociological or philosophical, it is regarded as being concerned with rather different emphases.
Some psychologists tend to argue that the curriculum is primarily concerned with the development of human abilities through the planned use of appropriate activities and experiences and consequently regard the abilities to be fostered as being of greater importance than the content of the curriculum.

Sociologists such as Bernstein and Young see the curriculum as being socially and societally constructed rather than as existing per se, and that curricula reflect the ideas of the dominant group within society. New areas of knowledge are seen as being constantly created, and the boundaries between subject areas are seen as being less rigid and more permeable.

"We are witnessing a shift in emphasis away from schools where the subject is a clearly defined unit in the curriculum, to schools where the unit of the curriculum is not so much a subject as an idea". Bernstein (1971). He is suggesting that schools are moving towards weaker classification with regard to subject areas, where movement between subjects is increasing and the barriers between them are becoming increasingly more permeable. It is also suggested that there is a subordination of those subjects which were previously insular, and that blurred subject boundaries are being formed which necessitate changes in social relationships. The sociological view adopted by Young (1971) infers that academic curricula reflect the idea of the dominant group within society and that as a result a rigid stratification of knowledge is created. High status knowledge is regarded as individual rather than collective, is written rather than oral, is abstract and legitimate (as opposed to non-school knowledge). Non-academic curricula infer low-status knowledge which is oral rather than written, is often concerned with group rather than individual activity and assessment, is concrete and has relationships with non-school knowledge. The arts area of the curriculum would therefore belong quite definitely in the non-academic curricula and be regarded as low-status knowledge. As Young also suggests that the rewards system belongs almost exclusively to the academic curricula, the role of the arts as non-academic therefore denies them a real, valid and equal place in general education. The acceptance of this sociological view would tend to infer that the historical prejudice against the validity of arts knowledge as of equal status with other forms of knowledge, is to be perpetuated. This sociological model is essentially a conflict one which serves to indicate that pressures are exerted on school curricula both from within and without, and that academic knowledge is generally regarded as prestigious, whereas non-academic or low-status knowledge is not associated with prestige.
The criteria for the academic curriculum consequently tend to be linked to the power structure of the school in ways such as the head's curricular decisions, salary points, time allocation etc.

Whilst the social and societal pressures on the curriculum cannot and must not be totally disregarded, the concept of socially generated knowledge and curricula may not be the most apposite model for evaluation of the arts in education.

Both Phenix (1975) and Hirst (1974) dispute this sociological claim of knowledge being socially created and re-created, and maintain that it exists per se, and the human mind is naturally directed towards it's acquisition.

They suggest that specific areas of knowledge are differentiated within the extant body of knowledge, and it is from this genus that the school curriculum should be generated.

Phenix suggests that the differentiations in the areas of knowledge, which he refers to as "meanings" are able to be experienced by human beings and that general education is the process of engendering these essential meanings. To cover the range of possible meanings he suggests the existence of six "Realms of Meaning" which are seen as comprising the basic competences that general education should develop in every person. Because the realms form an articulated whole, a curriculum based upon them can be seen as counteractive to the fragmentation of experience which can constitute loss of meaning. Various meanings are seen as being inter-related, complementary, and as forming part of a hierarchical system of meaning. The realms do not in themselves provide a complete basis for the construction of the curriculum for no practical blueprint relating to specific curricular issues is offered. Phenix's criteria do however, appear to provide a central conceptual framework against which the curriculum structure and the grouping of areas of experience matched to the realms may be assessed.

The six realms identified by Phenix are:
- symbolics, concerned with means of communication by verbal and non-verbal symbols;
- empirics, which is connotive of truths which are open to controlled experimental verification within a system of concepts;
- aesthetics, the area of prime concern with regard to the art and craft area of the curriculum which Phenix regards as being concerned with the contemplative perception of idealised subjectives.
The fourth realm is synnoetics and is the area of relational insights, especially interpersonal relationships. Ethics is the fifth realm whose concern is with codes of human conduct which are freely and responsibly selected, and the final realm is synoptics, the area of meaning which is the means of promoting a wholeness of meaning from life.

Phenix offers a useful locus by the division of knowledge into areas, but the exclusive use this model tends to provide an inadequate and incomplete picture, especially with regard to the arts, many of which can only be regarded as hybrid, and which do not fall neatly in any one of the Realms.

He sees education and the curriculum as being primarily concerned with engendering essential meanings, and is therefore committed to the initiation of pupils into the realms of meaning. It can be argued that he tends not to do full justice the either the logic or humanity of knowledge, and as already mentioned, he tends not to be prescriptive for secondary education, or even for education in general.

In a similar vein, Hirst (1974) suggests that knowledge is differentiated into seven "Forms", which to some extent correspond to Phenix's realms, but are taken further by the provision for the occasional or permanent integration of parts or aspects of the forms into "fields" of knowledge which encompass attributes of more than one form.

Several curricular areas may be regarded as "fields" rather than "forms"; geography and housecraft appear to be a particularly obvious examples of "fields".

Hirst maintains that his forms are defined in strictly cognitive propositional terms (he distinguishes between operational knowledge which he does not see as being the province of educational establishments, and propositional knowledge with which the school should be concerned) and that they represent the grouping of human experience and understanding into areas of coherent knowledge. The groupings are not arbitrary, nor are they made for convenience, but they correspond to reality, for they are seen as "describing objective reality".
Seven distinct forms are delineated; mathematics and formal logic, natural sciences, human sciences, history, religion, philosophy and ethics, and the most relevant for immediate consideration, fine art and literature. The forms are somewhat more akin to existing school subjects than Phenix's realms, but neither of the two see the need for a direct correlation, for some subject areas of knowledge may not be as distinct as Hirst's basic Seven, and may borrow concepts from more than one form, thereby allowing the existence of "fields" of knowledge, which bring together aspects of several forms either permanently or temporarily.

In summary then, the Hirstean argument centres on the premises that knowledge is differentiated in its very essence and that knowledge which meets the criterion of being publicly justifiable is regarded as existing per se rather than being a social artefact. The forms of knowledge are seen as more than mere assemblies or groups of information as they have inherent principles which structure information in ways which are distinct. The forms are seen as having their own distinctive forms of enquiry, language and modes of argument.

Whilst the Hirstean model may appear to be initially attractive, and may offer a sound basis for the differentiation of knowledge into individual and distinct areas, it cannot be accepted as a basis for curricular planning, in the arts area of the curriculum, without some reservations.

The definite and rigid boundaries between operational and propositional knowledge appear particularly unacceptable when considering the areas concerned with the arts, for much of their concern may justifiably, be with both operational and propositional knowledge by the very nature of the experience which they offer. Much of the distinctive experience of the arts falls into the area of operational knowledge, and is, as such, outside the scope of the Hirstean model.

It can be argued that neither the realms nor the forms do real justice to either emotional or physical development, but affective or physically-based curricula tend to have considerable shortcomings which outweigh the problems which arise from philosophically-based curricula.
Further reservations become apparent with regard to the structure of the seven forms; they appear to have an air of finality which may present problems regarding new developments in the body of knowledge. The criteria defining the forms can be seen as precluding the possible emergence of any new forms. If the Hirstean model (or the Phenix model) is to be accepted at all, it can only be in general terms, for no mention is made of it's possible application to educational curricula, nor of detailed recommendations for suitable teaching methods, or even of the types of school for which the model may be relevant. Hirst does, however, claim that the school curriculum can be generated from his general principles and that all the basic forms of knowledge need to be present if the curriculum is to be rationally defensible, free from distortions and is also to have intellectual satisfaction.

Despite the foregoing reservations, the philosophical model appears to be one which is acceptable, albeit in general terms, as a fruitful starting point for curriculum research. It can be generally accepted that the case for basing curricula for general education on knowledge itself assumes that modern knowledge has not disintegrated. In fact the reverse may well be true; the body of knowledge may well have grown considerably and may continue to do so.

Liberal education, a tenet to which commitment has been previously established, can only be planned if distinctions in forms of knowledge are clearly understood. Hence the exposition of the theories of Phenix and Hirst from which it has become apparent that the categories of knowledge are a valuable resource in curriculum construction. This can only be true however, in general terms, for the correlation between the categories and the existing school subjects is not great.

Accepting that the development of the rational mind (which must be a primary goal of liberal education) is contingent upon "the progressive differentiation in human consciousness of distinguishable cognitive structures" (Hirst 1974) then there appears to be considerable value in the acceptance of a philosophical rather than a psychological or sociological model as the central core on which to build the argument regarding the arts curriculum in the secondary school. There would seem to be considerable value in the construction of curriculum units based on the Hirstean forms which appear to be more directly related to general education than Phenix's realms.
They could be adopted either singly, or severally by the construction of fields of knowledge where the nature of the subject matter so demands. Having established the theoretical premise from which to begin, it would seem to be profitable to relate the theory to the situation as it exists in the secondary schools.

Because of the complex nature of education, no one approach or model can be exclusively adopted. To maintain a purely philosophical stance and to deny the relevance of social or psychological factors in education would be not only short sighted and inadequate, but also unjustifiable. At best, educational policies and curriculum planning can be regarded as leaning towards one or other of these possible approaches even though some schools may maintain that they operate essentially only one of them, either sociological, vocational or child centred for example. The majority of schools tend to follow the historically evolved curricular pattern of dividing the available time and resources into different areas of experience which are, in general terms, fairly consistent between schools. Some innovation has been undertaken where schools have subscribed to the view that "knowledge is a seamless whole" (e.g. Entwistle, 1970), and where attempts have been made to restructure the curriculum away from the traditional subjects and movements have been made towards areas of learning which are considered to be more in keeping with this aim, and which are consequently more justifiable in these terms.

Many schools see the need for social education and tend to orientate their curricula on a sociological base. It would be inconceivable to think that knowledge is totally divorced from society and any curriculum which did not do justice to the social and societal needs of pupils would be a very inadequate one. However, to adopt the premise of knowledge as a socially constructed phenomenon and to base curricula squarely on this view, may lead to curricular imbalance and considerable shortcomings if and if liberal education is the goal towards which schools are aiming.

In general schools tend to adopt the view that knowledge does exist, and that it has different and individual areas of experience which are unique and which need to be provided for in ways which reflect, enhance and maximise their individuality. Generally the "forms" and "realms" are comprehensively covered by the areas of experience even though there may not be any attempt to match subjects to forms, fields or realms. This does not appear to be of too great significance, for had Phenix or Hirst been prescriptive, then they may have suggested some direct correlation, whereas it is the total idea which seems to be of major importance rather than individual correlations.
The coverage of the forms and realms in some way by a pattern of areas of experience appears to be an acceptable and workable interpretation of the Phenix/Hirst intention.

It would seem reasonable to assume that the majority of secondary schools include areas of experience which deal with communication by verbal and non-verbal symbols across the curriculum, particularly in language, sciences, mathematics and the arts areas. Particularly, but far from exclusively, in the science area, schools provide experience in the controlled experimental verification of truths, and in music, art, drama and other arts-based subjects, various types of aesthetic experiences are provided. All schools, by their corporate nature, afford relational insights and interpersonal relationships and ranging across the curriculum in a similar way, ethical experience is central to a large number of subject areas, particularly R.E. and moral education. The interrelation of the various areas of experience and the ways in which they affect each other help to provide synoptic experience promoting a wholeness of meaning to life.

Similarly the Hirstean forms can be related, often more directly, than the realms to the school curriculum. Mathematics and formal logic, nature and human sciences, history and religion all relate closely to subjects which generally appear in the majority of school curricula.

It would seem reasonable to assume that the situation which exists in the majority of British secondary schools is one where the concept of knowledge as existing in it's own right is accepted and that curricula are based to a greater or lesser degree upon this premise.

As the frontiers of knowledge are pushed forward, and as the sociological and psychological factors affecting education change, so the school curriculum needs to change accordingly. In fact the school curriculum can be seen as being in a state of constant change and evolution; changes in education brought about by research, changing patterns of social and societal behaviour, economic and parental pressures on the school all contribute to the evolution of new curricula to meet the new needs. As educational policy becomes obsolete, so schools need to make changes to the curriculum. In practice however, educational innovation, especially where major change is involved is a slow and often strongly-resisted process.
Teachers, and, to some extent, parents are very reticent to give up proven and successful methods in favour of the unknown. Innovation often involves changes in the power structure of a school which result in shifts in the emphasis of power, for example, the creation of a creative arts faculty with a head of department may well denude the power of the heads of the component departments with the possibility of reduced commitment and resentment which may subsequently damage the quality of the educational experience provided. Sociologists such as Young (1971) suggest that as the rewards system in schools tends to belong almost exclusively to the academic curricula, changes in areas of high-status knowledge are difficult because of the strong links with the professions and with higher education. It is in the area which he defines as non-academic curricula, or low status knowledge, where change is much easier. To some extent this may be so, but the flexible nature of the subjects involved and their concern with the new, and novel solution may well be of more significance in their ability and readiness to accept change. To accept, to any significant degree, Young's categorisation of the arts subjects as being concerned with essentially low-status knowledge erodes their claim to be a central and essential part of any programme of general education and puts them at a distinct disadvantage in terms of status, bargaining power, and even justification. Admittedly, the arts are concerned with knowledge of a unique and exclusive kind, but to consider the qualitative value of such knowledge in terms of a hierarchy, or a division into high and low status knowledge, can only lead to the dismissal of the arts as an area of, at best, only limited importance. It may even lead to their total disregard in terms of educational value.

Curricular change in response to educational, sociological, or any other needs can be instigated from within the school, or it can be imposed from outside. Research (Bolam R. 1974, Teachers as Innovators) has tended to conclude that in-school innovation is more successful because of the staff commitment of consensus agreement which it engenders. Although actual innovation would appear to be in response to some externally generated piece of research or development which the school wishes to adopt. Curricular innovation in the arts area of the curriculum has tended to follow this general pattern and has occurred in response to major research reports. All the major reports from Hadcw (1926, Board of Education, "The Education of the Adolescent HMSO) to Newsom (1963 "Half our Future" Central Advisory Council for Education (England) HMSO) speak of the powerful educational potential of the arts subjects.
In 1943 Norwood (Board of Education, "Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools HMSO) complained that "the arts have not received the attention in school which is due to them"; McNair (1944 Board of Education "Teachers and Youth Leaders" HMSO) felt that the arts in secondary schools needed encouragement, and the Crowther report (1959 Ministry of Education "15 to 18" HMSO) maintained that most fifteen year olds need to be introduced to the arts and be given the opportunity to practise them.

Some examination of the nature of the arts subjects in general, and their relevance to general education, provides an overview against which the nature and value of the creative arts department may be examined and evaluated.

The school curriculum can be criticised for having an over-riding concern with instrumental considerations, and that it is dictated by starkly utilitarian concerns. It would seem to be essential that children should be introduced to experiences concerned with the quality of life, and education through the arts may well be the way in which this can be achieved.

Arts education is generally understood as being concerned with the transmission and exploitation of the best of our cultural heritage, on the assumption that the extension of cultural privilege will exert a powerful civilising influence on young people.

Teachers tend to seek to introduce children to those aspects of culture which are considered to be good.

It has been traditionally expected to effect a gradual improvement in the level of public taste, to lay the foundations for healthy and worthwhile leisure-time pursuits and, by affording emotional release and creative satisfaction, to contribute to the personal development of tomorrows artesans and professional citizens.

Aspin (1981) sees one of the chief tasks of any programme of education in the arts as being the transmission of the existing culture. He also sees the expansion of consciousness and the teaching of how to respond to and evaluate works of art as being absolutely central to arts education. By emphasising the premise that utility, or education for instrumental purposes is inadequate, he suggests that attempts be made to encourage children to develop worthwhile and satisfying pursuits.
It is however, difficult to establish criteria which can be used to guide choice in the arts, and as Quinn (1981) suggests, there may be inherent weaknesses in too heavy a reliance on the emphasis and perpetuation of a traditional standard.

Problems of definition and emphasis abound in the arts area of the curriculum, and the persistent lack of a serviceable theoretical foundation to give education in the arts authority, and to guide its development, has been most damaging to its cause.

Manzella (1963) maintained that "The future meaningfulness of the visual arts within general education is dependent on the establishment of a more reasonable philosophic base for the field and its generous support and implementation".

Not only does confusion exist in attempts to establish a theory for arts education, but the problem is compounded by further problems and contradiction found in the purposes and practice of much of the arts education in schools.

Authorities agree that whatever the differences in approach generated by shifts of emphasis, the arts subjects do have value in general education. Newsom (1963) sees the arts subjects as being able to "offer creative, civilising influences beneficial to all pupils".

One of the main contributions of arts education is in the education of feeling and emotion. However, to suggest that this is the sole area of contribution begs a number of questions, chiefly concerned with objectivity, and it also tends to deny the arts from having intellectual attributes.

The Schools Council Working Paper No. 54 "Arts and the Adolescent" (1975) suggests that "The relevance of the arts in education is to the world of feeling and although it has proved difficult to develop an effective theory of arts education on that premise, it is our conviction that nothing else will serve". Ross (1978) also asserts that "the prime concern of the arts curriculum should be with the emotional development of the child through creative self-expression".
The area of concern which then becomes apparent is the danger of interpreting "prime" as "sole"; it would be shortsighted and inadequate to accept the affective contribution of arts education as its sole contribution to general education. Other factors such as aesthetic, creative, intellectual and social contributions have importance for the arts per se, and for their justification as essential parts of a general education. One of the main dangers in regarding education in the arts primarily as a means of affective education, is that it can thereby be regarded as an essentially therapeutic activity, to purge emotional imbalance, or to promote emotional stability. Such aims do not do justice to the nature of the experience, nor can they be regarded as valid reasons for claiming the arts as essential and unique areas of experience.

It cannot be denied that arts education does, quite rightly, aim to further children's emotional development, and it is important that they should achieve the confidence and skill to give form to their feelings. The arts teacher needs to help emotional development by showing ways in which feelings may be creatively and responsibly expressed, and by helping children to acquire adequate expressive behaviour patterns to make possible an adequate feeling response to life and living.

In all the arts subjects there is an important division between the process and the product. The making of an artefact or piece of art in any artistic form rather than the final product can be regarded as the raison d'être for the experience. In education a greater concern is shown for the process in all arts activities rather than for the finished products. As far as the arts are regarded as being instrumental in affective education, the concern with process rather than product is of fundamental importance. It is our hypothesis that the arts offer us - not so much as product but as process - a vital instrument in the education of feelings" (Ross 1975).

To regard the arts solely, or exclusively, as process is quite acceptable when considering emotional development, but very unacceptable when considering aesthetic issues, where the product assumes the role of major importance. Just as it was not possible to accept one area (such as emotional development) as the sole aim of education in the arts, so it is not possible to divorce and isolate process and product. Both play an equally vital role.

The arts can be recognised and acknowledged as being the main area of the curriculum whose essential nature involves the capacity to respond and act feelingly, but other attributes of arts subjects must be neither rejected nor overlooked.
The value of the arts lie not only in their contribution to affective education, but also in terms of their intellectual, cultural, social and aesthetic qualities. They are just as much concerned in essential ways with perception, contemplation and appreciation as they are with the development of feeling. Any narrowing of view of the arts in education or over-emphasis on one of its fundamental attributes can only lead to confusion, imbalance and possibly loss of justification. If the validity of the contribution and value of arts education as outlined is accepted, then the question arises as to why the arts are only just receiving widespread acceptance and respectability.

Norwood (in Ross 1975) suggested a number of reasons for the arts being under-valued and consequently poorly provisioned, "Art music and handicrafts ..... have not received the attention in schools which is due to them. They were received as latecomers when they were taught they occupied a place outside the regular curriculum and were taught as "extras" or spare-time activities. The right teachers were not easy to find; the rooms and equipment demanded have not always been available and the subjects have, therefore lacked a good tradition in schools".

The reason why the arts subjects have traditionally been afforded a relatively insignificant position in the curriculum is the fundamental lack of universally agreed theory. "United we stand divided we fall" seems to be a particularly apposite maxim for arts education, for the large degree of variance in defined purpose, aims, and methods gives critics ample scope for claiming that the arts are too subjective to be taken seriously and that in the end it is virtually impossible to accept seriously or to justify what amounts to little more than differing taste. If arts claim to be concerned with ways of knowing rather than with bodies of knowledge, and that they are concerned with the development of intuition rather than intellect, it is easy for criticism to be levelled on the grounds that as they are not concerned with existing knowledge or intellect, they do not have a rightful and justifiable place in education. Admittedly, one can construct a very sound and defensible argument against this without accepting that knowledge and intellect are essential components of the arts, but to accept, identify, and recognise the knowledge content of the arts and to see them as having strong intellectual attributes can only strengthen their case and give weight to their claim to be in the core of any curriculum.
With regard to subjectivity, the arts are, by their very nature, to some extent subjective; the artist, working with paint, words, movement, sounds or in whatever other medium tends to create a very personal and subjective piece of work, but this can then be publicly measured and attested which thereby gives it objectivity.

With all objective matters there must be proofs, decision procedures and ways of establishing truth and falsity. Where proof is impossible one cannot claim objectivity. The main problems with establishing objectivity in the arts is that truths and proofs which are particular to other subject areas are often used to measure objectivity in the arts. It is not possible to cite truths and proofs for arts subjects in ways comparable with other subjects. In the arts, or in any subject area, for that matter, objectivity requires widespread agreement and Sibley and Tanner (1968) suggest that "People of variously developed sensitivity tend to converge on a broad target of agreement". They suggest the existence of a "Perceptive Elite", a body of connoisseurship against which the arts are matched and evaluated. The perceptive elite represents a realm of objectivity which is made possible by some limited, though not necessarily widespread, agreement. It is possible to manage, with reasonable success, to treat essentially aesthetic concepts as objective, even though there may be considerable disagreement within the elite. Absolute agreement is in no way essential in the establishment of objectivity for arts subjects. It would, however, be of paramount importance in areas such as mathematics or the sciences. In essence, the arts need not abandon all claims to objectivity because they are not able to fulfill criteria for objectivity demanded by other subjects; by applying relevant criteria, objectivity can be established for the arts in ways which are both acceptable and justifiable. To deny objectivity in the arts is to make a mockery of their purpose: without objectivity how can evaluation take place? how can the good be differentiated from the bad? and how can taste be developed? Without objectivity in the arts, any piece of artwork produced as such could claim equal validity with any other; the work of a pupil in the second year of the secondary school could claim equality with the paintings of David Hockney for example. Unless the good is delineated and used as exemplar for the development of taste then aesthetic education becomes impossible.

The arts subjects are often not seen as offering an entirely serious curricular experience because of the difficulty in seeing any practical purpose which they might serve. The arts are sometimes seen as needing to have some manifest purpose so that they may be demonstrably useful. The question of utility in the arts is of fundamental importance, particularly with regard
to the crafts, and will be considered in chapters two and three where it can be related to the nature and attributes of the individual subject areas.

The arts in secondary schools are still beset by the same problems as they experienced earlier in the century, inadequate resources, poor accommodation, shortage of good teachers, rigid timetabling, overloaded classes and a thoroughly depressed status. They have been hampered in finding their rightful place in education partly because of their late claim, and partly by the inadequate presentation and appreciation of their ease.

Each of the arts subjects faces its own set of problems, and each provides evidence of confusion over its function and contribution to a general secondary education. Neither the arts subjects nor its teachers have, until recently, been taken seriously, and the arts still lack the vital bargaining power enjoyed by many other curricular areas.

It is only during the past five years that opportunities to take Higher Degrees have been available to art and craft teachers. Until then only the fine artists had access to higher degrees at a few of the universities. Other arts teachers were only able to gain higher degrees by working in other disciplines, education being a notable example.

Norwood (in Ross 1975) regards their occupation of a very uneasy position in the general curriculum as another reason for the neglect of the arts. "When they were adopted into the curriculum they occupied an uneasy position .... there seemed uncertainty how they were related to other subjects, and they themselves did not always justify their inclusion on grounds which carried conviction".

The arts have a unique role to play in general education, intellectually, emotionally, aesthetically, creatively and socially, not just as the leisure interest of a privileged elite, but as an essential element of lifelong education. They must, however, claim their place in education by means of their unique nature and the individual and particular experiences which are only afforded by and through them.
By accepting the premises previously suggested, i.e. that knowledge exists per se, is differentiated into various areas of particular experience, and that it appears to be justifiable to base a programme of general education upon these, a background has been established against which education in the arts can be examined and evaluated.

The curriculum in the arts could include art, craft based subjects, music, literature, drama, human movement, history, humanities, geography, foreign languages and any other subjects which might not readily fit into a definition of 'science' subjects and as such, represents a vast and diverse area of experience. It would seem illogical to attempt to look at the arts curriculum in this it's widest sense because of this breadth of areas of experience and also because of the enormous differences between the subjects involved. A more profitable approach would be to look at a smaller group of arts subjects which may provide enough common ground to justify their being considered together within the secondary school curriculum.

On the surface it would seem reasonable to group together art, craft based subjects, drama, music, human movement and possibly literature, and to regard them as having conceptual similarities. Paul Hirst (1973) sees the fine arts and literature as a unique way of knowing in a fairly cognitive sense and sees the two areas as being conceptually similar. For the present purpose, literature other than in the context of it's contribution to drama, will not be included in the group referred to as arts subjects. This no way denudes it's value, underestimates it's contribution, or even questions it's validity to claim inclusion, but merely helps to prevent digression from the main issues which are being considered.

It has become fairly common practice for comprehensive schools to organise or reorganise subjects into departments or faculties. The larger departments often include a considerable variety of subject areas and serve as umbrellas for the constituent subjects. Such departments often tend to be based on the traditional working relationships between the constituent subjects. The sciences, physics, chemistry, and biology for example, would seem to be obvious areas for grouping into one large department. Often, as, for example, with the science subjects, the groupings are predictable, but in some cases especially with regard to the arts subjects departmental groupings are formed by using only part of the attributes of the subjects involved.
Subjects having expressive attributes may be grouped together despite other different attributes which each subject may have. By taking different attributes of the subjects, other, very different groups could be formed. Some subjects could, thereby be included in a number of groups depending on the chosen attribute which is taken as the basis for the grouping. Because of it's concern with applied scientific principles, domestic science could well be included in a science grouping, or because of it's concern with the design of the home environment it could equally well be included in a design or craft grouping. The crucial point, is that whatever the grouping to be formed it should be based on the essential rather than peripheral attributes of the subjects involved.

The differences between the arts subjects are as important as their similarities, because they offer between them a range of expressive outlets each of which makes demands and affords opportunities that are unique and quite specific. It is not, therefore, possible to substitute one for another.

"They are distinguished not merely by the technical demands or sensuous character of the medium, but also by the nature of the imaging and expressive action which each demands" Ross 1978.

Any possible grouping together of arts subjects should, take these differences into account and should make provision for them to be acknowledged and catered for.

In recent years there has been considerable pressure to tighten up and defend the arts curriculum; in America this has taken the form of a revision of the notion of education in the arts as being concerned fundamentally with the appreciation of works of art, whereas in Britain there has been a movement towards design education and a search for areas of possible integration.

Since the early Seventies, arts departments or faculty groupings have become increasingly popular, especially in the large comprehensive schools, for there may be enormous advantages to be had from an organisation which allows full and free contact and movement between essentially related elements of such groups of subjects. In general these groupings have tended to be fairly broad, and have tended not to make specific assumptions about the educational function of the subjects involved.

The actual subjects involved in an arts department will vary from school to school as will the way in which it is defined; arts faculty, or department, creative faculty, expressive art department or whatever, but for this purpose the term 'creative arts department' will be used to refer to the area of the curriculum which is concerned with the experiences afforded by art, the crafts, music, drama and human movement.
It is appreciated that it is a simple matter to impose a blanket term in education and that whatever title may be used to label a subject package, change of content does not automatically follow. Many courses have been repackaged under new and attractive titles which, in reality, have little by way of real change in subject content. However, the following discussion assumes that any grouping together of subjects may well result in a change in content brought about by the interaction of other components in the group.

The secondary school curriculum is often divided into five major areas: Sciences, English, Maths, Humanities and Creative Arts. The Creative Arts area which can account for up to one third of a child's timetable, is usually represented by one of three possible groupings. It may be represented by "Art and Design", a quite common department in secondary education which is usually composed of art, woodwork, metalwork, housecraft, design and possibly technology. Alternatively it may be regarded as an "expressive" grouping, which is less common, and is composed generally of art, drama, and music. The more common composition, especially in the larger comprehensive schools, is the grouping of art, metalwork, woodwork, homecraft, music drama and physical education into the Creative Arts Department.

The Art and Design and Expressive Arts departments are generally set up on the basis of a concept of shared attitudes within the group, but in practice this would only rarely appear to be the case. In the majority of instances Clement (1974) sees them as not tending to develop related work within the department, and as leading rather more often to confusion and even resentment amongst the staff concerned. He also regards them as leading to a reduction in timetabled time by the squashing together of subjects. The network of relationships in both these types of grouping is limited, and consequently, they may prevent some subjects from being fully effective. Both groups also tend to assume that the subjects involved are composite rather than complementary. The generally more limited nature of these departments may infer a greater chance of their working because of the lesser number of staff involved, and their supposedly close conceptual links. The Art and Design or even the more limited Art and Crafts department seem to be the ones which have achieved greater success. The expressive arts department is not common, and is regarded by Clements as not being particularly effective. Often there is conflict between traditional and progressive teachers in different areas which then prevents effective working together and sharing of experiences.
All too frequently the only real link between music and drama is the school production.

The third group, the creative arts department presents a very complex network of possible relationships, some of which may be strong, others less so. Homecraft may well be seen to have strong links with needlework, art with drama, and art may be seen to have strong links with the crafts, but crafts and music, p.e. and drama and p.e. and music for example, represent areas where any linking can only be regarded as reasonable rather than strong. Some areas within the department offer what can, at best, only be regarded as weak links, p.e. and homecraft or needlework; p.e. and the crafts or art; and even the links between p.e. and drama and p.e. and music cannot be established as very strong ones. Art and housecraft, drama and housecraft, drama and craft, music and housecraft or needlework, and music and the crafts represent further areas of weak relationships.

