

To find me? Can the life, the vitality, the warmth, the freedom in the playroom penetrate inside me, wake up that part of me deep within me which lies there dormant, which has never had a chance to grow? Can I even hope to find myself, my real self, my complete self? Is that possible?

John Dann

THE PERSON AS PRODUCT IN PROCESS: AN ART EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The process/product debate is still commonly encountered in the field of art education. 'Of course', it is said, 'the process is more important than the product'. Perhaps the most recent skit on this vulgar dichotomy is that offered by an anonymous writer in the first issue of J.A.D.E. (1982). Poor Alice, raring to go, asks Mr. Fellow, art teacher extraordinary: 'But what is the subject we have to do . . . ?' Fellow retorts:

Paint! Canvas! We are involved in rethinking - rethinking

'Paint! Canvas! We are involved in rethinking - rethinking the visio-plastic process. Finished canvases are products for dealers. Art is experience - the process, not property. Property is theft . . . '

Surely, assert those in the 'process' camp, it is not what the pupil makes, but how he makes it that really matters. The process is all. Whatever the shape of the palace of art education, process is King.

In the field of assessment, however, it is not too difficult to understand why assessors have tended to focus on the artefact. After all they can be packaged, stored, exhibited and observed at leisure. The process, however, may be inclined to resist such convenient capture! Rowntree's (1977) picture of the ecologist examining regurgitated owl pellets rather than waiting to observe what the bird eats, vividly portrays an understandable preference for the relatively accessible product.

For all that, art education is 'awash with process'. The product may reveal little about the process, and the process may resist exploration. The process/product divide itself may be artificial and helpful. For if the process shapes the product, the product no less shapes the process. Attention to the product can enrich the process just as the product is improved by attending to the process. One cannot be justifiably neglected at the expense of the other. Perhaps Aspin (1982) is right to insist that there is no gulf between process and product, participation and appreciation, form and content: 'antinomies which bedevil much talk about the arts'.

The Raison d'être of Art Education

It is the fusion of process and product within the context of an overarching concern with the person that provides the main thrust of this paper. Such a concern in the field of art education is certainly not new, nor need it be surprising. Stockl (1973) highlighted the art teacher's concern for persons which was clearly evident in the strong support given to the following purposes of art in the curriculum: to develop more sensitive visual perception; to encourage growth of imaginative ideas; and to provide opportunities for individual or personal expression. Interestingly enough the two suggestions receiving least support were: to provide a service for the school; and to develop an understanding of technological processes. Clearly then the person occupies a central place in the art education curriculum. Even if the process has no other product, it has the student. Whatever else is involved, the sculptor sculpts in human flesh. The heart of art education is the student whose experience and expression are the products in process. But what is involved in such a claim? What precisely is meant by person-centred art education? Any exploration of the place of the person in art education could profitably begin with two misunderstandings. The first, that education may be equated just with becoming a person, is dismissed by Peters (1981) who characteristically contends that 'in a straightforward sense many persons are uneducated'. The second alleged mistake tackled by Peters is Bereiter's (1973) claim, based on his distinction between training and education, that schools have no right to educate, since this involves the shaping of the whole personality. For Peters this possibility fails to account for the striking resistance to learning associated with the temperament - a not insignificant feature of the personality.

What then can art education be properly expected to promote? What is the *raison d'être* of the visual arts in the school curriculum? It is the personal development of the pupil. In the context of art education 'personal development' is taken to mean the pupil's 'progressive mastery of new and more complex levels of sensate experience'. (Witkin, 1974) Vital to any understanding of personal development in terms of the complexity of sensate problems which can be handled by pupils is the notion of self-expression. Whatever their limitations in articulating and substantiating their claim, art teachers have long been deeply aware of the opportunities for self expression in the creative process, and of the clues such expression offers about pupils' personal and social maturity. In pointing to the importance of self-expression in the artistic enterprise we turn quite naturally to the insights afforded by humanistic psychology for further clarification. For unless art education is touched by a generous and experientially unfolding humanism it will be tarnished with mediocrity and irrelevance.

