ARTIST-TEACHER PARTNERSHIPS IN LEARNING: THE IN/BETWEEN SPACES OF ARTIST-TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Sylvia Kind, Alex de Cosson, Rita L. Irwin, & Kit Grauer
University of British Columbia

Artist-in-residence programs frequently act as professional development initiatives for teachers. Little understanding of the relational nature of artist-teacher learning exists. In this article, we discuss *Learning Through The Arts* ™, describing conflicting expectations as artists and teachers learn from each other, and explore the relationship of artists' growth and learning to teacher development. Using participants' narratives, we illustrate existing tensions and challenges for visual art education. We present the need to open spaces for artists to construct new understandings of themselves as teachers in relation to themselves as artists, and for teachers to develop artist selves alongside their teacher selves.

Key words: teacher learning, artists as teachers, artists in schools, relational learning, educational dilemmas, beliefs, Learning Through The Arts™

Les programmes d'artistes en résidence font souvent office d'initiatives de perfectionnement professionnel pour les enseignants. On a peu exploré la nature de la relation entre l'apprentissage de l'artiste et celui de l'enseignant. Dans cet article, les auteurs discutent du programme *Apprendre par les arts*MC ; ils décrivent les attentes conflictuelles des artistes et des enseignants et explorent le lien entre l'évolution et l'apprentissage de l'artiste et le perfectionnement professionnel de l'enseignant. À l'aide des comptes rendus des participants, ils illustrent les tensions et les défis inhérents à l'enseignement des arts visuels. Ils décrivent le besoin de créer un espace permettant aux artistes de se comprendre eux-mêmes comme enseignants dans leurs rapports avec leur identité d'artistes et aux enseignants de se développer comme artistes en même temps que comme enseignants.

Mots clés : apprentissage chez les enseignants, artistes-enseignants, artistes à l'école, apprentissage relationnel, dilemmes pédagogiques, croyances, Apprendre par les artsMC

Since the 1970s there have been significant increases in artists-in-residence programs in both high schools and elementary schools throughout Canada and the United States (see Burnaford, Aprill, & Weiss, 2001; Irwin & Chalmers, 2007). These initiatives offer support for schools that are already strong in the arts and act as significant additions to schools with reduced or eliminated arts programs. Inviting artists into schools becomes a way to enrich and support curriculum, enhance school reform efforts, and also frequently act as professional development opportunities for teachers wishing to improve their arts education knowledge and practice. The latter is often the case in elementary schools. Artist-in-the-schools programs frequently serve as agents to bring new life to depleted arts programs (Hanley, 2004). Because arts specialists and arts coordinator positions in elementary schools have virtually been eliminated, many generalist elementary teachers find themselves with limited expertise and support in the arts. Interacting with artists in their classrooms can create unique and very valuable learning opportunities (Deasy & Stevenson, 2005; Fineberg, 2004; Rowe, Castaneda, Kaganoff, & Robyn, 2004). In this article we discuss one such program, LEARNING THROUGH THE ARTS™ *(LTTA™)*.

LTTA™ is a cross-Canada initiative that brings artists such as musicians, dancers, storytellers, actors, and visual artists into schools to work with teachers and students. This program, sponsored by the Royal Conservatory of Music (Toronto), provides a professional development model for generalist elementary classroom teachers to learn how to integrate the arts into all subject areas within the curriculum, and to provide children with opportunities to integrate the arts throughout their learning experiences. The program brings three different artists into a school to work with each teacher. Progressively over a three-year period, classrooms are added so that at the end of three years the whole school is involved. The three-year program was designed as an arts infusion initiative to integrate the arts into a variety of curricular areas at all grade levels in participating schools. Teachers and artists worked together for one, two, or three years. In the lower mainland of British Columbia, seven primary schools took part in the three-year pilot program. Our research[1] was situated in three of these schools. Although

there was a large cross-Canada study investigating students' learning and engagement[2] through LTTA™ (Smithrim & Upitis, 2003, 2005), we were interested in artist-teacher interactions, the nature of artist-teacher learning, and the kinds of professional development opportunities available for both the artists and the teachers.

Some understanding is beginning to emerge on how programs such as LTTA™ can function as professional development initiatives for teachers (Catterall & Waldorf, 1999), yet little research or understanding has occurred on how these initiatives also act as learning, growth, and development opportunities for artists (Upitis, 2005). In artist-in-residence programs, artists are often seen as serving the needs of the school, teachers, students, or curriculum. Yet as artists and teachers work together, both influence each other and shape each other's experiences, teaching, and artistic practices. Learning is not uni-directional, moving from artists to teachers, or even from teachers to artists. It is far more complex and interdependent and fits within bell hooks' (1994) understanding of an engaged pedagogy where learning is a shared, reciprocal act.