Clement (1974) believes that better links may be established by opening up new 'subject' areas, for example, communication studies, basic design studies etc., but at what cost to the individual nature and contribution of each subject? It is questionable whether the frontiers of knowledge are pushed forward by thus trying to create possibly false or tenuous groupings in this way, and in fact it can be argued that by adopting this approach the desired experience may be lost altogether. Some of the basic problems of creative arts groupings lie in the complex and varied nature of the component subjects, for they do not represent a homogeneous group in the same way as the languages or the sciences. This problem is compounded by the considerable variety of approaches within each subject.

Depending upon the criteria used for grouping, quite a number of alternative groups can be suggested. The groupings of art, music and drama may appear to be a logical and coherent one if aesthetic experience in a non-utilitarian form is seen as the common ground. Aesthetically-based considerations may represent one of the stronger sets of criteria for the formation of groups of subjects, and indeed the Hirstean model tends to suggest that subjects having an aesthetic base may best achieve their aims when considered alongside similar aesthetically-based areas. Creativity, expression, are alternative criteria which may well have some claim to be used as logical and justifiable bases upon which groupings should be formed.
As the creative arts subjects are much concerned with affective education, a case could be argued for this being the essential linking factor. Bantock (1967) advocates the theory of education through the emotions as a general principle. Whilst the essential contribution of the emotions needs full acknowledgement, it would however, appear to be dangerous to go overboard for them as the difficulties which arise when considering evaluation in affective terms are quite considerable. The element of pleasure in creative arts subjects may be seen as an essential linking factor, but the problems of a hedonistically-based group are comparable with those of an affectively-based group; evaluation and status, plus the danger of reducing the group to the level of recreational and leisure pursuits which cannot do justice to the nature of the subjects involved.

It would not seem to be possible to establish a single criterion as a base for the Formation of creative arts groupings, but those areas which would seem to be essentially involved are: aesthetics, creativity, emotion, and the fact that the creative arts subjects are experiential and are concerned with the acquisition of skills.

Looking at the creative arts department as a whole, it is seen to offer a fairly complete range of educational discourse; analytical, empirical, pragmatic, intuitive and experimental. It is essential however that the department does not subsume the essential modes of understanding of one or more areas in order to facilitate the aims of others within the group.

Ross (1978) sees arts teachers as a team bound together by a clear understanding of the purpose of arts education and their roles as arts teachers, but this does not infer that they invariably need to work together, rather that they need to be aware that they belong to an area which has common attributes. The Creative Arts department allows for a greater variety of working relationships and can allow the component subjects to develop in different ways and to find new relationships as staff and ideas change. Arts staff generally do not appear to be against the idea of this grouping together of arts subjects (Barnett 1979) and within the departmental structure they do tend to become more mutually supportive. They may realise that they have a common or similar language, they may see the main gain from collaboration as the gaining of a great deal of inspiration from each other, and they may tend to feel that they are being instrumental in the promotion of the idea in children's minds of the arts being collaborative rather than competitive.
For any department, creative arts or otherwise, to be effective at any level, the union of teachers in a common philosophy of what is to be done is essential. Unless a team is composed of committed enthusiasts, the department cannot hope to function at a higher level than that of a mere administrative convenience. For the departmental structure to be successful, the individual teacher must be convinced of the character and quality of the contribution which his own subject can bring to the group. As they exist, departments tend to reinforce the traditional subject groupings and patterns and tend to promote the popular view that to be educated is to be fairly good at a large number of different subjects. This view is substantiated by the premise of knowledge existing and being differentiated in essence.

The creation of a creative arts department, however it may be constituted, automatically excludes other liaisons with areas which are outside the group. There are links albeit of different strengths, from the component subjects of a creative arts department to a number of other curricular areas. Strong and logical links exist between drama and English, and between housecraft and social studies for example. The crafts can be seen as forming strong links with maths and science, but the strength of such links appears to be a matter of some uncertainty. There is a range of liaisons which although they cannot be regarded as having particularly strong links, are viable and justifiable. Art and environmental studies; art and English, especially Literature; drama and social studies; drama and humanities; and housecraft and science, are examples forming a far from exhaustive list. A link can be established between drama and moral education, but the whole area of moral education is peppered with pitfalls, and the pervasive nature of moral education itself, and its influence across the whole curriculum suggests that this experience needs to be treated separately, and cannot be regarded as a 'subject' in the same way as drama, art, or housecraft for example. Some attributes of music may form relatively weak links with English and Mathematics, and art can be seen as linking, albeit in a limited way, with maths, humanities and social studies; needlework and the crafts may also be seen as linking with social studies in some ways. At the risk of being repetitive, it must be emphasised however, that any liaison must be based on the essential nature of the subjects involved and should not subsume one of the subjects involved. Some of the weaker links suggested may well be perpetuating this, and one of the subjects involved in such links may be used merely as a tool to facilitate the essential aims and purpose of others. All departmental structures need to be constantly aware that the liaisons which occur both within it and without are educationally justifiable.
Departments are sometimes constructed for administrative convenience, or because a Headteacher has some generalised idea about the possible values of design or consumer education, or about the cultural value of the arts. The Creative Arts department as a concept is open to a variety of criticisms and engenders a considerable number of problems. The use of generic terms such as 'creative arts faculty' or 'design department' may be seen merely as attempts to uplift the educational opportunities, status and credibility of the constituent subjects; it may therefore be seen as essential to consider the genetics of the subject area rather than generic titles and influences. Also, as a package, the creative arts department may have less credibility because genetically it's roots are complex and difficult to define. It can be argued that the department or faculty structure gives political power to subjects which are often seen as peripheral to the mainstream curriculum. This view, denies the value of the essential nature of each subject and is not tenable within the premises already established. Departments can be seen as providing schools with the necessary strong middle management, but it is not really proven that the rearrangement of the political structure of the school has much effect on the content or the relevance of the teaching within it.

Other problems regarding teaching staff may arise from their allegiance and obligation to their known subjects, rather than to the group. Teachers have grown uneasy over the subjugation of the essential nature of their individual subjects to the rather more nebulous demands of concepts such as creativity or expressiveness. There is some evidence (Clement 1974) to suggest that all the arts groupings, however they may be constituted, may have adverse effects on the quality of specialist teaching. This is not necessarily because of any reduction in timetabled time, but because teachers may have assumed that integration at some level is necessary and they may therefore have tried to find the lowest common denominator for a group of subjects. Again, any such grouping can only be spurious and detrimental to the subjects involved.

The headship of the creative arts department often presents difficulties and requires a far more general and wide-ranging understanding of educational development coupled with the ability to initiate discussion rather than subject expertise. This is often particularly difficult when the Head of the department is also the head of one of the component subjects. The training of teachers in the creative arts tends to centre very strongly on one particular discipline and it is quite difficult for a head of department who is a drama specialist to easily appreciate the needs and constraints of the crafts, of art or of housecraft, for example.
Training which includes specialism and generalism may be the major way in which progress in the arts subjects may be made. In the area of Craft Design Technology for example a design-based training with a particular specialism is advocated rather than vice-versa. The diversity of the constituent subjects also makes the allocation of salary points to a creative arts department very difficult. A hierarchical salary structure cannot fully do justice to all the subjects involved and must rank some above others which may well create resentment and unrest. One possible answer to this problem is the development a salary superstructure which tends not to rely on subject agrandisement; staff could, for example, be remunerated for length of service rather than for the position which they hold within their school.

In some schools the use of blocks of timetabled time considerably reduces the allocation of time to certain component subjects; this seems to be particularly prevalent in Art and Design departments where it is common to allocate only four periods per week for all the components, which represents a forty percent reduction as against the more normal individual subject time allocations (source: Clement 1974)

The use of timetable blocks also makes inter-department liaison extremely difficult; it is desirable for inter-departmental links such as housecraft and social studies, drama and English, crafts and science, art and literature to be possible, which may not be the case where time is blocked for the whole department.

The inclusion of physical education in the creative arts department presents further problems; for it can be regarded as at best, only able to forge somewhat tenuous links with music and drama and very dubious links elsewhere within the department. The only real common ground which it may have with other areas can be seen in the development and education of emotions, but as this is shared with all curricular areas, it does not, therefore represent too strong a case. One possible areas of fairly strong liaison are the links which can be made with dance and with drama. The grouping together of all practical subjects in the first two years of the secondary school and the offering of them as an "integrated" whole is a further problem area; where sampling by rotation occurs, which is quite a common feature in the large comprehensive schools, the experience gained tends to be shallow and superficial. Such sampling courses tend to be without form or method, tend also to be regarded with suspicion by pupils, and are generally seen as unpopular and meaningless by teachers.
The supposedly attractive timetable savings provided by such a rotation in no way compensate for the lack of depth if experience, or indeed any real timetable savings exist, for the fitting of such a rotational system into the curriculum causes a substantial increase in the number of constraints put upon the curriculum in general.

Collaboration does not necessarily mean the invariable working together on the same educational project in the same room, rather it needs to be seen as an acceptance of the existence of possible areas of liaison which may be formed or disbanded according to need.

Whilst the existence of common ground may need to be acknowledged for educational reasons, it may be overshadowed by the need for subject separation for reasons of administration or for physical comfort. Practical difficulties may make it necessary to treat subjects separately, for, whilst music next door to needlework may not be intolerable, heavy crafts adjacent to the music room would be an impossible situation.

The problems which arise from the acceptance of self-expression or emotion as a basis for the creation of creative arts department have been indicated, the major constraints are in the difficulties of objectivity and evaluation. The specific problems of any attempt to be conclusive in the affective domain become apparent when empirical research projects are attempted. Appendix A is the report of an examination of the emotive qualities inherent in paintings. Groups of sixth form pupils in a large comprehensive school where shown series of slides which were considered by several panels of art experts to contain emotive images. Their reactions were recorded and attempts were made to correlate the specific emotions felt by the students to the particular painting involved. There was fairly wide agreement that certain paintings, Bacon's 'Isable Rawsthorne' for example evoked an emotional response, but the lack of identification of the type of emotional feeling involved and the low degree of correlation and consensus between the students showed clearly the tenuous nature of the experiment and the disparate nature of the experiences felt by the students.

Bantock (1967) asserts that for some pupils in the secondary school the way to education lies through the emotions, but wholesale acceptance of this premise is fraught with pitfalls. It may be an inappropriate way for all pupils, and if this is so, then the less able (he suggests) may well benefit most from such an approach.
To adopt twofold and very different approaches within the same school, i.e. cognitively based programmes for the able, affectively-based programmes for the less-able, appears to be divisive, totally at odds with the philosophy of comprehensive education, and possibly not the most productive method of education for all pupils. If self-expression and emotion are not wholly acceptable per se as bases for department formation, can aesthetic considerations provide the universal panacea?

Aesthetic considerations are unquestionably central to the concept of the arts, although unfortunately the whole field of aesthetics is notoriously difficult to define, especially as many writers and thinkers have imposed their own preconceptions on their definitions. For example, Santayana suggests that there is a very widespread and radical tendency in our nature to observe and value beauty, but the subjectivity of this phenomenon has tended to contribute to the absence or failure of aesthetic speculation. If attempts are made to conceptualise the aesthetic in terms of a definition, then Weitz (1966) suggests that the only logical result will be failure, for he maintains that only by seeing the aesthetic as summaries of seriously-made recommendations to attend in certain ways to certain features of it, can understanding be achieved. All aesthetic experience is experiential and is dependent on perception and the interaction of the participant, whether as observer or performer, and the object; painting, play, concerto dance or whatever. Aesthetic experience associated with the arts cannot be regarded as being composed of knowledge of all the same kind, as is the case with Science for example, for aesthetic experience appears to involve personal feeling, and value knowledge rather than knowledge of independent fact.

In Phenix's aesthetic realm, the object of knowledge is the singular particular form; it is not primarily concerned with types of things, but with unique individual objects. Understanding of the arts therefore is of "making particular things, and of particular things made".

Aesthetic meaning is gained by acquaintance, not by description, and each work of art contains its own meaning and speaks for itself. Aesthetic understanding is immediate, referring directly to objects perceived, and can only be attained by direct perception.

The aesthetic experience is fundamental to the consideration of arts education for it is the aesthetic aspect which gives art its uniqueness. Phenix maintains that the fine arts are to the aesthetic cultivation of mankind what the pure sciences are to the general development of empirical competences.
We tend to define the aesthetic as that which delights the senses when referring to its original Greek meaning, which may have led to it being regarded in the past as a "nice refinement" (Reid 1973) to the stern process of the acquisition of knowledge. In order to do full justice to the value of aesthetic consideration, the aesthetic experience must be regarded as a kind of knowledge sui generis; knowledge of meaning wholly embodied in the aesthetic object and as such, different from all other knowledge. The need to describe aesthetic enjoyment or the value of the aesthetic in education may go wrong in several ways. Firstly, by the use and interpretation of essentially aesthetic concepts and attributes in instrumental ways which do not do justice to their essential and unique nature. The use of aesthetic concepts or of any essentially aesthetic attributes in this way can lead to the arts being only a means of enriching other subject areas, or that they may even be denuded to such an extent as to be little more than instruments of cultural propaganda.

No doubt the arts should not be taught exclusively for aesthetic appreciation nor for artistic merit, but it seems unjustifiable to suggest that they be used primarily as means of instruction in extra-aesthetic values or as visual aids for other subject areas. A third area of possible difficulty is the divorcing of aesthetic experience from all other value experiences and by allowing it to be exempt from all standards whereby, like self expression and emotion, it becomes totally subjective. The problems of objectivity are considerably less with regard to aesthetic considerations and Sibley and Tanner (1968) suggest a very strong case for objectivity in the arts, for whilst art is always the result of someone "doing his own thing", it is also an objectification of feeling. Once, objectified, it enters the public domain and it is then judged by it's viewers.

Whilst aesthetic experience can be regarded as less subjective than self-expression or affective experience, it still suffers from similar problems regarding evaluation which tend to diminish it's value and relevance as the sole basis for faculty or department structure.

If the common ground for a creative arts grouping is seen as essentially Hirstean, then the "pure" aesthetically-based group would appear to be the more logical and profitable, but Hirst is far less convincing with regard to arts subjects because of their inherent concern with both propositional and operational knowledge, and because of their peripheral connections with other forms of knowledge. The practical considerations of a purely aesthetically based group such as art, music, drama and literature are also important and may be such as to mitigate against the formation of the group.
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The adoption of aesthetic considerations as a basis for grouping may over-emphasise the cognitive nature of the arts and whilst all the arts can be seen as being cognitive to some extent, the cognition involved in art and metalwork for example, may well not be of the same kind.

Creativity may be regarded as being the central concept on which creative faculties can be established. However, the concept of creativity is imprecise and its applicability to education has been very controversial. It has even been suggested that the concept is much over-rated, and in its strictest and most definitive sense, neither applicable nor relevant to children in school. The basis of such a view lies in the belief that only very few, possibly a handful of practitioners, ever achieve real and original creativity. It has been suggested that only the greatest artists, scientists, or reformers for example, can be truly creative, and that if this is in fact the case, then the activities which take place in schools can only be, at best, pale reflections of true creativity. This view, which may well be too absolute, denies the existence of levels or degrees of creative experience which appear to be fundamental if the concept of creativity has a part to play in the general programme of education.

It seems reasonable to accept that the concept is capable of having an inherent hierarchical structure and therefore that the school may well be able to assist in the development of creativity and the progression of pupils from low levels of creativity to higher ones.

Creativity is a relatively new concept still fraught with mystical connations and as yet, relatively little information exists on what might be termed general or universal creativity as a normal feature of intelligent behaviour.

Early in the century there was practically no work at all undertaken on creativity and the concept seldom appears in the literature of the pre 1920 period. Where used in relation to art, it was used vaguely and with imprecision. Although it is now regarded as one of art education's major organising ideas, it is still an imprecise concept. Much research has been done in the U.S.A., and although the findings have shed considerable light on the use of the concept, a precise definition remains elusive.

Most of the current attempts to define creativity are in terms of process, but it is very important to recognise that an essential element of all creative activity is an end product.
We tend to assume that there are few highly creative people in the world, and many who are non-creative, but it may well be that there is very little scope in the educational system for individuals who can be seen as having more or less creative ability, to behave creatively. Perhaps the opportunities are not available for the innate ability to become manifest.

Whilst one can agree with Gowan (1976) that there is no absolute need for everyone to agree on one single universal definition of creativity, researchers need to be clear what they themselves mean. Torrance (1967) defines creativity as "the process of forming new ideas or hypotheses, testing these ideas or hypotheses, and communicating the results". Although relatively little information exists regarding general or universal creativity, it is possible to identify attributes of creativity and of the creative person and to base assumptions for the development of creative experience in education on these premises.

It can be argued that the processes used in creative thinking are indistinguishable from those employed in ordinary problem solving (Parnes 1967) and that the creative process in the arts and in the sciences is to a large extent identical in its involvement of selective trial and error searching amongst a wide range of possibilities. We tend to regard thinking as being creative if one or more of the following criteria is satisfied; when the product of thinking has novelty value; if the thinking is unconventional; if the thinking requires high motivation and persistence over a considerable period of time or at a high intensity; or if the thinking solves a problem which has, to some extent lacking in structure.

The creative process differs from ordinary problem solving only in that the product is distinctive, and the concept of novelty in the context of the person's own development can be seen as a key factor in the recognition of creative activity.

Creative people tend to be very diligent and self-disciplined and tend to have unusual ability to think fluently. They are able to recall from memory storage items of information to be used in indirect or unusual ways and tend to be rather more individualistic. Creative people are also very flexible thinkers, who tend to be free from rigid thinking patterns; they tend to be pliable and changeable in thinking and are not bound by habit. They also tend to be able to elaborate in great detail on given situations and on past experiences.
It is apparent that for educational application at least, creativity needs to be understood in terms of the abilities and traits which contribute to it. The three main abilities being fluency, flexibility and elaboration. Creative success in the arts area of experience requires separate but parallel fluency in the two latter abilities of flexibility and elaboration. Creative thinking ability is regarded by Gowan, Demos and Torrance (1967) as not being a purely developmental phenomenon, and research has demonstrated that a considerable part of creative behaviour is learned. If this is so, then carefully structured teaching programmes are able to make considerable differences to the child's creative development. Creative approaches to learning are useful attributes which need to be developed in all children, providing that they are not suggested as being an exclusive way of learning. Although very little is known about creativity as a phenomenon, research has shown ways in which creative behaviour may be stimulated in individuals so that they are helped to release whatever creative potential they may possess. Hudson (1966) maintains that the creative ability of the individual may be severely repressed by education, so much so that he may be unable to even recognise his full creative potential let alone realise it. The argument often put forward by advocates of child-centred education tends to agree with this and regards children as essentially creative beings who need freedom and lack of direction in order that they may blossom. Teachers are often regarded as the blocking agent to this free development. It seems reasonable however to counter this by asking whether the type of pure creativity referred to is relevant in the school situation? The question of evaluation appears yet again to bring the constraint of rationality to bear on this argument. The acceptance of such a free approach leaves the field wide open for criticism and scepticism, especially on the grounds of pure subjectivity. It appears to be very tenuous to adopt the belief that education needs to take feelings and creative intelligence as a cardinal focus, for by so doing, the accustomed emphasis on subject content and structure is demoted, and the stress often placed on basic skill acquisition is likewise subsumed and given insufficient emphasis. It is equally tenuous to adopt the opposite view that creativity is too subjective an experience to warrant inclusion in the school curriculum.

However difficult a definition of the concept of creativity may be, it is accepted that the concept exists, is manageable in some pure or applied form, and that there are, within the school curriculum, certain areas which are concerned, to a large extent with creative activities.
The arts stand out as being the area of the curriculum where children are expected to be creative, but as Witkin (1978) clearly indicates, the arts are not the sole claimant to creativity, nor to the creative area of the curriculum and although it is commonly applied to artists, it's use is by no means their sole prerogative. Creativity in problem solving needs to be developed in many, if not all curricular areas and inquiry or discovering methods of teaching may well be major ways in which creativity can be fostered.

It is only by the understanding of the nature of creative performance in terms of abilities and other traits which contribute to it, that teachers can hope to be able to select material which will foster creative development. Creative potential can be compared with general intelligence, in that it is very complex, and is not a single ability or trait. The ability to produce a number of different ideas in response to certain given information is one of the more pertinent classes of intellectual ability commonly involved in creative performance. The abilities to revise, re-interpret, reorganise information and evaluate are of equal importance as resources for creative production as are divergent production abilities.

As each individual's pattern of abilities is different, so some are more related to creative potential, and as such, qualitative differences in creativity are apparent; it is not merely a question of having or not having creative potential.

It is relatively easy to advocate creativity as a universal panacea and the saviour of the arts area of the curriculum; in fact many child-centred thinkers do just this, but the acceptance of the concept per se is fraught with problems.

Teachers of creative activities need to be critical of the more grandiose claims which are made for them, must define their aims, and must at least attempt to evaluate their results. Evaluation of creativity is very difficult, but to disregard it, or to consider it to be too complex and too difficult a task, is to abandon all claim for it's inclusion in the curriculum. Unless creativity is to be justified only in terms of therapy, which has extremely far-reaching curricular implications, then evaluation in some form must be a constituent part of creative experience. The question can even be asked as to whether being creative is a relevant part of education, but such a view can be dismissed as over-emphasising the cognitive at the expense of the affective areas of the curriculum.
It seems to be eminently sensible to be sceptical of the value of some creative activities, and by exercising caution and careful selection, creative experience which can be subsequently evaluated can be seen as having a justifiable place in the school curriculum.

Creativity in one form or another can be, and often is, accepted as providing significant common ground on which arts subjects can be grouped and it is argued that a structured grouping can enhance the experience of creativity itself. Further benefit is claimed by the inherent lowering of craft demarcation boundaries and the increased awareness of common principles of design and the relationship of techniques to materials, design and function. If a grouping of subject areas with concern for creativity is formed, then it follows that experiences over and above those available by the discrete subjects might be expected, but whether creativity can lay claim to the role of the central integrating concept any more than self-expression, aesthetics, or affect is very doubtful. The common component areas of a creative arts department have, to a lesser or greater extent, some concern with the development of creativity, but they also exhibit other similar or common attributes which can also be justified as criteria for department or faculty formation.

The concept in it's pure form is undoubtedly not sufficiently justifiable as a sole basis for the creation of educationally sound departments because of it's requirement for novel or unique solutions which will only very occasionally, if at all, be produced in the school situation. To regard the novelty of the solution in relation to the development of the individual child is however quite an acceptable premise to adopt. If a child produces a painting which because it has involved him in new experiences and is novel to him even though similar paintings may have been produced by others, then a justifiable claim to creative experience can be made.

Creativity, if modified to take account of the school situation and related directly to educational experience, may not provide the complete answer to faculty structure, but will provide a useful point of reference, which, even though it may not represent the central and common characteristics we may have thought it to be, is a concept which should not be ignored when considering arts subjects in the curriculum.

It is becoming clear that no one concept is going to provide the sole basis for faculty formation in the arts area of the curriculum; the main stumbling blocks with those considered so far have been in terms of the complex nature of the concept involved and the problems related to evaluation.
It is possible to suggest that because the arts are usually concerned with pleasure-giving experiences, it may be justifiable to use their hedonistic attributes as a basis for faculty formation.

The recreative and leisure element of the arts cannot, and should not be denied, but to adopt it as a basis on which to build, appears somewhat unsound. Immediately the arts may be reduced in status to second rate or purely pleasure-satisfying knowledge which cannot hope to stand alongside the more academic forms of knowledge. The dangers are similar to those experienced when attempting to use emotion as a basis for subject grouping, namely of status, evaluation and justification in publicly-acceptable terms.

The concept of utility can be seen as a possible base on which to form creative arts faculties, but the constitution of departments formed in this way would not match the models previously referred to. The crafts would feature strongly as having considerable utilitarian attributes but what of music or dance? It would be difficult to regard their products as being utilitarian. The definition of utility itself presents problems, and the view expressed by Victor Hugo seems to be, particularly pertinent:- Le beau est aussi utile que l'utile; plus peuteture".

Hirst does not seem to do justice to the operational side of the arts by his severe subordination of operational to propositional knowledge. It is however conceivable, but not necessarily desirable, to regard the arts as being wholly cognitive experiences.

Many of the arts are primarily concerned with operational knowledge and are, therefore outside, or at best on the edge of, Hirst's model.

In education propositional knowledge should be present in all the creative arts subjects, but it can be argued that the craft subjects are less concerned with propositional knowledge than the areas which Hirst regards as more pure, such as music or fine art.

The more utilitarian the area, the further it moves away from Hirst's fine art form. It is most important however to realise that the majority of the creative arts subjects can only be seen as being on the fringe of Hirst's definition for they are fields of knowledge or are hybrids, where there is overflow from one form into another.
Although some of the creative areas such as music, art and drama may have a lesser concern with operational knowledge, and may be therefore more pure in Hirstean terms, this does not imply that they do not make important uses of, or are essentially concerned with operational knowledge. It does infer that they are less orientated towards utilitarian purposes.

Art could be part of a justifiable group along with music and drama (and possibly literature) based on aesthetic criteria which is concerned largely (although not exclusively) with non-utilitarian issues.

Art dance and music are essentially concerned with factors other than utility and so the idea of using the concept as a basis for an arts department does not seem to be particularly apposite.

In addition, it can be argued that there is already too great an emphasis placed on the production of artefacts of a high standard, particularly in the crafts. The value of the process can easily be ignored or overlooked, and the product assumes dominance and becomes the raison d'être.

Although the idea of functional beauty is attractive and relevant, the concept of utility cannot be regarded as a central or sole factor for the creation of a creative arts department.

Similarly the acquisition and practice of skills, whilst being an important and integral part of the arts curriculum, does not represent a sufficiently strong basis for grouping.

The concern of all arts to a lesser or greater extent with skills is beyond doubt, and particularly in the crafts, the subject areas become almost devoid of meaning without skills. However, it does not represent a feature of adequate strength to be taken as the sole or major basis for integration.

A further possible feature which could be seen as a basis for faculty formation is the experiential nature of the arts subjects.

When considering aesthetic attributes, it was established that the arts require first-hand interaction with either the process or the product and that through this direct perception aesthetic awareness is developed. It would therefore seem justifiable to suggest that this experiential attribute which appears to be inherent in the arts subjects could be taken as a basis for faculty formation.
The question does however, remain as to whether the idea of experientiality is a sufficiently strong feature to use as a major basis for faculty formation.

When compared with the wider concepts such as creativity, self-expression or emotion, the experiential nature of the arts subjects tends not to have comparable importance. There is no denying the part that it plays, and it would be remiss to ignore or denude its place as a factor affecting the formation of departments, but it seems that along with skill acquisition and utility, it can only be regarded as being part of a group of factors, all of importance, but which do not have sufficient individual importance to stand alone as the obvious and universal basis for department or faculty formation.

It seems clear then that to accept one factor as a basis for grouping arts subjects will lead to inadequacies and areas of tenuous justification.

By seeing several attributes together, it should be possible to suggest not only a basis for faculty formation, but also to give more precise direction as to the component subjects of such a group.

If one was to take for example, creativity, skill practice and utility as a basic group then subjects not having all three attributes could reasonably be excluded from the department.

It is easy, however, to become over-simplistic and to overlook the very complex and wide-ranging nature of the criteria involved. By doing so, tenuous departments may be formed which may in turn result in spurious and superficial courses which cannot do justice to any of the component subjects.

The creative arts department needs, therefore to be formed on the basis of the group of criteria composed of creativity, aesthetic considerations, self-expression, emotion, skill acquisition and practice and experientiality.

It must be stressed straightaway that it is not suggested that each component subject contributes equally in all areas, some will be particularly strong on one but relatively weak in other areas; the crafts are traditionally strong on skill acquisition and practice, but relatively weak on aesthetic attributes for example. It must also be stressed that more recent and the best craft teaching has not only maintained it's essential skill attributes but has also developed a high aesthetic content.
The group suggested is by no means definitive, other alternative groups of factors may well be equally justifiable, but for the present purpose, subjects which exhibit to a greater or lesser degree, the attributes stated will be regarded as having a strong claim for inclusion in a creative arts department.

(The term "creative arts department" is used throughout merely as a convenient denotation for the group of subjects based on the above criteria and is not intended to have connotations outside the bounds of the present discourse. As mentioned previously, careful and accurate delineation of terms is essential, and where this has not happened confusion and misunderstanding has occurred. It is often very easy and attractive to transpose terms from one argument to another with total disregard for context and where this has happened misconceptions have been perpetuated)

It would be inadvisable to continue the examination of the creative arts department without first having looked in some detail at the concept of integration.

There is no point in establishing criteria for department formation unless the concept of subjects working together is established and justified.

Most of the literature concerning integrated curricula tends to assume that the meaning of "integrated" is well understood.

To integrate means to make up a whole from parts; to combine separate elements, and thereby supposes the existence of divisions or separations which may be overcome by integration.

The implications behind a desire to integrate curricula lies in the belief that the traditional curriculum lacks something by the nature of it's being composed of separate parts.

Entwistle (1970) regards the traditional subject-centred approach as failing to emphasise the totality of experience and he suggest that when seen through separate disciplines, the environment appears as fragmentary and incoherent. He is however referring to total integration rather than the integration of a few related subjects which is the immediate concern and his argument may well therefore not be particularly pertinent.
The most persuasive case against the traditional subject-centred approach comes from their lack of explicit attention to the immediate practical and moral problems which all pupils will face.