The Primacy of Experiential Learning

The complex reciprocity of experience and expression calls for recognition. To be regarded as self-expression, whatever is expressed must be a fundamental aspect of the person. The possession of a self to be expressed presupposes that this self is expressed. How can there be a self without the expression of it? Self-expression involves a search for the self. Art education for self discovery is concerned to facilitate the pupil's discovery of his self now, and its potential. It seeks to offer the pupil legitimate grounds for self-esteem. The art room is ablaze with self data. The experiencing and expressive self is the centre of its concern. Experiential data are paramount. Experiential learning is pre-eminent. The pupil's feelings and motives matter. Any concern for the process or the artefact finds its ultimate concern in the person. The primacy of experiential learning in the art room is unequivocally asserted.

Of particular significance for a teacher of the creative arts is Rogers' (1954) emphasis on the person in the creative process:

Perhaps the most fundamental condition of creativity is that the source or locus of evaluative judgement is internal. The value of his product is, for the creative person, established not by the praise or criticism of others, but by him: self. Have I created something satisfying to me? Does it express

a part of me - my feeling or my thought, my pain or my ecstasy? These are the questions which really matter to the creative person, or to any person when he is being creative.

With this emphasis in mind, Samuel (1980) sought to promote pupils' self-esteem using a carefully designed programme in art education. The following questions, put to pupils, give some indication of the researcher's concern to obtain experiential data:

Did the art teacher respect your ideas?

Did the art teacher listen to you?

Did the art teacher understand your problems?

Was the course work set by the art teacher of interest to you personally?

Do you think that the art course has developed qualities which will be of value to you in a later life?

Do you think that the art course has helped you to understand yourself better?

The Art of the Art Teacher

Whilst it is important to recognize the primacy of experiential learning, it is also important to explore the role of the art teacher in the learning process. What then is his role in experiential learning? Certainly he cannot be reduced to an instructor bent on producing behavioural outcomes in line with precisely pre-specified objectives. Neither can he be merely an organizer of many activities involving a wide variety of materials with which pupils can work. His over-riding concern is to provide opportunities for a pupil's self-experiencing, self-expression and legitimate self-esteem. But how? Elaborating Winnicott's (1971) notion of the 'potential space' between mother and child, Ross (1978) sees the art teacher as a substitute for the mother creating a potential space, a place of healing, creative relationship and creative action offering experiences which lead the pupil to a new sense of self. In line with this concern Ross rightly rounds on those who, with all their talk of educational organization

and management, fail to 'motivate the young and to provide adequate emotional support for their development'.

For a searching commentary on the practice of art teachers in structuring affective experience we turn to Witkin's (1974) analysis of the psychological and epistemological foundations of the creative arts in education. Witkin's questions are suggestive: how is the art teacher to differentiate between 'legitimate' and 'non-legitimate' self expression?; how can he enter the pupil's expressive act? . . . Distinguishing between subject-reactive and subject-reflexive action Witkin draws a clear distinction between the work of a vandal and the work of an artist. Whilst the former is to do largely with the discharge of tension, the latter is about feelings which change and grow. For Witkin, creative self-expression is subject-reflexive. How, then, can the art teacher enter this creative process? How can his praxis become involved in the pupil's expressive act?

Witkins contends that the pupil's sensate experience is a sensate problem to the extent that the pupil is required to 'structure his particularity'. The task of the art teacher is to enter the creative process from the outset by appreciating the generality of the pupil's sensate problem, 'controlling and developing the structural demands made in respect of the pupil's unique experience'. The pupil, having grasped the problem as a 'felt reality', is motivated to pursue it through the 'making of a holding form' and through 'successive approximations to a resolution'. In this creative process the art teacher is able to 'work closely with the young in the development of the crowning achievement of mental life, the intelligence of feeling'. The pupil is led to discover what he has to express. He is helped to focus and shape the creative impulse through a suitable expressive medium. He is helped to understand what it means to 'insist upon himself' Such pupils may 'waste less of their time and energy protecting themselves against themselves'. (Maslow, 1968)

In answer to the question 'What precisely should art teachers be doing?' Ross (1978) contends that 'they should be encouraging children to respond to and "reflect upon" their feelings, and to give sensuous expression to their experiences'. The art teacher must match the pupil with appropriate media, recognizing that creative self-expression is a way of knowing. For Ross, knowing when to intervene and when not to, recognizing the 'stresses and rhythms' of the pupil's experience, and discerning the dynamic qualities of the 'impulsive thrust' are among the salient features of the art teacher's art. Clearly then this process by which feeling

becomes form centres upon the pupil as a person: a 'process' person and a 'productive' person.

