review of college catalogues, as indicative of how we organize art knowledge, would reveal that there is diversity, uniqueness, and something I call "loose compiling" in the way art is organized. From institution to institution, there is not a particular set model.

Practitioners' knowledge is fluid; it is not static. On cultural literacy art education, the fluidity of knowledge is observed and students are encouraged to participate in the ongoing constructive processes modifying and creating what is known as well as being able to recognize some knowledge as worthy of preservation. In cultural literacy art education the evaluation of curricula is problematic. It does not guarantee a similar knowledge base in each individual, and it does not enable us to compare intellectual performance nationally. Standardization is something that could not happen from a cultural literacy art education perspective.

An issue here is whether or not a nationally referenced achievement test, as favored in discipline-based art education, would determine the curriculum, or whether the local control of schools will, in fact, run the curriculum. The U.S. Constitution leaves education as the responsibility of the states to define and to create guidelines, and for districts to follow them. When Bowers talks about bio-regional, he's making a case for the curriculum to be specific to the region, for the people who live there and use it, as opposed to a national type of curriculum which may ignore regional differences. DBAE is a highly prescriptive approach to knowing about art while cultural literacy art education is reflective and reflexive and defies singular prescriptions for the knowing and experiencing of art.

*This paper was transcribed by Beverly Wilson, graduate research assistant at Louisiana State University, from an audio tape of a panel presentation that Dr. Nancy R. Johnson presented at the 1988 National Art Education Association Convention in Los Angeles. Dr. Karen A. Hamblem edited the transcribed copy and made revisions for readability on the basis of ideas Nancy Johnson had presented in her articles and other speeches. Since Dr. Johnson's written notes for this panel presentation were not available, references are not cited. Dr. Nancy R. Johnson died September 6, 1988 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Apart from minor revisions through the review process this essay remains intact. Two obvious references are cited below -*editor.*

References

Bowers, C.A. (1974). *Cultural literacy for freedom: An existential perspective on teaching curriculum and school policy.* Eugene, Oregon: Elan Pub.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

The Reality Construction of Technocratic-Rationality Through DBAE

KAREN HAMBLEN

The importance of differentiating between a discipline-based approach to art education and the prescribed DBAE curricular structure and goals presented by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts is developed. It is proposed that the Getty's reliance on the characteristics of contemporary general education for the theoretical foundations of DBAE is restrictive and contributes to technocratic rationalism in art education, and disallows the development of cultural literacy.

It is very important that we make the distinction that DBAE does not have to be any one particular program. However, because of the power the J. Paul Getty philanthropic foundation wields on the pages of our journals, its sponsored conferences, its glossy publications, its planning grants, and so on, DBAE has become almost synonymous with Getty. This is an unfortunate situation, and I think that we all need to make this important distinction when we talk about DBAE. When DBAE becomes synonymous with any one particular institution, its definition and, ultimately, its implementation becomes a closed, predefined situation. Perhaps, this perception is already occurring.

In the Getty version of DBAE it is proposed that there be a written, sequential curriculum that is implemented in designated districts and perhaps, even state wide. This curriculum is to consist of content in the areas of art production, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. Goals and objectives are to be clearly stated and outcomes are predefined (Greer, 1984; Greer & Hoepfner, 1986).

There are two aspects that are especially important in understanding the nature of this type of DBAE curriculum. First, it has been stated in a number of instances that a primary goal is to have art resemble instruction in the rest of education (Greer & Hoepfner, 1986; Hamblen, 1987). Second, and contingent with the previous goal, are statements by such Getty affiliated individuals as Michael Day (1985) that the main distinction between DBAE and previous art instruction is that DBAE outcomes are evaluated. Although evaluation can certainly encompass a range of methodologies - and Day cites and describes a number of approaches - Greer and Hoepfner (1986) propose that evaluation consist of objective, achievement testing.

Since the characteristics of general education are proudly cited in DBAE literature as being desirable for the education of students in art, what DBAE portends can be understood by examining the characteristics of general education. In effect, we have from general education extensive information on modal curriculum content and classroom practices as well as well-developed critiques of the world view that is being presented.

General education is characterized by an emphasis on predictability of outcomes, predetermined outcomes, efficiency of instruction and of student activities, and the accountability that comes from prescribed, carefully delineated content (Apple, 1979; Hamblen, 1985, 1987, 1988). General education depends on having standardized content that can be implemented in a variety of contexts. It is, in effect, content that is assumed to be context free. In much of general education, standardized testing is used to evaluate the outcomes of teacher-proof materials. Such materials emphasize the learning of factual information that is presented without attention to conflicting information, debate or the possibility of alternative interpretations.

Most instruction in general education is dependent on textbooks which present information noninteractively and at a predetermined rate of study (Apple, 1986). Lower cognitive levels of thinking are emphasized (i.e., memorization), and content is denotative and factual. Such content, of course, is also amenable to objective testing.

To understand the Getty version of DBAE, it is helpful to think of how some other subject areas are taught, such as social studies or math (Greer & Hoepfner, 1986; Hamblen, 1988; Rush, 1987). For example, math is taught in a linear, sequential manner, wherein the emphasis is on concept acquisition that is reflected in correct answers on daily worksheets and on achievement tests. There is the belief that a body of mathematical knowledge exists that the child can acquire at a more or less predetermined rate and prespecified sequence. Content is broken down into manageable morsels, and learning is considered incremental and predictable.

If one is moved to object that the above-cited characteristics may apply to general education, but that DBAE art educators are only selecting the best from other subject area curricula, it needs to be noted that the SWRL teacher-proof materials have been used throughout the Los Angeles School District in Getty-implemented DBAE programs (*SWRL Elementary Art Program*, 1975). One might also look at the test items in Utah's tests for grades one through six (*Art Inventory*, 1985) that are criterion referenced to the concept-centered state curriculum guide (Cornia, Stubbs, & Winters, 1976). Content in such curricula and its companion tests is reductionist and pedantic. The focus is on the formal qualities of art, on content that lends itself to easy identification testing, and on the technical aspects of art production. Concessions to individual differences are limited to developmental levels and the rate at which instruction is given. The emphasis is on simplistic, atomistic information about art that can be clearly defined and tightly sequenced. The student is rewarded for following directions, for neatness of art product, and for completion of the assignment (Bullough & Goldstein, 1984; Hamblen, 1987, 1988). In a discussion of test items for art, Greer and Hoepfner (1986) focus on what is "effective and efficient, and ... [what will] minimize dependence on unwanted variables, such as creative expression, interests, attitudes, and values" (p. 47).

An art curriculum is a reality-constructing document that allows for some views of art and that disallows for others. A curriculum represents choices, and, as Michael Apple (1979) has noted, choice of some sort is unavoidable. The characteristics herein cited for DBAE constitute an aesthetic reality that not only offers few choices for the teacher or student, it also obscures the very choice that underlies its construction.

DBAE curricula, as currently being defined and supported by the Getty Trust, obscure the human authorship of curriculum selections, its origins, and its historicity. To date, DBAE curricula have tended to be formalist, technical, and rationalistic, requiring conformity on the part of students and teachers to a preselected, unexamined standard. A view of art is provided that is supportive of white, upper middle class values, and that ignores diverse, hidden stream, and/or controversial art.

One of the keys to why general education has persisted in a rationalistic-technocratic format is that this format commands acquiescence. Curiosity and the pursuing of serendipitous goals, let alone dissent, have little place in such programs. As noted above, the choice that underlies the curriculum is obscured. Information in a curriculum, such as SWRL, is presented as fact. It is presented without debate or a sense of its origins and its dependence on variable interpretations. It avoids the confusion of alternative viewpoints, questions without easy answers, and problems without solutions. It provides closure.

Such a curriculum disenfranchises students and teachers alike. It does not lend itself to self-reflection or critical consciousness. Students acquire a restricted view of art and restricted abilities for critically analyzing aesthetic phenomena, much less questioning the information directly presented in the curriculum (Hamblen, 1988). DBAE, as currently discussed and implemented, fosters a passive reliance on experts who present a singular, supposedly socially validated aesthetic reality.

Cross-cultural aesthetics, avant garde art, the art of minorities, the unequal distribution of aesthetic capital in our society, and similar topics have little place in a curriculum that must be validated by an objective test that will be approved by school administrators. The shape of the aesthetic reality acquired from a DBAE curriculum would be one that is highly compatible with Hirsch's (1987) belief that there are several thousand facts that are needed to be learned to be culturally literate and with William Bennett's (1987/1988) belief that education should deal with our [sic] common aesthetic heritage. It is unfortunate that according to current trends in educational policy, there is one cultural heritage, and to most questions there is one acceptable answer. Curriculum, and ultimately reality, is presented as a *fait accompli* which requires no intervention and even punishes individual differences and variable output.

If the characteristics of general education are taken as integral to DBAE, the result is a view of art that is primarily limited to western fine art forms, formalist analysis, and easily delineated technical skills. DBAE, as currently presented, inculcates conformity to a preselected, unexamined standard that has its roots in the most restrictive aspects of general education and in the limiting world view of technocratic rationality.

References

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education.* New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Art inventory: Tests A-F. (1985). Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Board of Education.

Bennett, W. J. (1987/1988). Why the arts are essential. *Educational Leadership, 45*(4), 4-5.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Goldstein, S. L. (1984). Technical curriculum form and elementary school art education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 16,* 143-145.

Cornia, I. E., Stubbs, C. B., & Winters, N. B. (1976). *Art is elementary: Teaching visual thinking through art concepts.* Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press.

Day, M. (1985). Evaluating student achievement in discipline-based art programs. *Studies in Art Education, 26*(4), 232-240.

Greer, W. D. (1984). A discipline-based view of art education. *Studies in Art Education, 25*(4), 212-218.

Greer, W. E., & Hoepfner, R. (1986). Achievement testing in the visual arts. *Design for Arts in Education, 88*(1), 43-47.

Hamblen, K. A. (1985). The issue of technocratic rationality in discipline-based art education. *Studies in Art Education, 27*(1), 43-46.

Hamblen, K. A. (1987). An examination of discipline-based art education issues. *Studies in Art Education, 29*(2), 68-78.

Hamblen, K. A. (1988). What does DBAE teach? *Art Education, 41*(2), 23-24, 33-35.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rush, J. C. (1987). Interlocking images: The conceptual core of a discipline-based art lesson. *Studies in Art Education, 28*(4), 206-220.

SWRL elementary art program. (1975). Los Alamitos, CA: Phi Delta Kappa.

Cultural Literacy as Social Empowerment

Laurie Hicks

The concept of cultural literacy as a process of becoming socially empowered is developed. A comparison is made between "Getty-ized DBAE" with an approach to art education informed by the development of cultural literacy. How these approaches differ, not only in their design but in the fundamental goals which motivate and guide them is illustrated. An outline is presented of a pedagogical structure around which a cultural literacy approach to art education can be organized and implemented.

Introduction

In recent years art education discourse has become a highly politicized and philosophically charged debate over curricular content, sequential programming, and finances. At the forefront of this debate is the concept of an integrated art program which embraces not only the study of studio techniques and expression, but art history, criticism, and aesthetics. This broader based approach to art education has been appropriated and marketed by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts as Discipline-Based Art Education. Support for discipline based approaches to art education continues to grow as art educators, schools and teachers turn to embrace the plethora of discursive literature and programming dedicated to the theory and practice of a DBAE conception of art education. Currently, this conception most commonly embodies the notions and curricular strategies of the Getty Center. These notions and strategies are based on the assumption that art is grounded in four well established and concrete areas of inquiry and knowledge. According to this Getty Center's conception of DBAE, these four areas - studio production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics - represent self-sufficient and autonomous bodies of knowledge whose content can be clearly and unproblematically defined and articulated. The Getty-ized DBAE wishes to implement a written, sequential curriculum at the district and state levels which would reflect these four disciplines. Since the knowledge and processes traditionally assigned to these disciplines is not seen as problematic by the proponents of DBAE, content is viewed as rational and objective. A result of this view is the standardization of curricular goals, objectives, and learner outcomes (Greer, 1984). Further, this approach supposes that learning can be tested through objective, achievement oriented criteria (Greer and Hoepfner, 1986).