It can be argued that traditional subjects have ignored the important links between the different forms of knowledge and that all curricula need to do justice not only to the forms of knowledge but also to their inter-relationships.

To regard knowledge as a "seamless whole" and to establish teaching and learning situations which try to deal with knowledge "all in one piece" leads to difficulties. Claims that knowledge is a unity seem to be incomprehensible, trivial or false and there does not appear to be any real argument concerning the nature of knowledge itself which involves the conclusion that true knowledge must necessarily be acquired through an integrated or "seamless whole" approach. Obviously this is not to deny the fact that real life problems do require many dimensions of knowledge, but the necessary integration of the various forms of knowledge may well take place within the head of the individual as and when required.

Warwick (1973) claims that an integrated approach promotes "enquiring critical minds capable of research and sound judgement" but there is no empirical evidence for such a claim. Even if it was assumed that the intention was clearly defined; quite what is meant by the statement is far from clear.

Integrationists see the subject-based curriculum as being unable to relate to the child's environment because of it's compartmentalisation, but conversely the advocacy of integrated curricula can be seen as being largely a negative movement concerned with the rejection of the conventional patterns of curricula.

On the basis of conceptual analysis it has been argued that education is concerned with the development of a rational mind. It can then follow that the development of the mind involves the progressive differentiation of experience into distinct forms. A curriculum based on units corresponding to such forms would seem to be less likely to cause confusion between the distinctive elements of the forms and would appear to provide opportunity for systematic attention to be given to the progressive mastery of the most essential, central and fruitful concepts and patterns of reasoning of that particular form.
It does not necessarily follow that an integrated approach is the best way to deal with subject inter-relationships, for curriculum units need to recognise not only the connections between the forms of knowledge but also their distinctive differences, both of which are necessary features of knowledge.

Whilst we cannot ignore the sociological aspects of integration related to the power structure of society, nor the psychological issues which see subject based curricula as failing to communicate certain logical relations between concepts, they are not of prime importance and can only be regarded as instrumental or secondary to the main philosophical argument being developed.

Unfortunately there is no common understanding of the term "integration", it can be seen as a programme which attempts to relate the independent study of various disciplines, or as a course of theme teaching, or as interdisciplinary enquiry which could be a completely unstructured approach with no separate subjects as such.

It is very difficult to sort out the different arguments for integration in order to evaluate them because of the considerable differences between, for example, a motivational argument, for a programme of related studies and an epistemological argument for a theme-centred approach. It is very difficult indeed to equate claims that children will be more interested if subjects are integrated against the claim that the nature of knowledge is such that subject divisions impose artificial barriers.

Without elaborating on the many types of integration, each of which cannot obviously fulfil every function, it would seem reasonable to accept that because the argument so far has been of an essentially philosophical nature, epistemological factors relating to the nature of knowledge should form the basis of any possible subject integration.

Skilbeck (1972) identifies three levels of integration in the curriculum; firstly at a subject level, where subjects, which are regarded as integrated systems of thought, are also seen as the source of links which can be formed with other subjects. Subjects are brought together whilst retaining their individuality, to promote the understanding of concepts in one subject area because certain activities in another can help to promote this understanding i.e. the skills of one subject are useful to another.
Secondly at the level of interdisciplinary cooperation, where different forms of knowledge are brought together to promote the understanding of concepts which are shared by the subjects, and in which the logical coherence of the separate subjects is respected.

At the third level, subjects loose their separate identities and are replaced by a new form of the organisation of knowledge based on other than subject principles, as in Design for example.

The second level would appear to be the most apposite for creative arts integration, the first level is too instrumental and does not do justice to the nature and individuality of the subjects involved, and the third level is too general and may lead to the subjects loosing their individual nature by being subsumed into an amorphous mass.

The concept of integration is favoured by child-centred educationalists such as Entwistle and it may be useful to summarise the more common reasons in favour of curriculum integration.

Because some problems cannot be fitted within the limits of any one subject, the mastery of different subjects is not the sum total of all knowledge. Secondly, the curiosity a free enquiry of the pupil may be seen as an integrating factor from which the mastery of individual areas may follow. It is interesting to note here however that Hirst offers exactly the opposite view, viz, that the individual areas of knowledge need to be mastered prior to any possible programme of integration.

A third point in favour of integration is that the method of inquiry is unitary, and there is no justification for the proliferation of different modes of knowledge which may only lead to fragmentation.

The value of knowledge is dependent on the degree to which it satisfies the needs of an individual or society. Therefore, needs can be seen as giving direction and purpose to the educational process.

A fifth and final point is that certain complex concepts, are central to the thinking of the different areas of thought, and that these need close scrutiny in themselves so that they may thereby offer new ways of entering into different areas of knowledge.
The integration of subjects may also be seen as contributing towards a more intellectual approach to learning because of the provision of a more flexible grouping of pupils, because the barriers of recurrent breaks are removed and teachers are involved in the cooperative enterprise of team teaching, but these alleged advantages are not necessarily the by-products of subject integration.

There are many problems which stem from the introduction of the concept of integration into the curriculum, so many in fact that the concept per se may not be entirely suitable for the creative arts department. Several different reasons can be suggested as underlying curriculum integration and these need to be recognised. Themes in integration can function in different ways, either in the delineation of an area in which practical decisions must be made by either teacher or pupil and which must be focal points of enquiry, or as the naming of a complex body of information.

They can also function as the association of ideas to form the starting point for enquiry, or can be seen as representing and elucidating a certain structured body of knowledge needing to be mastered, but which at the same time can transcend the subject boundaries.

A further problem is that it is not always clear whether the various teaching methods are seen as being necessarily linked to integrated teaching. They may be a condition of its effective operation, or may merely be desirable ways of teaching which might be employed in both integrated and non-integrated curricula; learning by discovery methods can be cited as an example.

Pring's (1970) view of knowledge as a seamless whole appears somewhat unsatisfactory when closely examined, for it is not necessarily the case that true knowledge may be better acquired through some form of integrated programme; even if the premise is accepted that real-life problems are often complex affairs involving many dimensions.

Following from this the argument that the teaching of different subjects as distinct entities may militate against the development of a comprehensive and multi-dimensional perspective is an empirical claim which has nothing to do with the nature of knowledge and can therefore be regarded as lacking the backing of strong evidence.
It is evident that the knowledge content of subjects is expanding very rapidly, particularly in the areas of science and technology and it can be argued that an integrated approach may best facilitate this expansion.

Many schools are also looking at ways in which they can integrate the social sciences and areas such as social education, careers and moral education for similar reasons. One of the less remarkable consequences of falling rolls and economic stringencies is the damage done to the professional behaviour of teachers as they seek to defend their own subject against subjects which they hold to be inferior.

There may well be a number of curricular areas where integration may be the best if not the only defence against complete loss of those particular subjects from the curriculum. Integrated subjects do offer greater timetable facility, and may well allow for the inclusion of areas which may not in themselves have a serious claim to time, or which may be better covered by the process of infusion as part of an integrated programme.

The integration of subjects can also be seen as providing a broadening and deepening range of experience, but curriculum integration is a much more complex concept than is often realised in terms of it's effect on teaching roles, use of time, organisation of the school and classroom organisation.

One of the major problems lies in the incredible confusion regarding definition and usage of the term, and there appears to be very little clarity, which leaves the field wide open to any number of different interpretations. Often although different authorities mean entirely different things when they use the term, they tend to make recommendation as if a universal meaning was self-evident.

Many teachers have adopted integrated approaches before they have had an opportunity to examine closely the implications either of the term 'integration', or of terms such as 'unity' or "wholeness". Schemes of work produced by such teachers often evince a kind of spurious unity which does not even resemble truly integrated curricula. Whilst many teachers appear to accept that integration is good, only few of them have made any real attempt to understand it's meaning, and more importantly, its educational implications. It is all too easy to jump on the bandwagon of the latest educational fad or to try to apply a new theory without questioning its meaning, implications, or even the activities which its teachers organise.
Although many contemporary proposals for curriculum reform indicate that curriculum integration is very popular, many of its weaknesses stem from its open approach.

It is claimed that an integrated approach to education may make a more significant contribution to the life of the individual, but all curricula, whether integrated or subject-based must by their nature prepare children for life and it would seem to be unreasonable to suggest that any one approach is more successful without some empirical evaluation which would be particularly difficult to establish.

Integrated approaches are generally very open to criticism regarding evaluation for in any form of integrated teaching, the topics covered are determined by the teachers themselves which may present LEAs and Government with difficulties in monitoring and evaluation. This may be highlighted by the recent government intention to influence and to some extent control the curriculum.

Subject barriers, which integrationists suggest are "imposed from above" (Warwick 1973) are not, as they suggest, altogether artificial, for they represent necessary limitations and form categories which render experience intelligible as well as acting to mark the formal identity between different experiences. The boundaries of school subjects are not arbitrary, but are the products of a number of historical factors primarily the growth of knowledge and the changing social demands placed upon schools. Within this historical framework certain logical factors have played a significant part. The structure of subjects is far from being a contingent matter.

Although the Hirstean forms of knowledge are not directly matched to school subjects both exhibit a similar logical formation. Hirst is particularly cautious about lowering removing or re-drawing the boundaries of knowledge and therefore tends to oppose integrated curricula. He suggests that themes can only be explored if the concepts and methods are essentially the same and he favours children knowing subject boundaries, for otherwise if a unitary or integrated approach is adopted the boundaries may never become intelligible.

Specific problems arise with regard to the adoption of an integrated approach in schools.
In making proposals for integrated curricula, teachers need to consider whether their new offerings are better than those which they have replaced. Unless schools have the machinery to make such considerations, they cannot seriously consider the notion of integration or even cooperate between subjects.

Integrated courses tend to promote breadth of knowledge, but far too often they do so at too great a cost in terms of lack of depth. Undoubtedly specialism produces and promotes depth of knowledge, and whilst the idea of breadth in the curriculum is a very valid and pertinent criterion it cannot reasonably be advocated at the expense of or in place of depth of learning.

Where integration produces superficial coverage, the slow and poorly motivated pupils tend to do less well and pupil's work tends to become incoherent and little more than a random collection of data.

One of the principle tenets of integrated curricula is self-directed learning but this in itself may create problems regarding the development of learning skills for especially in the early stages, children may not be able to accept the large measure of responsibility for their own learning which is placed upon them.

A further major consideration is whether integrated curricula do justice to the most able pupils. There is a dichotomy to be resolved in this respect, for to suggest that the integrated approach may not be suitable for the most able pupils implies a two-tier system of education with integrated work being easy and not sufficiently taxing for bright children. Integrated curricula are also generally slow and are rather more time-consuming which can lead to boredom and monotony for the more able pupils.

Intellectual shallowness may result from integrated curricula because of the mixture of concepts and methodologies involved. Without some prior understanding of the requisite logical distinctions many topics become trivial and superficial. It is difficult to seriously consider "Our Town" or "Man" without some fundamental knowledge in constituent subject areas.

Many of the difficulties with integration arise from the failure of one party to recognise the validity of another's case. In the construction of any curriculum political conflict is generated by the existence of competing values, and unless there is integration of purpose, it seems difficult to see how teachers can seriously make proposals for any form of meaningful integration.
Only when the staff involved are entirely united on a common philosophy can integrated approaches have any measure of real success.

Integrated programmes can become very haphazard and disordered; this tends to be much less evident with a subject-based approach which tends to develop progressively.

It is quite possible, because of this lack of sequentiality, for pupils to repeat and duplicate quite considerably during the course of their education. For example pupils could study "Man" in junior school, 1st year secondary, 3rd year and again in the 5th year, and although the work will obviously be at different levels, it is difficult to imagine pupils being overenthusiastic for the third or fourth repeat.

Where themes are used in integrated programmes they can become very trite, mundane, and almost banal; "Man", "Flight", "Law and Order" for example, can only really elicit work of a limited educational value in secondary schools. The amount of time and effort involved may not justify the end result.

These are considerable difficulties regarding the organisation of integrated curricula on a large scale because of the lack of public consensus and the need for it to be teacher-organised. The shortcomings with regard to evaluation have already been mentioned. Other problems and their effects on the curriculum must not be underestimated.

Integration will affect school management, use of time, space and resources in ways which may lead to areas of conflict. Individual subjects can lose their claim to time, space and resources and may be forced into a situation where sharing or inadequate provision may lead to dissatisfaction and a reduction of commitment. Staff may tend to adhere to departments based on single subjects and derive their duties and responsibilities from them. A large more nebulous, department may not be able to delineate these in ways which the staff are able to accept or come to terms with.

Integrated departments generally appear to lack positive leadership, either because the head of the faculty is not adequately familiar with diversity of constituent subjects, or may only be interested in the promotion of his own particular discipline. Either of these approaches can only lead to division amongst the staff and to dissatisfaction and reduced commitment.
Open-plan architecture, although not now as popular as it was five years ago, can be regarded, along with integration of curricular as part of a process of homogenisation which is seen by the social analysts as the dominant trend of our times. Musgrove (1973) however argues that post-industrial societies are not characteristically homogenised and he suggests that they are even more segmented, differentiated and diversified. Differences are accentuated and the trend is not towards more bureaucracy.

"Subjects are not only intellectual systems; they are social systems: they confer not only a sense of identity on their members, they confer authority and they confer power" (Musgrove 1973).

There are considerable problems relating to the power structure which can arise from the adoption of integrated curricula. Only one person can remain in command when subjects are integrated and departments dissolved; everyone else, both staff and pupils alike become exposed and vulnerable. Decision making is removed from the network of subject areas and this may well lead to their feeling outside the innovation which is taking place. Decisions which should properly be taken by subject teachers are made on their behalf either by a small number of department or faculty heads or by the head himself who will have been granted unprecedented primacy by not having to encounter the traditional centres of academic power.

There is no easy way to resolve such power struggles, but perhaps the subject-based approach which affords greater participation by a larger number of staff may to some extent lessen the likelihood of conflict situations developing.

There is no doubt that integrated courses can be seen as a threat to teachers working in subject departments, and this is especially true in secondary education. Such courses may well not do full justice to the inter-relationships between the forms of knowledge and may tend to create problems regarding balance in the curriculum. Forced integration can easily lead to imbalance, and whereas in a subject-based curriculum adjustment can be made subject by subject, it is not altogether clear whether such adjustments are possible with an integrated approach.

Difficulties facing proposed programmes of integration in secondary schools include such considerations as: the schools being very much subject-orientated; integration and subject-based approaches are frequently seen as opposites which is not necessarily the case for they can be complementary; the difficulties in introducing total curriculum transformation to integrated approaches
(although 'mild' forms may often be easy); the widely held view of integration as a uniform phenomenon, and the fact that generally little consideration is given to alternative patterns of organisation which are in themselves capable of incorporating integration.

The latter three points can be used to form the basis of a possible approach which may be particularly relevant to the creative arts area of the curriculum. Some examination of the concept of integration with special reference to the arts is necessary to provide the foundation on which this approach rests.

Integration of arts subjects has tended to take place against a background of misunderstanding and disappointment, for in the past too many attempts at integration have failed mainly because the role of one arts subject has been seen as secondary and instrumental to the role of another. One arts subject has had to subsume its essential nature in order to give form to the ideas of another. This can in no way do justice to the belief that each one of arts has its own unique structure and insights and offers an individual mode of understanding.

As each subject discipline has inherent aspects which relate to and extend children's understanding, it is essential that these differences are respected and that each subject is allowed to develop an appropriate pattern of teaching which does justice to the nature of the subject as well as to the needs and aspirations of the children. It is unreasonable to integrate anything which may merely appeal to the teacher for only fields of activity which are logically similar can be justifiably integrated. "It is a mistake to attempt to establish tenuous links between categories of knowledge and experience which really have nothing in common". Entwistle (1970)

All too frequently teachers of the arts have found the lowest common denominator to act as a focus for integration, usually at some considerable cost to each subject's unique and individual contribution to learning.

Arts teachers have been very conscious of the way that their work has been trivialised and diluted by the imposition of large departments and faculties, rotational systems and integrated programmes to such an extent that many of them are seriously questioning the value of the composite or integrated contribution as opposed to the previously accepted discrete subject approach.
The rotational systems or 'circuses' can only lead to superficial sampling and really need to be avoided if there is to be a clear differentiation between teaching and entertainment. There can be no point in integration if it's ultimate justification is more tenuous than the autonomous subject divisions which it replaces.

There is also no real evidence to support the view that any new division of the curriculum into wider areas is any less water-tight or insular than by the use of traditional subject divisions.

At whatever level any programme of integration in the arts area (or any other area for that matter) relies on teachers being convinced of the value of integration. There is a strong requirement for a sustaining philosophy, committed teachers, adequate resources, and the necessary financial backing if any programme of integration is to achieve any degree of success.

Programmes of integration need to be related to the aims of the whole school curriculum and need to have a clearly outlined framework for properly balanced and structured programmes of arts education which take account of the variety of advantages and constraints which are particular to the individual school.

At the lower levels of ability, integrated courses may well be more likely to lead to the naive and inappropriate transfer of concepts and although Witkin (1974) suggests that some transference many occur across subject boundaries, Hirst (1978) sees the need to get the fundamental issues of each subject right before attempting to integrate.

Whilst it is apparent that some transference across subject barriers is desirable or even inevitable, this does not necessarily imply that the creative arts faculty needs to see all the arts as being similar areas. As previously mentioned, it may even be more profitable to explore the differences between the various arts subjects rather than their similarities.

Although practical professional and ideological reasons are suggested to recommend that the creative arts subjects liaise to make a coordinated bid for an adequate place within the common curriculum, such reasons need not result in integrated programmes nor do they necessarily infer that subject boundaries should disappear completely.
Because of the movement of education towards a greater concern with crossing subject barriers, it may well become more important for children to understand the structure and discipline of each individual subject rather than risk diffusion and confusion by using an integrated approach right from the start.

It seems relevant to claim that subject matter and techniques (as distinct from central concepts) are sufficiently autonomous to justify separation, at least to some extent.

Thus it becomes undesirable to teach art and music for example simultaneously or in a closely integrated context because of the differences at the surface level of content and the operational processes involved.

It can be suggested then that the teaching of certain skills and the handling of different materials need to be separated within the creative arts department. Only by doing this can it be ensured that the skills of an arts or craft subject are taught in the right sequence for otherwise the accent can only be on the discovery of materials, rather than as a means for giving substance to an idea.

It cannot be denied that there is a place for seeing the totality of experience at some time and in some areas of the curriculum, but as far as the creative arts go this does seem to present too strong a concept. The differences in subjects suggest that it would not be reasonable to try to integrate all the time, and it seems to be a strong argument which suggests that synthesis requires knowledge of the separate parts as a precondition to the integration of them into a whole. The idea of the integrated person may well be a more acceptable alternative to physically integrated curricula, where the integration is to take place in the mind of the individual and not in the structure of his education.

As single subjects and integrated programmes need not be curricular alternatives or mutually exclusive, school curricula should provide opportunities for children to experience widely different modes of learning and both analysis and synthesis are integral to the process of learning and thinking.

Indeed it can be suggested that integrated teaching and subject teaching represent two stages of the same process and that subject teaching is a form of integrated teaching in that to teach a subject is to teach an integrated cognitive structure of knowledge.
Whatever the groupings which are formed, others will automatically be excluded; it may well therefore be better to only create loose groupings so that the constituent subject areas can work together only as and when they feel the need to do so.

Very rigid groups can become counter-productive in the wider context, whereas looser groupings may have the flexibility to liaise over a broader area of the curriculum.

As a concept, integration is too definitive and too permanent to be really relevant to the arts curriculum.

Whatever common ground may exist between the arts, it is extremely diverse, and the criteria for looking at arts subjects together are so complex and wide-ranging that the rigid concept of integration is not able to do full justice to the unique nature of the constituent subjects.

The real purpose of integration in the arts may be seen, not as the facility for team or theme teaching, or in the joining together of formerly discrete areas of the curriculum but rather in the creation of meaningful relationships between the child's internal and external worlds. The true value of any form of liaison between arts subjects may encourage and develop these relationships.

Transference from one medium to another and the working together aspects can be seen as being of only secondary importance to this major purpose.

Whilst it is apparent that some common ground exists between creative arts subjects, the differences peculiar to each one have equal importance and need safeguarding, whatever form of grouping of subjects is proposed.

We often talk glibly of integration when we only mean cohabitation, and although the existence of areas of liaison is self-evident, the arts are so unrelated in so many ways that it is not always possible to transpose from one to another, because of the distinct, albeit not totally discrete, discipline of each one.

I would suggest therefore, that a more flexible liaison, which I will call variable interaction, offers greater scope for fruitful experience in the arts.
Variable interaction is a much less constraining concept than integration per se, which allows each subject to operate discretely and autonomously whilst still affording opportunities for quite extensive liaison as and when required.

The two particular strengths of variable interaction are firstly that as neither the nature and intensity of the liaison nor the composition of the group of subjects involved are fixed, they are therefore able to be changed to match the specific needs of a particular situation.

Secondly, unlike most programmes of integration which have a tendency to become rather rigid curriculum structures, variable interaction advocates that the working together of closely allied subjects occurs only on those occasions where it is deemed necessary or appropriate.

The more open nature of the concept may well have greater relevance to all creative subjects and it certainly avoids many of the problems which are inherent with more rigid programmes of integration.

Because of its looser nature, variable interaction may well be able to operate efficiently without the need for a universally accepted and rigid definition which is so essential when considering integration in its more pure form. A definition which I would suggest and which would be particularly relevant to the arts, is that variable interaction is a loose and temporary liaison between a group of conceptually related subjects or areas of experience created for as long or short a period of time as necessary or appropriate and during which time an area or areas of mutual commonality or interest may be explored.

Although it is difficult to establish a universally acceptable definition, the one suggested should provide an adequate base from which subject groupings may be explored and evaluated. It may also prove to be of practical relevance in relation to the organisation of arts experience within the school curriculum.

Variable interaction does not deny, denude or in any way lessen the uniqueness of each individual subject, for by its occasional nature, the essence of each area is not threatened, but safeguarded. Only when occasions for meaningful and profitable working together arise will there be any need to establish cooperative programmes based on common attributes.
This should prevent the spurious and tenuous liaison and integration which has become quite a common feature of creative arts departments. Depth of knowledge need not necessarily be sacrificed to breadth, as is common with many of the more rigid integrated curricula.

The premise of knowledge existing per se is central to the concept, and with variable interaction it is possible to master each individual subject area before any liaison takes place. This approach is favoured by Hirst and enables full justice to be done to the individuality of each subject or area of experience.

Although it has been suggested that integrated programmes provide greater timetable flexibility this may well be happening at the cost of loss of the essential nature of each subject.

Variable interaction requires much less sacrifice of subject knowledge on the part of the teacher and is much easier to programme and to evaluate because of it's respect for the individual areas of experience.

Learning can be more closely directed and weaker pupils can be more easily identified and where necessary, remedial action provided. The intellectual shallowness often evident in integrated programmes can be avoided and the more able pupils may be freed from the slow, time-consuming and possibly boring approach so common to integrated courses.

Very often integrated course have been established for other than educationally justifiable reasons; but the loose liaison suggested would militate against subjects being subsumed for non-educational reasons. Because of the loose nature of the subject grouping, a correspondingly loose organisational framework would need to be established. Heads of the component subjects would retain their identity and control of the teaching and administration of their own subject, for it would be inappropriate to create a faculty head to have absolute control over all the component parts as is the case with many integrated arts departments.

It would however, be necessary to create a coordinator of studies who, whilst having no power within each individual department, could liaise, establish, and organise the occasions on which all or some of the subject areas would work together.
As the actual power of leadership of the faculty would still remain firmly in the hands of the collective heads of subject, problems associated with the overall power structure within the school should therefore be minimised.

The wholesale acceptance of the purely philosophical account of the nature of knowledge may not give a complete or totally satisfaction basis on which to consider the relevance of creative arts groupings, for the sociological factors which influence our views of knowledge should not be ignored. If knowledge is seen as being to any extent a social construct, the inferences and implications which can then be drawn, assume considerable importance. Variable interaction would be able to take account of such sociological factors which may not be the case where rigid integration is based on solely philosophical tenets.

The organisation of a creative arts department, based on the criteria outlined earlier, of creativity, aesthetic considerations, self-expression, emotion, skills and experientiality and formed on the premise of variable liaison would present fewer philosophical and operational problems than the integrated equivalents in terms of the nature of component subjects, staff involvement and the power structure.

Having established the criteria on which to base formation of a creative arts faculty and having defined a possible way in which the constituent subjects may work together, it is necessary before drawing too many conclusions, to delineate the areas of experience which might constitute such a department, establish their essential nature, and to examine their areas of commonality.
CHAPTER THREE

The concept of integration has been suggested as being too definitive and permanent to be universally relevant to the arts subjects, and however the common ground is examined and justified, there does not seem to be enough of it for a truly integrated department.

Variable interaction which allows each subject to operate autonomously whilst at the same time affording opportunities for extensive temporary liaison is suggested as being a concept which offers far greater possibilities for fruitful experience and which may have greater relevance and be more suited to the needs of creative arts subjects.

It is undesirable that any grouping takes place without a thorough investigation of the component subjects.

As the expressive arts and the art and design groupings have already been discussed and set aside as having areas of severe reservation, the creative arts grouping consisting of art, the crafts, (heavy and light for both boys and girls), drama, music, dance and physical education is suggested as a possible model.

The constituent subjects need to be classified examined and their essential nature established before areas of possible liaison can be delineated.

All the arts are very complex and are somewhat vague and imprecise which makes them all the more difficult to adequately define. There are problems when investigating the nature of all of them, but this in no way inhibits or affects either their value, or the need for subjecting them to close scrutiny. The arts in general should not be compared and contrasted with other subjects using their criteria, but need different and arts-based criteria if any examination or evaluation of them is to have relevance and meaning.

ART

From earliest times philosophers have been concerned with the problems of the complex, open and everchanging concept of art; and the problems of establishing it's nature and it's function have been of particular concern.
Although the direct influence of philosophical thought has been relatively limited when compared with the effects of the working tradition and the training which artists have received, its indirect influence has been widespread and pervasive.

The study of the philosophy of art has concerned itself with a multiplicity of problems; the analysis of concepts of meaning, communication and truth, or criteria of excellence for example, but a central feature of any consideration of the philosophy of art is the concern with its identification and definition.

Definitions are profuse, multifarious and sometimes conflicting. Dewey (1958) seeing art as an intrinsically valuable experience suggests that: "Art is a form of experience which vivifies life"

Rosenberg (1967) suggests that: "Art is culture, the culture developed by the artists over millennia of creation".

Collingwood (1938) adopts a more expressionistic viewpoint by suggesting that "The work of art is something not seen or heard, but something imagined".

Croce (1909) like Collingwood sees artistic activity as being essentially the experience of expressing one's emotions and suggests that "Great works of art are sheer emotion absolutely identified with the most lucid imagery".

Any list of definitions could become almost endless; as many shifts of emphasis and differences in interpretation could be suggested.

Freud (in Arnheim 1971) sees art as wish fulfilment; Hirst (1973) sees it as being a language; Reid (1976) regards it as being a symbolic activity expressing meaning in symbols; Rosenberg (1967) sees it as essentially a social phenomenon, which is dependent on its cultural context or even becomes indistinguishable from that context. "Art is not a natural given, it is a social product with its own role and function in the life of man".

Whilst Rosenberg's view cannot be totally ignored, and art education must obviously be seen to impinge upon real life, it tends not to do justice to the transcendental nature of art.

Kosuth (1969) goes as far as to say that "art is the definition of art", that art merely is; and that it exists for its own sake.
Racey (1969) considers that anything made for appreciation rather than use can be art. This view does not attempt to evaluate art, but merely serves to describe it, defining its central property and its distinctive element around which it may evolve in unpredictable ways.

There are criticisms and inadequacies inherent in all the foregoing definitions but essentially any attempt to understand art must examine at some stage the actions of the artist and the characteristics and qualities of art work.

Historically, art's purpose has tended to be reduced to the preservation and perpetuation of objects or persons considered to be beautiful or important by the current society. It has also had religious significance by, in the earliest and simplest terms, the making present and visible images of the gods, as with the cave paintings of pre-history. In the middle ages, art served religious purposes in an educational sense by the teaching of religious doctrine via its visual images.

Art has been, and is, culture; and art was also thought to exist for the purpose of the display of the power and splendour of kings, or for the decoration of the environment.

Art has been seen as ideas and responses, and as the transmission of strong feelings from one person to another as it is often assumed that the distinctive function of the artist is to express emotions.

"A work of art is the expression of the artist's feelings or emotions, be they conscious or unconscious". Khatchadourian (1965)

During the development of civilization, art has served a variety of purposes: in instrumental ways by the Greeks, who were not alone in regarding art merely as manufacture; as functional beauty; as a way of improvement through education and propaganda; as expression as communication, or as having intrinsic value.

It does not seem to be sufficiently comprehensive to see art as being entirely one or other of these, and it would not seem possible to produce a universally acceptable definition to suit all contingencies, due to a large extent, to the changing nature of the concept.
"Each age, each art movement, each philosophy of art tries over and over again to establish the stated ideal, only to be succeeded by a new or revised theory, rooted at least in part, in the repudiation of preceding ones. Even today, almost everyone interested in aesthetic matters is still deeply wedded to the hope that the correct theory of art is forthcoming" Weitz (1968)

Aesthetic considerations are often seen as central to the concept of art but as with the majority of concepts relating to the arts, this field is notoriously difficult to define. These problems of definition are to a great extent compounded by the preconceptions imposed on the subject by writers and philosophers.

Santayana suggests that there is a widespread and radical tendency within our nature to observe and to value the beautiful, but unfortunately, the inherent subjectivity of the aesthetic phenomenon has tended to be regarded as a major contributing factor in the failure of aesthetic speculation.

