

## Some Results of Feminist Collaboration in the Visual Arts: Changes in Art History and Art Criticism

---

Cynthia Bickley-Green & Anne G. Wolcott

### Abstract

Women's activity in the visual arts both in and outside of the art institutions of Europe and the United States reveals a history of collaboration in artistic production and political activism. This paper analyzes the effects of feminist collaboration upon the disciplines of art, the pedagogy of art, and the administration of art institutions. In Part I, the authors review the impact of feminist collaboration in art history, aesthetics, art criticism, and art production. Part II provides examples of collaborative experiences of women in higher education art institutions and in some art communities in the United States, Scandinavia, and Italy. Three conclusions emerged from the review: (a) Collaboration facilitated women's entry into the visual arts; (b) collaborative dialogue has changed the academic structures of art criticism and art history, but collaboration has had a minimal effect in the areas of aesthetics and art production; and (c) collaboration has not resulted in a significant change in the administration or pedagogy of art institutions.

The authors suggest that collaborative dialogue between many different academicians and visual art professionals can create a more normative, comprehensive foundation for the visual arts disciplines. For example, in anthropology, visual art is considered a cultural activity that results in visual form. This definition is applicable to all societies. Some women's artwork falls into this general interpretation. Another instance may be taken from psychologists who have additional views on human behavior and perception that enrich knowledge of activities related to the visual arts. The paper cites women theorists who have demonstrated an ability to consider and connect many ideas and disciplines, and who have contributed to the reformation of a normative, more pluralistic art theory.

### Feminist Collaboration in the Visual Arts: Changes in Art History and Art Criticism

Collaborative feminist activities have changed the disciplines of art and the nature of art education. Traditionally, to collaborate means to work in conjunction with another, or, others, and to co-operate, especially in a literary or artistic work. Often collaboration of women in art is linked with artistic enterprise and production. In the 1970s and 1980s women's collaborative visual art included the Los Angeles' Women's Building, J. Chicago's *Dinner Party*, publications such as *Heresies*, and performance teams such as S. Lacy and L. Labowitz's *Ariadne*. These collaborations facilitated women's personal creative expressions. As women worked with others to create artworks that reflected women's experience, the societal silence surrounding women's life experience was broken. Just as often, for women art professionals, collaboration took the form of political activity for the purpose of achieving a common social or economic goal. In most cases, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries collaborating feminists explored political action to ease women's entrance to institutions of higher learning where professional training in the visual arts occurred. By the 1970s, collaborative political and creative work stimulated (a) the deconstruction of the disciplines of art; (b) the appointment of women to some professional academic and museum positions; (c) a new regard for, if not acceptance of, art by women; and (d) an introduction of pluralism into the visual arts.

However, deconstructive theory has not overturned academic conventions designed to promote and maintain the existing hegemony. Male visual artists have always been eligible for entrance into institutions that would promote their career building and individual recognition (Niceley, 1992). Today, some art schools continue to accept only art students whose works meet the art school criteria of craft and "look." Quality progress in certain programs still depends on gender, age, and creating a particular art school image. One older, female graduate student whose sculptural work demonstrated extraordinary representational skill and reflected calm domestic forms was harshly criticized for creating such work. Her art was not particularly eclectic or "far -out," nor did it contain a raging political message. Perhaps, if the woman had been a man, she would have been hailed as a gifted, hero artist despite the aesthetic preference for domestic representation. She would have been embraced by aestheticians who would accept male representation of visual experience as readily as they accept selected forms of visual abstraction, visual-political expression, and ritual objects in the approved deconstructivist mien. Or had the woman incorporated a tempered feminist message into her work, she might have been accepted more easily because her work would have been in step with prevailing contextual theory that women should create political messages. One may counter the fact that an older woman was in an art school as a student is still an event to be celebrated. Never-the-less, art institutions have not embraced an art theory that permits art education professionals to appreciate and understand the unique qualities of each person's visual expression regardless of that person's demographic statistics. The foundation for this understanding may result in a common theory of art that transcends the *au courant* parameters of art theory.

Beginning about 1881, during the process of women's entry into visual art schools, first as students and then as teachers, two major circumstances evolved. In relation to the structure of the visual art fields, women contributed to the initiation of pluralistic or contextual criticism of the visual arts. Also, many more women became art historians and their sensibility reformed the foundation of art history. However, the art world of the last decade of the twentieth century has not yet recognized women's work as contributing significantly to the development of new,

inclusive aesthetics or, in fact, to the development of new visual art forms. Additionally, although some administrative and pedagogic structures within art institutions have been modified by the inclusion of women into the professorial ranks, student bodies, and curatorial and docent staffs of museums; as noted above, the actual policies and administrative structure of these institutions is only now beginning to change. In summary this paper explores two results of feminist collaboration in relation to women's entry into the visual art academy: (a) How the disciplines of art have changed, and (b) how the institutions of art have changed. In this study, the academy refers to the practices of established institutions of higher education and museums both in the United States and Europe.

#### **Feminist Collaboration and the Visual Arts Disciplines**

Visual art disciplines developed by Euro-American scholarship comprise four distinct academic areas: art criticism, aesthetics, art history, and art production or the making of visual objects. Sensitive to the interconnectedness of human society, women artists, art critics, art theorists, curators, and art historians have contributed in varying degrees to the construction of pluralistic, contextually-based definitions of art theory. For example, marginal art objects traditionally crafted by women (as opposed to most works in fine art museums) have been put nearer the center of artistic creativity according to writers such as Korsmeyer (1993). Also, the process that creates these items has become legitimized by academic study (Congdon, 1985). Through collaborative dialogue, women have produced artworks that reveal the unique experiences of women such as childbirth (Chicago, 1984) and other feminist social concerns (Raven, 1988). These two particulars (a) the development of new art theory that includes works crafted by women and related to the contextual rituals of food preparation, child bearing, and homemaking; and (b) the creation of the works that depict female experience not previously shown in art, such as a women's view of sexual experiences, are substantive manifestations of the other voice and vision that were of minor concern in art before the 1970s. This other voice and vision calls for changing the disciplines of art and the institutions that promote visual art study.