In this article we consider both the artists' and teachers' teaching and learning to come to a deeper understanding of the interdependent relationship of artists and teachers. We highlight some of the successes, struggles, and difficulties artists experience as they step into roles as teachers in schools and explore some of the multi-layered, multi-dimensional complexities, tensions, and contradictions that are part of artist and teacher experiences. In this article, we focus primarily on the conflicting expectations and tensions as artists and teachers work together to more fully understand the challenges artist-in-residence programs encounter. Although elsewhere we highlight other aspects of the program and partnerships that were particularly successful (Grauer, Irwin, de Cosson & Wilson, 2001; Irwin, Kind, Grauer & de Cosson, 2005; Kind, Irwin, Grauer & de Cosson, 2005), here we are interested in understanding the contexts and conditions of artist-teacher partnerships and learning

ARTIST-TEACHER EXPECTATIONS AND LEARNING

In their profession, teachers are expected and encouraged to engage in continuous learning and development. Most teachers, therefore, entered the LTTA™ program anticipating they would learn more about the arts and how to teach them. Additionally, schools choosing to be part of LTTA™ clearly saw themselves as sites for professional development in the arts (Grauer, Irwin, de Cosson & Wilson, 2001; Kind, Irwin, Grauer & de Cosson, 2005). For example, when teachers reflected on the artists' visits, they frequently framed their responses around the amount of learning they experienced. Teachers who felt they learned a significant amount or gained critical insights through the artists' visits expressed more positive responses than those who felt they had learned little. For the most part, when artists were in the classrooms the teachers saw themselves as learners and were eager and interested in developing greater skill, expertise, and understanding with the arts.

Very early on in the program it became apparent that LTTA™ acted as a catalyst for the artists' pedagogic and artistic growth and development. For example, during post-visit interviews, we noted that artists frequently saw relationships between their classroom experiences and growth or changes in their artistic practice. Artistic growth was generally easy for artists to identify because their artistic practice was already a source of reflection, constant change, and development. It was far more difficult for the artists to reflect on and understand their pedagogic learning.

Although LTTA™ never had any intention of teaching artists to teach, artists were positioned as teachers and through their teaching learned about teaching. Because we were in the unique position of observing the same artist in multiple classrooms over two years, we observed continued adjustments and changes in artists' teaching practice over time. We documented specific instances of change and transformative pedagogic moments when the artist came to a new realization about teaching. Some of these changes were subtle shifts in ways of communicating and generating responses from young children, while other changes were due to deeper understandings of how children think, act, and situate themselves in the world. Still others were due to the artists' shifting identities as teachers. For instance, it was not unusual

for artists to begin to consider classroom management strategies as an integral part of their role in the classroom. One artist in his first year of working in K-1 classes, for example, tended to present long uninterrupted sessions where he kept the children sitting and silent for extended periods. Over the three years he learned to actively engage the children and give them opportunities to move and be physically involved. He took cues from the classroom teacher, began to appreciate children's developmental needs, and adopted some of the teachers' classroom strategies. His growth and learning as an educator were very evident.

That the act of teaching creates openings for learning, growth, and change for the teacher as well as the learner is a familiar way of viewing teaching (Britzman, 2003; hooks, 1994). Nevertheless, although we documented changes in artists' teaching practices, most artists lacked the opportunity and sufficient conceptual pedagogical knowledge to critically reflect on and adequately process their learning. This lack of opportunity was unfortunate because, as Grumet (1991) argues, for experiences to be meaningful they must be grasped reflectively. In each of the three schools we visited some opportunities occurred for teachers to share their learning among each other and discuss how they made sense of their experiences. Yet there was little opportunity (or expectation) for the artists to do the same. The artists generally came into the schools as individual practitioners without the mutual support of other artists working in schools. Several artists felt this lack of support and suggested to us that they would have appreciated the opportunity to have further reflective time with other artists in the program.

ARTIST-TEACHER PARTNERSHIPS

Understanding artist and teacher professional development and learning would have been much more straightforward had learning occurred independent (or even in spite of) the other's involvement. In fact, each of their respective learning and teaching was closely linked to the other's artistic and pedagogical beliefs and practices, which supports Britzman's (2003) view of learning as "a social process of negotiation rather than an individual problem of behaviour" (p. 31). It also frames professional development as a relational activity.

For example, the quality of artist-teacher partnerships was a significant contributing factor to the success of LTTA™ as a professional development model. In many ways this was self-evident. When teachers and artists developed strong working relationships and rapport, each learned a significant amount from the other. Artists responded positively to the teachers' insights and expertise and in return teachers became excited about the possibilities the arts and the artists had to offer students. When artists and teachers worked together well and developed meaningful and mutually supportive partnerships, there was an "elegant" and easy fit (Burnaford, Aprill, & Weiss, 2001) between art and the school curriculum, between teacher and the artist. When both the artist and teacher had similar outlooks and interests, their working partnership and collaboration emerged in very natural and comfortable ways (see Kind, Irwin, Grauer, & de Cosson, 2005). Additionally, as the artists developed as educators, the teachers respect for the artists and their expertise increased, in turn improving the quality of their relationship.

This deepening understanding for the others' craft was particularly transformative for one of the program's artists. This artist had begun the program thinking his knowledge of teaching was far superior to the teachers, basing his assumption on a very strong belief in self and the power of self-expression. Also negative experiences during his own schooling had led to a belief that education stifled creativity. After experiencing the challenges of teaching first-hand, and coming to appreciate teachers' everyday creativity and responsivity to the needs of the moment, he realized he had much to learn. This particular artist moved from an attitude of imagined superiority to admiration for a teacher's artistry in teaching and learning.