If the aesthetic is to be conceived in terms of a definition, then Weitz (1966) suggests that the logical result will be failure, for only by seeing it as summaries of seriously made recommendations to pay attention in certain ways to certain of its features can understanding be achieved.

In the examination of the nature of art, he does not see common properties emerging, but merely strands of similarities.

The making of aesthetic objects has been almost universal throughout history, and although works of art have in the past tended to serve some ulterior use, they can also be regarded as "new creations with autonomous criteria of value specific to themselves" (Osborne 1968). It is because of this that it is possible to see objects from the past, even though these may have been made for some ulterior value, as having their own intrinsic aesthetic value over and above the instrumental uses to which such objects were put.

The aesthetic experience inherent in art forms is not composed of a single kind of knowledge, as is the case with science, for example, for aesthetic knowledge involves personal feelings, and value knowledge, rather than knowledge of independent fact.

Art has attributes which can claim to be knowledge of a special kind. Hirst (1975) regards art as having claim as a cognitive area in that it's unique form is analogous with language.
He suggests that the observable features of art are used as symbols which have meaning and make artistic statements which can be judged as being true or false. He draws parallels between lines and shapes used in art and the words and sentences used to make linguistic statements.

Whilst he asserts that art is a language, he concedes that there is a fundamental difference per se between words and pictures. Works of art can however be seen as artistic statements stating truths which cannot be communicated in any other way.

Both Phenix and Hirst regard art as being cognitive and as providing distinctive types of knowledge within the aesthetic realm or form.

However, if art is described essentially as an instrument of cognition, it is thereby reduced to become a purely intellectual process which does not do justice to the richness of artistic experiences. Perceptual imagery is then also expected to undertake a task which it may not be able to fulfil.

Art experience cannot be regarded as being purely cognitive or propositional knowledge per se, for art knowledge can never be propositional in its essence.

Art has a strong affective content, and can even be seen as being essentially affective in nature but one of the major problems with affective theories is that qualitative aspects tend to be ignored and the difference between good and bad is overlooked. Expressive theories of art can be similarly criticised as not being sufficiently qualitative or discriminatory.

As all works of art are not, and can never be, equally good, the experience of art is necessarily impoverished unless degrees of quality can be discriminated.

It seems important that the relationship between the artist and the art product is recognised and given adequate emphasis. Whilst there are sound reasons for regarding the process and the product as two separate elements, it is difficult to separate them completely. Aesthetic appreciation tends to be largely concerned with the product, whereas art education tends to be, for the most part, concerned with the process.

Undoubtedly art is concerned essentially, although not exclusively, with feeling and emotion and an essential feature of art is that it expresses and embodies ideas and values of things which we care about.
Art is the interaction between artist, idea, medium and the world itself, and as with the arts in general, it involves both familiar concepts in new applications and quite new concepts which arise in the development of different traditions and their criticism. There does not appear to be any obvious sense in which a work of art is an attempt to approximate to something already given.

It would be invidious to suggest a comprehensive and universally acceptable definition of art, but it may be helpful to delineate its attributes which have particular relevance to art in education.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines art as skill, especially human skill as opposed to natural skill, and this is certainly evident in great works of art. However, skill only represents one of art's many essential attributes. It is concerned with aesthetic, emotive, social, perceptive, expressive and symbolic attributes and is, in its own way, a language form of communication. It is a kind of knowledge, which is partly, but not essentially, cognitive.

The relationship between the function of art and the function of education is a complex one and which is in a state of constant change. Sometimes the relationship between them is coherent, sometimes incompatible. Sometimes the two may even be seen as working in opposite directions.

Although there may be some doubt about the co-existence of art and education, for the present purpose the more generally accepted view of their overlapping or identifying with each other appears to offer a more justifiable standpoint. Read (1942) believes that art is a complete fusion of the two concepts, so that when art is referred to, an educational process is inferred, and when education is referred to, an artistic process of self-creation is also meant.

As art education tends to be mainly concerned with process rather than product, Read's view would appear to have relevance to the present discussion.

When we speak of art, we may be thinking of a single object, or of a creative experience, or we may even be considering the entire process of creation, but the general premise is that art education in schools should be firmly based in the practice of art.

This view is in itself a complex one, since art will be seen by the child as both process and product, and for many art teachers, the claims for attention from process and from product can appear as areas of unresolved conflict and dilemma.
"Art education in Great Britain is in a state of confusion. Completely different ideals and methods of teaching prevail at the primary, secondary, technical and university levels. No one in political or professional authority seems to know how much importance should be attached to the subject - indeed, no one seems to know how to give the subject a precise definition that would show it's relation to other subjects in the curriculum and permit it's integration within the educational system as a whole" Herbert Read.

Although considerable advances have been made in recent years, art education is still an imprecise term meaning art in schools, art in art schools, art in education or art as a means of education. The generally accepted view is of education through art, and Field (1970) suggests art education as being the understanding of art as a mode of organising experiences.

Rosenberg (1967) sees teaching art as "educating students, regardless of age, in the processes employed by artists in producing their works; in the attitudes towards their materials; in the character of their visual experience (not the visual-perception experiments of psychologists) including their experience of works of art; in the necessity for and the limits of imitation".

During this century there has been a shift in art education away from a concern with correct drawing, picture study and hand-eye coordination to an emphasis on developing children's creative capacities.

In the 1920's and into the early 1930's the emphasis was on the therapeutic aspect of art where relationships were seen between the art produced by children and the unconscious needs and desires underlying their behaviour. Art was regarded essentially as a type of therapy; a sort of "preventive medicine which contributes to the psychological comfort of the child" (Eisner and Ecker 1970)

During the 'thirties only certain standard materials and traditional methods were used and it took the shortages of materials imposed by the war years of the 'forties to provide the impetus for teachers to experiment with different and often unusual materials. Collage from discarded packaging, scraps of wood or metal waste or other found objects and basic printing with vegetables are just two examples of the types of innovation brought about by the lack of traditional art materials.
After the war, art teachers found themselves compelled to realise and accept the implications of new developments, particularly in the three-dimensional area, because of the increase in available materials.

When art first appeared in the school curriculum it was in the form of drawing exercises designed to develop skills; in the first half of the century children were encouraged to preserve the naturality, vitality and freshness of their work and until the mid 1950's art education tended to emphasise the value of the naive character of the developing child. Emphasis was placed on the expressive and novel media which were thought to bring out the child's latent creative capacities. Process began to be regarded as being more important than the product, and art began to be seen as an instrument for the attainment of larger and more general educational ends.

During the past twenty five years a radically different conception of art education has emerged. Emphasis has been placed on the importance of the environment in shaping, artistic attitudes and art education has tended to become concept rather than media orientated. Greater importance has been placed on the need for evaluation, and art is becoming increasingly regarded as having a unique contribution to make children's development.

These newer areas of emphasis have expanded considerably the whole scope and character of art education which is now concerned not only with the processes involved in the learning and production, but also with what the child learns and produces. Both process and product are seen as having importance.

Although Witkin (1974) regards art in schools as being "about the people who make it and only about the things made in so far as they are personally expressive of the makers feeling-idea", it seems inappropriate to try to separate process and product or even to emphasise one at the expense of the other.

Barrett (1979) feels that the process/product debate may never be completely resolved and agrees with Field (1970) in seeing the two as inseparable. Undue emphasis on either one provides scope for severe and fundamental criticism on the grounds of inadequacy and lack of comprehensive coverage.

As art is as much an agent of change as it is itself determined by change and new potential in society, any attempt to define it's value and role in education must therefore be sensitive and alert to contemporary issues.
Art education must not be resistant to change but rather must select carefully from the wide range of different proposals for change.

It needs to utilise scientific and philosophic procedures neither of which are, as is sometimes inferred, alien to art education. It may not be acceptable to regard art activity solely as a form of cognition, but it is equally unacceptable to deny the importance of the cognitive attributes of art education.

Although art in the curriculum is not primarily concerned with matters of fact in the way that mathematics is, or with the acquisition of a range of established skills, it has, like other forms of knowledge, its own structure, concepts, procedures and criteria. The function of art teaching is not to increase knowledge, but to understand what is already known.

It is through these that art is to be comprehended. Unlike other areas of the curriculum, there can be no finite understanding of art, for the concepts, procedures and criteria are the focus for speculation, rather than the object of ultimate mastery. Much research is still needed into both the factual and value problems involved in the establishment and enlargement of the traditional domain of art education.

The total value of all art knowledge can be regarded as being not what is actually known, but rather the way in which the knowledge is responded to. Commitment to this seems to be a crucial factor and a prime concern for art educators.

"Art experience is the most direct kind of knowledge we have, and it has a fullness, unity and completeness unknown elsewhere" L. A. Reid (1972)

Visual perception is an intrinsic aspect of art education, for works of art can only be known by direct experience. In this respect, art has no direct parallel with any of the more factual curricular areas.

Aesthetic meanings are gained only by acquaintance, and not by description, as are empirical meanings. Each work of art contains its own meaning and speaks for itself. Aesthetic understanding is immediate and as it refers directly to perceived works of art, it can only be gained by interaction with those particular works of art.
Accepting that art education aims to develop discriminating aesthetic comprehension and an understanding of the arts, then the aesthetic experiences inherent in such an aim are only possible via the direct interaction of the viewer and the work of art. The key element in art education is the experiencing of art.

Whitfield (1971) suggest that art education "is concerned with helping ordinary children to think and feel artistically, to understand art as an element in the growth of human beings, to see art in it's social and historic contexts and to grasp in what ways art might continue to be meaningful to themselves".

Art education does not primarily aim to produce professional artists, nor is it solely concerned with teaching children to observe external objects with exactness, nor is it's essential concern with attempts to sharpen children's powers of observation, classification, or memory. Although obviously some knowledge of what it might mean to be an artist will help, art education is primarily concerned with contributing to the aesthetic education of all pupils, rather than the furthering of an artistically gifted minority.

It is quite widely accepted that art is an expressive activity which is essentially concerned with personal response to feelings, ideas and intuitions. Barrett (1979) goes as far as to say that "Art is the use of the media to organise subjective experiences in visual form" and Bantock (1967) sees art as a means of education through the emotions. The inherent emotion in the arts in general and in art in particular cannot be denied, but it is unjustifiable to regard art solely as a kind of cult of private feelings and emotion. The problems of evaluation of such a subjective approach have already been outlined earlier.

The more extravagant and meaningless claims for art education have been made in the affective domain. The world of feeling has been set against the world of knowledge as representing two mutually exclusive views which they certainly are not.

Some teachers regard children's ideas and feelings as being of ultimate importance and see them as the only real starting point for learning. Bantock (1967) for example, advocates learning through feeling, but the concept is a dangerous one in that the whole point can easily be missed because of the imprecise and subjective nature of the emotions.
The process of art is a total activity which does not make such clear-cut distinctions between feeling and thinking as would be necessary for affectively-based art education.

Plowden (1971) regards art as "not only a matter for the emotions, for many boys and girls it can offer a rewarding discipline of hand, eye and intellect" which whilst not actually supporting the affective view, does not do full justice to art as a way of knowing.

The concerns of art education can be regarded as being with perception, creativity, emotion, expression, and cognition, and can be seen as aiming to enable children to "participate in and contribute to the aesthetic well-being of society" Allison (1978)

The most appropriate teaching process for art education would seem to be heuristic, i.e., learning by finding out, and Eisner (1971) delineates the four areas of expressive, perceptual, analytical/critical and historical/cultural which need to be covered by art education.

The general objectives of art education need to be translated into appropriate activities, which are related to the developmental stage of the children and which form part of the sequential process so essential to any form of art education.

It is quite useful to classify Eisner's two kinds of objective: the instructional objective, concerned with what the learner has to acquire, and the expressive objective which is concerned with the ways in which the learner uses what he has acquired. As it is not always possible to have precise outcomes with expressive objective, different methods of evaluation are needed for each kind. Evaluation is however, essential so that the efficiency of the teaching methods can be established, and the extent of the learner's development can be ascertained.

Because all art education involves change, the establishment of the precise point on the developmental continuum which a child has reached is useful in determining the progress which has been made.

Traditionally, art teachers have not been in favour of evaluation due to the vague and imprecise nature of what they feel is being or should be assessed.
If the premise of art as a way of knowing is accepted, then it must also be accepted that art criteria cannot be based on the norms or standards of other-than-art subjects. Art can only be known, and evaluated through the concepts, criteria and procedures which are essential and peculiar to it's nature.

Barrett (1979) suggests that all evaluation of art work is subjective, but again the argument against such a view on the grounds of justification and public accountability does seem to be an over-riding one. Where art is reduced to a solely subjective experience it can never hope to claim a justifiable place in the school curriculum.

To regard art solely as creative and personal rather than systemised, social and cognitive, cannot do justice to any kind of publicly acceptable evaluation and must therefore denegrate the subject to the level from which it is desperately attempting to rise.

Eisner (1966) sees evaluation as "judgement of the adequacy of behaviour as compared to a set of educational objectives". He qualifies this rather psychological point of view by suggesting that this can only apply where educational activities are planned to achieve specific ends.

However, the objectives of art education may not always be pre-planned, for the artefacts which are very often produced or the process which has learned have not been forseen, and teachers are quite often faced with the task of trying to exploit the accidental and ephemeral qualities which are displayed in a piece of artwork.

Comparison between the pieces of artwork produced by a peer group need not, necessarily be the dominant method of evaluation, although frequently the art product is regarded as the primary data for comparison. A more comprehensive method is the comparison of a pupil's piece of work with that which he has previously produced thereby giving some indication of the personal development which has been achieved.

Frequently in the past, and to a lesser extent at the present time, art has tended to generate undemonstrable goals. Although there have always been some demonstrable goals in art education, there has also always been difficulty in the evaluation of programmes of art education on levels other than superficial ones, or in terms of skill acquisition.
Art education must be at once both product and process, both ends and means, and must be able to demonstrate what children have learned from their art experience. Some feedback is essential if any system of art education can hope to lay claim to being efficient and to be regarded as educationally justifiable.

Art education attempts to develop its own peculiar and particular competences and understanding in its own unique way. Even though it shares some common ground with other educational experiences its nature tends to present difficulties and confusion as to precisely what it aims to develop and the reasons for doing so.

There must be something to be learned per se in any art experience just as there must be some content in any area of learning. This content needs to be defined, and learning experiences need to be structured along lines suggested by the nature of the content.

However, if as with art, some of the content is undefinable, or intangible then it is difficult to see ways of organising it into specific patterns. This then makes it very difficult to determine if anything has been learned.

The content of art education must be accepted as being in itself worthwhile, and as making a valuable contribution to the artistic development of the child.

It is necessary to determine what ought to be the responsibilities of art education so that teachers are clear as to the content which has to be dealt with and so that they are aware of the particular areas for which they have the sole responsibility for teaching.

Without proper structuring it is easy to be fooled into believing that the art experiences provided are valuable, expressive and educational, when in reality they may be little more than a conglomeration of ideas lacking in sequence and sustaining philosophy. Lack of structuring shows lack of philosophy, preparation and planning, and often leads to a desperate search for new ideas, gimmicks and novelties which may arrest children's waving interest.

Art education is being subjected to a more critical review of its role, function and its implications for education than almost any other subject in the school curriculum.
Every major educational report issued during this century has supported the view that art is an essential of a balanced curriculum.

Despite the support given by reports, particularly those covering the last forty years, art is still generally regarded as a peripheral subject.

This state of affairs would seem to stem from the inability or unwillingness of art teachers to formulate a case to justify and clarify the important function of art education. It may even be losing ground because of this apparent inability to articulate it's case.

The reluctance of art teachers to define strategies and rationales for art education stems from their fear of being confined by a structure which will subsequently restrict their freedom of operation.

This is a misconception, for a framework need not be prescriptive for methods of operation, but would act as a foundation for curricular argument and justification. Where attempts have been made to establish a framework, art teachers have often felt the need to justify art in terms used by other subjects, and have sought values other than art-values with which to support the inclusion of art in the curriculum. Art has often been regarded as therapeutic or recreational, neither of which are the essential concerns of the subject, and both of which demean art to a most trivial level. Neither therapy nor recreation can be advocated as being adequate justification for art as a curricular activity.

Similarly art is more than merely a design process; in fact Hinx-Edwards (1981) considers that at the moment art is being strangled by the teaching of design.

Although the ethos of the artist/craftsman which William Morris created cannot be denied, nor can the subsequent linking of art with traditional skill, it can be generally accepted that much progress has taken place and that the Victorian ideal of the artist craftsman no longer really obtains.

Traditionally the training of art teachers has often centred around the furtherence of their own practice, plus some superficial attempt to reconcile art and education. Art teachers have in the past often regarded themselves essentially as artists who need to teach in order to live.
Teachers of art require much more than good intentions; perceptual and intuitive insight into art and culture are also needed. The ability to manipulate the materials cannot masquerade as art education; visual, discrimination, the development of perception, the relationship of material to form and function expression and communication, critical analysis and appraisal, and realisation of the historical and social context of art are all vital ingredients in programmes of art education.

Unfortunately much of what has taken place in schools under the name of art has depended to a great extent on the person or persons who happened to be there at any given time; there has been relatively little common agreement on what has been taught. This "teacher-centred" art education has, despite some attempt at guidance by the G.C.E. and C.S.E. boards, tended to be so general as to be almost useless in the definition of areas of emphasis and special concern. Even though there may be apparent agreement about the aim of art education, problems abound in the formulation of procedures to be adopted to achieve these aims.

Many of the problems facing art education stem from pre-conceptions of it which may be derived from parental attitudes, peer group interaction or careers advice. Such comments as "What use is it Sir?", "What is it for", "It's not a proper subject is it Sir, not like Maths and English" or "I'd like to do it, but may parents say I've got to do Chemistry" may all lead to children making inappropriate subject choices.

Subject status, timetable inflexibility, minimal time allocation and related resources also tend to work against the acceptance of art education as an equal contender alongside the more traditional academic subjects.

The unfamiliarity of parents with the inherent nature of art and the failure of artists to produce a universally acceptable definition may well be major factors which contribute to the general inability to convince parents of the value and objectivity of the subject.

They may well believe that art is little more than a matter of indisputable personal taste, and as such it does not require the same consideration as empirically-based subject areas. The whole of art education may even be dismissed as futile, subjective and irrelevant. It may be quite a difficult job in today's technologically-orientated society to convince parents that their child needs art just as much as he needs science and maths.
Inevitably the question will arise "how will art help to get my child a job?"; such vocational questions appear to be assuming an ever increasing importance and to demand somewhat inordinate consideration in secondary schools. Goals related to the General Certificate of Education on the more academic subjects are often regarded as more profitable and justifiable than time spent on art.

Arguments in favour of the value of liberal education appear somewhat flimsy and tenuous in the face of such an onslaught; other curricular areas may even join forces with parents and pupils in support of such views.

Research (Eisner 1972) has indicated that many parents regard the school principally as a means to achieve social and economic mobility for their children.

Generally the time available for art decreases as the age of the children increases which is also true for other curricular areas such as music and religious education. The option system which is operative in the fourth and fifth years is generally geared to the more economics orientated and more academic subjects. Not only is art often set against certain prestigious subjects in the options, but teachers frequently guide academically able children from it.

By the allocation of time and other similar manifestations, children are soon able to ascertain where the school's emphasis lies.

Art education is a fundamental means of orientation derived from the need to understand ourselves and the world around us. If art is anything at all it can be seen as a quality of life which is to be intrinsically savoured and which draws attention to the non-instrumental aspects of life. "Art teaches us how to be alive" (Eisner 1972)

Experience of art itself should be at the root of art education, for through it we may have the means of a unique mode of insight into perception, imagination and other mental processes. The experience of art may be seen as a means of structuring the study of art education as well as being it's central concept and major aim. The prime value of art education is, then, in the unique contribution which it makes to the individual's experience with and understanding of the world through the aesthetic contemplation of visual form.
CRAFTS

As there is considerable commonality of philosophy amongst the subjects which can be generically termed 'crafts', it seems logical and justifiable to consider them together. For the present purpose emphasis will be placed on the heavy crafts of woodwork and metalwork, light craft activities (which may however in practice form an integral part of art education) and needlework and fabric-based subjects. Home economics is also reviewed, not because of its commonality with the other craft subjects, but because in practice it is generally included in the crafts area of the school curriculum.

The traditional emphasis on craft skills which has to some extent militated against the achievement of the real goals of craft education stems from the early origins of craft subjects.

"Manual instruction" is seen by E. Thring in "Education and School" (1867) as providing "balance within the curriculum by offering relief from academic study".

The introduction of manual training and housecraft in early elementary schools is closely associated with the utilitarian approaches which characterised this particular sector of education. Craft education was seen as a form of pre-vocational training for the rapidly growing ranks of semi-skilled and domestic workers.

Because of these historical antecedents the crafts have traditionally been regarded as being of low status. The early leaders in the field of craft education were the Swedes who from 1870 onwards developed the Sloyd method. It's aims were cultural rather than vocational and the emphasis was on manual dexterity, self reliance, and respect for the dignity of work.

In the 1880's the Sloyd method was introduced and developed in England, but despite this, craft teaching was very formal even into the early part of the twentieth century, with the distinct segregation of boys crafts exclusively for boys and girls crafts solely for girls.

Practical craftwork has been recognised as a school subject since the turn of the century and by 1937 the emphasis had been placed on design. The need for cooperation between the art teacher, and the craft teacher was laid down in the Board of Educations Handbook of Suggestions (1937) and the importance of the expressive goals of the crafts had been stressed by both the Art and Crafts Movement and the Bauhaus.
Although practical subjects for boys had a rather slower and more difficult start than the subjects traditionally regarded as girls' crafts, since the 1944 Education Act, there has been a growing concern with the creative aspects of all craft subjects. Developments during this century have been considerable because of the increasing concern with the material environment and the growing realisation that education must be concerned with the utilisation, control, and preservation of the environment.

From the middle of the century until the early seventies, art tended to move towards expressionism whilst the crafts moved towards craftsmanship. Historically the crafts were seen as providing a vocationally-oriented aspect of education which was often regarded as being of particular value and relevance to non-academic pupils. This widely held view consequently tended to widen the rift between art and the crafts.

Since 1970, the expressive aspect of art has become less dominant and developments, particularly in America, have led to the emergence of art and design courses which tend to subsume the design aspect in essentially art-based activities.

The idea of the craft subjects being of special relevance to the needs of the academically less able has been one of the major problems in regard to its status in the curriculum. The benefits of the crafts suggested by the Crowther Report (1959) can be regarded as widening the gap between the crafts and the academically able by suggesting that they provide "the alternative route to knowledge", implying that pupils who are unable to achieve academic success can somehow achieve success via the crafts. This not only lessens the value of the craft subjects but also makes fallacious assumptions about the remedial and therapeutic values of the crafts.

Dodd (1978) suggests that the two distinct educational traditions of scholarship in the grammar schools and apprenticeship in workshops may have further split the arts from the crafts.

The crafts have generally been concerned with the acquisition of skills and with utilitarian aspects and this may well be an important factor in distinguishing them from the arts in terms of different forms of experience. Their concern with practical and utilitarian issues has unfortunately perpetuated social divisions and has resulted in the crafts being ranked lower than subjects exhibiting concern with child-centred aims.
The low status which has been afforded to the crafts is not solely due to their concern with practical issues. Society's unwillingness to equate high educational achievement with a career in industry has also been a significant contributing factor.

Traditional views of crafts education being essentially vocational and utilitarian are somewhat unfair, for particularly during the last thirty years craft teachers have endeavoured to offer technological understanding, aesthetic judgement through the use of materials, transmission of values, knowledge and skill as well as standards of craftsmanship and the vocational and utilitarian aspects of their subjects.

Where the crafts are regarded as being education through the use of materials, this view also fails to do full justice to their nature and to their contribution to education. Craft education needs to be regarded as the traditional doing and making, plus a parallel emphasis on thinking with a greater concern for problem solving rather than 'copying'.

The metamorphosis of the crafts into design education has, in general terms, led to a much better coverage of craft experience in terms both of depth and breadth. Many of the craft aims and objectives have become part of the overall concept of design education since it's inception in the early 1970's.

The handling of materials has played an important part in the school curriculum for a number of years, and a considerable amount of craft education has tended to retain it's highly traditional emphasis on fine craftsmanship which may not perhaps be entirely relevant to twentieth-century education.

Craft education needs to become more concerned with the development of personal expression as well as with the participation of the individual, and whilst the working with materials offers pupils excitement and enthusiasm, the crafts are becoming increasingly concerned with the goals of creativity, inventiveness and discovery.

They aim to develop motivation for the achievement of their objectives and to develop personality traits and attitudes, creativity, skill the ability to use logical processes and strategies to develop knowledge. Claims have been made for the role which the crafts may play in vocational and moral education and in areas such as non-verbal communication, and whilst they make an undoubted contribution to these areas, they do not represent the essence of craft experience and are not attributes which are unique to the crafts.
Throughout the history of craft education generalised and extravagant claims have been made for social awareness, and aesthetic judgement and discrimination resulting from the production of a single utilitarian item which has considerably weakened the position of the crafts. Spurious and nebulous claims such as these can only result in the devaluation of the subject area. Fortunately, since the Keele incentive of the 1970's the more recent claims for the value of craft education relate to the specific nature of the particular craft subject. They have generally been offered under the heading of design education and enable the subjects to be revalued.

As a field of knowledge the crafts have a vitally important part to play in the curriculum as an area of experience to which the disciplines of art and science may contribute, Craft Design Technology is an example of recent development in which both areas have a vital part to play. An important feature of craft education is that it can offer a range of intellectual, aesthetic and practical activities to a wide range of pupils.

Undoubtedly the creative nature of the crafts is of major importance, and they must be regarded as processes of creative activity in which the product is the result or record of the experience. Just as with art, both the process and the product are vital to the creative craft experience.

Craft subjects are also concerned to a large extent with spatial perceptions which is another essential attribute of their unique nature. If the crafts are to be justifiable and comparable with other school subjects, a problem solving approach is both vital and essential. Crafts teaching needs to be not only concerned with the teaching of procedures, but also with the creation of problems calling for personal solutions. Where the teacher has a ready-made solution, the opportunity of growth through experience is destroyed, and the pupil's confidence in his own ability to create may well be adversely affected.

Craft education has an obvious and essential concern with the acquisition of skill, but schools should not limit their craft teaching to only a few processes as the constant development of new materials suggests that the area of craft education is ever widening and increasing it is by the acquisition of skills that pupils become able to carry out their ideas directly and without always needing to learn how to use the tools first. Ideally the tools, materials and processes should become the means to the extension of the pupils thinking, rather than the end or focus of it.
The best practice of craft teachers has focused particularly on the overlap between art and craft "the best handwork cannot be divorced from good taste and artistic feeling" (Board Curricular 1292-1922). Essentially there is a close relationship between art and craft, for good artists are craftsmen, and good craftsmen are, at least sometimes, artists.

Any attempt to justify the crafts as school subjects comes up against the problem of evaluation because many of the aims are so long-term. Craft activities have often been used instrumentally by the servicing other subjects, but it is only the reference to their own intrinsic individual and essential nature that they can claim justification as areas of experience worthy of inclusion in the school curriculum.

Because of the rapid developments in technology and the subsequent increase in new materials, craft teaching must, perhaps more than other subjects, take account of societal and economic demands. The crafts can provide experiences which will be of direct relevance to the industrial world and they can inculcate attitudes desirable in young people entering into an industrially-based society.

Reference so far has been to the crafts in general terms, and the majority of the points covered are relevant to all the craft subjects. The heavy crafts of woodwork and metalwork have tended to suffer greatly for want of a clear definition of their purpose and value and have lost ground by concerning themselves with aims which could be applied to many subjects, rather than "nature of the subject" aims. They have tended to see themselves as being essentially concerned with skill acquisition which has lowered their status and has led to them being regarded as suitable only for the academically less-able.

Only relatively recently have the heavy crafts moved towards the suggestions made in the Ministry of Education pamphlet No. 22 "Metalwork in the Secondary School" (1952) which states that "crafts are taught in schools to stimulate children's intellectual development, to give confidence born of accomplishment, to encourage discernment and promote good taste. Through creative experience in a variety of media a child can be led to distinguish and appreciate quality in craftsmanship and to value and enjoy beauty even in a sombre environment".

The growing concern with technology and with technological aspects of the curriculum has led to the emergence of new craft-based courses which tend to operate across formerly discrete subject areas.
Craft Design and Technology is one such area which could claim a place within a creative arts department.

It has become a subject of growing importance in schools and includes handicraft plus design plus technology, with the emphasis not merely on skill acquisition, but on learning through the use of materials. It offers a basis for understanding the effects of technology on life; provides a grounding in manipulative skills and a logical approach to problem solving. It develops the effective economic and aesthetic use of resources and provides a valuable and practical preparation for life.

The aims of Craft Design and Technology are to develop the skills required during the process of designing and making things, and to develop a fundamental understanding of the concepts involved. Communication, creativity, techniques of problem-solving, knowledge, affect, materials experience and the constructional aspects of design are all important attributes which are able to be developed in significant ways. A particularly important aspect is it's need to integrate knowledge from various fields and to reconcile their often conflicting claims. In schools it needs to be available for all ages. It requires integrated understanding, should provide problem-solving and evaluation, and ought to be available for the most able as well as the least able.

Craft Design and Technology opens up new areas of experience and extends the compass of the present argument into a much wider field. The area of Design also introduces a whole range of considerations which may well confuse rather than clarify the points at issue. For this reason Craft, Design and Technology is regarded as a craft area of comparable status to the heavy crafts. Design will be dealt with later as a separate issue.

The girls crafts have traditionally encompassed needlework and home economics, but the latter is really a rogue subject in both the crafts and in the creative arts department and could be considered equally well as an arts subject or as a science.

