DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 640 HE 010 908

AUTHOR Mayville, William V.
TITLE Institutionalizing the Muse: The Arts and Artist in Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education. Research Currents.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 6p.; Best copy available
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($.40)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Art Education; *Artists; Arts Centers; *College Role; *Cultural Activities; Cultural Enrichment; *Curriculum Development; Dance; Employment Opportunities; Enrollment Trends; *Fine Arts; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Music Activities; Music Education; Professional Education; Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS *National Endowment for the Arts

ABSTRACT

The role of higher education in fostering the arts and educating artists is addressed. Currently, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare focuses on aid to primary and secondary levels, and the National Endowment for the Humanities has not developed programs to support professional training in a specific form or arts education of the artist. In the fall of 1978, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) began to consider educational institutions as eligible for Challenge Grants, a development that points to certain basic issues about the importance of the arts experience for students at colleges and universities. Recommendations of a task force of NEA are cited, including the suggestion that grants be made available for needy students to pay for advanced arts study. Data are presented on postsecondary enrollments in the fine arts and employment opportunities after graduation. Several views on the relationship of the artist to academe, some innovative curricular developments in the arts, and examples of the collaboration of art and science are discussed. Information on performing arts programs provide some indication of the support higher education gives to the arts. The data reveal that the performing arts do not pay their own way. The fact that institutions are willing to support such programs is one indicator of the importance such programs play for the institutions. (SW)

ED165640

RESEARCH CURRENTS

AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education
January 1979

INSTITUTIONALIZING THE MUSE: THE ARTS AND ARTIST IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By William V. Mayville

The case for the importance of the arts to all cultures and all times has been made with enough frequency so that it no longer seems necessary to state the arguments again. But how the arts flourish, granting the impulse to create as a constant in all cultures, is a question of considerable dimension and debate. In the popular depiction of the artist, he or she is antisocial, otherworldly, occasionally incoherent or incomprehensible (i.e., elitist), theologically or politically unsound, and probably perverse. Yet it is also a cliché to relate that the artist uplifts the human spirit, points out the follies and felicities of human nature, is prophetic, has high ethical standards, shows us beauty, sublimity, and joy, and spurs our conscience and our will to reform ourselves and our society.

What, then, did the artist's schooling have to do with the power to create works of art that move us to action or reflection? Many hold that there is an antipathy to institutions, especially academic institutions, that resides in all artists, and that institutionalizing artists and the arts can be nothing but deleterious: it will imperil the ability of the artist to draw upon the "necessary tension" between himself and the place and time in which he lives. Furthermore, what does the creative impulse have to do with the principal aims of American higher education—teaching, research, and service?

Institutional Response to the Arts

The creation of the National Endowment for the Arts in 1965 seemed a more than adequate sign that the federal government considered the encouragement of arts to have national import and to be worthy of public monies. This also assumes that the public is in favor of such expenditures and that this was not an unpopular institution to bring into being. Milton Cummings of Johns Hopkins University points out that the political constitutency for the arts is growing rapidly and many new special interest groups have been created, such as OPERA America, Inc. and the Association of American Dance Companies. In 1965, twelve states had an agency for the arts; now each of the 50 states has such an agency, including four territories and the District of Columbia. The total NEA appropriation for 1966 was $2,534,308; in 1976 that total had grown to $82 million (Cummings 1976, p. 3). The 1978 total, including administration, is $123,500,000 and in 1979 it becomes $149,435,000.

Despite these fair-weather signs, Cummings (1976, p.5) can claim that arts policymaking is currently an underresearched field. One of the consequences of this shows up in the lack of allocation of NEA resources to institutions of higher education. As Robert Fitzpatrick (October 1978, p. 10), president of California Institute of the Arts, puts it, NEA would exclude colleges such as Black Mountain—where at one time faculty and students included such luminaries of the art world as Joseph Albers, Merce Cunningham, Robert Rauschenberg, Ben Shahn, Peter Voulkos, Buckminster Fuller, John Cage, and Franz Kline—from its challenge-grant category. Other federal organizations also are culpable in this regard. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare focuses on aid to primary and secondary levels and the National Endowment for the Humanities "has made limited and tentative forays" but has not developed programs to support professional training in a specific art form or arts education of the artist (Fitzgerald 1978, p. 18).

Perhaps a reason why the NEA has not recognized institutions of higher education for challenge grants can be understood in light of the remarks made by James Perkins, president of Cornell University, in March 1965, when he noted that "the production of art and the performance of artistic work is not a fully accepted part of liberal education,"—one reason being the differentiation between the study of the results of art work and the study of the creative process itself; an another reason being "the tenuous distinction between the production of artistic knowledge and the production of scientific knowledge" (Perkins 1965, p. 672). If that is the case, it is small wonder that federal agencies have been reluctant to consider colleges and universities as "cultural" institutions.

In the fall of 1978, NEA began to consider educational institutions as eligible for Challenge Grants, placing them in competition with museums, art galleries, and other cultural institutions, for federal monies. The impact of this deci-

Research Currents is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinion, however, do not necessarily represent the official view of opinions of either AAHE or the National Institute of Education.

Copies of Research Currents may be ordered for 40¢ each from the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

William V. Mayville is a research associate at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

sion will not be known for a while but it does point to certain basic issues about the importance of the arts experience for students at colleges and universities.

Support for such a decision can be found in the NEA statement of purpose. Its mandate was to identify and help the individual artists and institutions that are the best, most promising and seminal, and in the greatest need of help (NEA 1978, p.7). The goal of the endowment was "to insure that all Americans have a true opportunity to have the arts of high quality touch their lives so that no person is deprived of access to the arts by reason of . . . inadequate education . . ." (p. 8). An NEA Task Force, created in 1977 by Nancy Hanks, chairperson of the National Council on the Arts, has just released a report that speaks to the issues of public policy, and calls for an end to the "arbitrary compartmentalization in the arts and education and among the agencies and organizations that deal with them" (p. 10). The Task Force argues that the arts must be understood as "an essential rather than a peripheral part of the curriculum" from pre-school and elementary school onward (p. 11). The report goes on to suggest that the training of artists is as essential to society as the training of scientists and physicians, and that requirements of post-secondary artistic training be acknowledged" with respect to their location, duration, and cost" (p. 18).

An additional Task Force recommendation has to do with the issue of nonaccredited independent schools of the arts. The Task Force believes that "more responsive means of recognizing superior artistic training by independent teachers and schools must be achieved through existing or new private accrediting agencies" (p. 19). Schools of music and the visual arts have had professional accrediting recognition since 1924 and 1948, respectively. But schools of dance and theatre have not enjoyed such status. Prior to 1978, if a student had limited funds to study dance at a school run by an artist of international stature, for example, Martha Graham or Merce Cunningham, that student would not have been eligible for BEOG money. During the last year, the National Association of Schools of Music and the National Association of Schools of Art established a joint commission on dance and theatre accreditation for schools in those disciplines while they take steps to set up their own professional associations to accreditation purposes. This means that students at dance and theatre schools now will be eligible for any benefits if they are attending a professionally accredited institution (Hope 1978).

The NEA Task Force also suggested as an action item for the Office of Education, and institutions of higher education in cooperation with O.E., that grants be made available for needy students to pay for advanced arts study (p. 28). Because of equipment and supplies costs, as well as low teacher student ratio (often one-to-one, as in vocal study), the cost of pursuing professional level study is high

Enrollment and Employment

Official rhetoric is never quite enough. The Arts, Education and Americans Panel (in Carnegie 1977, p. 122) provided data that shows only 705 (23.7%) of postsecondary institutions in the U.S. offer music majors; 1,334 schools (37.1%) offer an arts major—with 1,214 teaching only one in art. Also only 233 colleges and universities award the bachelor of fine arts degree and only 130 offer the master of fine arts. Nevertheless, the Carnegie Council reports that in 1976, more students majored in the arts than in the physical sciences in all institutional categories except research universities. Six percent of all undergraduates majored in the arts compared to 5 percent in the humanities, and 7 percent in the biological sciences (Carnegie 1977, p. 111).

The vocational thrust that pervades student selection of major seems not to have affected the arts major. Glenny et al. (1976) predict a continuing increase in fine arts enrollments to 1980. Given the possibility of employment following graduation, the decision to major in the arts may seem risky. According to unpublished data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the total number of writers, artists and entertainers in 1970 was 797,564 of which 36,480 were unemployed, or 4.6 percent; in 1974, of a 1 million total, 48,000 or 4.8 percent were unemployed, the rate of growth over the previous year being 7.6 percent. In 1975, the last year for which data are supplied, of a 1,055,000 total, 78,000 artists were unemployed or 7.4 percent, with a 5 percent growth rate from the pervious year (National Endowment for the Arts, April 1976, pp. 10-11). According to NEA, virtually no research has taken into account the seasonal impact on unemployment in artistic occupations (p. 23). Also, there is the factor of "multiple" employment, or holding more than one job. It is commonly believed that artists shift from working for wages to self-employment. The research division at NEA maintains that "full understanding of the importance of shifts of status to the measurement of employment and unemployment of artists is not possible with currently available information" (p. 24).

Curriculum

Rudolph (1977, p. 265) comments that the most "unobtrusive" curriculum development of our century has been the acknowledgement of esthetic values and creativity as a bona fide part of education on every level. Rudolph observes that like many other curricular changes, the rise of the arts accompanied the decline of the classics. The advent of coeducation and the concomitant teacher training curriculum for elementary and secondary schools, mostly for women, also fostered the entry of instruction in art and music in particular. The arts also benefited by philanthropy and by institutional competition that" made new programs in the arts, quite as much as football, a measure of prestige and success" (Rudolph 1977, p. 266).

Some highlights of the introduction of arts courses, programs, and instruction include the introduction of the artist in residence idea at the University of Miami in Ohio in 1919; the introduction of dance into the curriculum at Wisconsin in 1926; the first film major at the University of Southern California in 1932; and by 1932, as a result of financial support by the Carnegie Corporation, and encouragement of the Association of American Colleges of its member institutions, there were over 200 art departments (see Rudolph 1977, pp. 266-267).

James Hall (1977, p. 462) noted that the relationship of the artist to academe has changed, in that "each seems to have discovered in the other a new, disturbing and vital force." He suggests that the reliance on verbal learning of the

medieval and English university system made literature and poetry the only "legitimate" arts. In Hall's view, the university of today has become aware that the "verbal limits of the past" are not adequate. He observes that the decline of the independent conservatories and art schools during the 1950s signalled the advent of the arts in academe. A part of the attraction is the availability of excellent facilities, equipment, and supporting staff to aid program development. In 1965, James Perkins president of Cornell, had said that the performance of artistic work was not a fully accepted part of liberal education (p. 371). In Lawrence Veysey's view, there has been a redefinition of the liberal curriculum so that it no longer is associated with "the genteel tradition" but is now more closely identified with critical intellect and creativity (see Rudolph 1977, p. 268).

However, one of the difficulties faced by the artist in academe is the artificial dualism between scholarship and creativity. As Perkins commented, the scholar-scientist is concerned with the universal, not the particular, and value judgments are to be avoided, since they can contribute to the distortion of truth. The artist, on the other hand, "does not try to remove personality from the creative process . . . this image, once projected onto canvas, into clay, in a music score, or on the stage of a theatre, has an objective reality for the artist as solid as the newest particle for the nuclear physicist" (p. 675). But the problem is that without commonly understood standards of evaluation, the scholar may conclude that artistic performance cannot be measured and for that reason does not correspond to the standards of objectivity that identify and set apart the scholarly disciplines. It could be argued that the benefits accruing to a given body of knowledge as represented by publication in a scholarly journal are just as prone to subjective judgment as an artistic performance. The issue that Perkins (1965, p. 678) sees is the importance of distinguishing between creativity and "mere productivity." A further issue is the relation of creativity to scholarship.

Walter Walters (1975, p. 316) believes the humanities and sciences are two great concepts of knowledge, but wonders if we "have the strength to recognize and emphasize the arts as a third such concept. He observes that this has already begun to take place in the form of the democratization of higher education but that the process is largely unformed, unexplained, and unpromoted (p. 316). Jules Heller of York University in Canada acknowledges that as a professor of fine arts and a dean he cannot recall in his thirty years of teaching even discussing the content of the arts curriculum, the nature and purpose of the department, individual or group philosophy, or the role of esthetics. More importantly such discussion did not take place within his college or university. Heller opposes "watered-down" fine arts courses for non-arts majors just to build better informed audiences, because he fears such students will become "esthetic cripples" (p. 322).

But Harold Taylor (1975, p. 346) former president of Sarah Lawrence College, thinks that if institutions of higher learning are merely places for preprofessional service to the arts, "then there is little chance . . . they will be able to meet their responsibility for bringing the live arts into the main- of life in the American community." Walters recom- a framework for arts education in higher education that would be organized around these programs in career, general (esthetic, historical, the creative experience), and societal/public. In his view, small, productive career programs can be justified if there are large general arts programs that receive professional and institutional support. He sees the population of American colleges and universities as comprised of future civic leaders, government workers, lawyers, and decisionmakers of tomorrow "who will become the spine of the American system." If this is so, then their collective attitudes shape our culture; without a strong sense of the meaning of the arts, their preparation for life will be seriously limited. So Walters argues that general education programs in the arts should be carefully designed to contain intellectual and creative depth on a par with that found in humanistic, scientific or social science programs.

There are signs of institutional curricular innovation to accommodate such proposals. For example, at Occidental College a year-long program for freshmen called the Collegium has been in existence for five years and seeks to integrate the arts into the curriculum (Sanders 1978). The program enrolls 60 out of an entering class of slightly over 400. There are four projects that must be done for successful completion of the program, one of which is a creative experience. Each student, with the assistance of peers and faculty, must do some creative project: for example, a painting or drawing, writing a poem or play, learning to play a musical instrument, or learning to dance. An important part of the students' integrative experience is the discussion of how scientists and artists engage in the process of discovery of new connections that result in the production of knowledge about the universe and ourselves.

Another, well-known curricular development in the arts is the Center for Advanced Visual Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Here the compatibility of art and technology is paramount. It is believed the concerns of the artist and the concerns of the scientist are identical: "the artist becomes more of a scientist so that he may be familiar with newly-made scientific discoveries in order to portend their significance." He must also become familiar with the tools developed by technology to use in communication with the public (Gunter 1975, p. ix).

The purpose of the center was articulated by its founder Gyorgy Kepes in 1967: a visually and ethically neglected environment needs the arts for essential improvement (p. xi). But the arts need the support of science and engineering "to broaden the tools and the language in order to create a new *public art* for potentially the largest audience which art has ever had" (emphasis added) (p. xi).

The use of computers by artists is another example of the changing profile of the artist, especially on campus. Ruth Leavitt (1976, p. vii) supplies a perspective on this phenomenon when she observes that the union of art and science in computer art reflects our times, in that we live in a technological society that demands interdisciplinary approaches to problemsolving. She sees the computer functioning as an "idea machine" that can "visualize fabric before it is woven."

There are many precedents that can be cited of the use by artist of scientific principles or ideas. Georges Seurat, the neo-impressionist, anticipating the computer, divided

colors in a "uniform, color-bearing system of dots" repeated with machine-like regularity. Here he was attempting to apply in painting the optical laws described in modern scientific studies of color" (Leavitt 1976, p. 1). Seurat also followed experiments with mental patients to find the psychological effects of linear movement and color, and used this information to attempt to evoke a particular mood in the viewer.

Uses of science by contemporary artists include holographic and laser sculpture, where the physicist and the artist occasionally collaborate in the solving of a technical problem that will have both a technical and esthetic solution. In Douglas Davis' (1973, p. 168) view, art must follow technology and vice versa. The composer John Cage, in a concert held at the University of Illinois, used as sound sources 52 tape recorders, 7 harpsichords, 59 power amplifiers, 11 loudspeakers, and 208 computer-generated tapes.

A final example of the collaboration of art and science involved twenty-nine industries and institutions and over seventy-five engineers and artists in Japan and the United States, including Envirolab, at the University of California, Los Angeles; the National Institute of Mental Health; the Seismological Laboratory, University of Nevada; the UCLA Space Biology Laboratory; and the Nippon Glass Company. The result was the Pavilion at EXPO '70 in Osaka, Japan. This illustrates the expanding public role of the artist in contemporary society which is helping to "eliminate the separation of the individual from technological change" (Kulver, Martin, and Rose 1972, p. x).

Performing Arts Programs

A sense of the support higher education gives to the arts can be gauged by data on performing arts programs. One hundred thirty-six institutions of higher education participated in a forthcoming survey done by the Association of College, University and Community Arts Administrators (1978). Two-thirds of the sample represented four-year institutions that award graduate degrees, 24 percent were four-year colleges, and 9 percent were community colleges. Thirty percent enrolled under 3,000, 24 percent between 3,000 and under 10,000, 16 percent enrolled between 18,000 and 19,999, and 20 percent enrolled 20,000 or more. The results showed that $9.3 million was involved in artists fees, with $3.7 million attributable to direct costs in 1976-1977. Direct ticket sales generated $9.4 million. Of the administrators who oversee such programs, 40 percent are from the arts, while 30 percent are from humanities, and 15 percent have education backgrounds. Approximately 38 percent are fulltime.

The categories of performance include symphonies, vocal and instrumental recitals, chamber music, opera, choral, jazz, rock, folk, big-name entertainers, theatre road shows, mime, ballet, contemporary dance, and ethnic dance. The rock and big-name entertainer category represent 6 percent of performances but generate 20 percent of the total revenue. Other categories that are very popular, and therefore revenue producing, are symphonies, opera, and theatre—although symphonies and operas are very expensive, so the net profit is offset. There seems to be a trend toward more theatre and less vocal recitals.

For an entire season the median total institutional budget item for the sample was $52,000, of which 42 percent was recovered through "membership" and ticket sales, 46 percent was subsidized by the university, and the rest was generated from other sources, such as private endowments, foundations, and government grants. The median for institutional ticket sales was $16,000, with the median for artist fees being $30,000. The average per performance ticket sales were $12,000 and the average artist fee $2,500. The median gross margin (sales minus total direct costs) as a percent of sales for the entire program works out to negative 40 percent. The median size of program was eleven performances. These statistics refer to professional touring groups and do not include either faculty recitals or other campus-generated arts activities.

It seems clear from this data that the performing arts do not pay their own way. Also, while salaries are up for performing arts administrators (the median monthly wage is $1600), many still do not have an arts background. The usefulness of having such programs for the benefit of the college community as well as the community outside the college or university is well understood. That institutions are willing to support such programs, which obviously do not pay their own way, is one indicator of the importance such programs play in the life of the academy.

Conclusions

In Walter's (1975) opinion the real national theatre, national museums, national audiences are dispersed geographically and numerically on college campuses. He believes the American campus is the most effective patron of the arts and that the quality of the patronage they receive is a reflection of our state of civilization (p. 317). If this is only partially true, it behooves the federal government, the states, and the general public to foster the integration of the arts at institutions of higher learning as a part of a national design not subject to curricular whims or funding inconstancy.

Two items for immediate action have been identified by the National Endowment for the Arts: (1) "Data and information on artists' training should be collected and disseminated with respect to enrollments, model programs, developmental pattern and funding sources;" and (2) Basic and applied research and dissemination into the nature of learning in the arts, the processes for identifying and developing artistic talent, and development of career examples should be undertaken (NEA, December 1978; p. 30). One organization, The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, in cooperation with the Fine Arts Commission, has completed a survey of its member institutions on the "State of the Arts" that should add valuable information of the type suggested by the NEA recommendations.

The use of this information should provide data to support what has already been illustrated in this discussion: the arts and the artist have much to do with the mission of teaching, research, and service in American colleges and universities. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development noted that the use of the creative arts in the curriculum deserves to be taken into account for

several reasons, among which is that "a university education which does not offer the opportunity of enhancing the quality of individual experience will leave chasms in society and culture" (OECD 1972, p. 226).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *Focus on the Arts*. Washington, D.C.: AASCU, May 1976.

Association of College, University, and Community Arts Administrators, Inc., *ACUCAA Handbook. Presenting the Performing Arts*. Madison, Wisconsin: ACUCAA, Inc., 1977. ED 144 424. Not available from EDRS.

_____. *Profile Survey No. 7*. Madison, Wisc.: ACUCAA. forthcoming (January 1979).

Carnegie Commission, *Missions of the College Curriculum*. A Commentary of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Cummings, Milton C. Jr. "Government and the Arts: Policy Problems in the Fields of Art, Literature, and Music." *Policy Studies Journal*.

Davis, Douglas. *Art and the Future. A History/Prophecy of the Collaboration between Science, Technology, and Art*. New York: Praeger, 1973.

Fitzpatrick, Robert J. "Who Should be Concerned About Cultural Reforestation?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 10, 1978, p. 14.

Glenny, Lyman; Shea, J. R.; and Freschi, K. H. *Presidents Confront Reality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Gunter, Virginia, project director. *ARTTRANSITION*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Center for Advanced Visual Studies and University Film Study Center, October 15-19, 1975.

Hall, James W. "The Artist-in-Residence" *Educational Record* 57 (Summer 1977): 162-169.

Heller, Jules. "Crisis in the Fine Arts: Malaise in Blunderland." *Arts in Society* 12 (Fall/Winter 1975): 318-323.

Hope, Sam. Executive Director, National Associations of Schools of Art and Music. Interview, December 5, 1978.

Kulver, Billy; Martin, Julie; Rose, Barbara. *Experiments in Art*.

Leavitt, Ruth. *Artist and Computer*. New York: Harmony Books, a division of Crown Publishers, Inc., June 1976.

Morrison, Jack. *The Rise of the Arts on the American Campus*. Sponsored by the Carnegie Commission, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Nakamoto, Kent. Researcher for Association of College, University, and Community Arts Administration. Interview Dec. 1, 1978.

National Endowment for the Arts. *Economic Impacts of Arts and Cultural Institutions. A Model for Assessment and a Case Study in Baltimore*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, April 1977.

_____. *Employment and Unemployment of Artists: 1970-1975*. Research ivision Rport No. 1. Washington, D.C.: NEA, April 1976. ED 125 416. MF-$0.83, HC-$2.15.

_____. "Report of the Task Force on the Education, Training and Development of Professional Artists and Art Educators." Draft. Washington, D.C.: NEA, December 1978.

Newsom, Barbara. "The Curator and the Professor." *Change* 9 (Nov. 1977): 40-45.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Center for Educational Research and Innovation. *Interdisciplinary: Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities*. Paris, France: OCD, CERI, 1972.

Perkins, James. "The University and the Arts." *Teachers College Record* (May 1965): 671-678.

Prince, Joseph. Special Assistant to the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts. Interview November 30, 1978.

Rudolph, Frederick. *Curriculum. A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636*. Prepared by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass. 1977.

Sanders, Timothy D. Professor of Physics, Occidental College. In-, Dec. 1, 1978.

Taylor, Harold. "A Note on the Professional Training of Artists and Athletes."

Walters, Walter. "Late Thoughts." *Arts and Society* (Fall/Winter 1975): 314-317.

To order documents in the bibliography by an ED number, write to ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Va. 22210. Documents with HE numbers are presently being processed by EDRS and will be assigned ED numbers upon publication in Resources in Education (RIE). In ordering, ED numbers must be specified. MF indicates microfiche and HC denotes hard copy; payment must accompany orders of less than $10.00; and all orders must be in writing.