On the other hand, when artists and teachers had difficulty relating, spent minimal time conversing and discussing their classroom and artistic practices, or when teachers perceived a lack of respect or honoring of their own areas of expertise, they had difficulty learning from the artists in their classrooms. As a result pre-classroom visit planning meetings and professional development day workshops were implemented. Nevertheless, the artists were in each classroom for only three sessions and were under considerable time constraints thus depth

of partnership was very limited. For the most part the best teacher-artist partnerships were those developed over time, and particularly over a period of several years (see Burnaford, et al., 2001; Catterall & Waldorf, 1999). As teachers became more familiar with the artist, more negotiation and discussion resulted. For some of the artists who remained with the program into its third year, deep bonds of trust where created with the teachers. Both spoke openly with admiration for their respective disciplines and knowledge and thus they where prepared to take greater risks and allow the process to unfold without the initial anxieties that where apparent on both sides. Nevertheless, time was not the only factor in influencing the quality of artist-teacher partnerships in learning. As James Catterall and Lynn Waldorf (2004) describe:

> The two need to be students of each other as they plan and begin. In a successful partnership, there is a constant process of teacher learning from artist and artist learning from teacher--and, of course, both learning from the students. … The teacher must learn to live with some unpredictability brought by the artist; the artist must learn to accept the necessary structure brought by the teacher. Couple these traits with love of the subject, love of art, and love of children, and a successful teacher-artist pair is born. (p. 60)

ARTISTS' BELIEFS

The literature in art education posits conflicting positions about how children develop, learn, and express themselves in and through art. Discussion on whether children's art production is shaped primarily by internal forces, outside influences, socio-cultural determinants, or psycho-biological factors continues despite the fact that the most pervasive and popular beliefs tend to be focused on the nature of children's creativity and whether it is due to inner motivation or outside influences. In classroom practice, these beliefs are subtle and unspoken, yet are often firmly held and foundational to how teachers and artists teach and engage with children during their art production. These beliefs may be varied, contradictory, and unfounded, or sound, supported, and based on solid pedagogical content knowledge, yet they shape teaching practice and can, in turn, affect how teachers engage as learners with the artists in their classrooms or artists in turn engage as learners with the

teachers in their classrooms. Often these beliefs are difficult for an individual to identify and may not be consciously held until challenged or disrupted. In addition, the artists' beliefs significantly influenced how teachers were able to benefit and learn from the artists' visits. All artists had strongly held beliefs about teaching, schooling, children, creativity, the role of the arts (in schools and in the community) that directed how they interacted with the students, their art making, and the classroom teachers.

To illustrate the above description and interpretation of artist-teacher partnerships in learning, we include narratives of two artists in the visual arts, working with identity themes in primary classrooms through the LTTA™ program. The artists' practices we have chosen to highlight also illustrate prevailing narratives or story lines in art/education. They are not necessarily representative of all the practices of all the artists in the program; however, they are representative of some of the existing educational tensions. While observing all of the artists in multiple classrooms over two years, we were able to identify particular themes and trends. The practices of these artists[3] are representative of several emergent themes.

Narrative One: Art As Self-Expression

As the teacher passed out paper and crayons, Sally Flower [artist] asked the children to trace their hands on the paper and use it as a basis for expressing something about themselves. The children responded by turning their outline drawings into turkeys, houses, trees, meadows, and random color-filled expressions. They blended written thoughts, names, words, and descriptions with their drawings watching each other carefully to see what friends and classmates were doing. "It has to be your own work," Sally Flower reminded them. "Just concentrate on your own drawing and use your own imagination." Later as children were chatting to each other she emphasized, "I want you to keep your thoughts to yourself. You'll have a chance to share later, that way you'll all use your own imaginations."

She discouraged children from socializing and talking with each other preferring to emphasize their individual creative processes and productions. The teacher watched somewhat suspiciously. They had gotten off to a difficult beginning because the artist had unsuccessfully tried to insist on children's

desks being separated from each other rather than remaining in their familiar groupings. Sally Flower viewed children's art productions as an individual activity and as an isolated representational act. And as she circulated among the children she gently redirected them away from including written text in with their images, emphasizing that they should be drawing, not writing.

When the children were finished, Sally Flower held up the drawings one by one, inviting children to add comments and reflections. "Would you like to say anything about your picture?" Though she asked questions she was unable to draw out much more than minimal comments. She continued talking, filling in the silences, spending more time on the more spontaneous, expressive looking drawings than the more conventional representations. "Nice colours. I like the movement and expressiveness," she commented. "It looks happy with lots of nice energy."

A non-interventionist or "art as self-expression" view of children's art making is a familiar one. It is based on the philosophies of Rousseau and the romantic notion of education as a natural unfolding and on the belief that "every child is born creative" (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1987, p. 76). This perspective views children's creativity as an independent, inner, innate impulse best left free of others influences to reach its full potential. Adult or outside influence is thought to hinder children's creative expressions rooted in their inner worlds of fantasy, imagination, and emotion. As Lowenfeld and Brittain (1987) describe, children "use their deeply rooted creative impulses without inhibition, confident in their own means of expression" (p. 7).

Free experimentation, spontaneity, originality, use of bold colours, expressive lines, and emotional content is typically thought to mark children's work. In this case a teacher's role is frequently reduced to offering encouragement, warmth, and support, dispensing materials, providing opportunity, and creating an environment that nurtures children's spontaneous pictorial expressions.