In the late nineteenth century, the obligatory subjects which elementary schools had to offer were reading, writing, arithmetic, and for girls, needlework.

Unfortunately and again due to a lack of an adequate definition of it's value and essential nature, needlework is in a position where unless radical changes take place quickly, it will be degraded to become merely a craft skill in which children learn to sew as a hobby.
Changes in needlework need to be accomplished through changes in teacher education, and in some cases, courses have been developed to attempt to revitalise the whole idea of needlework in schools.

An essential change has begun to take place regarding the nomenclature of the subject and courses in textile studies which are relevant to all children are being developed. Such courses are concerned with the buying, wearing and caring for clothes and give more scope for creativity and imagination as well as moving away from the traditional role of needlework courses as being merely sewing skills.

At the moment there is great concern to carefully consider and evaluate the subject and to make it more relevant and attractive. It has often been regarded as a peripheral option in secondary education and has tended to be too easily squeezed out from the mainstream of the curriculum.

At the secondary level, textile studies should be concerned with factual knowledge as well as with practical experience if it hopes to gain in status.

There is essentially a strong utilitarian element in textile studies which makes it very similar to woodwork and metalwork in its use and manipulation of materials, but like them, it should not be allowed to denegrate to the level of a mere skill by ignoring its aesthetic, affective, expressive and cognitive aspects.

Although textile studies tends to be grouped with home economics and is generally regarded as girls crafts, virtually all the recent developments in schools relating to fabric and fashion design have been the result of the work of art teachers, rather than ensuing from the home economics department.

Whilst considerable problems have been indicated with regard to the nature and value of art and the crafts, home economics is perhaps the most difficult area of experience to deal with. Traditionally it, like needlework, has also been regarded as being a "girls craft". Much of the current literature sees it in a much wider context, as essentially scientific, and places a heavy emphasis on hygiene and food science.

In the majority of schools however, home economics will still be found within the orbit of the creative arts department.
"Home economics is a field of knowledge and service concerned primarily with strengthening family life" (Fleck 1968) and it is generally seen as being concerned with educating pupils for family living and improving the services and goods used by families.

Traditionally home economics has taken food, clothing and shelter as it's contexts for problem-solving, but often, syllabuses have tended to narrow this down to the context of food alone. However, home economics is not concerned with the production of chefs, nor solely with the production of food. There is much diversity of experience and the whole field needs to be seen as a synthesis of a variety of areas.

The content of home economics is an amalgam of knowledge developed by it's own workers and of that developed by the physical, biological and social sciences, arts and humanities which are all applicable to the improvement of family living.

As with the heavy crafts, spurious and generalised claims of home economics being a panacea for all educational development have lead to cynicism and denigration. The study of home economics certainly "helps a person to develop as an individual" and may well develop an "appetite for learning". No doubt it may also be able to develop "values which give guidance and direction to life", but none of these are exclusive to home economics and none represent the unique contribution which can only be made by home economics.

The suggestion by Hall and Paolucci (1970) that "Most of all, the home economist realises her value to the community by her ability to help families lead happier lives" by it's subjective and essentially hedonistic nature abandons all claim for home economics to be seriously regarded as an area of experience worthy of inclusion in the school curriculum.

Outsiders tend to have difficulty in seeing the nature and purpose of home economics and the literature has done relatively little to help clarify this situation. Although home economics seems to have very nebulous and ill-defined aims, and is very difficult to define, it can be established that it is concerned with intellectual, manipulative, organisational and social skills and that it is it's concern with the practical which has led it to be included in creative arts groupings.
"The purpose of home economics in the secondary school is for pupils to learn those skills that will help them to fill their roles as family members in the most satisfying manner for themselves, their families and their communities". (Hall and Paolucci 1970)

Hall and Paolucci also see home economics as having some sort of integrating function in joining together physics, maths, music, religion, chemistry and philosophy and applying them to the "daily process of making a home". The discrete and very specialised training of home economics teachers with it's heavy concentration on social training may well account in part for the nebulous nature of the subject, it has not, until recently been in line with teacher training for other subjects. Only in the early 1980's are institutions such as the University of Technology at Loughborough making plans to produce a home economics degree course.

The nature of home economics has recently undergone considerable change in ways comparable with those undertaken by the heavy crafts in that skill acquisition is no longer enough, and pupils are now required to use their understanding and reasoning to logically solve real problems found in everyday living and to apply the knowledge which they have gained to new situations.

Home economics is concerned with creativity and aesthetic development by the fostering of discrimination and the development of critical taste via food production and the selection of artefacts and furnishings for the home.

The whole field of home economics is built on the basic premise that man could realise his potential for effective individual and family life more easily and satisfactorily if a concerted effort was made to utilise all known information and to focus it on the needs and functions of the family.

It aims to develop good citizenship, good parentship, stable and happy individuals and to improve the standard of all skills relating to the home. It is however very difficult to assess the success of home economics because it's major results may well occur after the pupil has left school.

The definite contribution of home economics to general education is seen by the Schools Council (Home Economics Teaching 1971) as by affording opportunities for practice in the organisation and planning of work.
Edwards (1981) sees home economics as a genuine science having physical, chemical and biological principles behind it's craft skills and the dichotomy as to whether it should be regarded as a craft or a science has to some extent lessened it's currency value as a school subject. It's status and time allocation in secondary education have been eroded because of the high costs in terms of staff and material resources, it's historical reputation, and because it has not tended to offer any obviously unique features which would ensure for it a secure place in the main curriculum.

In summary, home economics develops personal qualities, intellect, discrimination and aesthetic appreciation, develops self-awareness and societal awareness, prepares for adult roles and develops the particular skills and knowledge of the subject.

It's place within the creative arts department is tenuous not only because of it's lack of commonality, with other arts subjects but also because of it's dual role as an arts and or a science subject.

This arts/science dichotomy is being accentuated by the differing approaches taken by technical education and by the schools. There is a strong movement in colleges of Further Education for home economics to become "Food Science". This tends to be based on reasons of status, whereas some L.E.A.'s in an attempt to encourage schools to reappraise technology, energy use, and food development and conservation, tend to move home economics towards "Living Studies".

**DRAMA**

"From the very earliest days drama has fulfilled a basic need in man. It has enabled him to come to terms with himself and his environment" (Pemberton-Billing and Clegg 1965)

Drama lacks a simple and clear cut definition and, like other creative and experiential subjects, neither does it have a set body of knowledge to impart. Unlike the crafts it does not even have a clearly defined range of skills to be taught, for drama skills tend to be of a more nebulous nature and need to be acquired through self-exploration.

Fundamentally, drama can be regarded as a means of personal or group expression, and as such is a very subjective area of experience.
Way (1967) suggests a basic definition of drama as being "to practise living", but like many of the panaceic definitions of home economics, such a definition can be easily criticised as being banal, spurious very difficult to justify and so general as to be applicable to almost every subject and aspect of education.

Although drama can be regarded as being a relatively intangible area of experience, it is essentially creative and is grounded in the personal experiences and individual personalities of its participants Way (1967) goes as far as to suggest that drama is as intangible as personality itself, but although it may be as fraught with confusion and lack of definition as some other arts subjects, unless it's nature and value can be at least partly established, then it, like them, cannot hope to lay claim to a place in the school curriculum.

Drama's function can be seen as to provide direct experience which transcends the kind knowledge with which the more academic subjects are concerned, enriches the imagination and has some affective consequence.

Certainly drama is concerned with "knowing how" and aims to develop self-expression, imagination, movement, speech, organisation of ideas, originality, emotional growth, learning to listen, role play, social training, tolerance and aesthetic awareness.

The use of the senses of hearing, seeing, touching, smelling and tasting and mastery and control of the physical self are all essential parts of the drama experience. Although it is a strongly subjective experience, drama must be concerned with intellect if it is to avoid the charge of being totally subjective and in order that it may be effectively evaluated. Unfortunately drama is often seen as being to do with directionless self-expression and the generalised expression of emotion and feeling and this inaccurate and superficial view is a major factor which lays the subject wide open to criticism regarding justification.

It is fallacious to criticise drama as being merely an enjoyable activity which fits in with the freedom of the "modern approach" to education. It is too easy to see drama as an emotional mud bath having no value other than as an enjoyable but somewhat chaotic activity.

"Improvisation lies at the heart of school drama. It's contribution to the growth of children can be considerable. But a great deal of improvisation is shapeless and without clear purpose.
Much of the uncertainty in improvisation lies in the widespread use of movement by teachers of drama without a clear idea of it's nature. Too often it is thought to be "good for the children" and to help their self expression.  
D.E.S. Education Survey No. 2 Drama HMSO 1967  

Drama activity is not free; participants cannot be left to sort out self-expression on their own, and drama in schools must be very carefully structured. Although rather ironically, too much planning may destroy the spontenity and freshness of drama. Some sort of programme of activity and experience is essential.  

Way (1967) suggests that drama teachers need to be free to approach the subject in their own way, but this rather laissez-faire attitude can lead to pupils underachieving. Without structure, both visible progress and evaluation become so nebulous as to be almost impossible.  

Like the other arts subjects, drama is fraught with problems of evaluation because of the personal and subjective part of it's essential nature. The ends of drama teaching are also so long term that they may never be known to the school which has provided the drama experience.  

Drama is an art form concerned with make-believe activity and as such it involves the symbolic representation of experience.  

Although drama is concerned with pretending, this must not be seen as escapism, for the pretence acts as the foundation for a series of important interactions between individuals which are concerned with role play, evokation of emotions and aesthetic response, for example.  

It can be seen as an activity which develops through play and as it is essentially a social activity, the opportunities which it affords for social learning are considerable.  

Unlike many other art forms which are essentially personal experiences, drama is a collective activity essentially concerned with the collective explorations of felt experience and being concerned with collective statements. To a lesser extent dance, music and P.E. can be seen to have some degree of concern with collective experience, but not in the essential way which is unique to drama.
Where drama is included in the curriculum (for in some schools it does not appear at all) it tends to be on the fringe in terms of allocation of time, money and staff. In fact along with music, it can be regarded as being one of the least well provided for in terms of resources amongst the arts.

The essence of the case for drama lies in its ability to handle knowledge, learning and development of the whole person through its specific concern with the affective experience.

"Work in drama involves approaches to knowledge, to the development of personal growth and to the exploration of social and political values which should be at the core of secondary schooling now and in the future" (Mason 1981). The affective area of experience needs emphasis and generally very little work has been done to attempt to evaluate it using sympathetic criteria, and to justify drama's unique contribution to affective education.

If Drama is to be successful in its claim to be able to teach children about life, the self and relationships with others it is essential that children in schools actually participate in drama activity. Schools do not exist to develop actors, and therefore drama in schools needs to be generally child-centred rather than being theatre experience or drama for an audience which tend not to be apposite to the needs of all children.

The distinction between drama and theatre is an important one and it is essential to separate them. Drama may exist most clearly as an art form in terms of theatre, but theatre may always remain the concern of the few, for the ability to communicate to an audience may well be beyond the capabilities of most children.

There appears to be less justification for drama in terms of theatre in schools because of this essential concern with communication between actor and audience, whereas drama as a participating activity with its inherent freedom to develop personal ideas is able to fulfil the wider and more pertinent educational aims already outlined. Theatre can also be seen as being too restrictive in its need to keep to scripts, and may not be able to provide the breadth of conceptual knowledge which is available through drama.

Drama is a creative activity, and as such it fulfils the normal function of all creative activity by providing a medium through which the individual can express his own ideas.
Unlike the crafts, the mastery of media skill in drama is of much less importance as the skills to be learned are of a much less specific nature. It is however important to mention that good drama is per se a result of the mastery of drama skills.

The excitement of drama is seen as lying in the richness and variety of its resources and drama is for the performer role play through which hypothetical situations which may not be available in real life may be experienced and by which the understanding of the individual and his environment is extended and deepened.

Because of its personal form of expression, and its relative lack of media skills, drama may well have a high success factor for all children. Its "no-one answer" nature, which may well be a distinguishing feature of all creative arts subjects allows children to offer an individual interpretation which is not necessarily a right or wrong answer.

The form and content of drama must be appropriate to the role it is expected to fulfil and in order to do this some attempt must be made to identify its underlying aims.

Dodd and Hickson (1971) see drama as "aiming to help children to understand so that they are helped to face facts and to interpret them without prejudice, so that they develop a range and degree of identification with other people; so that they develop a set of principles, a set of consistent principles by which they are going to live".

The claims made for drama by enthusiasts are often exaggerated and are often very difficult to substantiate, but it’s potential as a valuable and worthwhile experience has become apparent. If dramatists could identify definition, aims, and ways in which drama can contribute to learning, its case would be more substantial and more watertight.

"Educational drama has grown rapidly in recent years and is still expanding, but there is, as yet no clearly definable discipline that can be so identified. There is for example, no general agreement on it’s relation to English with it’s literary and linguistic content, to movement dance and music" (DES Report on Education No. 50 1968)
Drama can exist in its own right, or in association with other subjects and unfortunately it is very often regarded as being instrumental to the achievement of the aims of some other subject. It is often used for example in history to give children the flavour of an incident, and whilst this may be quite justifiable and acceptable, it is only a part of what drama can contribute to general education. It must make some contribution per se which cannot be achieved in any other way. It's claim for inclusion in the curriculum must rest on more than its ability to be a tool for language or other kinds of non-drama learning.

Drama should only be used instrumentally after existing in its own right and having its own inherent value. It must be intrinsically experienced before being considered as a means to the achievement of extrinsic ends.

**MUSIC**

If Jones' (1981) assumption of music as the largest industry in the world is correct, it is incredible that although it affects the lives of almost everyone, no-one really knows why it is listened to.

Fundamentally music has no rationale which bears examination and is able to stand up well against the views of different pressure groups. The crux of the problem, just as with art, lies in the lack of any kind of conceptual framework.

Music can be regarded as filling a basic human desire in that it satisfies the need to comprehend the tonal beauty which man is able to hear. As only music is able to achieve this it becomes the distinctive contribution which music is able to make to the experience of life.

It can be seen as a natural discipline, like dance or drama in which the body can be used as the medium, but whatever form music takes, be it singing, instrumental, written or heard, it is a complex phenomenon.

It is far too simplistic to regard music as organised sound, for it is much more than this. Sound can be organised without becoming music. Musical sounds have regular vibration characteristics as opposed to the irregular sound waves of a noise, but even this fails to take account of the distinction between materials and elements and does not really afford the concise and universal definition of music which would be so useful a foundation.
The raw materials of musical experience are tones, each of which has its own pitch, loudness and timbre and it is these qualities which make up the sensuous material of music.

Music is concerned with expression, emotion and communication and aims to help to further the awareness of sound patterns as aesthetic components in the world of experience. It aims to increase the capacity to control the availability of aesthetic richness and aims to give individuals meaningful experience of the heritage of musical culture.

The idea of music simply as a pleasurable experience is attractive and offers a simple (albeit subjective and superficial) way of evaluation but at the same time it obviously denigrates music to a very low level. It is infinitely more than merely being a form of recreation and should play a decisive part in the development of both intellect and affect.

Musical experience can be analysed into patterns of melody, harmony, rhythm and tonal colour, and in common with the other arts areas, it has to be perceived at first hand. Participation in the experience is of vital importance for music knowledge can only come from the study of music itself.

In music, structured patterns are developed in a sophisticated and analysable form, and although the view of Levi-Strauss (Jones 1981) of music as "the supreme mastery amongst human knowledge" might be regarded with some scepticism, music as a form of knowledge has a unique contribution to make to the education of all children.

Music is concerned fundamentally with the three areas of: creative music making, by playing one's own tunes; recreative music making, by playing others' tunes; and appreciation, by listening to music.

Music education, is regarded by Broudy (1958) as "deliberately instituted procedures designed to shape the musical skill, knowledge and taste of the learner" and needs to reflect this threefold concern with creation, performing, either by playing or singing, and with listening.

"Man's relationship to music becomes educational when succeeding generations are assisted in becoming critically intelligent about musical styles and forms, about the organisation and design of sound, and about the social, emotional and physical phenomena which characterise music as an art form" (Schwadron 1967)
The scope of music in schools has recently widened to include the making of original music by children along with the more traditional musical activities such as singing, listening and the playing of instruments.

Music education is passing through an interesting although difficult period, where the last ten or so years have seen a tremendous proliferation of ideas and suggestions.

In secondary education in particular music needs to be of a wider scope than an elementary theory of music and singing, and needs to include the history of music, aesthetic values, and any other aspects which could help to complete an all-round education.

McMurray (in Henry 1958) sees the primary aims of music education as being "help everyone to further awareness of patterns of sound as an aesthetic component in the world of experience; to increase each person's capacity to control the availability of aesthetic richness through music; to transform the public musical culture into a recognisable part of each person's environment".

Music in schools should aim not to produce musicians, but to give all children the opportunity to create and recreate music to the best of their ability, and to extend their musical knowledge.

It should not be reserved for the specially talented, but is of universal importance and is able to be benefit to all children.

By the provision of general values and experiences which are unique to itself, music can claim a place in the central core of experiences which are considered to be necessary for all children and can, therefore, expect a place in the secondary school curriculum.

Once it has attempted to identify its philosophical base and has developed basic concepts consistent with this, music is able to make a unique contribution to general education in areas such as aesthetic growth, the productive use of leisure time and affective development.

Music has tended to function in schools either ritualistically in religious or secular ceremonial ways, or in terms of the conservation of the cultural heritage of music. It has tended to be rather vaguely defined, and has remained rather aloof and untouched by developments in child-centred education.
Generally it has relied too heavily and for too long on the rather narrow limits of its academic preserves. Music should not be taught merely as mental training or as the acquisition of techniques, it must also be concerned with the experience of music rather than with knowledge about music.

"The purpose of all music teaching must be to bring about the evolution of musical responsiveness or musicality" (Henry 1958)

Music may be seen as facing possibly the sternest task of all the arts because of the remoteness of the traditional music curriculum from the lives of the children which it hopes to influence. Pupils obviously need to have experience of contemporary music which is again an attribute it has in common with the other arts. The problems which are experienced by the distinctions between serious and popular art are equally valid and pertinent to classical and popular music.

Music education should make the listener more discriminating and sophisticated with regard to the materials and forms involved in music.

A key concept is connoisseurship, for all children need to develop taste and appreciation, which tends to increase with the growth of musical skill, knowledge, and the ability to understand and discriminate musical qualities.

This concept of connoisseurship tends to encourage the use of materials regarded by past experts as good or of importance; it does not exclude the contemporary or the avant-garde but does evaluate them in terms of musical knowledge and cultural taste.

Just as with art, music in schools is concerned with both process and product. Music education is not entirely or solely concerned with composition or performance in the same way that art is, for most people, are concerned with the appreciation of the art object rather than its production.

However, it must be emphasised that skill in performance undoubtedly does aid appreciation and generally leads to a better understanding of musical components through the familiarity gained from them by their use. Production is however an essential attribute if music is to be regarded as being personally expressive.
Concentration on the aesthetic side of music education rather than the productive, lays the subject open to the danger of becoming purely passive. Broudy (1958) argues that the place of music in the curriculum should be based on aesthetic considerations, for he sees the ability to detect aesthetic form as being at the heart of music education.

Music has obviously some primary concern with aesthetic experience, for it has to be perceived in order that it may be understood and appreciated, and this interaction between individual and artform is one of its prime purposes. However, to maintain that it is its sole or primary purpose does not do full justice to its expressive and creative attributes.

Frequently music falls short of fulfilling its expressive and creative functions in secondary education because of this insistence on it being primarily an aesthetic experience. Whilst it has as much intellectual content as any other curricular area, it also contributes significantly to affective experience as well.

Music can be seen as one of the most natural artistic media of expression and is not only a skill-learning activity and part of the cultural heritage, but also it is an important means of creative self-expression.

For most people music has generally been an interpretative rather than a creative experience by the singing of others songs and playing of other's tunes but in recent years the idea has developed that children should work creatively with the raw materials of the musician.

Innovatory music teachers have attempted to develop creativity and expression but an over-emphasis on these areas produces as much imbalance as over-emphasis on aesthetic or other considerations. Children respond to music not in a single way, but through feelings and emotions. Some skills are certainly needed for the development of good musicians whether these are reading music and instrument playing or the development of taste and appreciation.

"Music is not altogether feeling, although emotion is involved - music is not a portrayal of chemically compounded emotions. It is a metaphor of experience" (Ferguson D 1960)
Music teachers along with teachers of most other subjects tend to regard their subject as being a special case with singular problems of organisation, discipline and technique. They tend to see themselves as often being in an exposed situation and under pressure to measure up to other people's misguided or inappropriate expectations. The cultural and temporal gap between teacher and pupil, the inappropriateness of a good deal of a music teachers training, the demands of reading music, and the mastery of a musical instrument are also regarded as major problems facing music teachers.

Because of the lack of conceptual framework, music education can also lack a sense of direction, for apart from the development of instrument skills and notation, music seems to lack progression and sequence. This is unnecessary for appreciation which is essentially non-sequential by nature.

Not only can music teachers miss a sense of direction, they may also take the wrong direction, for although music is an important form of entertainment, it is quite inappropriate to suggest that this may be its primary function in schools. Although music may assist in the realisation of non-musical or more general school objectives it's prime purpose must be musical.

Music has been regarded as being beneficial to the corporate spirit of a school, and although there are usually a wide range of extra-curricular musical activities in most schools, the claim is rather vague and tenuous and whilst music can provide an opportunity for corporate effort, such instrumental claims are not of primary concern. "Music education should provide for increasing awareness, interest and insight regarding music" (Mursell 1936)

Music can be justified as a worthwhile curriculum area on the grounds that it's experiences are of moral, social or psychological benefit to the pupils lives, but it's distinctive and unique contribution to education lies in that it fills a basic human desire by satisfying the need to comprehend aural tonal beauty.
Looking into the recorded history of dance in the past, or studying the remaining cultures where dance plays an important part provides a background against which the nature of dance can be established.

Because dance has always existed, it is accepted as an old and deeply rooted human activity whose foundations lie in the nature of man himself. Early man did not know that he was producing an artform, he was merely projecting his wants, feelings and needs through movement. He moved his body as a means of expressing these inner feelings.

Dance played an important part in the ancient world where it took on a significant role in public life, and throughout history dance has had a profound connection with the working habits of the time. In fact, dance today can be regarded as the movement expression of modern industrial man. Every age has had its type of dance and its historical antecedents can be regarded as evidence of its value to society.

Whilst other art forms have left a considerable quantity of evidence of their activity, by way of pictures, buildings, manuscripts etc., the ephemeral art of dance has left relatively little trace, other than by description, of its profound affect upon the emerging culture.

The historical inheritance of dance is so meagre that its connection with changes in social life can easily be overlooked.

In early times dance was adapted to the practical needs of performance dancing, and in England, the dance tradition developed from the rural culture. It is only recently that certain parts of dance technique have been applied to other fields of human activity, and it is only during the last forty years that the idea of dance as a means of education has been accepted and developed.

The universal interest in dance rests on the fact that it is an activity very closely associated with the personal experiences of the majority people. It can even be regarded as being "co-existent with life" (H'Doubler 1966)

Generally dance can be considered as being a primary art because it is an expression of movement which is immediately conveyed via the body. The possible barriers or restrictions which might be imposed by the use of media, as in the other arts subjects, are removed and dance can be seen as one
of the most generally available artforms because the instrument needed is the individual's own body.

In dance the movement is the source of meaning as well as being the medium for expressing and communicating this meaning.

One of the greatest values of any art is its power to carry the individual beyond himself into a broader world of imaginative experience and understanding. Dance can be seen as an activity of the whole person; not just the physical, but the intellectual, emotional and intuitive aspects are also important parts of the experience.

Dance goes beyond the functional and expressive and can be seen not only as a medium through which man and society can bring about change and take hold of new consciousness through the capacity for change, but it can also be regarded as a force for social stability.

"Dance brings into play thought processes, physical activity, intuitive and imaginative powers and emotional responses. Dance is action". (Russell 1958).

Not only does dance concern itself with the making of subjective images (by using itself as the medium) and with the creative response to realised dance forms, but it also satisfies and deepens aesthetic sensibility and gives insight into the fundamental elements common to all the arts experiences. It serves the needs of physical growth, helps to develop the body, stimulates the imagination and challenges the intellect. It tends to help to cultivate an appreciation for beauty and deepens and refines affective behaviour.

Dance is a rhythmic motor expression of feeling consciously created for the pleasure and satisfaction of re-experiencing, expressing, communicating, and executing form. It must endeavour to achieve its aims by building a theory on the knowledge of the structure of the body and the laws of bodily movement. In dance it is the body which is used as the instrument for the portrayal of forms symbolic of the experience of feeling, which are thereby given objectivity in precise and manageable forms.

In common with the other arts areas dance is essentially experiential.

"Whatever we know of dance and whatever we may seek to know, it is the immediate encounter which constitutes the foundation of our knowledge" (Sheets M; The Phenomenology of Dance 1966)
Dance is, as Sheets suggests, totally dependent on direct experience of the dance itself.

Just as Broudy (1966) believes that all aesthetic experiences must be perceived at first hand so, Sheets maintains that "only in apprehending dance in its totality do we discover it's unique significance".

Communication through dance tends to be rather imprecise; for example two commentaries on the same piece of dance can be very dissimilar. This does not however imply that dance is thereby nebulous or imprecise, for it may well be that either words are inadequate for description, or alternatively that the viewer may be somewhat less of a connoisseur and would therefore be less able to discern the essential qualities of the dance.

Dance is undoubtedly essentially an aesthetic mode of experience and it is sometimes suggested that the aesthetic meaning of dance depends not on the emotions but on the physical sensation of movement and it's power of empathetic communication to others.

One of the chief aims of dance in education can be seen as being the development of the individual's own aesthetic powers. Dance is not primarily concerned with the pleasure of dancing, but with the improvement of the participants through their giving aesthetic forms to significant experience.

The affective domain is of central importance to the experience of dance for in dance feelings already vaguely felt and frequently experienced are given some new form, and feelings which may have never been experienced before can be discovered. Dance plays an important role in the education of feelings by it's ability to formulate imagined feelings into a communicable form.

"Dance is a significant activity in education because it gives form to feeling" (McKittrick 1973)

Like all works of art dance expresses emotions aroused by images which are sensory, psychic, objective or subjective in their origin, but in order to appreciate and understand the relation between feeling and action the psychology of the emotions and their part in expression through movement must be known. In the presentation of dance it is necessary to associate feelings with movement and at the same time to select the significant phase of motor response for artistic expression.
The emotional aspect of dance is an important one, for through dance, feelings about oneself, other fellow human beings, or about the nature of the universe can be expressed. Feelings can be learned by the mastery of certain dance techniques and insight into the affective world can be gained through the development and appreciation of dance forms.

Dance is seen by H'Doubler (1966) as a primary means to emotional education, for "by expressing emotion one comes to understand it better". The same could of course be said for all the areas of art experience involving the expression of feeling.

Just as with the other arts, dance cannot be regarded as being essentially concerned with the purging and releasing of undesirable emotions or it relegates itself to the status of mere therapy and creates for itself insurmountable problems of evaluation in relation to other areas of experience.

In education, dance must be not only emotional but intellectual, spiritual and physical if it is to contribute to the wider aims of education. Dance, in common with other arts subjects contributes significantly to the development of personality through conscious experience. Dance attempts to integrate intellectual knowledge with creative ability which can be seen as an aim of paramount importance in any form of education. It seems likely that through the creation and performance of dance, imaginative experience can be deepened and extended.

Movement is a form of expression with which children need to grow up and dance plays an important and unique role in movement development in that it provides opportunity for the acquisition of skill in dancing, for the making of choices and critical judgements, and provides opportunities to apply judgement to one's own and to others work.

An important concern of dance is the development of the power of expression through the study of dance. The dancer today is free to interpret a wide range of experience and is able to reveal his own visions through dance forms.

The chief requisite of dance as art experience is by communication and expression through bodily movement. Dance should not become over dependent on expression through associated imagery, for it's purpose is to execute movements whose dynamics and bodily postures embody expression and have the inherent ability to arouse similar feelings in the spectator.
Just how successful dance may be in this respect is not easy to ascertain, but tentative attempts to match the emotion embodied in works of art with the emotion evoked in the spectator perceiving the work of art suggest that the correlation is not a close one. (See Appendix A) It is exceptionally difficult to establish with any certainty that any specific emotion embodied or portrayed by an art form can be evoked by the participation or perception of a spectator.

Only recently has it been fully realised that some form of creative arts expression is necessary for the healthy mental life, and modern dance with it's essential concern with the flow of movement provides a much richer and freer experience of dance than the dance tradition which developed from the relics of medieval folk dances.

Dance provides opportunities for experience in the areas of effort, space, and group relationships. It is a fairly free art form without preconceived or dictated styles and is not essentially spectatorial. The inherent benefit is for the performer, and is achieved in a variety of ways including social, psychological, expressive and creative experiences.

The basic idea of modern dance is that action in all kinds of human activities consists of movement sequences in which a definite effort of the moving person underlies each movement. Instead of studying the particular movements as in the set step dances of the past, it is the principle of the movement and it's elements which becomes the central concept.

"Instead of studying each particular movement, the principle of moving must be understood and practised". (Laban 1948)

Dance is obviously creative in that new movement patterns are composed by the performer, but to be educative dance does not need to be creative in this sense. Just as with music, there is opportunity in dance for the creative interpretation of the compositions of others.

There are several aspects to dance; experimenting, creating, performing and appreciating, and the dichotomy over process and product which was manifest particularly in drama and in art, is just as much a problem for dance. Dance can operate on the two levels of participation, and of performance to an audience, and whilst dance in education, just as with the other arts, needs to be primarily concerned with participation, it cannot afford to subordinate or ignore the value of learning to appreciate as well as learning to perform.
Dance appreciation should include all kinds of dance; folk, ballet, modern and needs to take account of the social forms of dance.