'Process' Person and 'Productive' Person

Perhaps one of the richest aspects in Dewey's (1897) pedagogic creed is his advocacy of the continuous process of reconstruction of experience:

I believe finally, that education must be conceived as a continuing reconstruction of experience; that the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing.

Just as in the Deweyan view the ends and means of education are in continuous dialectical interaction, so too are experience and expression, process and product, in art education. Pupils are always persons in process. They are never self-actualized, but self-actualizing; never mature, but maturing; never self-fulfilled but self-fulfilling. Even the term 'fully functioning', although used in a hypothetical sense to refer to 'the goal of social evolution' - 'the end point of optimal psychotherapy', is also concerned with the process of actualization. For Rogers (1969) the fully functioning person is able to continue moving constructively in the direction of increasing growth and fulfilment. He will be open to new ideas and able to 'constructively meet the perplexities of a world in which problems spawn faster than their answers'.

The apostle Paul was a person in process - a pilgrim pressing 'toward the mark'.

I have not yet reached perfection, but I press on, hoping to take hold of that for which Christ once took hold of me. My friends, I do not reckon myself to have got hold of it yet.

Process persons, in Rogers' language 'are keenly aware that the one certainty of life is change - that they are always in process, always changing. They . . . are vitality alive in the way they face change'. (Rogers, 1980)

But 'process' persons are 'productive' persons, not merely in the sense that they produce material goods or works of art. For Fromm (1949) the person in process seeks a frame of reference, the productive orientation representing the fullest realization

of human potential. Productivity is seen as full functioning, self actualizing. Productive persons create their selves by creating their potentials, and developing a strong sense of their self-identities and self-shapings. But if the pupil is to recreate himself, he must first take issue with himself. And to do this he needs help. Amidst the dynamically functioning values of artistic expression the pupil is prepared to apprehend the necessity of orienting himself in a relativistic world through some form of personal commitment. The art teacher, seeking to promote the creative process, is concerned not only with 'productive' action but with a quality of being. His pupil is a person in process. He is the supreme product: a product in process.

References

- Aspin, D.N. (1982) The arts, education and the community. *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol.1, No.1.
- Bereiter, C. (1973) *Must we Educate?* Prentice-Hall.
- Dewey, J. (1897) My Pedagogic Creed. *The School Journal* 54, 77-80
- Fromm, E. (1949) *Man for Himself*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- J.A.D.E. (1982) Fine art and Communication. *Journal of Art and Design Education*. Bol.1, No.1.
- Maslow, A.H. (1968) *Toward a Psychology of Being*. Van Nostrand.
- Peters, R.S. (1981) *Essays on Educators*. Allen and Unwin.
- Rogers, C.R. (1954) 'Toward a theory of creativity', ETC: A Review of General Semantics Vol.11, 249-260. *Int. Soc. for General Semantics*.
- Rogers, C.R. (1969) *Freedom to Learn*. Merrill
- Rogers, C.R. (1980) *A Way of Being*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Ross, M. (1978) *The Creative Arts*. Heinemann.
- Rowntree, D. (1977) *Assessing Students*. Harper and Row.
- St. Paul (A.D.54?) *Epistle to the Philipians (N.E.B.)* O.U.P. and C.U.P. (1961)
- Samuel, J. (1980) *An Evaluation of a Programme in Art Education Designed to Promote Self-Esteem in Pupils in a Multi-Racial Secondary School*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Wales.
- Stockl, M. (1973) 'The Effects of Opposing Philosophical and Psychological Views on the Development of Art Education' in *Athene*
- Winnicott, D. (1971) *Playing and Reality*. Tavistock
- Witkin, R.W. (1974) *The Intelligence of Feeling*. Heinemann.