The artists who taught through an "art as self-expression" lens presented a difficult perspective for teachers to learn within. This was primarily due to the structure of the LTTA™ program and the limited amounts of time artists and teachers were allocated to critically reflect on classroom practices. Because the teachers' learning from the artists

primarily came from observation of the artists' actions rather than through negotiation or discussion, and because the art as self expression view limited direct teaching and artist "interference," teachers did not have much to draw on for their own learning. For example, most of the teachers participating in the program had limited expertise in visual art forms and tended to adopt a hands-off approach to art instruction because they were hesitant to restrict children's creativity and unsure of how to actually "teach" art. From what was immediately apparent, because Sally Flower's role was not very different from what they were already familiar with doing themselves, they did not observe new skills or approaches to art production. Therefore, in the end, although the children found the processes engaging and enjoyable and the resulting art products were hung with pride in school hallways and on classroom walls, the teacher's professional development was minimal.

From Sally Flower's perspective, her primary goal was to set an environment that would facilitate, inspire, nurture, and release children's creative processes. "It's not about answers," she insisted, separating herself from what she perceived as the primary function of schools; "It's about [children's] own thoughts and creativity." She intended to provide children space and opportunity to create personally meaningful and expressive images and have their expressions valued. Nevertheless, her beliefs about what art making was, or should be, for children were not given adequate opportunity for articulation and these beliefs were not readily apparent to the teachers observing her. This left openings for misunderstanding and missed opportunities for shared knowledge. Similar to many of the artists, the teachers did not have adequate pedagogical content knowledge, that is knowledge of issues in art education theory and practice, to appreciate the artist's positioning and as a result were not able to critically reflect on or create deeper meaning from the artists' visits.

Narrative Two: Art As Skill

Anna Rembrandt stood comfortably in front of the class chatting to the teacher as the children settled into their seats. Behind her was a colourful display of portrait reproductions created by well-known artists – Matisse, Picasso, Chagall, Van Gogh, Mary Cassat, and others. She pointed out the unique facial

characteristics in the images and referenced some of the stories behind the works and engaged the children with questions about their observations. Then on a large sheet of white paper taped to the board at the front of the class, she drew a large head and shoulders outline of herself on the paper, feeling her features and measuring proportions as she drew. She had placed a small mirror nearby and made frequent careful observations. "That doesn't look like you. You have more wrinkles". One child commented as the others watched quietly. The children quickly understood that to achieve a realistcially drawn likeness they had to make close and careful observations.

As Anna Rembrandt demonstrated a variety of drawing techniques and ways of noting proportions, children ran their fingers over their features, feeling the curves of their noses, the lines of their lips, and the shapes of their heads. She emphasized formal properties, such as colour, line, shape, proportion, and demonstrated shading, blending, and colour mixing. Then each child was given a small hand-held mirror as they began their own drawings. They were encouraged to fill their page with large drawings and were given specific instructions on how to notice the shapes of their heads and placement of their features. The children were neither encouraged nor discouraged from copying and learning from each other, but were instead focused on Anna Rembrandt at the front of the class as she continued to draw reinforcing the instructions and giving a visual example. The teacher circulated and following Anna Rembrandt's example, helped children take information from what they saw, translating it into their own drawings.

An "art as skill" view of children's art making emphasizes learning specific techniques and conventions. It tends to focus on the formal properties of artworks and relies on outside visual referents for children's ideas and imagery. This approach is similar to a discipline-centered curriculum which places the teacher as the expert and conveyor of knowledge with art as a body of knowledge with skills and techniques to be mastered (Choi & Bresler, 2001). This view promotes artistic learning through attention to technical and formal properties, draws on the dominant Western canon of art history, which emphasizes great art masters of the past, and tends to promote a learning-as-mastery rather than learning-as-experience view.

Following Anna Rembrandt's visits the teachers discussed how they had primarily worked from a perspective encouraging free creative self-expression. They assumed that children could figure things out for themselves and giving them opportunity to explore and experiment with art materials was more helpful and supportive of their efforts than actually "being taught." Teachers were very surprised to see how, with a "little bit of instruction" children's abilities and artworks were dramatically enhanced. Their experiences had not included learning how some basic skills, such as the placement of facial features and colour blending techniques, could significantly improve children's drawing abilities. This realization had a dramatic impact on how their work was perceived by others. "Wow! Your kids did that?" was often heard as teachers stood around admiring children's portraits. Other people's reactions also changed their understandings and valuing of what children did which in turn reinforced their newly acquired awareness that art could be taught.

For novice art teachers, Anna Rembrandt's sessions were a novel and transformative experience. She provided new experiences and opened their eyes to the effects of actually teaching art skills. She helped them realize that art can be taught and directed: teachers could play a significant role in influencing the quality of artworks children produce. This was a crucial point of learning: Beliefs about the nature of children's art production and a teacher's role in their production shape how art is taught. Experiences that help novice art teachers identify their beliefs and challenge existing beliefs are central to one's development as an art teacher.

OTHER READINGS OF CONTRADICTORY VIEWS

These two narratives illustrate a relationship between artists' beliefs and perspectives with teacher learning. It appears that an "art as skill" view is one that fits better into the needs of elementary school education and teacher professional development needs. At first glance it seems to be what teachers need and want. This idea has also been explored in Meban's (2002) account of being an artist-in-residence in an Ontario school in which she documents her own struggles as a postmodern/post-structuralist artist fitting into school modernist/structuralist expectations

and more formalist art education frameworks. Yet other readings of these narratives reveal that deeper issues were at play.