Although the two objectives may not always be compatible, dance should attempt to develop both the ability to dance and appreciate dance, and also to educate through the media of dance.

Where dance in education is centred on performance with the emphasis on technical skill, the beneficial effect of the creative activity of dancing on the personality of the pupil can never be fully realised.

Dance is, like the other arts, in an unsettled and developing state. The old forms and traditions are being discarded as new ones arise to replace them. Any era of change does however present a confused picture of current trends and which often leads to difficulties in the clarification and definition of the nature of the subject involved.

The concept of contemporary dance is not a prescribed system but is more global, complex and sophisticated, in that it is conceived in terms of all that is known of dance, it's philosophy, it's science, and it's art. It needs to be conceived in terms of those experiences which are intellectual, emotional and spiritual rather than in terms of arbitrary skills and forms.

Because of the considerable confusion concerning the aims of dance education, dance teachers tend to be recruited through the physical education department in the majority of schools. This dependence on physical education has severely handicapped the development of dance in a similar way that innovation in drama has tended to be impeded by it's association with the English department.

Dance has traditionally been regarded as part of physical education because of it's use of bodily movement. It shares the same medium as activities such as games and athletics and is concerned with the movement factors of weight, flow time and space which are essential.

It is by it's being in the shadow of physical education, that dance is often measured by the criteria of physical and psychological growth which, although apposite to the majority of physical education activities, are neither strictly relevant nor the most useful in terms of dance and dance education.
Although having some obvious alliance with physical education activities, dance is also essentially allied with artistic activities which are generally outside the concern of physical education. It is because of this primary concern with aesthetic experience that dance can claim to be an uneasy bedfellow with physical education activities. Movement in dance cannot be seen as having ends other than artistic expression whereas physical education activities can be seen as having essentially practical ends, and because of this, dance can claim to be taught as an independent subject. The problem is not, however easily resolved, for to remove dance from the physical education curriculum would certainly impoverish physical education and yet to place it exclusively in that curricular area would certainly impoverish the arts curriculum.

Whilst dance is clearly not, to any great extent, a vocational subject, and may not have any utilitarian value, because all movement activities are fundamentally important to life, it is therefore concerned with the fulfilment of human potential. There are dangers of teachers misunderstanding the role of dance, of them not seeing dance as being essentially an art form, or of them not seeing their own purpose as being the initiation of children into that art form.

Basically the same problems in education and the context of the school curriculum exist for dance as for music, drama art and the other arts areas, but an additional problem is that modern western culture tends not to rate very highly the movement arts and tends to see them being experiences to be savoured by an elite few.

As an art form dance is a medium which has always reflected man's mental evolution, it helps to develop the body, stimulates the imagination, challenges the intellect, helps to cultivate an appreciation for beauty, and has considerable affective significance.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Historically physical education has in some form or other been long recognised as an important aspect of education. "Mens sana in corpore sano" has been a strongly held belief in schools and society in general. Like other school subjects, it has been influenced by the social, political, religious, educational and economic forces of each particular period in history, and it is only in this century that it's full educational value has been realised.
The problems of definition experienced with other subjects having claim to inclusion in a creative arts grouping are considerable, but they are even greater when definitions of physical education are attempted.

There are rival factions in the literature and some of theories of its nature are little short of incoherent. If a theory could be found, then clear steps could be taken to implement it, but as it is there are a great many theories, a considerable number of which are not too closely related. Fortunately the most recent research does seem to be indicating a clearer way forward.

Initially the real problem with any attempted definition of physical education lies in the confusion of terms. It is difficult to talk of the whole field as one area of experience because of the diverse nature of the components. The terms 'sport', movement and physical education for example are given different delineations by different writers and are by no means mutually exclusive in nature or intent.

The contributing fields are vast and numerous and equating them is often impossible, for how can the same criteria be applied to both dance and rugby?

The problems with this confusion of terms may be so great that the only profitable way to examine the area of physical education may be by looking at the individual components in their own right. However, there are similarities between many of the areas of experience which justify some general statement and which are relevant to the greater part if not the whole of physical education.

Carlisle (in Whitfield 1971) defines physical education as "that part of general and aesthetic education in which knowledge, understanding, and the exercise and appreciation of skill is focused on a range of pleasurable activities which depend on the body as an essential part of the medium and object of action".

The emphasis placed by Carlisle on the pleasurable aspect of activities which rely on the body does however raise serious educational issues concerning the claim of pleasure or leisure pursuits as being educational and even having a place in the school curriculum.

Although it is easy to see the aims of physical education as instrumental, physical education activities are essentially intrinsic. They must be valued for their own sake and for their individual nature and contribution to education if they are to be included in school curriculum.
Many opportunities will arise in which physical education can provide ways to achieve latent and instrumental objectives which form part of the general aims and objectives of the school. These can, realistically, be incorporated into the curriculum, providing that they never become the subject's raison d'etre, and providing that they only exist in the shadow of physical education's intrinsic purpose.

Physical education must not be regarded merely as play or recreation even though both of these may at times, represent part of its aims. Whatever these aims may be they can only be achieved through a deep and liberal understanding of human movement, and they should develop a wide range of activities along with an appreciation of these activities and their place in society. It is an integral part of education for leisure and in school, and should aim to develop positive attitudes towards post-school physical recreation.

Just as with any other area of the curriculum, physical education must be defined and justified if it hopes to claim inclusion as a worthwhile area of experience. The view expressed by Morrison (1969) that "the inclusion of physical education as part of the school curriculum needs no justification" does little to further the physical education cause, for it would seem quite unreasonable for the value of physical education to masquerade as a self-evident truth.

Physical education is concerned with deliberately conceived physical action; it attempts to develop balanced growth by the development of physical resources, and the capacity for creative and imaginative work. It provides opportunities for the various facets of personality to combine and to relate to the development of the whole person and can assist in the development of initiative, moral and social attitudes and responsible behaviour.

"Physical Education then, is a phase of general education which specifically employs motor activities and related moral and social experiences for the purpose of developing an integrated individual and useful citizen" Webster (1965)

Participation in physical education activities provides opportunity for the development of physical skills and creative and imaginative ability; it encourages favourable attitudes to health through bodily exercise and develops an understanding of cooperative activity and experience of human movement as a means of communication.
By providing purposeful and enjoyable experiences in a sufficiently wide range of activities physical education encourages an increased responsibility, provides a sense of achievement and develops positive attitudes towards extra-curricular and post-school physical recreation.

Physical education also contributes to individual and group welfare by ensuring fitness through regular exercise.

Because, for convenience, we tend to use the umbrella term 'physical education' to cover the area of the curriculum concerned with physical activities, there is some justification for an examination of any attributes of the area of experience as a whole. However all physical activities can be distinguished by their different purposes, by the different relationships between their means and their ends, and by the individual and unique contribution which they make to human experience.

"There is some validity in regarding physical education less as a school subject than as an area of education embracing a number of separate subjects" Munrow (1972)

Physical education is a composite field of study which involves many disciplines, anatomy, physiology, physics, anthropology, history, psychology, sociology and philosophy, and which has been steadily extending its scope of activity as new opportunities and equipment have become available.

Some writers such as Bambra (1966) and Arnold (1979) use the term 'movement' as a general term to cover all physical education activities and tend to see human movement as the field of knowledge with which physical education is essentially concerned.

The distinguishing feature of physical education is this primary concern with bodily activity or movement, and "movement" can, and does provide a useful definition under which to consider general attributes but just as with the term "physical education," "movement" similarly does not enable full justice to be done to the individual attributes of a widely conceived range of activities.

Although physical education activities can be categorised in a variety of ways, there appears to be six main divisions which are usually included in school curricula; athletics, dance, games, gymnastics, outdoor activities and swimming.
Each of these divisions as well as contributing to the global movement aims, makes a significant and individual contribution. The largest difference would appear to exist between dance and games which seem to represent the two extremes of the physical education continuum. To try to apply all the same criteria to both of these would appear to be not only impossible, but very undesirable. It is questionable as to whether dance can, or should be seen as part of physical education because of its considerable aesthetic involvement and as it has already been treated separately, it is suggested that dance stand alone as an area of experience rather than as part of a physical education department.

Because physical education is concerned with this wide range of activities, it can be suggested that not all of them can be considered to be of educational value, but to accept that some or any of them are of lesser value, are instrumental or are merely therapeutic can only undermine their claim to be included in school curricula.

Renshaw (1974) sees the distinctions between the various areas of physical education as being based essentially on aesthetic criteria. It is beyond question that albeit in very general terms, physical education does have considerable concern with activities which are essentially aesthetic.

Physical education can, by perception, or by participation in experience, make a considerable contribution to aesthetic awareness and it is possible to conceive of physical education as being concerned with activities which are promoted with artistic and appreciative objectives in mind.

It can be argued that art and all physical education activities have common aesthetic attributes, but taking one extreme of the continuum, whilst games can be seen as being concerned with artistic concepts such as expression, it does not transform them into embodied forms for contemplation in the way that art does. The games player is not an artist in any strict sense, even though he may be concerned in part with artistic experience, for whilst games have aesthetic attributes and as such can loosely be regarded as an art form, games are of a different genus from art.

The dominating motive of the artist is to produce a form for aesthetic contemplation whereas the games player aims to play the game for its own intrinsic ends; any aesthetic involvement being of only secondary importance.
The main features of games and sporting activities is that they serve as a basis for the exercise of skill with physical prowess, and games players intend to win or succeed, to have a good game, and to be concerned with the activity or event in its totality.

If the aesthetic aspect of a game were to be over-emphasised, it would no longer function properly as a game, and in reality, any aesthetic qualities can only be regarded as by-products of the more function-orientated games. They can never be regarded as the central purpose of the game. Games do not exist entirely or even mainly for their aesthetic aspects, even though these are important aspects which need to be present.

Where the aesthetic attributes are recognised and given due, but not excessive, emphasis, physical play certainly improves, and general aesthetic development may well benefit significantly. Some physical education activities are more concerned with aesthetic qualities than others and it is through these activities, skating, diving, gymnastics for example that artistic and aesthetic education can really be seen as making a significant impact.

The product/process dilemma is less complex with regard to physical education, although it is important to establish the different relationships of participants and spectators. These are especially diverse with regard to aesthetic considerations, and it can be suggested that the experience can be of a more aesthetic nature for the spectator, the player's dominant aim is not aesthetic, but to win by playing well.

It would seem to be erroneous to rely too heavily on the significance or value of aesthetic experience, for aesthetic value does not automatically guarantee educational value, other justifications are available, and aesthetic features may not be dominant in educational contexts.

The generic term "physical education" whilst not being a completely satisfactory definition of the area of experience concerned with movement and physical activities, does serve in the present context as a convenient denotation of a complex area of experience which uses knowledge of movement to educate children, offer recreation to adults, and improve general fitness.

It should be linked to as many of the Hirstean forms of knowledge as come within it's scope, also although there is little agreement on what comprises and balanced programme of physical education, it should give instruction and practice in the basic skills and knowledge to develop social, ethical
and educational values through the various games and physical activities. It should also assist in the development of total fitness; moral, emotional, mental and spiritual as well as physical.

Because physical education is the only subject which takes as it's focus "those aspects of the culture that are to do with meaningful whole-bodied action" and is as such the only subject directly concerned with intrinsic movement experiences, it has a strong claim for inclusion in the curriculum.

Although physical education is concerned to some degree with aesthetic, creative and expressive attributes and also with affective experience in a peripheral way, there does not seem to be sufficient involvement for a serious claim that physical education should be a constituent part of a creative arts faculty. As previously mentioned, the common attributes of the other creative arts areas of experience can only, at best, be regarded as incidentals to the inherent nature and aims of the physical education subjects.

**DESIGN**

A final creative arts area which needs examination is design. The problems of definition and delineation which were experienced with other subjects pale into insignificance when compared with those concerned with attempts to make tangible the area referred to as "design".

The word design has been used in many different ways to cover a wide range of activities from electronics systems to textiles and whilst all usages have some degree of commonality, the divergence of interpretation has certainly been a major stumbling block in the development of design education.

"Design" can refer to the area of three dimensional study which results in the production of artefacts, or to an explanation of the composition of a painting; it can be used in a traditional sense by meaning simply to draw; it is sometimes used as an alternative term for planning and in schools it is sometimes used to refer to the creative arts group of subjects.

Archer(1965) sees design as "A goal directed problem-solving activity"; the Page Report of 1966 (in J. Christopher Jones, Design Methods, Wiley 1970) regards it as "The imaginative jump from present facts to future possibilities"; and the Design Council (1980) suggest that "To design is always to prescribe some form, structure pattern or arrangement for a proposed thing, system or event".
All three of these definitions are very general because of the wide-ranging nature of design itself. An understanding of design is dependent on an understanding of the skills, knowledge and values through which mankind comes to terms with the problems concerned with being part of, and trying to shape and develop it's manmade environment.

Unfortunately design has no recognisable body of knowledge which is peculiar to it, nor has it a peculiar research discipline. In essence, design activities seek to resolve specific practical problems through the integrated use of a wide range of knowledge and experience.

In Hirstean terms, design is definitely a field of knowledge rather than a form as designers are constantly called upon to make decisions which require information from more than one discipline. Design activities involve a number of diverse considerations and there is seldom a unique and inevitable solution to any design problem.

Where design is linked with technology, it's meaning tends to become particularly vague, and because of it's contextual differences in meaning it can be seen as essentially a physical skill-learning activity which may have doubtful curricular claims, especially for able pupils.

Unlike experts in other subjects, the designer does not need to know all about the body of subject knowledge, instead he needs to know 'how' rather than to know factual knowledge.

The bringing together of skills, experience, knowledge, understanding, imagination and judgement whatever their limitations in the execution of a specific task is the dominant feature of design activity. This involves the integration of a complex of activities which are specific because they relate to a particular need. They are inventive because they demand a creative response, are effective because the end result must be an improvement on the status quo, and they are evaluative because value judgements need to be exercised during the design process.

Just as there is no one real theory of design, similarly definitions of design education lack agreement and tend to span a range of interpretations. Despite this diversity and the partisan arguments which underly each interpretation, it is assumed that in all it's interpretations, design has an important and teachable function in the school curriculum.
In a society which is becoming increasingly dependent on technology and manufactured products and experience of design education assumes a role of comparable increasing importance.

"Design should be an essential part of the education of all children at all stages of secondary education up to the age of 16, and (that) it should be taught and examined in that light". Design Council (1980) After the 1944 Education Act, the tripartite system of education maintained the low intellectual status of the technical and art and crafts subjects. The idea of craftsman as artisan which are prevalent early in the century and which were outlined in the crafts, were perpetuated by the intellectually able pupils attending the academically-orientated grammar schools. To some extent, design, where it has developed from the old style woodwork, metalwork and craft courses, has had to fight to overcome this low status stigma.

Generally, design education is, by comparison with other school subjects, still in a foetal stage of development and consequently there is a comparable dearth of literature. In recent years however growth and development have been significant, and the old-style materials based courses have often been replaced with more integrated design courses which offer a wider range of skills and uses of materials.

Design education has tended to develop from the purer disciplines of metalwork, woodwork, the crafts and technology via a series of important projects such as the Keele University "Design and Craft Education" project of 1968-73, the Loughborough University "Project Technology" of 1967-72 the Art and Craft Education project during 1969-72 at Goldsmith's College, and the Royal College of Art "Design in General Education" project of 1973-76.

The Design Council has assumed a guiding role by the production of it's "Design Education at Secondary Level" (1980) and the Open University has recently established a Design Education Research Programme within it's Faculty of Technology.

Despite these research programmes, Cross (1979) feels that a lack of educational approach in the teaching of design still exists and is reflected in the noticeable lack of reference to educational theory and research in the practise of design teaching and in a tendency to regard the history of design education largely in relation to the history of those institutions specifically concerned with the teaching of art, craft and technical subjects.
The recent publications associated with the Schools Council Design and Craft Education project show a bias towards the extension of the existing craft-based approach to design in response to new opportunities and by building on the traditions and ideologies of the past. Design is however much more than this, just as it is more than technical or technological skill or applied science. It is the bringing together of traditionally discrete subjects as a new curricular subject which can develop certain techniques and attitudes which may not be acquired elsewhere.

The development of an understanding of design is at the same time both subject-based and inter subject, for design does not stem from a single curricular area, but from several. It is therefore, much more difficult to evaluate and assess than other subjects such as Mathematics or Foreign Languages.

If design is to be regarded as a fundamental aspect of education comparable with literacy or numeracy, rather than a specialised subject or group of subjects, and if it is to achieve parity with other school subjects, it's traditional learning attitudes need adjustment. Design education has intellectual content which is difficult to reconcile with the inherited legacy of educational provision in this area. It can be seen not so much as a particular facet of a more general discipline, but as an independent discipline on it's own, concerned with the development of cognitive, affective and motor skills.

Design education appears in secondary schools in a number of different forms depending on the sponsoring department. If design is seen in the light of the changing role of art education as it responds to the needs of a changing society, then design education tends to be concerned with fairly free, generally two dimensional experiment which seeks to develop novelty and individual sensitivity.

Where design is sponsored by the craft subjects then the situation is quite different, and function and utility assume importance and courses tend to be mainly concerned with three dimensional work on resistant materials.

Sometimes the two are brought together and design departments emerge. Unfortunately there is a danger of confusing design as a process with design as an educational process in just the same way that the early educational crafts became entangled with vocational training. Too often design departments become little more than a confused and ill-considered amalgamation of subjects, and design courses, consequently, become narrow in conception and essentially exclusive in operation.
The Design Council report of 1980 calls for design to be an essential part of all children's education, recommends a radical reappraisal of evaluation and examination procedures for design and calls for a greater degree of collaboration between disciplines. If, however, design is to achieve such a position, it cannot be merely the reorganisation of traditional arts and crafts subjects into some form of amalgamated department.

Design education should encourage creativity and should develop problem-solving skills. It's aims and objectives reflect both intrinsic and extrinsic means and ends and, overall, it can introduce a problem-solving approach to general education and can also act as a catalyst for the enhancement of performance in other mainstream subjects.

Only by sorting out issues relating to it's nature and operation can it become part of the core curriculum rather than remain as a peripheral issue and Archer (in Cross 1978) believes that only by being organised as an area of study comparable with Science and Humanities can design achieve parity with other curriculum subjects.

Unless design provides instruction in concepts and methods of enquiry appropriate to lifelong learning, and attempts to foster the understanding and appreciation of the contribution of design education to the individual's life, then it cannot hope to challenge the traditional subjects.

Although the suggestions of Archer and the Royal College of Art team that design is comparable with Science and Humanities may appear rather a strong claim, their research shows that design education is developing and accelerating, and has done much to counter the general feeling that design education has been undervalued and underdeveloped.

If design education can achieve it's five pre-requisites for success i.e. full staff cooperation, additional staff training, a clear philosophy for the whole curriculum, imaginative timetabling and well-managed resources, all children can benefit from an all-age-range course. This can develop personality and skills, enhance quality of life, and respond to the needs for training people generated by industrial demands and provide opportunity for those capable of becoming designers.

Progress in the recognition of design education has been hampered by the problems of resource management, the lack of regard for traditional manual skills, and career development and teacher training.
Design is generally taught by teachers or designers who may be skillful and well-informed in a particular specialist area, but who may not be equipped with the knowledge of educational procedures or the breadth of training to interpret design studies in their widest sense. Most of the teachers who teach design in schools have been educated as specialists either in art, handicraft, or home economics, and more often than not, in departments or colleges which devote themselves exclusively to one or other of these specialisms. For such teachers to attempt to relate educational theory and principles to an area which is often presented as a confusion of separate ideologies can, in many cases, be little more than a trial and error situation.

Traditionally, design has been taught as technical skills, crafts and trades, and courses have been essentially practical, based on manual work and generally more aligned to processes of training rather than education. Unfortunately, no amount of departmental reorganisation will significantly change what is taught or learned by the pupil, for what is learned is entirely dependent on the teachers understanding and how his training and understanding are applied to teaching situations. It is at this, the level of teacher training, that changes in the nature of design education will take place, and it is only by concentrated effort devolving on teacher training that changes will be accomplished.

Where design is seen by craft teachers as essentially a problem-solving activity, much of the design experience may degenerate into feeble problem solving without substance and without the development of skills. Where craft teachers maintain their traditional stance, design becomes merely a way to upgrade or intellectualise woodwork or metalwork and to attempt to erase their links with less-able pupils.

Leicestershire is a forerunner in design education, not only by the provision of purpose-built design centres in its secondary schools, but by the wide-ranging teacher training courses offered by Loughborough University of Technology. The university is one of only a very few institutes of higher education which has a specific brief to train design educators.

The use of the term 'design' in schools reflects the wider social implications of much of the work, just as much as it seems to be an educational hope for social change, and it is through the work of teachers trained in the wider field of design education that the aims of design education may be realised.
In a number of schools the design department replaces the creative arts department, and the wide aims of design education are used to embrace all the formerly discrete art and craft subjects. The nature and composition of a design department can be seen to be to some extent, closely allied to the creative arts department, but the two are by no means synonymous. The concept of design and its relative value as a replacement for, or as a component of a creative arts department are complex issues which may only confuse and diversify the present argument.

Design can be regarded as a subject, as a group of subjects, and as an integrating factor in its own right, and will assume a very different role depending on which of these views is adopted. In terms of the creative arts department, design is certainly the least easy to fit into a coherent and closely-knit group of arts subjects because of its diversity of content and approach. As a group of subjects, the design department can be one of several very different phenomena depending on the constitution of the department. It can stand as an arts-based group in place of the creative arts department, or it can exist alongside where it is essentially science and/or humanities based. As an integrating factor in its own right, it is certainly able to draw together different disciplines and experiences and bring them to bear on a specific problem.
CHAPTER FOUR

It is a common assumption that there can be transfer from one arts subject to another, and to a certain degree this is very much the case.

Areas of commonality, shared concepts and similarities in methodology and aims have already become apparent in the review of the individual subject areas.

There must, however be some parts of the subject experience which can be only provided by the subject itself. There is an essential part of each subject which cannot be transferred to, or adequately expressed through, any art form other than its own. Each area of arts experience has its own inherent and discrete equalities which identify and represent its uniqueness and the unique contribution which it makes to education. If this was not the case, then experience of the 'umbrella' area of the arts would be adequate curricular provision. Providing that some experience was offered somewhere in this general area, such criteria as would be laid down by this generalised experience would be met. There would, therefore, be little need to even consider providing the wide range of arts subjects, for any one would serve as good as any other.

Obviously this view can never do justice to either the subjects involved nor to any areas of interaction which they may exhibit. Dance experience, for example, can only be possible in dance, because the experience is inseparable from the physical movements employed and cannot be experienced through any other art form. How could it be seriously suggested that the experiences provided through dance could be adequately provided by the crafts? or how could the essence of art experience be provided by physical education?

Amalgamation of arts subjects into a totally homogeneous group is very undesirable, and all curricular programmes must take as much account of the inherent differences in the arts subjects as in their areas of commonality. Integrated is too strong a concept to be applied per se to arts subjects for the same reasons, and even programmes of variable interaction need careful handling to ensure that the discrete features of each subject area are not subsumed to others.

Before any form of working together between arts subjects can be attempted, areas of possible liaison and commonality need to be established.
Art is often seen as having many attributes in common with the other arts subjects and as it has generally been thought of as essentially a practical subject it has tended to be grouped with other practical subjects. (Field 1970) considers that art will lose ground in education unless it broadens it's bases and realises that although it plays a valuable part in individual development it also has an important, social role to play.

"There is an urgent need for the art teacher to clarify his goals and his methods in order that he may embark on work with other disciplines with a clear understanding of the ways in which collaboration may bring the utmost contribution from his own discipline". Field (in Disciplines of the Curriculum, Whitfield, 1971)

Essentially there is a close relationship between art and the crafts, for good artists are also craftsmen, and good craftsman are, at least sometimes, artists. There is however, still an important conceptual distinction between the two in that the craftsman carries out a predetermined plan whereas the artist tends to discover in the process of making. Generally artists aim to produce a form of aesthetic contemplation, whereas craftsmen tend to produce utilitarian articles, and whilst, obviously, the two elements are often continuous and indivisible, they are not synonemous, and they are, and must be, clearly distinguishable.

Art teachers must respect the autonomy of art, but they cannot exist in isolation from other factors of culture and whilst some concepts are only demonstrable through art, such as form, line and colour, there are a number of concepts which are shared with other subjects; harmony, rhythm and discord are shared with music for example. Beauty, fantasy and symmetry are examples of concepts which can be regarded as being the prerogative of all the arts subjects.

Although art is strongly linked with design, Hinx-Edwards (1981) believes that much of design is antipathy to the essence of art, and feels that by divorcing the two, art need not force areas of overlap to be created which may be spurious. The era of William Morris doctrine where art was reduced to the level of definable skill has passed, and it is through linking with other arts areas that the boundaries and possibilities of art may be extended.

Art has permeated into the area of the curriculum traditionally referred to as needlework, but which is now seen in the wider context of fabric or textile design and virtually all the recent developments in schools relating to fabric and fashion design have been the result of the work of art teachers.
Home economists have tended to withdraw from the traditional needlecraft/fabric areas and are becoming increasingly concerned with aesthetics via home creation. Courses tend to concentrate on interior design, choice of furniture, design of clothes visually-pleasing foods, flower arrangements etc. Through these areas, fabric design and home economics can forge meaningful links in dealing with functional beauty in its widest sense and can contribute significantly in the development of taste and discrimination.

Home economics has been described as an interdisciplinary subject and there is a danger of it becoming fragmented by being so. It must be remembered however, that rather than being disparate fragments, it is a field of knowledge with its own peculiar attributes.

Art and the crafts in general, and home economics in particular, can be seen to link with just about everything, but only those links which are justifiable and are neither superficial nor spurious can hope to gain recognition as being of curricular worth.

Similarly, drama can be seen to integrate with other curricular areas with ease, but again caution must be urged so that where drama is linked, for example, with history the product of such a liaison should be both good drama, and good history. Drama can, in such a situation, supplement the historians concern with facts by teaching human values and feelings.

Drama shares a cultural interest with English, particularly where it is seen as theatre, but care must be taken not to use the subject instrumentally. Where drama is linked with art and craft this becomes an area of concern for, too often, the link is little more than the art and craft areas producing the scenery for a particular production. Similarly with links between music and geography. Undoubtedly drama can forge meaningful links with a variety of subjects but links which are essentially instrumental should be avoided. Drama has, in more recent times, become strongly associated with physical education by the mutual and essential concern with movement and the use of the body as the medium. Likewise dance could be seen in a similar way.

Music may well, along with most of the arts subjects, work best in a free-ranging liaison situation where established or long-term links do not prescribe or constrain the nature of the experience.
Rhythm is a common element which music shares with art, dance, poetry and physical education and form, structure, melody, harmony are other attributes which might claim to have relevance as bases for inter-subject linking.

Tenuous or spurious integration between music and other arts subjects has tended to occur in the past, and where music has been seen to link with art by way of pictorial illustration of songs, the pictorial interpretation of music, song creation inspired by pictures, the making and decoration of musical instruments, the production of scenery and costumes for musical productions. Where this has happened the essential nature of the music and the art experience are subsumed to instrumental aims. Similarly where links are claimed between music and physical education which are concerned with singing, games and dances, and with the one subject serving the purposes of the other, the resulting liaison can be, at best, superficial.

Science and Maths can claim to be linked with music by way of the technology of music; languages can claim a liaison through the common attributes of communication and symbolism, and social studies can lay claim to having links with music. However, none of these are sufficiently strong to justify real integration; all are rather tenuous, are instrumental, and lack real concern with the essential nature of the musical experience and the nature of the subjects with which it may be linked.

Of all the arts, music possibly makes the most direct appeal to the emotions, and as such may be closely allied with dance and drama.

Music and dance have rhythm as the basis of their movement for music can express abstract aspects of action, and the association between dance and music is a close and natural one which if properly understood and developed can be of great mutual benefit.

It is however, quite possible to dance without music, and for its own sake dance needs to be recognised and experienced as an independent art. Because of the very special and almost organic relationship of music and dance, a great deal can be gained by building on the relationship and by opening the resources of music to the dancer.

Although dance can be seen as an art form allied with drama, it should not really be entirely divorced from the area of physical education, for there may be considerable gain from transfer of training from other physical education activities.
There has been considerable concern with the integration of the subjects within the physical education area and physical education itself can also be seen as an integrating factor within the school curriculum.

Physical education is not involved with the complex relationships between different forms of knowledge, nor is it concerned with the need for such connections to be made explicit. The place of physical education in the curriculum does not depend upon epistemological status, and therefore any possible liaison and relationships with other subjects must be on an entirely different level.

Playing cricket or football can be seen (Reid 1970) as being comparable with the crafts, for both are concerned with the carrying out of a pre-determined plan. Sport in general can be seen as a powerful means of expression and there may be links with outdoor pursuits, history, geography etc., but these tend to be made for convenience rather than for educational or theoretically desirable reasons.

The natural links between physical education and other subjects such as science, maths and literature can only really be treated as possible areas of spin off rather than being concerned with the essential meaning of the subjects.

Kane (1976) suggests that physical education departments cannot continue to retain a separate identity and he sees integration as a way of giving the subject status and negotiating power. This seems however to be undervaluing the unique contribution which it can make to the curriculum and seems to weaken its claim to be regarded as a worthwhile activity per se. Generally physical education does not seem to be a natural and obvious component of the creative arts department.

With all the arts subjects, wherever there is opportunity for integration, or natural links between subjects, the danger always exists of allocating an instrumental role to certain areas, art or movement for example.