Perhaps it is commonplace to say that acceptance of new visual images is a consequence of the development of new art theory and criticism. Yet the synchronous relation of theory to practice and practice to theory is paramount in creating change. Women's art representing women's experience could not be admitted to the academy until a new theory of art was developed. Similarly, a new feminist art theory was needed in order to generate new artworks (McNay, 1992). The current status of women's art work seems to call for additional theory to integrate women's creative expressions fully into visual art culture.

Elements that brought about the need for change and collaboration include the women's interpretation of full citizenship and suffrage and women's belief in the equity of each individual—a belief rooted in English law and the French revolution. Changing economic structures specific to the visual arts such as the declining prestige of the art academies in Europe (Parker & Pollock, 1981) and the need for art schools in the United States to maintain or increase enrollment have played a role in the acceptance of more women into art institutions. Three major coordinates—social change, the second industrial revolution, and rigorous academic practice—contributed to women's increased participation in art in this century (Elliot & Wallace, 1994). Culture, a social reality, develops outside of the academy. Women's knowledge has developed outside of the visual art institutions and disciplines. This paper explores how art structures have or have not changed as a result of women's experience and creative expression of that experience.

## Part I: The Four Disciplines

Although the organization of the art activities into aesthetics, art criticism, art production, and art history reflects Western academic practice, analogous social activities occur in non-Western cultures. Anthropologists, who study the art of small-scale societies, note the imprecise boundary between art and non-art, and document the aesthetics of persons within small-scale societies who make judgments about visual forms. Anthropologists affirm that the culture of small-scale societies determine aesthetic qualities in art. Art objects also enhance the small-scale societies' perception of the world (Layton, 1991, pp.

4-7). Criteria for making judgments about art and the idea that art enhances perception are elements of aesthetic systems in most societies.

Further, while art history as a profession is not always present in non-Western cultures, scholars have documented ownership of images such as the stamps on Chinese drawings or prints, or the guardianship over certain objects. For example, the guardians of *yananio* baskets are celebrated in Lega (Central Africa) society. The basket passes to the most recently initiated member of the ritual community. In one study, society members remembered the names of forty-two members of the community who had owned a *yananio* basket. Further, some objects in this society are subject to individual ownership, some to group ownership (Layton, 1991). There may be vast differences between memorizing guardianship lineages of ritual objects in Lega society and writing art history in Western society, yet the service to each culture is similar. Both Western and non-Western societies document the ownership histories of objects. Therefore, although the disciplines of art are Western constructions, other social activities assume these roles in many cultures. This paper examines the affects of feminist collaboration in the social activities surrounding art criticism, aesthetics, art history, and art production.

### Criticism

Since the early 1970s, feminist artists and art critics adamantly critiqued mainstream art and art criticism. One may say with little exaggeration that a whole system of formalist art criticism fell under attack. A series of articles published in *Women Artists News*, 1979, documents in a vivid, episodic way the fall of modern art criticism, or as it was eventually tagged, formalist art criticism. The first of these articles describe panel discussions held at Cooper Union and the New Museum in New York City entitled: "Artist and Critic: The Nature of the Relationship" and "The State of Formalism." In explaining these events, the editor of *Women Arts News*, Judy Seigle, writes that what was initially considered art criticism became *formalism*. Formalism was considered elitist. According to Seigle, the outcome of this challenge to formalism was that art criticism

entered a crisis which persists today (Seigle, 1992). Both men and women who were vocally critical of what they heard attended these two panel discussions. Their objection—both written and oral—created the dissonance that challenged the canons of traditional modern criticism. These sessions often attacked the art theories of Clement Greenberg.

These articles deconstructed the criterion of formalist criticism. Formalist criticism posits that an artwork is an object complete in itself. The artwork, free from its environmental milieu, should be studied for its own unique internal principles. A new paradigm described as contextual criticism evolved. In this paradigm, art grows out of and reflects its time and place in relation to the artist, the artistic tradition, and the critical theory. Feminist, Marxist, and African American theorists established the art canons for the 1980s. However, critics of contextualism contend that these approaches (a) pull the viewer's attention from the unique characteristics of the work and responds inordinately to the instrumental affect of the work; (b) limit criticism to that which "fits" with the context, the culture, or the style; (c) detract from the possibility of changing meaning; and (d) if used in educational settings may immoderately politicize the classroom (Gillespie, 1991; Blaikie, 1992).

Feminist art critics who recognized the dearth of women's imagery and women's participation in art initiated intellectual challenge. Their works raised the consciousness of significant numbers of academics. One of the most striking circumstances to come to the attention of aestheticians was that feminist awareness altered the way that the ideal viewer saw a painted female nude in an art gallery. Female art viewers were required to assume a masculine point of view when observing art, in order to actually experience the work from a traditional aesthetic stance (Korsmeyer, 1993). The knowledge represented in elite, fine art painting was gender specific and concerned primarily with the explication of the male gaze. The academic questions that developed then in the 1970s remain unanswered today: "What is the range of the female gaze?" "Once female experience is known can it be reconciled or integrated with male interests to form a more inclusive understanding of the world?" "Does the representation of female knowledge result in fine art?"

Contextual criticism, which involves a demographic focus on the gender, political, and ethnic status of the artist and how these demographics are manifested in the art work, may offer answers to these questions.

In the 1990s there was still discomfort when even traditional female vision was represented in art. For example, when reviewing the graphic work of female artist Jody Mussoff, male art reviewer Michael Welzenback (1992) states:

Mussoff's riveting colored-pencil drawings and oil paintings of women, clothed or nude, alone or in groups, always manage to evince a disturbing duality in the viewer—or in this viewer, in any event. . . . By and large the women here are young and lovely, sensuous and animated. But all of them—even the most attractive nudes—are absolutely untouchable. . . . Something that sets Mussoff's nude studies apart from the work of so many other artists, male or female, is the fact that all of her subjects have an identity. (p. D2)

The critic suggests that female knowledge about women in graphic art may not be comfortable, or recognized as appropriate, or even recognized as visual knowledge at all. Do nudes always have to be touched? Can females be represented as living in a personal space? Is it appropriate to represent human identities in art?

The Welzenbach critique confirms that males distort the female according to their image of her (Code, 1991). Since humans make knowledge, the male image of women is certainly accurate for them—that is not distorted. What is not admitted or explored is the female image of women, the acceptance of that image, and, eventually, the integration or reconciliation of images of women by both men and women. This integration would allow women's experience to create a knowledge as valuable and commonly acceptable or understood as the knowledge of men. Rosemary Betterton (1987) points out that we look at art for entertainment and pleasure, not solely for accuracy in representing social

reality. The stance of the voyeuristic male gaze does not exhaust the possible ways of seeing.

Although one may find isolated examples of art criticism that adequately address women's art images, that sensibility is not prevalent in academic art literature. For example, many art textbooks that reach thousands of undergraduates include presentation of this problem, but not as an integral part of the book. In one instance (e.g., Kissick, 1993), the text isolates women's problem and headlines a question posed by classical feminist theorists Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock (1981): "Why has it been necessary to negate so large a part of the history of art, to dismiss so many artists, to denigrate so many works of art simply because the artists were women?" (cited in Kissick, 1993, p. 477). The author John Kissick concludes that "though relatively young as a critical movement, feminist art and criticism have been essential in broadening the narrow parameters of art and exposing culture's unspoken relation to issues of gender and power" (1993, p. 489). While this situation is important, this manner of isolating feminist art criticism segregates feminist art within feminist politics of gender and power. Kissick sidesteps feminist experience as knowledge or art in a broader sense and avoids the potential of women's art to create general knowledge. The implied dialogue remains in the political field.

Terry Barrett (1994), whose introduction to the discipline of art criticism is used in many undergraduate art classes, cites passages from women critics to describe feminist aesthetics. He describes feminist aesthetics and criticism, and in this manner, affirms feminist thought along with other stances such as modernism, postmodernism, and multiculturalism. Also, Barrett articulates the notion that art is knowledge and knowledge of women's experience is as valuable as knowledge of male experience.

Other writers have begun to affirm the creative knowledge and production of women in mainstream culture. In their book *Women Artists and Writers: Modernist (Im)positionings* (1994), Bridget Elliott and Jo-Ann Wallace show how women such as Peggy Guggenheim, Romaine Brooks, Gertrude Stein, and Marie

Laurencin shaped the modernist notions of the avant-garde, professionalism, genius, and economic disinterestedness (p. 15). In *Get the Message? A Decade of Art for Social Change* (1984), Lucy Lippard weaves women's art through her recollections of political art of the 1970s and early 1980s. In this context women's art such as the performance piece of Ariadne *In Mourning and in Rage*, have unusual unity and power. Lippard writes:

One of the feminists' goals is to reintegrate the esthetic self and the social self and to make it possible for both to function without guilt or frustration. In the process, we have begun to see art as something subtly but significantly different from what it is in the dominant culture. (p. 151)

*Feminist Art Criticism: An Anthology*, edited by Cassandra Langer, Joanna Frueh, and Arlene Raven (1988), critiques the theory and practice of feminist art and offers suggestions for how to reshape the art world.

The interests of feminist critics has expanded. Two articles in the *Women's Art Journal* seek to identify the work of two artists in a formalist framework. Colleen Skidmore (1992) shows how the work of Dorothy Knowles meshes with Greenbergian criticism within a feminine sensibility. Katherine B. Krum (1993) reviews the work of Pat Lipsky Sutton to show how a female artist addresses formalism.

The introduction of feminist criticism in classroom instruction is a major change. Laurie Hicks' (1992) methodology of feminist criticism involves art instruction that (a) describes and ascribes meaning to the visual characteristics of the work; (b) compares images that have either similar or different views of women to explore beliefs about women; (c) through dialogue, puts the visual representation into the "real" world of experience to understand how the image might have "real" world consequences; (d) seeks out and explores the contexts that elucidate the production and viewing of art; and (e) takes action on the results of the critical analyses by offering methods to represent women in new ways. By using Hicks' methodology as

an indicator of feminist criticism applied in the classroom, the 90s emerges as the generative period for change.

### Aesthetics

Searching for aesthetic theory in women's art literature is rarely fruitful. For example, using *Mutiny and the Mainstream* as a general guide to popular feminist thought of the past two decades, the only mention of aesthetics is a male quoting the familiar cliché, "Aesthetics is to art as ornithology is to birds . . ." (Seigle, 1993, p. 127). This suggests that many politically active feminists—women who often rely on collaborative action—have not overtly contributed to the development of a feminist art aesthetic that is generally inclusive. The dilemma is that while feminists object to male aesthetic systems that omit the experience of women, women have not developed the inclusive aesthetics that can address all artists.

What aesthetic stances have women taken during the past two decades? An inordinate number of women artists (and perhaps women in general) have subscribed to the aesthetic stance of Foucault that the self is to be developed like a work of art (Foucault, 1984). Although enticing, this particular aesthetic position is not compatible with social collaboration. The effect of such an aesthetic is to focus on the individual's inner development. It reinforces the tendency of feminism to aestheticize problems related to forms of subordination (McNay, 1992). Developing certain aesthetic directions in relation to women's experience are counterproductive. The self as art objectifies self and suggests becoming an object of beauty. One might say that the aesthetics of Foucault and feminist art theory are antithetical.

However, there are exceptions. The first exception comes from academic feminists who have produced aesthetic theory in the psychoanalytic criticism of art—particularly scopophilia: a gendered and eroticized aesthetic position (Korsmeyer, 1993). Such development seems appropriate since to explore feminist aesthetics involves the exploration of female experience—a gendered and sometimes eroticized experience. Carolyn

Korsmeyer (1993) writes that a traditional, unified theory of aesthetics that considered questions such as What is beauty? and What is art? has crumpled under the challenge of feminist scholarship and the challenge to claims about universal human nature. Still, without providing a universal theory, feminist critics do not actually change the discipline. Working in this direction, Korsmeyer (1993) does propose that the topic of pleasure be reexamined because it spans feminist theory and traditional foundations of aesthetics, and because gender position needs to be articulated as the scientific theory of consciousness develops.

Griselda Pollock (1988) finds aspects of scopophilia useful in developing aesthetic theory. She writes that scopophilia is love of looking that, according to Freud, derives from the pleasure taken by the incompetent and immobile infant in imagining control over another by subjecting them—the others—to a controlling gaze. The combination of scopophilia and fetishism builds up the beauty of the object and transforms it into something satisfying in itself.

A second exception comes from work by Suzi Gablik who proposes a more collaborative model of aesthetics. She writes that presently aesthetics is not defined by "creative participation" (Gablik, 1991, p. 60). Current aesthetics is defined by the modernist notions of autonomy, separatism, and the self. The value of modern aesthetics resides in the object itself, with no concern for context or meaningful connections. As George Baselitz stated, "The artist is not responsible to anyone. His social role is asocial; . . . It is the end product which counts, in my case, the picture" (cited in Gablik, 1991, p. 61). This present attitude favors an intellectual approach over intuitive wisdom, individualism over integration, and competitiveness over cooperation. According to Gablik, in order to deal with our society and world, a new consciousness or model is needed; one that is perceived in terms of relationship, interconnectedness, and participation. Gablik notes that a very different kind of art is slowly emerging that deals with these issues. She believes that women have a different way of seeing the world and portraying it through their art; that women are more interested in creating bonds and building bridges, whereas men identify with the male

ethos of the artist as genius. Artists such as Mierle Ukeles are presenting aesthetic forms that create dialogues, interaction, and feelings for others. Her art forms create a different female energy pattern; one that transforms an alien audience into an empathic one; relating and weaving together rather than critical distancing. This new aesthetic will require changing the modern aesthetic by exploring a new openness with personal relationships. Gablik concludes, "Partnership is an idea whose time has come" (1991, p. 75).

Perhaps a model for the connectedness of objects to life activities and community is suggested by the aesthetics of small-scale societies. Layton (1991) describes many societies that have an appreciation of form and criteria for judging artworks. These criteria are often related to the effectiveness of the form in producing particular effects, such as prolific yam growing. Yet even knowing the instrumental purpose of small-scale societies' art, some anthropologists expressed a belief in a universal criteria of beauty because their judgment of good artworks were so similar to those of members of the small-scale society which they were studying (Layton, 1991, pp. 7-17).

In conclusion, because of the self reflective nature of aesthetic experience, feminist aesthetic theory has not developed significantly toward unified theory as women have entered the field of aesthetics. However, the pairing and combining of feminist thought with the work of male and female scientists who are unraveling mental consciousness<sup>1</sup> may provide the foundation for a universal, normative, aesthetic theory. Developing such a theory will require more collaboration between cognitive scientists and women in art fields.

### Art History

The discipline of art history was one of the touchstones that radicalized the art world. This discipline has changed most vitally due to the work of women historians. The cry-to-arms

---

<sup>1</sup>Here we mean the scientific study of the nature of consciousness and not the political action of consciousness raising.

began with the realization in the 1970s that the college art textbook *The History of Art* by H.W. Janson covered 25,000 years of art without mentioning a single woman artist.<sup>2</sup> Changes in recording art historical events created an expanded art history that critically considered the context in which art was made and the equally crucial context in which fine art was identified. Productive research and writing in this area has readily emerged since women historians have increased in numbers and have created new texts that affirm and record the pluralistic nature of visual art creation. Anthony F. Janson has become the new editor of the once infamous textbook. He now includes women artists within new editions of the text.

Women art historians have advanced universal theory in the history of art. Germaine Greer (1979) and Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock (1981) were in the vanguard of unraveling the socioeconomic nature of art production for women. In *Feminism and Art History*, Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard brought together an exemplary collection of art historical papers that questioned the litany of the very foundations of art history. They write that feminism and the historical discovery of women has had the effect of first broadening the discipline by way of rediscovery and reevaluation of the achievements of women artists and, secondly, of posing fundamental questions for art history as a humanistic discipline. Finally, a recognition of the distortions that sexual bias has imposed upon the creation and interpretation of art emerged.

A second form of historicism since the 1970s might be characterized as understanding how and for whom visual images create knowledge. Margaret R. Miles has produced such a book in *Image as Insight* wherein she explores the use of visual images in the early Christian church (1985). One of her major themes is the interpretation of the images of women in fourteenth century Tuscan painting. In her study she articulates the flexibility of language and its use in dialogue to develop interpretation of visual images. She shows how semiotic analysis renders new meaning of these Christian images to both men and women. Her

---

<sup>2</sup>Hence the question posed by Parker and Pollock cited above in the art criticism section.

presentation illustrates how collaboration in the form of dialogue builds a foundation of knowledge and how visual images constitute the substructure for that dialogue.

Marcia Hall (1992) has written an inclusive text that explores physical materials, perception, art theory and expression, and historic events in an interpretive analysis of artworks. This integrated approach to art history which utilizes scientific analysis may provide a more holistic knowledge base for art educators. In the arts, the focus on current political isolationism and deconstruction weakens the potential for fully understanding the iconography and environmental origins of the art object. Scholarship in iconography from a phenomenological approach on behalf of women's vision and production will create feminist knowledge. Consideration of the physical and psychological experience of artworks enables viewers to understand artworks, artists, and the world as authentic as well as political. The integrated, holistic approach developed by Hall has the potential to provide a comprehensive ecological foundation for understanding art production.

### Art Production

Edmund B. Feldman (1982) has described women artists as hyphenated artists, that is, women-artists. The implication is that women artists are not noteworthy according to universal criteria, but only as compared to other women artists. Unfortunately, the reality imposed by socioeconomic conditions has had the effect of insuring that fewer women than men have the autonomy to create large bodies of art work. The difficulty that women have encountered in creating environments that encourage their creative work impedes their ability to develop many artworks that might reach a large audience—and perhaps more easily meet universal criteria.

In an attempt to remediate this socioeconomic reality, women's art cooperatives were organized in the 1970s to make opportunities for women to create, exhibit, and sell their work, and for women to dialogue and develop theory. However, true to women's pluralist, cooperative nature, most of these

intellectual and economic havens soon were opened to more diverse artists. The pluralist inclusion also occurred since funding was more readily acquired when larger populations were served.

One way to maximize one's production is to collaborate with others. During the 1970s many women explored collaborative artwork. One leader of the feminist art movement, Mary Beth Edelson, co-created pieces with many individuals who cooperately developed and sometimes presented an idea. For example, in 1973 Edelson created a one-person exhibition by asking many of her Washington, DC art acquaintances for art ideas. Taking the concepts, Edelson created visual works that represented her interpretation of the ideas. Each of the works and the collaborators was represented in the catalog that accompanied the art exhibition. Some years later she traveled to campuses around the United States creating performance pieces that required the collaboration of the academic institutions, the faculty, and students.

Collaborative action in art making was explored to an extraordinary degree by Judy Chicago in both the *Dinner Party* (1978) and *The Birth Project* (1985). Women and men assisted Chicago in both the design and fabrication of these pieces. Occasionally the very activity of collaboration was criticized negatively in relation to these works—a criticism that has rarely been given to the work of male artists many of whom engage in similar production (Lippard, 1984). Both *The Dinner Party* and *The Birth Project* represent monumental efforts in the representation of women's experience, knowledge, and craft. But neither of the pieces has found permanent museum locations. Most recently *The Dinner Party* was gifted to the University of the District of Columbia in 1990 as a centerpiece for multicultural education. The work was rejected by the faculty and the student body of that institution due to the belief spread by Pat Robertson supporters that it would take resources from education (Richardson, 1992).

In the late 1980s, some women artists such as Teresa Norton embraced collaboration as a creative method that might lead, eventually, to monumental public art—an area art historians have not recognized, but women artists have explored

significantly. Working collaboratively with male architect Harp, Norton proposed a 30 million dollar monument to honor *Women in Military Service for America*. The piece was proposed for the gate to Arlington Cemetery called the *McKim, Mead, and White Hemicycle*. Norton won the first stage of the competition, and her proposal is a runner-up for the final monument. Her experience represents a new type of collaboration—women working collaboratively with men on projects of benefit to women. These types of partnerships can contribute to substantive art and design change in the next century.

In Europe, Magdalena Abakanowicz often works in collaboration with others. Although she works with fabric and the serial forms sometimes associated with women sculptors, her work is a protest against human cruelty and indifference, and human fear of self victimization (Beckett, 1988).

Taking another position, Linda Klinger (1991) questions the use of collaboration as a useful strategy for poststructural feminist artists. She raises the point that the identity of the woman is neutralized through collective action.

Collaboration, or collective action, is a particularly informative model to examine for early feminist ideas regarding authorship. Pedagogically, it was a strategy used to strengthen the ego and self-awareness of the female artist; practically speaking, it became a method by which to expand resources and remaneuver the limits of process. (Klinger, 1991, p. 45)

Klinger goes on to say that the tactics of collaboration and cooperation serve to demystify the persona of the artist and to expand the content of the work. In this way, the individual artist speaks with and for a larger community. Yet Klinger remains unconvinced by this political force of collaboration. She feels the tactic erases the individual genius of the artist and cancels the uniqueness of the artist's hand.

For the most part, successful women artists in the field today work from a political base. The imagery that they create

reflects established, accepted norms of mainstream visual communication. The message of their work is political. Jennie Holtzer, Suzanne Lacy, and Leslie Labowitz represent some of the ideas and issues of this aspect of women's artwork.

The problems encountered by women artists are not unique to the visual arts. Intellectual activity is often thought to be more appropriate for men. Knowers are self-sufficient, and objects of knowledge are independent and separate. Knowledge is a privilege value (Code, 1991, p. 110). Because women's art is often categorized as art only if it reflects political action, women's art production still is not valued outside of its political function. One may suggest that new art theory that includes the products of both men and women will identify the relation of the artist to the art work in a manner somewhat analogous to the knower in relation to knowledge. Still in the 1990s art and knowledge are both thought to be the provenance of men.

Elizabeth Chaplain (1994) writes that most feminist art is figurative or scripto-visual because these two modes are most successful in confronting the viewer with feminist ideas. If, for the purposes of this paper, we consider dialogue to be a collaborative venture between the artist and the viewer, then the scripto-visual works of feminists can be considered collaborative works.

One may explore the analogy between art and knowledge in relation to painting.<sup>3</sup> The artist actively searches for visual order. The painting is an epistemic result of the inquiry of the artist. The act of painting, art making, or image making in general, has been and continues to be dominated by males. By convention few women have been admitted into the art academy that creates visual form. That is, few women have been afforded the privilege of creating knowledge in visual art. Some women in the United States have been afforded the freedom of political

<sup>3</sup>The notion of art as knowledge is not new. In a 1955 essay, "Art as Knowledge," Harry Levin approaches the notion by way of a brief introduction to theories of Plato, Aristotle, Goethe, and Croce. (See Levin, H. (1963). *Contexts of Criticism* (pp. 15-37). New York: Atheneum.)

action and the representation of that action through art, but the forms of that creation assume traditionally accepted male-created formats. Until women's experience and thought is recognized as real and integrated, or reconciled with male experience, women's art production will not be valued outside of the social and political context in which it was made.

In summary, this study of women's work in the disciplines of art shows that women's artworks and methods of working utilizes active collaboration, not just in the political arena of the art world, but also in the development of academic dialogues and discovery. The study suggests that as more women have economic success and enter the visual arts fields a more complex rendition of human experience will emerge.

## Part II: Has Collaboration Brought About a Change Within Visual Art Institutions?

In answer to this question, one initially proclaims "yes." By working together women in both the United States and Europe have gained entrance into visual art institutions to which previously only males had access. In Paris in 1881, Mme. Léon Bertaux organized women artists so that they could improve their professional positions. She formed the *Sisters of the Brush*, a women's cultural organization. By 1896, their work gained entrance for women to attend classes at the *Ecole des Beaux-arts* (Garb, 1994). In the United States, Mary Ann Stankiewicz and Enid Zimmerman (1985) note that in the nineteenth century, higher education for women was rare and advanced degrees were almost unknown. Collaboration was an essential factor in the success of nineteenth century women art professionals.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the United States, *Dame Schools* provided women visual education and established the connection between women and the decorative arts. In these organizations, women learned to paint on velvet, embroider cloth, and create watercolors. The educational focus was to develop skills to create an attractive home environment (Plummer, 1979). Women's clubs, based on cooperative and collaborative social interaction, provided

training that promoted personal growth. The American notion that women are the nation's cultural custodians was popular, and women's clubs fostered this idea. Women did have a say in the direction of art education in public schools (McCarthy, 1991).

For example, art educator Mary Dana Hicks Prang collaborated with J.S. Clark and J.C. Locke to explicate the materials of industrial art designer Walter Smith. Her work made a great contribution to the growth of her husband's business the Prang Educational Company from 1879 to 1900. The company provided much of the art education curricular materials for students in the United States. The Prang Company had offices in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, London, Berlin, and Melbourne. In addition to working for her husband, Mary Prang worked in the civic arena with both the schools and the women's clubs to foster art education in the public schools (Stankiewicz, 1985).

Women leaders in the field of art education, particularly higher education, are often characterized as having a social consciousness (Stankiewicz & Zimmerman, 1985). Since many of these women began as artists (a career that requires focus on oneself) and moved into education (a career that focuses on others) it is easy to see how collaboration was a major trait that successful women in this field possessed. Their ability to collaborate with their students has been exemplified by Mary Rouse. She made lasting relationships with her students, opening career doors for them (Stankiewicz and Zimmerman, 1985). In the case of Rouse (1967) an equally notable achievement was her research on art programs (i.e., *Art Programs in Negro Colleges*) in predominately black colleges during the early 1960s. Her work easily contributed to a more complex rendition of human experience at a time when such work was not popular.

### How the Institutions of Art Have Changed

Has collaboration brought about a change within visual art institutions? Given the histories of women in art such as those in the introduction to this section, one can answer *yes*. Women

have gained entrance to visual art institutions; women have created visual art education materials for schools; and women have studied the forms of art education in higher education. In fact, it is not an exaggeration to say that, through collaborative effort, women such as Mary Dana Hicks Prang and Mary Rouse were among the leaders who changed art education in the United States.

However, taking a broader overview, one needs to respond that these women were working in areas that are marginal and often at risk in the general curriculum. Art education as a field in higher education is a stepchild that floats between schools of education and schools of art. In fact, visual art education as public school content area initially was omitted from the United States governors' educational goals for the year 2000. One can demonstrate the marginality of the visual arts by looking at a mundane example of the relation of women in the fine arts to general culture in the United States. Looking for any trace of women in visual arts at the start of this decade in the 1990 *Information Please Almanac* leads one to the *Entertainment and Culture* section and a glossary of art movements. Twenty seven art movements are listed, the earliest being Baroque and others including Beaux Arts, Op Art, and Black or Afro-American Art. The only woman artist specifically named is Louise Nevelson as a practitioner of Assemblage. In the same section, *Entertainment and Culture*, over sixty women are named as winners of the Miss America pageant (1990 *Information Please Almanac*). The reader may wonder if these women are meant to represent entertainment or culture.

#### **Institutions and the 1970s Feminist Art Movement**

In 1992, Arlene Raven, a New York art historian, created a twenty-year timeline of the feminist art movement for *Ms. Magazine*. Most of the events were in some way related to institutions. Women were either trying to effect change in established institutions or to create new institutional forms to meet their needs. The events on the timeline were the result of extraordinary collaborative effort: the picketings of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Corcoran Gallery of Art; the First National Conference for Women in the Visual Arts held

at the Corcoran Gallery of Art and the University of Maryland; the development of A.I.R. (Arts in Residence) Gallery and the Feminist Art Studio in New York City; the Feminist Art Program of California Institute of the Arts organized by Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro; and the organization of the Women Caucus on Art and the National Art Education Association Women's Caucus. Unfortunately, like many other fine art events, these and hundreds of other activities seem to have little impact on the mainstream culture in the United States.

Historically, the unequal representation of women in visual art units of higher education can be shown by the following: (a) In 1972-73, 40% of all studio degrees were awarded to women, but only 22% of the faculty in institutions awarding the degrees were women; (b) in 1972-74, 49% of the recipients of a Ph.D. in art history were women, but only 22% of the academic positions in art history in higher education were held by women and only 14% of these were tenured positions; and (c) in 1975, there were 16,193 recipients of bachelors degrees in art (studio and art history combined) and of these 10,901 were women, that is, fully two-thirds of the art students successfully completing degree requirements were women (Brodsky, 1979). Looking at the percentages today, they have not increased very much. In 1987, the percentage of full-time instructional faculty in the fine arts in higher education was 26% female and 74% male. In 1991-92, there were 19,928 recipients of bachelors degrees in the fine arts and of these 13,479 were women, and of the 149 doctoral degrees in the fine arts, 99 of them were female recipients (*Digest of Education Statistics*, 1994, p. 257). The professional success of these women can be estimated roughly by how many of them at the Corcoran Gallery of Art and the University of Maryland; the development of A.I.R. (Arts in Residence) Gallery and the Feminist Art Studio in New York City; the Feminist Art Program of California Institute of the Arts organized by Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro; and the organization of the Women Caucus on Art and the National Art Education Association Women's Caucus. Unfortunately, like many other fine art events, these and hundreds of other activities seem to have little impact on the mainstream culture in the United States.

### Collaborative Efforts in Art Education by Women in the Nordic Countries

Swedish artist and art teacher Iris Kronbeck stated that in 1945 only men were artists (personal communication, July, 1994). Now in 1994, women artists are blooming in Sweden. Some are self taught and others attend art schools often through adult education courses. Women in Sweden have also founded collective galleries. For example, a mile or so outside of Angelholm, Sweden, a group of five women care for a small gallery that shows and sells their work. Articles of clothing, prints, paintings, ceramics, woodwork, and knitting are sold in the gallery. Kronbeck, who is also a painter, printmaker, and part of this collaborative group, said that she feels that women's work is facilitated when women are able to show their works together. She feels that women artists work more cooperatively than male artists (I. Kronbeck, personal communication, July, 1994).

Over the past 20 years, there has been an increase in the numbers of women enrolled in art and design schools and there has been an increase in the number of women who participate in art and design. Sigrid Eckhoff, one of four or five women who have successfully entered the Norwegian industrial design profession, states that she is making a change in the way that things are designed (personal communication, July, 1994). She works collaboratively with people from many different fields. For example, in her design of children's footwear she used knowledge from ergonomics to construct and design the forms. She studied how children thought about their feet and used that information in the design of the new product. She changed the colors of shoes that were water protective. She said that since the shoes were to be worn in a cold, dark climate, she designed them to be light, white, and comfortable. Her product has had considerable success (S. Eckhoff, personal communication, July, 1994).

Finnish landscape architect, Anneli Ruohonen, says that there are more Finnish women teachers in Finnish schools, but art theory in general has not changed. She estimates that women

comprise 60% to 70% of students in Finnish art schools. Although she is satisfied with theory in her field, she asserts that there should be more public education in landscape architecture (A. Ruohonen, personal communication, July, 1994).

### A Brief Case Study: Italian Women in Art

In consideration of the development of the feminist art movement, it may be useful to reflect on a brief chronicle of its development in a single country. The following material derives from an interview with Pia Candinias, Director of Women's Studies in Italy at Temple University, in Rome, in July 1994. The general question to which Pia Candinias responded was "How have women changed art education in Italy?" As in the United States, the account shows that collaborative activity between women is more likely to reach a political objective. Once the objective is attained and collaboration is required in the broader community, success is more difficult to achieve.

The women's movement has brought few direct changes to Italian academic organization. For instance, Temple University, an American university in Rome, has the only women's studies program in higher education in Italy. There have been organized attempts to bring more women into higher education. In the 1970s, the *Centocinquanta* sponsored by FIAT and other large companies and labor unions, changed education to some extent. The program permitted women to attend university courses for 150 hours. Feminists of the period used this as a window of opportunity to design and teach women's studies courses to working class women. The *Centocinquanta* educational program was a sign of the political vitality of the country in the 1970s. However, in the 1990s, there are no Italian academic programs devoted to women's issues. Instead, many of the women who teach in Italian universities are feminists, and they develop and publish material related to women's topics (P. Candinias, personal communication, July, 1994).

During the past twenty years the feminist movement penetrated Italian politics. Women's political progress was the

major factor in developing the concept of self determination for women and in obtaining legalization of abortion and divorce in Italy—a difficult feat in a predominately Catholic country. While these social objectives were being realized, there was a significant amount of interest in collaborative political work for women, but the goal of that work, a women's political party, never obtained credibility. At one point, however, the women's movement was so powerful that it actually caused one government to resign. By 1994, many more women participate in the Italian government. Perhaps increased participation has occurred because of new regulations that require political parties to present an equal number of male and female candidates.

Once the major social objectives were achieved, the women's movement and the collaboration that it generated lost momentum. It is not anticipated that there will be a rise in the number of women's studies programs in Italy. Academic women who might have the expertise to lead such programs must expend energy fighting for equitable salaries and suitable working conditions.

Temple University Women's Studies program organized by Pia Candinas does not promote any particular political or academic agenda, but rather explores feminist thinking in the fields of literature, history, psychology, politics, and especially the arts. However, the program is also responsive to timely political issues. In the fall of 1993, Candinas organized a series of lectures that explored the political changes brought about by the *Operazioni mani pulite*, an investigation into the use of public money.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> During this series, Carol Beebe Tarantelli, the first American citizen elected to the Italian parliament, gave a presentation entitled "1993: An Italian 'Revolution': the Passage from the First to the Second Republic;" Antonella Picchio, a founder of the Italian feminist group National Organization of Autonomous Women [ONDA] spoke on "The Market, the State and the Moral Question;" and Luciana Castellina, a founder of the daily newspaper *Il Manifesto* and the new left-wing party the "Rifondazione comunista" spoke on "Post Cold-War Italy: Corruption, Reform, and Democracy."

In the spring of 1994, the program returned to its more familiar practice of addressing questions of culture by presenting a series of lectures by artists and art historians. In her introduction to this lecture series, Candinas called attention to one of the contributions that feminist theorists world over have uncovered, that is, art history is a representational practice.

Candinas' account shows how Italian feminist institutions, such as a women's studies program in art, are affected by other feminist political actions. As Candinas' program moves between presentations of cultural and political leaders, she indirectly changes the image of women in Italy. She weaves powerful politicians who have created social change together with women artists and art historians who seek to create cultural changes. This collaboration might serve as a model for women in art.

#### Summary: Has Collaboration Effectuated Changes in the Art Academies?

A simple answer to effects of collaboration is not possible. Historically in the United States, women, through collaborative efforts, have played significant roles in the development of the visual arts, but their actions remain in the periphery of popular culture. Secondly, as a result of women's collaborative political action, most art institutions in the United States and Europe have more women participating as faculty and students than ever before. But the participation is still at a low level. Within some institutions, governance has changed to create a supportive environment for women. For example, some institutions have changed to include mentoring and collegiality (Swoboda, 1990). However, the institutions have initiated this type of action, not the visual arts units of these institutions. Further, collaboration on creative works is not necessarily rewarded by tenure and promotion committees. Dr. Patricia Amburgy concluded that throughout her experiences in higher education over the last decade, the system does not promote or reward collaborative efforts (personal communication, March, 1994). In her experiences as a professor, the only recognized collaboration in her department was team-teaching two courses with female colleagues. She stated that the emphasis in higher education appears to be on a "me first" attitude, setting up a competitive

approach versus a collaborative one. Amburgy did remark that women faculty as a whole tend to want to do what's right for their program, what's best for the collective good, whereas men tend to want "to win." She also agreed with the assertion that the quality of participation in higher education does not go beyond a certain level. As a case in point, women as directors and deans of schools are few and far between; most women fill the lower end positions at universities. She contended that those women who do succeed in the world of art have to "buy into the system." For example, artists such as Jenny Holzer and Barbara Kruger have to turn to self-promotion, "me first," in order to make it in the system, and still there are no women artists that have "star status" like Jasper Johns (P. Amburgy, personal communication, March, 1994).

H.T. Niceley (1992) has written about the development of women art professionals. She describes the current situation in the following way:

Doors have been open, closed and slightly ajar for women artists. The flux and flow of the art establishment and of public opinion have not been constant. Prospects for the nineties seem to me to be brighter for equal inclusion of women artists in all facets of the art establishment. (p. 13)

### Conclusion

In the visual arts, women have been most successful using collaborative action to obtain political goals. The structure of art education has altered as a result of changes in the content of criticism and art history. Many of these content changes were initiated by collaborative dialogues and studies that revealed women's life experiences. However, the administrative structures of most institutions remain the same and collaborative efforts are not usually rewarded.

Collaboration as a creative strategy is more problematic. Some women have been very successful in creating monumental art works through collaborative efforts. However, some theorists

are beginning to view collaboration in creative expressions as counterproductive because the constraints of collaboration minimize the artists' identities. Nevertheless, if one is willing to view public dialogue and discourse as a collaborative effort, then collaboration continues to be essential to the development of new feminist artistic theory in aesthetics, criticism, art history, and art production.

### References

- Barrett, T. (1994). *Criticizing art: Understanding the contemporary*. London: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- Beckett, W. (1988). *Contemporary women artists*. New York: New York University Press.
- Betterton, R. (1987). *Feminism, femininity, and representation*. New York: Pandora Press.
- Blaikie, F. (1992). Thoughts concerning a feminist emphasis in art education. *Art Education*, 45(2), pp. 49-52.
- Brodsky, J. (1979). In J. Loeb (Ed.), *Feminist collage: Educating women in the visual arts* (pp. 292-296). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Broude, N., & Garrad, M. (1992). *Feminism and art history*. New York: Icon Press.
- Chaplin, E. (1994). *Sociology and visual representation*. London: Routledge Press.
- Chicago, J. (1985) *Birth Project*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Code, L. (1991). *What can she know?* Ithaca: Cornell Press.
- Congdon, K. (1985). Women folk artists as educators. In M.A. Stankiewicz & E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Women art educators II* (pp. 192-209). Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Crum, K. (1993). Pat Lipsky Sutton: The challenges of formalism. *Woman's Art Journal*, Spring / Summer.
- Digest of Education Statistics* (1994). U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

- Elliot, B., & Wallace, J. (1994). *Women artists and writers: Modernist (im)positionings*. London: Routledge Press.
- Feldman, E. B. (1982). *The artist*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Foucault, M. (1984). "What is enlightenment?" In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 31-47). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gablik, S. (1991). *The reenchantment of art*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Garb, T. (1994). *Sisters of the brush: Women's artistic culture in late nineteenth century Paris*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gillespie, P. (1991). Theater education and Hirsch's contextualism: How do we get there and do we want to go? In R. A. Smith (Ed.), *Cultural literacy and arts education*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Greer, G. (1979). *Obstacle race: The fortune of women painters and their work*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Hagaman, S. (1985). Mary Huntoon: Artist, teacher, and therapist. In M. A. Stankiewicz & E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Women art educators II* (pp. 82-99). Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Hall, M. B. (1992). *Color and meaning: Practice and theory in Renaissance painting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hicks, L. (1992). The construction of meaning: Feminist criticism. *Art Education*, 45(2), 23-31.
- Kissick, J. (1993). *Art content and criticism*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Communications.
- Klinger, L. (1991). Where's the artist? *Art Journal*, 50(1).
- Korsmeyer, C. (1993). Pleasure: Reflections on aesthetics and feminism. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 51(2), 199-206.
- Lacy, S., & Labowitz, L. (1985). Feminist media strategies for political performance. In D. Kahn & D. Neumaier (Eds.), *Cultures in contention* (pp. 122-123). Seattle: Real Comet Press.
- Langer, C., Frueh, J., & Raven, A. (1992). *Feminist art criticism: An annotated bibliography*. New York: G. K. Hall.

- Lippard, L. (1984). *Get the message: A decade of art for social change* (pp. 109-113). New York: E. P. Dutton.
- McCarthy, K. D. (1991). *Women's culture: American philanthropy and art*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McNay, L. (1992). *Foucault and feminism*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Miles, M. R. (1985). *Images as insight: Visual understanding in western Christianity and secular culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ms. Magazine*. (1992). Ms. 20 years of the U.S. women's movement [Special insert]. *Ms. Magazine*, 3(1).
- Niceley, H. T. (1992). A door ajar: The professional position of women artists. *Art Education*, 45(2), 6-14.
- Plummer, G. (1979). Past and present inequities in art education. In J. Loeb (Ed.), *Feminist collage: Educating women in the visual arts* (pp. 14-19). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Parker, R. & Pollock, G. (1981). *Old mistresses: Women, art and ideology*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Pollock, G. (1988). *Vision and difference: Femininity, feminism and histories of art*. London: Routledge Press.
- Raven, A. (1992). Arts: The archaic smile. *Ms. Magazine*, July /August, 68-72.
- Raven, A. (1988). *Crossing over: Feminism and art of social concerns*. Ann Arbor: UMI Press.
- Richardson, B. (1992). The Dinner Party. *Congressional Record: Proceedings and Debates of the 102nd Congress, Second session*, 138(19). Washington, DC.
- Rouse, M. J. (1967). *Art programs in Negro colleges* (U.S.O.E. Project No. 3159. ERIC microfiche EDO13859). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Rowley, H. (1991). Psycho analysis and feminism: Introduction. In S. Gunew (Ed.), *A reader in feminist knowledge* (pp. 201-204). London: Routledge Press.
- Seigle, J. (1992). *Mutiny and the mainstream: Talk that changed art, 1975-1990* (pp. 124-127). New York: Midmarch Press.

- Skidmore, C. (1992). The art of Dorothy Knowles: Greenbergian femininity. *Woman's Art Journal, Spring / Summer*, 10-13.
- Stankiewicz, M. A. (1985). Mary Dana Hicks Prang: A pioneer in American art education. In M. A. Stankiewicz & E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Women art educators II* (pp. 22-38). Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Stankiewicz, M. A., & Zimmerman, E. (Eds.). (1985). *Women art educators II* (pp. 1-8). Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Swoboda, M. J. (1990). *Retaining and promoting women and minority faculty members: Problems and possibilities*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin System.
- Welzenbach, M. (1992). Jody Mussoff's women: Images with identities. *Washington Post*, 65, D2.

### **Author Note**

Dr. Cynthia Bickley-Green is an assistant professor of Art Education at East Carolina University. Support for the interviews with European women was provided by the Graduate School of East Carolina University.

Dr. Anne G. Wolcott is the Fine Arts Coordinator for Virginia Beach City Public Schools, Department of Instructional Services, Virginia Beach, VA. Virginia Beach City Public Schools Department of Instruction contributed assistance in developing aspects of this paper.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Cynthia Bickley-Green, East Carolina University, School of Art, Greenville, North Carolina, 27858.