Although Sally Flower and Anna Rembrandt came into schools with what they perceived as new knowledge and ways of doing things, they in fact replicated old tensions in art education. Burton (2000) summarizes the "art as self-expression" and "art as skill" perspectives as the two primary frameworks that have historically shaped art education practices. In the "art as self-expression" view, children are thought to be naturally creative; they should be left alone to explore their inner worlds, shielded from outside influences. In the "art as skill" view, children's creativity is thought to be a result of direct intervention and teaching. One emphasizes art as an inborn natural talent; the other views art as a skill to develop. One assumes an inner motivation; the other depends on outside input. One focuses on artistic process; the other, on art product. These tensions between art as expression and art as skill are played out in multiple ways in art education today. Yet there are advantages and difficulties with both positionings: neither one is adequate in itself.

Lowenfeld and Brittain (1987), whose work has been highly influential in promoting the art as self-expression view, have offered the field an understanding of the whole child (emotional and spiritual as well as physical and intellectual) and a child's power to express, invent, and create. Their views tend to be based in a hopeful, positive place where children are expected to create with joy and confidence. However, Lowenfeld and Brittain do not necessarily take into account the difficulties children may encounter trying to communicate through art and their need to learn skills and techniques. Beauty, joy, pleasure, and engagement are experienced through the arts, and creating art can be a wonderful, satisfying, creative endeavour. Yet to bring this about and to facilitate this experience for children in meaningful ways often takes more than mere support and encouragement: it takes pedagogical understandings as well. Additionally, art activities rooted in children's individual inner experiences often assume an easy expression of emotional inner worlds rather than more complex constructed interactive, socially negotiated understandings and expressions.

On the other hand, although the "art as skill" view offers skill development and practical support for young artists, it has its own

limitations. In our study, an art as skill framework initially appeared to meet the needs of the teachers, but after two years it began to become constraining. For example, the teachers' first encounter with Anna Rembrandt and entry into viewing art as a skill that could be taught was a huge success. The instruction fit well with the children's interests, developed imagery frequently employed by young children, taught necessary skills and techniques, and fit with where children were at in their development in art. It had intersected beautifully with children's natural inclinations and pursuits, and the results were stunning. Displayed in hallways, large, striking, colourful, expressive portraits captured the unique characteristics of each child. Teachers and parents stopped by to view the portraits, and the children stood proudly under their images to have their photographs taken. The teachers responded by passing on what they had learned to other teachers in the school and soon several classrooms had large portrait images hanging from ceilings and on bulletin boards or walls.

After two years with the same project most of the teachers felt that they had learned a significant amount, had become proficient with the materials and techniques, and felt confident they could successfully teach a self-portrait lesson themselves. They had become competent with a set of skills and wanted to learn something new. At this point difficulties with the teachers' understanding of creative skills emerged. The artist decided to introduce a variety of other projects. However, rather than opening up to new perspectives and continuing to challenge teachers' beliefs and practices, each activity was still framed within an art as skill perspective. This resulted in a focus on technique separate from content and overemphasized for the teachers that art production was primarily about skills and conventions. This difficulty was not just due to the artist's modernist, art-as-skill view; it was also complicated by the artist's perception of what integration of the arts through the school curriculum meant. These factors promoted a surface focus which in turn reinforced the teachers' understandings that teaching art meant a focus on "how to do something." This awareness was further complicated by the time constraints of the program. Deeper meanings and connections could have been made if Anna Rembrandt had spent more time on an activity and had developed more content-rich art learning activities.

Without explanation, discussion, and mediating conversations, teachers adopted her methods and replicated the instruction so that children's art productions were reduced to surface qualities and skills. Without discussion on the "bigger picture," that is, why students were doing particular projects and what they were expected to learn, the children's art productions were reduced to a picture of something, rather than a potentially rich learning experience. For example, the art activities could have looked beyond the formalist or expressive elements to the personal, social, and cultural meanings that can be constructed through image creation and development.

Part of this limitation was due to problems within the structure of the LTTA™ program as a professional development initiative. The program designers assumed teachers would learn from the artists by watching what they did, an assumption that unfortunately reduced teaching to a technical skill rather than an activity based in attitudes, beliefs, and theoretical understandings. It reinforced teacher's perceptions that art teaching meant working through certain projects, rather than their awareness of underlying concepts, ideas, and understandings. They had learned how to do self-portraits, colour mixing in paint, and blending with pastels, but they had not been engaged with the artist around some of the deeper questions about meaning, content, intent, and learning. Leinhardt (1993) cautions against expecting this kind of direct assimilation of knowledge: "Knowing how experts tend to behave does not help in getting someone to that point, and more importantly, simply copying expertise alone is likely to result in an inappropriate conservatism and lack of innovation" (p. 44).

Furthermore, the structure of the program, the lack of support, and minimal opportunity for critical reflection tended to keep professional development at surface levels. Schifter (1995), for example, describes accumulation of skills, facts, and routines as the initial stage of teacher change. Mevarech (1995), in work examining teacher change in response to an innovation, outlines a five-stage, professional development model where teachers move through the stages of survival, novice, exploration, adaptation, and conceptual change. Deeper levels of engagement and more fully integrated learning characterize each of these stages. Other research (Patteson, 2005) proposes more flexible ways of framing teacher

professional development and growth as teachers move from superficial to multifaceted understandings. In LTTA™, however, learning was directed to surface qualities not to deeper understandings, and neither teachers nor artists were engaged beyond the initial stages of professional development. More could have been done to offer support for teachers and artists to move beyond this knowledge base to more conceptual and integrated understandings.