Whilst the preceding general review has indicated some possible areas of commonality between the arts subjects which may be worth consideration as bases for liaison, a much more structured and careful comparison of the subjects is needed before any positive conclusions can be drawn.
The subjects involved must be matched against certain criteria and the areas and degree of commonality then need to be established. Unless a series of common criteria can be applied across the whole spectrum of the arts, then the relative similarities and differences cannot be objectively evaluated.

One such series of criteria which may well serve to indicate which subjects should or should not constitute a creative arts area is the relative contributions which the arts subjects make to the Phenix Realms of Meaning.

Art, music, drama, dance, the crafts and design all make a significant contribution to the realm of symbolics, whereas the contribution of physical education to this realm is less significant, and the contribution of home economics even less so. Conversely of all the arts subjects only home economics can be seen as making any sort of contribution at all to the realm of empirics, and even then the contribution cannot be regarded as significant.

All the constituent subjects are concerned with the aesthetic realm; home economics probably least of all, music, drama, dance, the crafts, physical education and design all contribute very significantly, and art, is perhaps the area especially able to claim essential and massive concern with this realm.

Physical education and home economics can be seen as making the most significant contribution to the realm of synnoetics, although all the subjects involved make some form of contribution albeit a marginal one in most cases.

The ethical realm cannot really be regarded as being of prime concern for the arts subjects, and whilst the majority of subject areas would claim to contribute, their contribution can only be regarded as incidental and peripheral rather than being concerned with the essence of each subject. In fact the arts subjects cannot really make a claim of any greater value than any other of the subjects of the curriculum in terms of their contribution to the realm of ethics.

Again the contribution to the synoptic realm is not of major significance for any of the arts subjects. Perhaps design, home economics and physical education can claim to contribute slightly more significantly than the rest,
and it must be accepted that each subject does make a marginal contribution, but none is really concerned in an essential way with synoptics.

Symbolics and aesthetics are the areas of prime concern for art, music, drama, dance, the crafts and design, whereas home economics can be seen as being concerned primarily with synnoetics and physical education as being essentially to do also with synnoetics, and to a lesser extent with aesthetics.

The only fairly general commonality across the range of arts subjects is in the areas of symbolics and aesthetics, and the group which would therefore be formed based on this would include art, music, dance, drama, crafts and possibly design. A case could be argued for the inclusion of physical education on the grounds of it's concern with aesthetics as well as synnoetics, but home economics could not really lay claim to be included on such criteria.

As art crafts, music, drama, dance and design are concerned with a roughly similar degree of involvement with the symbolic realm, and all of them, with the addition of physical education are likewise similarly concerned with the aesthetic realm, there does appear to be some basis for liaison between the subjects taking aspects of Phenix's realms of meaning as a unifying factor. Phenix is not, however, prescriptive, nor are his theses applied directly to the school situation, and whilst there may be reasons, such as social considerations, which might militate against a Phenix-based grouping, there certainly appears to be sufficient justification for using the realms, in general terms at least as part of a group of criteria which may be useful in establishing and justifying the components of a creative arts department.

The fact that home economics can be seen only to make a significant contribution to the realm of synnoetics would be more than adequate grounds for excluding it from the group, and also the primary concern of physical education with synnoetics tends to indicate that it too may not really belong within a creative arts grouping.

The realms of empirics, ethics and synoptics are really beyond the bounds of eliciting a significant contribution from any of the arts; in fact in a large number of cases, they cannot be regarded as making any contribution at all, other than purely incidentally. It would be difficult to establish the contribution of art or music to the realm of empirics, or the real significance of ethics or synoptics in the crafts or physical education.
To summarise, Phenix realms of meaning can have significance as a general basis for the establishment of areas of common experience in the arts subjects, although, if standing alone, they may have shortcomings. The only justifiable arts groups based on those subjects contributing significantly to the realms of aesthetics and symbolics would, therefore be composed of art, music, drama, dance, crafts and design. The relative contributions of each of the arts subjects to the realms of meaning is shown in Appendix B.

The Forms of knowledge suggested by Hirst could be applied as a second group of criteria on which to establish commonality and base possible liaison. Basically they are very similar to the realms and it should be borne in mind that Hirst like Phenix is dealing with categories which are in some ways too large for the curriculum planner, and although his model may be useful as a generative locus for the curriculum, he offers no advice for practical considerations or for their implementation.

It can of course, be argued that Hirst is perfectly justified in deliberately leaving these for teachers to sort out as they are the ones who are best able to do so by way of their first-hand involvement with the practical situation.

The forms of mathematics and formal logic, natural science and religion are in general terms not the concern of the arts subjects. Drama, dance and physical education, can, by the nature of their involvement with the human body be seen as contributing to the area of human sciences, and through appreciation, art music and drama can be seen to make a contribution, albeit not of major significance to the historical form.

In general the arts can be seen as contributing to some degree to the philosophical and ethical form with possibly art, music dance and drama being areas through which quite a significant contribution can be made.

The main form with which all the arts are primarily concerned, is that of fine art and literature. With the exceptions of home economics and physical education, the arts all make a very significant contribution to this area.

Unlike history, or biology for example, the arts cannot be easily related specifically to one form. Subjects such as home economics and design are obvious fields of knowledge rather than forms, and home economics in particular tends not to match too closely with the common criteria of the other arts subjects.
As with the Phenix Realms of Meaning, the most justifiable grouping based on forms of knowledge would be composed of art, music, drama, dance, the crafts, and possibly design.

A third group of criteria which could justifiably be used to ascertain the components of a creative arts department and the areas of commonality which exist between them, is the eight "areas of experience" as outlined by Her Majesty's Inspectorate in the "Curriculum 11-16" reports of 1977 and 1979.

The documents are a series of working papers in which the Inspectorate suggests that the curriculum in schools should be composed of eight areas of experience and that each subject within the curriculum should evaluate its contribution in the light of these areas. The eight areas are aesthetic/creative; ethical; linguistic; scientific; social/political; mathematical; spiritual; and physical.

In general terms, all the arts subjects make some form of contribution to the majority of the areas; the mathematical and scientific being the only two where in most cases, a minimal contribution if any at all can be established. The crafts, home economics, and design, however, are something of exceptions, for they can justifiably be seen as making a moderate contribution to the scientific area. With the exception of drama, the arts tend not to contribute to a significant extent to either the ethical or linguistic areas.

Just as with the Phenix realms, art, music, drama, dance (and to a lesser extent) the crafts and design are essentially concerned with the aesthetic/creative area whereas home economics and physical education, although they have aesthetic/creative attributes, cannot claim that their prime concern lies in this area. The prime contribution of physical education is in the area of physical experience and home economics is primarily concerned with scientific experience.

The relative contributions of each subject area appears in tabulated form in Appendix B.

Using the areas of experience as a basis for faculty formation would produce a creative arts grouping of art, music, drama, dance, crafts, and design, all of which have considerable and essential concern with the aesthetic/creative area.
It is becoming increasingly apparent that home economics and possibly physical education may not have a strong claim to inclusion in the creative arts grouping. The ambiguous position of home economics has been outlined earlier, and it is becoming apparent that it is the most incongruous of the subjects which have been traditionally grouped in the creative arts department.

The use of design as a subject area comparable with art, music etc., is also very questionable, and not very precise, but unfortunately it does appear either in its own right or linked with technology in some creative arts faculties and therefore cannot be totally excluded from the argument.

It may seem unsatisfactory to regard design as a component subject rather than as the unifying link, and it may be quite justifiable to discard it from the present argument, but accepting the limitations of doing so, it will be seen as a component subject for the present purposes.

The Phenix Realms of Meaning, the Hirstean Forms of Knowledge or the H.M.I. Areas of Experience can justifiably be used as the criteria for establishing areas of commonality between arts subjects, and subsequently, for suggesting the subjects which have a strong claim for inclusion in a creative arts grouping.

However, it becomes apparent when the individual subject areas are examined in some detail, that the whole area of the arts is an extremely complex one, and it may well, therefore, be only partially acceptable to rely solely on one set of related criteria.

Also the three sets of criteria which have so far been applied are essentially philosophical and may not be sufficiently universal to provide a complete or adequate basis from which to work.

A much more comprehensive and complex criteria base must be established, rooted, not only in the Realms of Meaning, the Forms of Knowledge, and the Areas of Experience but which can also take account of other essential attributes of the arts subjects.

The aesthetic attributes of the arts have been covered in a fairly full way by the Realms and Areas, and it has been established that all the constituent subjects, including the rogue home economics, have some aesthetic element. It has also become apparent that this varies in degree from subject to subject, with, for example, art at one extreme and physical education at the other.
All the arts subjects can claim to be experiential, and as indeed they can all lay a very strong and similar claim in this area, it may be that experience can be regarded as one of the major areas of commonality amongst them. They all appear to be experiential to much the same degree and they are all essentially concerned both with doing and with appreciating.

Creativity is similarly an almost universal criterion; again all the arts are concerned with it and to a similar degree. However, each subject is concerned not in any general or transmutable way, but in its own unique and individual manner. If this was not the case, then any arts subject could be substituted for any other and the need to provide a range of arts experience would not exist.

The affective attributes of the arts provide another very important area of commonality, and it is indisputable that all the arts have some essential emotional element. It is not, however, consistent across the subjects, the crafts may well be less concerned with it than drama or dance for example. However it is an important attribute which needs consideration as part of the criteria group on which commonality and liaison can be justifiably established.

Affect can even be regarded as the over-riding criterion for the formation of creative arts departments and the whole value of such departments can be seen as being in the shared affective experience between the subjects. Undoubtedly there is a need for an increased weight to be put upon both the value of affective experience in education, and on the need for developing and applying affectively-based criteria of evaluation to these experiences. To concentrate solely on one criterion, however, does seem to deny the importance of other criteria which when applied as a group may well enable a more viable and justifiable creative arts department to be formed.

Although utility has been suggested as a possible linking factor, the involvement of the arts is very inconsistent in this area. Art, music, drama and dance cannot really be considered as being concerned in any essential way with utility, whereas in the crafts, home economics and design it is regarded as being of paramount importance. It does relate to physical education in a reasonably strong way through the development of a healthy body, but obviously to a much lesser degree.

Utility cannot really be used as a linking factor at all because of its patchy application across the range of arts subjects and can, therefore be effectively discarded.
The acquisition of skills is an attribute which, although variable in degree in the different subjects, is exhibited by all of them. There appears to be considerable and fairly uniform involvement with skills by all the arts, and whilst the crafts, home economics and design may well claim to be the most skill-based areas, there appears to be sufficient involvement for the criterion to be applied when attempting to establish commonality. The danger would be however, where this, or for that matter, any other of the criteria, is taken as the sole or even major factor for grouping. Only when seen in conjunction with other equally important criteria can skills acquisition be satisfactorily applied.

Self expression is a concept which again appears to some extent across the whole arts range, but because it is not consistent, it cannot be universally applied. However, as the areas where it is weakest are physical education and home economics, the group which excludes these can be seen as being heavily concerned with self-expression. The crafts are becoming increasingly involved with it but their claim for essential concern with self-expression may be seen, in some circumstances, as a fairly tenuous one.

The arts can be regarded as forms of cognition, and some authorities claim that they are essentially so. (e.g. Walsh D 1968) Whilst all the arts can be seen as being cognitive to some extent and cognition should not therefore be ignored, it does not appear in the complex of experience as a universal or high-ranking factor for establishing liaison, and can, therefore, be regarded as a linking factor of only marginal importance.

All the arts have some social elements, and home economics can claim to be essentially socially-orientated, but the variance in the degree of social involvement from home economics or physical education on the one hand to the crafts or art for example on the other, again suggests that there is not enough universal agreement to use social attributes as a major basis for subjects linking. As with cognition, the social attributes should not be ignored and are entitled to some consideration in group formation, but they can also only be regarded, at best, as marginal linking factors.

To use the symbolic attributes of the arts as a basis would be very apposite for the expressive subjects such as art, music, drama and dance which exhibit similar degrees of involvement in symbolism, but generally to accept such a premise would thereby excluded the crafts, physical education and design which tend to have only marginal symbolic concerns.
Strong links are becoming apparent, which ever criteria are applied, between art, music, drama, dance, the crafts and possibly design. When all the criteria suggested are brought to bear, then this emerges as the core arts group.

The place of home economics is indeed a tenuous one; linking only with the core in terms of experiential and social attributes. It is in term of it's practical nature that home economics has traditionally come to be regarded as part of the creative arts group, but in real terms it may well function best in isolation. Certainly it's assumed close links with needlework or fabric crafts only occur in terms of skill acquisition and in the instrumental role of fabric crafts in home making. The essential knowledge similarities are relatively few, and the "girls crafts" department composed of the two and sometimes found in secondary schools has very little to commend it as a worthwhile, logical or educationally justifiable group.

Physical education is also a very uneasy bedfellow in the creative arts faculty for it links only peripherally with the core group in terms of aesthetic, experiential and social attributes. Dance can be seen as being the real bridge between the arts core and physical education, and it may well be because of it's strong affiliation to the arts that physical education in general has been brought into the orbit of some creative arts faculties. As with home economics, dance may well be better as an independent subject, for of all the arts, it has the most strongly divided loyalties. It would be difficult to divorce it from either the arts core or from physical education and to move it solely into the province of one of them.

In terms of the established criteria, dance has a very strong claim as a member of the creative arts group and should therefore be regarded within the core. Unfortunately, it cannot be divorced from physical activity and must also maintain strong links with physical education. Of all the physical education activities, it is however, the one which could be shed. It would seem likely that the inclusion of dance in a creative arts grouping has led to physical education department per se being included. This is not necessarily the case, nor is it desirable. Physical education, without dance, may well function best outside the creative arts group.

In summary, the creative arts group which is most justifiable, in terms of commonality of experience is composed of art, music, dance, drama, the crafts and possibly design.
The idea of integration in its purest sense has already been discounted in favour of the much more flexible and loose liaison referred to as variable interaction.

Any liaison does however, by its very nature preclude other groupings which may be equally viable. The inclusion of drama, for example within the creative arts faculty may well militate against it's liaison with English Literature. Similarly if home economics was to be included, it's essential links with science may well thereby be denied.

It would seem likely that the looser grouping of variable interaction, where subjects come together only as and when the need arises may well go a long way towards making subject boundaries more permeable and may well also allow for subjects within a group to liaise successfully with subjects which are not in the group. The confines imposed by a very structured and rigid programme of integration may to some extent be lessened.

The preclusion of links between art and literature and drama and literature does not seem to be desirable, and any form of subject grouping which fosters this should be avoided.

Variable interaction between the subjects of a group composed of art, music, drama, dance, the crafts and possibly including design may well be able to offer the best of all worlds. Opportunities are afforded for liaison between the constituent subjects, but only as and when necessary. This thereby avoids the spurious and superficial integration which can result from liaisons which are too rigidly prescribed and which consequently force peripheral issues to become the locus for the liaison. Opportunities for liaison across the whole curriculum are not precluded and yet the constituent subjects form a coherent and justifiable group with a considerable nucleus of common attributes.
In schools which have established creative arts departments, much of the interaction of arts subjects has tended to take place against a background of misunderstanding and disappointment, for, in a large number of cases the role of one or more of the arts has been seen as being instrumental or secondary to the role of other arts. Where one arts subject is used primarily to give form to the ideas of another the insights offered and the particular structure of understanding of that subject can never be adequately experienced.

In reality, where the thematic approach has been adopted by creative arts departments, much subject subjugation has occurred and areas such as art and drama have fulfilled only minor roles in relation to their unique contribution to knowledge and experience.

Unfortunately, much of the planning of creative arts departments in secondary schools may not be primarily concerned with educational justification at all. Headteachers or curriculum planners may have the notion that the physical grouping together of subjects will automatically lead to some unspecified mutual and collective benefit.

It has been stressed previously that it is most undesirable that any form of creative arts department be established without thorough investigation of the component subjects in terms both of areas of commonality and of differences between them.

Wherever creative arts departments are established and even where they flourish successfully, the unrelated aspects of each arts subject should not be denied. It should always be borne in mind that it is not always possible to transpose from one art to another because of the distinct and discrete characteristics of each one and it would be naive to suggest that a painting, for example, could achieve the same experience or effect as that which can be afforded by the dancer's bodily movement through space.

Although, as McKittrick (1978) suggests, it is by the working together of the arts that contagion may occur, and that experiences may be deepened by the transfer of a central core of an experience into a different medium and back again, this may not always be possible. A stimulus or theme of an experience may in some cases be transferable 'flight' or 'strength' for example, but it is only through the individual and particular art form that the central core of that experience can be fully experienced.
Creative arts departments have been created in some instances, purely for reasons of administrative convenience. The grouping together a series of subjects, having one person as it's head with responsibility for the day-to-day administration of the department creates a clear hierarchical channel through which the headteacher and his senior management team can communicate. Information to and from the component subjects can be directed through one person, rather than six or more, and the head's administrative machinery can generally be streamlined.

Teachers of the arts can be seen as a team bound together, however loosely, by a clear understanding of the general purpose of arts education and their roles as arts teachers. This does not, however, mean that they invariably need to work together, rather that they need to be aware that they belong to a team which is concerned with an area having some commonality of philosophy and experience. "We are conscious of, and committed to our colleagues" (Ross 1978)

In the past, much of the failure of creative arts departments has occurred because it was felt that the arts subjects need to work together at all times rather than as and when necessary or desirable.

For any form of creative arts department to be at all effective at any level, the union of teachers in a common philosophy of the nature of the arts experience, and what is practically to be done is essential. Unless the creative arts team is composed of committed enthusiasts, the department will not be able to function at a level higher than administrative convenience.

Only when individual teachers are convinced of the character and quality of contribution which his own subject can bring to the group can any form of interaction be successful.

Arts teachers often work in isolation and tend not to expect much encouragement or understanding from their non-arts colleagues. Generally they do not forge very strong links with the world of education, but unlike teachers of many other subjects the sciences or maths for example, they are more active practitioners in their own specialism.

The pattern of art education at secondary level is extremely uneven and complicated, as there does not appear to have been much change in method of a great deal of the art teaching which takes place.
"There has not been anything like the radical re-thinking about the actual system of teaching amongst art teachers that we have seen in maths and drama and language teaching over the last decade". (Ross 1975)

In view of the more recent research and developments in arts education, this statement is somewhat severe and to some extent outdated, but certainly teachers of the arts do tend to be regarded as being essentially different from teachers of the more obviously academic subjects.

Arts teachers are often regarded as being in some way inferior which in turn promulgates the idea that arts subjects are of a lesser status than other areas of the curriculum.

Although it would be naive to suggest that the quality of arts teaching is related to graduate status, for traditionally many arts teachers are non-graduates, graduate status is an important factor which affects the arts teacher.

In the past, the high percentage of non-graduates amongst arts teachers has undoubtedly affected not only the emphasis given to the arts in the curriculum, but also the self-image of the arts teacher and his status in the eyes of his colleagues.

Although graduate-equivalent teachers have been produced since 1947, the more recent advent of the B.A. degree for those completing arts training has done much to raise the status of arts teachers to a more obviously comparable qualification level with modern linguists, historians and English teachers.

In some schools, the non-graduate arts teacher works at a considerable disadvantage, and in general terms the more senior management roles in secondary schools are not generally filled by non-graduates.

High academic qualifications are regarded as being essential to career advancement and although a large percentage of arts teachers (Ross 1975 suggests as many as 80%) are graduate equivalents, there is something basically different, although not necessarily inferior, about having degree equivalent status.

Until relatively recently arts teachers could only achieve graduate, rather than graduate equivalent, status by reading for a degree in another discipline; education is a notable example.
Just as the replacement of the A.T.D. by the B.A. has done much to upgrade the status of the art teacher, so the introduction of the B.Sc. in sports science has done likewise for the teacher of physical education and dance.

The comparable nature and quality of the different courses is not in question, for it would be invidious to suggest, without a great deal of research over a number of years, the relative merits and weakness of either the former or more recent courses in arts training.

Arts teachers do appear to be different from other teachers by way of their training, which is generally more subject specialised and less academic than that of their colleagues. Specialist graduate arts teachers tend to be trained in institutions which are devoted solely and exclusively to the specific arts concerned rather than being multi-discipline institutions like the universities. The amalgamation of colleges of art into the polytechnics is an example of the gradual shift away from this, which can only be to the advantage of the arts teacher, for the colleges of art, music and drama tended to add mystique to the aura of the arts teacher.

The many different possible training routes which can be taken by arts teachers also serve to undermine their status, whereas the teacher of French or German will have read for a subject degree at a university or polytechnic and followed this with a Post Graduate Certificate of Education in a similar institution, the arts teacher may have followed one or more of number of possible routes.

He may have read for a subject degree at a university or polytechnic and followed this with a P.G.C.E. at a similar institution; he may have gained degree-equivalent status from a college of music or college of art, followed this with a P.G.C.E.; he may hold a diploma or certificate from a college of music; or may have coupled this with a professional course at a College of Education; he may have undertaken a specialist teachers certificate at a specialist college and college of education; he may have gained a Certificate in Education from a college of education, or he may have read for the Bachelor of Education degree at a college of education, university or polytechnic.

Wherever different training routes and qualifications exist, there is room for question, doubt, and in all too many instances, the tendency to regard them as something inferior.
In terms of career advancement, the majority of arts teachers can only hope to reach Scale 3, head of subject level, unless they make a sideways move into the pastoral organisation of the school which may be able to offer the possibility of further promotion.

The creation of creative arts departments has provided the opportunity for arts teachers, albeit only one in each secondary school to be in charge of a large department with the possibility of being paid a salary on Scale 4, or even in isolated cases on Senior Teacher scale.

Arts teachers particularly in art and music, seem to favour a child-centred approach to their teaching and the nature and purpose of this relationship between teacher and pupil can be seen (by Ross 1975 for example) as being the most crucial aspect of arts teaching. This "educational encounter" (Witkin 1974) is in many arts areas concerned solely with expressive work and often means allowing the children to get on with the work without interference from the teacher. This "gardener" syndrome (Entwistle 1970) attracts scepticism and doubt and can lead to a lowering of subject, and teacher status.

Arts teachers should have teaching ability and an enthusiasm for their art which is infectious, but in so doing, they should avoid eccentricities of both manner and appearance.

The two most damaging features of the stereotype arts teacher are the assumed low academic status of subject and teacher, and this tendency for arts teachers to be prone to eccentricities in both dress and attitude. It is through the work produced that such eccentricies may be, and should be, displayed rather than in the appearance or manner of the arts teacher.

The newer broader and more visionary training courses which take account of the possible areas of interaction between arts subjects and which provide more of a comprehensive over-view of the arts will do much to improve the status of the arts and of arts teachers.

Over the past few years new and original kinds of honours degree courses have emerged. They are mainly concerned with the arts in a practical and creative context and bring together different art forms to be studied in close relation with each other. They attempt to study in essentially practical terms more than one art form coupled with related theoretical studies.
Recent trends in the arts and in the sociology of education have questioned and eroded traditional subject boundaries, and these coupled with a growing concern over the remoteness of the specialist artist from the larger social context, have created the background against which the new courses have emerged.

The emphasis of these new courses is on the development of understanding and sensitivity through practice and theory as distinct from the pursuit of high performance in a particular art form for its own sake.

Consequently a different kind of artist who has the conviction of authentic experience and a more critical awareness of the role of the arts and their inter-relationships is being produced.

Six such courses, validated by the C.N.A.A. are already established at the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Polytechnic (B.A. (Hons) Creative Arts), Brighton Polytechnic (B.A. (Hons) Expressive Arts), Crewe and Alsager College of Higher Education (B.A. (Hons) Creative Arts), Leicester Polytechnic (B.A. (Hons) Performing Arts), Middlesex Polytechnic (B.A. and B.A. (Hons) Performance Arts), and at the Trent Polytechnic, Nottingham (B.A. (Hons) Creative Arts).

These new degrees are characterised by their encouragement of students to spread their interests beyond the discrete and clearly defined art area of specific study into other areas. The wider and richer environment so produced should provide better opportunities in which students can develop. By grouping together artists from a variety of disciplines, painters, writers, actors, dancers and musicians, and providing them with a course structure which encourages cross-fertilisation and the exchange of ideas, and adequate and sympathetic resources, artists with a wider and more flexible vision should be produced.

Loughborough University of Technology was a fore-runner in linking together the crafts with art, and its Creative Design Department makes a major contribution to the development of creative arts and design departments in secondary schools by providing sympathetic and understanding graduates who have the breadth of vision to plan courses where meaningful interaction can occur.
Dartington College of Art has also recently set up a new Diploma of Higher Education course concerned with art and society which intends to explore new forms of practice in art and to question the existing assumptions upon which art and art education are based. This course attempts to help students to develop their imaginative abilities, relate their work to specific experiences and concerns in their environment, and to acquire a range of art skills which are likely to be relevant for use in the community.

As all these courses are relatively new, their impact is only just being felt, but already the effect which they are having upon the arts in secondary education is pervasive and revolutionary.

If the creative arts department is an educational concept worth keeping and developing, innovation and change in teacher training will be the major initiative which will enable this to take place.

Consequently, many of the mistakes formerly made by trying to fit traditionally-trained arts teachers into the wider creative arts context should be avoided.

The increase in more generally trained arts teachers who have experience of liaison and interaction with arts subjects other than their own specialism should enable schools to provide experiences via their creative arts departments, which encourage students to see the arts as being collaborative rather than competitive.

The wide variety of interpretations of the term "creative arts department" has led to a great deal of unsatisfactory curriculum planning and development. Many of the problems inherent in the lack of a universally acceptable delineation of the term have been indicated earlier but whatever it's composition, the creative arts department should aim to provide the greatest number of pupils with the greatest number of opportunities for learning.

The real and long-term value of the creative arts department may well lie in the way in which it encourages the development of relationships between the child's internal world and the external world in which he lives.

"Arts are important ways of knowing the world and of interpreting our experience in it" (Gulbenkien 1982)
Individual schools have established creative arts departments in response to their varying and individual needs, mostly based on educationally justifiable criteria.

Each school has adopted a type of grouping which it considers may well improve the standard of experience of the arts within it and which it feels able to fit into its curriculum and to adequately resource.

The model suggested which includes art, the crafts, music, drama, dance, physical education and design lies, more or less, at the heart of the majority of creative arts groupings.

Individual schools add to or subtract from this core according to their particular situation and in general terms the grouping does tend to offer some form of interaction and interchange of ideas.

The creative arts department, whatever its composition, is certainly administratively convenient and it would seem likely that the gains from a loose liaison of creative arts subjects outweigh the losses in terms of autonomy which the constituent subjects may experience. I would suggest that the inherent experiences gained in the creative arts department are wider, and offer a better creative and artistic background than the experiences formerly provided by the subjects operating independently and in isolation.

Having said that, some qualification is however, needed. Where programmes of rigid or pure integration have been attempted, they have not always been successful. Where the liaison is variable interaction then the grouping can achieve goals which may be greater than the sum contribution of the individual subject parts.

Because of the difficulties involved in the accurate evaluation of creative subjects, statistics to support such claims tend to be very hard to establish, but the theoretical evidence does tend to suggest that the knowledge gained from one arts experience may well contribute to a significant extent to development in other arts areas.

The practicalities of establishing, organising and running a successful creative arts department should not be underestimated.

Problems relating to the criteria for the establishment of the department, the nature of the subjects involved, their areas of commonality and difference, and the special staffing needs of such departments have already been examined.
The timetabling of arts subjects is, in many cases inappropriate and leads either to the fragmentation of the curriculum and of knowledge itself, or to a situation where excessive attempts to integrate lead to the loss of the essential nature of each arts subject.

Individual schools will vary considerably in the way in which they organise time and resources, and consequently there can be no one prescriptive suggestion for the organisation of creative arts departments.

Depending upon the number of periods in the school week and their timing, the arts may be taught in single periods of anything between thirty minutes and an hour, or in double periods of between one hour and one hour and a half; in a combination of singles and doubles, or in half-day blocks.

The longer periods of time seem to be better suited to the needs of arts subjects, and where they are blocked together for half-days this would seem to be the most advantageous for variable interaction to take place. Unfortunately for the arts, the very different curricular needs of other subjects may well take precedence, and may result in timetabling which does less than justice to the arts. In general modern languages tend to favour single periods, preferably on each of the five days of the week and although the justification for this "little and often" approach is not entirely acceptable, where it happens, especially in the fourth and fifth year option systems, some of the other subjects are automatically forced to follow suit. Where a school operates a five option block system and where French and German appear in two of them, a significant number of subjects will be required to accept single period teaching, or at best, a combination of singles and one double. The question of the right of any individual subject or group of subjects to dictate the terms of timetabling is both highly contentious and beyond the scope of the enquiry.

Certainly as far as the arts are concerned longer periods in which work can be sustained and where there is time for cross-boundary liaison is the most suitable and desirable timetable provision.

Block timetabling, where all or a group of the arts are operating simultaneously offers the best provision for variable interaction and when coupled with long sessions this offers the maximum opportunity for work within more than one subject.
In a substantial number of schools, a system of rotation of pupils around a series of different arts subjects is operated. This is particularly common in the first two years of the secondary school and may be extended to the third year. Pupils experience a greater number of options for a much shorter period of time; in some cases rotation takes place at the end of every term, or at a point halfway through the year. In a school where creative arts are offered for two double period blocks each week, and where termly rotation occurs, pupils can experience six different arts areas during the year. This certainly provides a broad coverage of the arts and may offer pupils an opportunity to relate one arts subject to another but because the period of exposure to each subject is so short, depth of learning tends to be sacrificed to breadth of experience. Better opportunities are provided for flexible approaches such as team teaching, but unless a fairly solid background of knowledge and skill acquisition apposite to each particular arts area is provided, pupils may well experience frustration by being unable to represent their own ideas in an adequate and satisfying ways.

Without the knowledge and skill background, ideas cannot be communicated or expressed in acceptable ways.

Provision of physical resources is an important factor in the successful operation of creative arts departments. Where the environment is designed for interaction then the problems are minimised. The Leicestershire "design departments" which have most of the creative arts subjects sited in close proximity are in a strong position to offer meaningful liaison between the subjects.

Generally, however, even this sort of provision tends to cater for art and the crafts and does not really provide for music, drama, dance or physical education. Obviously the problems in creating a site for the creative arts model already established would present considerable problems. The siting of each individual subject area needs careful attention, for whilst it is acceptable for the music room to be near the art or fabric areas, it would be a disaster to site it adjacent to the heavy crafts.

It would not be an insurmountable problem to site music, sports dance and drama facilities alongside art and crafts areas, although as far as I am aware, few, if any, schools have done so.
If there is to be some form of interactive teaching, the facilities must be so sited and arranged as to encourage and make this possible. If teachers have to transport their classes any significant distance in order to liaise with other departments, the chances are that the inherent problems will prevent such interaction happening. Although the siting of arts areas adjacent to each other in no way guarantees any form of automatic interaction, it would seem more likely to occur where the geographical location of facilities is accessible and conducive to working together.

The relationship of the arts to the whole curriculum should not be overlooked especially where provision is made for the creative arts department to be sited as an integral unit. The advantages of subject interaction should not occur at the expense of arts teachers being isolated from their colleagues in other disciplines. Creative arts departments can easily become divorced from the mainstream both in social and curriculum terms, and be totally segregated behind departmental walls.

In situations where education is still seen as being mainly the pursuit of academic achievement, and where the arts are regarded as unimportant, except for the less-able, the isolation of the department could well fuel this fire and result in the further depression of the arts by enabling them to be regarded as being something both academically and geographically apart from the mainstream or more academic curriculum.

Even where rooms are sympathetically sited, they need to be adequately equipped. The high cost of much of the equipment required by arts teachers puts them in a vulnerable position during periods of economic stringency. Where this is coupled with the unfortunate but traditional view of the arts as low-status subjects, their position becomes rather tenuous when areas of possible cuts are being examined.

Fortunately, in many schools and in a number authorities, the arts are well-established and make a vital contribution both to the education of the individual and to the quality of school life in general. This is however, not the case in all schools and in all authorities and even the existing levels of provision for the arts in schools is being threatened by cuts in public expenditure and by some of the demands of educational accountability.
Falling school rolls could well lead to considerable curtailment of arts subjects, and especially within creative arts departments where it is relatively easy to phase out a subject and still nominally maintain the curricular area.

Factors such as the type of environment, type of school and type of pupil will all affect the individual creative arts department and consequently a single universally acceptable and prescriptive blueprint for the creation and operation of creative arts departments cannot be suggested. Social and economic pressures from parents and pressure groups within the community, the career aspirations of pupils, and parental career aspirations for their children will all have some effect and need consideration.

Obviously the philosophical criteria must be the over-riding factors in the establishment, operation and evaluation of any creative arts department, but they should be seen in the social context if the department is to be successful.

The arts whether as discrete subjects, or as part of a more interactive department or faculty represent crucial elements in a balanced curriculum. They are not more important than other subjects in the curriculum, but they are certainly equally as important as other forms of knowledge.

Their contribution to education, as outlined in "The Arts in Schools (Gulbenkian, 1982) is by the development of the full variety of human intelligence, the development of creative thought and action, in the education of feeling and sensibility, in the exploration of values, in the understanding of cultural changes and differences, and by the development of physical and perceptual skills.

In schools, the case for the arts derives from the need for a system of education which takes account of contemporary social circumstances, and of the need for a breadth of education which is not over-emphatic on traditional academic learning.

The purpose of the creative arts department should be to provide the greatest number of pupils with the greatest number of opportunities for learning in the arts.
The major question which is raised by all the previous discussion is whether the creative arts department can provide an experience of the arts which is in some way fuller and better than that which can be provided by the arts subjects operating autonomously and in isolation from each other.

Having declared allegiance to the premises advocated by Phenix and Hirst, it is accepted that human beings are essentially creatures who have the power to experience knowledge and that this knowledge is differentiated in its very essence. Knowledge is therefore regarded an existing per se rather than being a social construct and general education is regarded as the process of engendering knowledge or essential meanings.

The acceptance of the differentiation of knowledge into various types tends to preclude postulation of the view of knowledge being a totally integrated experience. The concept of a fully integrated creative arts department may not, therefore be the most productive or satisfactory answer for the teaching of the arts in secondary schools.

Integration is too strong a concept to do full justice to the unique and individual nature of the arts subjects. Where full integration has been attempted, particularly where a thematic approach has been adopted, much spurious and superficial work has resulted. Areas of commonality based on little more than peripheral concerns of the constituent subjects have resulted in the essential and unique core of knowledge of each subject being missed altogether, or at best, given only passing attention.

A much more flexible liaison is necessary; one in which subjects can work together as an when necessary and which is instigated by a common need rather than by a rigidly imposed conceptual superstructure.

Variable interaction, where subjects are aware of each other's essential concerns and yet at the same time have the capacity to maintain their own individuality and autonomy appears to provide a structure which enables fruitful and meaningful interchange between the subjects to take place.

Not only does variable interaction provide opportunities for loose liaison within the established creative arts group, but it does not prevent liaison with subjects which are outside the group.
The establishment of departments almost invariably and automatically excludes cross-boundary working; and where rigid boundaries are established with departments being physically isolated as well as being mentally and philosophically separated, the group of subjects within the department can very easily become divorced from the mainstream of the curriculum.

A creative arts department based on variable interaction between the constituent subjects can provide an increased variety of experiences and media and can contribute significantly to aesthetic, expressive, affective, creative social and cognitive development.

However, this can only occur when the creative arts department is constituted from subjects having a justifiable claim for inclusion based on educationally viable criteria. There can be little real value, other than administrative convenience, in establishing groups of unrelated or tenuously related subjects, for any interaction between them will consequently be either non-existent or spurious.

The criteria suggested by the Phenix Realms of Meaning and Hirst’s Forms of Knowledge provide a useful and relevant foundation on which a range of selective criteria may be built.

Creative arts departments composed of subjects which have an essential concern with aesthetic attributes, are experiential, concerned with creativity, affect, and which are concerned with the acquisition of skills, self expression, and cognition would appear to have value as curriculum structures. Only compatible subjects could be included and there should be sufficient common ground for variable interaction between them to be fruitful. As knowledge is differentiated in essence, the nature of each constituent subject needs to be protected and the differences, as well as the areas of commonality, need to be acknowledged and respected.

A creative arts department which is composed of art, music drama, dance, the crafts, physical education and design and in which interaction between the subjects is variable according to needs would appear to offer a range of arts experiences greater than the sum of the constituent parts. The wider arts background provided by the group should encourage greater artistic vision not only in relation to the component subjects, but also in general terms.
In an economically recessive climate, education can easily become disproportionately concerned with vocational issues, but the arts not only represent an essential ingredient in a balanced curriculum but also make a unique contribution to the broad and liberal education of the whole person and as such, demand equal consideration alongside the more academic subjects. Curricular provision for the arts must rest on a sound philosophical base but must also take account of social and economic issues. Unless the arts are to be regarded as second best or as of only peripheral importance in education, some form of evaluation of their contribution is essential. Evaluation which is, however, based on criteria peculiar and relevant to arts experiences rather than those applied to other subjects is the only way in which this will be effectively achieved.

"People have made our world an ugly place. Teachers of art and design are the high priests of form and order, and it is up to them to come out from their studios and lead a natural crusade to improve our visual environment". (Holroyde 1981)

Although Geoffrey Holroyde cites art and design in particular, the sentiment of the quotation holds equally true for all of the arts. Teachers of art, crafts, music, drama and movement have a unique opportunity to enrich the impoverished world of education in the arts.

Creative arts departments operating programmes of variable interaction between closely allied arts subjects may well be able to contribute significantly to arts education in the secondary school and may even be regarded as representing major planks in the platform of artistic and creative development.
Emotional activity, in some form, appears to be an inevitable facet of human experience; Ryle (1) describes emotions as "turbulences in the stream of consciousness which the owner cannot help but register directly".

It appears to be directed in specific areas which Hepburn (2) refers to as targets and which may be internal or external. They should not however be confused with causes; for emotion is much more complex and may not be seen as having simple causes.

Yarlott (3) extends the target theory by suggesting that "emotion is an experience triggered off by perception in which a person appraises some object or situation as bearing favourably or unfavourably upon himself and the attainment of his goals".

It is suggested, albeit tentatively, that one's perception of works of art can result in emotional arousal and that this can be the direct result of one's appraisal of a specific work of art.

It is generally accepted that the employment of the arts may be instrumental in the widening of emotional experience, and despite certain difficulties, the role of the arts in emotional education is a fundamental and central one.

"Undeniably, the fine arts are productive of emotions, although they are not exclusively a vehicle for producing emotions" Raleigh (4)

It could be argued that art is the language of the emotions (Ducasse 5) which is a view widely held since Veron who in 1879 said that art is "the emotional expression of human personality".

It seems reasonably to accept the premise that fine art and emotion are essentially linked and that art may well, although not necessarily, result from emotional activity.
Initially, I set out to substantiate the hypothesis that pictures contain emotion-aroused stimuli which can be identified. Obvious difficulties immediately arose; for pictures can be regarded as containing emotion-aroused stimuli which can be perceived to a greater or lesser extent dependent upon a variety of factors, age, previous experience, relevance, both personal and social, of the picture etc. etc. Only some pictures may contain perceivable emotional stimuli. Some pictures may once have done so, but are now no longer sufficiently relevant socially or societally to do so. Contrary to this some pictures which are not capable of arousing emotion at the moment, may 'develop' emotion-arousal qualities in the future by becoming relevant to future viewers. There are some pictures may be deliberately emotionless, created specifically to be so. All these important differences were borne in mind throughout the experiment. The hypothesis I attempted to test was eventually arrived at as being "that pictures may, under certain circumstances, have the ability to develop emotion within the viewer".

Each stage of this experiment, was fraught with problems, alternative hypotheses, doubt and imprecision. I have tried to be aware of many of the problems and to take some account of them, but the limited nature of the experiment has in some case led to progression when the foundations on which progress was made were unsubstantiated. In retrospect, it may have been more useful to stop at the first problem and to develop and solve it, making that the content of the experiment. Despite glaring non-sequiteurs, and somewhat shaky premises, the situation was set up where I hoped to assess in some way the effect pictures had on the emotion-arousal of viewers. The testees were to be a group of lower sixth pupils in a large coeducational comprehensive school in a rural area. A series of slides of famous paintings would be shown to them and to which they would record their emotional reaction.

Twenty three slides were collected which were considered to be suitable. The problems of subjectivity involved in selection were ignored, slides were chosen which, covered a wide range of styles, periods and emotional content. The slides were chosen partly by the knowledge of their content, and partly by their title. I had presumed that where a title obviously indicated some type of emotion, the artist may have attempted to convey that emotion through the picture. The list of slides is appended. The range of slides available tended to limit the choice, for without a great deal of research and enquiry, the most readily available sources were the Tate Gallery and the National Gallery.
The limitations of choice are obviously apparent, and ideally the selection should have been made by a panel using all the available sources. The twenty three slides were shown, initially to several panels of judges. I had hoped to use six panels, but in the event, used only three; panel one, made up of ten 'A' level Art students; panel two composed of six members of the selection committee of a provincial Art society; and panel three, eight specialist art teachers who worked in the same educational establishment. (The full list of panels is appended).

The panels of judges were not asked to evaluate and record their emotional response without knowing the situation. The nature of the experiment was simply explained; the hypothesis was stated, and the panels were asked to record what, if anything, they felt. There was a great deal of disagreement, possibly because the number of slides was excessive, but it was possible to obtain a selection of ten slides where agreement between the judges ranged from five out of fifteen to twelve out of twenty four; this was the highest number of agreements. With the panel of 'A' level artists, there was the danger that they were trying to please me; with the art society committee the situation may not have been sufficiently and thoroughly explained. With the specialist artists, consensus was at it's highest. Obvious problems were disregarded in order that the test proper could be undertaken. It was felt that whether the selection panels needed to be composed of artists, and fine artists at that, was questionable, perhaps music and literature should have been represented or perhaps even a random selection of judges of the same age, irrespective of interest or training might be equally appropriate, although the work of Sibley and Tanner (6) seems to be significant here by their suggestion that as age and "education", increase, so one becomes better equipped to perceive aesthetic qualities, and this may well be true for emotional arousal stimuli too.

The ten slides selected are listed at the end. It was decided that the slides should be shown twice on the first occasion, the testees being asked initially to record whether they felt any emotion or not, and then what specific emotion was felt.

The group of sixth form pupils numbered thirty two, a large number of pupils being on a geography field trip; they assembled in the hall as is normal for the general studies lesson. Paper for recording was issued, and the group were asked to "look at each picture carefully and write down whether you feel anything or not. If you feel something, write 'yes', if not, then write 'no'. They were asked not to attempt to define what they felt at this stage.
The question may be obviously clumsy and in need of rephrasing, and as was not subjected to scrutiny by impartial judges, it can be seen as being very subjective. The analysis of the results of this test are appended in a tabular form. Four out of the ten slides were thought to have emotional content by a substantial majority of the testees. Slides 9 and 11 were found to have a large proportion of opinion against them having emotional content. Slide 9, an abstract by Rothko presented problems throughout the trial, and was the slide which met with least agreement by the panels of judges.

Immediately after being shown the slides, the exercise was repeated, and the question was asked "Look again at the ten slides and this time write down precisely what you feel when you look at the pictures. Try to be as accurate and precise as possible. If you feel nothing, then write 'nothing'. If what you feel is indistinct, or if you are not able to describe what you feel, then write 'something'".

From the results of this test, the questionnaire was drawn up. The views of the panels of judges were used in conjunction with the consensus of the testees answers. The diversity of answers was incredible, but a sufficient number of testees agreed with the panels of judges to make it worthwhile proceeding. Only answers which were identical with the views of the panels of judges were used; there was not the time to bring answers which may have had the same meaning as the judges answers, before a panel for possible interpretation. The questionnaire was drawn up, asking for absentees from last week's test to record the fact, also whether they were 'O' level or C.S.E. grade I artists.

In section one, testees were asked to delete the word which was not appropriate. On reflection, this may not have been a good idea; it may have been better to ask for the correct word to be underlined. Pupils were asked to "Look at the slides, and decide whether what you feel is pleasant or unpleasant, record accurately, and attempt to be as precise as possible".

The second section asked pupils to underline an appropriate word from a list of four alternatives. Each number had a choice of: the emotion agreed by the judges and subsequent results of test one; an emotion close, but not close enough to be confused with the agreed emotion; a totally inappropriate emotion; and the word 'none', signifying no emotion at all.
The question was asked "Look again at the slides and underline the word which identifies, or is the closest to what you feel. If you feel something other than the words listed, add your own word to the four and underline it. If you are not able to describe or identify what you feel, but feel something, write 'something'".

The conditions under which the questionnaire was given were as close as possible to those on the previous occasion. Forty two pupils completed the questionnaire, and the full results are appended.

There was found to be considerable agreement on two of the slides, numbers 1 and 20, which aroused feelings of repulsion (Francis Bacon : Isabel Rawsthorne) and calm (Corot : Summer morning) respectively. Thirty two out of forty two agreed on repulsion for slide 1; and thirty five out of forty two agreed on calm for slide 20. Considerable disagreement arose with regard to slides 2, 5, 9, 11 and 23, twenty six disagreed that peaceful was the emotional response aroused by slide 2; 24 disagreed with slide 5 being mysterious; 35 felt something other than warmth for slide 9; 29 felt something other than pity for slide 11, and twenty five pupils disagreed that warmth was the feeling aroused by slide 23.

The percentages of agreement ranged in Section One, from 26% - 95%, with seven out of the ten slides having over 50% agreement as to their being pleasant or unpleasant. In Section two, the percentages of agreement ranged from 17% - 83%, with over 50% agreement on only five of the slides.

The words which were added to Section Two, the testee considering that all four alternatives were inappropriate, are listed separately with those words which may be acceptable as being very similar to the agreed word underlined.

A tabular comparison of the results between the artists* and non-artists is appended. It is fallacious to attempt to draw conclusions from these figures, as the group of artists numbered ten, whilst the group of non-artists numbered thirty two. A slight increase in agreement was evident in the results of the artists, but whether this is in fact the case cannot be concluded, as the group was composed of only one third the number of the non-artist group. It may be significant however, that the greatest degree of agreement tended to occur in the middle of the range; in Section 1, 50% of artists scored six agreements, and 34% of non-artists scored 5 agreements.
Similarly in Section 2, the largest scores were recorded as 40% agreement by artists scoring six correct agreements, and 28% of non-artists scoring 5 agreements.

The fact that ten of the testees missed the first test session, did not seem to affect their agreement scores significantly when considering the questionnaire. Had time been available, it may have been profitable to look at the consensus of alternatives where a large score against the judge-agreed emotion was recorded.

The abstract slide, No. 9, (Rothko: Light red over black) created problems throughout; the age and experience of the pupils may have mitigated against the ability of the picture to arouse emotion, or the pupils may not have been able to recognise what they felt.

The shortcoming of this experiment are manifest and innumerable, twenty three slides may have been too large or too small a number to begin with; it might have been a good idea to keep to contemporary painters whose work may be of greater relevance, and it may have been profitable for discussion to have taken place at some stage, after, or possibly in place of the questionnaire.

It is questionable as to whether the use of slides represents the best way to present the pictures to the pupils postcard reproductions may have been better, but immediately problems arise in the provision of fifty postcards of the same picture.

The composition of the panel of judges may be criticised as already mentioned, and the age of the pupil testees may affect the results obtained. It may be that perception to emotion-arousal stimuli develops with age and maturity, in which case a repeat of the tests at various ages would be useful to show this progression. The exercise might profitably be repeated with pupils at four or five year intervals, and with students in Further Education. It may be that the testees were not sufficiently educated in distinguishing emotions, or even sufficiently aware to feel them. It is also possible that the emotions which the slides contained were too obscure for the testees.

One of the major difficulties appeared to be with regard to the introduction of the tests. It would appear that too little introduction could result in confusion, uncertainty and possible withdrawal of full participation, whereas too detailed an introduction may well destroy the objectivity of the test by suggesting and leading the "right answer" to be given by the testees.
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With the 6th form testees, I felt that the questionnaire achieved the right balance with regard to introduction; the questions asked appeared to be understood, and the results obtained indicated that participation had occurred. A large question mark hangs over all enquiries of this nature, where a written response to a given situation is required, in that one can only assume that the recorded response is in fact identical to the felt response. It is very easy to disguise our emotions and to feel one emotion and exhibit the attributes of another; it is even easier to feel one emotion and record another. Even the act of recording can be seen as prejudicing the outcome of the test in that time elapses between the feeling of the emotion and the recording; in this time lapse, it is possible to reconsider and reconstruct the original felt emotion; the recorded emotion then becoming a modification of the felt emotion.

The structuring of the test in a group situation may have influenced the results, also the use of words and questions may have prejudiced the enquiry. Perhaps an introduction to the expressive nature of art in specific terms at a previous time might have enabled the testees to be more accurate and discriminating. It appears to be very difficult indeed to decide how to present adequate information for the enquiry to operate realistically and purposefully without in some way prejudicing the results.

The sample of both judges and testees may well have been far too small, and of a too restricted nature. The time available for the experiment proved to be inadequate, resulting in progress being made where evaluation and reappraisal should have taken place. However, certain indications were apparent from the enquiry, and trends were emergent; albeit that they can in no way be regarded as conclusive or generally indicative.

Accepting the confines, inadequacies and limitations of the enquiry, it was found that agreement could be reached even though this may be to only a limited extent on the emotion which the viewing of a picture may arouse. It was found that a considerable degree of agreement could be reached in the differentiation between pleasant and unpleasant feelings evoked by a painting. It might be profitable to extend this distinction between two opposing emotions approach c.f. Yarlott's "mad/sad" concept, particularly if younger or less emotionally mature subjects were tested.

Abstract art appears to present inherent difficulties of its own; perhaps only those who are towards the positive end of Sibley and Tanners educated elite continuum are able to deal adequately with the complex concepts involved.
The subject matter of the paintings used was the focus for this enquiry, but other factors affect the results; colour and composition for example, but where the subject matter was less obvious, as with Rothko's abstract, it appeared that insufficient information was presented for an emotional response to be aroused. As previously mentioned, this may be seen as being a deficiency in the picture, or in the level of emotion recognition in the viewer.

I felt that I had fallen into the trap of trying to use and give importance to every scrap of information which I had gathered. In the event I attempted to disregard peripheral issues, but the large amount of information which the enquiry presented tended to lead to diversity and irrelevance.

In conclusion, I think that in certain instances, some pictures may be able to elicit an emotional response from the viewer. This is a far cry from the original hypothesis that works of art, pictures, are able to arouse emotional response.
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Part of this appendix was submitted as coursework in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the award of Master of Education from The University of Nottingham 1978.
If you passed '0' level art (Grades A,B,C only) or C.S.E. Art at Grade I, tick this box.

PLEASE LOOK VERY CAREFULLY AT THE SLIDES, AND ATTEMPT TO BE AS ACCURATE AND AS CONCISE AS POSSIBLE IN YOUR RECORDING.

SECTION 1: Delete as appropriate
1. Pleasant/Unpleasant
2. Pleasant/Unpleasant
5. Pleasant/Unpleasant
6. Pleasant/Unpleasant
9. Pleasant/Unpleasant
11. Pleasant/Unpleasant
14. Pleasant/Unpleasant
20. Pleasant/Unpleasant
22. Pleasant/Unpleasant
23. Pleasant/Unpleasant

SECTION 2: Underline ONE only in each number. Please check carefully to ensure that you are being as accurate as possible.
1. JOY NAUSEA REPULSION NONE
2. ANGER PEACE NONE NOSTALGIA
5. SHAME MYSTERY PEACE NONE
6. CONFUSION NONE DISTURBING TRANQUILITY
9. NONE WARMTH HAPPINESS FEAR
11. FRUSTRATION HUMILITY PITY NONE
14. DISTASTE NONE RAGE HORROR
20. NONE GRIEF AWE CALMNESS
22. ECSTASY LONELINESS NONE SORROW
23. ANGUISH EUPHORIA WARMTH NONE
1. Francis Bacon : Isabel Rawsthorne 1966
2. John Constable : Dedham Mill 1820
3. William Hogarth : Satan, Sin and Death 173540
4. Stanley Spencer : Christ carrying the Cross 1920
5. William Blake : Pity 1795
7. Bridget Riley : Fall 1963
9. Mark Rothko : Light red over black 1957
10. William Scott : Reclining Nude 1956
11. van der Aack : Old Woman seated sewing
12. Fra Angelico : Christ glorified in the Court of Heaven
13. Giovanni Bellini : Pieta
14. H. Bosch : Christ Modelled
15. Carracci : Martyrdom of St. Stephen
16. van Eyck : Arnolfini Marriage
17. Gericault : Horse frightened by lightning
18. Matteo : Assumption of the Virgin
19. Rubens : Judgement of Paris
20. Corot : Summer morning
21. Courbet : In the forest
22. Delacroix : Christ on the Cross
23. Jan Steen : Peasants merrymaking outside an inn
Panel 1: Ten 'A' level Art students.
Panel 2: Six members of the selection committee of a provincial Art Society.
Panel 3: Eight specialist art teachers working in the same establishment.
Panel 4: Eight trained artists.
Panel 5: Ten art students in Further Education
Panel 6: The Head of an Art School, an Art Adviser for an Education Authority, a Chief Examiner for '0' level Art, a professor of Fine Art, a philosopher.

Because of time restrictions, only panels 1, 2, and 3 were used.
**TEN SLIDES USED, SELECTED BY GROUPS OF JUDGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Isabel Rawsthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>Dedham Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>Pity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dali</td>
<td>Impressions of Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rothko</td>
<td>Light red over black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>van der Aack</td>
<td>Old woman seated sewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bosch</td>
<td>Christ mocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Corot</td>
<td>Summer morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Delacroix</td>
<td>Christ on the Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Steen</td>
<td>Peasants merrymaking outside an inn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question was asked:-
"Look at each picture carefully and write down whether you feel anything or not: If you feel something write yes; if not, then write no. Do not attempt to define what you feel".

Qu.1. 21 Yes 11 No +10 to Yes
Qu.2. 11 Yes 21 No -10 to Yes
Qu.5. 18 Yes 14 No +4 to Yes
Qu.6. 28 Yes 4 No +24 to Yes
Qu.9. 4 Yes 28 No -24 to Yes
Qu.11. 4 Yes 28 No -24 to Yes
Qu.14 9 Yes 23 No -14 to Yes
Qu.20 15 Yes 17 No -2 to Yes
Qu.22 27 Yes 7 No +20 to Yes
Qu.23 13 Yes 19 No -6 to Yes

A definite plus of emotional content on slides 1, 5, 6 and 22.

The question was asked:-

"Look at the ten slides again, and this time write down precisely what you feel when you look at the pictures. Try to be as accurate and precise as possible. If you feel nothing, then write the word 'nothing'. If what you feel is indistinct, or if you are not able to describe what you feel, then write 'something'.
**Agreement totals, Section 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qu.1</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.2</td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.5</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.6</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.9</td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.11</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.14</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.20</td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.22</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.23</td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** "Look at the slides, and decide whether what you feel is pleasant or unpleasant; record accurately and attempt to be as precise as possible".
### Agreement totals, Section 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Repulsion</td>
<td>+32</td>
<td>(-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>(-26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>(-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Confusion</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>(-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>(-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Pity)</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>(-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Distasteful)</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>(-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Calmness</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>(-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sorrow</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>(-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>(-25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** "Look again at the slides, and underline the word which identifies or is closest to what you feel. If you feel something other than the words listed add your own word to the four and underline it. If you are not able to describe or identify what you feel, but feel something, write 'something'.

**Considerable agreement:** Questions: 1 and 20 (2)

**Considerable disagreement:** Questions: 2, 5, 9, 11 and 23 (5)
**Agreement totals: % Agreement**

**SECTION 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qu.1</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.11</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.14</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.20</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.22</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.23</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 26 - 95  over 50% agreement: - 7

**SECTION 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qu.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.6</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.11</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.14</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.20</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.22</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu.23</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 17 - 83  over 50% agreement: - 5
Analysis of words added to those given on questionnaire
(words which are possibly acceptable, underlined)

Question 1: (Repulsion)
pleasing, grotesque, distasteful, mystery, satisfaction, something unspecified (2)

Question 2: (Peaceful)
something unspecified (2)

Question 5: (Mystery)
repulsion, something unspecified (2), very mixed feelings

Question 6: (Confusion)
interesting (2), strange, warmth, spaced out, fright, something unspecified

Question 9: (Warmth)
tripe, rubbish, yuk, amazement, boredom

Question 11: (Pity)
repulsion, loneliness, distasteful, hate, dislike

Question 14: (Distasteful)
religious, mysterious, sorrow, disturbing, sickening, something unspecified

Question 20: (Calmness)
too pastoral, distaste

Question 22: (Sorrow)
repulsion, something unspecified

Question 23: (Warmth)
strange grotesque.
Comparisons of number of agreements by artists* and non-artists

*artists are defined as those with grades A B or C at '0' level, or grade 1 C.S.E.

**SECTION 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTISTS</th>
<th>NON-ARTISTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agreements:</td>
<td>Number of agreements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 -</td>
<td>1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -</td>
<td>2 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3% (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40% (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6% (6.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample of 10 artists, 32 non-artists

**SECTION 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTISTS</th>
<th>NON-ARTISTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agreements:</td>
<td>Number of agreements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 -</td>
<td>1 9% (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -</td>
<td>2 6% (6.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3% (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 19% (18.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 28% (27.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15% (15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 6% (6.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 12% (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample of 10 artists, 32 non-artists
APPENDIX B (i)

RELATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PHENIX’S REALMS OF MEANING TO ARTS SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOLICS</th>
<th>EMPIRICS</th>
<th>AESTHETICS</th>
<th>SYNOPTICS</th>
<th>ETHICS</th>
<th>SYNOPTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAMA</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFTS</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRIME CONCERNS OF EACH SUBJECT

ART  symbolics/aesthetics  DANCE  symbolics/aesthetics  DESIGN  symbolics/aesthetics
MUSIC  symbolics/aesthetics  CRAFTS  symbolics/aesthetics
DRAMA  symbolics/aesthetics  P.E.  aesthetics/synnoetics

Common group based on the Realms:  Art, Music, Drama, Dance, Crafts, P.E., Design.
### Relative Contributions of Hirst's Forms of Knowledge to Arts Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Math &amp; Formal Logic</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Human Sciences</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Philosophy &amp; Ethics</th>
<th>Fine Art &amp; Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drama</strong></td>
<td>*?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance</strong></td>
<td>*?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>* (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crafts</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.E.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>** (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design and Home economics are fields rather than forms.
**APPENDIX B (iii)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AESTHETIC/CREATIVE</th>
<th>ETHICAL</th>
<th>LINGUISTIC</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC</th>
<th>SOCIAL/POLITICAL</th>
<th>MATHEMATICAL</th>
<th>SPIRITUAL</th>
<th>PHYSICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAMA</td>
<td>* * (2)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>* * (2)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFTS</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Relative Contributions of Factors Which Could Justifiably Be Used as Criteria for the Formation of a Creative Arts Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Experiential</th>
<th>Creative</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Skill Acquisition</th>
<th>Self Expression</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ART</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUSIC</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRAMA</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DANCE</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRAFTS</strong></td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.E.</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td><em>(i)</em></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN</strong></td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) Healthy Body

Utility and Social factors not adequately representative to be seriously considered as linking factors. Cognition only marginally acceptable as a linking factor.
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