**The Transition from Modernism to Post-Modernism
and Its Problematic Impact on Art Education Curriculum**

Ardesbir Kia

This study investigates the crisis of art education that developed in the era from 1899-1988. The following analysis identifies the hegemony of forces confronting the establishment of a Modern or democratic art education curriculum since the turn of the century.

The birth of Modernism in art and the downfall of the academic high art in the second half of the nineteenth century made it possible for the first time to relate child art with adult art in Europe. Child art came to be regarded as sensitive and a wonderfully artistic phenomenon. From the early 1900s to the 1960s, art education curriculum was dominated by child art. The individual was emphasized as the center of a child-based curriculum.

Influential educators and thinkers such as Pestalozzi and Froebel also believed that children need a special type of education suited to their nature and development. Cizek and Viola were among those pioneer art educators who were concerned with preserving natural child art from any adult influence. Arthur Wesley Dow, an American contemporary of Cizek, urged art for children in place of copying. Dow, however, argued that the elements of composition (e.g. line, spacing, etc.) should be the basis of art instruction. Dow's formalistic approach criticized the academic method of

learning to draw, but emphasized composition, which he called The Synthetic Method.

Around the turn of the century, the Child Study Movement, headed by G. Stanley Hall in the United States, popularized the theory that a child's mind was qualitatively different from that of an adult. Later, the movement, together with the work of John Dewey, influenced practices in art education. Writers such as Florence Cane, Margaret Mathias, Bell Boas, and Victor D'Amico described the potential of the child and his/her unique cognitive world. In place of all previous restrictive methods, they advocated a free atmosphere in which children were urged to exercise their creative self-expression through constructing images in their own unique ways.

Viktor Lowenfeld, by pointing to the danger of adult interference, copying, and the use of coloring books, lent credibility to the above views. Lowenfeld believed that the child should remain subjective in art. That is, art is not invested in an object per se, but reflects experience and impressions concerning the object.

By the mid-1960s, however, there was a major transition toward a discipline as the heart of art education curriculum. A significant event that affected change in art education was the 1965 Pennsylvania State University Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development (Barkan, 1966). One of the major themes resulting from the Penn State Seminar was that art education could be a discipline in its own right.

The structure of a discipline and its meaning for education as developed by Jerome Bruner (1966) has influenced many in the field of art education, including Barkan (1966). Citing Bruner, Barkan concluded that the curriculum in art can be both structured and, with the goals of art instruction determined by the characteristics of the discipline rather than from children's various developmental stages.

Influenced by Barkan, discipline-oriented proposals, emphasizing teaching the content of art since 1965 include: Stanford-Kettering Project; Aesthetic Education Curriculum Program (AECF), funded by Central Midwestern Regional Laboratory (CEMREL) and Ohio State University Research Foundation; Southwest Regional Laboratory Art Program for Educational Research and Development (SWREL); The Aesthetic Eye Project, funded by The National Endowment for the Humanities; Hubbard and Rouse Curriculum; Schwartz's Television Production; and Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE), initiated and funded by the Getty Center for Education on the Arts. The common denominator of all these discipline-oriented proposals is their minimization of the individual's role in artistic creation and viewing.

In this study, DBAE is analyzed within the context of hegemony, which sustains the power group's (Getty's) claims by rendering their prominence natural, justifiable, and beneficent. This historical study investigates components of the crisis in art education: the loss of individuality and freedom since the turn of the century.

Discipline Based Art Education is a corporate-sponsored proposal (McFee, 1984) that dehumanized the curriculum, reflects the ideology and conceptions of efficiency and systems of management to produce a complacent work force (Hamblen, 1985). DBAE reflects the ideological frameworks and values of distinct social groups. Although there might be some participation by the students, its prescriptive ideas consist of fundamental inequalities. Post-Modern art education proposals in the context of discipline based ideas reflect the power which resides in competing elites who seek to study the so-called popular culture as a means of producing and reproducing the norms and values and extend their influence over people's lives. If we accept the fact that democracy is a Modern phenomenon which is practiced from below rather than one dictated from above, DBAE is anti-Modern and anti-democratic.

Modernism which viewed art as an individualistic creative process was overshadowed by Post-Modernism and was never firmly established as a dominant force in art education. Post-Modernism (Habermas, 1983, p. 3) is defined as definitely presenting itself as Anti-Modernity by sacrificing the tradition of Modernity in order to make room for new historicism.

Post-Modernism as a new historicism is a concept correlating the emergence of a new type of social life and a new economic order (Jameson, 1984, p. 53). Within the Post-Modernist culture the integration of artistic and cultural production into commodity occurs partly through (1) the overextension of the commodity field into more and more areas of life

and culture, (2) the growth of the culture industry itself, (3) the need to make the products of capital at least superficially desirable, and (4) capital's need to annex culture to assist in establishing its own legitimacy. Post-Modernist pluralism has its basis in the market's desire not to lose any cultural form capable of conversion into money. Hence, the central theme of Modernism regarding art as a personal, subjective, expressive, and liberating force to free the individual and the society is ignored in Post-Modernist culture. Likewise, DBAE also minimizes the role of the individual by replacing her/him as the center of the curriculum by a discipline. It dictates certain prescriptive, elitist (Efland, 1987), (Lanier, 1987), corporate sponsored (McFee, 1984), technical oriented (Hamblen, 1985) ideas through an eclecticism of four often contradictory discourses of studio art, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics.

DBAE crystallizes the hegemony of the conservative forces' aggressive movement, exploiting the art education curriculum. The hegemony of conservative forces include collectors, critics, corporations, museums, and the last phase of avant-garde, technical, and formalistic schools that have been manipulating peoples' thoughts within very specific patterns. Values of the above groups - individually or combined in art criticism - directly or indirectly act upon peoples' thoughts and actions. Historically, the contemporary hierarchical structures have repeatedly suppressed the ideas of protest and progressive art and art education. This suppression has occurred either by direct confrontations (e.g. Nazi counter revolution or Stalinism, etc.), or by means of articulating modes of

ideological justification in support of Formalist schools of art (e.g. Nazi counter revolution or Stalinism, etc.), or by means of articulating modes of ideological justification in support of Formalist schools of art (e.g. Fauvism, Abstract Expressionism, etc.), technologically oriented (e.g. Bauhaus, DeStijl, Art Nouveau, etc.), or neo avant-garde art.

Through an analysis of the manifestoes and the ideologies of progressive movements in art, the conservatives have repeatedly attempted to discredit the idea of struggle for democracy, justice, freedom, and equality. They have supported those artistic movements which perpetuate the separation of artistic creation from the context of culture and society.

This study concludes that in order to have a free and democratic society, it is crucial to have a Modern and progressive art education. An alliance of all progressive forces in the context of a democratic front to provide a decent atmosphere in support of the modern spirit of the artist is the first step against all the anti-Modernist, reactionary responses in art and art education. This is quite complicated and difficult to accomplish. To have a free and democratic society, the acceptance of the idea by art educators who are concerned and involved is the first and foremost step.

References

- Barkan, M. (1966). **Curriculum problems in art education**, in E. L. Mattil (Ed.), **A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development**. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
- Bruner, J. (1966). **Toward A Theory of Instruction**, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Efland, A. D. (1987). **Curriculum antecedents of Discipline-based Art**

Education, **Journal of Aesthetic Education**, 21 (2) 57-95.

Habermas, J. (1983). Modernity--an incomplete project in H. Foster, (Ed.), **The Anti Aesthetic**, Washington: Bay Press, 3-15.

Hamblen, K. A. (1985). The issues of technocratic rationality in Discipline-based Art Education, **Studies in Art Education**, 27 (1), 43-46.

Jameson, F. (1984). The politics of theory: Ideological positions in the Postmodernism debate, **New German Critique**, 33, 53-67.

Lanier, V. (1987). Art, a friendly alternative to DBAE, **Art Education**, 40 (5), 46-54.

McFee, J. K. (1984). An analysis of the goal, structure, and social context of the 1965 Penn State Seminar and the 1983 Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, **Studies in Art Education**, 25 (4).