If professional development, as illustrated by this example within LTTA™, is characterized by surface learning and the replication of existing tensions in art education then how can artist-teacher partnerships and learning be re-imagined? To further investigate this issue, it is necessary to look beneath the surface to some of the underlying educational dilemmas. These dilemmas deeply influenced how the artists understood themselves as teachers and illuminated other significant issues, which shaped the artists' sessions. They also gave us a vantage to understand the effectiveness of LTTA™ as a professional development initiative.

TENSIONS AND DILEMMAS IN EDUCATION

Bruner (1996) presents three contradictory educational assumptions. He describes these as talent versus skill; individual realization versus culture preserving; and the particular versus universal. He describes these contradictions in education as antimonies or "pairs of larger truths, which, though both may be true, nonetheless contradict each other" (p. 66). Although all three are worthy of consideration, the first two relate directly to our discussion here.

The first contradiction, talent versus skill, encompasses the existing tensions in art education. The art as self-expression and art as skill narratives mirror larger tensions in education over whether learning takes place primarily as a result of inborn ability or talent and inner motivation, or is skill based and dependent on how well a student does at mastering knowledge, techniques, and skills, As previously discussed, artists frequently acted and taught within one or the other story lines yet neither one is adequate. And neither one is able to contribute adequately to teachers' professional development.

The second contradiction Bruner describes, that of individual realization versus culture preserving dilemmas, relates directly to the struggles artists find themselves in when entering institutions such as schools. At one end of this continuum is the assumption that education should enable individuals to reach their highest potential, fulfill their passions, and become fully realized human beings. On the other end lies the expectation that education should reproduce culture and further its political, economic, and cultural goals. Artists find themselves situated within this tension as well. For example, many of the artists tended to view schools as institutions that preserved and maintained culture and to view teachers as supporters of the system. Yet they viewed their own artistic practices as agents for change and transformation, pushing boundaries and challenging the status quo. This stance placed artists and teachers at opposite ends of the spectrum and placed the artists at a deeply unsettling juncture of how to locate or understand themselves as teachers in schools.

The artists were positioned as teachers within the program yet in many cases found this positioning problematic. As Myers (2003) suggests:

> Despite the almost uniformly positive response of classroom teachers when they become engaged in arts experience, they do not find it easy to build sufficient confidence and the skill needed to translate this response into defensible classroom practice. Moreover, artists, many of whom have no preparation in the teaching and learning of their art, often serve as the teachers of these general classroom teachers. Although they may be accomplished in the practice of art, this by no means guarantees an understanding of how to teach it. (p. 11)

"Being a teacher" created discomfort with what they perceived to be a teacher's role. According to our interviews and observations, several artists assumed that teaching was a repetitive, uncreative, rational, dogmatic set of rote behaviours. They viewed teaching as unimaginative and skill-based, and their own practices as open, responsive, aesthetic, and creative. "Artists" and "teachers" were viewed as distinct and oppositional. This understanding polarized roles, complicated artist-teacher partnerships, and placed both in a non-generative tension rather than in relationship with each other. Even artists like Anna Rembrandt

did not perceive her teaching as confined to a skill-based methodology, preferring to think that it was through the skills that creativity would flow. This assumption, although true for artists trained to go beyond the limitations of the skill-base, proved much more difficult for teachers who simply internalized the skills and moved on. The creative, generative, and opening attributes of art making were lost in the hustle and bustle of school routine and structure.

As Fineberg (2004) has similarly observed,

> Somehow the notion of teaching artists teaching teachers how to teach what the artist took years of study to learn does not seem quite right. Just as teaching artists are not equipped to teach after participation in a two-session workshop, so teachers of academic subjects are rarely equipped to teach art or music, or dance or drama, in their classrooms as a result of a teacher's workshop with the resident artist. (p. 56)

The question Bruner (1996) asks as he discusses the opposing assumptions and contradictions in education is, "can both positionings be true?" His answer "not quite yes" welcomes both sides as possibilities yet leaves spaces open for something else. He writes: "Finding a way within this antinomic pair does not come easily, particularly not in times of rapid change. Indeed it could never come easily at any time. But if one does not face it, one risks failing at both" (p. 67). The imperative, then, is to find another way. Re-imagining artist-teacher partnerships and learning depends on finding a new way through these tensions. The choice is not to choose one positioning over another, but to find a placement between each. This in-between positioning would allow for both, yet never to find a static placement in either. It would allow for continuous movement like, and open possibilities for, new partnerships and understandings to develop.

OPENING SPACES FOR ARTIST-TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Frequently education hopes for change and transformation, yet finds itself replicating old struggles and tensions. If art educators hope to use art education as a means of change, transformation, and growth, then they need to find new ways through these old tensions. As long as there

are only two positionings, there will be difficulty. What is needed is a third space (Deasy et al., 2005) that draws on the best of both and is situated in a place of movement or conversation in-between both. In re-imagining artist-teacher professional development, artists need support to develop teacher identities. If artist-in-residence programs are to facilitate learning for both teachers and artists as well as students, then art educators need to find a way to open spaces for artists to address and construct new understandings of themselves as teachers in relation, not in opposition, to themselves as artists so that their identities are not fixed in an either-or positioning (de Cosson, Grauer, Irwin, & Kind, 2005). Artists also need support to confront their assumptions of teaching and to examine other ways of conceptualizing "being a teacher" that are not rooted in a stereotypical image or what is immediately apparent on the surface so that they can begin to see teaching as a deeply personal, creative, artistic, aesthetic, generative act and artists/teachers as agents of personal and social change.

Artists and teachers both need support in finding ways to develop artist selves and teacher selves. In shifting understandings of identity from a single fixed entity to multiple selves and expressions, teachers can develop "artist selves" and move beyond the outward "how to" or project focus of art education to a deeper more personal exploration of their artist selves. Similarly, artists need support in constructing identities as teachers that do not see a teacher's identity as a single unitary image but that opens ways to develop their teacher selves alongside their artist selves: not giving up one identity in favor of another, but developing multiple identities.

Exploration of a "teacher as artist" metaphor (Eisner, 1977) would also be helpful in bridging the tension between teacher and artist, and the technical and creative. To see teaching as an art requires an appreciation of both skill and creative expression and creates a space for both artists and teachers. It also opens the underside and hidden aspects of teaching to its indeterminacy and looks beyond the surface and the technical to the tacit, intuitive, creative aspects of what it means to teach.

If art educators hope to accomplish more in the area of professional development and find ways to make the most of the rich opportunities of artist-in-residence programs, then it is also imperative that they

recognize both artists and teachers as participants and learners. As Hanley (2003) insists, "meaningful partnerships should involve working together for the mutual benefit of all partners" (p. 11).

In re-thinking artist-teacher professional development, art educators need to do more to create spaces of mediation, dialogue, and understanding. Nevertheless, in the absence of arts specialists in the schools, it frequently is the case that neither artists nor teachers have the necessary background knowledge to critically reflect on and process their learning or adequately understand the other's position. Generalist elementary teachers, rich in pedagogical knowledge and teaching experience, often lack art content knowledge as well as the necessary pedagogical content knowledge needed to teach art well. Artists are rich resources in art content knowledge and bring valuable experience and understandings as artists but frequently lack the necessary pedagogical content knowledge or an understanding of specific issues in art education theory and practice needed to teach. This position leaves art content knowledge as the only common ground of learning, which limits learning to surface applications and entrenches the either-or positioning of teachers and artists.

A third space is needed to mediate the two positions. Many possibilities exist to accommodate this third space. There could be, for instance, a journaling dialogue between the artist and teacher, a journal that could be visual/metaphorical (Dias & Grauer, 2005), a practice that could enhance the communication between the two but not be dialogue specific. This practice could be ongoing throughout the artist-in-residence program. Another possibility is that an individual not aligned with either side physically occupy the third space (see de Cosson et al., 2005). This could help avoid emphasizing notions of duality and thus defuse rather than further entrench the oppositional nature of the two positions. Rather, the position should be occupied by someone who is skilled at opening the middle space, understanding both positionings, and enabling both artists and teachers to construct new identities and meanings.

It is a fallacy to assume that two individuals or groups situated in divergent places can open up to new ways of thinking and acting on their own or change practices in meaningful ways through observation

and modeling without knowledge, intervention, and support. Artist-in residence programs frequently function with individuals or organizations acting as mediators between artists and schools. Yet these programs will realize their potential as professional development initiatives only if this third space is occupied by someone knowledgeable of the deeper tensions and contradictions inherent in education.

Artist-in-residence programs have much to offer. Yet much needs to be done if art educators understand them as a useful means of artist, teacher, and school transformation and change. As Rowe, Casstaneda, Kaganoff, and Robyn (2004) reiterate, elementary schools rarely have art specialists. Thus it is especially important to provide ongoing in-service opportunities for teachers to become more comfortable and skilled in the arts. As we have suggested, this professional development needs to embrace both artist and teacher learning for success to occur in the classroom. Without the reciprocal interrelated transformation being open to the artist as well as the teacher the potential for success is reduced.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for their generous support of our research program entitled '*Learning Through The Arts*: Artists, Researchers and Teachers Collaborating for Change' (Rita L. Irwin, Principal Investigator).

NOTES

[1] We conducted case studies of each of the three schools. Three artists were in each classroom for three one-hour sessions during each school year. We observed each time artists were in the classrooms. We used digital images and field notes taken during each session to prompt our reflections, interpretations, and analysis. We used photo elucidation techniques (Collier, 1967), action research methods, focus groups, and semi-structured interviews with both artists and teachers before and after the artists' sessions, and at the end of each year.

[2] The cross-Canada study, which had a primary focus on student learning, has revealed how the arts provide experiences that promote an engagement in learning in the arts that affects all learning. Details of this research can be found at Upitis & Smithrim (2003, 2005).

[3] The artists have been given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. These pseudonyms were chosen to represent aspects of the emergent themes and

are deliberately intended to illustrate prevailing tensions in art/education. The narratives and pseudonyms are not meant to focus directly on individual artists' practices. The narratives relate to actual events and were constructed from field notes recorded during classroom observations.

REFERENCES

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach* (revised edition). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Burnaford, G., Aprill, A., & Weiss, C. (2001). *Renaissance in the classroom: Arts integration and meaningful learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Burton, J. M. (2000). The configuration of meaning: Learner centered art education revisited. *Studies in Art Education*, 41(4), 330-345.

Catterall, J., & Waldorf, L. (1999). Chicago arts partnerships in education: Summary Evaluation. In E. Fiske (Ed.), *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning* (pp. 47-62). Retrieved April 23, 2006, from http://aep-arts.org/files/publications/ChampsReport.pdf

Choi, J., & Bresler, L. (2001). Theoretical and practical legacies of Broudy and Dewey: Competing frameworks for aesthetic education. *Arts and Learning Research Journal*, 17(1), 22-36.

Collier, J., Jr. (1967). *Visual anthropology: Photography as a research method*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Deasy, R. J., & Stevenson, L. M. (2005). *Third Space: When learning matters*. Washington, DC: AEP Publications.

Dias, B., & Grauer, K. (2005). Visual thinking journals. In K. Grauer, & R. L. Irwin (Eds). *StARTing with …*<chapter page numbers?>Toronto: Canadian Society for Education through Art.

de Cosson, A. F., Grauer, K., Irwin, R. L., & Kind, S. (2005). An artist-in-residence or a/r/tography in praxis. *Educational Insights, 9*(2). Retreived February 1, 2007, from http://www.ccfi.educ.ubc.ca/publication/insights/v09n02/exhibits/artography.html

Eisner, E. (1977). On the uses of educational connoisseurship and educational criticism for evaluating classroom life. *Teachers College Record*, 78(3), 345-58.

Fineberg, C. (2004). *Creating islands of excellence: Arts education as a partner in school reform.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Grauer, K., Irwin, R. L., de Cosson, A., & Wilson, S. (2001). Images for understanding: Snapshots of Learning Through The Arts™. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 2(9). Retrieved February 1, 2007, from http://ijea.asu.edu/v2n9/

Grumet, M. (1991). The politics of personal knowledge. In C. Witherell & N. Noddings (Eds.), *Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education*, (pp. 67 – 78). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hanley, B. (2003). The good, the bad, and the ugly - Arts partnerships in Canadian elementary schools. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 104(6), 11-20.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Irwin, R. L., & Chalmers, F. G. (2007) Experiencing the visual and visualizing experience. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International Handbook on Research in Arts Education* (pp. 179-193). New York: Springer.

Irwin, R. L., Kind, S., Grauer, K., & de Cosson, A.F. (2005). Integration as embodied knowing. In M. Stokrocki (Ed.), *Interdisciplinary art education builds bridges to connect disciplines & cultures* (pp. 44-59). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Kind, S., Irwin, R. L., Grauer, K., & de Cosson, A. F. (2005). Medicine wheel imag(in)ings: Exploring holistic curriculum perspectives. *Art Education*, 58(5), 33-38

Leinhardt, G. (1993). On teaching. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in instructional psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-54). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lowenfeld, V., & Brittain, L. (1987). *Creative and mental growth* (8th edition). New York: Macmillan.

Meban, M. (2002). The postmodern artist in the school: Implications for arts partnership programs. *International Journal of Education & The Arts*, 3(1). Retrieved February 7, 2007, from http://ijea.asu.edu/v3n1/

Mevarech, Z. (1995). Teachers' paths on the way to and from the professional forum. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices* (pp. 151-170). New York: Teachers College Press.

Myers, D.E., (2003). Quest for excellence: The transforming role of university-community collaboration in music education and learning. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 105(1), 5-12.

Patteson, A. (2005). Present moments, present lives: Teacher transformation through art-making. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Queens University, Ontario, Canada.

Rowe, M., Casstaneda, L., Kaganoff, T., & Robyn, A. (2004). *Arts education partnerships: Lessons learned from one school district's experience*. Retrieved February 20, 2007, from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG222.pdf

Upitis, R. (2005). Experiences of artists and artist-teachers involved in teacher professional development programs. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 6(8). Retrieved February 20, 2007, from, http://ijea.asu.edu/v6n8/v6n8.pdf

Upitis, R., & Smithrim, K. (2005). Learning through the arts: Lessons of engagement. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(1&2), 109-127.

Upitis, R., & Smithrim, K. (2003). Learning through the arts™: National assessment 1999-2002, final report to the royal conservatory of music. Retrieved February 1, 2007, from, http://www.ltta.ca/discussionzone/press/LTTAjun03 ResearchReport.pdf

Sylvia Kind is a practicing artist and an Instructor in the Department of Early Childhood Education at Capilano College. Her research interests include teacher education, emergent curriculum, studio inquiry, and the arts in early childhood.

Alex de Cosson has worked as a professional sculptor exhibiting nationally and internationally for over twenty-five years. He is presently Artist in Residence and Coordinator for the Teaching From The Heart Cohort and Sessional Instructor at University of British Columbia. His research interests include artists' ways of knowing and being (a/r/tography), arts-based teaching and learning, teacher education and lifelong learning.

Rita L. Irwin is Associate Dean of Teacher Education and Professor of Art Education and Curriculum Studies, in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia. Her research interests include lifelong learning, cultural studies, teacher/artist identity, and participatory forms of research, such as a/r/tography, across the arts in education.

Kit Grauer is Associate Professor of Art Education in the Department of Curriculum Studies, in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia. Her research interests include arts-based and image-based forms of research, teacher education, and arts education.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK