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Abstract

This thesis examines the implementation of the government educational policy document The Curriculum and Standards Framework. I examined the historical and political motivation behind the development of this document and how it introduced a pervasive new initiative of outcomes based education and accountability based on economic rationalism. In particular I examined the implications this new approach had for visual arts education and the subsequent changes to the arts curriculum. This has entailed the introduction of the aesthetic appreciation of the arts as an outcome of the CSF: The Arts.

I applied Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction in education which draws predominantly on a Weberian view and a theory of practice. Bourdieu discusses differential educational achievement according to cultural capital stating education requires certain forms of cultural capital that are not equally distributed among the classes. This therefore impedes or enhances life chances according to social class i.e. educational qualifications become a commodity in the labour market and other social fields.

I examined how aesthetic appreciation of the arts has evolved historically as a form of social distinction. This entails an abstract element of arts discourse, which demands a certain linguistic competence, and familiarisation, which Bourdieu claims, is developed in the family, as ‘cultural capital’ this is further perpetuated in schools. The likely outcome is that the introduction of aesthetic appreciation in arts education i.e the demand to ‘write about’ and ‘talk about’ art, will perpetuate class inequality due to social and cultural difference.

The study has been to examine the practices of arts education in four schools and the extent to which aesthetic appreciation was implemented in the visual arts. Data was collected by case study methods of observation, questionnaire and interview and was interpretive in both quantitative and qualitative methods. I analysed the data based on class differentiation by socioeconomic divisions and examined the school ethos and attitude towards the Arts along with differentiation in cultural capital between student population. I also found teacher and student habitus played a vital role in the implementation of the CSF. This is because habitus can cause resistance to change due to the division between the formulation of the curriculum in the bureaucratic order and the practice of teachers in classrooms.

My thesis interprets education as a form of social reproduction, perpetuating the existing social order. However, as Bourdieu asserts and I agree education is a form of
symbolic power as it conceals its social function under the guise of neutrality and the technical functional premise. Therefore, this thesis aims to make transparent how the education system serves the interests of the dominant group through curriculum policy. Consequently, it becomes clear how education has far reaching social implications where the distinctions of class are perpetuated through cultural reproduction.
Chapter 1 Introduction

This thesis concerns the study of the implementation of a new arts curriculum in Victorian primary schools. It evolved from a concern that what I witnessed in visual arts classrooms in Victorian schools during 1997 was not based on the Curriculum and Standards Framework: The Arts (CSF: The Arts), even though this policy document was mandated by the Directorate of School Education in 1996. This then led to the question: why was this document not being fully implemented by teachers? While I recognised there were many external and internal factors influencing the implementation of the CSF I focused predominantly on teacher education courses as a means to understand the question I had posed. However, as my research progressed I became more aware of, and concerned about, the issues regarding the social, cultural, historical and political contexts of the formulation of the CSF in general and the CSF: The Arts in particular. With the implementation of the CSF: The Arts, art appreciation was introduced as an assessable outcome which had not been previously evident in art curricula. By applying Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction in this thesis I examine how the introduction of aesthetically analysing artworks is a means of reproducing social class through art education. Further, Bourdieu’s theory of practice allows the examination of teacher practice and teacher reluctance to implement fully the CSF document.

To understand the political context which resulted in the development of the CSF, it is necessary to show that, in Australia in the late 1980s and through the 1990s, the concepts of economic rationalism and human capital influenced educational policy toward outcomes-based education. Governments’ concern for greater productivity and the production of specific skills, for the assessment of outcomes and for greater accountability underpinned the development of a national curriculum. While the resultant National Statements and Profiles were not mandated nationally, they provided the structure and content for the development of the Victorian state education policy document, the CSF. The Board of Studies, the government body responsible for the CSF document, acknowledges that ‘Much of the CSF’s content is adapted from the National Statements and Profiles’ (1995, p. iii).

Within the climate of economic rationalism, the preoccupation with assessment of outcomes, reporting and skills development is evident in the CSF. Throughout the CSF, these concepts are emphasised with the re-use or over-use of the words ‘reporting’, ‘assessment’ and ‘skills’. It is claimed that: ‘The...CSF provides the basis for curriculum planning...and for reporting on student achievement...The CSF will be used by schools to plan their curriculum and to refine their assessment and reporting procedures’ (p. 1). These views pervade the CSF: The Arts where there is
regular reference to the attainment of ‘skills’ and ‘skill development’. The expression ‘all students’ is also used extensively throughout the text. For example, it is stated, ‘The CSF has been designed to include the aspirations and experiences of all students’ (p. 5). ‘These programs should be based on the CSF, which is developed for all Victorian students’ (p. 5). Further, ‘there is a compelling case for all students’ programs to be clearly related to the CSF’ (p. 5). However, this thesis questions the relevance of the CSF to all students and the ability of all students to achieve the specified outcomes, particularly in the area of art appreciation.

In order to conform to the economic rationalist discourse, the arts had to justify its place in education and consequently art education policy changed dramatically. The examination of past art curriculum policy through to the development of the CSF: The Arts demonstrates the reform to art curriculum. Within the thesis I examine the implications the concept of outcomes-based education had for visual art education, particularly the introduction of discipline-based art education (DBAE). The implementation of DBAE with the CSF: The Arts meant the incorporation of art appreciation in the form of the sub strand ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’. The introduction of art appreciation and criticism meant students were expected to make informed statements about artworks in the primary years of schooling. For most teachers and students in the primary sector this represented a major change, because visual arts was traditionally focused on making and creating artworks with minimal or no emphasis on responding to art.

To understand fully the major significance of the introduction of art appreciation with the CSF I use Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction. Bourdieu presents the theory of cultural reproduction to explain how the institution of education perpetuates social and economic inequalities across generations. Bourdieu applies three fundamental concepts to explain his empirical anthropological research and understanding of modern societies: ‘field’, ‘capital’ and ‘habitus’. Each of these concepts is examined in more detail in Chapter 3.

In applying Bourdieu’s concepts to my research, I demonstrate how art education aids in the preservation of the social order. Bourdieu explains how, under the guise of neutrality and the ideology of the natural gift, education and art act as forms of social control, whereby those who have the required ‘habitus’ and ‘cultural capital’ are allowed entry into the cultured world while those who do not possess them are denied entry. Bourdieu discusses differential educational achievement according to cultural capital, stating education requires certain forms of cultural capital that are not equally distributed among classes. Therefore, education impedes or enhances ‘life chances’ according to class status. The forms of educational and artistic capital are transposed
into other forms of capital in other markets and fields, thereby acting to maintain the social order. Bourdieu developed Weber’s understanding of ‘social elimination’ as a means of perpetuating the dominance of the dominant social class. Bourdieu (1998) finds that, through various elimination techniques, the educational system acts as a ‘sorting mechanism’, therefore maintaining the existing social order (p. 20).

To understand how art acts to maintain social position I investigate the historical development of art as a form of social distinction. I discuss how the art field has evolved as an autonomous space where certain forms of art and art appreciation, that is the ‘disinterested approach’, distinguish class membership between the ‘cultured’ and ‘uncultured’ classes. Therefore, art is a marker of ‘taste’ and social distinction. It can be witnessed in involvement in art practices such as collecting art, attending art galleries and appreciating art with a ‘disinterested’ contemplation. The valuing of art allows the development of an aesthetic disposition that enables one to ‘enter the game’ of cultural practices and continue due to cultural obligation and aspiration. Further, to engage in art appreciation one must have the ‘linguistic capital’ to do so, that is, a knowledge of the ‘code’ for deciphering art. This allows one to participate effectively in art appreciation.

In applying Bourdieu’s concepts of field, cultural capital and habitus I explain the difference in the implementation of the CSF: The Arts sub strand ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’ and the ability of students to participate effectively in art appreciation in various schools. The research methodology I employed was an interpretative case study approach applied to four primary schools: two public schools and two private schools from varying socio-economic positions. School One was a public school of working to lower middle class with both single and double-income families, predominantly in trades and service work. School Two was a private Christian school with predominantly double-income families who were lower middle class. School Three was in a lower working class area with a high level of transitory welfare recipient families of single-parents or unemployed — some parents worked in the local factories or service industries. School Four was an elite private school, whose families were predominantly double-income from highly paid professions, such as doctors, lawyers or business owners.

Conducting case studies allowed me to ascertain the extent to which ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’ was implemented in the visual arts classroom in each school. I analyse the data based on social class differences according to Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction. I collected information through school documents, questionnaires, observation and interviews. In each school I administered questionnaires with grade five and six students and conducted interviews with a
selection of the students, the art teachers and the principal. The data were collected under certain criteria pertaining to teacher education, place of the visual arts in the school, time allotted to the visual arts, resources, art philosophy and structure of the arts program. Information was also collected about the implications the CSF may have had in accordance with the visual arts, changes to the art program, use of the CSF, use of support material, use of language in the CSF, professional development, limitations of the document, interpretation of content and use of the CSF as teacher accountability. Student data were collected about their recollection of art appreciation in the art classroom, participation with cultural practices and aspirations.

The information gathered from the four case studies constituted my empirical study which then was explained through the application of Bourdieu’s concepts of field, cultural capital and habitus. I examined each school site as a social field where certain ethos and aspirations were developed and transferred to the students within that field. The value placed on art was portrayed in each school through the displays of artwork, time allotted to the arts, the art program, excursions to galleries and students gaining a familiarisation with works of art. I further examined the extent to which art appreciation was present within the four schools and if the discourse of art appreciation was presented as a disinterested approach, thereby enhancing or inhibiting students’ abilities to attain the necessary linguistic capital to engage in ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’.

Further, to inform the ability of students to participate in art appreciation, I examined the cultural capital of students. Bourdieu developed the concept of cultural capital from the Weberian view of ‘status’ and uses cultural capital to explain difference in lifestyle and taste which accounts for scholastic achievement or disadvantage in the education system. Within my study I explore students’ cultural capital and the development of a cultural disposition from their family backgrounds by examining differences in children’s participation in cultural practices and familiarity with art in a cultured environment. I explored ‘inherited’ and ‘acquired’ cultural capital and the value placed on the arts within the family inculcating a cultural aspiration.

I further present the impact of teacher habitus on the implementation of the CSF through Bourdieu’s theory of practice. Bourdieu finds that practice is governed by actions which are not deconstructed by the practitioner. These actions inform the habitus without conscious rules or meanings. Bourdieu (1998) claims that the habitus directs practices and perceptions like a force but without mechanically constraining them—it guides actions like a logic of necessity (“I can do no differently”) (p. 134). Therefore, teacher practice is so ingrained that it forms their habitus, which, in turn, tends to protect and preserve current practice while informing future practice, often
without conscious awareness. For example, teachers claimed that they were implementing the CSF, but had also been teaching the way the CSF directed before it was mandated. However, observations revealed that teachers were simply adapting the outcomes to suit their current teaching practice.

Contradictions and limitations in the research have presented themselves. For example teachers wanted to appear to be implementing the CSF, when in practice this was not the case. At other times I witnessed teachers as hesitant to reveal their true attitude toward the CSF for fear of reprisal in a time of accountability. Further, as the method of research is case study, the research was conducted over a specific period and, therefore, possible changes to teacher practice or attitude after data collection are possible. However, I did return to Schools One and Three to ascertain whether the teachers’ intentions of introducing aesthetics and art history in the art room were achieved. As presented in Chapter 9, while both teachers attempted to incorporate art appreciation, it was limited by student habitus and linguistic capital. Further, the students’ personal involvement in cultural practices with their family was solely informed by student interviews. Therefore, this may have been a limited perspective as students may be involved in more activities than they recalled.

The issues of implementing the CSF: The Arts relating to class distinctions appear to have been overlooked, if not neglected, in recent research. Consequently, my research makes an original contribution to research as I present the social, historical and political context in which the CSF: The Arts was developed and understand the social issues involved by applying Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction. The significance of this study, therefore, lies in the relevance of understanding the factors which aid or impede the implementation of policy documents beyond simply publishing the document and expecting it to be effectively put into practice. Consequently, the findings of this research significantly impact on, and inform, arts education policy in the future, along with the practical application of policy in educational institutions considering teacher habitus and student cultural capital. Further, I illustrate how the introduction of art appreciation in the CSF: The Arts contributed to class reproduction with the subordination of the “uncultured” classes as they lack the required cultural capital to meet effectively the outcomes of ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’.

Arts curriculum reform in Australia has seen the application of DBAE to art education policy. In Chapter 2, an examination of past art curriculum through to the development of the CSF: The Arts will demonstrate the significant changes to art curriculum. Specifically, the introduction of art appreciation is presented as an assessable outcome for all students. In Chapter 2, I argue that the expectation that all
students achieve the outcomes of 'arts criticism and aesthetics' presents a high art
definition which fails to recognise the social, cultural and educational implications that
assist or impede the ability for students to respond aesthetically to art. Throughout
this thesis I argue the point that the introduction of art appreciation in the CSF: The
Arts contributes to the cultural reproduction of the social order.
Chapter 2 Historical and Philosophical Overview of the Visual Arts Curriculum

Historical Overview of the Visual Arts Curriculum

Examining the historical, political and philosophical developments of art education enables an understanding of the evolution of art curricula in Australia and the influences guiding its policy development. The economic climate of Australia in the late 1980s and into the 1990s has seen art education policy determined by economic rationalist philosophies and dramatically altered to justify its position in the curriculum. The preoccupation with measurable outcomes and accountability has seen art curricula move towards an outcome-based model of DBAE. The introduction of DBAE was established with the national curriculum and subsequent publication of the CSF: The Arts in Victoria. The CSF: The Arts claims to incorporate an inclusive approach. However, this claim is contradicted by ‘high art’ principles evinced with the introduction of arts criticism and aesthetics as an assessable outcome. The incorporation of art appreciation in art education policy has definite social implications that assist in the preservation of the social order.

In the Victorian art syllabus document of 1949 it is evident that an instructional approach was undertaken whereby the teacher taught what was described in the syllabus. However, in these art curricula there was a concern with developing the individual child’s creativity. Despite this, the 1949 art course was still a prescriptive syllabus and introduced a progressive syllabus for each grade with expected standards described for both teacher and student. As stated in the method of teaching drawing, ‘In the work of all grades a reasonable degree of accuracy should be insisted upon...in no instance should careless or slovenly work be accepted’ (Education Department of Victoria 1949, p. 4).

It was not until the 1950s and 1960s that child-centred art teaching was fully introduced into the art curriculum in Australia. The theories of Victor Lowenfeld greatly influenced art curriculum especially the 1958 art course. In 1947 Lowenfeld and Brittain published Creative and Mental Growth in which they outlined their theory of child development in terms of intellectual, perceptual, physical, social, aesthetic and creative growth. They outlined stages of artistic development each child progresses through naturally and discouraged the intervention of teachers in student artwork. Lowenfeld and Brittain’s stages of creative and mental growth were seen as natural aspects of human development and it was assumed the child must pass through one stage before advancing to the next level.
Dewey also influenced art curricula in Australia with the Progressivist Movement. This approach emphasised process, experience, self-expression and creativity. Dewey (1959) felt children should be seen as active learners whose creativity centres on their own experiences. Through the ‘progressivists’ it also became recognised that children’s self-expression in the visual arts had its own authenticity that did not depend on the traditional notions of skilful representation. As a result children’s artistic achievements, which were previously seen as crude attempts at adult representation, were recognised as a genuine form of artistic expression (Grenfell 1997, p. 7). The 1958 art course embodied this concept thus: ‘individual, creative expression need not be representational, but may be somewhat the result of inner feelings’ (Education Department of Victoria 1958, p. 24).

The subsequent 1967 art and craft course was also based around the developmental stages outlined by Lowenfeld and also emphasised the total growth of the child. Again this was a child-centred approach. However, social awareness was also introduced, as it was felt the art and craft program could contribute to the child’s understanding of their own role in society. The art course was now less prescriptive with a broad and varied curriculum. The 1967 course emphasised self-expression, communication, experimentation and participation as ‘more important than the end product’ (Education Department of Victoria 1967, p. 26). They also discouraged any ‘vocational bias or training, and that skills and techniques should be introduced simply as means to more adequate personal expression by the child’ (p. 26). One of the main features of the 1967 art and craft course is the proposition stated that the course is based on the following: ‘That any distinction between art and craft is artificial and untenable’ (p. 26). Therefore, the division between high and popular works was discouraged.

The art courses during the 1960s also tended to be studio-based and omitted aesthetic appreciation. Grenfell (1997) finds this omission of aesthetics ignored part of Lowenfeld’s theory which also emphasised appreciation and aesthetic sensitivity. However these ideas were largely disregarded by teachers and one aspect of his theory was focused on: the development of creative and emotional growth in making art. Art programs were activity-centred and aesthetic awareness was an accidental by-product (p. 4).

During the early 1970s art was largely a neglected area of education in Australia. Boomer (1985) affirmed that ‘Arts education was accorded a minor place in most educational institutions’ (Department of Education and Youth Affairs 1985, p. 28). However, by the mid 1970s, an increase in community concerns, such as for quality of life and awareness of Australia’s cultural plurality, influenced national interest in the
arts. In 1975, the Schools Commission and the Australian Council agreed to examine the place of the arts within education. An Education and Arts study was commissioned, with each State forming a study committee which prepared reports for their States, and a National Steering Committee prepared a complementary report summarising the issues of national importance (McKinnon 1980, p. 215). Further, in 1975 the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) was established, and in the following year the 'Multi Arts Project' established arts as an integrated construct within education (Department of Education and Youth Affairs 1985). Grenfell (1997) explains this was a new approach to the arts, which was previously presented traditionally in a subject specific approach.

In 1976 the Victorian Primary Art and Craft Curriculum Committee published *Impressions '76: Art Education In Victorian Primary Schools* based on responses by generalist and specialist teachers reviewing the 1967 art and craft course. The report discussed the weaknesses and strengths of the syllabus and revealed the need to incorporate into the arts education areas such as arts appreciation and aesthetics (Grenfell 1995, p. 23). There was also some criticism of Lowenfeld’s theories regarding lack of teacher-intervention, where some classroom art activities degenerated into mindless play (Grenfell 1997, p. 8). The report raised concerns about the lack of teachers’ expertise and practical, physical and organisational problems that compromised the aims of the course. Further discussed was the ‘lack of objective standards by which to evaluate art, and the low fringe status afforded the subject has resulted in a general lack of evaluation of children’s work and the effectiveness of teaching programs’ (Primary Art and Craft Curriculum Committee 1976, p. 9). Despite these findings many teachers felt that the course was still relevant and the 1967 art and craft course formed the basis of primary school arts programs in Victoria for almost twenty years.

Nationally, the Schools Commission and the Australian Council completed a report in 1977, *The Education and the Arts, A Joint Study of the Schools Commission and the Australia Council: National Report*. This was the first major national report on the arts and it painted a bleak picture for Australia’s art education, stating facilities were inadequate, there were insufficient competent arts teachers, many generalists lacked confidence in the arts and the arts fared badly in competition with the ‘basic’ subject areas such as mathematics, science, and language. Grenfell (1997) found one of the most positive outcomes of the joint project was the raised profile of the arts in education and the fact that current practices in Australian arts education were examined and evaluated, which resulted in the approach to the arts changing direction during the 1980s.
In 1980 a national conference reviewed the progress since 1977. This resulted in the arts being seen to play a vital role in education and valued in the community. In Victoria, a ministerial working party examined the place of the arts in that state with a report in 1983. Also in 1983, the Australian Task Force on Education and the Arts was established, chaired by Garth Boomer. This produced the 1985 report *Action: Education and the Arts: Report of the Task Force on Education and the Arts to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs*. This report found ‘The need to redress the imbalance in the school curriculum, in terms of an inadequate provision for the arts and the misconception that the arts do not contribute as much as some other “fundamental subjects” to the intellectual development of the student’ (p. 2).

Further; in early 1985, the CDC Council appointed an Arts Advisory Committee to assist future policy directions for the Commonwealth. In late 1985, the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission and the Australian Council sponsored the *Review of Arts Education and Training Report* (The Botsman Report). This report examined pre-professional training in the arts and the need to review teacher training in the arts fields (Grenfell 1997, p. 17).

In Victoria specifically, a number of papers were published on the place of arts in education. The Ministerial Paper No. 6 *Curriculum Development and Planning in Victoria* (Education Department of Victoria, 1984) addressed the need to raise the profile of the arts in education and to accept that the arts are an essential part of all students’ learning. It was also recommended that school communities should provide access to a broad range of arts experiences and relate learning to action (Education Department of Victoria, 1984, p. 18).

The culmination of continuous reports, both nationally and in Victoria, regarding the arts in education was the publication of *Artmaps: Art Explorations for Children* by the Ministry of Education, Victoria 1986. This document incorporated a thematic approach to learning and, for the first time in primary schools, arts experiences included art practice, appreciation and history. Underpinning *Artmaps* was the concept that art is like a language which combines students’ artistic experiences of making, appreciating and criticising art. Art making and appreciation were seen as closely interrelated: ‘Art making helps us appreciate art. Art appreciation helps us to make art’ (Ministry of Education (Schools Division) Victoria 1986, p. 40). Therefore, the emphasis in art curricula was also no longer on technical and media competence but on student experience and subject matter.

*Artmaps* also incorporated the theoretical framework based on research by Goodnow (1977), Gardner (1980) and Wilson and Wilson (1982) which, in contrast to
Lowenfeld, established that development in art is stage related and not age related (Grenfell 1997, p. 19). *Artmaps* was presented as an approach to the teaching of art and not an art program. However, the curriculum developers stated, ‘As well as providing opportunities to make art, a good art program should develop children’s knowledge of art’ (Ministry of Education (Schools Division) Victoria 1986, p. 35). This approach, however, was child-centred and presented the teacher with an art compass posing the different questions when exploring artworks and incorporating the four aspects of art appreciation recognised in *Artmaps*: seeing, understanding, judging and liking.

During the 1980s, a variety of ministerial papers acknowledged new conceptual and philosophical theories for the arts in education. In 1987, the Ministry of Education, Victoria published *The School Curriculum and Organisational Framework P–12*. In this document it was declared, ‘Our society expects that its schools will provide a curriculum which will ensure that intellectual, social, physical, aesthetic and moral development of all students. It also expects schools to assist in the further advancement of society’ (Ministry of Education (Schools Division) Victoria 1987, p. 16). Nine areas of learning were now identified with the arts being one of them. It was believed, ‘Each area of study has a unique and significant role, but should complement and reinforce the other areas’ (Ministry of Education (Schools Division) Victoria 1987, p. 16).

It was evident that there was an expectation of schools to produce students who ‘contribute’ to our society. However, it also endorsed an inclusive curriculum whereby both sexes, all socio-economic and cultural groups, students with disabilities and special needs be catered for. In *The Arts Framework* again the total growth of the student was expressed and declared: ‘Learning in the arts is essentially student centred’ (Ministry of Education (Schools Division) Victoria 1988, p. 13). It was also stated, ‘Many “teacher-centred” or “knowledge-centred” approaches to teaching are generally unsuitable for arts education’ (Ministry of Education (Schools Division) Victoria 1988, p. 16). Students were placed at the centre of the learning experience and in the arts learning model perceiving, transforming, expressing and appreciating were interrelated.

*The Arts Framework* envisaged an integrated curriculum with other art areas and offered assessment based on individual artistic growth and achievement of personal goals. As presented, ‘This focus emphasises the importance of assessment to students and not just to parents and the school administration’ (Ministry of Education (Schools Division) Victoria 1988, p. 25). It further found that assessment should be participatory and include student self-assessment. The intention of reporting was seen
to improve the quality of student artistic experience...[and] needs to be detailed, positive and ongoing’ (Ministry of Education (Schools Division) Victoria 1988, p. 26). Again artistic development and maturity of individual students were determining factors in student achievement. There was also a shift away from a materials-based curriculum to the needs of the student and the content of the course.

In the late 1980s, however, the role of education was dictated by economic concern and the previous State and Federal positions on arts education were disregarded for an economic rationalism position. The ‘need’ to produce human capital emphasised the importance of mathematics, science, technology and literacy, which saw the arts marginalised in a climate increasingly driven by economic rationalist philosophies (Boughton & Aland 1989; Boomer 1990 cited in Grenfell 1997, p. 23). There was a departure from earlier practice, as the debate about curriculum change in art education and the frame of reference for this change were now drawn from economic rationalist and management models (Sullivan 1989 cited in Boughton 1993, p. 19).

Grenfell (1997) discusses how Stewart (1993) found, along with the marginalisation of the arts, the inconsistency of government statements which espoused the reliance on creative Australians to revitalise the product economy, while simultaneously rejecting the arts as an area of key competency (p. 167). During the initial consultancy process of the national curriculum, the arts were eliminated from the core curriculum. Grenfell (1997) explains that only due to intense lobbying from the arts industry and art educators were the arts included as a field of study (pp. 23–24) in the national curriculum.

**A National Statement for the Arts**

Economic rationalism influenced the intellectual climate of government decision-making in educational policy and consequently the curriculum structure of the arts. As stated, the emphasis on specific skills, not on the arts, was obvious early in the development of the national statements. At the Australian Education Council (AEC) meeting in August 1987, five priority areas were identified: science, numeracy, literacy, LOTE and ESL. By the end of 1988, a meeting by the AEC decided that Directors of Curriculum would intensify their efforts and work collaboratively in six areas: mathematics, science, English literacy, ESL, LOTE, and technology (Marsh 1994, p. 46). Social science and environmental studies also entered the arena in 1989. However, mathematics/numeracy and language/literacy remained the priority, as in June 1990 the AEC resolved profiles should be developed in these two areas. In the AEC meetings in June and December approval was given for the development of national statements in English, technology and science. Marsh (1994) declared, the die had been cast for subjects to be included and some excluded from the national
collaborative process (p. 48). This caused great concern and debate for many educators in the areas that had been excluded from this process, such as the arts. However, Marsh (1994) attests that there was little debate about the three areas included which were conceived as the traditional subjects of mathematics, English and science (p. 48).

It was not until 1991 that the arts appeared in the national curriculum process when it was eventually included as one of the eight areas of learning approved by the AEC. Marsh (1994) verifies that the arts area was one of the later learning areas to be developed in the National Statements. A steering committee was established in August 1991 and a tender was advertised to produce a brief for the arts. This tender was won by two academics, Emery and Hammond, from the University of Melbourne. By the end of April 1992, a first draft had been produced by this team for the Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CURASS) meeting. Subject areas of the arts were named as strands: Dance, Drama, Media, Music, and Visual Arts and Design and the components of the strands consisted of processes such as ‘making’ (perceive, transform, express) and ‘appraising’ (history and culture, criticism, aesthetics). The issue of using generic strands versus subject strands was discussed at several CURASS meetings. However, there was insufficient support to have generic strands across all bands (p. 99).

In June 1992, the design brief was endorsed by CURASS. However, there were concerns about the areas of craft and multi-arts not being sufficiently included. The Crafts Council of Australia, the Visual Arts/Craft Board of the Australia Council and the Australian Academy of Design strongly protested about the early arts brief. They proposed that craft practice should be identified as a strand and, while there was some support for this stance from two States, it was considered insufficient to make the change (Marsh 1994, pp. 99–100). The separation of art and craft brings credence to the aspect of purely developing high art principles and practices into the National Statements and Profiles whilst rejecting the crafts or manual arts. Bourdieu (1984) refers to such divisions as the mental/manual divide which aims to aid the division of labour, legitimating and empowering the mental over the manual. Therefore, by excluding craft from the arts curricula, was this reinforcing the mental and manual divisions and enabling the reproduction of social distinctions through the arts?

Marsh (1994) reports that, due to the extremely tight schedule, the tender for the national statement was advertised despite the fact some of the concerns about craft and multi-arts had not been resolved (p. 100). The same two academics from Melbourne University won the tender, which was a rare case of continuity across the learning areas. These two chief writers were supported by associate writers from several States.
(p. 101). Also in the June 1992 CURASS meeting the matter of process (generic) strands was again raised and it was recommended that process strands may be included in the arts profile when it was commenced. Therefore, the arts was to have generic strands applied across all art disciplines, despite this having been rejected earlier.

In October 1992 a draft national statement had been approved by CURASS and a formal consultation period was undertaken through to February 1993. Once again, the tender was won by Emery and Hammond from the University of Melbourne. Many issues were raised in consultation responses about the arts national statements and they were discussed at the March 1993 CURASS meeting. There was a concern with the matter raised earlier about the place of craft in the document. The recommendation was that the strand of art and design be renamed ‘Visual Art’ and have three elements: art, craft, and design. Another concern was about the number of performing arts as compared with the visual arts which was submitted by the Australian Institute of Art Education which recommended the document have only two strands: visual arts and performing arts. However, this proposal had limited support at CURASS and it was rejected (Marsh 1984, p. 101). In June 1993, the final edited manuscript The Arts—the National Profile was published and it included the arts strands of dance, drama, music and visual arts while design had been renamed media.

While there was broad support for the content of the statement, other concerns were based around the use of strands and components. Some States worried about the use of art forms as strands and there was also concern about the names given to components, especially ‘transforming’ and ‘aesthetics and criticism’ (Marsh 1984, p. 101). While in the final document ‘transforming’ was effectively changed to ‘creating, making and presenting’, the term ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’ remained. Further, the strand of ‘past and present contexts’ was concerned with art history.

Again the use of terms such as ‘criticism’ and ‘aesthetics’ presents a strong commitment to incorporate ‘high art’ into the curriculum and reinforce the distinction between the mental and manual components of the arts and craft. Essentially, introducing aesthetics and criticism transformed art into an academic knowledge-based subject, whereas previously art was a practical area in many schools, based around arts making. While arts appreciation and criticism had been introduced to arts policy in 1986 in Artmaps and further endorsed in 1988 in The Arts Framework P–10, art making and appreciation were presented as closely related in both documents. Also, in practice, many schools maintained an emphasis on arts making (Duncum 1993a).
The introduction of aesthetics and criticism in the national curriculum saw a shift in art education policy, for it was incorporated as an assessable component of art education. This initiative was a new element that art educators were expected to undertake, and for many this would challenge their existing teaching practice. Bourdieu’s concept of habitus is employed to explain teacher resistance and inability to change existing practice. This will be examined in detail in Chapter 3 and applied to teacher practice in Chapter 11.

There was concern with the terminology in the arts national statements, with the need for language to be improved considerably and for an editor to be employed to ensure the final version provided a clear and consistent account (Marsh 1984, p. 101). Another major concern indicated by respondents was the need for more inclusivity regarding Australia’s cultural diversity. It was felt a multicultural focus should be given greater prominence (p. 102). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander consultants were involved in the initial draft. However, how much of their contribution remained in the document as it ‘evolved’ in the re-drafting process is unclear. Again this raises the issue of incorporating pre-dominantly an Anglo-Saxon approach to education as discussed by Marginson (1993) and Boughton (1993).

Marginson (1993) states that to a certain extent, the knowledge taught as the ‘the arts’ is natural to one part of our society, the Anglo-Australian middle-class (p. 18). Boughton (1993) also proposes that minority groups questioned the core values promulgated through the existence of Anglo-European curricula operating in most Australian schools systems (p. 19). However, Boughton found that the curriculum content had been broadened and no longer were European ‘high art’ forms the sole focus of visual arts programs in Australia. There was evidence that curriculum policy statements identified a need to move beyond a traditional Western ‘high art’ view of content (pp. 19–20). Duncum (1993b) describes this as moving beyond the ‘fine arts ghetto’, where a more comprehensive view of the visual arts in society was necessary. However, Duncum (1993a) also realised that practice does not always follow policy and questioned the extent to which a broad view of the arts was pretense and allowed maintenance of fine arts practice (p. 108). As argued previously, the preservation of fine art principles will be examined as a means to reproduce social class inequality by applying Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction.

The overall development and publication of the National Profiles and Statements were expeditious processes with the arts initial drafting beginning in April 1992 and the final version being submitted to the June 1993 meeting of CURASS and then being endorsed for submission to the AEC. This allowed three months for final revisions
and editing of the arts national statement based on the recommendations identified in
the consultation reports.

In 1994 *The Arts—A Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools* was published
incorporating a DBAE approach — this was ostensibly an outcomes-based art
education model. While the national curriculum was not implemented, in Victoria an
outcomes-based curriculum was endorsed and the Board of Studies Victoria, derived
the basic structure of the *CSF: The Arts* from the work done nationally to develop
curriculum statements and prescribed learning outcomes.

The approach to arts education in Australia and specifically Victoria had changed
dramatically, moving from a child-centred approach based around creative self-
expression of the 1950s and 1960s, then a society-centred integrated arts curriculum
of the 1970s, a child-centred approach again in the 1980s, to an outcomes-based
DBAE in the 1990s. The central focus was on accountability and achieving stated and
measurable learning outcomes which a DBAE allowed. A DBAE was also developed
around the concept of students partaking in the four roles of artist, art critic, historian
and aesthetician. It was believed this would allow for the understanding of the
professional roles in the field of the arts and hence justify the place of the arts in
education during this time of accountability and preoccupation with an economic
rationalist discourse.

**DBAE**

Examining DBAE allows for an understanding of how this approach to art education
correlates with the outcomes-based education models in Australia in the 1990s and
espouses 'high art' distinctions. DBAE has its origins in America: Clark and
Zimmerman (1978) developed the discipline-based approach in their paper 'A walk in
the right direction', stating that four roles should be used as models for outcomes of a
visual art curriculum. Greer (1984) described DBAE as approaching art as a subject
or discipline whereby the four parent disciplines—aesthetics, studio art, art history and
art criticism—serve as the touchstone for art education. That is, the ideas, concepts,
principles and techniques drawn from the four disciplines define the discipline of art
(p. 213). Greer also presented DBAE whereby activities and skills are taught in a
sequential curriculum which produces an evolution from naïve (untutored) to a
sophisticated (knowledgeable) understanding of art (p. 212). With the discipline-
based approach to art education, skills are taught and knowledge acquired. Therefore,
the approach is strongly content-centred (p. 213).

In 1987 Clark, Day and Greer refined and developed the discipline-based approach to
art education in their paper, 'Discipline-based art education: becoming students of
art. In this paper they outlined how to incorporate the content of the four roles of the artist, historian, aesthetician and critic into an integrated approach in an educational context rather than as separate discipline specialist areas. Clark, Day and Greer believed that aesthetics in DBAE was concerned with 'increasingly accurate use of art vocabulary and developing skills of categorization' (p. 156). They also believed in the area of arts criticism students should write and talk about art and their 'levels of learning should progress from simple descriptive statements, to more complex ones incorporating analysis and interpretation' (p. 156). Instruction in art history was also modelled on the professional and dealt with facts about the context of artwork such as artist or group of artists, style or school, culture in which the art was created and societal function of the work. Art production was concerned with manipulating materials to help students understand art concepts and also further students' abilities to respond to and appreciate other works of fine art. Clark, Day and Greer (1987) also felt that the disciplines of criticism, aesthetics and history increased the store of images for reference to draw on for the students' own artwork (p. 156).

Consequently, by incorporating a DBAE, increasing levels of language and cognitive skills are required as students are expected to use accurate art vocabulary and description incorporating analysis and categorisation of artwork with a knowledge of styles, culture and historical periods. Students are required to respond to artworks both verbally and in written form, with increasing knowledge and understanding. Therefore, a broader aesthetic competency is required to participate fully in DBAE. Bourdieu defines aesthetic competency as aesthetic disposition, and also academic requirements demanded by the education system as the adoption of the scholastic point of view. However, Bourdieu (1998) finds that the attainment of the aesthetic disposition and the scholastic point of view both have social presuppositions. Therefore, the employment of DBAE has social ramifications whereby certain class fractions are in a position of educational and social disadvantage, aiding in the subjugation of these classes.

However, there was an awareness that incorporating a discipline-based approach would mean attention must be given to the developmental levels of students and to educational activities being appropriate for students' comprehension (Greer 1984, p. 216). In order for a discipline-based approach to be appropriate to students' comprehension, the ability to acquire the aesthetic disposition needs to be considered. Further, Bourdieu finds that the attainment of the aesthetic disposition and understanding of art is related to the level of student cultural capital.

discusses the acquisition of cultural capital from within the environment in which the child grows up, such as the family, which in turn may be extended by schooling. Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital explains the acquisition of aesthetic competence necessary for the ‘sophisticated’ appreciation of art. Further, the appreciation of fine art is an important form of cultural capital. Bourdieu (1984) discusses the appreciation of art as a ‘disinterested’ approach which requires a specific art knowledge and art discourse. Bourdieu (1984) explains the reading of an artwork is an act of deciphering a specific code and, therefore, a work of art has meaning only for someone who possesses the cultural competence, or the code, into which the artwork is encoded (p. 2). Full implementation of DBAE must consequently consider the cultural capital students bring to the art classroom and their level of aesthetic disposition and cultural competence inherited from their family. Further, Bourdieu finds that cultural capital is not evenly distributed among the social classes. Therefore, reliance on cultural capital to perform the requirements of DBAE has social implications.

Bourdieu (1998) explains the distribution of cultural capital is reproduced and achieved in the relation between familial strategies and the logic of the school institution (p. 19). Bourdieu contends that the school system acts as a sorting mechanism by a series of selection operations, separating the holders of inherited cultural capital from those who lack it. He finds the differences of aptitude are inseparable from social differences according to inherited capital. Thus the school system maintains the preexisting social order, that is, the gap between the pupils endowed with unequal amounts of cultural capital (p. 20). Consequently, the cultural capital obtained within a family can be activated within the school system and act to enhance already existing cultural differences among pupils, such as the acquisition of aesthetic competence and understanding. The relation between cultural capital and education will be examined further in Chapter 4 and the importance of art and art appreciation as a form of cultural capital will be explained in Chapter 5. The empirical application of cultural capital is examined in Chapter 10.

Teacher cultural capital and habitus, as discussed, are also considerations with the implementation of DBAE, for teachers are expected to implement the approach; therefore, prior knowledge, training and understanding of the arts play an important role. Greer (1984) explains, ‘Studying art and putting it in the context of aesthetic education are two major distinguishing features of discipline-based art education...to place them in their historical and cultural contexts marks a...feature that differentiates the discipline-based approach to teaching art’ (p. 215).
In the United States of America, the Getty Institute for the Arts was aware of the fact that, in order to implement DBAE programs, teachers need additional, ongoing training: 'This attention to training is essential because the instructional content and methodology for such programs are new, and there has been little guidance heretofore for programs that incorporate criticism, history, and aesthetics, along with art production' (Getty Institute URL: http://www.artsednet.getty.edu/1997).

Art educators were expected to be efficient in art criticism, history and aesthetics. However, the practice of art making was also different from past instruction in art making. Rush (1987) stated, 'DBAE...differs profoundly from the approach taken by most art educators with respect to studio art instruction' (p. 206). In discipline-based instruction children manipulate art materials that parallel the processes of adult artists by creating images that express ideas, moods and dynamic states; they transmit meaning. DBAE teaches children to understand a language of visual imagery and putting this imagic literacy at the centre of studio art departs from traditional practice (Rush 1987, p. 206).

In order to accommodate the changes to art education the implementation of DBAE would entail, Clark, Day and Greer (1987) found DBAE 'is marked by systematic, regular art instruction, aided by the expertise of the teacher or artist in residence, art gallery education officers, administrative support, and adequate resources to achieve the learning objectives' (p. 135). This statement clearly indicates DBAE was an approach that would require providing many resources and services to ensure its effective implementation into schools.

In Victoria, the introduction of DBAE, in the form of the CSF: The Arts, saw documents being produced to assist with the implementation process such as Using the CSF (1996), The Arts Course Advice (1996), The Arts Assessment and Reporting Support Materials (1997) and Effective Assessment for Visual Arts (1998). However, these documents added to the 'paper overload' of implementing the CSF: The Arts, presenting a time consuming task for teachers.

The importance of assessment and reporting is evident in the publication of The Arts Assessment and Reporting Support Materials (1997) and Effective Assessment for Visual Arts (1998). The discipline-based approach to art education encompasses the ideals of outcomes-based education where it was espoused specific knowledge or disciplines could be learnt and assessed. Greer (1984) explains, 'In teaching art according to discipline-based principles, everything done is referenced to art. There is content (information, concepts and techniques) that can be assessed and for which
teachers can be accountable’ (p. 217). Therefore, the introduction of DBAE is apparent as it allows for assessment and accountability to be performed.

In addition, Greer’s statements are evidence of the climate of economic rationalism when art had to prove its justification for inclusion in the curriculum. Greer (1984) stated, ‘an important aspect of the discipline-based view of art education is that it should be an integral part of general education’ (p. 216). Further, ‘There must be a stance that convinces the school board and administration that art is a serious area of study worthy of attention as a part of general education. The discipline-based view has that potential’ (p. 217). Greer further espouses, ‘When justifications for art education are made in terms of increasing competency rather than enjoyment, school people and parents look at art as a legitimate subject of instruction’ (p. 217). In DBAE, ‘The artworks of children become examples of concepts learned’ (p. 212). Therefore, with DBAE the place of the arts can be justified in education, as students’ increasing competency can be measured and evidenced in their artwork.

Rush (1987) also explains that learning objectives in discipline-based art lessons are stated in behavioral terms and these behaviors are linked to visual concepts (p. 209). By incorporating a DBAE approach, children’s images display visual concepts acquired as a result of instruction (p. 206).

Consequently, DBAE was accepted as the approach to art education policy in Australia in the 1980s and through the 1990s with The Arts—A Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools, and subsequently the CSF: The Arts. A close examination of the CSF: The Arts reveals the importance the DBAE concept played on its development, with learning objectives stated in behavioural terms (Rush 1987) and curriculum foci prescribed, along with expected learning outcomes that ‘identify expected student achievements for each strand and each level’ (Board of Studies1995, p. 12). In the CSF: The Arts, examples are given ‘that illustrate some ways students can demonstrate achievement of the outcome’ (Board of Studies 1995, p. 12). Therefore, achievement of outcomes through performance indicators are clearly outlined in the CSF: The Arts, attributed to the climate of economic rationalism and concern with assessment and accountability.

The CSF: The Arts

As explained, the CSF: The Arts incorporates a DBAE approach which was affirmed in the statement, ‘Arts uses a discipline-based strand structure’ (Board of Studies 1995, p. 2). Further, the CSF: The Arts implements the roles of artist, critic, historian and aesthetician by declaring, ‘Study in The Arts engages students as makers or producers, performers or presenters, audience members, critics and arts theorists’
The formulation of the substrands of the CSF: The Arts also provides evidence that it is based around a DBAE approach while duplicating the strands of the national curriculum, the substrands being ‘creating, making and presenting’, ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’ and ‘past and present contexts’. In ‘creating, making and presenting’, students are expected to engage in art making by developing ideas in a range of artistic processes refining their skills and then presenting their work as a professional artist would. In ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’ students engage in arts criticism as they describe, analyse, interpret, evaluate, develop preferences and the ability to discriminate between arts works’ (p. 11). In ‘past and present contexts’ students study the social, cultural and historical contexts in which the arts are produced’ (p. 11). The relation to a discipline-based approach to art is evident in these descriptions of the CSF substrands.

Within each substrand there are curriculum focus statements, which, according to the Board of Studies, ‘describe sequential patterns of learning with discrete experiences in each strand at each successive level’ (p. 11). The importance of sequential learning in discipline-based art education was discussed by Greer (1984) and developed by Clark, Day and Greer (1987). Sequential learning is evident in the CSF document with statements such as: ‘The Arts CSF provides for developing sequential and balanced Arts programs’ (p. 12), ‘Each Arts strand describes a progression of learning’ (p. 12), ‘Learning in The Arts should be based on the systematic provision of strands to allow for the sequential learning of skills and concepts’ (p. 13) and ‘It is essential that the students experience each of the arts strands as a discrete learning experience so that understandings and skills central to each strand are developed sequentially’ (p. 12). Therefore, the structure of the CSF: The Arts is based around sequential learning and the development of concepts and skills. The last two statements attest to the importance of the attainment of concepts and skills in the CSF. As discussed by Greer (1984) and Rush (1987), having concepts and techniques that can be assessed allows for the justification of arts in education. In a time of accountability and measurable outcomes, justification was vital to ensure inclusion of the arts in the core curriculum.

The strand structure of the CSF: The Arts is based around six recognised strands of dance, drama, graphic communication, media, music and visual arts. Again, these strands are based on those recognised nationally, except for the addition of graphic communication, which further attests to marketplace influence and economic interest in producing creative and profitable designers.

The Board of Studies states the CSF ‘can be delivered through a wide range of integrated approaches and by individual discipline-based courses’ (p. 7). These two
approaches are presented as quite different and, therefore, it is questionable if both approaches can be adopted simultaneously. The CSF: The Arts is contradictory in these terms: while it states an integrated curriculum or linked arts program may be experienced, it also maintains that each arts strand represents a distinctive way of learning. The Board claims, 'It is essential that the students experience each of the arts strands as a discrete learning experience' (p. 12). However, the Board claims 'students can work effectively across arts strands', assisting them to 'explore linking concepts and to enrich their understanding of the complementary relationships between the Arts strands' (p. 12). Once again, a contradiction is posed between implementing an integrated approach or a discipline-based approach. The format of the text reveals a bias toward the discipline-based approach, by segregating each arts strand. The statement 'Each Arts strand — Dance, Drama, Graphic Communication, Media, Music and Visual Arts — represents a distinctive way of learning' (p. 13) reveals the preferred approach.

The segregation and atomisation of arts strands are carried through with the substrands. The substrands of 'creating, making and presenting', 'arts criticism and aesthetics' and 'past and present contexts' are generic for all of the arts strands and it is proposed that they are 'offered concurrently'. However, they are presented quite separately in the text. The Board declares that 'Schools need not and should not atomise their curriculum in order to achieve the learning outcomes described in the CSF' (p. 8). However, this is not how they have presented the document as a text. The layout is very atomised with the use of strands, substrands, tables and dot points to indicate the 'expected' learning outcomes to be achieved. These dot points are examples that 'illustrate' the achievement of outcomes. However, it is further stated that these examples are 'not a checklist for the achievement of the learning outcomes' (p. 12) although the learning outcomes are 'expected' to be achieved.

It can be argued that the use of the atomised format allows for specification and definition of these skills. However, while the skills are specified, they are not obviously specific or clear. As the Board proclaims, the 'curriculum focus...outlines in broad terms' (p. 12). Broad definitions can be a positive but also cause potential problems as teachers may be unclear how to implement these statements. If this is the case, the document may not be used by teachers or may be only partially implemented. Hall (1999) contends, when the innovation is broad, stages of personal concern are high as teachers do not know if they are doing it correctly. This uncertainty leads to various innovation configurations not envisaged by policy makers. The CSF: The Arts acknowledges the adaptation of the document 'allows for a diverse range of approaches to teaching and learning in The Arts' (p. 12). However, it should also be realised that, if statements are broad and vague, adaptation may mean omission of
some components of the document, especially if teachers are unsure of how to incorporate them into their existing teaching program — that is, in Bourdieu's terms, if the new expectations do not adhere to teacher's existing practice or habitus.

The substrands in the CSF: The Arts are defined in broad and somewhat idealised terms, such as, in 'creating, making and presenting', it is proposed that students 'extend their understanding of the potential of the arts to express, challenge, stimulate and shape meaning' (p. 11). In 'arts criticism and aesthetics', 'They [students] learn how social and cultural values and meanings are constructed, challenged and reconstructed' (p. 11) and, in 'past and present contexts', 'Students learn about the construction of arts histories and the relationship between social and cultural issues and arts practices' (p. 11). While these statements are broad, it is also questionable whether they are attainable for all students. The proposition that in 'arts criticism and aesthetics', all 'Students listen to, talk, read and write about artworks' (p. 11) is a highly idealised and unrealistic expectation and forms the focus of this thesis, particularly in the area of the visual arts.

The Visual Arts

The visual arts is the area of concern in this thesis and specifically level four as this is the level where students are to partake in verbal and written art appreciation. At level four in the substrand 'arts criticism and aesthetics', students 'begin to write informally about artworks noting narrative qualities, expressive effects, use of art elements and principles of art such as balance, harmony and contrast' (p. 114). While it is noted that students are only expected to do this at an informal level in the curriculum focus, it is stated as a learning outcome that the student: 'uses art terminology and descriptive language when comparing artworks and expressing his or her aesthetic response' (p. 115). Therefore, students are expected to use the correct art terminology and descriptive language to express aesthetic responses. This indicates the level of art discourse expected of all students at level four. As discussed, in Bourdieu's terms, this is the application of the scholastic point of view, whereby education demands abstract and analytical understanding. In art discourse, art is treated as an object of 'disinterested' contemplation, where a knowledge of specific art language is required to participate successfully, a specific 'linguistic capital' is required.

The term 'aesthetic' invokes the ideals of high art and academic principles and, in the visual arts strand of the CSF: The Arts, there is an eclectic combination of both high art and popular art. The differentiation between high art and popular art historically is substantial where high art views painting, sculpture and drawing as superior to popular art which is seen as handicraft and as using objects which were considered inferior.
High art is also synonymous with high social status as opposed to popular art and lowly social class. This will be further explained in Chapter 5.

In the CSF: *The Arts* the combination of high art and popular art is presented and expected to be examined, as it is stated students ‘speculate about artists’ intentions’ and ‘look at products in daily use and discuss design features’ (p. 114). Students are to view and discuss artworks in galleries, homes, museums, public buildings and shops (p. 114). They are to find contributions made by artists, designers and craftspeople (p. 115). But it does not mention the distinctions between these fields of art or that they be discussed.

Students are also to partake in arts of past and present: as stated, students ‘focus on the role of the visual arts in history and tradition’ (p. 115). However, the history and tradition of art are complex and often what is represented in art texts and galleries is not always comparable with the extended view of art. This also indicates the post-modern movement of eclecticism in the arts, however, the extent to which a post-modern view has been totally incorporated in the CSF: *The Arts* is questionable.

With ‘*arts criticism and aesthetics*’ presented as a strand, it is questionable if a populist view of everyday art is represented or an elitist high art definition, where one must obtain the skills to discuss and write about artworks. This then is an approach relevant only to those who have the appropriate aesthetic disposition and cultural capital, and are prepared for a scholastic, disinterested view of the arts. While there has been some attempt to incorporate a broader view of the visual arts, one must question the prevailing existence of the elite high art proponents.

As argued, high art expectations of aesthetically responding to artworks links to class relations of cultural capital and the ability to examine the arts in a specialised arts discourse. With the introduction of arts criticism and aesthetics, the expectations placed on students in art are greater in academic terms. Bourdieu finds that the ability to appreciate art is an acquired skill formed in the family and reinforced in education. Therefore, due to social class distinctions, some families have the required cultural capital and aesthetic disposition to engage in art appreciation while others do not. By incorporating art appreciation as a requirement of arts study in the CSF: *The Arts*, social class distinctions are reproduced in art education. To understand fully how class reproduction works in society, Bourdieu’s concepts of cultural reproduction will be examined in Chapter 3. The understanding of social class and the perpetuation of cultural reproduction through education and specifically art education will be further discussed in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.
Chapter 3 Bourdieu and Cultural Reproduction

A Critique of Bourdieu

While this thesis is founded on the theoretical contributions of Bourdieu, it is recognised that these have come under some criticism. Some of these criticisms, however, have been explained as ‘blurred visions’ and ‘fragmented readings’ of his work (Wacquant cited in Robbins 2000, p. 105). Robbins (2000) finds that the criticisms of Bourdieu’s work can be defined into certain categories: the imprecise definition of his concepts, the inability to transfer his concepts cross-culturally, the timeframe from research to publication of his findings, the denigration of the working-class, and the inability of his theories to account for change. The criticism of his work for its multiple definitions and applications of concepts have come from Swartz (1977), Bredo and Feinberg (1979), Granovetter (1985), Camic (1986), Lamont and Lareau (1988) and Jenkins (1992). Bredo and Feinberg (1979) criticised his work in Distinction by stating: ‘One of the major theoretical weaknesses of the book is the key concepts that remain unclearly specified’ (p. 324). Criticism has been aimed at the specific concepts of habitus, cultural capital and Bourdieu’s understanding of culture. Jenkins (1992) ponders over Bourdieu’s concept of culture in relation to habitus, asking, ‘What exactly is the habitus? How does it relate to the notion of culture?’ (pp. 92–93).

Bourdieu’s formulation of culture is different from the semiotic and other versions of culture. Bourdieu (1984) explains, ‘The manner in which culture has been acquired lives on in the manner of using it’ (p. 2). Consequently, Bourdieu’s concept of culture can be seen as the outcome of habitus and practice, produced and defined in its continual use. Bourdieu (1984) further argues that ‘There is no way out of the game of culture’ (p. 12). Supporting his notion of culture that we are all active and situated in culture, and that there is no escaping it, Robbins (2000) explains, ‘Culture is enacted by everyone. It is a game in which there are no non-participating spectators’ (p. xi).

Further, within his theory of practice, Bourdieu understands actions as the consequence of the mind and the body; they are not separate entities. Bourdieu used the concept of habitus to explain this interconnection, finding that practices speak directly to the motor function forming a bodily hexis. The criticisms of Honneth (1986) fail to recognise the relevance of the mind/body connection. He felt Bourdieu’s theory gives too much prominence to human action as a form of production rather than to human rationality (Robbins 2000, p. 126). The reliance on rational thought, can be seen as a dependence on Kantian theory, where reason is the
driving force of practices. Bourdieu, however, proposes that practice is the consequence of the body with little reliance on reason: ‘Practical sense, social necessity turned into nature, converted into motor schemes and body automatisms, is what causes practices...It is because agents never know completely what they are doing that what they do has more sense than they know’ (1990, p. 69). Bourdieu (1990) contends that this ‘unthought’, the unawareness, is what produces adherence and perpetuation to practices and it is absolutely opposed to Kant’s ‘pragmatic faith’ that is arbitrary (p. 67).

Bourdieu finds that classical social theory is characterised by opposition between subjectivist and objectivist views, which does not give credence to his understanding of practice and the construction of the social world. That is, subjectivists feel humans or agents have beliefs, desires and judgments and consider the agent endowed and empowered to make the world and act according to their own light, while the objectivist view explains social thought and action in terms of material and economic conditions, social structures or cultural logics. These ‘constructions’ are seen as superordinate, more powerful than agents’ symbolic construction, experiences and actions (Calhoun, Lipuma & Postone, 1993, p. 3). Bourdieu argues, social life must be understood in terms that do justice to both views—to objective, material, social and cultural structures and to the constituting practices and experiences of individuals and groups. Bourdieu’s theory of practice seeks to overcome the dichotomies of subjective and objective (Calhoun, Lipuma & Postone 1993, p. 8).

Influenced by Marx, Weber and Durkheim, among others, Bourdieu sought to move beyond the limits of objectivism and the construction of the world based on language, symbols and structures of thought. From an objectivist perspective, practical activities appear as nothing other than the application of a rule, or the realisation of a model or structure. Bourdieu’s alternative theory of practice attempts to ‘move beyond objectivism without relapsing into subjectivism, that is, to take account of the need to break with immediate experience while at the same time doing justice to the practical character of social life’ (Thompson 1991, p. 12). Bourdieu (2000) argues, ‘if there is one thing that our “modern” or “postmodern” philosophers have in common...it is the excessive confidence in the powers of language’ (p. 2). He further posits, ‘I think it is important above all to reflect not only on the limits of thought and the powers of thought, but also on the conditions in which it is exercised’ (p. 2).

There has been some criticism as to the transfer of Bourdieu’s theories on to other cultures other than those he studied and in particular French culture. Robbins explains that the American positivist critique of Bourdieu finds that his findings do not transfer cross-culturally (p. 108). Brodo and Feinberg and di Maggio (1979) are
sceptical about Bourdieu’s claim of universality (Robbins 2000). Despite this, Bourdieu presents his social theory as ‘universal anthropology’ (1989, p. 4 cited in Brubaker 1993, p. 229). However, Brubaker (1993) questions Bourdieu’s work as ‘universal’, claiming much of Bourdieu's work is based on cross field and not cross-national differences (p. 229). Bourdieu (1998) answers this questioning through by explaining his irritation at foreign ethnographers analysing France, just as Japanese sociologists have criticised outside representations trying to discuss ‘Japanese sensibility’. However, just as Bourdieu (1998) understands French culture, not simply because he was born there but as he has studied it a great deal, he states he does not confine himself to the particularities of one society. As he argues, the model of social space and symbolic space he presents for France could just as well represent Japan, Germany or the United States (p. 1). Or as I aim to demonstrate Bourdieu’s model of social space and symbolic space can be seen in Australia.

Ultimately, Bourdieu’s concepts develop from a theory of praxis; that is, theory is formed in practice. Bourdieu (1993a) finds a major cause of misunderstanding of his work is the purely theoretical readings which ignore its empirical dimension. He explains his empirical research and the instruments they produced were intended to be ‘put to use’ in new research. He calls this ‘comprehension through use’ (pp. 270–271). The model Bourdieu proposes, such as in Distinction (1984), has a reference to empirical reality and the notions of social space, symbolic space or social class are studied and tested through research in which the theoretical and empirical are inseparable and which mobilises numerous methods of observation and measurement as Bourdieu explains (1998, pp. 1–2). Bourdieu asserts that the researcher should aim to understand the principles of construction of a social space or the mechanisms of reproduction of that space and, therefore, register the real differences that separate structures and dispositions (habitus). They should not focus on the peculiarities of a national character, but rather on the particularities of different collective histories and should seek to represent a model with universal validity (pp. 2–3). Bourdieu (1993a) finds that his empirical research provides knowledge about French society but also about all modern societies (pp. 270–271).

Criticism has come from those who believe Bourdieu’s work denigrates the working-class and does not account for social change (Bredo & Feinberg 1979; Gorder 1986; Jenkins 1986; Honneth 1986; Lash 1993). However, Bourdieu argues that the working-class aesthetic is practical and functional rather than purely aestheticist and that the aristocracy has generated the exclusive concept of the ‘aesthetic’ (Robbins 2000, p. 115). However, this form of aesthetic is not absolute and static. The ‘legitimate culture’ is such due to its dominance and not to its intrinsic quality. Bourdieu and Passeron (1970) define legitimacy as the function of dominance and
that the ‘dominant’ is not absolutely dominant ‘high status’ culture but only the dominant for that particular social formation (Robbins 2000, p. 118).

Bourdieu (1984) finds that culture is dynamic, constantly changing according to what objects are considered works of art at particular times and what forms of appreciation are considered legitimate. Bourdieu (1984) states, ‘The definition of cultural nobility is the stake in a struggle...between groups differing in their ideas of culture and of the legitimate relation to culture’ (p. 2). As fields are ‘sites of struggle’, there is room for change and evolution and the dominant in one generation may not be dominant in the next. That is precisely why they rely on methods of reproduction to attempt to maintain their position in the social spaces.

However, criticism has also come in the form of Bourdieu’s methods of research and theoretical conceptions. The French intellectual tradition questions his use of philosophical concepts in social science and the transference of concepts among discourses (Robbins 2000, p. 130). However, Bourdieu has moved among philosophical, anthropological, sociological and cultural discourses with the flow of events (Robbins, p. 133). Further, Bourdieu (1987) explains the influence of philosophers on his work and his sociological research is a good terrain for ‘fieldwork in philosophy’ (cited in Swartz 1997, p. 28). Bourdieu (1993a) defends his work and attributes criticism to the critics’ failure to consider his work in the field of its production and to view ‘the progress of my work...which led me to change progressively’ (pp. 263–264).

Bourdieu (2000) further felt that it is the task of the sociologist ‘to tell about the things of the social world’ for ‘the sociologist breaks the enchanted circle of collective denial. By working towards the “return of the repressed”, by trying to know and make known what the world of knowledge does not want to know, especially about itself’ (p. 5). With this statement Bourdieu remarks on the field of sociology and academia rejecting his findings, as they were part of the whole process of cultural and social discrimination and reproduction. His empirical investigations were to enable him to say ‘things which are not said but deserve to be’ (p. 7). He aimed to ‘utter publicly the constitutive mechanisms of social games that are as shrouded in prestige and mystery as those of art, literature, science, law or philosophy and charged with the values commonly held to be the most universal and the most sacred’ (p. 6).

Wacquant (1987) finds that Bourdieu’s work is best understood by appreciating the practical application of his concepts. Robbins finds that many authors have demonstrated the practical use of Bourdieu’s concepts in their investigations in various intellectual fields and cultural contexts (p. 129). This is the approach I have
undertaken in my empirical research; I find that the practical application of Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction in the field of art education is the most valid theory for the analysis of my research. Therefore, I aim to ‘utter publicly’ that the introduction of art appreciation in all schools further perpetuates the social division of modern society as it reaffirms the links between scholastic aptitude and cultural heritage.

The introduction of art appreciation and aesthetics in the form of written and oral outcomes in Victoria via the CSF: The Arts brings a requirement of linguistic competence not apparent in previous art curricula. The implication of art criticism and aesthetics in art curricula is the necessity for a familiarisation with the discourse of art language or what Bourdieu (1991) describes as ‘legitimate language’. Language is legitimated in particular fields, such as the art field, and further acts as a form of class distinction. The concept of aesthetics and appreciation in art education, therefore, has implications for and dependence on social class. Bourdieu in his theory of practice elucidated that participation in particular fields and their appropriated practices requires the appropriate habitus and capital. Habitus and cultural capital are acquired through familial experience and reinforced through practice in particular environments or fields. Bourdieu explains how there are certain distinctions and differences in peoples’ habitus and forms of cultural capital depending on their social background and the values they place in groups on certain practices. These groups, who participate in similar practices and acquire similar styles, can be defined as social classes.

Bourdieu’s Theory of Social Action

The three fundamental concepts in Bourdieu’s work: “habitus”, “capital” and “field” are central to his theory of social action. Bourdieu (1984) devised the formula \( (\text{habitus} \times \text{capital}) + \text{field} = \text{practice} \) (p. 101). This formula is vital when analysing practices and brings to light the structure of the symbolic space and the systematic nature of life-styles and what they constitute. Bourdieu states one must ‘return to the practice-unifying and practice-generating principle, i. e., class habitus, the internalized form of class condition and of the conditioning it entails’ (p. 101) that produce homogeneous dispositions and practices. The concepts of habitus, capital and field are relevant to my study and are further detailed, as they are used to explain the findings of practice in various school sites and the relation of social class to art and the incorporation of art appreciation in education.

Habitus

In 1967, Bourdieu theorised the notion of habitus to expand on Panofsky’s concept to account for the ways in which all social structures are generated in practice by participating social agents...[and how] All humans inherit dispositions to act in
circumscribed ways. In this sense they possess an inherited concept of society which they then modify, generating a new concept which is apt for their conditions and experiences’ (Robbins 2000, pp. 26–27).

Bourdieu uses habitus to explain the transmission of old values in new situations and behaviours. These values are not just attitudinal but also physical and the concept of habitus denies the mind/body separation. Bourdieu mentioned Marcel Mauss and his rediscovery of the corporal dimension of hexis/habitus, ‘where it serves to express the systematic functioning of the socialised body’ (cited in Robbins 2000, p. 28). Along with Mauss’s social psychological understanding of behaviour, Bourdieu noted Merleau-Ponty’s thinking in *La Structure du comportement*, 1942, which understood behaviour as ‘the physically and mentally adaptive piecemeal actions of behaving persons’ (cited in Robbins 2000, p. 28). Merleau-Ponty presented a materialist, phenomenological account of behaviour, Bourdieu was able to apply his concept of habitus to this. For Bourdieu, habitus embodies attitudes which are inherited, but it does not constitute a stimulus which conditions how a person must behave. He felt that our actions are not purposeful but continuously adaptive (Robbins 2000, p. 29).

Bourdieu explains habitus can be ‘understood as a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a *matrix of perceptions, and actions*’ (Bourdieu 1977, pp. 82–83). Bourdieu (1990) explains how the habitus is the product of the past and produces individual and collective practices, ensuring active presence of past experiences, which are deposited in individuals as ‘schemes of perception, thought and action’ and tend to guarantee ‘correctness’ of practices and constancy over time more reliably than formal rules and explicit norms (p. 54). This is because the habitus is ‘embodied history, internalised as second nature and so forgotten history’ (p. 56). The factors most influential in the formation of the habitus are transmitted without passing through language or consciousness, but through ‘suggestions’ inscribed in situations and practices of everyday life which appear insignificant. Thus, the modalities of practices, ways of looking, sitting, standing, keeping silent or speaking are full of injunctions that are powerful because they are silent and insidious, insistent and insinuating (Bourdieu 1991, p. 51).

Bourdieu (1990) argues that this internalised history speaks directly to the motor function and becomes a bodily hexis which forms a pattern of postures that is both individual and systematic (p. 74). The relation to the body is a fundamental dimension of the habitus (p. 72). Thompson (1991) explains the body as the site of incorporated history and this history is the source of the practices and perceptions which reproduce that history (p. 13). In this sense, this incorporated history acts as a
reproduction process whereby certain actions and perceptions are passed on through generations. The habitus can be seen as structured dispositions which are also durable as they are ingrained in the body in such a way that they endure through the life of the individual, operating in a pre-conscious way that is not readily amenable to conscious reflection and modification. ‘The practical sense is not so much a state of mind as a state of the body, a state of being’ (Thompson 1991, p. 13). Bourdieu (1990) finds bodily ‘hexis’ is turned into a permanent disposition, a durable organisation of one’s body, and thereby of feeling and thinking (pp. 69–70).

While the habitus functions at an unconscious or subconscious level, this does not mean that agents have no say over their actions. Bourdieu (1998) explains they are ‘active and knowing agents endowed with a practical sense, that is, an acquired system of preferences, of principles of division and vision (what is usually called taste), and a system of durable cognitive structures...and of schemes of action which orient the perception of the situation and the appropriate response’ (p. 25). Bourdieu (1998) states, ‘The habitus is this kind of practical sense for what is to be done in a given situation — what is called in sport a “feel” for the game’ (p. 25).

Habitus is central to Bourdieu’s (1990) theory of practice, for it is constituted in practice and always oriented towards practical function (p. 52). Bourdieu’s concept of habitus reveals how people’s practices are structured and habitual, and become ‘dispositions’ that are internalised over time and, therefore, not examined or questioned by the practitioner or agent. Habitus, in this sense, explains the reproduction of similar practices over time and often the inability of people to change their practices. As briefly mentioned, Bourdieu’s concept of habitus is applied to teacher practice to explain their ‘resistance’ to implementing fully the CSF: The Arts, which would entail changing existing practice. In Bourdieu’s (1984) view, ‘The habitus is necessity internalized and converted into a disposition that generates meaningful practices and meaning-giving perceptions; it is a general, transposable disposition which carries out a systematic, universal application—beyond the limits of what has been directly learnt—of the necessity inherent in the learning conditions’ (p. 170).

Bourdieu’s theory of practice and habitus also explains how ‘practices’ act as distinguishing features among social classes. In his account of class division, classes produce classificatory judgements on particular practices of their own and those of others. Particular practices are awarded certain value over others, as there is a hierarchy of practices which is predominantly determined and generated by the dominant group. Bourdieu (1984) finds the habitus is both the generative principle of
these classifiable judgements and the system of classification of these practices (pp. 169–170).

Bourdieu (1984) explains that because different conditions of existence produce different habitus, the practices engendered by the different habitus function as different life-styles (p. 170). Life-styles are the systematic products of habitus, which become signs that are socially qualified, such as ‘vulgar’, ‘distinguished’, etc. (p. 172). In translating as life-style, the habitus relates to choices of goods, practices, people and opinions. These in turn become signs, signs of difference and even further still signs of distinction and dominance. Bourdieu (1998) explains that these differences associated with different positions, practices, goods and manners function in each society and constitute a symbolic, mythical system, that is, as distinctive signs (pp. 8–9). However, Bourdieu (1998) explains difference becomes a sign of distinction, or vulgarity, only if a principle of vision and division is applied to it which is present among all agents and structures the perceptions of agents (p. 9). Often this perception is generally applied from the view of the dominant group or what Bourdieu (1998) terms the dominant ‘aesthetic’.

Habitus, therefore, is almost invariably linked with social distinctions because as Bourdieu (1998) argues, one of the functions of habitus is to account for the unity of style, which unites the goods and practices of individual agents or a class of agents (p. 8). The habitus and the life-styles they produce are class defined and class specific. Bourdieu (1998) explains ‘to each class of positions there corresponds a class habitus (or tastes)’ (p. 7). These tastes are produced by the familial and social conditioning of the agent and, therefore, act as indicators of class difference. Habitus as a form of class distinction, through life-style choices, will be examined in Chapter 10: specifically, the participation of students in ‘cultural practices’ to verify the development of an ‘aesthetic disposition’ in order to partake in art appreciation.

Bourdieu (1998) finds, ‘Habitus are generative principles of distinct and distinctive practices...But habitus are also classificatory schemes, principles of classification, principles of vision and division, different tastes’ (p. 8). Bourdieu states they make distinctions between what is right and wrong, what is good and bad. However, he argues that these distinctions are not identical for everyone, for the same behaviour, practice or good may be distinguished for one person yet pretentious to another, or cheap to yet another (p. 8). Generally, though, the same behaviour or good is valued by the same social group or class, as these habitus act to distinguish them from other social groups. Habitus is also a generational principle, and particular practices are passed on from one generation to the next to maintain social position.
Bourdieu (1977) explains the structures constitutive of a particular environment, for example class condition, produce habitus, and habitus is the ‘systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations’ (p. 72). Therefore, habitus is produced within a ‘structure’, or within social conditions in which expectations of practice are placed on agents, and the acquired habitus then acts as a structuring device for the perception of further experiences. Likewise, agents within a similar environment, or social group, will be expected to have the same or similar habitus.

According to Bourdieu (1990), a social class has the same or similar habitus, for habitus is understood as a system of dispositions common to all products of the same conditioning (p. 59). Bourdieu (1984) finds that, as structured products of a structuring structure, all practices and products of an agent are harmonised among themselves, without deliberate or conscious pursuit of coherence with those of all members of the same class. The habitus continuously generates practical metaphors, such as the way one walks or talks; that is, the habitus is ‘put into practice’. Practices of the same agents or practices of all agents of the same class owe their stylistic affinity to the fact that they are the product of transfers of the same action from one field to another (pp. 172–173).

However, Bourdieu (1990) understands that it is impossible for all members of the same class to have identical experiences, but it is certain each member of the same class is more likely than other members of other classes to be confronted with situations most frequent to members of that class (p. 60). In societies based on class, ‘social conditions’ invariably reflect political divisions, and the dispositions produced unavoidably reflect the social conditions within which they were acquired. A person from a working-class background will have dispositions different from those acquired by a person brought up in a middle-class background (Thompson 1991, p. 12). Bourdieu (1977) explains habitus is the ‘past which survives in the present’ (p. 82), ‘laid down in each agent by his [sic] earliest upbringing’ (p. 81) and although it may be modified by subsequent experience, it is ‘dominated by the earliest experiences’ (p. 87).

However, agents’ habitus are further reinforced and perpetuated in social groups, institutions or fields. Bourdieu (1977) finds that habitus is not the exclusive principle of all practice, for there is a whole field of practices subject to traditional precepts and ritual prescriptions which functions as a regulatory device which orients practice without producing it (pp. 20–21). For individuals act in specific social contexts and hence particular practices should be seen not as the product of the habitus as such, but
as the product of the relation between the habitus and the specific social contexts or ‘fields’ (Thompson 1991, p. 14).

Field

According to Bourdieu’s perspective, the development of Western societies since the Middle Ages can be seen as the differentiation of distinct spheres or fields of practice, each involving specific forms of capital and value as well as specific institutions and institutional mechanisms (Thompson 1991, p. 25). Bourdieu (1998) states the ‘evolution of societies tends to make universes (which I call fields) emerge which are autonomous and have their own laws’ (p. 83). Wacquant (1992) explains each field prescribes its particular values and possesses its own regulative principles and these values are imposed on all the objects and agents that enter the field (p. 17). Bourdieu (1990) explains that those who enter the field have an investment in the field, in the outcome, and this investment is described as illusio. Furthermore, to enter the field one must have a commitment to the presuppositions and a belief in the field, known as doxa (p. 66). Bourdieu finds, ‘Belief is thus an inherent part of belonging to a field’ (p. 67). However, Bourdieu elaborates, that this belief is opposed to Kant’s ‘pragmatic faith’ and describes it as ‘practical faith’. He explains fields impose conditions of entry in practice, through sanctions, examinations, etc, which obtain ‘undisputed, pre-reflexive, naïve compliance’—doxa (pp. 67–68). Therefore, Bourdieu finds ‘Doxa is the relationship of immediate adherence that is established in practice between a habitus and the field to which it is attuned’ (p. 68).

The concepts of illusio and doxa allow for some explanation as to why certain groups enter certain fields, while others do not. For certain groups, or social classes, the participation in certain fields, such as the art field, are valued. Investment, illusio, in these fields is an important display of their ‘taste’. The doxa, or belief and adherence to the practices of the field, demonstrate the compatible habitus of these classes. The illusio and doxa help to explain the participation and non-participation of schools and students in cultural practices of the art field.

While it is stated that these fields are autonomous to a degree, they are not completely disconnected but are interlocked in complex ways. A sociological study of these fields, as proposed by Bourdieu, is to establish the ways in which they are linked, while avoiding the tendency to reduce one field to another, or to treat everything as a mere construction of the economy (Thompson 1991, p. 25).

Bourdieu’s concept of ‘field’ was to provide a substitute for Marx’s economic structures. Bourdieu sees the failure of Marxist theory of class in reducing society to the economic field alone and failing to incorporate other influences. Thompson
(1991) attests that, while Bourdieu did not want to reduce fields to an economic logic in the narrow sense, he realised practices are somewhat governed by an economic logic in the broader sense, in so far as they are oriented towards the gain of some kind of 'capital', whether it be cultural or symbolic, or the maximisation of 'profit' for example honor, prestige or status (p. 14). Bourdieu (1990) explains, 'Even when they give every appearance of disinterestedness because they escape the logic of “economic” interest (in the narrow sense)...practices never cease to comply with an economic logic' (p. 122).

Thompson (1991) suggests, 'A field is always the site of struggles in which individuals seek to maintain or alter the distribution of the forms of capital specific to it. The individuals who participate in these struggles will have differing aims—some will seek to preserve the status quo, others to change it—and differing chances of winning or losing, depending on where they are located in the structured space of positions' (p. 14). In this sense Bourdieu's perspective on the development of modern society was strongly influenced by Weber, for, like Weber, Bourdieu was interested in the ways groups emerge in different fields and struggle for power (Thompson 1991, p. 29).

However, according to Wacquant (1992), in the course of these struggles the shape of the field becomes the central stake, for altering the weight and forms of capital may modify the structure of the field. This gives fields malleability and historical dynamism, avoiding the inflexible determinism of classical structuralism (p. 18). Bourdieu (1990) explains any field 'presents itself as a structure of probabilities—of rewards, gains, profits, or sanctions—but always implies a measure of indeterminacy' (p. 89). Therefore, a field is a space of conflict and competition where the participants vie for monopoly of the capital that is effective in that particular field, such as the cultural authority in the artistic field (Wacquant 1992, p. 17).

Therefore, Bourdieu's approach offers an account of how cultural products were, and are, situated in their particular fields (Robbins 2000, p. 51). These fields of literature, art, politics and religion are characterised by their own distinctive properties and forms of capital. These semi-autonomous fields play a vital role in the development and continuation of practices and the value placed on practices by groups and the accumulation of capital. Thompson (1991) explains a field or market is a structured space of positions in which the positions are determined by the distribution of different kinds of resources or 'capital' (p. 14). Capital is therefore an ultimate stake in the struggles in the various fields and as stated the types of capital are determined in the specific fields. However, the various forms of capital, while specific, may also have value in other fields, further determining the balance of power of groups or
individuals. The configuration of an agent's capital, therefore, has definable effects on their social position.

Capital

Whilst Bourdieu recognises the failings of Marxist theory, he is strongly influenced by Marx and the role economic capital played in defining social classes. Thompson (1991) sees Marx's influence in the theoretical priority Bourdieu gives the role of economic capital in society and social classes (p. 29). However, Bourdieu developed Marx's purely economic theory, realising that other forms of capital existed which are just as pervasive, if not more so, as they are discreet and hidden in their transferal and reproduction of power.

Calhoun (1993) explains Bourdieu finds that there are immaterial forms of capital—cultural, symbolic, and social—as well as a material or economic form and it is possible to convert one of these forms into the other (p. 69). Bourdieu sees the structure of the social world as given by the distribution of the various forms of capital and that they are capable of conferring 'strength, power and profit' on their holder. According to Bourdieu (1987), the most efficient form of capital is 'firstly economic capital, in its various kinds; secondly cultural capital or better, informational capital; ... and thirdly two forms of capital which are very strongly correlated, social capital, which consists of resources based on connections and group membership, and symbolic capital, which is the form the different types of capital take once they are perceived and recognized as legitimate' (pp. 3–4).

As stated, Bourdieu (1991) saw the failings of Marxist theory of class as a result of reducing the social world to the economic field alone and, therefore, defining social position with reference solely to relations of economic production. Consequently, Bourdieu felt the significance of positions occupied in different fields and sub-fields, particularly in relation to cultural production was not registered or recognised (pp. 244–245). Bourdieu suggests there also exists an economy based on 'cultural' goods, where social agents try to accumulate cultural goods in a similar fashion to material goods (Crook 1997, p. 24). These cultural goods Bourdieu describes as 'cultural capital' which agents then exchange to acquire certain social status in a 'field'. In this way cultural capital is given market value and used as a commodity to ascertain and maintain one's position or status in a given class.

Therefore, while Bourdieu appreciates economic capital is the most efficient form of capital, he believes it must be disguised as symbolic capital, such as social and cultural capital. This is to mask the economic domination of the dominant class and socially legitimate hierarchy by making social position essential and natural (Calhoun, Li
Puma & Postone 1993, p. 5). In this sense, Bourdieu’s notion of capital does not purely refer to the economic form of capital but also implies social, symbolic and cultural capital. For the purpose of my study in art education, the concept of cultural capital is applied to examine the cultural background of students and how this affects their ability to engage in art appreciation.

**Cultural Capital**

Bourdieu specifies a two-dimensional model of social stratification by distinguishing two separate hierarchies. One is based on material capital (similar to Weber’s ‘class’) and the other on ‘cultural capital’ (drawn from Weber’s ‘status’) (Crook 1997, p. 24). Weber (1978) states, “classes” are clearly the product of economic interests, bound up with the existence of the “market” (p. 45). Weber defines status groups as sharing tastes or preferences in the sphere of consumption (Giddens 1973 cited in Crook 1997, p. 8). In contrasting class with status groups Weber finds members from a status group share a common style of life and enjoy (or suffer) a similar level of social (dis)honor (Weber 1946 cited in Crook 1997, p. 8). Further, members of a status group share a common level of social prestige based on lifestyle, education and occupation (Weber 1947 cited in Crook 1997, p. 9). Bourdieu understood status as cultural capital. As Crook (1997) explains cultural capital refers to ‘culturally valued taste and consumption patterns’ (p. 25). Crook asserts Bourdieu’s notion of cultural capital parallels Weber’s ([1922] 1968) notion of status groups where members share similar styles of life and patterns of consumption, and are identifiable through associated tastes, attitudes, occupations, clothes and the like (p. 26). Recognising the patterns of consumption of cultural goods, Bourdieu (1984) finds, ‘There is an economy of cultural goods, but it has a specific logic’ (p. 1).

Just as social groups differ in material capital, so they vary in their respective taste, skills and funds of information for interpreting social situations such as the education system or works of art. Therefore, the differing levels of cultural capital among social groups and individuals manifest themselves in leisure-time pursuits, such as the arts. Therefore, people rich in cultural capital have very different life-styles from cultural have-nots. If people from the subordinate group want to gain admission into the dominant group, or an institution governed by the dominant group (such as education), they must learn the appropriate cultural repertoires. That is, they must adopt the habitus of the dominant group (Crook 1997, p. 25).

Bourdieu identified three forms of cultural capital: *incorporated*, which is in the form of durable dispositions (the habitus); *objectivated*, in the form of cultural goods, pictures, books, instruments; and *institutionalised*, a form of objectivation, such as scholastic titles (Bourdieu 1979 cited in Robbins 2000, p. 34). Robbins (2000)
explains the key factor about incorporated cultural capital is that it is confined to the physical life-spans of individuals. Objectivated cultural capital, however, exists independently of people and has acquired autonomous market value over time and present day position-takers deploy second or third hand the value created by earlier position-takers first hand (p. 35).

Robbins (2000) further indicates that Bourdieu wanted to make it clear that he was not stating a necessary or fixed and static relationship between specific tastes and specific class positions. On the contrary the 'objectivated' cultural capital accumulated in one generation can collapse in the next, for the value of the capital has to be renewed constantly in the new market. Although objects such as books and pictures can be seen as repositories of objectivated cultural capital, they too have no value unless they are strategically activated in the present. Therefore, objectivated cultural capital is reliant on the selections of individuals (p. 35) and the value placed on these objects.

Robbins (2000) explains Bourdieu’s theory of social practice, stating we are not intrinsically altered by our preferences, but the judgments of value made between our preferences within the cultural system affect a person’s position within that system or field. These in turn have consequences for the economic and social position-taking of that person. Social positions are modified solely by cultural tastes in as much as the cultural system assigns more value to some tastes than to others (p. 32). That is, the objects individuals and groups of individuals class as having value and worth are the objects desired by those wishing to display that they possess the legitimate ‘tastes’ of that particular society.

**Taste**

Bourdieu (1984) states:

Taste is the practical operator of the transmutation of things into distinct and distinctive signs, of continuous distributions into discontinuous oppositions; it raises the differences inscribed in the physical order of bodies to the symbolic order of significant distinctions. It transforms objectively classified practices, in which class condition signifies itself (through taste), into classifying practices, that is, into a symbolic expression of class position...Taste is thus the source of the system of distinctive features which cannot fail to be perceived as a systematic expression of a particular class of existence, i.e., as a distinctive life-style, by anyone who possesses practical knowledge of the relationships between distinctive signs and positions in the distributions (pp. 174–175).
Bourdieu finds that members of the dominant fractions of a class amass the (culturally and economically) most expensive and most prestigious activities, such as owning works of art, pianos, art books, antique furniture and foreign cars, visiting galleries, antique-dealers and theatres, holidaying, skiing, playing tennis and golf, riding and water-skiing (p. 286). Participating in these particular practices is a sign of distinction which indicate you are a member of the middle class and that you have acquired taste.

Taste, Bourdieu (1984) finds is an acquired disposition to ‘differentiate’ and ‘appreciate’, therefore, to establish and mark differences by a process of distinction. However, this is not necessarily a distinct knowledge as the habitus, the primary forms of classification, function below the level of consciousness and language. They orient practices practically, embedding what some mistakenly call values in the automatic gestures of the body and hence engage the fundamental principles of construction and evaluation of the social world. They directly express the division of labour (between classes, age groups and sexes), or divisions of the work of domination, in divisions between bodies and relations to the body and hence appear as natural. Therefore, taste is a practical mastery of distributions which makes it possible to sense what is likely to befall an individual who occupies a given position in social space. It functions as a social orientation, a ‘sense of one’s place’, guiding the occupants towards the social positions adjusted to their properties, and the practices and goods which suit them (p. 466).

Bourdieu found in his empirical investigations there is no universally followed standard of taste. These standards of taste are produced as a form of social practice to differentiate among certain social groups and to indicate their social standing. Bourdieu (1984) explains tastes function as markers of ‘class’ (p. 2) as ‘Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier’ (1979, p. 6). The significance of taste to art will be discussed in Chapter 5.

As explained, these tastes are displayed through particular practices (habitus) and acquired objects and ways of life (cultural capital) that are acted out in social environments (fields). The relations of habitus, field and capital define Bourdieu’s concept of social class and how they work to define social classes through difference and distinctions in taste, which are awarded certain value.

Social 'Class'

Bourdieu (1991) views the social world as a multi-dimensional ‘space’ constructed on the basis of principles of differentiation or distribution of capital that is able to confer power on its possessor. Agents or groups of agents are defined by their relative positions in this space. This space Bourdieu also describes as a ‘field of forces’, or a
set of objective power relations imposed on all those who enter this field (pp. 229–230). The field is constructed by active properties which are the different kinds of power or capital that are current in different fields. As discussed, capital can exist in objectified form as material properties, or incorporated form as cultural capital. The kinds of capital an agent possesses are powers which define chances in a particular field and help determine position in that social space (p. 230). Bourdieu explains agents are distributed according to the overall volume of capital they possess and the composition of their capital (p. 231).

According to these positions in space, Bourdieu (1991) finds that classes can be carved out, which he describes as ‘agents who occupy similar positions and who, being placed in similar conditions and submitted to similar types of conditioning, have every chance of having similar dispositions and interests, and thus of producing similar practices and adopting similar stances’ (p. 231). Bourdieu describes this as ‘class on paper’ or a probable class, as he finds it is not a real class as such but helps explain the practices and probability of individuals constituting themselves as practical groups, families, clubs, associations etc. What does exist is a space of relations in which movements can be paid for by labour, effort and time (p. 232).

This ‘space of relations’, as defined by Bourdieu, exists as a result of continued maintenance of the social structure by agents submitting to their own subjugation. Bourdieu explains this self-subjugation as a form of internalised habitus and bodily hexis, as discussed, whereby actions and practices remain at an unconscious body level and, therefore, are not questioned. This allows agents to reproduce class distinctions and their position within this structure without consciousness or objection—what Bourdieu defines as ‘doxic submission’.

**Doxie Submission and Bodily Hexis**

Bourdieu (1991) discusses agents ‘knowing their place’ and how they conform to aid in their own subjugation. He finds these perceptions of the social space incline agents to accept the social world as it is and the sense of one’s place is an acceptance of one’s position, a sense of limits (‘that’s not meant for us’). This amounts to a sense of distances, to be marked and maintained, respected and expected of others (p. 235). This sense of perception of knowing your place is implied in the family. Bourdieu (1991) finds the notion of ‘become what you are’ is expressed implicitly and sometimes explicitly by members of a family group continually to the young child, varying in intensity according to social class, sex and rank within the family (p. 122). This acts to keep the lower-classes ‘in their place’ but also to exert expectations on the upper classes for their perpetuation and privilege (p. 123).
Bourdieu (1991) explains the naturalisation and inculcation of the sense of limits inclines some people to maintain their rank and others to know their place and be happy with it, therefore denying a sense of deprivation (p. 123). The denial of the sense of deprivation can be understood due to the reasoning Bourdieu (1991) finds, that the essential part of one’s experience of the social world and one’s perception of it takes place ‘in practice’ and without reaching an explicit level of representation or verbal expression. Bourdieu explains this as closer to ‘class unconsciousness’ as opposed to Marx’s ‘class consciousness’ (p. 235). This class unconsciousness allows agents to be happy with their position in the social world, for they do not question it at an explicit level. In this sense dispositions or the habitus remain internalised and unconscious (Bourdieu 1974, p. 39). In this way the internalised habitus and a sense of limits are crucial in the reproduction of the established order.

Bourdieu (1977) explains that every established order tends to produce itself through the ‘naturalization of its own arbitrariness’. He finds the most important and concealed way to achieve this is with agents’ aspirations, from which arises the sense of limits or commonly known as a sense of reality (p. 164). The correspondence between social structures and mental structures are the basis of the almost ineradicable adherence to the established social order. However, the adherence to this social order remains ‘misrecognised’ and the social world appears as natural and taken for granted. Bourdieu calls this experience doxa (p. 164) or the ‘universe of the undisputed (undisputed)’ (p. 168). Bourdieu (1977) finds that the doxa or adherence in the ‘doxic mode’ contributes to the reproduction of the social and traditional world, as it is undisputed (p. 164). As previously explained, the doxa is the congruence between the habitus and the field, which results in the unquestioned compliance to the expected practices of the field.

Within the doxa exists a ‘universe of discourse (or argument)’ which implies an awareness or recognition of opposing discourses and a field of opinions (p. 168). However, the doxa and its doxic submission, or undisputed practice are the dominant feature of the reproduction of the social world, while the universe of discourse, or language, is constructed within the world of action. However, Bourdieu (1998) explains it should not be forgotten that this doxa is a conformity, a right, correct, dominant vision which has been imposed through struggles against competing visions. What appears as self-evident today is the result of the stake of struggles between the dominant and dominated groups. The doxa is a particular viewpoint, of the dominant, which presents and imposes itself as universal (pp. 56–57).

To understand doxic submission, Bourdieu (1998) sees it as necessary to break with the intellectualism of the neo-Kantian tradition and acknowledge that cognitive
structures are not forms of consciousness but dispositions of the body (p. 54). Bourdieu (1998) explains this doxic submission is a deeply buried corporal disposition, outside consciousness and, therefore, a product that Marxism cannot understand (p. 55). Wacquant (1992) explains the submission of the dominated not as a deliberate or conscious concession but as residing in the ‘unconscious fit between their habitus and the field they operate in. It is lodged deep inside the socialized body’ (p. 24). Bourdieu (1989) argues, ‘If it is fitting to recall that the dominated always contribute to their own domination, it is necessary at once to be reminded that the dispositions which incline them to this complicity are also the effect, embodied, of domination’ (p. 12 cited in Wacquant 1992, p. 24 author’s emphasis).1

Bourdieu also sees bodily hexis as an indicator of class definition. Bodily movements are ‘highly charged with social meanings and values, socialization instils a sense of the equivalences between physical space and social space and between movements…and thereby roots the most fundamental structures of the group in the primary experiences of the body’ (1990, p. 71). ‘What is “learned by body” is not something that one has, like knowledge that can be brandished, but something that one is’ (p. 73). Bourdieu (1982) states, ‘The body is in the social world but the social world is in the body’ (p. 38 cited in Wacquant 1992, p. 20).

Bourdieu (1990) testifies that the whole social order imposes itself at the deepest level of the bodily dispositions (p. 75). He finds physical potency is inseparable from social potency which governs all bodily experiences (p. 78). In a society divided into classes, all the products of a given agent speak inseparably and simultaneously of his/her class and their position within the social structure and of their body — more precisely, of all the properties, always socially qualified, of which they are the bearer (p. 79). Bourdieu (1990) explains ‘Bodily hexis is political mythology realized, embodied, turned into a permanent disposition, a durable way of standing, speaking, walking, and thereby of feeling and thinking’ (pp. 69–70). These ways of acting,

1 The influence of Merleau-Ponty led Bourdieu to study the corporality of human behaviour (Robbins 2000, p. 44). Merleau-Ponty and Bourdieu reject the mind/body dualism and aim to reveal the social agent not as an object but as a vessel with generative perceptions formed in practice through the body. They aim to reveal the important role of the body moving purposively in the world and the subsequently generated perceptions of the world. Wacquant (1992) suggests that Bourdieu in this sense is the ‘sociological heir’ of Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology in finding the body as the source of practical intentionality and meaning grounded in experience (p. 20). The body and bodily hexis play a vital role in their understanding of the formation of social agents and their own subordination which allows for the indisputable reproduction of class.
which are embedded in the body, then become signs of distinction along with the practices and goods possessed by agents, the cultural capital.

Bourdieu places importance on the habitus, the embodied ways of talking, walking, speaking, and thinking along with accumulated cultural capital as they act as indicators of a person’s class position in society. Specifically, in terms of the way of talking Bourdieu (1991) finds that language is a body technique: linguistic practices are inscribed in the most deep-rooted of bodily dispositions. Linguistic and phonetic competence is a dimension of the bodily hexis in which one’s relation to the social world, and one’s socially informed relation to the world, are expressed. Bourdieu states the bodily hexis characteristic of a social class, determines the system of phonological features (p. 86).

**Linguistic Capital**

Bodily hexis, therefore, plays an important role in language and linguistic competence, which translates as linguistic capital. However, the attainment of linguistic competence, such as that related to the art field, depends on social and educational familiarisation. Therefore, linguistic capital has social implications reinforced by the sanctioning of art appreciation as a proponent of art education. For the social ‘distinctions’ demonstrated through the demand to produce a specialised language, assist in the reproduction of the social order. Consequently, the introduction of aesthetic appreciation of art in the CSF: The Arts requires a certain level of linguistic capital in relation to art discourse, thereby producing and confirming social class difference.

Bourdieu (1991) explains a discourse can exist in its current form only so long as it is socially acceptable (p. 76). Therefore, discourse must be realised as the result of value placed on the language within the market. Bourdieu finds that ‘linguistic signs are also goods destined to be given a price by powers capable of providing credit’ (p. 76). He explains the market or field fixes the price for a linguistic product and, therefore, the objective value (p. 76). Further he states that ‘discourses are always to some extent euphemisms inspired by the concern to “speak well”, to “speak properly”, to produce the products that respond to the demands of the market’ (p. 78).

In relation to Bourdieu, Thompson (1991) explains what circulates in the linguistic market is not ‘language’ as such, but discourses that are stylistically marked by their production and reception (p. 39). Bourdieu (1991) states how a linguistic market creates the conditions for a competition in and through which the legitimate competence can function as linguistic capital, producing a profit of distinction (p. 55). However, Bourdieu explains the legitimate competence does not refer only to the
ability to produce sentences that are understood but that are *listened to* and *socially acceptable*. Bourdieu further states that speakers lacking the legitimate competence are excluded from the social domains in which this competence is required, or are condemned to silence. Bourdieu finds that, while we have the capacity to speak as such, the competence to speak the *legitimate language* is rare. This inability to speak the legitimate language re-translates as a form of distinction (p. 55).

Bourdieu (1991) explains there is a legitimate language that is sanctioned by the state, and is imposed as the norm and all forms of language are measured practically against the legitimate language (p. 45). However, he finds the embodied way of talking, linguistic capital, is transmitted by the same laws as other forms of cultural capital among generations and linguistic competence, which is measured by academic criteria, depends on level of education and the social ‘trajectory’ of the agent. The mastery of the ‘legitimate language’ is acquired through familiarisation and prolonged exposure to it (such as within the family) or the deliberate inculcation of explicit rules (such as in the educational system) (pp. 61–62).

However, Bourdieu (1991) argues that the sociology of language is inseparable from the sociology of education, for the linguistic market is subject to the verdicts of the guardians of the legitimate culture. Therefore, the educational market is dominated by the linguistic products of the dominant class and tends to sanction the pre-existing differences in capital. Bourdieu observed that the combined effect of low cultural capital and the associated low desire to increase it through education condemned the least favoured classes to negative sanctions of the scholastic stance, i.e. exclusion or early self-exclusion due to lack of success. Therefore, those least able and least inclined to adopt the language of the school are those exposed for the shortest time to the language and educational correction. Hence the initial disparities are reproduced (p. 62).

Bourdieu (1991) explains the habitus with its embodied actions are linked to the various markets not only through its conditions of acquisition but also through its conditions of use. For we have not learned to speak simply by hearing a certain kind of speech spoken but also by speaking. This occurs through exchanges in the family occupying a particular position in the social space and that provide models that diverge more or less from legitimate use. The agent also learns the value placed on their linguistic product in this primary market along with the authority it provides and receives in other markets, such as the school (pp. 81–82). Therefore, one’s linguistic competence is produced and received in a market or in a discourse of practice and the agent further gains an understanding of the compatibility between their linguistic capital and the legitimate language.
Bourdieu argues that every new experience can have certain effects on the habitus and these depend on the ‘compatability’ between this experience and the experiences which have already been assimilated by the habitus (p. 82)—that is, the familiarity the agent has with the experience and their ability to ‘deal’ with it. In terms of language use, Bourdieu describes this as linguistic ‘sense of place’ and explains how the field, depending on what it requires, will impose either a silence or hyper-controlled language on some people while allowing others the freedom of the language that is securely established within them. Bourdieu finds the sense of value of an agent’s own linguistic product is fundamental to the sense of knowing the place one occupies in the social space. He states the original relation with different markets and the experience of the sanctions placed on one’s own production are some of the mediations which help to constitute a sense of one’s own social worth which governs the practical relation to the various markets (confidence, shyness, etc.) (p. 82).

Bourdieu (1991) finds what expresses itself through the linguistic habitus is the class habitus of which it is one dimension. Further, the linguistic habitus of the members of the dominant class (especially if they were born in that class) is the realization of the norm and who can express the self-confidence that is associated with a situation where the principles of evaluation and the principles of production coincide perfectly (pp. 83–84). In this sense, Bourdieu explains that the demands of the market and the dispositions of the habitus are perfectly attuned and the law of the market does not need to be imposed since it is accomplished through the relation to the market in its incorporated form (p. 84) the linguistic habitus. Effectively, those with the acquired linguistic habitus are able to perform the required legitimate language for the specific market or field. Therefore, they are able to partake successfully in the specialised discourse. Art discourse is highly specific and developed historically, with a ‘disinterested’ approach valued in the art field. Therefore, the demand for students to appreciate art requires a knowledge and ability to converse in the ‘disinterested’ contemplation of art, which is highly analytical, removed and abstract. The ‘disinterested’ approach to art discourse will be examined further in Chapter 5.

As discussed ‘linguistic capital’ receives its value only in relation to a market (Bourdieu 1991, p. 67). Further, the value placed on specific capital, in certain markets, is decided by the ruling or dominant class members at the specific time, which explains the correlation between their habitus and the legitimate forms of culture, such as language. This correlation in turn helps to maintain the position of those agents in the ruling class, where certain forms of capital act as signs of distinction. However, these forms of distinction do not need to be overtly displayed but become subtle but powerful forms of symbolic capital that exercise class control.
Symbolic Violence

Giroux (1983) explains Bourdieu (1979) finds that class control is not the crude result of economic power imposed in the form of overt force and restraint but maintained through 'symbolic violence'—that is, subtle or symbolic power that is more implicitly applied by the ruling class to 'impose a definition of the social world that is consistent with its interests' (Bourdieu 1979 cited in Giroux 1983, p. 87). This subtle form of class control is asserted through the accumulation and exchange of cultural capital that is awarded value by the ruling class.

As previously discussed, generally people from the same social class will share similar levels of cultural capital, that is, interests, tastes and preferences, and further they will tend to reproduce and restrict entry into their elite group. Crook (1997) states people with similar cultural capital form social groups intent on excluding people poorer in cultural capital (p. 26). Therefore, cultural elites successfully transmit privilege by using exclusionary techniques to monopolise scarce resources and, therefore, retain their social position (p. 24). Weber (1978) also discusses the method of monopolisation by the privileged class (p. 57) and how one's position in class, status or party affects access to resources, services and goods that are scarce (Crook 1997, p. 8). However, for Bourdieu exclusion and 'symbolic violence' occur at the level of practice and remain unreflected upon, particularly in cultural exchanges.

Therefore, while Bourdieu understands and places importance on the economic factors influencing class structure, his theories of cultural capital reinforce the importance of more implicit forms of power such as the transmission, consumption and exchange of culture to impart social position on individuals and groups. His construction of culture as a marketable commodity, valued and appreciated in certain fields, also acts as a signaling system, indicating class membership and alliance. This is evident through the practices and attitudes of agents whose assimilation with others in their way of life forms social groups or classes. According to Calhoun (1993), Bourdieu recognises the importance of cultural capital for he realises how the labour of parents is translatable to the attainment of 'status' of their children. This is achieved through cultural capital or the embodiment of distinctive and distinguishing sensibilities and characteristic modes of action which is not directly dependent on financial inheritance (p. 70).

Evidently, while Bourdieu places importance on the notion of class, he differs from traditional Marxist literature in that Bourdieu does not define classes in terms of ownership or non-ownership. Bourdieu defines classes as sets of agents who occupy similar positions in social space, and hence possess similar kinds of capital, similar
dispositions and similar life chances (Thompson 1991, p. 30). These are theoretical constructs that help explain social phenomena while Marx discusses real social groups and fails to see the symbolic mechanisms and struggles within these groups. While Bourdieu is influenced by Marxist theory, in terms of placing importance on social classes, and the role of economic capital in the social space, he draws more so on Weber and adapts his theory to concrete social analysis (Thompson, pp. 30–31). Bourdieu sets alternative ways of understanding the socially and political instituted ways of speaking, thinking and acting which are characteristic of modern societies (Thompson, p. 31).

Despite the obvious differences among and within groups in modern society, Bourdieu (1998) finds there is in modern social discourse a denial of class. He states that denying the existence of classes means denying the existence of differences and of principles of differentiation. Bourdieu proposes difference, which he used to describe social space, exists and persists in several forms. As he states his work shows in countries said to have become homogenised and democratised that difference is everywhere. However, Bourdieu attempts to extend the idea of ‘class’ beyond Marxist interpretation—that is, ‘a group which is mobilized for common purposes, and especially against another class’ (p. 11). Bourdieu finds what exists is a social space, a space of differences, in which classes exist not as something given but as something to be done (p. 12 author’s emphasis). For Bourdieu ‘the social world, with its divisions, is something that social agents have to do, to construct, individually and especially collectively, in cooperation and conflict’ (p. 12). Bourdieu states that the very existence of classes is a stake in a struggle as everyone knows from their own experience (p. 11).

Therefore, class and social difference are expressed in the actions of groups over time, and they are more pervasive and persistent than is believed. Through these practices certain objects and actions are ‘valued’ by social groups and so become signals for group membership and non-membership. However, with appropriation of certain objects, such as art and art appreciation, certain classes are restricted in their participation as they are beyond the interests of their social class. That is, either they do not have the appropriate habitus required to participate fully, or they do not have the desire to invest—illusio, or the ‘valuing’ and belief—doxa—to enter the field and adhere unquestionably to the specific practices of the field. In relation to the art field, Bourdieu (1993) describes the ability to value and appreciate art as a cultivated disposition—a durable attitude which implies recognition of the value of works of art and the ability to appropriate them by means of generic categories (p. 230). Wacquant (1992) explains a high-school dropout cannot understand the passion for the latest conceptual art, because he has not been socialised to give it value (p. 26).
Further, art appreciation has been developed through a complex art field of history, social and aesthetic discourse that requires familiarisation.

In terms of understanding how Bourdieu's theories apply to art education, the introduction of discipline-based arts education, with the component of art appreciation, has been discussed as requiring a specific aesthetic discourse. Bourdieu's theories of habitus and cultural and linguistic capital mean that certain groups will have the desired ways of speaking and thinking now required to partake successfully in the arts, while other groups will not have the appropriate forms of legitimate language. It is due to the forms of cultural capital imposed on education, such as acquired ways of speaking, listening and thinking—the scholastic stance—that are specified as legitimate by the dominant class, that Bourdieu finds that class control is not overtly maintained but implicitly reproduced through the education system. Consequently, applying Bourdieu's understanding of class reproduction through education will be examined in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4 The Field of Education as a means of Class Reproduction

As examined in Chapter 3, fields are spaces of practice, which have their own laws and forms of capital. They are semi-autonomous but not entirely independent of other fields, as various forms of capital accumulated in one field can be transferred to another and transmit power and/or position. In this sense, the education system can be viewed as a field, where certain laws are followed which result in capital which can be converted to occupational and effectively social status. Therefore, the education system, which appears to be autonomous, is not a neutral institution but is highly politicised and consequently acts as a form of social control. By demanding the attainment of certain forms of knowledge, the scholastic stance is placed upon all who enter the education system despite the fact that the prerequisites for this are not equally distributed in society. Examination of Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction allows the social function of education to be revealed—that is, the maintenance of the social order.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) find that the social function of the educational system is concealed through various beliefs and processes of the field, which are influenced both internally and externally. The social function it performs is thereby more effective. Accordingly, Giroux (1983) states education is an important social and political force in the process of class reproduction. For schools play an important role in reproducing and legitimating the dominant class culture, as they often embody class interests that capitalise on a kind of familiarity and set of skills that only specific students have received by way of their family background and class relations (p. 88).

Williams (1981) discusses the concept of reproduction in education and how educational systems claim they are transmitting ‘knowledge’ or ‘culture’ in an absolute, universal sense, though it is obvious that different systems, times and countries transmit very different selective versions. Williams mentions Bourdieu (1977) and how there are fundamental and necessary relations between this selective version and the dominant social relations (p. 186). Williams states, ‘These can be seen in the disposition of a curriculum, in the modes of selection of those who are to be educated and in what ways, and in definitions of educational (pedagogic) authority’ (p. 186). Therefore, it is reasonable ‘...to speak of the general educational process as a key form of cultural reproduction...’ (p. 186).

Giddens (2001) also discusses education and cultural reproduction and defines cultural reproduction as ‘the ways in which schools, in conjunction with other social institutions, help to perpetuate social and economic inequalities across generations’
Giddens equates this concept with Illich’s (1973) notion of the hidden curriculum, whereby schools influence the learning of values, attitudes and habits as they reinforce variations in cultural values. These implicit lessons are picked up early in life and ultimately have the effect of limiting the opportunities of some, while facilitating those of others (p. 513).

**Cultural Capital and Education**

Bourdieu argues that familiarity with high culture, shown by styles of living reflecting taste and preferences, are keys to educational success. As discussed in Chapter 3, to support this Bourdieu specifies two separate hierarchies: one based on material capital and the other on cultural capital (Crook 1997, p. 24). Cultural capital is central to understanding Bourdieu’s (1977) analysis of how schools perpetuate the notion of cultural reproduction. Bourdieu (1986) developed the concept of cultural capital “as a theoretical hypothesis which made it possible to explain the unequal scholastic achievement of children originating from different social classes by relating academic success...to the distribution of cultural capital between the classes and class fractions” (p. 243).

Cultural capital, as defined previously, refers to the dispositions agents inherit through familial interaction and are expressed as styles of living, preferred tastes, cultural interaction, attitudes, appearance and linguistic competence. These dispositions are then awarded differing status by the dominant groups in society and so validated as legitimate forms of cultural capital. The legitimate forms of cultural capital are then reflected in the education system perpetuating social class. Bourdieu (1998) states “the school institution contributes...to the reproduction of cultural capital and, consequently, of the social structure of space...The reproduction of the structure of the distribution of cultural capital is achieved in the relation between familial strategies and the specific logic of the school institution” (p. 19).

Crook (1997) explains the main point that Bourdieu (1973) makes is that people who possess cultural capital are educationally advantaged (p. 27), because children from advantaged backgrounds possess the formula for educational success (p. 28) due to their cultural capital. In contrast as Crook explains disadvantaged people’s cultural capital and habitus do not produce and reinforce the cultural characteristics that are expected by schools (pp. 27–28). Therefore via culture, the school transforms social and cultural advantage into educational advantage. Consequently, those who succeed at school are able to capitalise and build on their already high levels of capital, for educational capital serves them well in the pursuit of prestigious occupations (p. 28).
In this sense, the parallel an agent’s cultural capital has with the education system aids in the perpetuation of divisions of labour and maintaining class divisions. Therefore, the dominant groups in society maintain their positions of power. These positions of power, however, are not reproduced explicitly or with force but through what Bourdieu calls ‘symbolic violence’ (1979). As previously mentioned, existing power relations are reproduced subtly through the exercise of symbolic power, whereby the ruling class impose a definition of the social world consistent with their interests. Schools are seen as assisting in this symbolic power by acting as a symbolic institution reproducing power relations subtly through the distribution of a dominant culture that tacitly confirms what it means to be educated (Giroux 1983, p. 87).

**Linguistic Capital and Education**

As discussed in Chapter 3, competence in language is a form of capital defined by Bourdieu as ‘linguistic capital’. Bourdieu (1991) finds the transmission of linguistic capital is based on the transmission of cultural capital among generations, with the two principal factors in the acquisition of linguistic capital being the family and the education system. However, as argued, the educational market is dominated by the linguistic products of the dominant class and, therefore, maintains the pre-existing differences in capital (pp. 61–62). Therefore, as Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) explain, ‘the unequal social-distribution of educationally profitable linguistic capital constitutes one of the best-hidden mediations through which the relationship...between social origin and scholastic achievement is set up’ (pp. 115–116).

Bourdieu (1991) explains linguistic capital is important because all linguistic practices are measured against the legitimate practices which are the practices of the dominant group. Bourdieu states the legitimate language is the ‘elaborated code’ as described by Bernstein (1971) and is recognised as the norm and imposed on all members of the same linguistic community, most especially in the educational market (p. 53). Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) have many parallels to Bernstein’s cultural reproduction theories in education. They state the relation to language and culture is continuously taken into account throughout education, as is the logical and symbolic mastery of abstract operations but also the functioning and organisation of the school system through multiple codes which retranslate inequalities in social level into inequalities in academic level (pp. 157–158).

As examined in Chapters 2 and 3, the level of linguistic capital is vital in understanding the introduction of art appreciation in art education, as students either have the linguistic competence to participate in art discourse, or will be reduced to silence or a limited ability to participate. Therefore, those with higher levels of
linguistic capital, especially in the form of art discourse, will be educationally advantaged in art education and, hence, gain greater academic capital and maintain their social position. Crook (1997) explains a command and possession of linguistic capital contributes directly to cultural and social reproduction for language is more than a means of communication. It is a means whereby individuals can or cannot understand, decipher and manipulate various structures. It confirms the linkage between command or grasp of language and social and familial background (p. 27).

**Habitus and Education**

The social position of agents can be understood as the differing habitus of agents in relation to their position in the social world. As discussed, people in different social classes tend to have different habitus, as it is acquired in different social environments or fields. The habitus is vital in understanding the degree of difficulty or ease a student experiences in relation to education and is the principle explaining social and academic achievement. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) explain that while the relation an individual maintains with the school and the culture it transmits is more or less 'effortless', 'brilliant', 'natural', 'laboured', 'tense' or 'dramatic', it is also important to recognise the principle underlying the production of the most durable academic and social differences, the habitus (p. 161).

Connell (1983) explains that the habitus is the system of dispositions, inculcated in the growing person, which generate the appropriate actions in later life and is the means by which the family hands on its 'symbolic capital' to the younger generation. This is also the business of the pedagogy in schools (p. 145). In this sense Bourdieu also expresses how the educational system is an institutionalised habitus, for the school system is seen as a catalyst in the process of social reproduction, as a functional substitute for the family. Also through its curriculum and associated qualifications, the school system represents intellectual divisions of knowledge and the distinctions among professional and occupational structures (Robbins 2000, p. 62). Thereby, reinforcing divisions of labour as a form of maintaining class inequality.

However, it is not the education system itself that produces and perpetuates class inequalities, this is achieved by what is implicitly presupposed by the teachers (Connell 1983, p. 146)—that is, the presumption that all students enter the educational system with equal opportunities, experiences, attitudes and values—the same cultural capital and similar habitus. Therefore, Bourdieu and Passeron state it is necessary to bring the structural and operating properties an educational system owes to both its internal and external functions into relation with the socially conditioned dispositions the agents owe to their class of origin, class membership and the position they hold in the institution, in order to understand fully the nature of the relationship between the
educational system and the structure of class relations (p. 203)—that is, to understand the class habitus of agents and its compatibility with the education system.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) explain the traditional system of education presents the illusion that it owes its different effects of student achievement exclusively to the innate abilities of those who undergo it, and that it is, therefore, independent of class determinations. Accordingly, it merely confirms and strengthens a class habitus which, constituted outside the school, is the basis of all scholastic acquirements. Therefore, it perpetuates the structure of class relations while simultaneously legitimating it by concealing the fact that the scholastic hierarchies it produces reproduce social hierarchies (p. 205). To understand the extent to which the traditional educational system serves the functions of social conservatism, one needs to look at the affinity among the culture it inculcates, its manner of inculcating it and the manner of possessing it which this mode of acquisition presupposes and produces (p. 205).

Selection and Exclusion

Bourdieu and Passeron further state that, if the relationship between the school and social classes appears to be harmonious and perfect, it is because the ‘objective structures’ produce a class habitus and, in particular, the dispositions and predispositions which enable the structures to function are perpetuated. The disposition to make use of the school and the predispositions to succeed in it depend on the ‘objective’ chances of using it and succeeding in it that are attached to the different social classes (p. 204). That is, those who have the doxa—the compatible class habitus and the belief in education—will adhere to the desired practices of the educational field and ultimately succeed in it. Alternatively, those who do not have the doxa will fail to succeed and often even fail to enter the field. As Bourdieu and Passeron explain, the negative dispositions which lead to self-elimination, such as self-deprecation or resigned expectation of failure or exclusion, can be understood as unconscious anticipation of the sanctions the school has in store for the dominated classes (pp. 204–205).

In this way, exclusion and selection in education are important elements in maintaining class divisions in society and Bourdieu and Passeron examine exclusion and selection through examination and non-examination in the educational system (p. 153). As they state we should not lose sight of the external functions and particularly social functions which academic selection and hierarchisation always perform, even when schools seem to be obeying the logic proper to the educational system. For the apparently purely academic cult of hierarchy always contributes to the defense and legitimation of social hierarchies, because academic hierarchies always owe something
to the social hierarchies which they tend to reproduce (p. 152). Bourdieu and Passeran explain with examinations we must realise how much the examiners' judgements owe to implicit norms which retranslate and specify the values of the dominant classes and term them as the 'logic proper' to the educational system. Then it is clear that candidates are handicapped according to the distance between these values and those of their class of origin (p. 162).

Bourdieu and Passeran explain how, by delegating the power of selection to the institution, the privileged classes are able to appear to be surrendering to a perfectly neutral authority the transmission of power from one generation to the next, and renouncing the arbitrary privilege of the hereditary transmission of privileges (p. 167). Through its formally academic verdicts, which always serve the dominant classes, the school is better able than ever to contribute to the reproduction of the established social order, since it succeeds better than ever in concealing the function it performs (p. 167).

As stated, another form of selection occurs through self-elimination. Bourdieu and Passeran find this is because some students excluded from studying at various levels of education eliminate themselves before being examined. They find that pupils from working-class origin are more likely to 'eliminate themselves' from secondary education by declining to enter it (p. 153). Bourdieu and Passeran explain this is because a scholastic future is probable only for a given individual insofar as it constitutes the objective and collective future of their class. Dispositions, or habitus, play a determining role in defining the likelihood of entering education, adhering to its norms and succeeding in it. Therefore, the objective probability of entering a stage of education that is attached to a class is not simply an expression of unequal representation of different classes but also a subjective expectation which leads an individual to drop out, which depends directly on the conditions determining their chances of success proper to their class (pp. 155–156). Therefore, to understand fully the selection process which takes place in the educational system, one must take into account not only the explicit judgements of the academic examination, but also the 'convictions by default' which the working-classes inflict on themselves by self-elimination (p. 157). As discussed in Chapter 3, this form of self-elimination can be attributed to the sense of knowing one's place, a sense of limits to 'become what you are' which is expressed in the family, and reinforced in the education system.

However, Bourdieu and Passeran find nothing is better designed than the examination for universal recognition of the legitimacy of academic verdicts and of the social hierarchies they legitimate, since it leads the self-eliminated to count themselves among those who fail, while enabling those elected to see in their election the proof of
a merit or ‘gift’ (p. 162). Bourdieu and Passeron state schools today succeed with the ideology of natural ‘gifts’ and innate ‘tastes’ in legitimating the circular reproduction of social hierarchies and educational hierarchies. In this way the most hidden and specific function of the educational system consists of hiding its objective function, that of masking the truth of its relationship to the structure of class relations (p. 208) or masking the relationship between social origin and academic performance (p. 209). This ideology of grace or giftedness relates to the aristocratism of talent—which retranslates the aristocratic ideology of birth right and the defence of status rights (p. 202). They find the ideology of ‘giftedness’ among students and teachers prevents one from seeing that in its academic form this ideology constitutes one of the ways of securing recognition of the legitimacy of pedagogic action—and the demand for the reproduction and legitimation of class relations (p. 188).

Bourdieu (1998) finds that the use of the examination as a process of rational selection is partial as it overlooks the aspect of school operations, which also fulfil functions of rationalisation. However, Bourdieu points out this is not in the Weberian sense (pp. 2122). In relation to the CSF, the introduction of outcomes-based education incorporates the rationale of selection, as students are expected to meet outcomes specified by the state. Specifically, corresponding to the CSF: The Arts, students are expected to participate in arts appreciation, whereby a scholastic point of view is imposed on art education, raising the level of expectation and subsequent success or failure of certain students based on social class prerequisites.

Bourdieu (1998) further finds, ‘Tests or competitive examinations justify in reason divisions that do not necessarily stem from reason, and the titles which sanction their results present certificates of social competence, not unlike titles of nobility, as guarantees of technical competence’ (p. 22). He explains that heirs of the old bloodline of nobility have now converted their noble titles into academic titles which grants them statutory consecration as bearers of social competence and the right to rule (p. 22). Thereby, the ruling class maintain their positions through the education system, as their habitus is attuned to the requirements of school. Consequently they are destined to succeed in the state sanctioned institution of education.

Social Control by the State

The consecration of academic titles and the power to rule is sanctioned by the state. Therefore, education can be viewed as a mechanism of the state legitimating class relations and a form of social control. The concept of social control is recognised by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), who find that the educational system of a given society reflects that society’s social system and reduces the academic institution to its generic function of ‘social control’ (p. 189–190). This ‘social control’, which
features in schools via the ritualisation of pedagogic action, such as the production of manuals, corpuses and topics, which are devised for and by the school, is a form of ‘routinisation’ or bureaucratic organisation (p. 190). As expressed, this is the case with the CSF as a form of state sanctioned educational policy.

Referring to symbolic violence, Bourdieu (1998) explains how the state does not have to give orders or exercise physical coercion to produce an ordered social world for it can rely on doxic submission (p. 56). As explained previously, actions can be understood as embedded in the body, as bodily hexis, they become so ingrained that they transcend consciousness. Doxic submission can be understood in this way, as dispositions embedded in the body and beyond consciousness. Yet they follow certain unwritten rules; they submit to the beliefs of the dominant without even an explicit awareness. This form of doxic submission, Bourdieu argues allows education to reproduce social structure through the compliance of agents, as they unquestionably follow the instructions of the state as legitimating forms of knowledge and pedagogy through the bureaucratic order. This doxic submission is a form of symbolic power governed by the state.

Bourdieu (1998) explains that in order to understand fully the symbolic dimension of the power of the state, he builds on Weber’s theory of symbolic systems that reintroduced ‘specialised agents’ and their interests. While Bourdieu argues that Weber, like Marx, is interested in the function rather than the structure of symbolic systems, he does, however, give attention to the producers of these products and their interactions. Bourdieu asserts to understand a symbolic system it is necessary to examine the system of agents who produce them (p. 57). Bourdieu verifies this holds for the state in understanding its symbolic dimension, and what he calls the effect of universality (p. 58).

Bourdieu explains it is necessary to understand the specific functioning of the bureaucratic microcosm and analyse the genesis and structure of the agents who have constituted themselves into a state nobility by instituting the state. Bourdieu further espouses that, by the performative discourse on the state being produced, the state came into being by saying what it should be. This was done under the guise of what the state is. However, this discourse of state was produced by these agents by virtue of their specific capital and interests, which then in turn provided a justification for their own positions in the state (p. 58). By naming the state and its discourse, however, Bourdieu elaborates how it stopped being a mere fiction and became an autonomous order capable of imposing submission to its functions and the recognition of its principles (p. 58).
Within education the state hands down its decisions of what, when and how subjects should be taught with the development of educational policy documents, which are expected to be implemented by schools and teachers. This was the case with the CSF, with the formulation of the document within bureaucratic restrictions, incorporating what the state decided was the forms of knowledge to be included based on an economic rationalist discourse. It was then expected this document could be handed to the schools and teachers and it would be unquestionably implemented.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) further find that analysis of the bureaucracy and its relations to the educational system, which refers to the practice and values of the administrative bodies of the state to the training given by the school (p. 191), reveals a tendency to formalism, punctuality or rigid adherence to the rules particularly of the administrative staff, which express the system of dispositions (ethos) of goodness, integrity, meticulousness and morality. These are the characteristics members of the upper class owe to their class position and which predispose them to espouse the values and ‘virtues’ demanded by the bureaucratic order (p. 192). Bourdieu (1998) refers to these virtues as symbolic capital, as evident in his statement ‘he has the profit of virtue’ (p. 103). Bourdieu further states that symbolic capital is common to members of the same group (p. 103). Bourdieu (1984) finds that with the increase in school populations and academic qualifications, members from high status groups are relying on their inherited ‘virtues’ of symbolic capital to maintain their positions in society.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) argue how the true homologies between the bureaucracy and the educational system are revealed by realising the homology of their relations with the social classes. Further, one must understand the notion of ‘social control’ which the educational system performs, thus reproducing the structure of class relations and serving ‘Society’ in the sense of the social order, and serving the educational interests of the classes who benefit from that order (p. 192). The classes who benefit are the middle-class, for as Crook (1997) explains schools are essentially middle-class institutions (p. 27).

**Scholastic Point of View**

Bourdieu (1998) proclaims one of the major powers of the state is to produce and impose, especially through the school system, categories of thought that we apply to everything in the social world (p. 35), that is, the scholastic point of view. Bourdieu (1998) explains the scholastic view is the view of the school, or the academic vision (p. 127). Bourdieu further finds that the ‘scholastic view is a very peculiar point of view on the social world, on language, on any possible object of thought that is made possible by the situation of school, of leisure, of which the school—a word which
derives from skhole—is a particular form, as an institutionalised situation of studious leisure...[and] the adoption of this scholastic point of view is the admission fee tacitly demanded by all scholarly fields’ (pp. 127–128). Therefore, the school is a place where the scholastic point of view is valued. As Bourdieu states, ‘The scholastic point of view is inseparable from the scholastic situation’ (p. 128).

Bourdieu further finds that ‘Grammar is a typical product of the scholastic point of view’ (p. 130). He explains how the skhole allows agents to move from the primary to the secondary mastery of language, ‘to accede to metadiscourse on the practice of discourse’ (p. 130). Therefore, Bourdieu states, meta is injected into discourses and practices (p. 131)—meta being the analytical approach to language, to step back and analyse in an abstract way, as is expected in the ‘disinterested’ approach to art discourse.

Bourdieu (1998) explains though that the scholastic point of view assumes that everyone has the means to do so, that is, free time and being outside the urgency of the practical situation and most importantly that they posses the disposition (the inclination or aptitude) to invest oneself in the scholastic world (p. 128). He finds that ‘to truly enter these universes, where context-free practices or utterances are produced, one must dispose of time, of skhole, and also have this disposition’ (p. 128).

Bourdieu (1998) states that we have to ‘acknowledge that if everything leads us to think that certain fundamental dispositions toward the world, certain fundamental modes of construction of reality...constitute universal...possibilities, these potentialities are actualised only in definite conditions, starting with the skhole, as distance from necessity and urgency, and especially the academic skhole and the accumulated product of prior skhole that it carries, are unevenly distributed across civilisations’ (p. 137). Despite this uneven distribution of the disposition pertaining to the distance from necessity, the scholastic viewpoint is demanded of all who enter the educational system. In conjunction with the scholastic point of view comes the hierarchy of knowledge, whereby certain forms of knowledge are considered more ‘favourable’ and highly regarded.

**Hierarchy of Knowledge**

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) are aware of the ‘de facto hierarchy’ among disciplines and subjects which runs ‘from those intellectual activities perceived as the most abstract to the most concrete’ (p. 158). That is, subjects considered to acquire forms of abstract knowledge, are placed at the top of the hierarchy while subjects, considered to apply concrete forms of knowledge are positioned lower. For example, in the arts, art appreciation is regarded as a higher level of scholastic value due to its
reliance on abstract conceptualisation and contemplation, as opposed to art making, which can be viewed as a manual experience. Again this is representative of the mental and manual division of labour in society.

Bourdieu (1996a) further finds that 'academic subjects assumed to require talent and gifts and associated with the possession of considerable inherited cultural capital...contrast with those that are seen to require primarily work and study' (p. 11). Bourdieu explains that 'Talent subjects' offer the most profitable investment to inherited cultural capital—that is, culture and familiarity with culture acquired through teachings of familial education as opposed to academic—and recruit from the higher social level (p. 14).

Bourdieu and Passeron state how this hierarchy of knowledge is retranslated at the level of school organisation and into the hierarchy of types of schools (p. 158). That is, certain schools incorporate into their curriculum the subjects that are highly regarded by the social elite to attract a certain 'clientele'. These schools often include subjects that are reliant on high levels of cultural capital in order to participate and succeed. Bourdieu (1996a) explains 'these schools attach a great importance to less directly academic properties, such as particular ways of behaving, carrying oneself, and speaking, or culture générale [general culture]' (p. 153). Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) claim that different schools attract pupils from different social classes very unevenly and the combination of the educational chances of different classes and chances of subsequent success attached to different types of schools constitutes a mechanism of deferred selection which transforms a social inequality into an educational inequality (p. 158).

Bourdieu (1998) explains how privileged families invest in education as a means to perpetuate their power and privileges in society and how the highest school institutions, which give access to the highest social positions, become increasingly monopolised by the children of privileged categories (pp. 19–20). Therefore, the privileged classes use education, but more specifically high status schools, as a reproductive strategy to maintain their positions of power. As explained, the privileged classes have the disposition to enter the scholastic world, and, furthermore, the propensity to invest in education. Therefore, they have the illusion to realise the importance of investment and the outcome of the investment that education can generate. For they are aware of how educational capital is translated in other fields, thereby ensuring the success of their children and subsequent maintenance of their positions of power in society.
However, by reproducing power relations through symbolic violence, education can appear to be an impartial and neutral transmitter of the benefits of a valued culture; schools then can promote inequality in the name of fairness and objectivity (Giroux 1983, p. 88). Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) state that the most radical 'critiques' of education find that the generic function of every educational system is the means of masking the class functions it fulfils (p. 193). This is achieved through the relative autonomy of schools to act as neutral and objective institutions.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) assert it is precisely its relative autonomy that enables traditional education to make a specific contribution towards reproducing the structure of class relations, since it needs only to obey its own rules in order to obey the external imperatives of legitimating the established order. Therefore, it is simultaneously fulfilling its social function of reproducing class relations by ensuring the hereditary transmission of cultural capital, and fulfilling its ideological function of concealing the social function by accrediting the illusion of its absolute autonomy (p. 199). Despite the educational system's relative autonomy, there is a determinate relation between the internal functions of the school and external functions. There is always a determinate type and degree of dependence on other systems, such as the structure of class relations (p. 197). Therefore, the educational system has both a relative autonomy and a dependence with the social classes (p. 194).

The Technical Function of Education versus the Social Function

Bourdieu and Passeron find that the educational system is capable of concealing its social function of legitimating class differences behind its technical function of producing qualifications. Modern societies are more and more successful in getting schools to produce, and guarantee, more and more skilled individuals, i.e. agents better qualified for the demands of the economy (p. 164). However, when addressing the demands of the economy the technocratic discourse of economic rationalism reduces education to measurable outputs and fails to consider the social functions performed by education. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) explain the technocratic measurement of educational output assumes the model of a system which, knowing no goals other than those derived from the economic system, responds primarily, in quantity and quality and at minimum cost, to the demands and needs of the labour market (p. 181). They state technocrats profess the idea of an educational system reduced to its economic functions alone, as they fail to relate the economic system to a structure of class relations, and also believe that economic demand is independent of the power relations between classes (pp. 185–186). Then under the cover of its technical function, the technocrats reintroduce the social function of education and reproduce and legitimate the structure of class relations (p. 186).
Therefore, Bourdieu and Passeron find that the technocratic notion of ‘output’ has the function of preventing analysis of the educational system’s ‘real’ functions; for the functions of the educational system cannot be defined independently of the structure of class relations (p. 184). They confirm there is no society where the educational system is reduced to an industrial enterprise, subject exclusively to economic goals. It is only by sheer force of ideology that the ‘needs of the economy’ or of society can be presented as the rational, reasonable basis for the consensus on the hierarchy of functions of the educational system (p. 185). However, this is the basis claimed by the state for the formulation of the national curriculum and subsequently the CSF in Victoria: the interests of producing a productive human capital by stating required outcomes to answer economic difficulties and thereby addressing economic needs. However, behind this reasoning for the return to centralised control and outcomes-based education, the real function of the educational system may be social control and the maintenance of class structure.

Bourdieu and Passeron further argue that, if schools have both the technical function of producing and regulating qualifications for the labour market and a social function of conserving class structure, power and privileges, then modern societies furnish educational systems with vastly increased opportunities to exercise their power of transmitting social advantages into academic advantages. These, in turn, are convertible into social advantages as they present academic (implicitly social) requirements as technical prerequisites for the exercise of an occupation (pp. 166–167).

Therefore, Bourdieu and Passeron find that, to grant the educational system the absolute independence it claims, or to see it purely as a reflection of a state of the economic system or the expression of the value system of society as a whole, is to neglect to see that its relative autonomy enables it to serve external demands under the guise of neutrality and to conceal the social functions it performs and so to perform them more effectively (pp. 177–178).

Bourdieu (1998) asserts that the educational system acts as a sorting mechanism and thus maintains the existing social order, that is, the gap between students endowed with unequal amounts of cultural capital. As he finds, by a series of selection operations, the system separates the holders of cultural capital from those who lack it (p. 20). He then explains how the school institution, once thought capable of introducing a form of meritocracy by privileging individual aptitude over hereditary privileges, actually tends to establish, through the hidden linkage between scholastic aptitude and cultural heritage (p. 22), the social order of class divisions in modern societies.
In this thesis, the role of education as a means of class reproduction and specifically the role of art education in that reproduction are examined. Accordingly, the function of art as a form of social distinction must be examined in order to recognise the value art has to define group membership and contribute to the division of social classes. The artistic field has evolved from a long history and particularly the practice of art appreciation has definite social implications based on one's relation to culture acquired through the family and extended through education. Art as a form of social distinction will be examined in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5 Art as a Form of Social Distinction

The formation of the art field, where traditions and practices are established, has been influenced by cultural, social and historical agendas. These influences can be viewed as forming the conception of art we know today, but further to this art has developed as a form of social distinction. In order to understand how art acts as a form of social distinction, it is necessary to examine the evolution of art through history.

The modern conception of art is part of a tightly woven social and historical fabric and to understand the nature of art we must recognise the historical contingencies that have shaped our ideas of art. The origin of the modern conception of art is deeply embedded in history, tradition and practices, and is also an important part of the way many people think of themselves. Further, the modern conception of art grew out of specific historical processes; it became institutionalised and gained material worth and social status (Mortensen 1997, p. 5).

Dickie (1974) defines the art world as a social institution in the sense of an 'established practice' (p. 31), or a 'customary practice' (p. 35 cited in Mortensen 1997, p. 16). Art can be seen as a form of cultural practices which have evolved historically and follow customs and traditions. However, we can participate in art practice and form a conception of art but not be able to articulate this concept that sustains the practice. A certain practice may be described as possessing regularities or being in accordance with rules of which we are unaware. Bourdieu finds that the art world, in this sense, is based on practices that remain at an unconscious level; they are unwritten rules that guide practice in fields. However, these rules do not need to be explicit for one may learn through repetition and then come to perform in accordance with the established practice. Rules have to be accompanied by practice for the ability to learn how to do things, to perform an action, to imitate can be achieved without resorting to the application of a rule (Mortensen 1997, p. 24). Bourdieu (1990) explains a rule may fit a certain set of phenomena, but it need not serve as a guide for the phenomena observed (pp. 39–40).

Mortensen finds that the practical conception of art is similar to Bourdieu’s concept of habitus. As explained in Chapter 3, Bourdieu (1990) defines habitus as a ‘system of durable, transposable dispositions’ or as ‘principles which generate and organize practices’ (p. 53). Mortensen explains the habitus can define entire cultures or more limited practices within a culture, such as artistic practices. It also represents the principles within which an individual is conditioned or socialised and enables them to perform according to principles acceptable to a given culture or class. These principles are developed through the history of the culture and, therefore, we expect
members of our culture to act in certain ways. However, these principles or rules defining a habitus are unconscious and, therefore, appear as nature, as they are ‘inscribed in bodies’ (Bourdieu 1990, p. 59), as the bodily hexis.

The habitus also establishes patterns of representation and perception, for the habitus makes aesthetic judgements conform to standards and makes them appear to be beyond time and space (Mortensen 1997, p. 41). Further, Lash (1993) proclaims the educational system plays an important role in this area as creator of competent consumers for the aesthetic products and establishes a set of classificatory schema (p. 196). These classificatory schema can also be seen as a form of standards or taste that divides the ‘good’ from the ‘bad’ and establishes preferences for different cultures of groups who define themselves by the choices they make. Bourdieu (1984) confirms, ‘There exists an economy of cultural goods, but it has a specific logic’ (p. 1).

MacIntyre (1984) states a practice involves standards of excellence and obedience to rules and to enter into the practice is to accept those standards and to subject one’s attitudes, choices, preferences and tastes to the standards which define the practice (p. 190 cited in Mortensen 1997, p. 24). That is, the doxa, as defined by Bourdieu is the belief in the practices of the field and to adhering to them without question. Bourdieu (2000) explains, ‘the distortions linked to membership of a field and to adherence, is unanimous within the limits of the field, to the doxa which distinctively defines it’ (p. 11). Furthermore, what is ‘implied in the fact of being caught up in the game, in the illusion understood as a fundamental belief in the interest of the game and the value of the stakes which is inherent in that membership’ (p. 11) is important for practices in fields to be adhered to. However, Bourdieu (2000) clarifies that ‘the specific logic of a field is established in the incorporated state in the form of a specific habitus, or more precisely, a sense of the game...which is practically never set out or imposed in an explicit way. Because it takes place...gradually, progressively and imperceptibly...[it] passes for the most part unnoticed’ (p. 11). Therefore, the practices demanded by entering a specific field are never explicitly stated. They are implied and gained through immersion in the field and the gradual habituation of practices—the development of the habitus. Consequently, to understand fully how practices follow a set pattern or tradition, it is necessary to apply Bourdieu’s notions not only of habitus but also of field to artistic practice.

**The Artistic Field**

Bourdieu (1998) explains the artistic field was constituted in the nineteenth century by taking as its fundamental law the reverse of the economic law. The process began with the Renaissance and reached its full realisation in the second half of the
nineteenth century, with what is called ‘art for art’s sake’. This law amounts to the 
dissociation of art and lucrative ends, such as the opposition between commercial art 
and pure art. Pure art recognised as the only true form of art according to the specific 
norms of the autonomous art field (p. 84). However, while Bourdieu asserts that in 
the artistic field the law of economic interest is suspended, this does not mean that it 
does not know other forms of interest. He states the sociology of art unveils and 
alyses the specific interests which are constituted by the field’s functioning (p. 88).

Bourdieu (1993b) finds that the experience of a work of art as being immediately 
endowed with meaning and value is the result of the two mutually developed aspects 
of the historical institution: the cultured habitus and the artistic field (p. 257). The 
aristic field in its autonomous state exists with and through the emergence of specific 
institutions which are necessary for the functioning of the economy of cultural goods 
such as galleries, museums, academics, salons, art schools, dealers, critics, art 
historians and collectors, all of which and whom have the dispositions required by the 
aristic field and the specific categories of perception and appreciation (p. 260).

Bourdieu (1993b) further states how the work of art exists only if it is apprehended 
by spectators who possess the disposition and aesthetic competence which are 
required. Therefore, it is the aesthete’s eye which constitutes a work of art as art. 
However, this is possible only when the aesthetics are the product of long exposure to 
arworks (p. 257). Therefore, Bourdieu finds that the value of art and its meaning are 
created not by the producer, the artist, but by the entire set of agents who are engaged 
in the artistic field such as the critic, clients, curators and collectors (p. 261).

Furthermore, Bourdieu (1993b) finds that, to endow art with value and meaning, the 
arwork must not be measured simply by the duration of production or the quantity 
and price of materials. In this way the artist is not that different from the house 
painter. That is why, among all the inventions which accompany the artistic field, one 
of the most significant is the elaboration of an artistic language (p. 260). Bourdieu 
finds that firstly this involves establishing a way of naming painters, of speaking about 
them and about the nature of their work as well as the form of remuneration. This 
established an autonomous artistic value separate from strictly economic value. This 
also involved a way of speaking about painting itself, about pictorial techniques, using 
appropriate words which enables one to speak of pictorial art and the individual style 
of the painter. Further, the discourse of celebration, the biography, also plays a vital 
role as it establishes the artist as a character worthy of historical account (p. 260).

Bourdieu (1993b) finds that the categories which are used to perceive and appreciate 
arworks are bound to historical context—they are linked to a situated and dated social
universe (p. 262). Therefore, the language of art appreciation is not a fixed use of language as such—it is continually developed and changed through and by history as it contributes to and is part of the stake in the struggle among groups in the artistic field. Bourdieu (1991) explains, ‘Every field is the site of a more or less openly declared struggle for the definition of the legitimate principles of division of the field’ (p. 242).

Thompson (1991) suggests that, to understand the interests at stake in artistic production, one must reconstruct the artistic field in relation to the fields of the economy such as politics. This may reveal the greater the autonomy of the artistic field, the more the agents are oriented towards non-monetary and non-political ends. Thompson further argues, ‘The fact that artistic production appears as disinterested, as a haven for gratuitous activity that is ostentatiously opposed to the mundane world of commodities and power, does not mean that it is interest-free: on the contrary, it means only that it is able more easily to conceal its interests beneath the veil of aesthetic purity’ (p. 16).

Bourdieu argues that cultural fields are produced by human agents; they are constructed in history and do not have a necessary existence (Robbins 2000, p. 60). In Bourdieu’s perspective individuals in society are productive agents who produce structures needed to safeguard the originating social condition. These agents receive and biologically internalise structures which are inherited from previous generations (habitus) and themselves conserve these inherited structures by reproducing them in future generations. Therefore, there is a process of reproduction which occurs intergenerationally within structures, but these structures are not absolute. They are the constantly modifying objective mechanisms by which individuals renew themselves and preserve the fabric of society. In this sense social reproduction is the hidden agenda of cultural reproduction (Robbins, p. 61).

As examined, the habitus acts as a means for reproducing social and cultural practices within the art field, for Bourdieu developed the notion of the habitus as a mechanism by which the values of one generation are embodied in those of the next (Robbins, p. 62). Mortensen argues that, to understand the habitus which has shaped artistic practice and behaviour, one must examine the history that has led to the modern conception of art as we know it today (1997, p. 41).

From Politeness to the Fine Arts

The concept of art as it is currently understood did not exist until the late eighteenth century. Staniszewski (1995) states during the Middle Ages art was considered a skill that could be mastered and during the thirteenth century art was seen as a mechanical
art along with cooking, juggling, shoemaking, etc. (p. 113). During the Italian Renaissance writers and artists argued painting should be considered as one of the liberal arts along with grammar, geometry, astronomy and music and not as a mechanical art (p. 113). However, in Italy the modern notion of fine art did not begin until the late eighteenth century. Mortensen (1997) confirms this is also true in Britain, where in the early eighteenth century the ‘fine arts’ did not yet exist (p. 122).

The development of the concept of fine art was consolidated in France in the late seventeenth century, where the arts were separated from the sciences which were seen to depend upon mathematics and factual knowledge whereas the arts were determined by talent and taste (Staniszewski 1995, p. 115). In 1746 Batteux published The beaux arts reduced to one principle, and the fine arts—music, poetry, painting, sculpture, and dance—were separated from the mechanical arts (p. 115). Therefore, the concept of fine art was established as it is recognised today.

During the early eighteenth century art was also closely connected to the issue of luxury. Saisselin (1992) explains art or paintings ‘were only one manifestation of the taste of the rich and the great for possessions, pleasures, magnificence, and pretty woman’ (pp. 52–53 cited in Mortensen 1997, p. 123). Therefore, as Mortensen points out, art was seen as directly connected with the life of the idle rich, or as a mere display of wealth, and therefore morally suspicious.

However, by the mid-eighteenth century Hutcheson wrote an essay entitled ‘Of Refinement in the Arts’ and luxury was no longer used as such a negative term but now had a sense of refinement and polish (Mortensen, p. 124). Therefore, refinement and an interest in the arts became recognised with the notion of ‘politeness’ which was used in the sense of ‘civilised’ or ‘cultured’. The term ‘politeness’ was used to describe expressions of ‘desirable patterns of social behaviour’, and expressed an ideal of behaviour, education and sociability and became the criterion for membership of the elite. Consequently, politeness became an image: the manner in which you present yourself on the market in the hope of increasing your value; it became a commodification of interpersonal relationships (p. 130). As is discussed in Chapter 3, Bourdieu refers to this as cultural capital.

In the eighteenth century in England, art was thought to have an influence on the morals of humans and was expressed by Shaftesbury, Locke and Hume culminating in the work of Kant (Rookmaaker 1976, p. 180). Kant felt moral actions were the ‘immanent’ use of ‘transcendent’ principles (Roberts 1988, p. 56). Therefore, morality was innate and inherent, based on inspiring principles such as through the arts. However, there was a contradiction in the writings of these theorists and
philosophers who valued art as a moralistic educator, when at the same time art was placed on a pedestal and said to be unconnected to real life (Rookmaaker 1976, p. 181). Again, these beliefs were founded in Kantian aesthetic terms, in that those things that are beautiful are without purpose. Kant (1790) declared his critique of aesthetic judgement in ‘Analytic of the Beautiful’, where he states, ‘We call that good for something (useful) which only pleases as a means; but that which pleases on its own account we call good in itself’ (1952, p. 46). Therefore, the aesthetic judgment of art was based on ‘disinterested’ principles of the object.

However, it was also recognised that to become a ‘man of breeding and politeness’ in practice, as proposed by Shaftesbury, is restricted to those who have substantial amounts of time and money to spare and is a social privilege (Mortensen 1997, p. 134). Veblen (1931) found that ‘Refined tastes, manners and habits of life are a useful evidence of gentility, because good breeding requires time, application, and expense, and can therefore not be compassed by those whose time and energy are taken up with work’ (cited in Mortensen 1997, p. 135). This safeguards against imposters as ample time and money are required for what Veblen calls ‘conspicuous leisure’ to participate in the appropriate activities of the eighteenth-century gentlemen, such as displaying proper taste in arts.

This idea of conspicuous leisure had great appeal for the upper class and high and low culture became increasingly separate as the upper classes no longer participated in popular culture and came to view it as vulgar. The term ‘polite arts’ expressed a social approval of the occupation with certain forms of art and from the mid-eighteenth century became the ‘fine arts’. This represented the classical distinction between the vulgar or mechanical arts and the liberal arts. Those requiring manual effort were considered inferior, the mechanical arts, and were considered not appropriate activities for the elite. Therefore, the connection between the ‘polite’ arts or fine arts and a social elite became apparent (Mortensen 1997, p. 136). As defined, one of the practices of the elite was the display of proper taste in arts.

**Taste in Art**

To comprehend the concept of art as a social indicator or form of social practice one must acknowledge the significance of ‘taste’. As examined in Chapter 3, Bourdieu (1984) argues that taste is the marker of class and acts as a form of distinction. In relation to art, Bourdieu (1984) examines the workings of taste and how the consumption of art and culture legitimates social differences. Mortensen elaborates, ‘To have certain preferences, interests, and knowledge in common serves to distinguish those who belong to those who do not belong to the elite, at the same time as it justifies the existence of the elite’ (p. 106).
Within the art field the practice of collecting, or acquiring, artworks acts as a form of distinction and an indicator of taste. However, Mortensen (1997) finds the art we surround ourselves with expresses more than just differing tastes and, since the beginning of the eighteenth century, it has been apparent that patterns in consumption of artwork, clothing and other commodities are not guided exclusively by practical considerations. Artistic preferences are often an attempt to project a view of oneself and this is not always a conscious process. However, as competent social agents we are aware that particular preferences for art are indicators of certain groups and we draw conclusions about people based on their artistic preferences (p. 86).

Bourdieu (1984) finds status-linked familiarity, or artistic preference, is manifested in knowledge of the opportunities and conditions for acquiring works of art, which depends on material and cultural capacity to appropriate art but also a long standing membership of a social world in which art, being an object of appropriation, is present and familiar in the form of personal objects (p. 75).

However, when acquired, artworks become material and symbolic objects and Bourdieu (1984) sees that the whole relationship with the work of art changes when (p. 273) the painting, statue or antique furniture belongs to the world of appropriation, as it becomes a luxury good which one can possess (p. 278). The appropriation of symbolic objects with a material existence, such as paintings, raises the distinctive force of ownership and reduces the purely symbolic appropriation to an inferior status. To own a work of art is to assert oneself as the exclusive possessor of the object and of the authentic taste for that object. This, thereby, negates all those who are unworthy of owning it, for lack of symbolic or material means of doing so, or the lack of desire to possess it (p. 280).

Bourdieu (1984) feels the consumption of works of art is a means to accumulate symbolic capital and evidence of objectified ‘personal taste’. It is one of the most unequaled and excused forms of accumulation—that is, the internalisation of distinctive signs and symbols of power in the form of natural ‘distinction’, personal ‘authority’ or ‘culture’. The exclusive ownership of priceless works reveals those who cannot dissociate their ‘being’ from their ‘having’. Bourdieu also finds that as well as acquiring artworks one has to attain a disinterested approach to their appreciation which is an affirmation of personal excellence (p. 282) and obvious good taste.

Staniszewski (1995) suggests taste is not an ideal but functions as a means of distinguishing class and is an emblem of the way cultural criteria are legitimized
(p. 121). She states taste is not natural but cultural; it is produced. Having taste and appreciating fine art are ways of distinguishing oneself, of demonstrating one has ‘class’ (p. 121). Therefore, ‘taste’ in art, evinced by the consumption of artworks and the appropriate forms of appreciation, signals group membership in certain social classes, specifically the elite. Alexander calls taste ‘a conspiracy among the informed: so it is, so long as taste is in the hands of an elite’ (cited in Smith 1988, p. 6).

Mortensen discusses the significance of taste in Britain in the early eighteenth century as a way of indicating one’s social standing. This was due to the collapse of the social order, whereby distinct social differentiation created by birth and rank was no longer apparent. The possession of ‘good taste’ became an indicator of belonging to the right social group.

In the early eighteenth century Addison defined taste as the agreement of the judgment with those recognised to have taste. Consequently, taste is circular and acquired by emulating those with these qualities. Therefore, taste was a quality belonging to a specific social stratum. Hume [1777] (1987) found that some people possess a ‘delicacy of taste’ (p. 235) which would allow them to become a competent judge of art—or the ‘good critic’ (p. 240). Hume found that to become the good critic one had to rise above personal prejudices and preferences, that is, to apply a ‘disinterested’ approach. Mortensen points out that since the only way to determine whether or not a person has delicacy of taste is their conformity to a set of standards, the possession of taste becomes a criterion for belonging to a certain group of people. Shusterman (1993) further finds that Hume’s demand that the good critic be free of prejudices is actually a demand that the good critic has the right prejudices (p. 106) and judges art according to the ‘universal standard’ (Hume [1777] 1987, p. 243).

Hume’s qualities of the good critic, or person with taste, in reality require a large share in the dominant culture, sufficient time to develop the specific type of knowledge and having received a certain type of education. Therefore, Hume’s standard of taste is not based on all human beings as he claims, but only on an elite group (Mortensen 1997, p. 104). The notion of the universal standard, therefore, has to be questioned, for it is these standards which ostensibly determine inclusion or exclusion. These standards must be carefully examined, revised or even rejected, as they have incorporated into them oppressive practices masquerading as being ‘universal and objective’ (Brand 1994, Pollock 1988 cited in Mortensen 1997, p. 105).

Kant also felt the judgment of taste had its basis in universal human nature, stating ‘the beautiful is that which...is represented as the Object of a UNIVERSAL delight’ (p. 50). However, this ‘universal delight’ was not universal, for it presupposed certain
attributes based on social, cultural and economic conditions. Shusterman (1993) explains what Kant proposes in the name of ‘universal human nature’ is actually ‘a socially distinctive acquisition, presupposing and motivated by sociocultural distinction’ (p. 116).

While Bourdieu (1998) agrees with Kant’s view of aesthetics he asserts that it is true only as aesthetic experience for those people who are the product of skhole—that is, ‘distance from necessity’, those who have the time and money to partake in ‘leisure’ activities. Therefore, Bourdieu (1998) explains that the experience of the beautiful as described by Kant has definite economic and social conditions of possibility which Kant ignores (p. 135). Consequently, Bourdieu argues that there is not a universal capacity to grasp the beautiful but rather an incomprehension and indifference of some social agents who are deprived of the adequate categories of aesthetic perception and appreciation (p. 135).

Despite this inability by some agents to appropriate artworks legitimately, Bourdieu (1984) finds that any legitimate work tends to impose the norms of its own perception and defines as the only legitimate mode of perception the one which brings into play a certain disposition and competence. He further recognises how this means that all agents, whether they like it or not, whether or not they have the means of conforming to them, find themselves objectively measured by those norms (pp. 28–29). That is, there is seen to be a legitimate mode of perception and appreciating works of art and, even if one is unable to gain access to this one is still judged by one’s ability, or inability, to do so in the legitimate ‘disinterested’ way.

Furthermore, Bourdieu (1984) finds the ‘popular aesthetic’, which is based on an understanding of art performing a function, is in opposition to Kant’s aesthetic which is based on detachment and disinterestedness, ‘which aesthetic theory regards as the only way of recognizing a work of art for what it is, i.e. autonomous’ (p. 4). Bourdieu explains, ‘Kant strove to distinguish between that which pleases from that which gratifies...and to distinguish disinterestedness as the sole guarantor of the specifically aesthetic quality of contemplation’ (p. 5). In Critique of Judgement, Kant (1790) states, ‘The agreeable is what GRATIFIES a man; the beautiful what simply PLEASES him; the good what is ESTEEMED (approved), i.e. that on which he sets an objective worth’ (1952, p. 49).

Consequently, that which is good, or approved, is considered worthy and by which all other works are judged as having or not having taste. Bourdieu (1984) finds Kant’s division of the ‘taste of sense’ and the ‘taste of reflection’ is the basis of high aesthetics (p. 6). Kant (1790) defines the ‘taste of sense’ as the private, personal
judgements, and the ‘taste of reflection’, as judgements of general validity (p. 54). Therefore, Kant observed that the personal judgement of taste was invalid, whereas the judgement of reflection had a universal validity and recognition of the object as beautiful. Bourdieu explains that ‘the culture which results from this magical division is sacred’ (p. 6). Therefore, Kant’s theories of aesthetics and taste have been pervasive ideals which continue to govern and dominate aesthetic appreciation in the artistic field.

Consequently, the definition of ‘taste’ and the appreciation of art have their origins in Kant’s ideal of ‘disinterestedness’. Kant (1790) espouses, ‘The delight which determines the judgement of taste is independent of all interest’ (p. 42). He expands, ‘Everyone must allow that a judgement on the beautiful which is tinged with the slightest interest, is very partial and not a pure judgement of taste’ (p. 43). Kant also described taste as ‘the faculty of judging an object or a method of representing it by an entirely disinterested satisfaction or dissatisfaction’ (cited in Rose 1984, p. 75). The concept of disinterested satisfaction or disinterested contemplation led to the belief that art was autonomous and has a value of its own—the art for art’s sake argument that Bourdieu (1998) finds is a fundamental law of the art field.

The ideas of Kant have led to the development of the concept that art has a value of its own, particularly in the form of the artwork. However, even when art is appreciated for its form alone, it has a moral and political function though it is less direct. The disinterested contemplation of art does not separate it from morality or politics but, when translated into the real world, emphasises social distinctions, since not everyone can obtain the required disinterested state (Mortensen 1997, p. 169). It is for this reason that the notion of art’s autonomy is important in the modern conception of art. For according to this idea, when we contemplate art we adopt a certain ‘aesthetic attitude’ which serves to attend to the artwork in an aesthetic manner only and disregard the practical, moral, religious, political or other concerns we may have. If there is a claim that we value art exclusively for its own sake, that its value is purely intrinsic and beyond social, political or moral concerns, we are doing so in a deceptive way (Mortensen 1997, p. 151).

‘Disinterestedness’

In the nineteenth century out of German idealism the theory of ‘l’art pour l’art’ was born (Rookmaaker 1976, p. 181) with the revival of Kant’s theory of ‘disinterestedness’ (Hauser 1962, p. 19). Bourdieu (1996b) confirms that, from the 1840s onwards, the position of ‘art for art’s sake’ was established against the influence of money, ‘bourgeois art’ and ‘social art’ (p. 71). It was indifferent to the exigencies of politics and morality (p. 77), where the artist was dedicated to their work.
in a total and exclusive manner (p. 76). In this view, the work of art can be thought of as 'an independent formal structure existing for its own sake' (Hauser 1962, p. 20). Further, 'from the standpoint of the direct aesthetic experience, autonomy and self-sufficiency appear to be the essence of the work of art' (Hauser 1962, p. 20).

However, the historical relation of the autonomy of art took as its model the Kantian ideal. Hauser (1962) explains that the middle class make the mantra of 'art for art' its own, which stresses the ideal nature of art. This goes back to the idea of autonomy of Kant's philosophy and revives the theory of 'disinterestedness' of art (p. 19). In this sense, the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness was another means of distinction among the social classes. Therefore, the concept of disinterestedness does not separate perception of the work of art from the interests of a group. Consequently, art appreciation in the appropriate manner became an important token in social interaction among the enlightened bourgeois as it signified a level of sophistication and membership (Mortensen 1997, p. 106).

Bourdieu (1998), therefore, poses the question, 'Are disinterested behaviors possible, and, if so, how and under what conditions?' (pp. 85–86). He continues, 'If disinterestedness is sociologically possible, it can be so only through the encounter between habitus predisposed to disinterestedness and the universes in which disinterestedness is rewarded' (p. 88). Bourdieu further finds that among the universes where disinterestedness is valued are the different fields of cultural production such as the artistic field (p. 88).

Therefore, Bourdieu (1984) discusses the idea of 'disinterestedness' as an approach towards the arts. As previously explained disinterestedness is the only way of recognising a work of art for what it is and as a way of contemplating its form over its content. Bourdieu refers to disinterestedness as 'pure gaze' or 'pure aesthetic' and according to Bourdieu the 'pure gaze' is a historical invention linked to the emergence of an autonomous field of artistic production, a field capable of imposing its own norms on both the production and the consumption of its products. This occurred with a shift from art imitating nature to art imitating art, deriving from its own history the source of experiments or breaks with tradition (p. 3).

Consequently, an art which contains reference to its own history demands to be perceived historically, and asks to be referred to the universe of past and present works of art (Bourdieu 1984, p. 3). Bourdieu (1993) states that the refined appreciation of a work of art, particularly non-representational works of art, requires the mastery of the appropriate instruments at the time (pp. 220–221). They require a knowledge of the history of art, different styles, individual artists, art theory and
knowledge about acceptable ways of interpreting the artwork. The higher one’s
degree of subtext, the better one masters the code, the higher one’s cultural capital
(Mortensen 1997, p. 174).

Furthermore, Bourdieu (1984) finds that the disinterested aesthetic disposition
demanded by the artworks produced in the art field is inseparable from a specific
cultural competence. Like artistic production, in that it is generated in a field, aesthetic
perception is historical for the ‘naïve’ spectator cannot attain a specific grasp of works
of art which have meaning—or value—only in relation to the specific history of an
artistic tradition (pp. 3-4). Therefore, the ‘reading’ of a work of art, as Bourdieu
states, is an act of deciphering, or decoding, which presupposes practical or explicit
mastery of a cipher or code. Thus, ‘A work of art has meaning and interest only for
someone who possesses the cultural competence, that is, the code, into which it is
encoded’ (p. 2). Bourdieu then finds the capacity to see is a function of the
knowledge, or concepts, that is, the words, that are available to name visible things,
which are programs for perception (p. 2).

Bourdieu (1984) finds, ‘A beholder who lacks the specific code feels lost’ (p. 2).
Therefore, ‘the encounter with a work of art is not “love at first sight” as is generally
supposed’ (p. 3). For this ‘presupposes an act of cognition, a decoding operation,
which implies the implementation of a cognitive acquisition, a cultural code’ (p. 3).
Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain, ‘Considered as symbolic goods, works of art
only exist for those who have the means of appropriating them, that is, of deciphering
them’ (p. 39).

Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) also assert a person’s degree of artistic competence
depends, not only on the degree to which the available classification system has been
mastered, but also on the degree of complexity or refinement of this system. This
system of principles where representations of a society can be classified into
categories is like a social institution of artistic mode (p. 41). It is a historically
constituted system founded in social reality, a set of instruments of perception which
makes up the means of appropriation of artistic goods in a given society at a given
time, and does not depend on individual will and consciousness. ‘Instead, it imposes
itself on individual people, more often than not without them knowing it, defining
those distinctions that they can implement and those which elude them’ (p. 41).

Therefore, the legibility of a work of art for an individual depends on their competence
of the complex and sophisticated code demanded by the work and further the degree
to which the social code, which is also complex and sophisticated, is mastered
(Bourdieu and Darbel 1991, pp. 42-43). When the code of a work exceeds the code
of the spectator in its sophistication and complexity, the spectator cannot master a message that then seems devoid of all necessity (p. 43).

Bourdieu believes necessity and the withdrawal from necessity play a vital role in the development of the disinterested aesthetic or the pure gaze. As he states, the pure gaze is rooted in an ethic or an ethos of elective distance from the necessities of the world from a ‘withdrawal from economic necessity’ (1984, p. 54). Bourdieu finds that favourable economic and social conditions of existence presuppose this disinterestedness as they allow the agent to remove themselves from the necessities of living. ‘These conditions of existence, which are the precondition for all learning of legitimate culture, whether implicit and diffuse, as domestic cultural training generally is, or explicit and specific, as in scholastic training, are characterised by the suspension and removal of economic necessity and by objective and subjective distance from practical urgencies’ (1984, p. 54).

Bourdieu (1998) asserts that one cannot denounce the inhuman social conditions of existence imposed on certain people and then credit them with the full accomplishment of their human potential, particularly with the unnecessary and disinterested dispositions that are inscribed in notions such as those of ‘culture’ and ‘aesthetics’ (p. 136). By this, Bourdieu understands the social conditions under which some people live whereby they barely survive, such as living in poverty where attaining the necessities of life, such as food and shelter, has greater priority then attaining an adequate appreciation of the arts. This is where Bourdieu argues that the freedom from necessity in economic terms allows certain people to undertake and participate in more than the necessities of life. Here, Bourdieu distinguishes between the ‘taste of distinction’ and the ‘taste of necessity’.

Johnson (1993) attests the taste of distinction allows artistic competence and the aesthetic disposition to develop and permit the distant relationship to works of art required by a pure aesthetic as there is a freedom from economic necessity. Contrary to this, taste of necessity implies those endowed with less cultural and economic capital develop a more functional aesthetic based on a perception of everyday life (p. 24).

However, Bourdieu (1998) discusses the ‘privilege of the universal’ by explaining how we grant the economic and social privilege that is the precondition of the pure and universal point of view to all men and women. However, he further states that the human works we treat as universal, such as the fine arts, cannot be dissociated from the scholastic point of view or from the social and economic conditions which allow
them to exist. They have been engendered in these peculiar social universes, as fields of cultural production, such as the artistic field (p. 135).

Bourdieu (1998) contends the legitimate or pure aesthetic disposition presupposes *historical and social conditions of possibility* (p. 134). He (1998) confirms, “this pure pleasure which “every person ought to be able to experience”, is the privilege of those who have access to the conditions in which such a “pure” disposition can be durably constituted” (p. 134). Johnson (1993) explains, “The implication of Bourdieu’s theory is that any form of analysis which overlooks the social ground of aesthetic taste tends to establish as universal aesthetic and cultural practices which are in fact products of privilege” (p. 24).

Therefore, if we are to understand Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction, it is necessary to realise that there are certain fundamental dispositions or modes that allow agents to construct a reality of the world (aesthetic, scientific, etc.) that constitutes universal possibilities. However, these potentialities are unevenly distributed across civilisations and within societies, across social classes or ethnic groups, across positions in social space (1998, p. 137).

**Education and the Pure Gaze**

While understanding the privilege of the universal and the economic and social conditions under which the pure aesthetic is formed, Bourdieu also mentions the scholastic point of view associated with the fine arts and their appropriate appreciation. Consequently, the disinterested aesthetic can be seen as a form of scholastic view placed on the arts which is sanctioned by the education system. Bourdieu (2000) explains that the scholastic view presupposes a single, fixed view that abstracts the spectacle with a rigorous boundary. This singular view is regarded as universal and all of the ‘subjects’ are reduced to a pure gaze—like the Kanitar subject, assured of having the same view. However, Bourdieu reaffirms that this lofty, distant gaze is the process of social construction and historical invention (p. 22) that is perpetuated through education. As examined in this thesis, the aesthetic appreciation of art in the *CSF: The Arts* requires a specific, scholastic view in order to develop the appropriate, pure gaze.

The role of education and the scholastic view in the reproduction of culture has been examined in detail in Chapter 4, with particular reference to Bourdieu. However, in relation to art, Bourdieu recognises how the aesthetic disposition, the ‘eye’ or the pure gaze, is a product of history which is reproduced by education (p. 3). For Bourdieu (1984) finds that the ability to appreciate a work of art in the disinterested or aesthetic manner is related to one’s educational capital, or the duration of one’s schooling.
(p. 18). The higher one’s educational capital the better one’s ability to approach a work of art in this detached manner (p. 23). Bourdieu finds how people with limited formal education typically do not observe art in a detached way, but relate it to their own lives. Bourdieu explains though how differences among people with equal educational capital can be explained by their social origin, for education alone is not decisive, since access to education and academic success are also determined by social background (p. 23).

Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain, ‘The existence of such a strong relationship between level of education and cultural practice must not hide the fact that, given the underlying presuppositions which govern it, the educational action of the traditional school system can only be fully effective as long as it is exercised on individuals already equipped by their family upbringing with a certain familiarity with the world of art’ (pp. 26–27). Bourdieu (1993b) states that the educational institution inspires a certain familiarity, a feeling of belonging to the cultivated class and the world of art (p. 230).

Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) discuss how the action of schooling reaches children of different social classes very unequally and achieves only a very unequal success amongst those to whom it does reach. It tends to strengthen and consecrate initial cultural inequalities by its sanctions. Therefore, the proportion of those who have received early cultural initiation from their family increases greatly with level of education and what is expressed through level of education is merely the cumulative effects of the training acquired through the family and schooling (p. 27).

Bourdieu (1984) explains that there are two fields or markets, the family and the school, and they function as sites in which competencies deemed as necessary at a given time are constituted by use. Furthermore, these are the sites where the price of these competencies is determined, i.e. as a market which evaluates performance and reinforces what is acceptable and discouraging what is not (p. 85). Bourdieu states that, given that each social space or field determines the value of a competence, one would expect each field to set the highest price on the products created within it. But this is not always the case for even the education system does not value the scholastic habitus as much as that produced within the family. Bourdieu (1984) explains that in the classroom, the dominant definition of appropriating culture and works of art favours those who have had early access to legitimate culture, in a ‘cultured household’ (p. 2). That is, it favours direct experience. This can be understood as the demands of the dominant factions of the dominant class, who by valuing the familial acquisition of knowledge are perpetuating their own cultural dominance (p. 88).
Bourdieu (1984) explains how the bourgeois relation to culture is acquired pre-verbally, by early immersion in a world of cultivated people, practices and objects. Those who have discovered painting or art belatedly in a museum differ from the relation developed by those born into a world filled with art objects, familiar family property, which testifies to their wealth and good taste (p. 75). Bourdieu (1984) states that the total early learning performed in the family from the earliest days, and extended by scholastic education that presupposes and completes it, differs from belated methodical learning in the relationship to language and culture which it simultaneously inculcates. It confers a self-certainty which accompanies the certainty of possessing cultural legitimacy, which bourgeois (middle class) families hand down to their children as if it were an heirloom (p. 66).

Bourdieu (1984) explains the competence of the ‘connoisseur’ is an unconscious mastery of appropriation which evolves from a slow familiarisation and is the basis of familiarity with works. It is an ‘art’, a practical mastery which is learnt from repeated contact with cultural works and cultured people (p. 66). Bourdieu (1984) finds this mastery is, for the most part, acquired simply by contact with works of art—through implicit learning that makes it possible to recognise familiar faces without explicit rules or criteria—and it generally remains at a practical and implicit level (p. 4). For the acquisition of culture from within the family tends to favour an enchanted experience which implies forgetting the acquisition (p. 3).

Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) assert for those who did not receive the instruments of familiarity with art from their family or schooling they are condemned to a perception of a work of art which takes its categories from everyday life and results in basic recognition of the object depicted. The ‘unprepared’ viewer cannot see anything other than the primary meanings that are not characteristic of the style of the work of art. Deprived of the knowledge of style, the least cultivated individuals are condemned to see works of art in their purely phenomenal state, in other words as simple objects (pp. 44–45). Therefore, the insistence on realism in a picture can be understood because they are deprived of specific categories of perception and can apply to works only in another ‘code’, the code that allows them to perceive objects belonging to their everyday environment as meaningful (p. 45).

Bourdieu (1984) explains the working class expect every image to perform explicitly a function, if only that of a sign (p. 5), whereas, the upper and middle class recognise that art can be appreciated purely for itself. Bourdieu confirms the denial of lower, coarse, vulgar—natural—enjoyment implies an affirmation of the superiority of those who can be satisfied with the sublimated, refined, disinterested, distinguished pleasures and forever closed to the profane and vulgar (p. 7). As previously
discussed, the division between the disinterested and natural judgment of art was predominantly developed by Kant and continues to guide high aesthetics and acts as a form of social distinction.

Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain that in order to differentiate and appreciate artworks and in order to understand and value them, the uncultivated individual can invoke only the quality and quantity of the work put into them, with moral respect taking the place of aesthetic admiration (p. 47). They find that is why when the 'uncultivated' participate in a cultural practice, such as visiting a museum, they are totally reliant on the aids provided within it and, when museums address themselves to the cultivated public, the uncultivated are 'out of their depth' (p. 49). However, having the appropriate knowledge required for decoding and deciphering artworks allows for greater understanding. Bourdieu and Darbel explain the feelings of confusion when confronted with works of art decrease as soon as perception is equipped with a certain amount of knowledge. The first stage of aesthetic competence is defined by a mastery of a stock of words allowing differences to be named, such as names of painters, styles, art schools, etc. (p. 55).

Consequently, Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) find it surprising that the ideology of the 'natural gift' and the 'fresh eye' is widespread amongst the most cultivated and amongst museum curators. However, they explain that if this ideology makes the encounter with a work of art an 'occasion of a descent of grace', it provides the privileged with a justification for their cultural privilege, and also makes them forget that the perception of artworks is necessarily informed and learnt. Therefore, working-class visitors to museums are well placed to recognise that the love of art is born of long familiarity (p. 54) from within the family and reproduced in the school.

Bourdieu (1998) further discusses how school inculcates a cultivated disposition which implies recognition of the value of works of art and the ability to appropriate them (p. 230). Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) find that entry into the cultivated world gives access to the right and duty to appropriate culture and cultural practice is strongly encouraged by certain reference groups (p. 62). Therefore, the insistence that all students participate in art appreciation, in the CSF: The Arts, fails to recognise the social and cultural variations among students and their consequent cultivated dispositions. The cultural and educational capital of each student will either inspire a value of art and its appropriation or fail to recognise any significance in these cultural activities.

For the appreciation and consumption of artworks is not a natural aspiration of all classes in a given society. Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain, 'While members of
the cultivated classes feel themselves called to cultural obligations which impose themselves as an essential part of their social being, members of the working classes who in their practice break with the aesthetic and cultural tradition of the class would be called to order by their social group, who would be quick to perceive the effort to "cultivate themselves" as an attempt to become bourgeois' (p. 26).

Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) find that 'Aspiration to cultural practice varies in the same way that cultural practice does and "cultural need" increases the more it is satisfied' (p. 37). Once again with reference to the cultural practice of visiting a museum, Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain that, while museums are accessible to all, they found that statistics show that access to cultural works is the privilege of the cultivated class (p. 37). They state that, if society offers to all the pure possibility of taking advantage of the works on display in museums, it remains the case that only some have the real possibility of doing so (p. 37). That is, even if museums offer exhibitions with additional information, still only some people will visit as they have the aspiration to do so because the arts are valued in their social class. Therefore, Bourdieu (1984) explains the acquisition of cultural competence is inseparable from the acquisition of a 'sense' for sound cultural investment (p. 85)—or, as previously explained, the illusion.

Bourdieu (1993b) suggests that schooling tends to transpose an inculcation to admire and love certain works, or certain classes of works, which become linked to a certain educational and social status (p. 230). Therefore, "The appreciation of the right kinds of art in the appropriate manner becomes a requirement for, and a sign of membership in, a cultural elite" (Mortensen 1997, p. 174). The classification between the 'right' type of art can be examined as the distinction between high and popular art.

**High and Popular Art**

The assumed differences between high and popular art, as implied by Bourdieu, are in part a consequence of the disinterested approach to art. Advocates of the disinterested approach feel that, through such, the features of the work will be apparent and justify the distinction between high and popular art (Mortensen p. 175). Novitz (1992) finds that high art is thought to satisfy a refined taste and not be merely pleasing or entertaining (p. 23). However, since works of art are socially produced, the demarcation between high and popular art is a socially created distinction and not found in the physical features, properties or origins of the work (p. 28).

Novitz (1992) finds the distinction between high and popular art is evident from the beginning of the twentieth century, when modernist art becomes increasingly abstract and difficult to understand. Novitz also recognises the social function and distinction
between high and popular art: since high art was accessible only to those with education, its appreciation became a sign of belonging to a cultural elite (p. 36). Staniszevski (1995) also refers to abstract art in the early twentieth century, where abstract artists were idealistic and attempted to create a universal language for the modern world. However, she finds that rather than being a universal language, ‘abstract Art was—and remains today—an arcane, esoteric subject that is understood and appreciated by an informed few’ (p. 193).

However, the distinction between different forms of art has been associated with cultural classes since the late eighteenth century when, as discussed, the fine arts were dissociated from the mechanical arts which were considered inappropriate for the upper classes. Staniszevski (1995) confirms that, during the eighteenth century in the West, high culture was the privilege of the aristocracy (p. 204). She finds what we consider popular art is similar to folk traditions—crafts, poetry, song (p. 204). In The Critique of Judgement (1790) Kant made the distinction between art and handicraft. For Kant handicraft was viewed as ‘use objects’ and art objects were ‘free’ or ‘disinterested’. The handicraft and art objects were intrinsically opposite to one another (cited in Rose 1984, pp. 74–76).

Part of the distinction between high and low art is the ceremonial behaviour surrounding high art, such as the disinterested approach towards artworks, and the equivalent of this is the detached manner in which we are expected to listen to a piece of music, or the quiet solemnity we observe in a theatre or art gallery (Mortensen 1997, p. 179). Bourdieu (1984) states how the art gallery admits all fractions of society without any constraints, but the gallery does demand an appropriate behaviour, an austere, quasi-scholastic disposition, oriented towards the accumulation of experience and knowledge as well as the pleasure of recognition and deciphering (p. 272) of the artwork.

The disinterested approach towards the high arts is not a natural response but one that is conditioned as a result of a historical process and individual socialisation (Mortensen p. 179). The disinterested approach requires a cultivated habitus and beliefs that exist as a ‘state of the body’ (Bourdieu 1990, p. 68). As examined, the required habitus is acquired through familiarisation within the family and educational institutions which value this disinterested approach and only certain classes produce this specific habitus. Consequently, Novitz (1992) states, ‘the distinction between high and popular art does not merely distinguish different types of art, but, much more than this, it actually accentuates and reinforces traditional class divisions within capitalist society’ (p. 36).
Furthermore, Bourdieu (1984) proposes that a class or class fraction is not defined by its overall judgement of artists but by the choices it makes from the range offered by the field of production (p. 293). In surveys in art galleries Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) discovered working class visitors are more interested in ‘minor works’, such as furniture, ceramics and folk art, as it is more accessible because they know what it is used for, whereas the upper class are attached to noble works such as painting and sculpture (pp. 56–57). Bourdieu (1984) finds popular taste concurs with the working classes and the lower fractions of the middle classes (p. 294).

Bourdieu (1984) further finds different classes have different expectations from artworks. He states that the ‘intellectual’ fractions expect from an artist a symbolic challenging of social reality while the ‘bourgeois’ fractions expect their artists, writers, critics, jewelers and interior designers to provide emblems of distinction. Luxury goods and works of art are the most visible aspect of the décor enveloping bourgeois existence (p. 293). Therefore, art and certain goods are a display of taste and consequent class distinction.

The different forms of art within the art field demonstrate what Staniszewski (1995) states, that art can be understood as the domain shaped by ‘the great divide’ which separates high art from popular culture and each defines the other (p. 199). This means that each area is defined by what it is not: high art and popular art are considered opposites and in this opposition each is defined.

Bourdieu (1984) finds that social identity is defined and asserted through differences, and that these differences are defined and distinguished by what they are not, from everything they oppose. The most fundamental oppositions (high/low, rich/poor) tend to establish themselves as the structuring principles of practices and perceptions of practices (pp. 170–177). He states that this network of opposites has its ultimate source in the opposition between the ‘elite’ of the dominant and the ‘mass’ of the dominated. The formal oppositions within this social mythology derive their ideological strength by referring back to this fundamental opposition of the social order (pp. 468–469).

Bourdieu (1984) proposes these classificatory schemes based on opposites can function in specific fields, such as in the field of cultural production, which is organised around oppositions which reproduce the structure of the dominant class and are equivalent to it. Therefore, the rudimentary opposition constantly supports secondary oppositions such as aesthetic judgements while modifying itself to the point of misrecognition (p. 469). The disinterested approach acts as a disguise of the existence of the struggles among different classes with culture (p. 250). However,
Bourdieu asserts that the opposition between 'authentic' and 'imitation', 'true' culture and 'popularisation' exists in culture, just as oppositions exist in other classifications, but they exist only through each other and it is the relation which produces the value of culture and the need to possess it. Furthermore, it is in the struggle between these opponents that the value of culture is generated, which amounts to belief in the value of culture, interest in culture and the interest of culture (p. 250). Therefore, those who recognise these distinctions in culture gain a value of culture, whereby they understand that entering into the art field will provide a form of profit or cultural capital.

Bourdieu (1984) finds that culture is a stake which simultaneously presupposes and demands one take part in the game and be taken in by it. The value of culture is generated in the initial investment implied by simply entering the game, joining in the collective belief in the value of the game (p. 250). One of the effects of the game is the belief in the innateness of the desire to play and that interest in culture is a natural property and an intrinsic interest (p. 250).

However, Bourdieu (1984) asserts struggles over the appropriation of cultural goods are symbolic struggles to appropriate distinctive signs in the form of classifying and classified goods and practices. They are a means to conserve or subvert the principles of classification of these properties. Consequently, life-styles, the space where occupants differentiate themselves intentionally or unintentionally, are the balancesheets of the symbolic struggles over the imposition of the legitimate life-style. The legitimate life-style is the most fully developed in the struggle for the monopoly of the emblems of 'class', that is, luxury goods, legitimate cultural goods and the legitimate manner of appropriating them. The field in which these goods are produced, reproduced and circulated while yielding profits of distinction lies in the strategies which gives them their rarity and the belief in their value (pp. 249–250). Consequently, Bourdieu explains, 'The more legitimate a given area, the more necessary and 'profitable' it is to be competent in it, and the more damaging and 'causethly' to be incompetent' (p. 86).

Bourdieu (1984) further finds it is no accident that there is practically no questioning of art and culture which would genuinely object to the cultural game as the dominated classes are so invested with a sense of their own cultural unworthiness. The dominated classes intervene in the symbolic struggles to define the legitimate properties and mode of appropriation only as passive reference points. The basis against which culture is constructed is nothing other than what is considered 'popular', 'common', 'low' and 'vulgar' (p. 251). The basis of culture, therefore, is
a clear indication of the opposition between high and popular art and the social distinctions they convey in the social order.

These pervasive oppositions act as the distinctions by which we are judged and by which we judge ourselves. That is why, Bourdieu (1984) contends, art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences (p. 7).

The modern conception of art has always had built into it cultural differentiations as it has emerged as part of a complex cultural, social and political history. The disinterested or aesthetic appreciation of the fine arts became an important part of the self-consciousness of the emerging middle class. Because the middle class alone were able to approach art in this detached manner, this approach became a way to justify their social position to themselves and others, thereby advocating their self-worth (Mortensen 1997, p. 182).

Hauser (1962) asserts that the 'way to a genuine appreciation of art is through education. Not the violent simplification of art, but the training of the capacity for aesthetic judgement is the means by which the constant monopolizing of art by a small minority can be prevented' (p. 246). However, Bourdieu (1993b) finds that art education presupposes (p. 231) that individuals are endowed with a previously acquired competence in cultural capital which is unequally distributed among the social classes. He explains art education can fully benefit only those who owe the competence acquired to their family, because it does not explicitly give to all what it demands from all. He asserts the fact remains that the effectiveness of the formative action of schooling is directly dependent on the degree to which those undergoing it fulfill the preliminary conditions for adequate reception (p. 232).

While it is recognised that the attainment of the pure gaze is learned and not entirely intrinsic, the outcome of aesthetic appreciation in the CSF: The Arts requires specific familiarity with art and art discourse. In this sense the requirements for achievement in art education in the CSF are based on cultural and social divisions that will be examined in this thesis.
Chapter 6 Research Methodology and Design

Policy into Practice

The research I have undertaken has been an examination of policy into practice. That is, my goal has been to examine the visual arts programs in primary schools and determine the extent to which the CSF: The Arts policy document has been implemented into teaching practice in the art classroom. The implementation of a policy is a complex process; there are many factors which assist or inhibit the implementation of the document which extend far beyond the confines of the classroom. This research aimed to examine these factors as it considered the political, social, cultural and educational implications of incorporating the CSF: The Arts into practice.

The development of the CSF: The Arts policy was examined, with consideration of the political factors that often govern educational curricula. In this sense the research examined the political and social hegemonic relations in education and further how the high humanistic view of the visual arts contributes to the maintenance of the social order. Specifically, this research examined the visual arts programs currently taught in four Victorian primary schools in relation to the government document the CSF: The Arts and the inclusion of art appreciation as an assessable outcome.

The CSF: The Arts introduced the substrand of 'arts criticism and aesthetics', which previously had not been present in other art policy documents. Therefore, art appreciation had become an expected outcome for teachers to implement and students to achieve. The introduction of art appreciation brought with it higher expectations of teachers and students and put into play the ability of students to appraise artworks critically. The ability of students to appreciate artworks can be seen as dependent on their cultural capital. Therefore, differences in social class among students was a vital component of arts education and, therefore, the CSF: The Arts can be seen to assist in social and cultural reproduction.

Therefore, the research aimed to determine the teaching practice of the visual arts in the school at level four of the CSF; or grades five and six, and evaluate how visual arts are presented to students—for example, art as craft, dominated by studio-based practices, or art as discussion and writing about their own work and that of others as expected in the CSF: The Arts. As previously discussed, I applied Bourdieu's theory of cultural reproduction to the findings. I examine both student cultural capital, to determine how predisposed they are to partake in art discourse, and teachers' practices
as habitus, to ascertain their ability to implement change and their beliefs about their
existing teaching practice.

Bourdieu (1990) argues that practice is constructed and the principle of this
construction is a system of structured and structuring dispositions, known as habitus
(p. 52). Bourdieu's concept of habitus was discussed in Chapter 3. However,
regarding habitus and practice, Bourdieu (1990) states that 'the logic of practice
understands only in order to act' (p. 91) and that practice is without conscious
reflexion or logical control (p. 91). Practice excludes attention to itself, it is unaware
of the principles that govern and contain it (p. 92). Therefore, when examining
practice, it is vital to observe the practice in question for the actor or agent may not be
aware of their actions in practice. Simply asking a teacher about their practices does
not deduce an appropriate and final conclusion of the social significance of their
practice. Therefore, in my study art teachers were not only interviewed but also
critically observed in the classroom with the expectation of finding differences
between the teachers' concept of their practice and the actual practice.

The Ethics and Politics of the Study
Due to the potential ethical and political implications this study held for participants, I
employed appropriate means to conceal the identities of all participants. Possible
ethical implications relate to school staff not adhering to school policy or rejecting
government policy reform with the potential that these findings could be used to hold
participants accountable. In this time of accountability some teachers were concerned
with confidentiality and the use of the data. Therefore, I had to ensure participants that
their statements and actions would remain anonymous. Ethical clearance was obtained
from the university with the understanding that the identities of schools, teachers and
students remain anonymous with data stored securely at the university. I also gained
permission from the Department of Education, Employment and Training to conduct
research in schools. The Regional Director was also advised about my research.
School participation was granted from each school principal, written parental consent
was obtained for students’ involvement in questionnaires and interviews. Student
interviews were conducted in the school after observations in the art room, therefore,
students were aware of who I was and the study I was conducting in their school.
This was constructed with the idea that students would be more comfortable with me
as they had seen me prior to interviews. Obviously, there are still potential problems
with interviewing children such as having them answer to please the interviewer and
supplying limited responses to questions as discussed further in this chapter. All
participants were invited to participate in the study after reading a plain language
statement. All participants were able to withdraw from this study at any time and
withdraw data with no adverse consequences. One teacher chose not to submit her work program due to her own concerns which she did not specify.

**Method of Research**

The method of research employed in my study was empirical, with an interpretive and critical approach, applied through four case studies. The four case studies were conducted in four separate school sites in Victoria. The schools were selected according to criteria based on various socio-economic backgrounds in order to measure differences in cultural capital of students and teacher practice. Two public and two private schools were chosen. One public school was working to lower middle class with both single and double-income families, predominantly in trades and service work. The second public school was in a lower working class area and some parents worked in the local factories or service industries. Also there was a high level of transitory families receiving single-parent or unemployment welfare benefits. The private schools chosen were also varied, with one school being a Christian school with predominantly double-income families who were lower middle class. The principal reported that parents sent their children to this school for the pastoral care the school offered and its Christian values. The second private school was an elite private school, which prided itself on achieving well in academic and sporting terms, along with developing cultural awareness. Predominantly, families were double-income from highly paid professions, such as doctors, lawyers or business owners. This school was renowned for its prestige, tradition and high fees. Each school will be examined in more detail in Chapter 7. Statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics 1996 Census of Population and Housing for the geographical area of the study were used to inform the selection of schools regarding occupation, employment and income. These statistics assisted the socio-economic classification of each school.

**Case Study Method**

For Walker (1987) a case study is ‘...the examination of an instance in action’ where ‘the study of particular incidents and events, and the selective collection of information on biography, personality, intentions and values, allows the case study worker to capture and portray those elements of a situation that give it meaning’ (p. 4). Walker also argues that case studies reveal ‘what institutions mean to individuals (and) helps us get beyond form and structure to the realities of human life’ (p. 4). He further finds that case studies offer ‘some escape from the language of theory, but the case study may contribute to theory, for it promises to reveal how theoretical abstractions relate to common sense perceptions of everyday life’ (pp. 4–5).

This is how I have used the case study method, and the data collected from the four case studies were analysed as Bourdieu’s theory in practice. However, initially my
concern was with the implementation of the CSF in relation to teachers and teacher training. The research led to the realisation that there are many factors which inform the implementation of an educational policy. Consequently, I became more concerned with the social reproduction through education and found the cultural reproduction theory of Bourdieu could effectively analyse the findings of the research. Therefore, I focused on analysing the data according to Bourdieu's concepts of field, cultural capital and habitus.

Smith finds that case studies are totalities; that is, they are 'holistic' or 'systematic' in quality (cited in Walker 1987, p. 12). In this sense, a holistic picture of each school case was explored and vital in understanding how the arts were valued and placed in that particular school. Due to the research needing to be holistic and naturalistic, it is based on qualitative methods. Simon and Dippo (1986) describe qualitative methods as important as they allow access to the practices, that is, the words, actions and personally appropriated signs of social life. However, the authors do not preclude the use of quantitative data 'as a way of indexing practices and characterizing the distribution and extent of particular material circumstances' (p. 198).

Although case studies are regarded as qualitative research, Simon and Dippo (1986), along with Stenhouse (1987a) and Walker (1987), advocate the collection of appropriate quantitative data within case studies. For while initial case study research may be concerned with qualitative data, subsequent data collection may become more focused and, therefore, supplementary data may be required (Germain 1986) in the form of quantitative data which can be utilised to reinforce findings in a case study. Walker also reports that the case study worker is often more quantitative than is realised. Walker describes the work of Becker (1961), stating how his work is within a descriptive frame. However, he is concerned with occurrences and frequency of items within the data (pp. 14–15). This was also the method of analysis adopted in this research: applying a qualitative approach within a frame of description but also employing quantitative methods when required. Therefore, I was examining the data for regularity and frequency of common trends and patterns. These patterns of regularity and trends were often revealed during the data collection and, therefore, formed the basis of further investigation.

MacDonald and Walker (1975) explain, a 'case-study worker should aim to increase understanding of the variables, parameters and dynamics of the case under study' (p. 7). Therefore, within educational case studies, the case study worker aims to create a whole picture of the school setting, the people, theories, practice and internal and external influences on that particular school. Consequently, the history, school policy, curriculum policy, extra-curricula activities, facilities, the possible changes due to the
CSF, main objectives and the relational discourses of the school were examined to gain an insight into the workings of the school, or the school ethos. Further, as these particular case studies involve the study of humans, the study cannot be context free, for, as Germain (1986) reports, ‘human behaviour is context related’ (p. 154). Therefore, the attitudes and perspectives of those involved with the school were also examined, including the principal, the art teacher and students.

**Method of Data Collection**

Stenhouse (1987a) notes that the conduct of case studies involves three operations:
1. gathering and recording information; i.e. fieldwork
2. organising the information about the case
3. writing a report or disseminating the information in some alternative form (p. 17)

The components of fieldwork are then categorised as:
   a. collecting or evoking documents
   b. observing
   c. interviewing
   d. measuring or collecting statistics (p. 18).

Adelman and others (1976) discuss how case study methodology is eclectic, although the techniques and procedures for collecting information for a case study are commonly observation (participant and non-participant), interview (conducted with varying degrees of structure), audio-visual recording, field note taking, document collection and negotiation of products (discussion of accuracy of accounts with those observed).

The research I have undertaken has involved the use of the methods and techniques of case study method utilising document collection, observation, audio recording, questionnaire, interview and field notes. Time spent in each school has been approximately one month in order to collect relevant documents, observe art lessons, conduct questionnaires and interviews. Therefore, the case studies were condensed and evaluative as defined by Stenhouse (1987a, p. 11).

The documents that were collected from each school included the school charter, vision statement, school handbook, operations and documentation manual and school magazine (when published) which revealed the schools’ ethos portrayed to the public, and priorities and philosophy regarding learning and the position of the visual arts within the schools framework. The art teachers’ lesson plans and programs were also collected to provide evidence of lessons taught but not observed and the inclusion of *CSF: The Arts* outcomes in their planning of lessons.
Observation in each school site was undertaken to inform the case study as part of the fieldwork. Stenhouse (1987a) finds there are various roles of the observer: fully participant (i.e. having an available participant role in the setting observed); aspirant participant (i.e. creating an acceptance of an unusual participant role, e.g. researcher); non-participant (i.e. minimising interaction); and covert (i.e. hidden from those observed either by one-way screen or unobtrusive observation without disclosure of research role) (p. 21). In my role as researcher as being that of aspirant participant and non-participant, I aimed to be accepted as a researcher within the school and also to minimise interaction with those observed. Germain (1986) explains, as a participant observer, the researcher observes in a low key manner so as to induce as little change as possible (p. 154). Further, the non-participant observer may be visible but does not interact with those being observed; for example this may be appropriate during meetings or classroom observation. However, complete non-interaction was a difficult process, as often students would want to discuss the microphone, or ask questions about my research and their work. Therefore, on occasion I found myself taking on the role of teacher, although I tried to restrict this, it was unavoidable at times.

Observing refers to ‘perceiving and recording events, behaviour (including speech) or appearances in the case under study’ (Stenhouse 1987a, p. 21). The observation of each school site was extremely important as it provided an insight into the workings of the school, the image the school portrayed to the public, the art lessons taught and the value placed on art with respect to the facilities of the school and display of artwork. However, observation was predominantly based on art lessons with respect to student behaviour, especially regarding the interaction of students in art appreciation. These lessons were also audio-taped to gain a case record of the structure of art lessons, the content, teacher terminology and student participation and discussion while in the art room. In observing these art lessons I also made observational notes as to the practice of events, timing of lessons, for example time spent on making art and time spent on talking about art, the actual art activities conducted by the teacher and how students responded to these, materials used, teacher awareness of what students were achieving or not achieving and time spend by students on actual activity or other behaviour.

Individual accounts of situations are not a reliable resource alone. Therefore, detailed and particular observation was vital in providing a comprehensive case record of each school case study. However, I also relied on interviews to derive information from art teachers, principals and students. Stenhouse (1987b) notes a distinction between interview-based case study as an oral history and participant observation as a kind of ethnography (p. 14). While I attempted to remain a non-participant observer, I aimed to provide an ethnographic description of each school case study based on both observation and interview. Stenhouse (1987a) finds, ‘observation often provides cues
for the agenda of interview', and this was the case. However, I also employed specific questions to ascertain certain information during interviews. Further, though, Stenhouse (1987a) states 'the crucial issue for such condensed fieldwork is whether observation or interview is regarded as the more valid and reliable' (p. 24).

In this research initially I observed a few art lessons, then interviewed the participating art teachers. Some questions were uniform across each teacher interview and further questions were concerned with validating observations or comments made by the individual teacher. Afterwards, I would continue observations partly to verify comments made in the interview about teaching practice. As indicated in Chapter 7, in School One and School Three, I returned after a few months, to observe if what the teachers had stated in the interview had been achieved, such as incorporating more art appreciation. Generally, the teachers at both schools were attempting to incorporate more art appreciation, however, it was limited due to their own habitus and teaching practice as well as the students’ cultural capital.

The interview with the art teachers was structured in terms of asking specific questions relating to their teacher education, personal interest in the arts, art philosophy, importance of the visual arts in school according to them and others, structure and approach of the art program, balance between making art and responding to art, justification of the visual arts in education, use of technology, use of language in the CSF, use of support materials and professional development. Questions were also directed at evaluating the implications of the CSF for the visual arts, such as changes to the art program, use of the document for development of curriculum, reporting, knowledge and understanding of content, perceived limitations of the CSF, political motivations such as accountability, centralised control over curriculum and use of past documents. Therefore, the interviews commenced in a broad order of questioning and became more focused and specific regarding the topic studied.

Commonly within the interviews, I would expand on questions in an unstructured manner if the teacher began discussing a relevant matter. Information was also discussed in an unstructured way with teachers on informal occasions, which often revealed their attitudes and opinions towards the CSF. Therefore, interviews with art teachers were both formally structured and informal when appropriate.

The principal of each school was interviewed in a structured method and information gathered can be divided into three main components: the school’s history, underlying philosophy, priorities, timetabling, budget and specialist teachers. Information about the CSF, implementation of the document, changes to the school, resources, government support, professional development and the principal’s attitude to ascertain
whether this document was considered as relevant and important in the school from the administrative view. Also the importance of visual arts in the school was examined with concerns about budget, expectations of the principal, awareness of the art program and the importance of art in education.

Student interviews were conducted after observation and questionnaires were completed and analysed. Years five and six students completed questionnaires about their experience of art, if they enjoy art in school, what they do in art, what they would like to do, what they think they should do and what they prioritise as important in art. Further, I asked about their participation of art at home, importance of art as a subject to them and how they interpret their use of art knowledge as prospective adults. Due to the stronger focus of my thesis towards the cultural capital of students partway through my study, in Schools Three and Four I also added students’ attendance at art galleries and talking about artworks with friends or family to ascertain more precisely students’ cultural capital. Further, in Schools Three and Four I asked students about the artwork within their home environment to gain insight into the familiarity they had with art and value placed on art in their family which, according to Bourdieu, aids in the development of an aesthetic disposition.

After examining the questionnaires I selected students for interview who responded in both positive and negative ways towards their visual arts experience and beliefs. These students were then interviewed to gain a further understanding of their responses, thoughts and participation in cultural practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table One: Collection of data and fieldwork in school sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Principal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Teacher One:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Teacher Two:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Two
School Principal:
   Interview - 27 May 1999
Art Teacher One:
   Interview - 1 May 1999
   Observation of art lessons - 7 May 1999, 14 May 1999, 21 May
   1999, 28 May 1999
Art Teacher Two:
   Interview - 17 May 1999
   Observation of art lessons - 11 May 1999, 25 May 1999
Art Teacher Three:
   Interview - 28 May 1999
   Observation of art lessons - 28 May 1999, 4 June 1999
Students:
   Questionnaire - May and June 1999
   Interview - 18 June 1999

School Three
School Principal:
   Interview - 7 June 2000
Art Teacher:
   Observation of art lessons - 12 November 1999, 19 November 1999,
Students:
   Questionnaires - December 1999, June 2000
   Interviews - 13 July 2000, 17 July 2000

School Four
School Principal:
   Interview - 29 March 2000
Art Teacher One:
   Interview - 29 March 2000
   Observation of art lessons - 10 May 2000, 17 May 2000, 22 May
   5 June 2000, 6 June 2000
Art Teacher Two:
   Observation of art lessons - 23 May 2000, 30 May 2000, 6 June 2000
Students:
   Questionnaires - May and July 2000
   24 July 2000

Analysis of the Data

Stenhouse (1987a) states once the case records have been collected, such as
documents, interview transcripts, observer notes and statistics, it is time to commence
organising the information in order to begin analysing and synthesising. Organising
involves categorising to reveal patterns within the data. These patterns will provide
topics that will in turn provide a structure for the final report (p. 27).
As noted previously, my thesis is based on an interpretive case studies approach, although I present my findings as an analysis of theory in practice. Therefore, I applied Bourdieu's concepts of field, habitus and cultural capital to my data and these also provided categories of analysis in conjunction with the patterns within the data. Data provided evidence of the theory in practice with observations and quotations supporting the conceptual framework. Stenhouse (1987a) finds that the conceptual framework is contributed by the author and draws on systematic theory (p. 30), which is the case with this thesis. As an interpretive analysis, the case study method has some limitations and these were encountered in this research.

**Limitations of the Research Method**

Walker (1987) states there are some problems regarding the case study method of research, he finds that 'case studies are inevitably always partial accounts involving selection at every stage, from choosing cases for study, to sampling events and instances, and to editing and presenting material' (p. 14). Consequently, the case studies presented must be viewed as partial accounts and instances in time. As the research was based on condensed case studies, it is vital to understand that 'data is embedded in time' (Stenhouse 1987b, p. 1). Therefore, the research is not a complete picture of events or future occurrences and the time from data collection to the completed report means situations may have changed in each school site.

Further, with the case study method, reliability and validity are considerable problems. Adelman and others stress the importance of triangulation due to the multiplicity of perspectives of events in social situations. They find that all accounts are expressive of the social position of the informant. Consequently, there are conflicting and differing viewpoints. Therefore, certain facts may need to be followed up in subsequent interview, observations or document collection—they need 'cross-checking' (p. 6). As mentioned, I did not rely completely on one method of data collection, but conducted observations, questionnaires and interviews with art teachers, students and principals in an attempt to 'cross-check' information.

Student interviews also gave their perspectives of their relation to cultural practice within their family and home. Possibly this was a distorted or limited view that did not account for all cultural interactions within the family. However, this also reveals the importance these students may place on cultural interactions, further revealing the valuing of art developing in their habitus. Some students also had a limited recall of situations in the art classroom which I had observed. Hence, some students' responses were contradictory to others and, therefore, not always a reliable source of information. However, these contradictions also can relay the importance and interest
a particular student placed on particular events. Furthermore, some students stated they had not been to an art gallery in their questionnaire, but, when asked in interviews, they remembered they had. Therefore, questionnaires alone were not a reliable source of information and data. Consequently, I relied on student interviews than on questionnaires to inform the research.

Further, in interviews some students appeared to give answers they felt I wanted to hear, again distorting the representation of reality. Some students gave very limited responses and drawing information from them was difficult and resulted in further probing questions at times. The example of limited responses was prevalent in School Three, and can be regarded as an indication of reluctance to discuss their situation and/or an inability to verbalise their thoughts. Further, this can be seen as a distrust of an outsider and, therefore, reluctance to reveal information about themselves. Walker (1987) finds that in an interview the interviewee ‘will react to or against what is perceived to be the interviewer’s frame of reference and definition of the situation. He [sic] will attempt either to “tell the interviewer what he [sic] wants to know” or take issue with what he [sic] perceives as the interviewer’s point of view’ (p. 27).

During teacher interviews, teachers were also reluctant at times to discuss how they ‘really’ felt about a situation. This reluctance was more concerned with an awareness of accountability and representing themselves as confirming to the demands of the government and implementing the CSF document. They were aware of possible reprimand, consequently, many were also concerned with confidentiality issues. However, more often than not, teachers eventually revealed their opinions and thoughts quite extensively during interviews and informal discussions.

As discussed, during the course of my research, my focus altered due both to the findings of the data and also to an extended application of theory. Therefore, data gathered in earlier school sites, Schools One and Two, were not as concerned with information about students’ cultural capital and family background. This has presented some problems regarding information about student interaction with cultural practices. However, students’ reactions to visiting art galleries were presented as an example of their cultural capital and consequent cultural aspiration. Information gathered about students was far more extensive in Schools Three and Four, and, therefore, there are more data about student cultural capital for these two schools. Further, as expressed, particular schools presented certain trends towards particular practices, such as in School Four, where there was a dominance of students who stated they and their family read frequently. Further, they recalled their parents listened to classical music. Both of these are signs of class membership, according to Bourdieu’s categories of distinction. Therefore, these findings are presented about
School Four, but not about other schools, as they were not prevalent in other school sites.

Further, it is important to consider that the analysis reflects the view of the researcher, as Walker argues, 'the case study worker acts as a collector of definitions, not the conductor of truth' (1987, p. 29). Consequently, despite my best intentions, my own prejudices, or habitus, will be reflected in the interpretation of the data. Bourdieu (2000) was also aware of these contradictions in his empirical studies of society, and his role as an academic and intellectual. He tried to move beyond his role as an intellectual, declaring 'I have never really felt justified in existing as an intellectual; and I have always tried...to exorcise everything in my thinking that might be linked to that status' (p. 7). However, he was aware that his thinking had limitations, as difficult as it was for him 'in accepting that my freedom has its limits' (p. 7). However, he tried to deploy all the available instruments of objectification (statistical surveys, ethnographic observation, historical research, etc.) in order to apply an objective of knowledge (p. 10).

Ultimately, I aim to present an empirical investigation of theory in practice, for as Bourdieu (1998) explains, 'The theoretical and empirical are inseparable' (p. 2). In this sense, applying the theory of cultural reproduction, I argue that the CSF: The Arts, with the incorporation of art appreciation, contributes to the existing social class divisions in society.
Chapter 7 Schools as Social Fields

Schools act as social fields whereby practices, discourses and ethos are shaped by the institution and further shape the individuals within these institutions. Examining the particular idiosyncrasies of different schools reveals how they assist in the formulation of habitus, both individual habitus and group habitus or class habitus. As discussed in Chapter 4, schools perpetuate cultural reproduction and often in an implicit manner, where values, attitudes and habits are transmitted reinforcing certain cultural values. Therefore, various forms of cultural capital are accumulated which then aid in the opportunities of some, while limiting the chances of others. Different schools appropriate the recognised legitimate culture depending on the value and importance they place on reproducing its dispositions and requirements. The value of certain practices and discourses is acquired over time and informed from tradition and generations of class expectation. Along with class expectation come class aspiration and cultural obligation that can also be expressed by the school through the particular ethos it portrays.

Bourdieu realises the importance of academics in education that can be recognised due to the curriculum delivered in schools. The inclusion of specific curricula defines the importance various schools place on certain forms of knowledge, the hierarchy of knowledge and how this knowledge is appropriated. Bourdieu recognises that there is a certain high academic view that is produced in schools and then transposed on the world in general. As explained in Chapter 4, Bourdieu (1998) refers to this view as the scholastic point of view or ‘the academic vision’ (p. 127). Bourdieu (1998) finds that the scholastic stance is inseparable from scholastic fields such as schools and that to enter these scholarly fields one has to adopt the scholastic point of view (p. 128). Certain schools encourage the scholastic point of view and aim to produce students who can effectively participate in this high view of the world whereby the ‘academic experience’ is a ‘gratuitous game’ a ‘mental experience that is an end in and of itself’ (Bourdieu 1998, p. 128).

School Ethos

Certain schools aim to display an image, whether intentionally or unintentionally, which reproduces the legitimate culture through the practices and discourses of the school. Concurrency with the legitimate culture can be seen in the philosophy of the school, the curricula, extra-curricula activities and facilities which all inform the cultural environment of the school. In comparing the variations of schools in these particular areas it is possible to attain some understanding of their compliance with or disparity from the legitimate culture and the ethos of the school.
School One

School One was a rural public school with over 500 students, enrolments had grown rapidly with the growth of the local residential area. The school had a long history in the local area and the local community was highly involved with the running of the school and decision making regarding school policy, student welfare, learning programs, resources, improvement of school facilities and learning programs for adults, such as parent effectiveness, technology, and job skills. There was also a school helper’s volunteer program and an awareness of ‘the crucial role parents/guardians play in their child’s education’ (School Charter 1998, p. 1). The parents from this school were predominantly working class to lower middle class and single-income families, some were double income. There was a low proportion of non-English speaking background students and ‘29.5% of recipients of the Education Maintenance Allowance’ (Triennial School Review, Education Victoria 1998, p. 1). Data from the Census 1996 Statistics for Suburbs report for the region show the backgrounds of the parents, such as employment. For the surrounding suburb of the school one of the highest percentage of occupations was Trades 17.44%, Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service Workers 16.5%, Professionals 14.94% and Associate Professionals 13.62%. The industries they were employed in were Manufacturing 19.94%, Retail Trade 16.95%, Health and Community Services 10.48% and Construction 8.70%. The unemployment rate was 3.6%. The highest weekly income for males was $400-$499 with 11.63%, $800-$999 at 9.98%, $500-$599 at 9.47% and $120-$159 at 9.19% but they were mostly of retirement age. The weekly wage for females was $200-$299 at 14.34%, $300-$399 at 11.25%, $400-$499 at 10.94% and $120-$159 at 10.03%. Again the majority were retirement age.

School Policy

The school policy for School One aimed to prepare each child for the future by providing a ‘comprehensive and effective curriculum’, a safe environment where ‘children are confident to takes risks with their learning, to accept challenge, set realistic goals and adapt to change’. The school also aimed to develop each child’s abilities so they could ‘enjoy a sense of achievement and self worth’. The school was also concerned with developing ‘life skills such as responsibility, independence, communication skills, inquiring minds, problem solving and creativity’. The school also aimed to promote and strengthen ‘positive links between the home and school’ (School Charter 1998, p. 1).

The school’s motto [for confidentiality school mottos will not be included] promoted the importance of learning and the school believed this was its core purpose, i.e. learning (Vision Statement 1998). The school presented itself as facilitating students
in becoming ‘successful learners’, ‘lifelong learners’ and ‘learning how to learn’ (Vision Statement 1998). The school focused on developing learning skills, with students becoming responsible for their own learning.

**Curriculum**

The school offered an integrated curriculum and the belief in the notion of multiple intelligences and a constructivist approach to teaching where ‘knowledge is constructed by learners through an active, mental process of development’ (Vision Statement 1998). Literacy and Numeracy were priorities of the school as it was stated ‘these skills are prerequisites for achievement in all learning areas’ (Vision Statement 1998). The school’s Charter priorities were to ‘improve student learning in English and enhance access to a wide range of learning technologies’. These were recommendations from their Triennial review conducted in June 1998.

The school provided instruction in the eight KLAs through an Integrated Curriculum and had specialist teaching in the Visual Arts, Music, LOTE (Indonesian), Physical Education, Information Technology and Library which also housed a new Learning Technology Centre. School One provided intervention with Reading Recovery, Bridging the Gap program, Phonemic Awareness, a spelling program, speech therapy and educational psychologists.

**Extra-curricular Activities**

The school also provided enrichment programs such as a Perceptual Motor Program, Bike Education, Swimming, Sports Clinics and school based basketball and netball teams. Children could participate in the Talented Children’s Program which incorporated debating, Maths Challenge, Tournament of the Minds, Statewide Science, Maths and English Competitions.

The school also offered welfare programs: Turning the Tide (drug education), Police in Schools Program, Puberty Courses, Safety House; Social Service, Out of School Hours Care and an Anti-Bullying and Harassment Policy (School Charter 1998, p. 2).

**Facilities**

School One was situated on ‘approximately 4. 5 hectares of well maintained grounds with strategically placed shade areas for sun protection. Facilities including a fitness track, three Adventure Playgrounds, cricket nets, full sized ovals and basketball courts support both active and passive recreational play. The school buildings comprise a modern central core of Administration offices, open plan classrooms and specialist areas’ (School Charter 1998, p. 1).
School Two

School Two was a private Christian school with four campuses and just over 1000 students enrolled at the time of my study. The social background of the students was varied. Some families sent their children to this school for the Christian values and caring environment the school advertised, while other students attended this school after being expelled from other schools, usually for behavioural problems. Other students also had learning disabilities. The students came from various areas around the surrounding suburbs but predominantly they came from the immediate area of each campus.

The students from this school were predominantly in double-income families and were lower middle class. In the 1996 Census it was reported that adults from this suburb were involved with occupations such as Professionals 25.5%, Intermediate Clerical and Service Workers 15.28%, Associate Professionals 14.2% and Managers 10%. The industries they worked in were Retail Trade 16.38%, Education 13.37%, Manufacturing 12.95% and Health and Community Services 11.99%. The unemployment rate was 3% and weekly wages for males ranged from $1000-$1499 at 10.95%, $800-$999 at 9.53%, $400-$499 at 8.11% and $120-$159 at 7.8% who again predominantly were retirement age. The weekly wages for females was $200-$299 at 13.90%, $160-$199 and $120-$159 both at 10.37% with the majority at retirement age again and $300-$399 at 9.24%.

School fees at School Two were not high: ‘The College Board is committed to maintaining as low a fee structure as possible’. The school also administered a sibling discount: that is, with each child attending the school the fees were discounted. It was further stated, ‘Parents are well represented on the Board’ and parents were also able to attend the school’s Association meetings. Membership of this Association was open ‘to any parent who meets the requirements set down in the Memorandum, applies for membership and is accepted by the Board’ (School Information Booklet: Fee Structure).

To encourage the Christian principles, the school endorsed that students and staff attended mass or ‘devotional time’ each morning where Bible stories, prayer and songs of worship were undertaken. Each campus had its own chapel and a school Chaplain was available for counselling students and families. The school principal felt parents chose this school for its pastoral care predominantly, and not the academic achievement of their children.
School Policy

The school placed an emphasis on pastoral care for its students, adopting a ‘Christ-centred life style’ and the nourishment of ‘mind, body and spirit’ (School Information Booklet: College Philosophy). The school portrayed its style of education as caring, warm and secure. The school motto was based on Christian beliefs and seeking God first. The school also believed in the development of independent learning skills along with ‘self discipline, initiative, self esteem and self motivation’. This philosophical framework the school hoped would ‘engender confident, purposeful students who see that striving for excellence is not an ideal of a bygone era’ (School Information Booklet: College Philosophy).

The school also explained its holistic philosophy, stating the ‘need to educate the whole child rather than just emphasise academic and physical realms’. School Two stated how ‘our caring and well-qualified Christian staff aim to ensure that your child’s full character, potential and abilities are nurtured in an atmosphere of concern’. However, the school was aware of the ‘future demands of the employers and tertiary institutions’ and the school and staff aimed to create a curriculum that kept these in mind. This school emphasised ‘a balance of care and curriculum’ (School Handbook).

In order to meet its demands of Christian beliefs, the school had a strict discipline code whereby ‘Self-discipline and responsible behaviour are the aims of the whole discipline policy’. The school implemented ‘positive reinforcement as well as negative disciplinary measures’, and felt ‘Students need clearly defined boundaries within which to operate. Whenever inappropriate behaviour occurs, the students are disciplined in order to bring about a modification in behaviour’. This discipline ‘must be administered with consistency and with Christian love for the students’ (School Information Booklet: Discipline Policy). The Principal displayed his strong belief in the school’s discipline policy and instilling the principles of morality and Christianity. The Principal showed a liking for standards and achieving goals. He felt the CSF was going back over old curriculum which he felt ‘was not necessarily a bad thing’ (Interview 27/5/99). This school encouraged an ‘old fashioned’ approach to education and raising children whereby good moral character along with a caring Christian but also strict approach were followed.

Curriculum

The educational objectives of School Two’s curriculum were based on students developing their abilities to the ‘highest level academically, socially, physically and emotionally’ (School Information Booklet: College Curriculum). Again the
curriculum mirrored the school’s philosophy, stating the aim to develop independent thinking, self-discipline, responsibility and sensitivity to others ‘as expressed in Jesus’ teachings in the Gospels’. The curriculum also recognised specific learning difficulties and the needs of some students. The curricula were planned within the guidelines of the Education Department Frameworks documents and prepared students for V.C.E. and future tertiary studies. As stated, ‘Emphasis will be given to learning basic literacy and numeracy skills, which give a firm foundation for the wide variety of other educational studies’. However, the head of the primary campus did recognise ‘an appropriate educational program into the year 2000 must also develop the scientific and technological skills necessary for each student’s future as well as ensuring an insightful appreciation of the arts in society’ (School Handbook).

Art in this school policy document was seen as ‘fostering each child’s creativity and artistic expression’ and introducing ‘many new and exciting ways of self-expression through drawing, painting, craft and sculpture’ (School Handbook). Music, however, had a higher profile than the visual arts. As stated this school ‘regards Music as a vital study, enabling students to develop a foundation of fine musicianship as well as excellent listening skills’ (School Handbook).

The school in junior years and years five and six had specialist teachers in Art, Physical Education, Music, Library Skills and Languages Other than English. Languages offered were Japanese and Indonesian. Students also attended Christian Education, Language, Mathematics, Health and Science, Social Education and Computer Education.

**Extra-curricular Activities**

Music played a major role in the extra-curricular activities offered at School Two with optional instrumental music and various bands. The school had a concert band, training band and stage band, choir and madrigal group. Instrumental music lessons were available during school hours at extra cost to parents. Classes were held for trumpet, trombone, French horn, euphonium, tuba, drums, percussion, piano, electric keyboard, flute, clarinet, saxophone, oboe, classical guitar, popular guitar, electric guitar, bass guitar, violin, viola and cello.

Students participated in interschool sporting competitions such as football, netball, swimming, athletics, cross-country and cricket and after school sports of netball and basketball were offered. Students also participated in school camps where they developed ‘social skills, tolerance and understanding’ (School Information Booklet: College Curriculum) as well as outdoor activities. Senior students were also able to visit Japan or Indonesia on an exchange program. The school also encouraged
students to care for others less fortunate with Project Care such as visiting the elderly, contributing to charities and sponsorship in World Vision.

Facilities

School Two consisted of four campuses which comprised a Kindergarten, a Junior School for years prep-four and a Middle and Senior School for years five-nine with the Senior school catering for years ten-twelve. There was also a fourth campus for prep-year seven with plans for extension up to year nine in the near future. Each campus had its own facilities of playing fields, library, music rooms, art/craft rooms, science laboratories and an Environment Centre at campus four. Year nine students at the Middle school campus also participated in Rural Technology Studies at a farm.

School Three

School Three was a government public school ‘situated in a Low Socio-Economic area’ (Operations and Documentation Manual 2000, p. 5). As stated in the school’s charter for 1997-1999, the student enrolment was 473 with 25.2 full-time teaching staff. The school had a special learning needs index of 1.2423 and ‘serves a predominantly rental community which is highly mobile and EMA (Education Maintenance Allowance) recipient’ (School Charter p. 4). ‘52% of the families are supported by the Education Maintenance Allowance’ (Operations and Documentation Manual, 2000, p. 5). The Census report confirms for this suburb that 24.87% are in rented dwellings whereas the School One area rented properties were 11.25% and for School Two it was 15.99%. Further in School Three there was a higher percentage of single parent families with 5.56% compared to School One 2.3% and 2.89% in School Two.

In School Three’s suburb, adults were predominately employed as Intermediate Production and Transport Workers 19.99%, Tradespersons and Related Workers 17.10%, Labours and Related Workers 125.12% or Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service Workers 12.51%. Only 2.7% were Managers and Administration and 6.8% Professionals. The industries most represented were Manufacturing 29.49%, Retail Trade 17.04%, Property and Business Services 6.71% and Health and Community Services 6.52%. The unemployment rate was 7.5%, more than double those of Schools One and Two. The weekly wages for males was $120-$159 at 16.14% and, while the majority was of retirement age at 18%, a high number was also of ages 25-34 at 16%. $500-$599 at 10.38%, $400-$499 at 10.23% and $300-$399 at 8.27%. For females, the weekly wages were $120-$159 at 16.32% which was again a majority at retirement age but also 17.08% between ages 45-54. 14.77% were earning $200-$299 with the majority in ages 35-44, 12.39% were at $160-$199 and 11.54% at $300-$399.
The school felt other significant factors for the school were ‘a highly mobile Koori [Aboriginal] sub-group (16 students)’ and a part-time teacher was employed ‘specific to the provision of support for students and families who experience social/emotional problems’. The school felt ‘Student Welfare is a key issue and the school through their own resources provides support of a Speech Therapist and Speech Aide, Guidance Officer and Home Liaison Officer’ (Operations and Documentation Manual 2000, p. 5). The Census report revealed 1.14% were Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander with 0.45% at School One and 0.39% at School Two.

**School Policy**

School Three believed in ‘principles and practices which facilitate: positive, strong and effective home/school linkages; the involvement of parents in the school’s educational programs; the promotion of inquiry based, discovery learning strategies, democratic and collaborative decision making; comprehensive student assessment and reporting procedures; appropriate student-teacher ratios’ (School Charter 1997-1999, p. 4).

The school promoted an ‘open door policy within the school, which provides parents the opportunity to develop a positive relationship with the school, which in turn enhances the education opportunities of the children’ (Operations and Documentation Manual 2000, p. 5). Parents were encouraged to play many roles in the school and had the opportunity to increase their skills by using the Technology Centre, parent Participation workshops and Early Years programs.

‘The school vision is to continue in all aspects to strive for educational excellence through the constant monitoring of its practices and curriculum’ (School Charter p. 5). The school motto encompassed the ideal to strive for excellence and saw technology as playing a crucial role in the achievements and success of its students, as evinced in the statements ‘Believing that technology is the key to success, [the school] seeks to incorporate up to date computer practices in both its administration and curriculum delivery’ and ‘Computers support learning programs from within the grade areas as well as from specific programs supplied from the school’s technology centre’ (School Charter, p. 5). As from 2000, grade six students undertook all of their classes in the technology centre, except for specialist areas of art, music, physical education and LOTE.

Priority 1 in the School Charter was ‘To increase the use of local technology to support students’ learning across the 8 KLAs of the curriculum’ (School Charter p. 12). This goal as Priority 1 emphasised the role technology was seen to play in the learning and success of the students at this school. The implementation of technology
was believed to ‘improve student outcomes’ and was ‘based on current evidence supporting the view that technology will provide the key learning achievements in the future’ (School Charter p. 12).

Curriculum

The school it was stated ‘is committed to the provision of a comprehensive, inclusive and sequential curriculum which reflects the 8 Key Learning Areas (KLAs). In the term of the current charter, particular emphasis was placed upon improving student outcomes relevant to Number and Reading’ (p. 4). As stated, ‘Where appropriate, grades are constructed around singular years’ and the ‘Key Learning Areas of Reading, Writing and Mathematics are taught within ability grouping with additional support supplied in the infant areas for Numeracy and Literacy’ (School Charter p. 5).

Students participated in Language, Mathematics, Science, Technology, Studies of Society and Environment, Health, LOTE (Japanese), Art/Craft, Drama and Dance. In term four grade six students at this school selected Art/Craft as an elective. The art teacher explained having Art/Craft as an elective allowed students to experience Dance as a compulsory subject in order to have boys participate in Dance, as they would not have chosen it as an elective. Having Dance as a compulsory component for term four also allowed students to practise for the end of school concert. Therefore, Art/Craft became an elective in term four along with Drama.

Extra-curricular Activities

In School Three students could undertake Instrumental music involving keyboarding, guitar and flute. Grades five and six students also participated in an end of year production which incorporated ‘modern dance’. Camps and excursions were organised to ‘provide experiences which will stimulate academic and social development. To provide cultural experiences which may not otherwise be included in the children’s family experiences’ (Operations and Documentation Manual 2000, p. 52).

The school also stated that it ‘has a proactive philosophy, exemplified by the provision of a diverse range of value added initiatives’ (p. 4), including a family maths night, Success Maker program, Parents as Tutors, After School Care, a breakfast program, Perceptual Motor Skills program, Parents and Computers, Pastoral Care and a Drug Education Program.

The school provided intervention with reading and spelling programs to improve reading ability and basic literacy skills. Success Maker aimed to improve reading
ability and maths throughout the school. The programs aimed to address the charter priorities of improving mathematical understanding and writing of children throughout the school. These needs were recognised after the school’s Triennial review, where ‘Space and Measurement needed to be worked on’ (School Charter, p. 13) and ‘raising the standard of written expression’ (School Charter, p.14) was identified as being necessary.

Students also participated in Road Safety, Personal Development and Healthy Relationships Programs. The Personal Development Program offered children ‘knowledge useful in everyday life, an appreciation of understanding and valuing self and others, and skills needed for decisions and taking action in everyday life’ (Operations and Documentation Manual 2000, p. 44). The Healthy Relationships program aimed to ‘encourage and promote the development of human values which will help children to set boundaries for their own behaviour’ and ‘help children obtain the understanding, knowledge and experiences of 36 basic values which are fundamental in the production of positive relationships’ (Operations and Documentation Manual 2000, p. 45).

Facilities

School Three had twenty-four classrooms, an Art/Craft room, a Technology Centre with seventy computers, playgrounds, shade areas, playground equipment, a small library and a multi-purpose room for Dance and Physical Education.

School Four

School Four was an elite co-educational private school that comprised three campuses: an Early Learning Centre, a Preparatory and a Senior school. It also had a long tradition of boarding, attracting regional, interstate and international boarders. School Four was over one hundred years old, originating as a traditional boys school priding itself on academic achievement and cultural attainment as well as sporting prowess. While parents of students in this school did vary, predominantly they were two income families of highly paid professionals, such as doctors, lawyers, nurses and teachers. Other parents also owned their own businesses. The students at this school came from various areas in the region. However, the majority were from two suburbs in particular. Therefore, data from the Census report will be presented from these areas.

The data from the main suburb will be presented first. The adults in this suburb were employed in occupations as Professionals 29%, Associate Professionals 13.63%, Managers and Administrators 9.8% and Trades 8.74%. Compared with School Three, this area had only 4.14% in both Intermediate Production and Transport
Workers and Labourers. The industries were Health and Community Services 15.45%, Retail Trade 14.05%, Education 12.5% and Manufacturing 11.43%. The unemployment rate was 3.63% and that of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were 0.23%. The weekly wages for males was 9.24% at $1000-$1499, 8.76% at $800-$999, 7.87% at $400-$499 and 7.5% at $120-$159 which was predominantly retirement age. For females the weekly wages were 13.11% at $200-$299, 11.03% at $160-$199, 9.96% at $120-$159 majority at retirement age and 9.56% at $400-$499. While the rent of housing appeared relatively high at 20%, 45.4% of homes were fully owned while in School Three only 29.56% of homes were fully owned. 3.05% were single parent families.

The second suburb where students lived and attended School Four had similar data to those of the previous suburb. Occupations were Professional 29%, Associate Professional 13.63%, Managers and Administrators 9.8% and Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service Workers 12.97%. Only 1.89% worked as Intermediate Production and Transport Workers. They were employed in industries of Health and Community Services at 18.7%, Property and Business at 14.5%, Education at 12.58% and Government Administration and Defence at 11.61%. This was due to a Military Base in this suburb. The weekly income for males was 13% at $200-$299 but of this 31.48% were 75 years and over. 11.38% was in the $160-$199 range and again the majority in the retirement age group. 10.41% was at $400-$499 and 9.92% at $300-$399 again with the highest numbers in the retirement ages. This indicates that the majority of people living here were retired. Of those aged 35-44 the highest range was $800-$999 with 18.84% and then $1000-$1499 with 14.49%. In School Three in this age group the highest range was $500-$599 with 15.86% while in the $800-$999 range the percentage was 11.2% and in the $1000-$1499 range it was only 5.68%.

For females weekly wages were 18.64% at $200-$299, 13.89% at $160-$199, 10.6% at $120-$159 and 9.5% at $300-$399. Again for all of these figures the highest age range was that of the retired age with the highest percentage of females for this area being in the 75 years and over age group at 28.88%. As far as housing was concerned 22.64% owned their own homes and 10.28% were renting. Only 1.62% were single parent families and no one was an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander. The unemployment rate was 3.36%. Due to the number of boarders at this school from interstate, the data presented from the census report figures are only a partial indication of student background, compared to the other schools.

School Four was funded by high student fees, government funding for independent schools, fundraising events and donations by various members of the community,
such as staff past and present, former students and parents. Those who made donations were thanked in the school’s monthly community magazine. Also listed in this magazine were the names of former students and what they are doing as far as careers are concerned, along with engagements, marriages, births and deaths. This is an indication and display of the importance this school placed on maintaining an association and affiliation with former students and a way of indicating expectations of success to current students. It is an extensive and pervasive association with former students as the school often holds reunions and ‘get-togethers’ and past students offer their support, time and expertise in various fields and functions for the school. Along with the monthly magazine an annual magazine testified to the cultural, sporting, academic and social events and achievements of the school.

School Policy

School Four fostered an environment of competition, success and achievement in all areas attained through hard work. This philosophy is based on Christian principles whereby striving for individual achievement and self-fulfilment combine with concern for others (School Handbook). The school is affiliated with the Uniting Church and states its ‘ethos is based on Christian principles, fostering an environment where students develop a powerful sense of self and respect for the differences, abilities and achievements of each other’ (School Handbook, p. 4).

Tradition played a major role in School Four as a sense of pride and expectation. This was evident in the School Handbook where the statement, ‘The tradition begins...’ was blazoned across the top of the first page with photos of past and present school principals. On the following page the school principal stated the school ‘combines its long and proud tradition with a strong commitment to progress, and the excellent academic results and all-round achievements of its students reflect the success of that philosophy’ (School Handbook p. 2). The principal further emphasised the importance of tradition in the school magazine, stating ‘we are the inheritors of an estimable tradition’ (1999, p. 2).

Students were aware of the tradition bestowed upon them. The school captains stated in the school magazine that the school has a ‘sense of tradition that exists in today’s students’ and ‘One of the most important elements of the [school] is its rich sense of history and tradition. From the old buildings that radiate character, to the pride continually stirring in the hearts of its members when a time-honoured football song or war cry is expounded after a [school] victory’ (p. 6). This statement also testifies to the competitiveness and success of the school.
The tradition and past of this school formed the basis of its ethos and underpinned the identity of those who were associated with the school. Students were aware of how the past and the traditions of the school had formed their habitus: 'the past is so important not just in shaping the future, but in defining who we are' (School Magazine 1999, p. 6). Their continued association forever defined them as a member of this elite group and, therefore, being recognised as a previous student of the school was an important component of attending this school.

The students also realised the importance of this membership which can be understood as being a member of the school community. 'All past students are encouraged to maintain life-long contact with the school' (School Handbook, p. 18). For membership into this community is both valued and valuable as a form of social capital whereby resources are based on connections and group membership. The school captain reported 'the sense of community for which our school is renowned' (School Magazine 1999, p. 6) and how the school 'has a spirit of community and welcome'. This welcome, however, is selective and, while the school does not test or screen children before entry, selection is produced through high school fees and self-elimination.

Part of the reason for attending this school was the advantage and opportunity given to the students, such as access to resources and facilities, but also the accumulation of cultural capital. As stated by the principal, 'Children educated at [the school] enjoy great advantages and opportunities which stimulate their minds and prepare their bodies for a confident, healthy and well-balanced future' (School Handbook, p. 3). There was also an awareness on the part of the students as to the advantages given to them and of what the school had provided: 'This school has provided me with a start to life I shall always cherish' (School Magazine 1999, p. 6) and the school has 'Provided us with a firm foundation for the coming years' (p. 6).

The school motto further attested to achieving great heights, it appeared in Latin underneath the school Coat of Arms and aspires to students reaching for the stars. Therefore, the accomplishments of the students are potentially unlimited. Further the principal stated, 'We encourage our students to search within themselves and discover their aspirations' (School Handbook, p. 2). These aspirations are based on tradition, success, reaching greatness and realising expectations and opportunities.

Curriculum

'Traditional academic disciplines continue to flourish at all levels' (School Handbook, p. 3). Students studied core subjects of English, Mathematics, Science, SOSE, Physical Education, Religious Studies, Art/Craft and LOTE. The languages taught in
the school were French, Chinese and Latin. The school also offered Drama, Music, Sport, Outdoor Education, Environmental Education and Health.

The school’s curricula were based on a liberal education where there was an understanding of the importance of the arts and sport. ‘As part of our strong commitment to a broad, liberal education, we offer a vibrant creative arts, sports and music program as well as a quality second language learning experience to all students’ (School Handbook, p. 3).

Extra-curricular Activities

A wide range of sports was offered at the school such as basketball, softball, swimming, hockey, fencing, netball, tennis, football, cricket, soccer, snow sports and rowing. Students were also offered an extensive musical education with private tuition in classical instruments such as violin, clarinet, viola, cello, trumpet, French horn, piano and voice. Students performed in symphony and string orchestras, concert and stage bands, ensembles and choirs in the local community and competitions. Students also attended drama and performed in productions throughout the year.

For the preparatory school during the year additional activities included debating, Tournament of the Minds, Maths Olympiad, Maths Talent Quest, Science Talent Search, Model Solar Car construction, Inter school sport, Ceramics, Writers workshop, the year six Challenge, year eight production, Music performance evenings, House Leadership opportunities, Inter house competitions and various academic competitions (School Magazine 1999, p. 3). The Head of the preparatory school commented how ‘some of our students took part in many or all of these activities!’ (School Magazine 1999, p. 3). This level of involvement testifies to the competitive nature developed and expected in this school. For it was also stated, ‘We do expect that all of our children will take up some or all of the opportunities that are offered by the school. We do expect that our students will represent the school and their families with pride and we do expect that our students will give their best in everything that they do’ (School Magazine 1999, p. 3).

For the senior school it was stated, ‘Academic studies are supported by a rich variety of co-curricular activities, including: theatre, music ensembles, debating, sport, the House of Guilds, camps, exchanges, school committees and major social events’ (School Handbook p. 9).

Facilities

The school possessed extensive facilities. The preparatory campus was set among 14.5 hectares of gardens and sporting grounds divided into two learning areas: the early
learning centre and preparatory school. This campus had a swimming pool, arts centre, science laboratories, gymnasium, tennis courts, library with multi-media centre and seminar room, environment centre and animal nursery, multi-purpose hall, music centre, technology centre and use of notebook computers in classrooms and for individual students when they reached year eight and onwards for use in class and at home. The senior campus had a hockey field, tennis courts, netball and basket ball courts, squash courts, fully equipped gymnasium, weights room and aerobics studio. There was also an indoor recreation centre with an eight lane 25 metre pool, indoor diving pool with one and three metre diving boards. Due to the centre’s opening in 1999, swimming, diving and water polo were to be added to the list of school sports. The school also had football ovals, science laboratories, an arts center and computer centres. School Four further had a chapel where a chaplain worked full-time at the senior school and a minister part-time in the preparatory school.

Aspirations Espoused in the Schools

The combination of cultural capital and habitus is a vital element in the development of an agent’s aspirations. The school ethos and the messages given to students can inform and enhance their aspirations or limit them. As discussed, Bourdieu (1977, 1991) espouses how people work within a ‘sense of limits’ or reality, knowing one’s place and becoming what one is. This message is expressed in the family and then reiterated in the school. While the culturally subordinated realise their limitations the culturally privileged are expected to maintain their positions through a sense of ‘cultural obligation’.

The pressure to maintain cultural privilege was evident in School Four where students were expected to achieve academically and participate in many extra-curricular activities including sport and the arts. Students were encouraged to ‘discover their aspirations’ and rate their success and achievement against previous students, who acted as models of success. In the school’s magazine the principal discussed the achievement of their most ‘distinguished’ student and how his ‘life’s work serves as a great model’. While the principal realised that ‘Absolute excellence in the traditional fields of prowess—academic and co-curricula—does not, of course, touch every student...it is our avowed aim for each and every one to strive for personal distinction. Our prime duty...is to ensure that every possible opportunity is given to our students to realise their worth...which will enable each student to make their own individual mark in [the] world’ (School Magazine 1999, p. 2). Students were expected to achieve their absolute best and to aim for the stars as was expressed in their school motto. The need to remain focused on their achievements was observed by the use of the actual word ‘focus’. This word was used frequently by teachers observed in School Four during lessons. It was used in relation to students focusing
on their work and their behaviour. It indicates the ethos of the school: the expectations of the students to focus, to have direction and to achieve. Students were not allowed to flounder in their work or their attitude. The use of the word 'focus' was not observed in any of the other three schools.

By comparison, School Three hoped students would find success through the use of technology and early intervention programs which aimed to assist and raise the levels of numeracy and literacy. The school also aspired for students to be able to maintain healthy relationships by setting boundaries for themselves and giving them the knowledge of basic values fundamental to positive relationships. This insinuates that these students did not have these basic skills and, therefore, the school played the role of 'social teacher'.

School Two encouraged, above all, Christian values and aspirations of kindness and Christ like sentiments: 'to adopt Christian perspectives and standards within their lifestyles' (School Information Booklet: School Philosophy). The educational objectives of the school aimed to 'ensure that each student was assisted to develop his or her abilities to the highest level academically, socially, physically and emotionally' and further to 'guide students towards a spirit of freedom and confidence which recognises self-discipline and responsibility' (School Information Booklet: School Curriculum). However, Christian values were again espoused with students developing 'a sense of self-appreciation, social awareness, integrity and responsibility, particularly in becoming sensitive to the needs of others as expressed in Jesus' teachings in the Gospels' (School Information Booklet: School Curriculum). Students were involved in 'a wide range of experiences which will enable them to participate effectively in, and cope with the pressures of modern society' (School Information Booklet: School Curriculum). The educational aims of this school, therefore, reveal aspirations more towards developing model, contributing, socially aware and responsible citizens.

School One encouraged self worth and achievement, along with risk taking. Predominantly, though, School One was concerned with developing students' learning techniques to acquire 'life-long learning skills'. However, it reinstated the setting of 'realistic' goals ensuring students did not think beyond their limits, and that they realised their 'sense of reality'.

**Student Aspirations**

Each of the four schools inculcated varying aspirations for the students depending on the ethos the school displayed and imparted on the students. However, the students were also drawn to the schools, particularly the private schools, due to their
background and the correlation between what the school offered and what the parents envisaged for their children. Therefore, parents who valued an education where extra-curricular activities were important, and who had the financial funds, would send their children to a select school, such as School Four to ensure ‘success’. These parents realised the importance of investing in their children’s education, the illusio, and of acquiring educational capital which then translates as cultural capital and aids the maintenance of social class position.

The aspirations of most students at School Four were high as they aimed to be lawyers, doctors, a marine biologist, a pilot, a vet, an Egyptologist, a choreographer and an actor. These students possessed the dispositions, the habitus and the cultural capital, along with the opportunities to achieve these aspirations. For these students this was their ‘sense of reality’ as their parents were often established in these professions. The aspirations of students was evident in their knowledge of, and the expectation to attend, university, and even specific universities. During an observation some of the grade six students started talking about what university they wanted to attend. They one another if they were going to Deakin University (as they knew this was where I was from). ‘It’s okay there,’ Jonathan stated. ‘I want to go to Melbourne Uni. Where are you going to go?’ He asked another boy. ‘I want to go to RMIT,’ replied Jess. ‘That’s good for computers,’ said Jonathan. ‘Is that what you want to do?’ ‘No,’ Jess answered. ‘I want to do cars’. Jess then started talking about Mercedes. ‘It’s Mercedes, Jess’, Jonathan corrected him on his pronunciation. Then they started asking each other what they wanted to be. ‘I don’t know,’ Jonathan said. ‘I haven’t really thought about it – I’d like to be an actor’ (Field Notes 17/5/00). So evidently he had thought about it and certainly had a knowledge about the different universities and their attributes. The fact that Jonathan wanted to be an actor displays an interest and an acceptance of the arts which was expressed in his school.

Students in the other three schools did not display such a knowledge of their ambitions or universities. When asked in interviews, students in School Three aspired to be footballers, a cartoonist, horse rider, an artist, a roller blader, a teacher, a plumber and a wrestler. James stated, ‘I’m going to be a wrestler so I can lift up chairs and hit people over the head with them’ (Interview 17/7/00). The majority of students interviewed said they had not talked to their parents about what they hoped to do when they were older and they had a limited knowledge of universities. Mark wanted to be an ‘AFL star’ but felt his parents would like him to ‘Be smart, go to university, which I am, and have a good education and I’m gonna finish school...after that I’ll go to university. Is that after? High school then university and probably go to TAFE and get a job there’. He felt the type of job he would get after university would
be ‘A good one, ‘cause I’ll be a AFL player but AFL players have to have jobs... the job I’ll probably have will be a smart one. Um I don’t know what job I’ll have. It’s a hard thing to decide. I don’t know’ (Interview 17/7/00).

Students in School One discussed wanting to be artists, footballers and teachers and students at School Two mentioned aspirations of being a teacher, a hairdresser, an artist, a businessman, a police man, work in a bank, making computer games and be a basketballer.

Therefore, it can be assumed that these students’ ambitions were influenced by their parents’ jobs and also by the ethos developed from their school, and it acted to inform their habitus and aspirations.

Gifts and Talents

Another ethos developed in schools is the idea of the innate gift or the talent as a means for success. In School Four the idea of having a gift or talent was spoken about by some students and teachers. The idea of the gift was discussed usually regarding ability in art or sport. As examined in Chapter 4, Bourdieu finds that the idea of the innate gift is a means of the privileged to justify their educational dominance and mask the social origin of educational success. In relation to art, Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) find that the ideology of talent denies the social and cultural conditions of acquisition which is attained through familiarisation; instead it treats this as a natural gift (p. 69).

One of the art teachers in School Four stated to me how ‘Louis is actually quite a talented little painter’ and ‘Alice really who’s actually quite a bright child but doesn’t really have a great deal of artistic talent’ (Field Notes 6/6/00). Sarah, one of the students in School Four, discussed how ‘if you’re good at learning an instrument, if you pick it up really easy, than that’s a gift’. When asked if someone is good at art or music if that is a gift, she replied, ‘Yeah, they’re gifted in that way and if they think they are terrible at English or maths, if they want to get better they have to have extra lessons or give it more of an effort’. She felt she was gifted in ‘Probably long distance running, I won the school and district event, I like maths and English, I really like English, I think I’m probably gifted in that sense’ (Interview 18/7/00).

Nessie, another student at School Four, also felt she had a gift or talent. When asked how you know when you have a talent she stated, ‘Well if you’re good at it, and you practise, and a lot of people say your art’s good and you need to practise it. Like you do if you do an instrument because the teachers usually tell you, because my teacher tells me I’ve got a talent for violin so I have to keep on practising’. Therefore, she felt
that one was told that one was talented and how her teacher 'makes me work hard to get it all out of me and I think I've probably got, I don't know if I've got a talent for art or if I'm just good at it' (Interview 20/7/00). Therefore, Nessie realised she had to practise to be good. However, this was somewhat disguised with the idea of the talent. The notion of talent was mentioned only once in another school: Jessica in School Three believed that people made art 'To show their feelings and talent' (Interview 17/7/00). Therefore, the notion of talent again was thought to be for artists with an innate natural ability. In this sense, this student was excluding herself from having this talent, whereas students at School Four felt they possessed a gift or talent.

Bourdieu (1993b) finds that schools treat socially conditioned inequalities of cultural competence as natural inequalities, in other words, as inequalities of gifts or natural talents (p. 233). Further, Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) espouse that 'By acting as if inequalities in relation to culture can only stem from natural inequalities, that is, inequalities of talent, and by neglecting to provide for everyone that which some derive from their family, the school system perpetuates and sanctions initial inequalities' (p. 68). Therefore, it is vital to examine each school's relation to culture to ascertain the extent to which each site is providing, or neglecting to provide, the essential art experience for students to obtain a cultivated disposition. In Chapter 8 the value of art will be explored in each school, where a sense of familiarity with the world of art is developed and recognition of the value of art and the ability to appropriate it are inculcated.
Chapter 8 Valuing of Art

Bourdieu (1993b) finds, ‘Even when the educational institution makes little provision for art training proper, it tends on the one hand to inspire a certain familiarity — conferring a feeling of belonging to the cultivated class — with the world of art, in which people feel at home and among themselves...; and on the other hand to inculcate a cultivated disposition as a durable and generalized attitude which implies recognition of the value of works of art and the ability to appropriate them by means of generic categories’ (p. 230).

Developing a familiarity with the world of art and inculcating a cultivated disposition, where a positive attitude towards the arts is activated, are vital components in constructing the value of art. As discussed in Chapter 5, the value of art is a legitimate cultural practice for the culturally advantaged who use art as a form of social distinction. As discussed, the value of art is attained by entering the art field and believing in the practices within the field; the doxa. One also has to have the illusio, that is, valuing the investment in the field and the resultant profits; cultural capital. Consequently, valuing art by entering the art field and partaking in cultural practices has social implications for the development of cultural obligation and cultural aspiration.

However, a distinction is made with the valuing of certain forms of art and artistic styles such as the fine arts over craft based forms. Consequently, the approach towards the teaching of art by teachers will be examined as it reflects an art or craft based emphasis in each school. The division between craft and art is seen as the mental/manual distinction and was discussed in Chapter 5 as having social implications. The valuing of high or fine art is seen to bring forms of cultural capital which define the socially dominant class as the ‘cultivated class’. Bourdieu (1983b) finds that school learning tends to create the inclination to admire works approved by the school and a duty to admire certain works or classes of works which are linked to educational and social status (p. 230). Therefore, valuing these specific arts is not apparent or accessible to all, thereby limiting the ability to appropriate these works and confining the cultural capital of the already subordinated groups or ‘uncultivated class’.

Bourdieu places great importance on familiarity with art as a means to recognise the value of art and the ability to appropriate it. Bourdieu (1984) finds that the mastery of appropriation evolves from familiarisation which is acquired predominantly by contact with works of art (p. 4). Therefore, the accessibility of works of art in the classroom and around the school enhances and develops the students’ familiarisation and
competence in appropriation. As mentioned, appropriation of artworks is an ability to decipher the codes of artworks, that is, to have the generic categories required to appraise the work in a disinterested approach. This ability is fostered in the home and in the school where children receive a cultivated disposition, thereby, valuing art and acquiring the ability to decipher art appropriately.

The valuing of art can be revealed in certain ways in schools, such as the study of art in terms of making and appreciating, time allotted to the arts, displays of student and other artwork around the school, priority areas of subjects, excursions to art galleries, the study of particular artists, artist in residence programs and art curriculum days. All aspects mentioned can demonstrate the type of art programs taught in each school based on the value placed on art and further develops a familiarity with art for students in that particular school. The following discussion will examine the value of art in each school and the art program taught by each teacher.

School One

Due to School One’s major involvement with an annual art/craft fair as a form of fundraising, the school appeared to have a high profile in the arts. The school foyer testified to this with student work displayed and changed regularly. Artwork by local artists was also displayed in the foyer. These works were purchased from the art/craft fair as a school requisite. These artworks were predominantly paintings of landscapes, seascapes or portraits in a realistic style.

In the arts area, students participated in a drama performance and an end of year concert, and attended visiting productions and student artworks were submitted in local exhibitions, such as the local regional country show and the local bank. Student artwork was also displayed and judged by a local artist in the school’s art/craft fair. In 1998 over 200 paintings were exhibited by local artists. Most paintings were in a realistic style and many were of the local area. Pottery, china painting and porcelain dolls along with other craft items were also exhibited. While students had contact with artworks from the school’s art and craft fair, they did not attend the local gallery for excursions. Grades five and six students did visit the National Gallery in Canberra when on excursion.

During the research, School One had undergone a change of staff from 1998 to 1999, when the art teacher moved into the classroom and a new art teacher was employed. There was a distinct difference between these two teachers in their approach to the visual arts as a body of knowledge and their philosophy regarding what students should be achieving in visual arts. Teacher One had a definite craft based approach towards the arts and stated her approach was focused on making and doing and was
skills-based and materials-based. Teacher Two was art specialist trained at a secondary level and had a process based approach and believed students should partake in art making and appreciation.

Teacher One was not art specialist trained, and, while it appeared that art had a high profile in the school, she felt other subjects took precedence when excursions occurred. Consequently, excursions to art galleries rarely occurred. Students attended art lessons for one hour a week in a separate art classroom with a thematic approach correlating with classroom themes. In the art room artworks by other artists were not displayed. Art resources were limited as art books were also not used for reference by the teacher or students. There were sets of art/craft magazines for the teacher’s use.

With Teacher One students made craft-based objects such as puppets using clay, Indonesian shadow puppets using paper and dowel, marionette puppets with paper mache and woodwork. Students also created political cartoons and political puppets for the theme ‘Discovering Democracy’. For Easter they made a rabbit, chicken or bilby from clay. For the 1998 art/craft fair, students painted animals in their natural environment to correlate with the ‘Endangered Animals’ theme and also created animal toys from threads and textiles using pom-poms and plaits. Students had also attended an excursion to Madame Tausaud’s for the theme ‘Replicas of Ourselves’ and made a modroc mould of their faces adding facial features with paint and hair. Students also painted animal masks, backdrops and props for a drama production.

Teacher One based her work program on the 1967 Curriculum Guide: Art and Craft, (Primary Education Department of Victoria), within which there was a model of art and craft curriculum outline of two and three dimensional activities: painting, drawing, threads and textiles, clay modelling and constructional activities. Activities listed included stage sets for class dramas, puppetry, mask making, paper mache, simple crafts, woodwork, weaving and pottery. The correlation between these activities and her work program was obvious. As she stated, ‘I like them to do woodwork, clay modelling, drawing, painting, threads and textiles, paper craft, construction. I like them to make a mask of some description and do some puppetry and printing so I try and incorporate through my activity something in each of those areas’ (Interview 20/8/98).

Teacher Two felt the visual arts had a fairly good place in the school and because of the school’s association with the art/craft fair the art reputation was quite good, but this also brought with it high expectations. She felt that parents and other staff did not understand the importance of the visual arts and were more concerned that students do something fun and creative, but failed to see the skills being learnt. She said, ‘...they
don’t understand the skills that they’re learning they won’t learn in other areas and I think teachers’ perceptions are very much the same unless they’ve taught in the arts themselves’. She felt this affected what she was expected to teach, which was more end-based products, and found this in contradiction to her own beliefs of process-based. She stated: ‘I think to be honest what staff and parents would like is a lot of beautiful things out in the display board and as long as it’s pretty work and it’s something they can credit their child to they’re happy, whereas...I’m not necessarily interested in that. It’s the process I’m interested in’ (Interview 17/3/99).

At the time of the interview, Teacher Two had worked in the school for approximately seven weeks and planned to make changes to the art program. She recognised the craft focus of the previous art teacher and planned to introduce more art history and aesthetics. She explained, ‘I think in most schools...in art classes there is too much focus on creating and making...I’d like to show them how real artists work...I’ll be doing classes where all they’ll be doing is just research work or projects rather than creating and making all the time’ (Interview 17/3/99). However, Teacher Two was aware of the limited resources, such as text books, in this school to incorporate art appreciation. She stated,‘I think primary art is usually very much based on creating things and I don’t think that there’s enough art history and art aesthetics taught and I think if they had a class set [of books] even if it’s really simple they’d start to realise the importance of that [art history and aesthetics] as well...That’s something that would be good to change, but we’ll just have to wait and see’ (Interview 17/3/99).

Teacher Two felt it important to incorporate all of the substrands of the CSF: ‘creating, making and presenting’, she liked to cover aspects of printmaking, painting, and modelling and wanted to move away from focusing on craft and look more seriously at artists and learning about the process. She explained, ‘I’m trying to get them to see themselves as artists’. She felt that the substrand of ‘past and present contexts’ would naturally fall into the art areas as she would show works relating to what students were creating. ‘Arts criticism and aesthetics’ she felt would also naturally be incorporated and she would have ‘a small discussion on it within their creating and making or I would sit down and have a lesson where all they’re doing is art aesthetics’. She felt this focus allowed students to realise there was more than just one aspect of visual arts. She stated, ‘it’s good to incorporate them throughout the one lesson perhaps in some way but I think it’s important to have a focus just on that because otherwise you’re saying that the most important thing in art is creating and making’ (Interview 17/3/99).

During the time she had taught in the school, Teacher Two introduced students to art scrapbooks or portfolios. She planned to incorporate more structured discussions
about artworks and writing in portfolios. However, Teacher Two said the art program was still predominantly studio-based, but she was trying to have students experience all of the substrands of the CSF but was finding it difficult. She explained: 'I'm trying but it seems to me that they're not used to that. I really think that it's just as important that they have past and present information and art aesthetics...and they have a hard time with that...If they're sitting down explaining goes beyond ten minutes they're starting to show me signs that they're bored because I'm talking too much...It's just a different way of them doing it here' (Interview 17/3/99). She felt that to start with the students would not cope with the change and that they would say, 'What are we doing this for? We're meant to be making things in here', she felt this was 'because that's what they're used to' (Interview 17/3/99).

The artwork produced with Teacher Two consisted of developing a colour wheel based on Australian animals. Students also painted Aboriginal designs, based on indigenous artworks, for the theme 'Multicultural Australia'. Students did printing using various techniques, such as string printing and foam board printing of a ship for the 'First Fleet' theme. They used found objects to make markings and create a bird using these tools. Clay modelling was in the form of a human figure adding texture and oxides to show an aged appearance as these were based on the 'Gold Rush' theme.

School Two

School Two had four art teachers for grades five and six. Three of them participated in the research as one of them did not want to participate in the study. Teacher One, who was also Head of the Art Department, and the principal agreed that the profile of the arts in the school was not high. Teacher One felt there were 'those who are very sympathetic to the arts and value the arts...then there are those who still have a notion of the frill of the curriculum...first thing to go if there are cuts' (Interview 4/5/99). The principal admitted to not knowing what occurred in the art room and whether or not it complied with the CSF. Despite this, Teacher One stated, 'I think the school is realising more and more the value of a high profile arts program' (Interview 4/5/99). She explained how the school had incorporated a gallery into the foyer and a display policy whereby student work could be acquired. The students also attended excursions to the local gallery in level four once a year, and had a Festival week with a visiting artist and a school art show which incorporated art by students and artists. All of these art related activities were encouraged by the Head of Art and not so much the school.

The foyer in School Two had limited decoration: in a small waiting room there was one large painting by a previous student and there were some smaller artworks by
students. However, the foyer was quite sparse. In comparison the principal’s office, which was recently renovated, was highly decorated with two leather couches, a large wooden desk and drapes. Some student artwork was also displayed along with various ornaments and collectables. This office was obviously meant to make an impression on visitors/parents of taste and wealth.

Resources for the arts were adequate with a lot of art books for teachers to use as reference materials and students to use as inspiration. Teacher One realised, however, that with the introduction of art appreciation in the CSF: The Arts, schools needed to have the resources for students to discuss artworks which can be expensive. Therefore, she explained she bought one art book a year from the art budget and these were kept in the library (Field Notes 7/5/99).

Each of the art teachers taught to their own individual style and philosophy, as there was not an overall philosophy regarding art in the school as a whole. Therefore, each art teacher’s program and aims in art were quite different. Teacher One was very pro-CSF and followed a DBAE approach; students looked at many examples of artwork. Teacher Two was anti-CSF and highly suspicious of accountability; however, she too had students look at artworks. Teacher Three felt the CSF ‘was okay’ but she was not confident with teaching the visual arts. She stated she had not done a lot of appreciation but felt she could. Students in each campus attended art in a separate art room and undertook two fifty minute lessons of art each week, usually consecutively, which allowed for a one hour and forty minute session.

Teacher One was art trained and this was evident in her lessons where she spoke about different artists and their work. During one of her lessons students were making a mask from clay, decorated with paint, feathers and wool. At the beginning of this lesson she introduced students to various styles of masks from different cultures such as Indian American, African, Mexican, Japan, Classical Greece, Rome and Egypt. Students used these for ideas for decorating their masks. In another lesson students painted an emu egg with Aboriginal designs. The art teacher discussed some of the characteristics of Aboriginal design and elements such as dot work and patterns. In Teacher One’s art room there were many displays of various artworks, and she referred to some of the displays of contemporary Aboriginal art. Students also produced a print using foam board, and metallic inks on black paper. This was based on their ‘Space’ theme. Again, the teacher produced reference books for students to use for inspiration in their drawings which they completed in their sketch books before transferring to the foam board. Another class produced a relief sculpture for the ‘Space’ theme, by gluing pipe cleaners, straws and pop sticks onto
card and covering with aluminium foil. The teacher discussed what relief sculpture meant at the beginning of the lesson and referred to examples around the room.

Her work program showed students participated in a variety of media and elements of art such as exploring line, shape and pattern, where they produced scratch art, paper mosaic and tile painting based on a ‘Sea Creatures’ theme. Students also studied Aboriginal design by looking at Aboriginal author and artist Sally Morgan’s work from ‘The Flying Emu and other stories’. Students created their own narrative using symbols, animals, shapes and patterns. Students further explored crayon resist with wax pastels and water dye. Students made a dragon decorated with patterns to create a camouflage with the background.

Teacher Two in School Two was also art trained and felt that some art teachers are just ‘thrown in’ and that teacher training ‘was not adequate’ (Field Notes 11/5/99). Teacher Two taught at a different campus than Teacher One and the school foyer had student artworks displayed as well as in the art room. However, no other artworks were displayed in the artroom. Students looked at other artists’ examples relating to the unit of work they were undertaking. During observations students had commenced a unit on interior design looking at clay work by Tricia Guild, and students had made a clay cup and saucer. They had also previously worked with pastels to decorate a room using different patterns, textures and perspective; again this unit was influenced by Trisha Guild. During the new unit of work observed, students designed a corner of a room with card which was decorated with oil pastels and they had to make furniture, etc from clay. Students firstly sketched ideas for their interiors in a sketch book; this work demonstrated the use of perspective and colour as well as 3-dimensional objects and an appropriate size for their room. Students used the skills taught in the previous two units with blending and scraping techniques with oil pastels for room decoration and clay joining techniques for creating the furniture.

Teacher Two did not want to give a copy of her work program. Therefore, any more units of work other than what were observed were unavailable.

Teacher Three at School Two was trained in ceramics: the art room she was teaching in revealed this interest as various artworks displayed were pot designs, teapots and sculptures in ceramics. There were also prints of Picasso’s abstract paintings and a Chagall print. Minimal student work was displayed, which was predominantly ceramics. The week before observing the art lesson, students had looked at work by Van Gogh and the Fauves then experimented with colours and different techniques of paint application. They then had a pre-drawn still life which they had to paint using the different colours and techniques they experimented with. The teacher felt they still
tended to use ‘normal colours’ which she had wanted them to break away from (Field Notes 28/5/99). Approximately half way through this lesson most students had completed their painting; for the rest of the lesson students received a pre-drawn picture of a car front window and students had to draw what they would see through the window.

During the second lesson I observed Teacher Three wrote different emotions on the board and two circles, then she asked students to draw a sad and happy face in the circles. Then she asked one student to draw an angry line on the board. Students then used black paper and dry pastels to make drawings, trying to show emotions with lines. At first the students seemed confused and looked at one another’s papers; students began to work more freely after a while. The teacher moved around the room and asked students to explain their work and the use of line. For those who finished early they could free draw which had students revert back to simplified, ‘formulaic’ drawings of trees and cartoon characters.

Teacher Three’s work program revealed students had experimented with printing with different objects other than a paint brush such as sticks, fingers, foam blocks and plastic. They also produced a painting on ‘Bugs Life’ as the theme with a background and a bug made from clay and placed in the foreground. Students produced a colour wheel. Students also had sketchbooks in which they experimented with colour use and painting techniques such as contrasting colours and scratching back to reveal an underneath colour. Teacher Three seemed to base her units on experimenting with various techniques but also had prepared hand out sheets for students to work from.

School Three

Art was not a high priority in School Three: as noted previously in Chapter 7, Mathematics and Literacy took precedence along with providing students with social welfare programs. The principal claimed that ‘The parents in this school do not value art; they want their children to do Maths and English’ (Interview 7/6/00).

Students attended art for an hour once a week in a separate art classroom that was not very spacious or organised. Students mainly produced craft-based items relating to the theme of their year level for the term. The art teacher felt the thematic approach was restrictive sometimes but this was what the school expected so she complied. She felt it was important that students enjoy art and to be creative and for some students to forget about their home background. She also felt students liked to take something home and have a feeling of success, that they could do something. She stated, ‘These kids probably more than anyone want something concrete to take home and say, “I’ve
done this. I’ve made this, this is mine,” (Interview 25/11/99). She also indicated that for these children they could do art ‘as an outlet: they might use art to express themselves...it’s a release because...these kids might never have a full time job and the prospects for some of them aren’t that good’ (Interview 25/11/99). Again this statement indicates the importance of welfare issues within the school where art was used as a form of therapy.

Around the school, student artworks were displayed as well as around the art room itself. A mural of each child’s hand was on a playground wall and an Aboriginal Koori mural represented the Aboriginal ancestry of some of the school’s students. The art teacher explained how the principal wanted artworks displayed, but this did take a lot of time. She felt it was important though and tried to have each child’s work on display throughout the year as it made them feel their work was worthwhile.

Despite the displays of student art around the school, the art teacher felt that art was not valued as much as she would have liked. While there was a separate art room and a specialist art teacher, images of artists’ work were not displayed in the art room. School Three had very few books on art in the library: there were approximately ten art books along with craft, buildings and ‘how to’ books. This school had A Child’s Guide to Looking at Paintings, which was a donation. Therefore, students had little or no contact with artworks in this school, limiting their familiarity with art and their valuing of it. Students did not visit the art gallery on school excursions with this teacher and had been only once with a previous art teacher.

During observations of art lessons in Term Four 1999, the grade six students chose art as an elective. These students were producing craft-based work, such as a bird puppet using wool pieces, leather strips and goggle eyes; they also made a signature bear from a pattern cut out on material and hand sewn. The art teacher’s work program revealed students made a construction of a peg creature for the theme ‘Myths and Legends’. Students created a fossil using card, toilet paper and sand. Grade five students still participated in art as a core subject and participated in the regional show with the theme of ‘Living in the Year 2000’ by making a poster with a variety of materials. They produced a clay piece related to the theme ‘Occupations’ and drew a landscape using pastels to show a background and foreground. The teacher demonstrated ‘drawing “carrot” people—an easy way to depict the human figure’ (Work Program 29th October 1999). For the ‘Australian’ theme students produced a ‘stained glass’ using cellophane based on ‘Australiana—gum leaves, kangaroos, sharks, boomerangs’ (Work Program 5th November 1999). For Christmas students made cards using the quilling technique. The art teacher admitted that her program
was craft-based, stating, 'I'm more into craft than art...I probably do a fair bit of craft because that's what the children like to do the most'. Despite this she felt, 'I do a fairly balanced program really' (Interview 18/11/99).

As explained above, in Term Four grade six students selected art as an elective and, therefore, not all grade six students were participating in art during initial observations in the school. However, all students did participate in visual art in the first three terms and, therefore, I returned to School Three in Term One of 2000.

On my return to the school in 2000, the art teacher expressed how students did not like to draw as such and preferred to make three-dimensional constructions. She stated she was trying to get the grades five and six students not to draw on the bottom of the page and felt their work was not that good. She felt this was due to the fact that they felt they could not draw and they do not do much drawing at home. She said how she had to use interesting media, such as pastels, for them to enjoy drawing (Field Notes 24/5/2000).

The dislike of drawing can be related to the notion of the need to be kinaesthetically doing something with their hands, the 'hands-on' experience. This exemplifies Bourdieu's theory of the bodily hexis, whereby the practices are ingrained in the body and reveal themselves as class divisions based on the mental/manual distinction. For these students the ability to sit still and translate three-dimensional objects to two-dimensional representations can be viewed as a mental challenge.

In Term One of 2000, the art teacher introduced artworks for students to look at relating to the classroom themes 'Early Settlement' and 'Food'. Students constructed a dwelling based on an early settlement and had examined pictures of buildings from this period. They had also made a place-mat from cloth decorated with pictures of food that were first drawn on paper and transferred using an iron; the edges were folded and hand sewn. Students also constructed a food collage, cutting out food shapes from felt and gluing onto card. The teacher said they had looked at works with food in it where artists had modelled food and it looked real, but she did not name the artists. The teacher had mentioned the significance to her when viewing artworks and explained this to students, stating how when she goes to the art gallery to see famous paintings she is 'amazed how realistic they can make it look; it looks like a photograph'. Therefore, this teacher valued artworks that were realistic in style. Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) find that those who do not have the ability to decode works of art perceive artworks based on everyday life and recognition of objects. Therefore, they insist on realism in pictures and relating art to their everyday
environment. Therefore, this teacher's preference for realistic imagery can be seen as an inability to decipher more abstract images.

School Four

School Four had a high profile for its art program which was evident with the construction of the Arts Centre. The Arts Centre was officially opened by an artist, a former student of the school, in 1994 and five of his artworks were displayed in the centre. There was also an original print by Normana Wight and a large batik wall hanging along with six Chagall prints. Student work was also displayed throughout the centre and there was also an exhibition space for works. The centre had a room for junior students and a room for senior students as well as a ceramics room and textiles room. The art teacher explained the importance placed on the arts: 'Well, it's a pretty important aspect of this school along with the other arts like music and drama because being a private school parents want the extra-curricular, because you can see from this building, it's considered to be an important part of the school...I mean, the students have two periods of art a week which is pretty good' (Interview 29/3/00).

The art teacher felt the art program was one of the reasons parents chose this school. 'I think this is one of the reasons, among many others, why they send their kids here. The parents are obviously interested in the arts and see the art environment and program here as an option for their kids' (Interview 29/3/00). Art appreciation played a role in the school’s art program: as stated by the principal and art teacher, parents expect art appreciation in a private school.

In the foyer of the school, student work was displayed based on artists' work such as Monet's 'Waterlilies' and Van Gogh's 'Sunflowers'. The display on Monet also had French titles for the work and information about the artist and the Impressionist movement. This unit of work was also on display in the parents' waiting room. There was also a display in the foyer of year five artwork, entitled 'Influences by Van Gogh', which showed the students' work based on 'Sunflowers'. Underneath the display of this work were the words 'shape' and 'colour'.

In the preparatory school, students participated in two one hour art sessions each week and were offered drawing, painting, print making, textiles, graphics, construction, ceramics and appreciation. In the junior artroom there were examples of artists' work, such as Picasso, Matisse, Kandinsky, Van Gogh, Da Vinci, Klee and Modigliani with the names Picasso, Da Vinci and Van Gogh in large print. Also the word 'emotion' was near Picasso's 'Child with a Dove' along with the words 'Portraits' and 'Self-Portrait' next to examples of work. Furthermore, there was information on Pablo Picasso with the terms Cubism, Realism, Blue and Rose periods 1930s and war years

In the senior artroom there were three large paintings, Kandinsky prints and student work based on these images. The words ‘colour—primary, secondary, tertiary, and monochromatic’ were on the wall. There were also prints by Van Gogh and Eugene Van Guerard and a book Look Again: An Appreciation of Art by Donald Williams. There were also student artworks and projects by students on various Australian artists such as McCubbin, Dickerson, Glover, Brack and Streeton. These projects had examples of artist work and information about the artist.

School Four had an abundance of resources for the arts: the library had an extensive catalogue of art books —eighty-one ‘Art’ items were found on the catalogue, such as Famous Artists, The Story of Fine Art and Great Artists of the World. There were also books on specific artists, such as Renoir, Michelangelo, Rembrandt and Botticelli along with Monet, Klee, Picasso, Matisse, and Van Gogh. There were also books on architecture, drawing, Australian art and artists, The Renaissance and Aboriginal Art, along with Annotated Art—The World’s Greatest Paintings Explored and Explained and A Child’s Guide to Looking at Paintings. Student work was further displayed prevalently around the school but also in the local art gallery. Students also attended the art gallery regularly on school excursions as the school allowed at least one gallery visit for all groups per year.

In the art staffroom there was also a large array of art books such as Modern painting in Australia, Inca, Indonesia, National Gallery of Victoria, Looking at Paintings, Da Vinci, Henry Moore, Portrait Painting, Videos on the Australian Eye Series—Contemporary Painting, Heidelberg School, Albrecht Durer and an Art Meets Craft series.

Furthermore, artworks were displayed around the grounds of the school such as sculptures and mosaics which had been influenced by famous artists when students had worked with artists in residence. The artist in residence program worked with the year eight students. Year seven students also had an annual Creative Arts Day when they participated in various art activities.

In the senior school fine and applied arts were offered as students participated in ceramics, wood technology, textiles, studio art, visual communication and design and photography. They were conducted in a centre for creative pursuits by both students and community members. Students were offered art excursions throughout the year.
and also had an artists-in-residence program along with an Arts Week where all students experience arts-based activities.

The artworks grade six students were undertaking during my observations were paintings based on Picasso’s Blue Period. Students used a monochromatic palette of blue with white and black. Students produced a tonal gradation painting as a background and then painted a self-portrait showing a sad expression. Grade five students created paintings of buildings based on two artworks: one by Laurence Lowry, ‘Coming from the Mill’, and a set design for a scene from ‘Firebird’ by Natalia Goncharova. Students had to reproduce the shapes they saw to create patterns and a cityscape. The art teacher’s work program also showed students worked with ceramics, drawing, textiles, paper mache and construction. They constructed a paper mache head based on Picasso’s distorted images and observation drawings of outdoor sketches based on Frederick McCubbin.

The school artwork program indicated that students were introduced to a wide variety of artists from Prep, such as Van Gogh, Klee, Matisse, William Morris, Rousseau, Cezanne, Renoir and Turner. Students also experienced a range of cultural works such as Aboriginal, Japanese, Chinese, Indonesian and African artworks.

As presented above, the approach to the arts was very different in each school depending on the school’s value of the arts and each teacher’s style of teaching art. The art experience of students in each school helped to cultivate the disposition they developed towards the arts and how they saw the place of arts in their lives. In School One students’ art experience was dominated by Teacher One’s skills-based and craft-based approach. While Teacher Two attempted to incorporate a process-based approach and introduce arts appreciation, this was predominantly resisted by students. School Two also had various approaches by different teachers but generally students were introduced to artworks and produced art based on these. Students in School Three experienced a craft-based approach with limited availability of artworks. By comparison students in School Four were surrounded with artworks where art was highly regarded and formed the basis of student art making. Consequently, students in School Four had the greatest familiarity with art, constructing a positive disposition towards the arts. Bourdieu (1984) finds this familiarity and a cultivated disposition allow for the ability to appropriate art. In Chapter 9 the appreciation of art in each school will be examined to reflect the level of incorporation of the CSF: The Arts substrand ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’.
Chapter 9 Discourse of Art Appreciation

As discussed in Chapter 5, the appreciation of art is a product of history and social distinction and as Bourdieu (1993b) confirms ‘although appearing to be a gift of nature, the eye of the twentieth century art lover is a product of history’ (p. 256). Bourdieu explains the pure gaze allows the artwork to be apprehended as it demands, as form and not as function, and is inseparable from the producers of art motivated by a pure artistic intention. This is inseparable from the artistic field with its autonomy which is capable of formulating and imposing its own ends to outside demands (p. 156). Bourdieu further states how the pure gaze is associated with very specific conditions of acquisition, such as early frequenting of museums and prolonged exposure to schooling, and the skhole that schools imply and these conditions are the product of privilege (p. 156).

According to the CSF: The Arts, at the completion of level four students are meant to ‘Talk and write informally about personal observations of visual artworks’ (Board of Studies 1995, p. 115). It is stated that ‘This will be evident when, for example, the student: uses art terminology and descriptive language when comparing artworks and expressing his or her aesthetic response’ (p. 115). As discussed, the ability of students to perform these tasks depends on social, cultural and economic conditions of acquisition which are unequally distributed. However, with the CSF: The Arts the disinterested approach of art appreciation is demanded by all.

The level of implementation of arts appreciation varied greatly in the four schools due to the conditions of acquisition mentioned above and the differential interpretation by the art teachers of the substrand ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’. After observations in each school it become apparent that in some art classrooms art appreciation was nonexistent; while in others there were attempts to incorporate it and in others art appreciation was covered comprehensively. The following discussion will examine the extent to which the discourse of art appreciation was implemented in each school based on interviews with art teachers and students and observations. The modelling of the appropriate disinterested art discourse inculcates a cultural disposition and the required linguistic capital to participate successfully in art appreciation.

School One

In School One art appreciation was non-existent with Teacher One even though she was confident students were experiencing all of the substrands, ‘because in my curriculum audit I go through that and make sure the strands…everything fits in’ (Interview 20/8/98). However, when asked if students talk and write about artworks she admitted, ‘Well, they’re talking informally but we’re not writing’.
Teacher One stated that the reason students did not write was based on her belief that they think it is ‘boring’. She realised it was in the CSF and was beneficial and as an ‘odd thing’ writing would be fine. But she felt it could occur only occasionally, explaining, ‘If they came in and [I] said here’s a piece of paper and said to write a paragraph on this piece of artwork tell me what you think about it they’d all go “oohhh”’ (with a non-excited expression) (Interview 20/8/98). When asked why she felt students would react this way, she responded, ‘It’s probably my fault that they think it’s not part of the art program because they haven’t done it’ but then added, ‘There’s not that much time in here really when there’s an hour...so that side of it, the actual writing about it side has been neglected but the talking about it side hasn’t been’.

However, ‘talking about art’ was more concerned with what the students were making. As stated, ‘...we have a ten minute introduction...talk about what we’re going to do...and have a sharing of ideas...and at the end of the lesson...just a summing up and a bit of praise and a bit of a look...and that’s all part of the CSF anyway’. While she felt they talked a lot, it was usually not structured into the lessons and occurred haphazardly: ‘We talk about things as it comes up with their theme’. When asked if students discuss other artworks she replied, ‘We have but not all of the time and not a great deal of the time...I wouldn’t say it’s a regular occurrence although it would be good if it could be’ and ‘That’s probably something...I could do a little bit more of appreciation’ (Interview 20/8/98). Despite the fact that students did not participate in art appreciation she felt students generally speaking were able to use art terminology and felt they were achieving at level four, as indicated in the CSF.

Teacher One explained that time was predominantly taken up in class with making, due to her belief that students come into art ready to make something. She explained, ‘Even if I talk to them for too long [for their introduction]...they remind me of the time...because...they want to get stuck into it’ (Interview 20/8/98). One of the students, Jessica, indicated this was true in her questionnaire and interview, responding that the teacher talked too much and explained, ‘We didn’t get too much time to do things because she would go over and over and over and over again every lesson’ (Interview 17/12/98).

**Student Interviews**

The students interviewed for School One indicated predominantly they were not interested in talking about art. When I asked Adam if he would like it if the teacher talked about artworks in class he replied, ‘No, not really, it would suck a bit’ (Interview 17/12/98). Due to their art experience where art making predominated, the students expected to make art rather than talk about it and most were not positive
about the idea of talking about artworks or writing about them. For example, Daniel stated when asked if he would like to talk about artworks, ‘No, I’d rather make it than talk about it’ (Interview 17/12/98). When they did talk about art, as the teacher stated it was to do with the making. Daniel explained, ‘Yeah, we talk about just how you do it’.

Ryan further felt art was about ‘getting out of work’ because ‘we don’t have to sit down at our tables and do sheets, boring old maths and all that and language’ (Interview 17/12/98). He preferred to make things and he stated that talking a bit more about art would be okay ‘but not writing’ because he felt, ‘Art’s more for making and designing things than sitting down at your table and doing writing and all that’. Daniel interrupted at this point: ‘We do a lot of writing in class…we’ve got one hour a week usually. I don’t see why we need to write in art’. Ryan agreed, ‘Yeah. It’s like a break out of school, out of class’. Daniel agreed, ‘Yeah. Different to other things we do in class, art is’. When asked if they felt they should learn about different artworks in art, Ryan replied, ‘We learn about different artworks when we go on excursions and all that but I don’t really think we should write in art ‘cause it’s like a break from doing work in class’. Daniel continued, ‘We never really do reports or anything like writing, so I don’t really think we have to’. When asked if they would like to do reports, Daniel stated, ‘Not really’ and Ryan replied, ‘No, not really’. For both Ryan and Daniel art was a respite from work. In particular art was not associated with written work but was a chance for them to get out of work.

When Carl was asked if he would like to talk and write more about artworks, he said, ‘No…‘cause you get embarrassed ‘cause everyone else doesn’t talk about it and you talk about it and they just laugh at ya’ (Interview 17/12/98). Carl was a new student to this school but was aware of the fact that students at this school did not talk about art. Therefore, it was not a part of the discourse and not an acceptable practice. Justin was quite an articulate child and did not mind looking at some artworks. However, he also replied they should ‘just keep doing the art’ and not talk and write about it (Interview 17/12/98).

Not all students interviewed in School One were opposed to talking about art. Steven stated they had looked at Aboriginal artworks a few years ago and the teacher talked about them. He said they did not do that very often and he would like to do it more ‘to find out about things like that’. He liked talking about artwork and would like to do it more, stating, ‘Yeah, I find it interesting’. However, at this point in the interview another student, Melanie, was shaking her head. When asked if she thought art was the place to write and talk about things, she firmly stated, ‘No’. When asked why not, she replied, ‘Because it’s boring. I’d rather make stuff’. Another student, Elise, also
enjoyed talking about art and when asked if she felt that they did this enough in art she responded, ‘No, we don’t do that at all’. While she was not opposed to writing in art, she stated how she would choose art in high school as ‘It’s different from all the boring subjects: instead of all the time having to write down everything you get to make something and have something to show for it’.

While some students said they did not look at or talk about artworks some said that they had over the years. However, talking about art was very minimal. When Melanie was asked if they looked at artworks, she replied, ‘No, we don’t do that’ but then she remembered, ‘Once we were doing Indonesia for Indonesia week and we had to make a mask and she got all these Indonesian books and she showed us the artists and the Indonesian things and the characters to help us’. Simone also recalled they had looked at art from Indonesia and recalled, ‘We kind of talked about the patterns and how they done it and everything’. Justin also said they had looked at ‘only the Indonesian puppets’. Therefore, while students did look at some artworks it was very rare.

Due to the art program being more art making based, Teacher One did not actively engage students in art appreciation, as presented above students’ time was spent predominantly making and creating. Consequently students’ ability to practise art appreciation with appropriate terminology was very limited. Teacher Two was very aware of the students’ limited ability in art appreciation after a couple of weeks in the art room. She aimed to rectify this situation with the introduction of art appreciation in her program.

Teacher Two felt there needed to be more emphasis on responding to artworks. She found the students at level four were not able to discuss or demonstrate the principles of art due to their lack of previous art appreciation experience. She stated: ‘Because there’s been more of a craft emphasis here than an art emphasis...I find that their knowledge is limiting...I think the basic knowledge is there...just the art language that goes along with it that they get stuck on...They sort of know it exists...but they’ve never really thought about it as a word or a concept...Maybe it’s just that there hasn’t been enough talk and enough art vocabulary for them to explain back to me that they know it’ (Interview 17/3/99). She felt that students ‘Haven’t been taught visual language yet; good to them is enough to say’. Her aim was to have art words around the room ‘so it becomes a part of their vocabulary and if I speak in those terms they’ll just pick up on it’ (Interview 17/3/99).

In an attempt to introduce students to the concept of looking at artworks and collecting pieces that may influence their own art, Teacher Two introduced students to
scrapbooks and brought in her own journals from university. Students were initially interested in her journal. However, one student said, ‘It’s a waste of time doing scrapbooks’. The teacher responded, ‘It’s not a waste of time’. Other students were fidgeting and after fifteen minutes were saying, ‘Look at the time’. Another student asked, ‘Is this going to be the whole art lesson?’ After thirty minutes the teacher explained to students that they were going to look at some paintings and if they liked the painting they go to one end of the room if they don’t like it they go to the other end. She showed them Van Gogh’s ‘Lane with Cypresses under Starry Sky’. She asked some students why they chose to stand where they were and explain their opinions. One student said, ‘I just like it the way they’ve done those little marks for the sun and everything they sort of use the same sort of pencil and the way they’ve coloured it’. ‘Okay, you like the texture in it. Is that what you’re saying?’ the teacher replied. When she asked another student why they did not like it they replied, ‘Because it’s all blurry and the trees look like smoke’. Another student said, ‘I think it’s dull’. Another student who was in the middle responded, ‘I like the way they’ve drawn the picture but it looks a bit scribbly the way they’ve coloured it in’. Another student stated he liked it, ‘because it looks like a lot of stripes of different colours and it’s made a picture’. ‘That’s great. That’s a good reason to like it’ the teacher replied. When she asked another student why he did not like it the student stated, ‘It looks like it’s a bonfire’. Some of the other boys around him laughed and said, ‘It’s boring’ and it looked ‘stupid’ (Observation 23/3/99).

The teacher asked if they knew who the artist was and no one replied. Then she showed them Van Gogh’s ‘Sunflowers’ and no one had seen this image or knew the artist. One student said she liked it, ‘cause I like the dead flowers and the live flowers’. Another said he did not like it because ‘it’s all dark and the flowers are dead’. Other students who did not like it said, ‘The flowers are dead and the vase is all white’, ‘The paint is blodged on’ and ‘They’ve used all the same colours’. Students who did like it commented, ‘They made it look real’, ‘It’s better then my drawing’ and ‘I like the picture and the live flowers, but the dead flowers don’t look as good as the live flowers’. Therefore, as discussed those with the lack of ability to decipher artworks in terms of form refer to the object and its relation to realism.

While Teacher Two planned to introduce more arts appreciation she found that due to the past experience of students in the classroom along with student, parent and school expectations she was restricted by what she could achieve. Another interview was conducted three months after the initial one to determine if she had achieved more art appreciation as intended. She explained, ‘With level four I haven’t had a chance to—creating does take over’ (Interview 25/6/99). She stated they had looked at artworks and discussed them in the introduction of the lesson and felt students
enjoyed this. She stated, ‘They initially think what does the artist have to do with them’ (Interview 25/6/99). But then she explained they looked at Picasso, showing his progression from realism to abstraction, and she felt that the students really enjoyed this.

When asked if students had improved when responding to artworks, she stated she ‘hadn’t noticed a big change but they are more open to discussing what they see’. She explained, ‘They still offhandedly say, “That’s crap”, but then when asked to explain they can expand on it, but it is still limited’. She intended to get students next term to do research, to pick an artist and learn something about them and paint in that style. She had already told students about this and they responded with ‘What? We don’t write in art’, confirming the dominance in their habitus of their previous art experience.

When asked whether she thought introducing more aesthetics and writing was idealistic, she stated it probably was: ‘it’s hard coming into a new school where expectations are on creating a lot, and there are really strong expectations’ (Interview 25/6/99). As a new teacher it was hard to break the habitus or practices set by the preceding teacher as the expectations are set into the school and most strongly those of the students. Teacher Two explained, ‘students have a hard time with aesthetics and relating to artists when all they want to do is make egg carton caterpillars’. She stated, ‘It is great to have four areas in art but there is no way you can cover all of them equally, unless you had a fresh lot of kids who didn’t have any experience with art, they think you have to take something home each week’ (Interview 25/6/99). Consequently, Teacher Two’s intention to incorporate more aesthetics and appreciation especially in the form of written response was affected by the student habitus that had been established from the previous art teacher.

Another five months after the second interview, I returned to the school and spoke to the students to see if they had undertaken more aesthetics. The students responded they had not looked at other artists’ work very much. They had done a little but said it was ‘boring’ and they preferred to be ‘hands-on’ making. One girl stated they had looked at Picasso, which confirmed what the teacher said, and felt what they did was good. They had to draw a person and not look at the paper, producing a continuous line drawing. Therefore, the pupil had remembered mainly the art making activity rather than the artwork they looked at or talked about.

Students had also looked at Van Gogh and Monet and some prints of their artwork were hanging up in the room with the artists’ names above them. When students were asked why they think they look at other artwork and talk about it, one student replied
in an imitating way, ‘Because art isn’t just about doing; it’s learning about it as well!’ (Interview 22/11/99). When asked who said that, she declared the art teacher said ‘something like that’. Therefore, it appeared Teacher Two had introduced more talking about art, but the students still found it difficult truly to understand the reasons behind this and preferred to make art than appreciate it.

**School Two**

In School Two three art teachers were observed who had various approaches to their art program. However, for this discussion of art appreciation my focus is on Teacher One. She was pro-CSF and incorporated a DBAE approach in her teaching, stating, ‘I’m probably the person who has introduced it [the CSF] more fully into this school as Head of the Arts/Technology Department. I think I’ve been the one who’s been more pro at it than anyone else’ (Interview 4/5/99). She felt she covered all substrands of the CSF: The Arts, including art appreciation. She explained though that the art department was redeveloping their art program in line with the CSF, ‘to try and ensure we do have coverage...so that’s basically what we’re hoping to do so I guess I can’t answer definitively whether we do at the moment but I’d like to think so’ (Interview 4/5/99). She did state though that this coverage ‘doesn’t necessarily have to mean even coverage’.

While Teacher One incorporated talking about artworks into her lesson she admitted that writing was limited, explaining her arts program was ‘predominately studio-based because I’ve found that they get a bit disappointed if they have to do lots of writing and then it kind of goes against...what they’re there for anyway. Like you get such little time to create that I tend to do my theoretical stuff in different ways other than writing’ ‘cause I think they get so much of the written in other subjects. I tend to stick with things like games to reinforce ideas, picture chats, small group discussions. Quizzes. Those kinds of things rather than where they have to write down...I might use that once a semester or something but not as a general rule’ (Interview 4/5/99).

Teacher One valued talking about artworks and felt it was important for students to develop a ‘visual literacy’, stating, ‘I feel visual literacy to me is just as valid a form of literacy. Just as any other form of intelligence. Developing visual intelligence is just vital to a child’s total development. I think the world is becoming increasingly visual...and kids really need to be able to discriminate with images and be able to have an intelligence about regarding imagery and selecting imagery’ (Interview 4/5/99).

Teacher One realised, as did Bourdieu, that developing visual literacy, the ability to decipher images, is a learnt language. She explained, ‘They [the students] need to be able to decipher images in a sensitive and intelligent way...I always say to them it’s
like reading a book... Unless you’ve learnt to read you can’t pick up a book and make any sense of it or if you pick up a book in another language it doesn’t make any sense. Your art is a language and it does have to be learned. It has to be taught, it has to be learned. It’s a valid language and I think it’s really important for students to learn that language and realise it has to be learned... and there is an element of teaching involved’ (Interview 4/5/99).

She felt students at level four were able to discuss the principles of art but not consistently and independently, stating, ‘They tend to forget the names for it. But they can do it but you have to keep reinforcing it. I find I’m constantly having little quizzes with them to reinforce those words’.

Observations (7/5/99) revealed that Teacher One did introduce students to various artworks. In a unit on mask making students had been previously introduced to masks from various cultures. Some students were able to recall the reasons for mask making: ‘for different ceremonies’, ‘for people to act’, ‘to scare away evil spirits’, ‘for plays’, ‘for decoration’ and ‘as a disguise’. During this lesson students were shown a mask and the teacher asked, ‘How would you describe this one?’ Students responded: ‘hot’, ‘burnt’ and ‘I think it looks evil’. The teacher asked, ‘What has the artist done to make it look evil?’ A student replied, ‘Used black and red’. ‘Yes’, the teacher replied. ‘Used the colours in a very expressive way to make it look very evil’. The teacher showed them a mask in a style they had previously looked at and asked, ‘Who can remember where this mask was from?’ A student answered, ‘Mexico’. However, during this discussion some students were very disruptive and did not pay attention while others were very responsive.

Students at School Two attended the local art gallery in level four once a year. Teacher One felt it was very important for students to go to art galleries, stating, ‘I’m very pro gallery visitations’ (Interview 4/5/99). Prior to this gallery visit students had a lesson on gallery ‘etiquette’. The teacher showed students one of the artworks from the gallery, telling the students, ‘This is “The Hunt” by an artist called Brack. Tell me what can you see when you look at this painting?’ One student stated, ‘There’s hieroglyphics’. The teacher responded, ‘So they look like ancient symbols. Very good. They’re not hieroglyphics which are Egyptian; they’re Syrian’.

Another student asked, ‘Didn’t he paint that picture of the city and all those people were hurrying? I think he painted that one too’. The teacher answered, ‘Excellent. Yes, you are very, very clever. Fancy picking that up. That is a great call’. The teacher then explained, ‘Often you can tell an artist’s work by their style and he has a definite style and if you see some of his other paintings you’ll probably recognise
them as Brack because of the way he painted'. Therefore, the teacher discussed with students the concept of individual style as a form of aesthetic response to artworks. As presented by Bourdieu (1993b), speaking about the nature of an artist's work was a way of conversing in the artistic language. However, the teacher did not expect any students to recognise his work, as she was quite surprised by this student's response. Therefore, developing cultural disposition based on recognition of artists was not a driving factor in the teacher’s incorporation of art appreciation.

After discussing this she showed students a print of 'A Bush Burial'; no one remembered what it was called but when asked who the artist was a student answered quickly, 'Frederick McCubbin'. The teacher explained to students how the painting 'Tells us about what a funeral would have been like in the old days in the 1800s'. Incorporating a historical perspective on the work, the teacher utilised art as a resource of historical account, more so than as a piece for disinterested contemplation.

The teacher also showed students some of the artworks from the gallery's collection and asked them to see if they could 'spy' them when they went there. When she held up abstract works some students responded, 'I could do that', 'You could do that' or 'I couldn't do that one'. Other students said, 'That's nice' but another student said, 'It's just black with a red thing around it'. These responses by the students revealed they still possessed a limited understanding of art, particularly abstract art, which can be accounted for by their cultural capital opposing the scholastic stance of their in school learning. The teacher discussed with students how 'Art is up to what each person thinks and feels and not everyone will agree that that is the best painting...You and your friends may go into a gallery and you may disagree about what is an excellent piece of work...You will probably have different opinions and that's good as long as you support your opinion' (Observation 14/5/99). Therefore, the art teacher tried to develop students' abilities to appreciate artworks critically with knowledgeable opinions to support their views.

At the art gallery the teacher recalled the previous talk in class about the artworks; some students found the artworks they were shown in class. The teacher discussed with students to try to work out what the artist was telling them, to look at the way it's been done, who made it, what materials, and colours were used, to 'really look'. She showed them 'A Bush Burial' and had students work out 'the story, the narrative' then students re-enacted the painting, expressing the feelings of the characters. Therefore, the teacher tried to have students relate to the work and understand the expressions portrayed in the art through playacting. Therefore, again the art teacher tried to build a relation of students to the artwork, as opposed to a disinterested
approach to the artwork, where form not content predominated in how to analyse an artwork.

Student Interviews

Student interviews in School Two revealed that students had looked at and talked about artworks and predominantly the students enjoyed this and could see the importance of doing so. Renee recalled, 'She [the teacher] has shown us some paintings that other people have done from the other places, from an art gallery'. Renee enjoyed this because 'it shows how people have done artwork from when they’re a bit older' and 'it's fun'. Madeline also found looking at artworks interesting and fun, 'because we talk about artists and every year we go to the art gallery and look for certain paintings' (Interview 18/6/99).

However, Madeline stated she did not remember what artists they had talked about. Kellie also knew they looked at artworks and enjoyed doing this but could not remember them all: 'Yeah, we look at Aboriginal artwork. Um I think that’s all'. However, she recalled some of the stylistic features of Aboriginal art, stating 'they used to do dots and lines and little creatures and skeleton work'. Alistair felt they had 'not really' learnt how to talk about art. He said he would like to as 'I reckon it would be fairly good if we could talk about some sort of artwork'. He felt looking at other people's artwork 'gives you ideas on how you could do something yourself'. When asked if they did do that very often, he replied, 'I suppose'.

When asked if they talked about or made art more often, other students responded they participated in both but did a lot of talking. Kellie stated, 'Talking about things or a little bit of both'. Madeline agreed: 'We spend a lot of time talking and making sort of at the same time'. Lachlan further explained, 'We do both really. Before we actually do it with the teacher we talk about it a lot if we're changing or doing different [things]. She's got these art books that she shows us and stuff like what we're going to do'.

When asked why he thought they looked at art books before they start to do work, Lachlan answered, 'She shows us what we're going to do and some of the other types of art'. He also felt it was important to learn how to talk about artworks, 'because then you're learning how they've done it and why they've done the painting or drawing or art like that. Because they're not always a clear picture; sometimes they're just designs or sometimes they're just completely black'. He said these artworks were, 'all right—— they're not my favourites, though'. He preferred 'The ones with an image and designs'. While he had developed an appreciation of abstract art as they had looked at it in school, he still preferred art where he could decipher the subject
matter, and therefore decode the art according to recognisable objects. Renee, however, liked the abstract artworks and also had developed a form of understanding of them, stating, ‘I think they try like a quizz sort of for people to try and figure it out’.

Madeline explained what they talked about when the teacher showed them artworks. ‘She tells us who it’s by and if it’s an artist’s picture —like if its in the gallery we’ll try and figure out the name of it—like there’ll be a whole heap of different names’. When asked why she felt the teacher showed them other artists’ pictures and why they talked about them, she responded, ‘I think she wants us to get involved in art so she talks about them in a way so we don’t get bored and everything and it’s a good way to express your feelings’. Madeline’s response reveals talking about artworks was acceptable in this school art room and it was not considered ‘boring’ as students from School One had stated. Due to their exposure to various artworks from Teacher One students had developed a familiarisation with artworks and an acceptance of talking about art. Teacher One had developed students’ aesthetic disposition, in this sense developing a habitus, whereby discussing artworks was expected in their art lessons before commencing their own art making.

The students at School Two confirmed they talked about art and predominantly enjoyed doing this, and realised its importance. Madeline stated, ‘I think it’s important to talk about art instead of sort of like just trying to mumble and trying to think’. All students stated they did not write about art and, while some felt this would be a good idea, others did not agree. Madeline said, ‘No, not really’—they did not write in art and said she would like to write about ‘sort of like pictures and art’. Renee also stated she would like to write about art but more as a narrative, stating, ‘Well, you could write a story’. Alistair said when asked if they did any writing about art, ‘No, we haven’t done that’. He stated he would ‘not really’ like to as he preferred just talking. Even though Lachlan enjoyed talking about the artwork, he said he would like to write, ‘a bit, but not really...because I tend to prefer the drawing more than anything in art but I sort of—I don’t know—I just wouldn’t really like to do it’. Kellie baldly replied, ‘No...I just don’t like writing’ and preferred just to talk about art. Stephen agreed: ‘I like talking but I wouldn’t like to do writing’.

Therefore, students’ habitus at School Two had predominantly been developed to accept and enjoy talking about artworks, but as they had not written about them the concept of this was foreign and unwelcome to most. Students’ aesthetic dispositions were also developed by the school as they frequented art galleries. This developed a cultural aspiration amongst some to frequent art galleries when older. This cultural disposition was imparted predominantly by the school, as most students interviewed
stated that they had not been to the gallery with their family. Therefore, they were lacking ‘inherited cultural capital’ but had attained a level of ‘acquired cultural capital’. Students in School Two had developed their cultural disposition due to the scholastic stance presented by the art teacher, whereby students were introduced to artworks and discussed art. However, a completely ‘disinterested’ approach to art appreciation was not entirely undertaken.

School Three

In School Three the art teacher explained that in her work program she related lessons to the CSF outcomes. However, she admitted she did not include art appreciation: ‘No, not yet. I’m going to do that next year…That’s really my focus next year is to do a lot more appreciation’ (Interview 25/11/99). She felt she had not included art appreciation yet, due to the students’ ‘attitude’ and what they expect to do in art. ‘They wanted to come in, they want to do something, they wanted to get results and that was it and take it away’ (Interview 25/11/99). She further explained, ‘I thought, “Well it’s no good sitting down with kids that really want a result with a picture and looking at it “cause they don’t want to do that”’ (Interview 25/11/99).

She believed that the students experienced all of the substandards of the CSF, stating, ‘Most of it. Most of it, yeah. I’d say I’m doing a pretty good job and over the two years I would be covering them. That’s my aim, is to go over two years’. She also believed that the grades five and six students were achieving at level four, claiming, ‘I mean to me they are…At the start of the year, no, definitely not. But by the end of the year I think they are, but that’s just my opinion’.

However, she admitted that level four students were not able to discuss and demonstrate the principles of art, admitting, ‘Yeah, well, we haven’t done [that]…I wanted to do perspective and I haven’t got into that because I thought it would be just too hard for them. So that’s something I’d like to get into next year but I haven’t used those terms with them really. I use the terms of what the painting is, what type of painting, like there’s “still life” and the colour and I talk about balance and things…I suppose a lot of it is more the crafty, construction type thing…So it’s just moving them gradually into it’. She explained, ‘These kids didn’t even know what a “still life” was, they’d never heard of it, had no idea what I was talking about’ (Interview 25/11/99).

She conceded that her visual arts program was predominantly studio-based and that students did not write about artworks: ‘No, they don’t write much’. She realised that getting the students to write and talk about art ‘might be quite simplified for them’. But then she said, ‘I think there’s ways and means of getting around kids and if it’s
not working you stop it and don’t do it...I mean, it’s not a writing class. It’s not a language class, so if they can tell me about [it]...I think they should be able to succeed in art...I think it’s the one place where someone can have success. I don’t want it to be a negative experience’.

She felt that to introduce art appreciation she would have students look at artworks and they say, “Oh, yeah, that’s really good”’. Therefore, her expectations of students’ abilities to discuss art were restricted by her own experience in discussing art with terminology such as ‘That’s really good’. Further, her own limited understanding of various art styles, such as abstract art, meant she passed this knowledge on to her students valuing, instead, realistic forms of art as she had the ability to decode only these styles of art. She stated, ‘I’ve said to the kids, I’ll look at something and think, “That’s ridiculous”...I said to them once, a painting won a prize at the gallery and it was a red cross on a white background and I looked at it and I thought, “No, I’m sorry, I cannot see anything artistic about that”. And yet someone else thought it was good enough to win a prize’ (Interview 25/11/99).

She felt students should participate in art appreciation and attend an art gallery, stating, ‘I think I would really like to do the appreciation. I’d like to be really able to take them to an art gallery. I think it would be nice to take that level to an art gallery and have a look around, and look at the art and have someone there that they can talk to them about it and say “What’s this and how’d they do this?” and discuss it’. As she explained, ‘I don’t even know if they’ve been to an art gallery in the past’.

She was aware that student background and previous experience needed to be considered, especially regarding talking about artworks. She said, ‘That’s something you’ve got to get them into and get them used to and I guess they may not have had a lot of that’. She felt students did not have a lot of experience of discussing artworks at home. ‘No. I don’t think so’. She also considered their background in relation to her art program to a degree, explaining, ‘I suppose to a certain extent you do because if they come in with some sort of preconceived [idea] about things...If they’ve been to an art gallery and...they know what you’re talking about but if you try to describe a painting to them that they’ve never heard of and they don’t know the artist...You’ve really got to start from scratch’. She conceded she was starting from scratch with these students, declaring, ‘I feel like I am, yeah. With the older kids, yeah. I feel as though I’m easing them into art...That’s my focus for next year [appreciation]...I would like to go into that and looking at art’.

When I returned to the school in 2000, the art teacher appeared to be incorporating more aesthetics and appreciation in her program. However, this was at a very basic
level. She declared, ‘This is one of my aims now’, to add more appreciation. This aim I suspect was due to my visits last year and questioning her on art appreciation in her program. Observations in 2000 revealed students working on the theme ‘Early Settlement’ and the art teacher showed them pictures of colonial artists and books based on life in early Australia. These artworks were discussed more in terms of the content in the pictures such as details and shadows and adding features to their own artworks such as timber and stonework ‘to make their house more interesting’ and to get ideas for their own artwork. The teacher explained to the students, ‘That’s why I want you to have a look at all the pictures and get ideas I don’t want you to copy them, just get ideas’.

At the end of this lesson the teacher asked students what they learnt; various students replied: ‘how to shadow’, ‘that houses aren’t flat’, ‘to draw a timber house’, ‘not to shadow first because they might end up in the air’. Therefore, all comments related to their art making experience even though they had looked at other artworks. Another student stated he learnt how to draw a horse so it looked real. The teacher responded, ‘sometimes when I am looking at portraits in the gallery and sometimes they look like photos. It’s just amazing I can’t believe how clever some artists are. That’s very hard to do’. Again this reflects her dependence on images having to be realistic for her to appreciate the quality of the art as opposed to the style.

During another lesson students were using all gold materials as their theme was ‘Gold’. She told them, ‘I’ve got a couple of pictures for ideas’. ‘Is that a magpie?’ a student asked when she held up the work. The teacher replied, ‘It’s called “Time Study” and it’s a black and white photograph. It’s looking at light’. However, the students were trying to work out the time in the picture and the teacher stated, ‘What we’re looking at really is how it’s done, what’s used?’ The teacher was discussing the use of shadow when a student said, ‘That guy looks like George of the Jungle’ (a character in a movie) and the other students laughed. ‘Yeah, it could be’, the teacher replied.

She showed them two other prints, stating, ‘This is actually a photo but I thought you could do a cityscape with the gold with the building and leaving your windows just the black paper and using different shades with the crayons to make your light and dark. These are just ideas’. With the second print she said, ‘It’s very interesting and they’ve obviously photographed it because of the line and the colours and it’s just an interesting picture...so that’s another idea’.

The teacher showed them other works, explaining, ‘These are all paintings and they’re in a catalogue that are sold at Christie’s. People actually own paintings and they sell
them’. One student asked ‘Are they?’ The teacher continued and showed them a figurative piece, stating, ‘That’s what you could do, just the figures because it’s basically one colour’. A student asked, ‘Is that ballet, is that dancing, ballet?’ The teacher answered, ‘It’s called ‘Dancers’ and it’s worth $35-45,000’. A student asked, ‘But what is it used for?’ and the teacher continued, ‘It shows you if you grow up and become an artist’. She then showed another artwork stating, ‘This one is more abstract, the faces together, you could do that with your shading’. ‘How much is that worth?’, a student asked. ‘It’s worth $20-25,000’, the teacher responded. Another student stated, ‘I could do that’. For these students the ‘value of artworks’ was a new concept that they found hard to believe. Most did not realise that artworks were worth so much, especially as they could not see the value as they did not perform a function.

Following this lesson, in a student interview, I asked James if he thought paintings were worth a lot of money. He replied, ‘Yeah’. When asked if he felt they should be worth that much, he answered. ‘Nup’. When asked why not, he said, ‘cause they’re not really much materials, just paint’ (Interview 17/7/00). Therefore, he reverted to the literal worth of the materials, and not the remuneration placed on artworks in the artistic field, which, as Bourdieu (1993b) explains, is separate from the economic market.

The teacher then showed them another work produced from a student in the previous class and they responded with: ‘Wow’, and ‘That’s nice’ and a student asked, ‘What is it?’ The teacher answered, ‘Just pattern. You don’t have to do a certain thing. You can just do something like this; it’s just pattern and line’. ‘So have you got some ideas?’ the teacher then asked and added, ‘Please go beyond just a love heart. It is not very interesting’.

Despite being shown abstract imagery for ideas in the introduction and the teacher suggesting students could produce work based on line and pattern, the notion of producing an abstract work was in direct contradiction to the message she had given the students earlier and her belief that art has to be ‘realistic’ to constitute ‘good’ art. Consequently, students produced very formulaic drawings such as a dog, a flower, a person, a car, a fish, stars, a house, and landscape imagery they were familiar with. Only one student produced an abstract design (Observation 12/7/00).

When asked if she felt the students were able to talk about the artworks, the teacher replied, ‘They did a bit, but they didn’t do a lot...This year’s my year when I’m trying to show them more artwork. I’ve made that one of my aims, is that I actually show them a lot and I’ve bought a lot of sets of prints, landscapes and all sorts that we’ve been looking at. But they can’t, they’re not very good at talking about it, they’re getting better but they don’t say a lot...A lot of it they can’t see. You’ve got
to draw it out of them’. When asked if she felt this was because they did not look at paintings often, she replied, ‘I’ll say, yeah! Half of them, I’d say the majority, haven’t been to the art gallery’ (Field Notes 24/5/2000). She did mention how they had not gone to the art gallery with the school since she was running the art program, claiming, ‘It’s not a high priority, art, and it’s not something they’d have a day’s excursion to’ (Field Notes 24/5/2000).

Student Interviews

Student interviews revealed students had been introduced to looking and talking about more artworks than last year as the teacher had planned. The majority of students responded they looked at more art this year and that or thought it was a good idea. Mark replied, ‘We probably done it just this year’ and when asked if this was a good idea he responded, ‘Oh, yes and no’. He explained it was a good idea ‘because you get to learn about different paintings and that’ and he did not think it was a good idea ‘because she’s already showed us what there is and that and we already know’. He said, ‘She sometimes shows us the same things’. James said they did not talk about artworks last year. He stated that they started ‘About six months ago’ (Interview 13/7/00).

Erin, however, believed they looked at artworks last year, stating, ‘Yeah, we have, every single time we do something about paintings and masks’, although she did admit they looked at more this year: ‘Not quite a lot but a few more than last year’. Erin was also very interested in looking at artworks, more so than the other students, which can be explained due to her parents’ interest in art and the fact that she had been to the art gallery many times with her grandmother. When asked if she liked looking at other people’s paintings, she answered, ‘Yeah, it’s really good because it looks interesting and even the ones that are just bluey pictures they look really good’. Therefore, she had some appreciation for abstract art, explaining she liked abstract the most, ‘cause it looks creative and you can make it into lots of other things. Yeah, I like to talk about them’. She explained, ‘I mainly talk about the colours that are used, even if it’s black and white I say “gee that black and white looks really good and effective on that piece of paper” and it just looks good and everything’. When asked if she felt she was good at talking about artworks, she replied, ‘I’m pretty good but not the best person in the world. When I look at something I don’t necessarily think about it as much but I can get it if I think about it for a little while’ (Interview 13/7/00). Although Erin believed she was ‘pretty good’ at talking about art, her description of how she spoke about artworks was basic, especially her ability to participate in the ‘disinterested’ discourse of art appreciation.
Despite Erin stating the teacher talked about artworks a lot, she could remember only two images based on description, ‘We’ve looked at a fruit bowl one and a blown picture, straw blown picture’. She was unable to remember any artists: ‘I can’t remember any names but they’re really good’. All of the students interviewed could not recall any of the artists’ names they had looked at. Jessica remembered: ‘We’ve looked at Aboriginal painting and paintings from famous people’. Most students recalled the artwork by description of the subject matter, such as when Tenaya said, ‘We’ve looked at like a big street thing of buildings and stuff and like just pictures of houses pictures of people from the olden days and the inside of their house’.

Two students did claim to know an artist Mark explained, ‘In art sometimes the teacher gets out a book and she says who this paintings by like Michelangelo and that’. James also claimed to know an artist: ‘I know a famous artist, Leonardo Da Vinci, I think he cut off, his ear his left or right ear’. When asked how he knew that, he answered, ‘It was on the news like in the Guinness Book of Records. Yeah, he chopped off his ear with a knife which would hurt’. James also felt the worth of paintings was ‘cause they’re really famous like the Mona Lisa or whatever it’s called; that’s really famous’. When asked how he knew the ‘Mona Lisa’, he explained, ‘I’ve seen it on a game, World Tour [Playstation], and I blew her up’. When asked if he would like to see the painting in real life, he replied, ‘Yeah, and I would like to blow her up’ (Interview 17/7/00). Therefore, his relation to the painting was purely through his Playstation and not as a valued piece of art. Further, when asked what paintings he had looked at in art, his response was similar to the other students: ‘We looked at houses, the 3D ones’.

The inability of students to recall artists’ names and artworks looked at in art class can be explained as the teacher did not really talk about the artist. Furthermore, the teacher mainly did the talking, according to the students. Carly explained the teacher ‘mainly talks about it’. When asked if they got to talk about the art, Dylan replied, ‘Nah, not really’. When asked what the teacher talked about, the students stated, it was mainly the content of the work. Dylan explained, ‘She says about all the stuff the different things that they put in the drawings and pictures...like how it’s got trees with a bit of bark on them and a house’. Erin also stated, ‘She’s told us to have a look at it just like that for a while and then actually talk about what you saw in the picture itself’.

Mark explained, ‘It’s just mainly at the start we just talk about it’, such as ‘how he draws it and that and how he only uses a couple of colours’. Other students recalled the teacher talking about colour. Jessica stated, ‘Yeah, what different shades they’ve done’. Tenaya also responded she talked about ‘the colours and line’. Dylan said, ‘She talks about the colours and how they make it’. Ashley stated, ‘She just says
how you should make it like 3D shapes and things like that so it looks realistic and
effective’. Emma felt the teacher gave some information on the artwork: ‘she was
saying the historical background on the artwork and the colours and lines and shapes
that they’ve used and how they’ve done it’. James said they talked about ‘who drew
it, what they used, what’s it about and she sometimes reads the information on the
back’. Jessica said the teacher talked about ‘how much you tell they’ve put into it’.
Therefore, the ability of the artists, the effort such as time put into the artwork and if it
was realistic had been passed onto the students by the teacher.

Predominantly, students enjoyed talking about the artworks. However, some students
were not that enthusiastic. While most of the students said they liked it, some of them
appeared to be responding to me, perhaps feeling they had to say ‘yes’, thinking this
was what was expected and even (unfounded) fear of retribution, as some students
changed their mind during the course of the interview. For example, Dylan initially
replied, ‘Not really’, when asked if he liked looking at other artworks, but then
replied, ‘Yeah’ a moment later. Tenaya also responded positively about talking about
artworks, then at other times she answered, ‘Sort of. It gets a bit boring’.

While most of the students ‘stated’ they did not mind talking about the artworks,
some students were not overly enthusiastic with responses such as ‘Oh yeah, sort of’
and ‘Yeah, sometimes’. All students, except one, preferred to make the art than talk
about it. Jacinta was the only student who responded, she liked looking at the work
more, ‘Because I like the way they do the shadow and how they do it three-
dimensional’. This response was directly related to the work they had recently looked
at and what they were doing in art themselves. Erin also stated she enjoyed ‘Mainly
making it except I really like talking about it too’. When asked why she thought they
looked at other artwork and talked about it, Erin responded, ‘Because it’s fun to do
and you can learn’. She explained, ‘Mainly we learn about the paintings and how to
paint them and we learn how to shade and do shadows’. Jacinta also stated they learnt
by looking at artworks ‘how to do the house 3D, do the shadow and the background
of it’.

Students related what they looked at in art to their current art making and that they
‘get ideas’ from the artworks. The teacher often referred to ‘getting ideas’ from the
artworks. Therefore, students discussed this concept as well. Jessica stated what she
learnt was ‘how to to do different shades and how to do different things like people’s
ideas’. She explained that they looked at other artwork ‘To get ideas for your stuff
and...how they made it and what they did to make it look better’. Tenaya also
commented she learnt ‘how to get ideas and how to draw better things’. Mark also
stated, ‘You learn how to paint like they do and you get some different ideas’. Ashley also felt, ‘I reckon you get more ideas of what you should do on yours’.

Dylan said you learn ‘Skills...with your hands’. Emma also related what they learnt by talking about art skills. However, she felt you learnt ‘Stuff like how they’ve used their skills putting it into the painting’, thereby referring to the skills of the artist. Again, the skill put into the work by the artist was an important factor for how these students judged artworks, reinforcing the comments made by their art teacher regarding artistic ability.

Other students realised they learnt about art, but also related this to making. James stated he learnt ‘who drew it, what they did, what they painted, what they used, what materials’. Tenaya felt they talked about artworks, ‘so we can learn about art and how to do paintings and pictures and stuff’. Initially, when asked if you learn a lot by talking about different paintings, Carly replied, ‘No, not really’. When asked why she thought they look at other people’s artworks, she responded ‘To get ideas and that’. Then when asked what she had learnt in art, she answered, ‘About other pictures about what other people have done’. Therefore, students predominantly related to their art making experience. Looking at, and talking about, art also reinforced their own art making. Although students were introduced to artworks by the art teacher in this year, they had not written about them and all students verified this in their interviews. Ashley replied, they had not written about artworks and he would ‘not really’ like to because ‘I don’t know; I don’t like writing about things’. Mark also stated he would not like to write about art ‘because writing’s not art. It’s English, I reckon’.

Some other students gave contradictory responses again between their interview and their questionnaire. In his interview, James replied they had not written and he would like to. Yet, in his questionnaire, he responded he felt that learning how to write and talk about art was least important and the most important was to learn how to make art. Emma also said she would like to write about art. However, she stated learning how to talk and write about art was not important because ‘When you’re doing art you don’t really talk about it it’s not like speech or anything you sort of paint it and sell it and stuff’.

Two other students, Erin and Tenaya, had written about their own artworks at home and would like to do so in art at school. Erin said she wrote about what colours she used. Tenaya stated she would like to write ‘what we do in art—just write about a picture describing it’. She said, ‘I do it at home’ and her Mum taught her as ‘she just told me one day you just write stuff and you just describe the picture and stuff’. She did not do this regularly, stating, ‘I just do it every now and then...I write about
people I draw and houses and I just write how I drew it and what they're made of. Due to her experience of writing about art at home, Tenaya felt learning how to write and talk about art was most important, 'so that you will know about more stuff when you are older and you'll remember it and stuff'. When asked if she felt they do enough of this at this school in art, she replied, 'Not really'.

Due to students' art experiences being dominated by art making, when asked what they think art is, students responded with answers relating to art making. Carly stated, 'That is when you make stuff and do paintings and drawings'. Erin said, 'Art is a type of work where you make lots of things and where you join things together and make things and not necessarily real'. Jessica responded, 'Like drawing and stuff and...sewing and everything'. Dylan stated, 'Learning skills about drawing or painting or doing work with clay and drawing stuff'. Tenaya said, 'Like when you make stuff and just when you make stuff and just do it for fun'. Emma stated, 'It's just a skill that you get or you learn and you can either keep it to yourself or you can sell it and make money'. Two students mentioned more than just art making. Mark stated, 'To learn about art and to just draw'. James initially answered, 'When you draw pictures', but when asked what else art was, he replied, 'When all people form a group and they paint pictures and that'.

Principally, students at School Three had a limited understanding of art, particularly in their ability to engage in art discourse. Their limitation in art appreciation can be explained due to their limited exposure to art language and interaction with art terminology both at home and at school. The scholastic stance within School Three was not high, as the art teacher's understanding of art appreciation was also restricted by her own beliefs and habitus. When she attempted to introduce art appreciation, discussion was often based on the subject matter of the work as opposed to the style and stylistic features of individual artists. She rarely mentioned artists' names and, therefore, students were unable to recall artworks or artists. Due to their lack of modelling and engagement with art language and familiarity with artworks, students at School Three had not developed an aesthetic disposition which would enable them to decipher artworks in a disinterested approach.

School Four

The art teacher at School Four explained that art appreciation was expected in this school. The principal had also expressed this belief. The art teacher explained how she would introduce an artist when a new unit of work was introduced and students would discuss the work. She explained how students participated in art appreciation in all year levels. She felt students were experiencing all of the substrands of the
CSF: *The Arts* and that the document had not changed the art program explaining, 'Not really because our program was pretty close to it anyway'.

She felt art appreciation was important, stating, 'Oh, yeah, I think so but I think also that being an art educator it's a very important aspect of a child's education because 99 per cent of them are never going to touch a paint brush or work in clay or whatever again. But they're all going to be exposed to the visual world, architecture, sculpture, planning of cities or even just their decisions of colours in their own home. That's why I think the appreciation side of things is extremely important' (Interview 29/3/00).

Despite her belief that art appreciation was an important aspect of art education, she stated that her art program was predominantly studio-based, 'and I think that's the way it should be'. This she based on the need for children to develop their coordination and have creative play, which she felt did not occur due to the widespread use of computers and television. However, she also stated she would like to include more art appreciation in the art program 'because I think it's important...I think that's almost as important as the other side although I'm contradicting myself...I just think that's important and I think with the CSF that's made us aware and I think that the parents expect it too. A lot of parents expect it and the students enjoy that too. They can see how it all ties in to their artwork'.

She felt that for the parents art appreciation was not the main concern, but it was a concern. 'They don't really see the appreciation as the important thing but the expectations are that it will be a good, full, rounded art program...We have art curriculum nights and the parents that attend those are interested to know we are teaching the kids art appreciation'. She also explained the apparent interest of parents in art. 'There's probably a higher number of students at this school than state schools who also visit galleries around the world. I have a boy in my painting group who's going to Europe for a month and a half next term. There is a percentage of parents who travel a lot and take their kids to galleries'. Students also attended galleries with the school: the 'year four and fives have been to the gallery this year'. She stated how the school is 'allowed at least one gallery visit for all groups' per year.

She felt students did not really write a lot in art. However, compared to the other three schools, they were the only students who did any form of written appreciation. She explained they did 'a little bit, not much. They talk about it more than write about it'. I asked about the worksheets they do and she replied, 'They all do it. Yeah, but that would be once or twice a term; it's not every week; we wouldn't have time to make anything'. When asked if students are happy to do worksheets, she responded, 'I
found that the younger ones are quite happy to do that. As they get up higher into the school they get a little bit more resentful but I think if you can bring it in at the lower level as a more meaningful thing to do and very important in the arts. I think they except that as part of the art program which is the way we do it here'. Therefore, this school was developing a cultural disposition at an early age whereby aesthetic appreciation was part of the arts program. It formed part of their acquired habitus. Students when observed completed art appreciation worksheets without objection, indicating they had done these before and they were an expected practice in the art classroom.

The teacher did admit that she considered student background when developing her art programs. She explained, 'Depending on the clientele...I'd vary that program depending on the mix of students, what cultural backgrounds they're from and adjust it'. She realised 'it's a very Anglo-Saxon school' (Interview 29/3/00). Regarding art appreciation she said, 'Yeah, depends on the students. You could even change that slightly from class to class'.

During my observations at School Four students did participate in art appreciation. In a grade six lesson (10/5/00) the teacher showed works by Picasso, explaining, 'He was the most famous artist of this century', and showing a photograph of him. She explained, 'He was born a long time ago in the 1880s and he was a very talented artist right from when he was very young, about your age. What he used to do is sketch a lot and paint a lot and one day his father, who was also a painter, said to Picasso, “Can you please help me with this painting”, but he did such a brilliant job on the painting that his father said “I’m not going to do any more painting again. You’re too good; you can take over and be a painter”.... One really important period of Picasso’s life was when he was about twenty and he went through a very sad period of his life and he painted pictures like this one here'. She pointed to two works on the wall form his Blue Period. She asked the students, 'When you look at these pictures how can you describe the colours that he used?’ ‘Really dark blue’, one student replied. ‘Good, that’s a good description. How do you think the dark colours make you feel?’ ‘Sad’. Another student said, ‘It’s kind of like ghostly, like there’s water above and it’s dark and the light is coming from the water and there’s all that weird bluey dark stuff’. The teacher replied, ‘So what would you call that? He sort of created a sad atmosphere with the colours he has used’. The teacher also stated how ‘the faces are gaunt looking. What do I mean by gaunt?’ One student replied, ‘Sad, freaky...They’re just like plain faces and they haven’t got much expression’. The teacher also stated, ‘The body language, even the body is stooped over, the head’s down, the eyes are down and look at those skinny, long, bonny hands, so he’s used all these tricks to create a feeling of sadness'.
The teacher then explained, ‘Picasso lived in Paris pretty much on the poverty line, like one of those typical artists you think of that was in poverty, worked in poverty just painted and didn’t make much of a living. And apart from painting these sad paintings he was affected by another terrible incident in his life when he lived in Spain and he painted this painting which is totally different from the other one. Perhaps some of you might describe what you feel or what you think this painting is about?’ She pointed to ‘Guernica’. ‘Well, it’s a weird painting, and I reckon it’s about bull fights’, Jonathan said. The teacher responded, ‘Good, it’s a weird painting but what’s so weird about it? If you think you have a word to describe why you think this painting is weird, think of a really good word or good description.’ ‘It’s got funny faces and the bull has a funny ear’. The teacher said, ‘Can you see this figure here? She’s crying and Picasso thought, “I can paint paintings of people that look sad but I’m going to change my style because I want a painting to have more impact than just a real looking figure, I want the figure to be distorted”. So he hasn’t used colour. What do you think he’s more interested in than colour?’ ‘The mutilated faces’, a student replied. ‘Right, and the shapes and he’s used lines...It’s about the Spanish Civil War in 1937 because he was annoyed about the fact that his friends were being killed...He didn’t use colour. He only used black and white and maybe just a little bit of blue. It’s called monochromatic colour. He wanted to express his feelings about the war just using shapes and lines’.

The teacher then showed Munch’s work ‘The Scream’ saying, ‘This is by a Norwegian artist that Picasso thought was pretty good, because instead of painting what he saw he painted what he felt...This artist’s name is Munch, Edvard Munch, and you can have a look at all the expression and feelings that have gone into this painting. You don’t look at that and say, “Oh, isn’t that a pretty painting?”’ Therefore, the art teacher was making students aware that there were various styles of painting that were often more interested in expressing emotion than in creating a ‘pretty’ picture or a realistic representation. She was giving students the vocabulary to ‘decode’ the artworks based on use of line, shape and colour as a form of expression. She was also telling them information about the artist. In Bourdieu’s (1993b) terms, this was the ‘discourse of celebration’, whereby the biography establishes the artist as worthy of historical account (p. 260).

When asked questions about the work students were keen to contribute: there were usually about three different students with their hand up to answer each question. At the end of the lesson, the teacher asked questions about Picasso that they had discussed and students were able to answer these. The teacher asked, ‘Can anybody remember anything about that large painting that was in monotones that I talked
briefly about? To remember the name would be pretty amazing’. A student answered, ‘Guer...nica’ ‘Very good. Can anybody remember what it was about?’ ‘About people’s feelings’, a student answered. ‘Certainly to some degree’ the teacher replied. ‘It was like people fighting and war’, another student replied. ‘Very good. Can anybody remember what war it was about?’ and a student answered, ‘The Spanish war’.

The following week I observed the same class (17/5/00) and during this art lesson the teacher again talked about Picasso and showed the works from the previous week, from his Blue Period. As the teacher was talking about colours one student, Jonathan, said how Picasso ‘painted weird, square faces with droopy eyes to make it look sad’. He was not necessarily talking about the two images that the teacher was holding up at the time but I feel talking more about Picasso’s later work. A few of the students started to laugh at this but the teacher responded, ‘No, he is right’ and this stopped their laughing. The teacher then went on to the talk about the hollow faces of the images and held up ‘Guernica’, discussing how the shape of the faces and heads is weird. Therefore, the teacher was reinforcing the responses from this student and valuing the ability to talk about art in an aesthetic sense at a young age. The teacher also discussed the ‘funny angles and shapes to exaggerate and shock people’ and how Picasso ‘didn’t want to paint the same as the Blue Period’. She talked about Picasso’s life further. She discussed the transition from the Blue Period to the Rose Period explaining how Picasso ‘used line and abstraction and he painted in this style for another year’ and showed some of Picasso’s work from his Rose Period, thereby, introducing another of Picasso’s art styles.

When students moved to the tables to do their portraits, the teacher asked students whether they should paint an outline when they paint on the nose. She was holding up a photo of a person’s face. Some students said, ‘Yes’, but Jonathan confidently responded, ‘No, I wouldn’t because it takes away from the 3D effect. I’d use shading as the nose is made of shading depending on the light’. The teacher said, ‘Excellent’ and once again reinforced the ability not only to paint but also to articulate it.

I observed (6/6/00) art lessons by another teacher, although she was not the focus of my study. She also revealed the incorporation of art discourse in this school. This particular teacher highlighted the correct use of art language. In one art lesson a student asked, ‘Who was the guy that painted that one?’ The teacher replied, ‘I beg your pardon?’ ‘Who was the guy…’, the student repeated but the teacher interrupted with, ‘No, we wouldn’t say that if we were talking about this person. What would we actually call him?’ she asked. ‘Who was the painter’ another child answered. ‘Artist’, other students also replied. ‘The Artist’ the teacher repeated and then
answered, ‘Munch, Edvard Munch, MUNCH’, she spelt out and then wrote it up on the board, ‘and it’s called ‘The Scream’’ and wrote this too. She continued, ‘But we usually refer in this particular case to artists, or creators of the art or painters. “Guy” really doesn’t tell me anything, does it, so you really do need to be more specific, particularly if it’s an art discussion because you want to know about the artist and the way he worked’.

The artwork teachers incorporated into their lessons was important. Bourdieu (1993b) explains how schools inculcate a love for certain works which are linked to certain educational and social status (p. 230). In School Four, they predominantly looked at Western examples of artworks such as Rembrandt, Impressionists, Post-Impressionists, Expressionists, Early Colonial Australian landscape painters and 20th century Australian painters. While students were exposed to a variety of artists and styles, the art program was predominantly based on the study of Anglo-Saxon artists, considered the ‘Greats’ and a part of the ‘high art’ order, establishing these artists as being recognised among the middle class and, therefore, the ability to talk about them qualified one’s social status, ensuring membership of this particular social group or class.

Student Interviews

Overall students at School Four demonstrated a greater understanding of art appreciation and recollection of artists than students in the other three schools. Predominantly, students enjoyed talking about artworks and felt they could talk about them confidently, although some students were not as confident in their ability. Most students recalled that they had talked about artworks in art. However, some students responded they had done so more recently. When asked if they had always talked about artworks in art class James responded, ‘Not always, this year we’re doing more than we did last year’ (Interview 18/7/00). He felt this was ‘all right’ and that they did the right amount in this school, however, he stated, ‘I don’t mind learning about it occasionally but if we learnt too much I don’t think it’s worth it. We should be doing paintings and getting better at it’. Maddison however said, ‘Yeah we talked about some of the best artists in art’ (18/7/00).

Sarah explained, ‘Sometimes between students we sometimes talk about how good they are and basically it’s just the teacher explaining and then you comment about it’. She told how ‘we’ve done some last term and in year five we did a little bit of it, well a fair bit, but not too much and year four we didn’t really look at artists but we looked at paintings but not actually at the artist themselves’. Shaun replied, ‘Yes, I think so. We might have just started a couple of years ago...We have done it for a while’. Nellie even recalled one of the artworks and the style, stating, ‘...there was this one
I've forgotten who it was by but it was called Scream and she said it's good because it's not straight. There's no brushstrokes that are straight; it's all curvy' (21/7/00).

Madeline discussed the examples of artworks in the artroom: 'Yeah, 'cause there has always been like posters and each term I think they redecorate the room and there's always different paintings by famous people'. She further explained that in Prep 'I don't think they really explained the artwork, we just did it, but when we were in year two they started talking about famous artwork and people' (Interview 21/7/00). Nessie confirmed what Madeline said, that they started talking about art in year two. ‘Yeah. I think I remember. Until year two, we were with Mrs Wright and she talked a lot about artwork’ (Interview 20/7/00). Nathan also remembered when they started talking about artworks: ‘In year three we only did a little bit ‘cause I came in year three. And we didn’t really talk about it. But year four and five we started to talk about a lot of painters’ (Interview 20/7/00).

Most students enjoyed talking about artworks and felt they could discuss art quite confidently. However, two students preferred to make artwork. James initially stated he was not that good at talking about artworks and explained it was mainly the teacher who talked about the work, explaining, ‘We don’t really speak about that; the teacher will just ask us a question and we’ll answer it and she’ll tell us a bit more about it’. He did feel he could answer the questions asked: ‘Yeah, I’m all right; everyone’s okay’. When asked if he liked to talk about artworks he replied, ‘No, not really. I prefer to just paint than actually talking about it’ (Interview 18/7/00). Nessie also felt she was ‘okay’ about talking about art but preferred to make art. Due to her lack of confidence she explained when asked if she liked to talk about artworks: ‘Well, I don’t like doing it that much ‘cause I’d much rather go onto other things’ (Interview 20/7/00). Nellie also initially answered when asked if she felt she was good at talking about art, ‘Not really...sometimes I can’t explain things’ (Interview 21/7/00). However, she did like doing this and when asked again if she felt she was good at looking and talking about art she replied, ‘Yeah, I guess so’.

Brigit (Interview 24/7/00) also felt she was not good at talking about artworks and, despite her lack of confidence in her ability, she still enjoyed talking about works and did this frequently with her parents. Madison also had some hesitation about talking about art, stating, ‘I won’t really say too much, because it’s embarrassing because the boys laugh at you’. But again despite this ‘embarrassment’ she liked to talk about artworks. Shaun was also enthusiastic about talking about artworks, explaining he liked to do this ‘Yeah, a lot, yeah’ and he enjoyed talking about more than making art (Interview 21/7/00).
Sarah was extremely confident when asked about her ability to talk about art, replying, ‘Well, I understand it and I like to make my view and a point about things and how the painting’s turned out’ (Interview 18/7/00). Therefore she enjoyed talking about art in class.

Madeline was also very confident, replying ‘Yeah’, she was good at talking about artworks and she knew this because ‘Well, like I can talk for a very long time about one piece and all the different colours and everything that’s in it’ (Interview 21/7/00). Consequently, she enjoyed talking about artworks, responding, ‘Yeah, yeah’ enthusiastically.

Chris also really enjoyed talking about artworks and her ability to do so was positive. She felt she could talk, ‘Oh yes, fairly well’ and she liked to do this stating, ‘Yes. I find it interesting’. She explained what she found interesting ‘Well that you can sort of get into the artist’s mind and what he feels when he was painting it. And like you can look at all the little textures and things that they’ve put into it. So it’s quite interesting because you’re not just looking at a flat piece of paper. You’re looking into someone’s mind. Like a place where only you can go if you look at this picture’. She enjoyed doing this and explained, ‘Yeah, we do quite a lot of looking at paintings’ (Interview 18/7/00).

Predominantly, students enjoyed talking about artworks and could understand why they did it and what they learnt although some students were unsure. Madison was not sure what they learnt, stating, ‘I don’t know. It’s just something you want to do and it’s fun; it’s exciting’. Shaun realised they learnt something: ‘Yeah, I think you do but I’m not really sure in what way’. When asked, ‘What do you get out of it yourself?’ he replied, ‘I just enjoy it’. Later on though he was able to explain that by talking about artworks one learns ‘how they [artists] can express what they’re thinking’.

Sarah was more articulate: ‘Yeah, you seem to learn a fair bit of how different artists paint and express themselves like that’ and felt this was probably why they talked about artworks at school. ‘Yeah, it gives me lots of ideas and the style to paint my things like’. Sarah also told how ‘I just comment, say what it’s about, like whether they’re cool or hot colours, just general things about the work itself’. Therefore, Sarah also related what she saw to how she painted and was beginning to use art language terms like ‘style’ and to analyse the work in terms of the elements used, such as warm and cool colours. Brigit also said they talked about ‘Probably shapes and how you could do this and what sort of styles you could do’. Therefore, she too
was using terms such as ‘style’ when discussing what different types of art they could do.

Other students also related why they talked about artworks to their own work. Chris stated, ‘So that we can get into the feel of it. It sort of actually makes us better at our drawings. We find lots of different things that are interesting and then we try and use them and then [the art teacher] tries to get us to think like the artists to make our drawings the same perspective’. Nessie also felt it improved their own artworks, ‘to learn about art so you can get more techniques and being a better artist’. Nellie also felt they learnt about techniques ‘kind of like how it’s done like in art they say whether it’s blobbed on or brushed that way’. However, she also realised they talked about the different styles of artists: ‘Well, they’re different from other ones and it’s good to see the difference. At art when we have to do one thing it’s good to see how they’ve done it differently from other people’.

Other students realised they learnt about materials and techniques, but also about the artists. Nathan felt they learnt a lot when talking about artworks, ‘because you get to learn an artist’s name and what they actually use, like oil pastels or something like that’. Brigit also felt they learnt ‘how they did this, what style, who they were’. Madeline said, ‘We learn about different people and the different types of textures that are in the painting and sometimes our art teacher tells us there is a story in the painting of that person’s life’.

Students discussed that they talked about the artists and also what elements of art they used: predominantly shape and colour. The tendency for students to express that they talked about the colour in an artist’s work can be related to the recent discussions they had about Picasso’s Blue Period. Nellie stated they learnt about ‘the different colours and sometimes we have to paint something with only three colours’, relating directly to the recent work they had done. Nessie also explained: ‘We look at shades and shapes and we look at the way people draw it. If they make it like in a background they could do big buildings and then smaller buildings. So it would be like looking into a distance’. Chris also said, ‘We usually try and find what shapes they have in them. So [the art teacher] will ask us what shapes and we’ll say, “Oh, they have a triangle up there or there’s an arch up there”. And then we’ll use some of those ideas in our own drawings and she tries to make our own drawings better by finding ideas that other people have used. And then not exactly drawing them the same way but putting them into things’.

Nathan said they talked about ‘What the colour sort of is and what painting, if it’s water colour or oil pastels or oil paintings’. James stated they talked about ‘Whether
it's a sad painting or a happy painting and why he did it and what type of colours he
used’. Shaun said, ‘Just what we think when we look at them’ and they talked about
shape and colour. He explained the teacher also talked about the meaning of the
painting and he enjoyed this, stating, ‘Yeah, really it’s fun’. Madeline also felt they
discussed what the artist was trying to express: ‘We kind of like talk about what
colours they use and what do you think the painter’s trying to express and tell you’.
Therefore, students were developing their understanding that art communicates, it has
a language they can interpret and they were learning the ‘code’ to ‘read’ these
artworks. Students were learning to speak about the works with the appropriate
language, by analysing the ‘pictorial techniques’ (Bourdieu 1993b, p. 260) such as
colour, shades, shapes and styles of work.

The art teacher also introduced students to the artist, giving some of the biography of
the artist and establishing the artist as worthy of historical account (Bourdieu 1993b,
p. 260). Shaun told how the teacher talked about the artist: ‘how old he was’.
Madeline stated that they also talked about the artist: ‘Especially Van Gogh’. Other
students recalled they talked a lot about Van Gogh, as they had done an extensive unit
on his work from the previous year. Chris stated, ‘We usually talk about like [the art
teacher] actually read us a book on some of the artists that we’ve done. One was
Vincent Van Gogh’. Nathan said, ‘Oh, yeah, I think it was Vincent Van Gogh, how
he chopped his ear off with an axe or something and sent it to his wife or something
that divorced him, to try and get her back’.

Brigit remembered ‘We saw a copy of the “Sunflowers” last year and then we
probably talked a bit about Vincent Van Gogh’. She said she knew some of his work
and had seen it in real life ‘in the London Art Gallery. The place about modern art’.
Brigit had a high level of cultural capital as she had visited art galleries around the
world as well as in London with her parents.

When asked what artists they knew or artworks they had seen, students predominantly
recalled Van Gogh and Picasso and felt they knew other artists but could not recall
their names ‘off the top of their head’, but felt they would know them when heard.
This could be seen as a need to protect and project a level of cultural familiarity.
However, most students could recall some artists with real familiarity compared to the
other schools. Shaun stated, ‘Yeah, a couple. We did do a bit of Picasso last term’,
but he did not remember any of the paintings. ‘I’m not sure if she gave us the names
but we did look at his work’. He also recalled they had looked at ‘Van Gogh and
another guy I’ve forgotten his name but it was good’. James remembered, ‘We did a
bit of Vincent Van Gogh’ and felt he knew other artists but ‘I can’t remember their
names. I know a couple of other ones but I can’t remember them off the top of my
head’. Madeline said, ‘I can’t really remember the names of them but we’ve looked at lots of different artists’ but when asked again she recalled, ‘Van Gogh’.

Madison stated, ‘There’s one that’s lost its ear. Vincent Van Gogh. I tried doing the “Sunflowers”, but I didn’t have the right paint to do the thick paint. I did read some books about Van Gogh that the teacher gave me’. Nellie also remembered, ‘We’ve done like sad paintings and Van Gogh and I’ve got a print of Van Gogh in my room’. Chris remembered some other works as well as Van Gogh: ‘Mona Lisa and...oh, I can’t remember what it’s called but it’s something like the flames, the city of flames or something. But it’s all just buildings; they’re all red and white and black and then it has blue for the sky’. When I asked if it was the painting they looked at for the play the Firebird, she responded, ‘Yeah, Firebird, that was it’ and added, ‘I think that was really imaginative, to be able to think you’re really looking out over a city’. She also remembered: ‘Vincent Van Gogh, we looked at lots of his. There was one that was like a street going down, I can’t remember what it’s called. And also the “Sunflowers”...we made these big sunflowers and then we were going to put them into this big field of sunflowers to make it like that...I know we have done others but I can’t remember them’. Nessie also recalled, ‘We’ve looked at Van Gogh’s “Sunflowers”. And the pictures of him which he drew. And we’ve looked at the back-drop of a play. And we did a painting of it and then we’ve looked at other artists’ work but I’ve forgotten their names’.

Nathan also remembered: ‘Vincent Van Gogh which was sort of like oil paints I think and also this other...Da Vinci that’s right, and we looked at some of his paintings and we looked at an Australian young lady that won...Young Australian of the Year Award, I think it is, and she takes big pictures of butterflies but then minimises them and puts them onto pieces of paper and makes sort of spiral shapes and stuff’.

Sarah also recalled Van Gogh and knew another ‘very famous’ artist, but could not quite remember his name. She stated, ‘We looked at a lot of um, I can’t remember his name—some famous artist’s work, very famous, it wasn’t Van Gogh, it was, I can’t remember’. It was last term. He wrote about the depression, drew about it and we looked at another artist who painted “The Pioneers”. I asked her if she looked at Picasso: ‘Yeah, Picasso, we looked at Picasso’. She continued, ‘Yeah, that was really good and that was really interesting and it was nice looking at his work’. She also recalled artworks she knew from home. She said she knew ‘Ken Done, I’ve seen a lot of his stuff, Mum likes it, Dad doesn’t mind it either, the beach stuff’. She also felt she knew other artists if told: ‘I don’t know them off the top of my head but I know them once someone suggests them’.
Brigit had been introduced to artworks from within her family and knew a different artist from the other students because of her familiarity with art from galleries. She stated she knew ‘Matisse because I’ve been to the Pompidou centre quite a lot’. She explained she could not recall other artists’ names but would recognise them if told, stating, ‘I don’t really remember the names but if somebody said them I’d probably would know. Say “Oh, yeah, this is the painting”’. I asked if she had heard of Picasso and she replied, ‘Yeah’. I asked if she knew what style of painting he did and she answered, ‘Sort of abstract a bit’. She had also seen his work in ‘some art galleries’.

Generally, students stated they did not write in art and if they did it was not very often, as the art teacher explained. James said, ‘No, but we learn about the artist but we don’t write about the artist’. He also felt he would not like to, explaining, ‘No, I’d probably do drawing or painting than write about the artist’. Shaun also felt they did not write in art and he also stated, ‘No, not really’ as to whether he would like to. Brigit also responded they have never written in art but this can be explained as she had been absent a lot traveling with her parents. She felt she would like to write, ‘Yeah, probably a bit. But I reckon that making art itself is a bit more fun’. Chris also said they had not written in class but then remembered they had, ‘Once—the first time that you came’. She said she would like to write more, ‘Yeah, I think it would be good’. Other students recalled doing some writing but not frequently. Sarah explained: ‘Not generally in class but once last term we had to write about what we thought about art during an art lesson’. She also agreed they had done a worksheet on an artist but they do not do these very often. She would like to do them more, ‘Yeah, probably a bit more often, that would be better’.

Two students recalled they had done written work and what it was about in more detail. Madeline stated they had written ‘Not very much you know. Maybe twice in a year. We’re learning on a particular painting for a few weeks and our teacher gives us a test, not like a test, but some questions because she gave us all the information and we had to write it down on a piece of paper’. She enjoyed doing this. Madison explained, ‘We did one sheet about Van Gogh and what’s your favourite, Van Gogh or that other guy. We talked about what one you like and I picked Van Gogh’. When asked why, she responded, ‘Because I like it how he does something different than the other artists. All the others do real life ones, I do like that, but I like it how Van Gogh does it’. When asked, ‘How does he do it?’, she replied, ‘Just like a lump of paint and the brush has little strips on it and it makes it look good. I like it’. She also enjoyed writing about the art and felt they wrote about it: ‘To make you want to know more about art and want to do art and make stuff and know about it’.
Therefore, they were developing a familiarity with art and enhancing their cultural aspiration for and valuing of art.

Due to the students’ art experience in School Four, which involved both making and appreciating, students generally realised that art was about creating works themselves but also learning about other artists and how they express themselves through art. When asked what they think art is, James responded, ‘Learning the way they paint mixing colours, why they painted that way, how to do it, stuff like that’. When asked, ‘Who’s they?’ he replied, ‘The artists like Vincent Van Gogh and people like that. Yeah, like why they painted’ and he felt this was interesting ‘Yeah, yeah, it’s pretty interesting like the way they painted and why they painted sad and why they painted happy’. Shaun felt art was ‘Paintings and artists’ and expanded, ‘Just looking at them and doing it yourself’. Nellie was the only student who responded art was only about making, ‘like creating things and making’.

Madeline initially felt art was equivalent to making ‘You draw and paint pictures of what you see and what you think’, but observed artists make art ‘To express their feeling to say what they feel like throughout pictures’. Other students also related how artists express themselves. Sarah suggested that art is ‘a visual way to express yourself. Just say you didn’t know how to write or read then you’d be able to look at the picture or the sculpture and get a mind’s view of it’. Therefore, she was aware of the ‘language’ in artworks that can be ‘read’.

Chris stated: ‘I’d say it’s probably a group of things that you can let your imagination go wild and just express all of the things that you’re feeling with it. I mean, you can do lots and lots of things with art and there are so many different things that you can do...I mean, you don’t have to draw, there’s like clay modelling and woodwork, all different things that you can do in art’. Brigit also explained art was to do with the different materials used, but also realised art can be eclectic and made from everyday objects due to her exposure to various forms of art. She stated, ‘It can be made with wood, with all sorts of things. Basically anything can be made into art. Most forms of art are paintings. But I saw some thong pyramids in a gallery so anything can really be art’. She explained she saw this in ‘Sydney Art Gallery and it was for this sculpture and that was the one that won it [the competition]’. When asked if she thought it was good she replied, ‘Yeah, I liked it’. Revealing an acceptance and a valuing of contemporary art. Nathan also related art to looking at artworks in school and his visits to art galleries: ‘I think it’s when a teacher shows you something and then says “Now you do it” and how you go to art galleries and you look at art from Vincent Van Gogh or Australian artists’.
Students at School Four showed they had developed an ability to discuss art, examining the use of art elements to understand how artists expressed themselves and communicated through their art. They were beginning to use appropriate art terminology to admire certain artworks aesthetically, moving beyond simply relying on the subject matter of the work and the quality or quantity of time put into the work. In comparison to students in the other schools—particularly School One and School Three—who had to rely on content and realism to inform their understanding of artworks. Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) find the reliance on realism, is due to the ‘unprepared’ viewer being deprived of the knowledge of style and, therefore, seeing works as simple objects and relying on basic recognition of the object depicted (pp. 44–45).

Students in School Four were shown by their teachers the ‘correct’ ways to interact with and appreciate artworks by using art language. Students were developing their linguistic capital and consequently their aesthetic competence to participate in art discourse. This is congruent with Bourdieu’s (1991) observation that discourses are inspired by a concern to speak well and speak properly, producing products that are valued and responded to on the market (p. 78). Students were able to name some artists, discuss pictorial elements and styles of artists and recount the historical biographies of artists. Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain that having the appropriate knowledge and language for decoding and deciphering artworks allows for greater understanding (p. 55) and therefore, acceptance and value of art. Students in School Four were acquiring an awareness that art can be appreciated purely for itself. Bourdieu (1984) explains this allows for the ‘disinterested’ (p. 7) approach to be developed. However, the ability to appreciate art through familiarisation and modelling of art discourse is not only developed in the school but also inculcated in the family. In Chapter 10 the cultural capital of students will be examined to ascertain a cultural environment conducive for the development of a cultivated disposition.
Chapter 10 Student Habitus and Cultural Capital

Cultural disposition and the valuing of artworks come not only from education; it is initially inculcated within the family. Consequently, students come to school with an already developed habitus and cultural capital depending on the practices of and value placed on art in their families. Bourdieu (1984) regards the value of culture is generated simply by people entering the ‘game’ of cultural practices, a collective belief in the value of the game (p. 250). However, not all groups have the desire to participate in cultural practices, to enter the game, for cultural aspiration and cultural obligation vary just as cultural practices vary. As examined in Chapter 3, cultural capital comprises the styles of acting, talking and thinking which are inherited from the family and act as markers of class, as distinctions of taste.

Bourdieu (1984) finds that the ideology of charisma regards taste in culture as a gift of nature. However, he observes that cultural needs are the product of education and upbringing and cultural practices (museum visits, concert-going, reading, etc), along with preferences in literature, art and music, are closely related to educational level and social origin (p. 1). Further, the acquisition of culture can be attained pre-verbally, ‘by early immersion in a world of cultivated people, practices and objects’ (p. 75). In this chapter the cultural capital of students from each school will be examined, to ascertain their relation to culture.

However, Bourdieu (1984) explains that there exists a hierarchizing world of cultural works, and they are closely linked to the different modes of acquisition—domestic and scholastic or scholastic exclusively—of cultural capital (p. 76). Therefore, even within the same school, students may have varying degrees of cultural capital, depending on the acquisition of their capital: inherited or acquired. They may possess both strong inherited capital along with strong educational capital or they may have an inherited cultural capital but a lower educational capital. Furthermore, they may have a lesser level of inherited capital and owe their relation to culture more to the school and less to their family (Bourdieu 1984, p. 81). Further still, students may have both low levels of inherited and scholastic capital, placing them at a distinct disadvantage in their relation to culture.

However, the CSF: The Arts requires that all students participate in art appreciation regardless of their relation to culture. Bourdieu (1993b) finds that when art education is reduced to a discourse (historical, aesthetic or other) it necessarily presupposes that individuals are endowed with a previously acquired competence and with a whole capital of experience, such as visits to museums, concerts, lectures, etc., which are unequally distributed among the various social classes (p. 232).
Therefore, student visits to galleries with their family and the school will be examined as a means to understand their proposed ability to participate effectively in art appreciation. Student responses to gallery visits will also be presented as an indication of cultural aspiration and obligation. Bourdieu (1984) also espouses that the playing of a musical instrument and the personal production of art presuppose a long establishment in the art world and culture, but also the economic means and spare time to do so (p. 75). Bourdieu proposes that those among the dominant class play musical instruments more so than those from the middle and working class (p. 75). Therefore, in Schools Three and Four cultural practices such as participation in music, reading and the cultural works within the family home will be shown as a further indication of cultural capital.

**School One**

Students in School One rarely frequented galleries. Consequently, their aesthetic disposition was limited and they lacked the cultural aspiration to visit galleries. When asked if she attended galleries with her family, Melanie responded, ‘Not usually’. When asked if she would like to go she replied, ‘Not really’ and explained, ‘I don’t know; I’m just not interested. It’s just boring walking around looking at all the paintings’. When asked why it was boring she said, ‘Some of it was good but I don’t know—it’s just boring’. When asked if he thought he would visit art galleries when he was older, Daniel replied, ‘Yeah, sometimes but sometimes just looking at pictures is a bit boring’. Justin enjoyed talking about art but when asked if he would like artists to come and talk about their art or go to galleries he responded, ‘We don’t go to galleries very much and I don’t want artists coming in explaining because it gets boring after a while because they talk about their design and you don’t get to do your designs’.

Ryan said, ‘I don’t really go anywhere with my parents to look at artwork and that’. When asked if he would like to go, he said, ‘No’. However, when asked if he would like to go with school he responded, ‘Yeah’. Initially Carl stated he had not been to art galleries. However, he remembered he had been with his previous school. When asked if he enjoyed going to the gallery, he said, ‘Yeah’, but when asked if he would like to go with his class, he responded, ‘No, it’s pretty boring—you just walk around looking at all the paintings’.

The confusion amongst the students as to whether they wanted to go to art galleries or not can be explained with wanting to fit their own habitus and disposition with their class habitus—that is, staying within their boundaries, knowing their limits and not breaking with the cultural tradition of their class. For most of the students at School One, going to the gallery was not a regular practice. It did not mesh with their class.
habit. To fit in with the ‘group’ they had to portray themselves doing the group activities that were acceptable. Therefore, because they did not have the acquired or inherited cultural capital, they found attending the art gallery ‘boring’, which can translate as ‘unacceptable’ and extraneous.

Not all of the students were unfamiliar with visiting art galleries, Elise had been to galleries with her parents, saying, ‘Whenever I’m on holidays we always visit arts museums’. She enjoyed looking at and talking about art and did this with her parents. However, the galleries she visited were small local galleries. She had not been to the larger galleries. However, her familial experience had made visiting galleries an acceptable practice where she would have liked to look and talk about art more in art class at school.

Most of the students had been to Canberra Art Gallery on an excursion that year and for the majority this was their first experience of visiting an art gallery. Steven explained how they had ‘this tour guide and she explained some artworks and there was this one that looked like scribble and it was all colourful but after she explained it to us’ he understood it better. He told how the tour guide explained, ‘how the colours and how he expressed feelings in his paintings and that’. When asked if that helped him understand the painting better, he replied, ‘Yeah, like why they did the art’. He felt if he had been looking at the artwork himself he would have been unable to understand it, and he needed someone to help him. Afterwards he could understand it, explaining, ‘Yeah, it was like you just thought it was just paint splattered everywhere and he didn’t really care but you found it took him like half a year, a year to do it and he took really care with it’ (Interview 17/12/98).

Therefore, when Steven was given information he understood the meaning of the artwork better as he was given the ‘code’. However, he still valued the work on the time and effort put into it rather than the style of the work. Ryan and Daniel also realised they would not have understood the painting had it not been for the tour guide explaining it to them, with Ryan stating, ‘No, not really—not unless the person was telling us what it’s there for and why he did it’. However, despite gaining a greater understanding of the art, Daniel did not want to talk about the artworks in this way in art class. The fact that these students gained some understanding from the guide can be understood, as Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain, that when the ‘uncultivated’ participate in visiting galleries they are totally reliant on the aids provided because they do not possess the code required to appreciate the artworks by themselves (p. 49).

Ryan said when asked if he liked the Canberra Art Gallery, ‘Sort of, yeah’. He said he liked ‘most of the paintings’, but when asked if he liked learning about them he
responded, 'Not really—I didn’t like learning about them'. Daniel enjoyed the Canberra Art Gallery as he saw ‘different kind of stuff’ such as ‘Aboriginal poles and they’re all painted’, although he could not remember the significance of the poles.

Simone did not go to the Canberra excursion, but recalled how the other students talked about it and when asked if they said they liked it she replied, ‘I don’t know. Some people said they didn’t and some people said they did’. When asked why they said they did not like it, she replied, ‘They said it was boring’. When asked why they thought it was boring, she stated, ‘I don’t know. They just said it was boring; they didn’t like it’. Whereas those who liked it said, ‘It was fun’. Therefore, for some students visiting the art gallery was acceptable as it was fun while others thought it was boring, or irrelevant. As stated, this was not an activity regularly practiced in their social class. However, students could not explain clearly why they thought it was boring, as this was part of their ‘class unconsciousness’ which aided in their own subjugation and reluctance to enter an art gallery.

Further, while some students gained greater understanding of artworks and enjoyed attending the art gallery during their school excursion, they did not attain the cultural obligation or aspiration to attend galleries regularly in the future. Justin explained, ‘I’ve been to a few but I just don’t like looking at them ‘cause you see other people’s art and you think that’s good…and you think, “Oh, that’s better than mine”’. Therefore, the gallery posed a threat where artworks were seen as works of genius that could not be reproduced. Justin stated, ‘You think, “If I could do that maybe I could be as good as that”’, and you try it and sometimes it just doesn’t work out…and you don’t like art after that’ (Interview 17/12/98). Therefore, the artworks in the gallery were intimidating and, consequently, visiting the gallery was an uncomfortable and threatening experience. Further, because attending galleries was not a practice highly valued by students’ families, students did not have the cultural aspiration to attend galleries, as they felt ‘out of their comfort zone’ and ‘beyond the limits’ of their class habitus.

**School Two**

Students at School Two had developed some level of acquired cultural capital because of their scholastic art experience. Due to their exposure to art in the school and excursions to the art gallery, many students developed an acceptance and valuing of art and some cultural aspiration. However, their familiarisation with art from the family was often limited. Therefore, their levels of inherited cultural capital were not well developed.
Madeline said she did not visit galleries with her family ‘because mostly we don’t have the time’. Therefore, the issue of time, as discussed by Bourdieu (1984), was a factor in her inability to attend to cultural practices. She would like to go to galleries more often ‘because they’re fun and you’ve got a whole heap of different pictures to look at and they’re really nice’. She felt she would ‘sometimes’ go to galleries when older. She said what she had learnt in school would help her look at other artworks when she was older. She thought it was important to learn how to behave in galleries, explaining, ‘Well, I sort of think it’s important because like you sort of know what you’re doing there and everything’. Therefore, familiarisation with the practices of the art gallery were important in order to participate ‘correctly’. Before attending the gallery with the school, students had been ‘taught’ how to behave correctly. Renee also stated she had not been to art galleries with her family. However, she would like to. When asked if she felt you learn things when you go to the art gallery, she answered, ‘Yeah, well, you see the types of paintings that other people have done and they might influence you’. Therefore, Renee associated looking at artworks to her own art making.

Lachlan also felt he would go to the art gallery and look at artworks when he was older as he liked to do this. He also realised that learning how to talk about artworks in school would help him when he went to the art gallery stating, ‘Well, you’ll be able to understand what the art is, what art is like and how you could...well, how to understand something’s and not to think that it’s silly because it’s...not necessarily a drawing of something in particular’. This response demonstrated an understanding and acceptance of various art styles, such as abstract art, as students had been introduced to them in School Two.

Alistair did go to art galleries with his family: ‘Sometimes we go to Melbourne art museum’ and he thought this was good. However, when asked if he talked about the art with his parents, he answered, ‘No, we mainly just have a look’. He was not entirely confident that when he was older he would be able to talk about art himself, although he thought it was a good idea to be able to talk about the art because ‘if you look at it and you haven’t learnt anything about some sort of painting and you might not know what sort of thing like what has been put into it and stuff’. Stephen also went to galleries with his family and also thought this was important, ‘just to see all the work that the artists put into their work’. Therefore, both Alistair and Stephen judged artworks based on the quality and quantity of time put into it which Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) found occurred when people did not fully understand the aesthetic style of the work (p. 47).
Students at School Two still had a limited understanding of the aesthetic style of artworks. However, due to exposure to various works they were accepting of some abstract work and realised the importance of talking about artworks. Due to frequenting art galleries with the school they felt comfortable with their abilities to interact with the artwork and, therefore, all students felt they would attend galleries when older. Students in School Two had ‘acquired cultural capital’ as opposed to ‘inherited cultural capital’, as their aesthetic disposition was developed more by the school than by their home life.

School Three

In School Three, of the eleven students interviewed, five students had attended art galleries with their families and other students had been with the school once when they were younger. Despite some students having been to the gallery many of them possessed little inherited cultural capital and a limited understanding and appreciation of art, with limited ability to ‘talk’ about artworks with any aesthetic knowledge. One student in particular, Erin, had inherited a certain level of appreciation and cultural capital from her family as she frequented art galleries quite regularly. However, due to her art experience in School Three, her scholastic experience failed to convert her inherited cultural capital into educational capital (Bourdieu 1984, p. 80). Erin stated she looked at art books a lot at home, as there were about twenty art books in the house, which were purchased when they went to the ‘Geelong museum and we have been going quite a lot’.

She explained she went mainly with her grandmother but she also went with her parents. She attended frequently: ‘I’ve gone about five times with Mum and Dad and I’ve gone with my Nan quite a few’, about twice a year. She said it was usually her Nan’s and her idea to go, explaining: ‘My parents are very busy except when they go they are really happy’.

She had been to Melbourne Art Gallery and stated she enjoyed going to the galleries and would like to go more. Even though she had gone frequently to galleries her level of aesthetic understanding was based on the information provided by the gallery. She stated, ‘Under each picture there’s information about that picture and the artist who did it’. She read these, explaining: “I really like looking at the information underneath because it gives me a bit more information”. She mostly understood the information but admitted, ‘Some of them are a bit complicated’. She also said, ‘There’s a little tour you can go on’. She had attended these tours and felt they were good, stating, ‘Yeah, it’s really interesting because they explain it all’. Consequently, Erin had developed her level of interest in artworks, also producing a certain cultural aspiration. However, as Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) state her level of understanding was limited and she had to rely on the aids provided by the gallery (p. 49).
Erin had some posters of artworks from the gallery. Her grandmother bought these for her. She said, 'I say an artist's name and my Nan buys one'. In the rest of her house they had paintings that her aunty did ‘which are of cows and abstract ones and cats and vases’. Her sister did dragon paintings and ‘our house is extremely bright’. Erin’s family also aimed to impress an interest in music as she had had private ‘keyboard’ lessons since prep. She liked to listen to pan pipes and the rainforest sounds and was ‘not too keen on too rocky, like Shania Twain. I like Britney Spears’.

Jessica stated she had been to the gallery with her parents about twice a year but this depended on ‘if my Mum’s got enough money’. Therefore, the issue of ‘distance from necessity’ (Bourdieu 1998), such as money, was a factor. She was unsure which gallery it was: ‘I think it’s the one...probably Geelong’. She enjoyed going and would like to go more often; they mainly went on holidays. When describing what she had seen she explained: ‘There was one that had a house—a really nice house with a garden around it and some trees and it was sort of dull; it was mostly dark colours’. She did not talk about the art; she would ‘just have a look’. Her mother ‘sometimes’ said, ‘Isn’t that a nice painting?’ or something like that’ but she did ‘not really talk about the artists’. They read the information on the work: ‘if we like the painting we read it’.

Jessica felt her Mum took her to the gallery ‘so I can get ideas if I ever want to be an artist because I’ve told her sometimes I’d like to be an artist’. She had told her Dad that she wanted to be an artist but she was unsure what he thought because ‘he doesn’t talk very much’. She felt she would go to galleries when she was older. Despite having been to art galleries Jessica still had a low level of cultural capital and aesthetic disposition. While she went to galleries with her Mum, her Dad was ‘not really interested’. They did not have any art books at home and artworks within the house were a ‘painting in the lounge room of these bricks surrounded by some dirt, a dirt track and just trees everywhere. Not sure who did it. There’s pictures of old fashioned cars in the kitchen and people walking down the street in the olden days and some sewing that Mum’s done and in the hall, most of our stuff and photos’ (Interview 17/7/00).

Emma also went to the gallery with her Mum, ‘probably about five or six times a year’, but could not remember which galleries, stating, ‘I don’t know. We try to go to all different types of galleries’. She could not go with her father: ‘No, he hasn’t got a car so we can’t get there’. She explained what she saw: ‘We’ve seen stuff like pictures of famous people, pictures of old historical things, pictures of houses, streetscapes, autumn times, summers’. She felt this was interesting but did not really
talk about the artworks: ‘Not really. My Mum just says, “Oh, yeah, that’s nice”. We just admire the pictures’. They sometimes read the captions which helped them as when asked if her Mum knew much about artworks, she replied, ‘Not much’. Her Dad liked to talk about other artworks even though he knew ‘not much either but he likes to talk about it’. She was unable to name any artists or paintings, stating, ‘Not really. I don’t study it. I just talk about it with my parents’.

Emma’s cultural capital and understanding of art were limited even though she went to art galleries with her mother. She said she had art books: ‘I’ve got books like making stuff with paper and books on craft with glue and sticks and I’ve got books on how to make simple things around the house’. This statement revealed her understanding of art as craft. She also stated she had art posters on her wall: ‘I have art posters hanging in my bedroom of pictures... just like tree pictures with no people, just nature’. When asked if they were of famous artworks, she replied, ‘I don’t know. They just look nice, stuff like water falls and stuff’. She said she talked about the pictures, stating, ‘I talk about stuff. My Mum says, “This is a nice picture” and I say, “Yeah, I like that one’.

Emma had developed an interest in art due to her parents’ interest in drawing and painting. She said her Mum painted pictures of ‘houses in a streetscape’. These pictures were hung in the house. The artworks in the house were ‘posters in my room and there’s paintings all up the hallway and in my Mum’s room but in the lounge room we’ve just got photos of all us kids’. She stated her Mum ‘likes to do basically the same stuff as me like craft’. Her father had tried to get work as a tattooist: ‘He tried but he missed the job’. Emma stated he did ‘Nothing—he just draws’. While her father valued drawing, the style of drawing was not considered ‘high art’. Emma explained her Dad drew pictures of ‘dragons and hearts and daggers through hearts and he does this picture and he writes up the top in an arch sort of a shape “Forever in my heart” and he does a big love heart with a scroll going through it and he writes all us kids’ names in it’. Emma played the recorder and sometimes the keyboard and would like to have singing and dancing lessons.

Dylan had been to the gallery once with his parents and once with the school with the previous art teacher. He remembered seeing paintings and vases and a cutlery set when he went with the school and thought it was interesting. He also said he would like to go again. Dylan had been to Melbourne Art Galley with his parents and also thought this was good. He could not recall any of the artists’ names but said his family talked about the works, saying, ‘I liked all the paintings that had houses there ‘cause they were all big ones and how they drew them’. He said, ‘My Dad liked the one with the old mine shaft and my Mum liked the one of the farm’. This was the
first time he had been to the gallery with his parents ‘because we were just in Melbourne so we just went there’. This trip was not an organised trip and he told how they go to the football more than five times a year and he liked going to the ‘Footy probably a little bit more’ than the art gallery.

Dylan described the artworks in his house: ‘We’ve got a picture of a harp seal and a mirror in the hallway. In Mum and Dad’s room they haven’t got any pictures. In my sister’s room she’s got Pooh Bear. There are photos of the family and my Grandpa used to collect whisky bottles and my Dad has quite a few’. His father also ‘likes cars but he doesn’t collect them; he just likes the old Fords and Holdens’. He told how ‘my friend—he wants to be an artist when he’s older...[He] wants to draw pictures of old cars and engines of them ‘cause he likes cars’. Dylan read ‘mostly Play Station magazines’ and short novels and his parents read ‘Sometimes. Mum normally reads in bed, these short story books from the book club’ and his Dad reads ‘Mainly Rolling Stone, ‘cause he likes the band’.

Carly had been to the gallery with her family once and said she enjoyed it and would like to go again. She did not remember which gallery it was but recalled seeing ‘paintings’. She said she did not talk about the artwork with her family. Carly said she made cards, painted and drew at home and her Mum did ceramics and had recently started doing painting lessons. Her Mum had painted ‘a big mural in our backyard of dolphins’. Despite their mutual interest in art, her Mum did not teach her about painting nor did they talk about art. Her Dad ‘probably works on his car’. She said her ‘Dad sometimes takes them to the movies’ and she plays netball. She did not play a musical instrument, but would like to play the recorder and reads children’s novels ‘sometimes’.

She did not have any pictures in her bedroom besides family photos but they had pictures in the rest of the house: ‘We’ve got pictures’ but said ‘Can’t remember, some of animals. One of an oil painting...of trees, some water’. When asked if it was a real painting, she replied, ‘I don’t know’.

Tenaya had been to the art gallery once with the school in grade three and she had enjoyed this. She recalled, ‘I saw some paintings with the sun and the water on the back and like paintings of houses and olden day stuff’. She talked about the work: ‘Sometimes when I walked past them I said, “Oh, that’s good. I’d like to try and do that”’. Tenaya had a limited art vocabulary, describing the work as ‘good’ and relating the work to her own art making. She explained they did not have a guide in the gallery: ‘No, we had parents “cause we went in little groups and they showed us round and they had writing on the paintings and they just read us some of that’. Once
again the need to read the information provided by the gallery suggests that the parents did not have the code to decipher the work. Tenaya said she could understand only ‘some of it’ and she could not remember any artists’ names. However, she did say she would like to go back to the gallery with the school but not her Mum. When asked if her Mum would take her to the gallery, Tenaya replied, ‘Maybe, ‘cause she’s busy most of the time’. Again the factor of ‘distance from necessity’ was an issue.

Tenaya stated she had some art books at home, ‘Yeah, I’ve got some but I usually go to the library and borrow them on how to make stuff’. These books, she explained, ‘show you how to draw houses and people and animals’. She said she had one book with artworks in it: ‘Pictures like that people from the olden days have painted and people from different countries and stuff’. She enjoyed looking at this book and when asked if she talked about the work she replied, ‘I say “That’s good. I wonder how they made that?”’. Again her vocabulary was limited to “That’s good”.

Tenaya felt there was a lot of art in her house. In her bedroom there was ‘A Pokemon poster. People eating at a party. It’s an olden day picture and a bear sitting down with flowers in its hand. It’s like a cartoon picture’. In the rest of the house was ‘Heaps. There’s one of a little girl in my Mum’s room and a picture of flowers and clay pictures. We’ve made her in art’. They had one painting: ‘We’ve got just a picture of a person’ but she did not know who painted it. She said her Mum ‘didn’t collect anything’, although she did sewing.

Mark had gone to a gallery in grade prep with the school. When asked if he would like to go with this teacher he replied, ‘Oh, I don’t really care’. He recalled seeing ‘heaps of good paintings and there was heaps of sculptures and that’. When asked if he liked it, he answered, ‘It was all right’. His one visit had not encouraged any level of cultural aspiration to return to the gallery, as it was opposed to the practices of his family and friends. When asked if he would like to go with friends or family he answered, ‘Nup...’cause I’m not into that sort of thing’. He stated he was into ‘skateboarding, footy, cricket, basketball, nearly all sports’ and with his family they ‘go to the footy’.

Consequently, Mark did not have a high value of art, stating that he thought art was ‘all right sometimes; sometimes it gets boring’. He felt he would not really like to go to the gallery more often because it would be boring. He felt when he did go, ‘Some of it is, some of it isn’t boring’. He felt it was boring ‘when the man takes you round and shows you stuff. We should just be allowed to go by ourselves with just the teachers’. Mark thought what the guide talked about was boring ‘cause he just kept on talking about the same thing’. Mark explained, ‘He just talked about the artists,
when he was born, his Mum and Dad and when he died’. He did not want to know that information, stating, ‘It was boring’. For Mark, the ‘biography’ of the artists did not interest him as he did not value art and felt it was irrelevant and not in accordance with his class habitus.

It appeared that Mark’s family did not have a high value of art, as they had never been to an art gallery and did not consume artworks. In the house Mark stated, ‘There’s just photos of the family, school photos and me at Olympic Park when I ran and two big car photo frame pictures of a Porsche and a Ferrari’, which were his fathers. His Dad liked cars and ‘He’s got the new model Ford out’. There was also ‘a big cabinet where our footy trophies go, me and my brothers’’. This suggests that sport was more highly valued than art. In his bedroom Mark had a ‘Britney Spears poster, Southpark poster, an AFL poster of Geelong, motor bike posters and certificates from school’.

James had been to the art gallery once with the school, in grade three, he had not been with his family, ‘No, only with the school’. He thought it was good and remembered seeing paintings. He could not recall which gallery, but he liked what he saw and said he would like to go back again. He said when they were in the gallery they talked about the art with the class teacher such as ‘What’s that, who’s that, what’s up there, dadada, etc’. When asked what he said about the art, he replied, ‘Nothing much’. When asked what makes him like a picture, he answered, ‘The colours, ‘cause my favourite colour’s red’. Therefore, James had little knowledge other than his favourite colour, to judge an artwork.

He had never been to a gallery with his family—he said they play games together and do ‘nothing much’. They go to football sometimes and he likes to play football, basketball and soccer. He said he would like to ‘go to the museum, play footy, soccer’ and felt he would see in the museum ‘paintings, sculptures, dinosaurs’. Therefore, he had some misunderstanding between the art gallery and the museum and, while he had acquired a small amount of cultural aspiration in wanting to go back to the art gallery from the school, in reality his limited cultural capital inherited from his family would probably prevent him from attending. His said he had no paints or brushes at home to do any artwork, and if he asked his Mum ‘she’d probably say no’. He also stated they had little money as his Mum did not work: ‘She doesn’t get paid, we’re going poor, barely got any food in the fridge’. Therefore, spending money on art items and attending galleries was not a high priority, as this family was restricted by their financial situation. Their ‘distance from necessity’ inhibited their attainment of cultural capital. James’s interests were evident in the posters in his bedroom of ‘Hollywood Hogan, 3 dinosaur posters, cars, Ferraris’. He stated, ‘I don’t really like
art that much. I just like painting the pictures'. Therefore, James's interest in art was confined to making and not appreciating artworks.

Jacinta had not been to the gallery, not even with the school. Despite not having been she said she would like to go. When asked if she talked about paintings or posters with her friends or family she said, 'Not really'. She enjoyed drawing and went to the library to borrow 'how to draw' books. When asked if she looked at other art books, she replied, 'There was this craft book, it showed you how to make diaries'. However, she stated she did not have any art books at home. She said she liked to read 'craft books' and her Mum 'likes to read Stephen King'. Her Mum collected porcelain dolls but did not do anything else, as she was 'too busy'. Her Dad 'normally just goes and fixes his cars'.

She was not surrounded by high art images and did not partake in cultural practices with her family. In her bedroom were posters of bands and dolphin pictures and in the rest of the house, 'We've got a picture of Princess Diana in the lounge room. She [Mum] bought it; it's framed. Dad has a car picture of a Monaro'.

Ashley had not been to the gallery and felt he would not like to because 'I don't know. I reckon it would get a bit boring looking at so many of them'. When asked what he thought he would see in an art gallery, he replied, 'A lot of paintings, pictures and don't really know what else'. When asked what would make him want to go, he answered, 'I don't really know'. He stated, 'There's some sort of paintings I like and some I don't'. He explained, 'I like ones with heaps of colour and have heaps of action in them' and he did not like 'The dull ones that don't have much in them'.

When Ashley was asked if he thought he would talk about paintings with his friends or family, he responded, 'I don't know, really'. He talked about 'football, fishing, sport things'. His interest in sport was shown in the posters in his room: 'I've got a lot of Richmond posters in my bedroom, some fishing posters as well. I've got car posters of a Formula One car and a Bathurst car'. His interest in cars was inherited from his father: 'He likes to fix them'. The house was decorated with images of cars;'Dad, he's got this Falcon legends one with four cars on it. It was on the wall near our pool table. Now it's in my brother's room'. He also said, 'We've got a lot of other pictures. Mum's got a lot that she likes like flowers. Mum's got a lot of vases with flowers'. His Mum also 'does like these flower things and stuff...Sometimes she buys little wood things and she paints them'. Therefore, Ashley had a limited inherited cultural capital that was required by the CSF: The Arts, as his family did not value cultural practices or cultural goods that were valued by the dominant classes and embodied in the CSF.
Students at School Three had a limited inherited and acquired cultural capital: while some had been to the art gallery and felt they would attend when older, they were often restricted by the inability to distance themselves from necessity due to time and money. Discussions of art were limited and art discourse was not developed within an environment of familiarity. Art objects in the house were not those highly regarded by the dominant groups in society and not appreciated in art galleries or the CSF document. Consequently, students were disadvantaged with the requirement to appraise certain images when their cultural and linguistic capital was restricted by their social class position.

School Four

Compared to the three other schools, most students interviewed at School Four had strong inherited cultural capital which was subsequently converted into educational capital. For these students their scholastic experience extended their familial experience, particularly in the arts field. The early learning performed in the family in relation to culture and language is extended by the scholastic education that presupposes and completes it (Bourdieu 1984, p. 66). Many of the students interviewed were brought up in a world filled with ‘cultivated people, practices and objects’ (p. 75). They had familiarity in the world of art with contact with artworks within their home or by frequenting art galleries. Students had a high level of cultural capital and cultural aspiration whereby they felt obliged to continue visiting art galleries or collecting art. Further, art was discussed within the family home as a topic of conversation. Therefore, students were familiar with the language of art discourse. Students at School Four also participated in other cultural activities such as reading and playing musical instruments and their parents listened to classical music. Most students were introduced to many cultural practices within the family home at an early age and so a strong inherited cultural capital was inculcated. Some students had not inherited the same level of cultural capital as others in School Four, but it appeared that their parents were counting on scholastic capital to ensure their children’s future by sending them to this particular academic institution.

Acquired Cultural Capital

It appeared that James’s parents were trying to attain educational capital by sending their child to School Four. James’s family did not participate in attaining cultural capital in the arts field outside school. James said when asked if he would like to go to art galleries with his parents, ‘It’s not really the kind of thing we would do because they’re not really into art. They enjoy it, but they probably wouldn’t go to a gallery’ (Interview 18/7/00). He was not that ‘into’ art himself: while he had been to the local gallery with the school and found it ‘interesting but half way through it was boring’. 174
He explained he would not mind going to a gallery more but if you went too much it would get boring...so maybe once a year—maybe twice a year— he felt would be adequate. James felt in order for him to go to the gallery it would need ‘probably more colour and it was a bit dull, it was a bit grey’. He did say they had a tour guide and felt ‘she was good’. However, he could not recall any of the artists he had seen.

Decorating his bedroom were ‘just a couple of football posters’ and he felt they did not have many paintings: ‘No, not really. We’ve just got a couple of my cousin’s paintings and some old vases. Dad and Mum don’t collect anything’. James did feel he was a good reader and enjoyed reading ‘any [thing] really’. He had tried to learn guitar but it became too hard and he did not have enough time for practice as he did a lot of running practice. For James sport was his interest and he hoped to be a runner or footballer as he felt he had ‘never really been good at art’.

Madison had been to the Melbourne Art Gallery with her family twice; she had gone with ‘My friend and Mum and Nan’. Her Mum had organised the trip, ‘like a little thing for me to do with a friend to have a little trip up to Melbourne’. She said she did not go often ‘because I don’t have enough time to go up to Melbourne’. She had not been to the local gallery. She felt she talked about the artworks, saying, ‘Oh, look how they did that cow and look how they made that thing look real. We had headphones and they told you a story about the painting’. Therefore, Madison did refer to the subject matter and its relation to realism. She also used the aids in the gallery to hear the ‘story’ of the artworks. She could not remember any of the artists she saw at the gallery: ‘No, I just looked at the pictures a lot’ (Interview 18/7/00).

Madison enjoyed going to the gallery. However, she felt it was both interesting and boring. She explained it was ‘kind of both, because we keep on seeing drawings all the time, but there was sculptures’. She was unsure whether she would like to go more often, ‘That one I don’t know because sometimes I like to draw and sometimes I like to know more’. She said ‘I might’ go to galleries. When asked if she would collect art books she said, ‘I will probably collect how to draw books’. She had a lot of these at home which came with the paints she bought. She enjoyed making a lot of art at home and said, ‘I’ve got a studio’. She did not have posters or art in her bedroom—she had photos of her horse jumping. Her art was displayed in the house and a picture of their house ‘a person drew’. Madison was learning to play the drums at school and her father also played the drums.

Shaun said he had never been to an art gallery but he would like to go and felt there would be ‘lots of different paintings’ in the gallery. He felt it would be interesting to go, as he enjoyed talking about artworks, and explained, ‘That’s why I’d like it’. He
said if he asked his parents to take him they would say, ‘Yeah, probably’. Shaun said his parents were not that interested in art, stating, ‘They don’t do a lot of things about it’. Despite his parents not showing a high interest in art themselves, they had tried to develop an interest in art for their son by buying him art books. He said he had ‘just a couple of small ones’ of ‘not really famous [artists], just different paintings’. He said he used to look at them a lot by himself, not with his parents. He enjoyed looking at the images, ‘because I like to and talk about things’. However, he did not talk about the art with his parents and the books were not his parents: ‘They bought them for me’ (21/7/00).

Shaun’s parents also realised that learning a musical instrument was part of their son’s participation in cultural practices. He said, ‘I play two, I play violin and piano’ and it was his parents’ idea to play violin and his to play the piano. He stated he felt he was good: ‘Yep, I think so’. He said his parents did not play an instrument ‘but they’d like to’. He had both lessons at school and private lessons and practised ‘half an hour every one or two days after school’. His parents also realised some of the indicators of class through listening to classical music. He said his ‘Mum listens to a lot of classical stuff’ and ‘Dad doesn’t listen’. Shaun said he likes listening to classical music ‘sometimes’ and he learnt classical pieces on the violin and piano.

His mother also enjoyed reading: ‘she likes to read a lot’ but was unsure about his father: ‘I’m not sure, maybe he does it, but I’m not sure about it’. Shaun also enjoyed reading: ‘Yeah, a lot’ and read ‘Novels and exciting books and adventure stories…I have four authors I like and I switch between them…. Willard Prase, the Harry Potter books’.

In his bedroom he had his exam certificates for his instruments. There were ‘stitchings [tapestries] in the lounge room’ and he felt they looked expensive. There was also ‘a massive painting above the fireplace of a plane’. He did not talk about these pieces with his parents; they were ‘just forgotten’.

Shaun had some level of inherited cultural capital as his parents were aware of some of the legitimate cultural practices and encouraged their child to participate. However, he had attained a greater degree of acquired capital through his scholastic encounters. Therefore, he developed a small level of cultural aspiration as when asked if he would go to galleries when older he responded, ‘Yeah, maybe, yeah’.

**Inherited and Acquired Capital**

Madeline had attained a certain level of cultural capital at home, but was also reliant on developing her cultural capital within the school. She attended the local art gallery
with her family and the school: 'I've been a few times with school and Dad took us a few other times' (Interview 21/7/00). She explained she went in the holidays and participated in the holiday art program: 'There's activities there...There's competitions where you can draw'. She had done this 'maybe three times in a year. We don't go that often'. She said it was usually her Dad's idea to go the gallery 'because he likes to get out and about because he looks in the paper and says, “Oh, the art gallery's open today. How about we go there?”' Madeline recalled, 'We see like sculptures and sometimes when we go with the school there's somebody there who directs us around the place and says this painting was done by whoever'. She thought this was good and explained how the tour guide 'talks about it and if we've got any questions she answers them'.

Madeline felt she did not really talk about the art with her Dad: 'Not really; he just tells us that sculpture was once in wherever and this is just a mini version of it and a really, really big one was somewhere'. Madeline said her father knew about the art and was able to tell them information. She said her Mum could also talk about the work, but her sister also knew about the art, as she had attended private art lessons. 'Sophie knows oil paintings and knows without even looking at the tag on the side of the picture'. Therefore, due to her family's familiarity with art, they were able to appraise the art without necessarily relying on the information provided by the gallery.

Madeline found the gallery interesting and would like to go more often, particularly with the school: 'I wish the school would take us a lot more because I really like the tour guides and maybe even the Melbourne gallery. I haven't seen it yet so I don't know what it is like'. The art she had seen in art class related to copies of work she had in her house, providing a sense of familiarity and approval. She told how they had paintings in their house: 'I don't know who they're by but we have a picture we learnt about in art. There's three pictures but they're separate. They were green. It's the same person who did the 'Bush Burial'”. She realised the works were copies and when asked if it was called 'The Pioneers', she replied, 'Yes, that's it'. She knew it was called this because 'One day our teacher for one of our paintings—she gave us a test and she just showed a poster of it'. She said they also had antiques that had been handed down in the family. 'We've got “hand me downs” we call them from family long ago, furniture, rugs and mats, and bowls'. She said, 'They're old but they're nice'. 'Once again Madeline had objects that testified to her family heritage that demonstrated legitimate “taste”, along with material and cultural wealth.

Madeline's family also participated in other cultural practices of reading and music. She explained her Mum 'reads a lot' and 'I read books a lot'. She read 'every night' and 'I like Harry Potter because that's the only fantasy one I like and then I like
books about people’s lives but they’re made up characters’. Her favourite authors were ‘J. K. Rowling, oh no, Colin Tiele. I’ve read nearly every single one of his books’. She said her Dad ‘reads the newspaper and sometimes magazines’. She told how her father listened to ‘old music like the Beatles and he’s got millions of records that he plays’. He listened to classical music: ‘sometimes he does in the car just to relax’. Madeline also played the violin since prep and felt she was good at this. She did practise a lot: ‘probably nearly every day, because I have an exam coming up’. She also sang with the school choir and a local well-known choir.

Madeline said they had ‘lots’ of art books at home. ‘We’ve got books with art pictures in them’. She enjoyed looking at these and did this ‘once a fortnight’. She talked about the art: ‘Yeah, if somebody’s around. Mainly I just look at things myself in my room’. Therefore, Madeline was exposed to artworks with her family by attending galleries and looking at art books. She had acquired a level of cultural capital and cultural aspiration, whereby she would like to go to galleries more often.

Chris also attended art galleries with her family, and said she went about three times a year and visited galleries every time they went on holidays. She recalled she had been to quite a few galleries: ‘I’ve been down to the one at Lorne. I’ve been to the Geelong one, Melbourne Art Gallery. There’s a small one...in Port Lincoln. And I’ve been to one in Adelaide and there’s one in New Zealand that we went to. That’s just from one artist, but it’s very big and has lots of different things’ (Interview 18/7/00). She said it was ‘usually Mum’s [idea to go] or sometimes Dad wants to go and if they see something in a paper or some special thing displayed there they’ll go and see it’. Due to her parents’ interest in visiting art galleries, Chris said she would like to go more often as she had established cultural aspiration.

Chris stated her parents did not have a favourite artist: ‘They like many but they don’t really have a favourite’. She said they liked to look at a lot of art and she liked to go to the galleries as well: ‘Yes. I think it’s quite interesting’. She recalled seeing ‘usually landscapes, and paintings of portraits. What’s it called when they have like it’s just lines?’ I replied, ‘Abstract’. She responded, ‘Abstract, that’s it’. When asked if she liked abstract work, she said, ‘Yeah, I reckon they’re cool’. Therefore, she accepted abstract work, even if her language was not that of legitimate arts discourse.

Chris felt they talked about the art ‘quite a lot’ when she was in the gallery with her parents. They talked about ‘the way that it’s drawn, like what perspective it’s from, and what colours have been used’. She said her parents talked about the art and they
all talked about it, ‘when we get home’. She said they talked about what piece was their favourite and why it was their favourite.

Chris’s family also attended the theatre regularly: ‘Yeah, they like to see plays. They’ve seen quite a few’. She said they go to Melbourne ‘down at the Art Centre’. She said, ‘They have gone to see some operas’ and had not taken her: ‘No, not yet, but they say they will’. Therefore, they were apparently intending on introducing Chris to further ‘legitimate’ cultural practices and were establishing an acceptance of these in the home. She explained, ‘My Dad always has it [classical music] on the radio. [He] Likes the old classical music…and opera’. Therefore, Chris was being exposed to classical music and opera regularly. Chris had also played the piano since she was five. She had private lessons twice a week and stated, ‘Oh, I’m quite good’.

Her family also enjoyed reading. Chris declared, ‘We’re a reading sort of family’. She read ‘lots of books’ and her favourite author was ‘Margaret Benoid, the crime file books’. She also had a lot of art books to look at along with original artworks. ‘We’ve got lots of big picture books with paintings downstairs and we’ve also got in our lounge portraits like we can look at…We’ve got lots and lots and lots and lots and lots of paintings in the rest of our house. They’re all not copies, they’re originals and they’re all spread out in the hallway usually so that when people come down they can see them’. Chris, therefore, described how her family ‘displayed’ their artwork for others to see. This was a sign of their ‘taste’ and an indication of their membership into the ‘cultured’ group. Chris also realised the importance of pointing out that these works were originals and not copies.

Chris described the paintings they had with knowledge and familiarity: ‘We’ve got abstract, landscapes, lots of landscape pictures. I don’t think we’ve got any portraits down that hallway but in our dining room we’ve got some’. These works were not portraits of family members, but were still old. ‘No, not people that we know. They’re very old people from a long time ago’. Chris said they talk about them ‘sometimes. We don’t now because we know what they are’. Therefore, she had developed a strong familiarity with the art through daily contact. She moved ‘in a universe of familiar, intimate objects’, ensuring an ‘immediate familiarity with the things of taste’ (Bourdieu 1984, p. 77). They bought these artworks mainly on their vacations. ‘Usually from New Zealand, from that art gallery that we go to. That’s where we buy the abstract ones. I think when there was something on at the Geelong Art Gallery they bought some there. And they’ve got lots that were done by the artist in Port Lincoln’. Chris’s family valued art and acquired pieces to demonstrate a sense of ‘belonging’ to the cultured world.
Nathan also moved in a world where displaying the ‘correct image’ was important. The importance of demonstrating signs of taste was indicated to him both at home and at school. Nathan told how when they go on excursions with the school ‘we have to put on a fantastic show for the people who are walking around’ (Interview 20/7/00). He said the teachers told them they had to have ‘very special behaviour’. ‘Because if we’re being really silly...people say, “Oh no, I’m not going to [that school] because there’s silly kids, there’s people who go silly on excursions” and stuff like that and so they get a bad impression’. At home Nathan told how they have three lounge rooms and there is a good one ‘that’s used for tea and coffee’ for when people come over. He also told how his parents listen to classical music, ‘only if there’s a dinner party on’ otherwise his Mum listens to Eva Cassidy and ‘Dad listens to Cold Chisel and Red Hot Chilli Peppers’. They also had some antique vases and Nathan knew they were antiques ‘because we got them from an antique place’. He said they had a ‘real’ painting and ‘two are just posters’. He said, ‘We’ve got a few artworks from Australian artists, but they don’t have it [name] down in the bottom like some artists put their name and their date and stuff. It doesn’t have any of that’. Therefore, he could not remember who painted the works but this statement indicated he did have some familiarity with artworks and the practices of artists. Nathan also had some car posters in his bedroom from when he went to the motor show with his Dad.

Nathan’s family participated in some ‘legitimate’ cultural practices but not all. He said, ‘My Dad likes to go to art galleries and he likes to play golf and go to the footy...Mum likes to play tennis and go to art galleries’. However, Nathan's family realised the social and educational importance of going to the art gallery and talking about art. Nathan had been to the Melbourne Art Gallery twice with his family and the local gallery three times, once with his family and twice with the school. He remembered seeing ‘pictures about our culture and pictures that had odd shapes on them’. He said when he went with his family ‘We go to the art galleries and we get a guy to take us round. They talk about the textures and the shapes and the tones’. He felt this was good ‘because you get to learn a lot’. They were not reliant on the guide as ‘sometimes I go with them [parents] and sometimes we go with the guide’.

He enjoyed talking about the artworks and talked with his parents: ‘I talk with my Mum and my Dad. We mostly talk about Vincent Van Gogh and some other Australian artists’. He explained they had recently been to the gallery and what they talked about. ‘Well, we went last Saturday to the Geelong and Melbourne Art Gallery because there was an art exhibition on and then we went home. And that night we talked about...Mum and Dad asked me questions like “What did you feel when you were looking at the painting? What did you think it meant to our culture?” Just stuff like that’. He felt he could answer some of these questions and that he told them ‘that
it made me feel good when I looked at the painting because it makes me just think of how long it took for the painter to actually paint it. And it was one of the paintings that represented...It was this barbwire fence and it was Australian, white Australians on one side and Aborigines on the other side and they had like torches and spears and stuff. While Nathan had some understanding of the cultural meaning of the work, he also relied on valuing the work for the time the artist took to paint it.

While Nathan’s parents valued art, he said that they did not have any art books at home but intended to buy some: ‘We might get a few next week, Dad said’. Nathan read a lot, including Harry Potter and his Mum read a lot but his Dad ‘just reads like business stuff’. Nathan played the drums, his sister sang and his uncle played guitar, and they ‘jammed on Saturdays and Sundays’. Nathan had acquired cultural aspiration as he hoped to go back to the Melbourne Art Gallery: ‘Mum’s taken me up there at least two times in my life. I really want to go back there again’.

Nessie had been to galleries with her family a few times a year and attended galleries in Paris. She explained, ‘When we went overseas we went to a lot of art galleries in Paris and we’ve been to the Geelong Art Gallery’ (Interview 20/7/00). She had been to the local gallery with both her family and the school. When in Paris she recalled, ‘We saw the “Mona Lisa” and we saw another famous painting, this lady in a white dress, and we saw Van Gogh. We were going to see Van Gogh’s “Lilies” but there were too many people there’. She enjoyed going to the galleries: ‘I like to go there when there’s good paintings there because I would have liked to see the “Lilies” but it was too crowded’. She thought she had also been to the Melbourne Art Gallery.

Nessie said it was ‘usually Mum or Dad’s’ idea to go to the gallery. She found it interesting most of the time. She explained: ‘Some of them [paintings] are interesting but some of them aren’t because they might be old ones that Mum and Dad really only know about them’. She told how her parents know about the paintings and the artist. When they were in Paris they went to a gallery with a certain artist’s work, she could not remember his name, but said her parents ‘talked with each other because we didn’t really understand it that much because we’ve never really heard of him’. When her parents were talking about the art she said, ‘Nan and I usually just walk around looking at them while they read the little thing at the side’. She said her parents talk about the art and ‘they say they are very famous and you should see all the things which they do in the paintings and other things’. Nessie said, ‘I’d like to understand more about the people but since I really don’t know who they are I can’t really understand Mum that much’. Therefore, the language her mother used and the history of the artist were difficult for Nessie to comprehend completely. However, she was being exposed to the language of arts discourse.
Nessie was also surrounded by antiques, books and some artwork. She explained, ‘We have paintings which I think our aunt’s drawn and I’ve got the Van Gogh painting in my room [a copy] and Mum and Dad like collecting a lot of antiques and books and Mum—she just has a lot of old things’. She said her Dad collected old books and ‘he reads a lot of books which he gets at our book store, which we know really well’. Her mother and sister were also good readers and Nessie enjoyed reading but felt ‘It’s really hard to find a book which I like because I didn’t really like the Harry Potter book’. She said they did not have a lot of art books: ‘I have the drawing books and I have art books but I don’t have very much’. She explained that when they went to the ‘galleries they only get the little booklets which tells you about the paintings...We usually get one each because they’re free so we just get them’.

Nessie was exposed to music and had developed interesting music taste for someone of her age. She said, ‘I like to listen to Scottish bag pipes and I like listening to other instruments like the flute and the Irish tunes and I like listening to some of my bands which I like’. She said her parents ‘like classical music, like opera and other music with violins’. She said, ‘I learn the violin, Ann learns the clarinet and Robert learns the drums’.

Because of her exposure to cultural practices, Nessie had developed a cultural aspiration and stated, ‘I’d like to go to more galleries’. Her family did not participate in activities that were not considered ‘legitimate’ cultural practices. As she stated, ‘No, we don’t really go for football that much’.

**High Inherited Capital**

Sarah had a high level of inherited cultural capital as she was surrounded by artworks and regularly visited art galleries with her family, especially when they were on vacation. She explained, ‘The last holidays we went up to Broken Hill and Mildura and Mum went to the national gallery up there...Normally they’re recommended or they just go past and they see them and they love looking through them...So that’s really fun. They just like looking at the paintings’ (Interview 18/7/00).

She told how her parents often bought artworks from the galleries when on holiday: ‘We saw a really nice painting up at Queensland so they had to get it sent down. We’re going to W. A. and Broome next holiday so we’ll probably go to heaps of galleries there as well... We went to America...Mum and Dad went to a lot of galleries over there and bought a lot of prints from Seattle, otherwise they sort of get them locally’. She said one of the next trips was based around visiting galleries:
‘We’re planning on going to Europe in the next few years because they really want to look at the galleries there, so that will be really good’.

Sarah enjoyed the galleries but this can be seen as a form of cultural obligation as when asked if she liked to go to galleries she replied, ‘Yeah, it’s pretty good. Sometimes when you don’t really feel like it, you don’t really want to go but you go anyway and it’s always good’. She did think the galleries were interesting and realised that they go quite regularly, therefore, she did not think she needed to go more: ‘We probably go very often, well, pretty often anyway so’, although she did state, ‘We haven’t been for a while but on holidays we tend to go’. She explained how they do not often go when they are not on holiday: ‘Not really, unless Mum has a sudden urge or she hears about a new one’. Sarah had been to the Melbourne Gallery ‘Yeah, probably twice’ but could not recall what she saw clearly. ‘Not really. It was a while ago but there was lots of nice paintings and it was actually really good’. She had not been to the local gallery but was certain her parents would have: ‘No, I haven’t but I’m sure Mum and Dad have’.

Sarah stated she had not been to the gallery with the school, as she had not always attended this school. However, she felt an excursion to the gallery would be good. ‘It would be interesting because we haven’t done it and it would be new and it would be just good to look at different art and it would be fun with your friends’.

Sarah’s strong interest in art can be explained as she was surrounded by artworks in the house and her parents’ ‘love of art’. She knew they loved art because ‘Well, they’re all over our house...They just like the paintings to decorate the house. They like the art in general...There’s a huge big painting downstairs. It’s all just strokes of brushes in gold, yellow and blue and sparkling, dotty things. It’s really good’. She said they also have copies of some famous artists and original paintings. ‘They’ve got a few prints of some American artists when they went to America. And they’ve got a few prints of Matisse and the rest are all a lady called someone Flowers. She’s a Queenscliff artist’.

Sarah said they talked about the artworks: ‘When friends come over they say, “What a great painting”. When we first get them there’s a lot of talk about it and then just occasionally we’ll look at it and say, “What a great painting”.’ She also said her family talked about the art when they were in the galleries: ‘Yeah, they might see one they’re familiar with, an artist, and they might just talk about it. We give our opinion’.

Sarah also said they have art books. ‘They have one book that has heaps of paintings in it...It’s modern art’. She said she looked at it ‘quite a bit, but not too often’ and
her parents looked with her. When asked if her parents talked about the artists with her, she answered, 'Not really. She [Mum] knows like the famous ones, as everyone does, but not really'. She felt her Mum was able to talk about famous artists but did not talk about them much with her. 'Not too much because we all know about it anyway'. Sarah believed she knew about famous artists and had confidence in her ability to recognise and talk about them. She seemed to believe that everyone did. However, her ability to appropriate and recognise artworks was an unconscious mastery of slow familiarisation, learnt from repeated contact with works (Bourdieu 1984, p. 66). Sarah's learning about art was implicit, for the acquisition of culture from the family favours an enchanted experience of forgetting the acquisition (Bourdieu 1984, pp. 3–4).

Sarah experienced the acquisition of culture, not only through contact with art, but also through cultural practices of reading and playing musical instruments. Sarah explained that her entire family read a lot: 'We're very, very keen readers. I like to read. I'm currently reading the fourth Harry Potter. I like Emily Rodder, Elisabeth Honey. I like adventure stories. I like all stories, really'. She said her 'Mum likes murder and mystery. She likes Tom Clancy. Dad likes newspapers and general...factual books'. Her parents also listened to classical music: 'Mum loves classical and opera and a little bit of pop. Dad likes 80s stuff and classical as well'. She said they listened to classical regularly: 'Yeah, it's on every morning, ABC FM'. She enjoyed classical herself and could not understand why other people did not. 'Yeah, it's pretty good. I like it, but I don't know why many people don't. They're just not into that kind of stuff. I don't know why. But I like it'. Once again, Sarah could not fully explain why she liked classical music, nor why other people did not, but she did realise they were into different 'stuff'. This difference can then be seen in Bourdieu's terms as a distinction in taste and, therefore, a distinction in class. Sarah clearly separated herself from the people who did not like classical music.

Sarah learnt the piano and viola at school and had private lessons. It was her Mum's idea because 'Mum really really likes us learning an instrument. She thinks it's great and Dad thinks it's really good as well. It's important to do. They like music tuition'. Due to her contact with art and cultural practices within the home, Sarah had developed a strong sense of cultural obligation. She said she would collect art: 'Yeah, I will definitely have paintings, I love paintings'.

Nellie was the great grand-daughter of a prominent wealthy family in Australia, where cultural legitimacy was passed down the family like an heirloom (Bourdieu 1984, p. 66). Nellie participated in cultural practices but also lived amongst material wealth shown in the objects inherited and acquired by the family. Bourdieu (1984) states that
material inheritance is also a cultural inheritance, for family heirlooms bear material witness to the age and continuity of the lineage, consecrating its social identity. But they also transmit values and competence which are the basis of legitimate membership in bourgeois dynasties. Bourdieu argues that what is acquired in daily contact with ancient objects is the relation of immediate familiarity with certain 'taste'. Further, there is a sense of belonging to a more polished, polite world, justified in its beauty. Finally, Bourdieu states there is an immediate adherence, at the deepest level of the habitus, to taste and distastes which forge the unconscious unity of class more than declared opinions (pp. 76-77).

Nellie inherited her great grandfather's large dresser and bedside table, which had previously been passed down to her grandfather. They also lived in a house that was 106 years old, and that was on 'three blocks with a cottage on one, our house and a tennis court' (Interview 21/7/00). Her house had a formal dining room for 'dinner parties' and another dining room: 'That's where the piano is and the fireplace and Mum listens to her music...classical music'. Her Dad also listened to classical music. Nellie learnt singing and the piano and felt she was good: 'I guess I'm good at piano'. There were photographs in the house her Mum had taken, as her hobby, and also drawings of boats. Her father also had a large painting 'of a boat and the sea...because he loves sailing'. Her father had 'two boats. He loves sailing and he loves flying. He's a pilot and we have a plane'. Her Dad also enjoyed going to galleries 'but not as much as Mum, I don't think'. Nellie also had a print of Van Gogh in her bedroom.

The evidence of wealth and culture was also apparent when she spoke of going to the art gallery with her family. 'I think I went to one in Adelaide or Sydney. There was this one [painting] that my Great Grandma had, my Mum's grandma, and I think she sold it to the gallery, I think it was Adelaide. She had a painting, she sold it to the gallery'. Nellie could not recall if it was a famous artwork, stating, 'I've forgotten what it was called, yeah probably, and we went and looked at that'. Nellie also stated how her mother frequently went to Rome. 'When she went to Rome, she loves going there for the architecture and things like that'. Nellie said she had not been to Rome, but felt her Mum would take her: 'Yeah, maybe except Mum said it would bore me because she'd always go to lots of art galleries'. Nellie explained she liked going to galleries and talking about art: 'Yeah, but Mum loves going to art museums and things like that, so sometimes I think it's a bit boring'. She felt it was a bit boring because 'Well, she [Mum] stands in front of the painting for ages. It's good to look at it, but not for ages'.
Despite her reluctance to stand in front of the work ‘for ages’, Nellie still enjoyed attending the gallery. ‘We went to the Melbourne one. I liked that’. She explained, ‘I’ve got this book called *Roy and Matilda the Gallery Mice* and it’s got all these paintings in it and it says when you go to the gallery look for this boy in the forest. So we went to that picture and found the boy’. She said her Gran gave her the book. She was not sure if there were other art books at home: ‘Mum might but I don’t really know except for *Roy and Matilda*. I love that book’.

When Nellie was at the gallery she said they did not really talk about the work. She did read the information and found that helpful ‘because it explains what it means. And I like that’. She did say she could ask her Mum about the art or the artists and she knew ‘Quite a few I think’. Nellie said she liked to talk about the art, ‘except I don’t even really know what to say’. Again, she could rely on her mother to help her: ‘Yeah, usually she explains what it is’. Once again, Nellie’s exposure to artworks was generally one of ‘quiet contemplation’, of implicit learning on the basis of slow familiarisation with artworks. In her familial surroundings art was highly valued, especially the appreciation of art but also the inherited cultural capital passed on to her through material and cultural inheritance.

Nellie was exposed to the cultural practices of music, ballet and reading. She had been to the ballet with her Mum in Melbourne. ‘I’ve been to a couple of ballets…I went to one; it was just recent. It was the Australian Ballet: the Nutcracker’. She explained, ‘I love reading’ and she read ‘Harry Potter…and I love Jacqueline Nelson; she’s an author’. Her Mum also read a lot: ‘She’s a good reader’. Her father also read: ‘Yeah, he doesn’t read as much as Mum’.

Both of her parents did not ‘need’ to work, therefore, they had the required time and money; the ‘distance from necessity’ (Bourdieu 1984) to participate freely in cultural practices. Due to Nellie’s exposure to a cultured world, she had developed a strong cultural obligation. When asked if she would like to go to galleries more, she replied, ‘Yeah. Mum says when you’re older you’ll like them better or you’ll take more notice of them’. The obligation to visit galleries was impressed upon Nellie, particularly by her mother, and was evident when asked if felt she would take herself to galleries when she was older. She replied, ‘Yeah, probably. Well, I want myself to’. When asked why she wanted herself to, she answered, ‘Because Mum says, “Oh, you’ll miss out on it if you don’t”’. Yet she was unsure what exactly she would miss out on: ‘I don’t know. She just says like…”Yeah, you won’t be as good” or I don’t know’. When asked if her Mum thinks she should go to the gallery, she answered, ‘Yeah’. Clearly, the ‘need’ to attend galleries was a message strongly conveyed to Nellie. She was expected to partake in the legitimate cultural practices to
display her cultural heritage and membership of the culturally elite group. This tends to confirm Bourdieu and Darbel’s (1991) view that cultural obligation is imposed on the cultivated classes as an essential part of their social being (p. 26).

Brigit had a very high level of inherited cultural capital due to her family travelling regularly and living overseas, where they frequented art galleries. She had lived in Paris for five years and had recently returned from Senegal, Ireland, England and France. She said she had been to ‘quite a few’ galleries when she was away and remembered some of them: ‘A gallery...which had some sort of African art. We saw a place in Dacha, Senegal. Louvre, which we’ve been to loads already’ (Interview 24/7/00). She had been to a gallery in London. ‘I don’t think it was the National Gallery, I’ve been to the National Gallery before’. Brigit had seen original works by Picasso, Van Gogh and Matisse and spoke of visiting galleries such as the ‘Pompidou centre quite a lot’, the London Art Gallery and the Guggenheim Museum and other galleries in America. She stated she liked ‘modern art’, explaining: ‘I prefer the style’. She said, ‘I don’t like the sort of classical...so boring...I get a bit fed up with it. You see too much’. She recalled she had seen a lot of classical art and preferred to see modern art which she had seen in America. ‘I went to one [gallery] in Los Angeles’. Brigit felt her parents liked both classical and modern art.

She talked about the art and artists with her parents. She said they knew about the history of artists: ‘They do. Loads’. They talked to her about this ‘a bit’ and discussed the art when they left the gallery. She said it was usually her Dad’s idea to go to the gallery and she liked going and found it interesting. She realised they went a lot and so did not need to go more often. She said they also went to the gallery when they were in Australia. She had been to the Melbourne Art Gallery twice but was not aware there was one in Geelong asking, ‘Is there one? No I haven’t been to that. We usually go to the major places’.

Brigit was immersed in a world of artistic culture within her home. Her parents collected art and her father also enjoyed drawing: ‘He likes drawing landscapes and plants’. Brigit also drew realistic drawings. Her mother watched ‘some sort of arty program on SBS’. They collected artwork from around the world and had a large pottery collection ‘from all over the world’. They also had landscape paintings collected on their travels and their furniture was ‘probably mostly antique’. Her parents listened to classical music, and she learnt the flute and cello and did jazz dance. She also learnt ballet whilst living in France. Brigit was inculcated with a strong cultural obligation from her family. She felt she would go to galleries when she was older. However, she felt ‘it depends on what place. What gallery’. Brigit
had realised the importance of attending the ‘right’ galleries, as she said her family only really went to the ‘major’ galleries.

Within the four schools, students had quite different levels of cultural capital due to their various interactions with cultural practices. Students at School Four had a distinct advantage in their ability to appropriate art in terms of the requirements of the CSF: The Arts, for they had greater familiarity with art and art discourse. However, students in the other three schools by comparison were collectively at a definite disadvantage. To reiterate, members of the dominant groups use exclusionary tactics to ensure their positions in society. Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) find that within the middle class a certain familiarity with the art world is inspired, a feeling of belonging to the cultivated world—where one feels at home, as the accredited addressee of works of art which are not delivered to just anyone (p. 61–62). Entry into the cultivated world gives access to the right and duty to appropriate culture and cultural practice is strongly encouraged by reference groups (p. 62).

Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain: ‘Members of the cultivated class feel entitled and obligated to visit this hallowed ground of culture [art galleries], from which others feel excluded for lack of sufficient culture’ (p. 102). They further find that museums are presented as the monuments of past splendour and public heritage but there also exists a ‘false generosity’, for while entry is free it is also optional and reserved for those equipped with the ability to appropriate artworks and therefore those who have the privilege of making use of the freedom. In this sense, they find themselves legitimated in their privilege, in their ownership of the means of appropriation of cultural goods and, in Weber’s terms, in their monopoly of the manipulation of cultural goods and the institutional signs of cultural salvation (p. 113).

These exclusionary techniques rely on cultural, social and economic distinctions among classes to ensure cultural reproduction. However, as discussed, the notion of ‘universal’ is applied to all. For participation in the ‘legitimate’ cultural practices are the measuring stick by which all arc judged even though they may not possess the means or the desire to enter the game of cultural practices. Bourdieu (1993b) argues works of art are accessible only to those who are disposed to appropriate them because they attribute a value to them, it being understood they can do this only if they have the means to appropriate them, which is received from their family environment and school (p. 227).

Furthermore, Bourdieu (1984) explains, given that scholastic success mainly depends on inherited cultural capital and the propensity to invest in education, it is clear why the proportion of students in a given school who come from a culturally rich
background rise with the position of that school in the specifically academic hierarchy (p. 122). However, the art experience students encounter in schools is also informed by the art teacher and their understanding of the art curriculum. Furthermore, teachers bring with them their own habitus which informs their teaching practice. Chapter 10 examines teacher habitus and how it reflects upon the implementation of art appreciation in each school.
Chapter 11 Teacher Habitus

The degree of implementation of ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’ varied, not only among schools, but also among different teachers. Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain that, in the absence of a specific organisation directly oriented towards the inculcation of artistic culture, activities at school are left to the enterprise of individual teachers (p. 60). The variation between teacher practice can be explained by applying Bourdieu’s concept of habitus to understand how individual agents’ practices and perceptions are formed. As discussed in Chapter 3, Bourdieu’s concept of habitus explains how everyday practices are developed and remain at an unconscious level, which allows them to be perpetuated and continue unquestioned, particularly by the agent carrying out the actions or practices. According to Bourdieu, the habitus can be understood as a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, and actions...’ (Bourdieu 1977, pp. 82–83). The habitus is produced within an environment or field, where agents have certain limits placed on them that structure their habitus. Within the education system structures are devised that define teacher practice to a degree, but teachers also bring with them their own habitus.

Bourdieu (1990) explains that the habitus is a product of history, which produces individual and collective practices. It ensures the active presence of past experiences, which are deposited in individuals as schemes of perception, thought and action and tend to guarantee ‘correctness’ of practices and constancy over time, more reliably than all formal rules (p. 54). The habitus is a system of dispositions—a present past that perpetuates itself in similar practices, an internal law through which external laws are reducible to immediate constraints (p. 54). The habitus is an internalisation of externality that enable external forces to exert themselves but in accordance with specific logic of the organism in which they are incorporated (p. 55).

For many teachers their practice is the outcome of their habitus. The teachers’ habitus is constructed as they integrate their school and familial upbringing with their teacher education, past documents (which are predominantly practical and studio-based in the arts), school procedure and past teaching experience. Teachers then incorporate this to form their current perceptions and actions. This internalised history then leads them to perceive and respond to new curricula in certain ways. Within this research, commonly teachers responded to the CSF, the new policy, with the statement, ‘We are doing it already’. This response can be viewed as a defense mechanism but it is also tenable that these teachers truly believe they are doing what they say and justify their existing practice in this way. In Bourdieu’s terms, actions or practice become internalised and the person does not question him or herself about it and, therefore,
they believe they are implementing the new curriculum in their practice. Brubaker (1993) explains: ‘The habitus governs practice in a subconscious, unreflective manner…Self-consciousness can inhibit or even destroy the practical efficacy of the habitus’ (p. 225).

Bourdieu (1990) argues that the actor acts in the urgency of the moment and is caught up in ‘the matter in hand’, totally present in the present and in the practical (p. 92). Practice is constructed in action and the principle of this construction is the system of structured and structuring dispositions, the habitus, which is constituted in practice and always oriented towards practical functions (p. 52). Bourdieu further regards the habitus as ‘a system of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures and as principles which generate and organize practices…without presupposing a conscious end or an express mastery of the operations’ (p. 53).

Ostensibly the ‘doing’ comes first and much of the ‘practice’ is learnt or enacted in institutional settings or ‘fields’—as such it carries certain ‘logic’ whose direction or reason may not be obvious to the practitioner. A teacher’s existing practice is what they have come to learn works in the situation or the particular field. A field can be described as a frame or a space where people interact and each field has its own accumulation of history, its own logic of action and its own forms of capital. Each field has particular values, expectations and boundaries and these are imposed on the person when they enter into it. However, each field is not entirely independent as they are immersed in an institutional field of power and class relations (Calhoun, LiPuma & Postone, 1993). Art education is a field that prescribes certain expectations and has historical boundaries, but it also operates under the institutional field of the government and their educational policy. Each field is a site of struggles, where people either want to change or want to preserve its boundaries.

For teachers, the education field is a site of constant change. However, teacher habitus tends to favour preservation of current practice and resist change either unconsciously or even consciously for some teachers. The implications of implementing the CSF: The Arts are revealed in teacher practice and their perceptions and reactions to the document. While the teachers who were interviewed and observed in my research often claim to be implementing the CSF at some level, frequently they are merely fitting the outcomes around their existing teaching practice. In fact their teaching or content of lessons had changed little if at all. Their existing practice was their ‘security blanket’ and people tend to stay with what they are familiar as their perceptions (via their habitus) enable them to relate to it and understand it more readily. When teachers are required to do something other than what they know and
are comfortable with, the innovation is often absorbed into the practice that already exists, as witnessed in my study.

Bourdieu (1990) explains that early experiences have particular weight because the habitus tends to ensure its own constancy and defence against change through the selection it makes by rejecting information capable of calling into question its accumulated information (p. 60). The habitus tends to protect itself from crises and challenges by providing itself with a milieu to which it is pre-adapted (p. 61). The habitus stays in a relatively constant universe of situations to reinforce its dispositions by offering the market most favourable to its product. These avoidance strategies are largely the product of non-conscious, unskilled avoidance, whether it results automatically from conditions of existence, or is produced by strategic intention (p. 61).

What follows in this chapter is the teachers’ beliefs that they have ‘always done’ what the CSF: The Arts required and, therefore, their art program did not need to change. Further, teachers will discuss their personal and professional response to the CSF as a document.

**School One Teacher One**

Teacher One stated that the CSF had not changed the art program, ‘No, not at all...I found it very easy...to fit in with the CSF’. She said she did not refer to the CSF before developing the visual arts curriculum, she explained she looked at her checklist to see an area they may not have covered, such as mask making or woodwork, then referred back to the outcomes in the CSF, ‘then I slot the outcomes in...I match the activities that I’ve done against the outcomes. Really I find it quite simple, but it’s probably because I’ve been doing it for so long...I don’t find it difficult’ (Interview 20/8/98). She felt she was covering the CSF anyway: ‘You’re covering the CSF...It just fits in with the CSF...It’s what we do anyway and it all just ties in so I’ve found that I can easily cover the CSF’. She felt students talked about what they’ve learnt and what they’re doing and used art language. She stated, ‘I’ve always done that...We’ve always covered what’s in the CSF...I honestly haven’t found it difficult at all’.

Asked whether the CSF is too broad, she responded, ‘I suppose so and that’s why we had the old course that covered those areas...Threads and textiles and the woodwork...That was how we used to do it before the CSF. You know, we were happy’. She stated, ‘I find the outcomes very broad and you can pretty much fit anything you do into three or four outcomes’. She explained, ‘You’re covering the
CSF...It just fits in with the CSF...It's what we do anyway and it all just ties in so I've found that I can easily cover the CSF.

When asked if she felt the CSF had changed her approach to teaching, she stated, 'No, not at all.... I still encourage the kids to talk about what they've learnt, what they're doing and to use some art room language...and I've always done that...We've really always covered what's in the CSF...I honestly haven't found it difficult at all'.

Initially Teacher One felt the students were experiencing all of the substrands of the CSF: The Arts. However, when asked specifically about how she would interpret the substrand 'arts criticism and aesthetics', she stated, 'All right that's...the one that I haven't done much written work on. Well, I don't know, I sort of see it more as an appreciation thing...of what the kids are doing and how they see each other's work and the work around them. And how they...learn to appreciate the efforts of their fellow students. That's within my discussion with the children in the classroom with their artwork. After referring to the CSF document, she claimed, 'We do all that...We're always talking. Well, it says here the qualities in artworks...and we do that, the different ways that they've used paint and the colours they use and the texture they've used...we've held up paintings and kids ask if they can show their painting and other kids will talk and they'll talk about what they've done so that again just fits in...and we were doing that before the CSF was even invented...That's just been part of it since the year dot, I think'.

All of these statements by the teacher give an indication that she does not think she needs to change her teaching style or practice. Even though Teacher One was not openly disapproving of the CSF, and in fact did not think it was restrictive at all as it was so broad, there was some tension in her responses as to whether the CSF had changed what she taught or how she taught. Many of the responses tell of the frustration that teachers have with being 'told' what to do and of replying with statements of 'We've always done it'. The comment, 'That was how we used to do it before the CSF. You know, we were happy', certainly gives an insight into the fact that many teachers were happy with how they taught and do not feel there is a need to change.

Teacher One simply saw that her lessons fit in with the CSF, and, therefore, felt that she was 'in a lucky situation'. She did not develop her program to ensure that the outcomes were covered. As she stated, 'It just so happens that it all matches up with the CSF...If it was the other way around though...If I found that I was really pressured to meet the CSF I really don't think I would change my style of doing
things’. She felt this even though she knew her accountability was at stake, but felt that the students having fun and a varied art experience was ‘what it’s all about’.

**School One Teacher Two**

Teacher Two was aware of the fact that teachers may find the CSF restrictive or limiting, but she felt they would probably do what they wanted to regardless of the document. As she stated, ‘I think they’d find it restrictive perhaps although I think they would probably do what they want anyway and just justify it with the learning outcomes. I think a lot of teachers do just what they want anyway and then just justify it’ (Interview 17/3/99). She backed this up with a story of her old art teacher: ‘When I went to secondary school the art teacher there is still teaching the same things as he’s taught me and so the CSF and...whatever they had before the CSF has obviously changed but his learning style has not changed one bit’. She also felt this was common as teachers tend to ‘realise we’ve got this [program]; we’ll do this year after year after year’.

She felt this was due to teachers feeling that the CSF would be changed anyway and, therefore, would be a waste of their time and effort. As she stated, ‘The perception I get from teachers who have been in it for a long time is that, “Oh, they’ll change it again in another few years so what’s the point? I’ll just continue doing what I’m doing and I’ll justify away”, so they’re just going to see it as more time and not worth the effort’.

She stated she followed the CSF and constantly referred to the document when developing her lessons, stating, ‘I rely on that’. This was due to her training which focused solely on the CSF policy document. She used the CSF to form the basis of her art lessons. As she stated, ‘If I’ve done my lesson planning and I’m covering an area of the CSF, I’m happy. If I’ve written out a plan and thought how am I going to fit this in to the CSF...That’s the wrong way around, I think, as long as I know I’m covering each area’. However, she also felt she needed to look at the CSF document more: ‘I incorporate my lesson plans into the CSF, but I probably would like to look at the CSF more to be honest because it’s easy to just get caught in the process of teaching art and you do lose focus of all the areas you should be covering’. She felt the learning outcomes were clear and easy to follow and did not have a problem with the document which can be explained by the fact that she had not seen other policy documents. She stated, ‘I don’t have a problem but...I’m not comparing it to anything else’.

However, she did not feel it was her education training as much as her visual arts training that influenced how and what she taught. The fact that she endorsed the CSF
was because she learnt a lot about art history and aesthetics in her visual arts training as she majored in ceramics but did two theory subjects as well. As she commented, 'I think I'd be similar to this no matter what the CSF documents were, actually...because we learnt more than just creating and making in university...It's just a natural combination for me'. Therefore, even though she felt she did implement the CSF: The Arts, she admitted that she would teach in her own style no matter what the document was due to the habitus she had developed in her visual arts training. Her earliest training had formed the basis of her habitus and remained the most powerful. However, as shown in Chapter 9, after having taught in School One for a few months, she realised that to incorporate art history and aesthetics into this school meant changing perceptions of students, teachers and parents which had been ingrained through previous practice, and this was a very difficult process. Therefore, her own habitus was then altered by the field she had entered and the class position and cultural capital of the students.

School Two Teacher One

Teacher One was pro-CSF but even she felt that the document had not really changed her art program. She believed that 'I don't think it's really changed the way I teach. I guess it has just encouraged me to reflect...I guess I tend to sort of look at it and say "Oh, do I do that, do I do that?". So I guess I use it as a bit of a check list to make sure, "Okay, yeah, I am covering the same, covering that". I don't think it's necessarily really changed because I think I've always taught...That's where a lot of good old art teachers who've been teaching art well for many years, why they are a little bit sceptical about it, because they've been teaching that way for years anyway. This is really just putting in place...I suppose verbalising, putting it down on paper what they've been doing for years anyway. So I don't think it's necessarily changed the way I teach but I think...I can reflect in a more focused way using that as a guide, I suppose' (Interview 4/5/99).

She did refer to the CSF when developing her art program but adapted the CSF outcomes to suit the existing program. She explained, 'In fact, we're sort of using a CSF format which we've adapted though to suit our own needs. So, yeah, we are using a CSF format and then what we're doing we're sort of cutting and pasting what we already do into those headings so we can say we have covered the scope of the program'.

She did feel the CSF had limitations: 'I think it's got limitations because one of the problems with it is teachers do need some kind of guidance when working with it...because the problem is that many teachers are just not aware of how to incorporate it into their work. So I think that's a limitation...They should have provided teachers
with more actual support in terms of in-servicing, free in-servicing and more support...I really feel that’s probably one of the limitations that I see because some people are scared of it, some teachers are a little bit scared to embrace it and that’s only really I think because they don’t really understand it and they don’t know how to go about implementing it. And also they’re frightened it’s going to add to their workload’. Therefore, Teacher One in School Two was aware of the problems the CSF had posed as far as being completely implemented by all teachers due to a lack of guidance and fear of added workload.

She also felt assessment of the CSF: The Arts was not clear, stating, ‘I think it’s fairly vague...I could imagine a lot of teachers finding it very vague...You physically do not have the time to be going around with check lists and ticking boxes and focusing specifically on minimal aspects of a child’s development and as far as I’m concerned you’re wasting your time. I think you’ve got a lot more to give, there’s a lot more positive and quality teaching to be given in engaging with a child than necessarily ticking a box. And I don’t believe in objectifying aspects to assess either because I think that contradicts the very nature of the arts. I will think of it as a very sad day if the CSF gets to a point where...which I think it is heading, where lap tests are developed. To test the arts because I just don’t believe that...My perception of what the arts are contradicts that notion’. Therefore, while this teacher presented that she was pro-CSF, she still had doubts about the complete implementation of the entire concept of the document, especially assessment of the arts.

School Two Teacher Two

Teacher Two had a similar approach to Teacher One, but was not positive about implementing the CSF. She felt what she taught was the same as the CSF: The Arts. She said, ‘When I look at the CSF I thought, “Well, that’s what I’ve been doing” and so I felt confident that what I’m doing is along the right track anyway’ (Interview 17/5/99). She felt that students covered all substrands of the CSF: The Arts including arts appreciation. Further, when asked if she felt that the grades five and six students were achieving the learning outcomes at level four in terms of the CSF levels, she answered, ‘Generally speaking, I suppose...See, this is where I think the CSF, to have a guideline, you just take it like any other guideline that have been before, you take it with a grain of salt’.

She did contradict herself at times: ‘I couldn’t really say I have a negative view on the CSF, wholly. I think it is useful for people who have been placed in an art room without any experience in art. But I suppose my background helped with my art teaching. I found that the terminology in the CSF...didn’t seem to encourage people when they were confronted with the terminology. They were easily confused; they
panic. I went along to a few official meetings of the implementing CSF in the arts areas and I just saw a lot of panic and confusion and wondered why because I'm sure most of those teachers were doing what the CSF indicated anyway, they were just changing the words. I always feel a bit sceptically the way things are written in art books they seem to crowd out a lot of the majority of people and it almost becomes an elitist type of terminology and I think it needs to become a lot more simplified'.

She further stated, 'I didn't find the CSF personally helpful at all. In fact, I found it more of a bother. Only because I had to officially rewrite certain things and I was doing that anyway in practical and I have done so for years. So I just found it more of a hassle to attend these meetings and...Just the actual structure of the CSF and having to implement it in a certain way and in a certain structure really annoys me, to put it plainly'. When asked if the CSF meant having to buy more resources she replied, 'The CSF hasn't made a difference to my art program really. Hasn't really made any difference to me personally'. She further felt that incorporating all of the substrands of the CSF was a natural part of her program, arguing, 'Well, they're just sort of a natural part of it'.

She said she 'never' referred to the CSF when developing her art program or when assessing student work: 'No, never. I just go by my own knowledge'. She said she used her own assessments and felt they would correlate with the CSF. She stated, 'I think if I went back each time to the CSF it would be the same basically'. She also felt that the CSF demanded too much time for assessment, claiming, 'Another aspect of the CSF that I found was that, even though it stated valuable areas that I know that a teacher had to cover, I found it went overboard, the pendulum swung too far the other way and if you spent your whole time and writing out your evaluation, as the CSF demanded, you would have no time to practically work with the children in the class. I found it impractical in those areas and it's not just limited to visual arts'.

She had quite strong negative feelings about the CSF, stating again how it had not changed her program: 'For me personally, no. It may have changed for the other teachers, I can't sort of speak for them but...I probably had more negative feelings with the CSF. As I said earlier I can acknowledge there have been some positives overall but the CSF for me personally was more of a hindrance; [it] might be a bit harsh but [it] just aggravates me'. She stated the CSF had not changed her approach to teaching the visual arts, 'Not at all', and stated she continued to teach the same way she had for the past ten years.

She stated one of the reasons she did not embrace the CSF was that she felt it was restrictive and it would change again. 'I felt that what frustrated me with the CSF was
just basically stating the obvious to me and it aggravated me... I felt restricted that I had to set it out in a certain way. I like a lot more freedom in what I do in my art program and I just felt frustrated I had to call things in different ways and with the knowledge that in another five years most likely those terms would change again’. She based this belief that it would change on past experience.

When I explained that the CSF was under review with a new document coming out, she responded, ‘I’m not surprised. I guarantee there will be some more documents coming out in another few years’. When asked what recommendations would she have, she said, ‘I would be a lot more practical with the demands of what’s expected in certain particular areas like evaluation. Before I draw up a document I would go and ask art teachers who are feeling happy with their own programs and talk to them and find out the ins and outs of how they feel art should or should not be taught. And listen to them first before I throw out any airy fairy concepts and terminology and just be a lot more practical and down to earth’.

She did not like the terminology of the document. She said, ‘I could understand what they were saying but I felt that the way they said it seemed to... just the phrases seemed to say nothing and they could be best served with just a plain simple term. But it was just frustrating to see the way it was termed... It just tended to be confusing’. When asked what areas were confusing, she replied, ‘Just the general feel of the whole document was confusing. Confusing, but it stated the obvious at the same time, I just thought what a funny way of putting that and then they would have a strand and then a substrand and I thought, “That’s obvious”’. Like when you begin a lesson you introduce it and it just listed a lot of points that I thought, “Well, that’s obvious, isn’t it?” When you introduce a lesson, why do you have to list that as a curriculum focus. Having to structurally put everything down with every lesson like that to me... I personally feel quite restricted with it. Sometimes something will bounce off and allow the lesson to turn into a totally different direction, you know. That’s good. I like change. Being able to change. I found it quite restrictive and frustrating because I felt like I was doing it anyway and having to rewrite everything’.

She felt the CSF document was also condescending where teachers were not valued. She felt they were ‘given a document to say, “Right, what you’ve been doing”... You felt you were told that what you’d been doing, that’s not the right way and this is the way that you have to write it up. And I sort of felt resentful of that and really negated what any person was doing in the past, what they were probably doing in the right way anyway. It was just termed in a different way and I didn’t feel that the CSF was presented in a very practical way. It was just another intellectual document... As I said earlier it did list certain areas that are important in art like the criticisms, bringing in
and using other artists in the way you present your material but I feel that if people went around in-servicing teachers and showing them in a practical way and demonstrating how you do these things [it] would have been a lot more valuable'.

She believed that the document had moved away from the practical and become more intellectual. ‘I think some of the really old programs that you found in books brought out art education in a more practical way, whereas it’s tended...to become a lot more intellectual and a lot more exclusive and a lot more broadening...and it’s because people feel that things, to be any good, it has to be modernised and updated...We have to say this in a new way because that’s old fashioned and it’s lost a lot in the process and I’m generally speaking in education. Its not just in art’.

She was aware of the political motivation behind the document in terms of the government having to change and update policy documents. She felt the influence was ‘We’ve got to update this because it’s been around a few years and that way of thinking just seems to be part and parcel of being in the education system. Like if it’s been sitting there for five or six years this mustn’t be any good. Text books are constantly being replaced and slightly changed but if you looked at what’s behind the text books it’s nothing really greatly different. As I said different ways of putting things but I think it’s also good to have a look and review things. Change is good for areas where it really does need it and there are some very old fashioned ways of thinking that I don’t agree with in art education...It has aided a lot more people to see what is involved in art, a good art education, so in one respect it has its negatives and in another respect it has had its advantages of finding out how we can teach the creative process in a more positive way’.

She did feel strongly though that the CSF was concerned with teacher accountability: ‘Oh, yes, certainly. Maybe some of the panic was, “Help, I’m not doing anything of those and I should be” obviously and now I’m having to write things down in areas where I didn’t even now about myself, let alone teach it. So in that respect...Panic is good in a way, that sort of accountability. It was just the excessive panic probably in the way it was presented but it just seems to be fairly typical of how it is presented. Maybe a bit more thought could go into the way things have changed toward that. People may feel insecure and what they’re doing is wrong whereas it possibly might be but there’s ways of going about it in a lot more practical way to give people confidence and reassurance at the same time and then also make people accountable with...“Okay, so I’m not doing this but look this is set out so I can understand what I’m not doing and I’m not made to feel threatened...[instead of] I’m totally lost now. I don’t know what I’m suppose to be doing at all”’. She stated
that the panic and insecurity are what a lot of teachers felt: ‘Yeah, they did. A lot. I mean a lot of teachers felt confused’.

Teacher Two was aware of people’s resistance to change, explaining: ‘Change generally throws people out and you’re going to get the panic anyway as soon as you change anything so that’s just a natural reaction to change, and you’re going to get that’. For her personally the main issue was that the CSF document failed to present a practical approach to arts teaching. Bourdieu (1990) discusses how the habitus is formed in practice and always oriented towards practical functions (p. 52). Therefore, Teacher Two was oriented towards wanting ‘practical functions’ of the document: what could be incorporated into her teaching practice. However, she found the terminology of the CSF too theoretical to be easily implemented into practice and, therefore, was rejected. Her defence for this rejection was that she was ‘doing it anyway’ and, therefore, did not need to change.

School Three

Initially, the art teacher at School Three was worried whether she was covering all of the areas of the CSF: The Arts correctly. However, then she explained that the CSF would not change what she taught and she felt the document was far removed from reality, especially in her school. At the beginning of the interview she stated, ‘I am happy to work to it and whatever I do I will have an aim that I want to achieve and it just so happens that they’ve given me the aims. So the outcomes are the aims or objectives, aren’t they? This is my objective and I’m happy to work with that’. However, when asked if she felt the document was concerned with teacher accountability, she responded, ‘You do feel like that because they’ve put it out and they’re telling that this is the bible …They don’t realise schools work in themes and that sometimes some things don’t fit in. You’ll try as hard as you can to do something but it doesn’t fit in’.

She explained, ‘I use the CSF but…it suits me, I don’t suit it. But there are times when I look at it and think I should have done that and I should have done that. Especially past and present context. I was thinking, “Oh, I failed the kids”. But you do, you think, “I haven’t done this and are they going to be having problems?”’ (Interview 18/11/99).

She still felt the document was a good guide, but it could be improved. ‘I think it’s a good guide but I think they could probably improve it a lot. It would be nice to have a few examples of work that people had done and kids had done and show this is level four, to see if you’re doing the right thing. Because sometimes when I look at my work program you think, “Oh, well, this all fits in, they’re doing this, and they’re
doing this and I’ve got the skills techniques, I’ve got exploring and developing ideas. I’ve got my objective here and I’m looking at it and I’ve got my materials”. But I wonder if it’s really what they would be looking for.

When asked if she felt the government was expecting a lot from teachers, her mood changed. ‘Yeah, of course they are. I think they’re very lucky I’ve even bothered to do it. Because you’re just thrown in...Luckily we’re intelligent enough to be able to do it as teachers, but really if I walked into them and said, “Okay, here’s a book, this is what you’re doing, off you go, you have to do this, tells you exactly what you’ve got to do there, there you go, do it” They wouldn’t like it at all, would they? And yet that’s what they expect of us’. She further stated she felt the document was overwritten, explaining: ‘It goes on with too much BS [bullshit]...It’s just like someone’s justifying their job. Instead of making it simple’. She told how ‘I looked at it and I thought, “Oh”. It was just too much...You know, you’ve got so much to do in your job and you open it up and it’s not easy to read. I don’t find it easy. I want something simple that I can look at...Right, boom, boom, boom, boom, here I go. I don’t have time to wade through all of this’. Therefore, time was a factor again for this teacher as one of the reasons why she did not implement the CSF fully. Furthermore, there was the matter of keeping the document ‘simple’ or practical. She stated, ‘I probably preferred the old system where we had materials, thread and textiles, colour and light, drawing and painting, I like that. Because I could always find something from all of them to do...It was great. I don’t think this is as valuable as the old course notes’. Therefore, she wanted a more practical document that related to her teaching practice. She did not really incorporate the CSF. She explained about using the document: ‘It doesn’t really worry me because...As I said, I use it to suit my purpose and I’m creative enough to be able to use it’. She stated that the CSF had not made a difference to her program, ‘No, not really. But I am anonymous, aren’t I?’.

She realised that, in general, the CSF document was produced by the government for a particular agenda regarding teacher accountability. She declared: ‘To me, I mean, you know, I just think government...To me it’s just like big brother. I just look at it as big brother telling us what to do’. She felt the document was more about accountability for teachers. ‘It’s really assessing us, isn’t it, rather than the kids?...I think as an assessment on teachers, that’s basically what it’s for. It’s to say, “Okay, we’ve got this lovely little document, we’ve spent $200,000 doing and now we want you to do this and we might just pop in one day and see what you’re doing”. And who knows, they might, they probably won’t but they might’. She felt the CSF was also an elitist document, stating, ‘Yeah, it is elitist, oh, definitely. The whole thing is elitist, the language used is elitist’. When asked why she thought they wrote an elitist document
she replied, ‘Because they’re...you know, I really can’t say on tape. They’re
smarties. They know everything about art and they know everything about teaching
art and they want to go in there and show off. It’s basically what it is, it’s just a show
off document. And this time it’s a Liberal show off document and next time it will be
the Labor show off document. That’s all it comes down to except Labor might use
words that people understand’. She also felt the document was far removed, stating,
‘I think they’re so far removed, you don’t even know who wrote it, do you? Doesn’t
say, doesn’t say who’s responsible for it’.

She was aware of the constant changes in education policy and found this frustrating:
‘I don’t know why we can’t just have something that works and if it needs a few
changes with the times, fine, but why do we have to throw everything out and bring a
new idea in. When basically what you’re doing is the same, you go to any school and
they’re doing the same things I’m doing’. She further explained why she thought the
government changed the policy documents. ‘I think it was the new government,
wasn’t it, Liberal government? To me it’s a government thing where Liberal...everything Labor did is bad. We’ll bring this out because we know better,
we’re the experts and I’m sure that this time someone will get rid of this now and
there will be something else brought out by the Labor government. It’s just politics’.

When asked if she thought they made changes for the benefit of the children, she
replied, ‘No, I don’t. That would be the least...They’d say that but why wasn’t the
other one any good? Why do they bring it out and say it’s so wonderful and then its
thrown out, if it’s so wonderful why is it changed? We had Frameworks before this,
well, why was that thrown out, what was wrong with that? When that came in it was
right. So if that’s the case I should be thinking, “Well, this isn’t going to be right”
because in a couple of years...they’ll throw this out and they’ll bring something else
in and we’ll go, “Yes, sir”, off we go and do it’. However, her statement that they
‘go and do it’ was imprecise. As she herself explained, teachers simply adapt the
document to suit their existing program. She felt teachers were sick of the changes
and, therefore, ‘They’re just doing what I’m doing and adapting it to fit in to what
they’re doing. Look, things come out and you look at it and you think, “That’s
great”, but everything new is not better...They change things to be trendy and some
idiot in America comes up with an idea and everyone jumps on the band wagon and
says, “Oh, yeah, we’ve all got to do that”. And then it turns out three or four years
later that you’ve wasted three years of the kids’ schooling and they haven’t achieved
anything and they go back...What I always do is I always pick the eyes out of
everything and I say, “Yes, that’s a good idea, I can see that working, and I can see
that working, and I can see that working”, and I’ll use it but I’m not going to do
something if it’s not working and it doesn’t suit the kids. I mean, what’s the point?
To me art for kids they should come in and they should have a positive attitude to it and be happy and want to do it. If I’m going to do something that makes them miserable and they feel they have no confidence in, what’s the point?

The art teacher was, therefore, aware that the document did not suit ‘all’ students and the outcomes placed high expectations on students, not just on teachers. She explained, ‘Because kids are all different and I think that again these people who sit in there and think that every child... if you’ve got a grade three child or a grade four child this is what they’re like and they’re not; they’re not all the same’.

She agreed that the document may be based on the ideal school and ideal students as she stated, ‘Yeah, with all the art, that’s it. [the students] had paintings shown to them before they were born and...The trouble with the CSF, all of them is, that every child is so well rounded in everything. So musically they’ve had all these things like the arts, they’ve done drama and this and they understand this and they don’t. Sometimes you think, “Well, I should go back to level one...They don’t understand it”. What’s the point of throwing them up here to do something when they don’t understand this basic back here? That’s not the teacher’s fault’.

Therefore, she realised that students come to school with their habitus and cultural capital already formed and teachers had then to work with these perceptions and ways of life that were inculcated in the family. She explained some students are just not going to achieve the outcomes and the CSF does not take into account students’ backgrounds. ‘If they don’t reach that I don’t see that as a problem with me...They haven’t reached that level and it doesn’t matter what you write in a book. If the child’s not going to reach that level, they’re not going to reach that level. You can write things until you’re black and blue, and they can sit in their ivory towers and write and write and write but they probably need to come out and have a look at the chalk face and see what’s going on. It might have been an idea to talk to a few teachers. They always get all these experts...and they don’t live in the real world, I don’t think. You’d probably be better to get someone like me that’s done all sorts of teaching to have some input. I just think sometimes...[they have] blinkers that they wouldn’t be able to see anything but this and they forget about all the other things that come into it. And if a child...for example he talks to his artwork, the child might be shy, the child might have a speech problem, the child might have had Mum hit Dad over the head last night. It doesn’t mean you’ve failed’.

She felt the government did not consider student background when producing the CSF because ‘I don’t think they’re really interested in that. I think it’s just
something the governments of the day can stand up and say, “Here we go, we’ve done this, and this shows that we’re doing the right thing by the kids”.

She also felt the document justified the jobs of the writers. She said it ‘justifies and gets these people a lot of money to do this. They’re taken in there and it’s a cushy job and they sit in there and write these things and then after two years they finish that and they start writing the next one and then that’s thrown out. That’s what annoys me. This is all thrown out and something new comes in and we’re expected to just change over night and no collaboration with us at all’.

Therefore, she felt there was an ‘us’ and ‘them’ approach. ‘Yeah. Well, who comes out to the school and has a look at what we’re doing. Be nice to have someone come out and say, “Well, what are you doing in the school? Let’s have a look at the work and how are the kids coping with this. And do you find you’ve got any problems with this?” And just take an interest. I don’t think they’re interested. They probably go to a select few schools they’ve chosen and they’d be chosen, probably in the Eastern suburbs of Melbourne...and they’d have this perfect artwork and there’s perfect children and there’s perfect art rooms. That come from homes that probably have originals on the wall. That’s the thing: this is a low socio economic area and the standard of work I’m getting from these kids, I’m thrilled with because anyone probably in there would be saying, “Oh, you wouldn’t get anything from those kids. They wouldn’t be able to do any art, you know”. And they’re responding incredibly. I’m just thrilled with the way they’re doing their work. I get emotional about it because they’re doing such a good job for kids that I think are disadvantaged. And yet they could look at this and say, “Oh, but they haven’t achieved this”’.

For her, the CSF was not based in reality, especially for the students at this school, and she again told how she adapted the document to suit her program and the students. ‘I just look at it [CSF] and think... so what! Come out to the real world. I mean you can tell people as much as you like and it’s a landmark document, it’s a landmark document for the people who wrote it. If it didn’t exist...if tomorrow every copy disintegrated, it wouldn’t change my program in any way. I’d just adapt it to whatever else they came out with because I know what I’m doing. I’m happy with what I’m doing and I know what I’m doing is right for the kids. Whether you have this or something else really makes no difference. You teach to your kids...If you’re doing the right thing...I mean, if you’re a really lousy teacher this is not going to make any difference. You can justify anything anyway. It’s not going to make any difference. And if you’re a good teacher you don’t need it anyway because you know what you’re doing. So I just think it’s something they’ve got to show people. I think it’s
for parents, I think it’s for the media, the government: “Look what we’re doing. This justifies us, we’re doing something, we’re achieving something”.

She then justified her art program in relation to the students’ interest levels: ‘As far as I’m concerned my lessons relate to the CSF and I’m not going to change them and I’m not going to change something that the kids aren’t going to enjoy because it fits in with the CSF. If it’s going to be a lousy lesson and the kids are going to muck around and I can say, “Okay, we didn’t achieve anything, I had two kids that ran out of the room, I had a couple more that were fighting in the corner, but, gee I tried to do this”. What’s the point, you know? There’s no point. So you’ve got to do what works as well and that’s the thing...You have to do what works with the kids’.

When asked if she thought what worked for the children was different in different schools, she answered, ‘Yeah. And the kids don’t want to sit on the floor for a long time and have you talking to them. They come in here to do something. As I said, they’re rearing to go, let’s go. Sometimes they’ll come and sit on the table to sort of tell me we don’t even want to sit on the floor. We want to come and work straight away’. She explained they are unable to sit on the floor for extended periods: ‘No, they don’t, and they can’t. They’ll be touching someone or fighting with someone, you know. Or annoying someone or laughing or whatever or “I want to go to the toilet” or “I want to do this”. So definitely changes from school to school. And that’s why I’d love the people who wrote it to come out and take a lesson. Okay, come out with the grade six. You wrote this, do one of your lessons on past and present context, come and take it. Come and do a lesson on art criticism...of this painting and show me what you do and I tell you what: they’d get the shock of their life. Because they haven’t got any idea and they sort of aim at this middle of the road I think’. She then felt the CSF was aimed even higher: ‘Well, this is probably above middle of the road. Really I’d say. I mean, as I said I can fit my program into it, I can evaluate, but probably my evaluation of what I call established might be beginning or consolidated’.

She felt in another school students would be more accepting of talking about artworks ‘and even if they didn’t accept it they’d sit there and listen because that’s what they know is expected of them. That’s the difference, see: the kids here are saying to you if you keep me sitting on the floor too long I will punish you. I will play up...That’s what they’re saying. And I can’t see anything wrong in responding to that and making [art]...If it works and the kids are happy and they’re doing something and creating, fine. That’s the way it is and that’s the way I see it and saying you’ve got to spend this long doing this. It’s just not realistic’.
For the art teacher at School Three, students’ needs dictated the art program and were based on their inherited cultural capital and habitus. She was restricted by student expectation and behaviour due to their social class position which influenced their cultural disposition and limited value of art appreciation. However, she was also restricted by her own understanding of art, explaining her own art education was studio based: ‘I can’t remember doing any appreciation of art, really’. Therefore, her habitus was established as a practical approach to the arts and continued throughout her teaching career, proving change where art appreciation was incorporated a difficult prospect. She therefore ‘adapted’ the CSF to suit her already existing program and justified her decision based on political grounds. She questioned the intentions of the government as to whether they were producing the CSF for the betterment of ‘all’ students or were more concerned with teacher accountability. She also felt the document was not ‘simple’ enough or practical and would change in the near future.

School Four

The art teacher at School Four stated within her teacher training she did participate in art appreciation: ‘Yeah, we did lots of artists, aesthetics, we did art appreciation’ and, therefore, she felt her training was adequate for implementing the CSF. She felt that the CSF had not made any difference to her teaching as this was how she taught before. ‘I think I’m really well prepared for the CSF; it’s spot on. The CSF is no different to the way I’ve been teaching all along, but perhaps a little bit more interested in some certain areas. More appreciation in the senior school but I’m teaching junior art’.

She stated she did not look at the CSF when developing her program: ‘I hardly look at it... Well put it this way: we looked at the CSF initially and decided that we’re spot on with the CSF. Everything they’re trying to say, except the appreciation and aesthetic, we do a little bit more of that, we were covering all the other areas and so there wasn’t any point. I mean, we were doing [that] before they brought it in anyway. So any planning that we do now we continue along the lines we were, knowing that we’re along the lines with the CSF anyway. What’s the point of looking up what we’re already doing?’

She stated the CSF had not changed the art program in this school: ‘Not really because our program was pretty close to it anyway and as I said we did analyse our programs when the CSF first came out. We did in-services and work shops, and we had to work out what we were covering and we weren’t compared to the CSF, and we found, well, the only area, as most schools, probably was aesthetics and appreciation. And we actually included a lot more of that six years ago and we just let it lapse a bit and we’re sort of more aware. I think it’s made us more aware that we should be
doing more in that area. So it’s helped us there in that area, structuring it more into the program, it’s always been there with the art background that I’ve had and some of the others there’s always been discussion of artworks and artists in our program. We’ve used artists to influence our practical work.

Despite initially stating that the CSF did not change the art program, she felt the document did make them more aware of having to introduce more art appreciation, even though she felt this school did do this before. She felt the substrands of the CSF: The Arts fitted into their program. She claimed, ‘Well, I feel that our program fits into them perfectly; well, they fit into our program perfectly. We basically teach what they expect us to teach and we were before too...It hasn’t really changed. And I think I said to you before private schools have always been quite strong on curriculum. There’s been a lot of thought and planning that’s gone into our curriculum in the past. Having the art education background that we’ve all had we know it’s important to include variety in your program and cover certain areas and include discussion of artists and kids should be looking at artwork and analysing artworks and looking at architecture and design and those sort of things. We all know all of that. It [CSF] hasn’t really changed it, so that’s good: it’s confirmation rather than anything else. The only good thing that I feel is that it’s made us more aware of the appreciation and criticism. When you get very busy sometimes that gets left out but we’re trying to address that by building more programs around different artists’.

Therefore, while she did not see the CSF overtly changed the art program, she did feel it was positive. ‘Well, it’s probably positive that it has forced us to look at our program again and see where we’re going and if we’re heading in the right direction...and it has reaffirmed that we are doing the right thing’. However she was negative about the document in some respects stating she did not really use it. ‘As I said to you I think we are using it in our own way and we have been doing before, so I don’t really refer to the document any more. I’m just a bit ambivalent about it’.

When asked if she thought the curriculum focus and learning outcomes as prescribed in the CSF: The Arts were clear and easy to follow, she answered, ‘I suppose they are but they’re fairly general too. I’m not following them that closely now. I looked at them initially and then when I went to some of the in-services on it and got down to the nitty gritty, I thought, “Well, that’s what we’re doing anyway’. Her belief that the art teachers at School Four were already doing what was prescribed in the CSF was strong, as it was in the other three schools. When asked what she meant by ‘they were doing it already’, she replied, ‘Yeah, we were covering all of the areas that they asked that we should be covering. We had a good balance of 2-D and 3-D work...and we have had worksheets when we’re doing art on line. We talk about
asking them to use line in their work and the kids do a sheet where they answer questions about line and find a painting with lines in it...We did all that before the CSF. Because there was Frameworks, that was similar to the CSF but with my time with teaching I see a circular movement with curriculum and I think we get too tight in one direction. I think that can be a disadvantage with the CSF too. People become very structured and outcomes based and then you don’t have that spontaneity...that sort of ticking off whether they’ve all achieved’.

She felt the concept of checking students’ achievements came from accountability: ‘I think that’s come from the accountability of the government basically’. When asked if she thought this was accountability for students, teachers or schools, she replied, ‘I think more for probably teachers, you know; also with the contracts too and the school with the choice for parents you know schools have been advertising more so it’s become a lot more competitive’.

Due to the competitiveness among schools, she felt there was pressure to prescribe to the CSF outcomes. ‘Yeah, I do feel that there’s some sort of pressure there and...there shouldn’t need to be in a private school, but we could do our own thing, what we like. So it’s coming from people that are the chief administrators...I’d be really bucking it if it wasn’t similar to our program, but because it’s basically what we’re on about, but we should be saying, “We’ve got this great program, this is what we do whether it’s the CSF or whatever it is”’. She felt this school did not always follow the government line and ‘It just depends on who’s at the top. I think it depends on the administration...over the years people have become a lot more conservative and so they go along with the flow...I don’t see that as a bad thing with the CSF because as long as we put into perspective and say, “Okay, we do our own program but we’re following the CSF” but don’t let’s get caught up in it all if we want to do something different that we think is appropriate. Let’s do it and feel that we’ve been directed but that’s the way we can go’.

The art teacher stated she initially thought the CSF was produced to help guide teachers who did not have any art training, but later felt there was more to the CSF. ‘I feel that it’s got a slight political agenda, but...schools, they obviously need to have more accountability, but I don’t like standardising the arts like they’re trying to do to categorise and comparing this school with that school because they haven’t reached those standards at a certain level and that worries me because you can’t do that...A lot of schools don’t have fully trained art specialists. There’s no way they can achieve some of those outcomes. Maybe that is to help them achieve them and I suppose the other thing is: perhaps it makes art seem a more valuable aspect to curriculum throughout schools, because it’s like all the other Key Learning Areas’.
Despite feeling the CSF: The Arts had contributed some positive aspects, she did feel more comfortable using other documents that were more practical. She explained, 'I looked at the CSF initially and we did some work on it but that's as far as it's gone now. You can sort of put it aside and realise that we looked at other books like this one 'Art is making, creating and appreciating': I'd rather turn to a book like that which is spot on with the CSF stuff with all the practical pictures and stuff than look at the other document [CSF]'. She felt the CSF was not 'user friendly'. 'It's all a bit general and removed, but when you look at it and analyse it, it's what you do, but it's just different language basically, and it puts me off. I can't get enthused by it at all, I much prefer the Frameworks document. I found that more user friendly. It's [CSF] very clinical, I find it's very clinical...Because we're doing it, not really theorising about it...I don't like it all categorised in little boxes and it's very clinical...I've had enough of it. I just feel confident that reading all the latest literature that comes out from other art educators that we're doing the right thing. And then I just feel that it's unnecessary at this stage to have to plough through boring paragraphs of stuff about the arts, when I can pick up something very similar in this format that's more spot on'.

Part of her disdain for the CSF came from the constant changes of past policy documents. When asked how she felt about another change with the CSF II being launched in schools, she replied, 'Well, that's why I've hardly bothered to look at it. I just feel it's another thing. When I first came to this school we had quite a good curriculum, but it needed some balances in it so I changed that and wrote that. Then we had Frameworks and we had sessions on that we were supposed to rewrite with Frameworks in it, then CSF came in. I mean this in thirteen years and they're not easy things to do, restructuring your program. You've got to sort of really spend hours in documentation and so I've given up now'.

It is apparent that the teachers from all four schools clearly felt they were doing what was prescribed in the CSF before it was even published and distributed. This belief can be explained by applying Bourdieu's (1990) theory of practice, whereby practices are so embedded in action they are not truly contemplated at a conscious level. For actions are defined in practice, not theory, as the teacher at School Four stated: 'We're doing it, not really theorising about it'. Furthermore, the CSF was not seen as a practical document which could be easily implemented by teachers: it was too theoretical, too elitist and just not 'simple' enough.

Applying Bourdieu's concept of habitus allows one to understand that individuals develop their practices and have them remain at an unconscious level, whereby their
past experiences are deposited in their schemes of thought and action. Consistently, teachers preferred to refer to past policy documents that had helped form their initial teaching habitus. Furthermore, teachers stated they already taught what was required in the CSF and that it was just the language or terminology that had changed. However, it is vital to realise that the habitus subconsciously ‘directs’ individuals to act in certain ways that protect and allow for consistency of their practices, thereby making change a difficult process. Further to this, the habitus is inculcated in fields that place certain restrictions or demands on the agent. The education field is the site of struggles where teacher habitus may clash or correlate with education policy and some agents act to change the field while others aim to maintain it. However, the development of policy documents needs to consider teacher habitus along with student habitus and cultural capital if the implementation process is to be effective. Otherwise there will be minimal or no change to existing education programs.

In education if change is to implement a new government policy document, one must question the reasons for this change and whom the changes are really for. Further, if change is to be successful at a teaching and learning level, I feel we need to give greater weight to the concept of the habitus or the accumulated histories of teachers and students. Further we need to recognise the social factors which also influence them and the way these agents see themselves in the world.
Chapter 12 Conclusion

As presented in the Introduction, initially I set out to examine why the policy document, the CSF: The Arts, was not being fully implemented in art classrooms in Victoria. However, my focus shifted and I considered the historical and political context of the formulation of the document and discussed the social and cultural implications that the CSF: The Arts had for schools, teachers and students. Applying Bourdieu’s theory of cultural reproduction, I analysed my data in terms of his concepts of ‘field’, ‘cultural capital’ and ‘habitus’. In line with Bourdieu I have argued that education is not a neutral discourse, but a field where social class distinctions have a strong tendency to be expressed and maintained. Further, I examined the art field as a political ideology that defines high art, and art appreciation, as signs of distinction, that distinguish social class divisions based on ‘taste’. From this perspective, art has also assisted in the perpetuation of the existing social order with its inequalities by the cultural elite who use it to define their class positions and group membership. Consequently, I proposed that, in certain ways, the production and implementation of the CSF: The Arts promotes social distinctions among schools and maintains the existing social order. I argued that the introduction of art appreciation in the form of the subbrand ‘arts criticism and aesthetics’, in the CSF: The Arts, meant that those who possessed the required cultural and linguistic capital would be advantaged while those who did not would be further disadvantaged.

I considered how arts curriculum reform in Australia in the 1980s and through the 1990s was driven by economic rationalist discourses, which resulted in a framework of outcomes-based education and the introduction of DBAE. In this context, the CSF: The Arts developed in Victoria incorporated arts criticism and appreciation as an assessable outcome that all students were expected to achieve. However, art appreciation was a concept not previously mandated in art education policy and was unknown in the majority of primary schools, particularly public schools.

The research revealed that the incorporation of art appreciation is likely to have the effect for many students of raising the bar to a height that is largely unattainable due to the social divisions among schools and the students in them. The approach of ‘disinterested’ art appreciation, based on the scholastic stance, requires a way of looking at the world that in Bourdieu’s terms is analytical and abstract, an unnatural approach of detached contemplation, a ‘pure gaze’. This approach has a long history in Western thought and social practice through Kant’s aesthetic ideal maintained within the discourse of the art field into contemporary times. Furthermore, the ability to appreciate art in this manner is still in large part based on Kant’s premise of the
"genius", or innate gift, which has the ideological effect of the justification of the elite in their positions of dominance.

This thesis argues that the ability to critique and appreciate art aesthetically in a "disinterested" manner is attained through familiarisation in the school and the home. The "pure gaze" of artistic appreciation is learnt through familiarisation with artworks and attainment of the linguistic capital of art discourse. A knowledge of the "code" to decipher artworks—that is, the vocabulary of art discourse to name artists, recognise styles and consider the life of the artist—is obtained in the home and reinforced in school. This habituated knowledge and familiarity enable a cultural disposition to develop, enabling effective participation in art appreciation. If one does not have the required cultural disposition and understanding of the code of artworks, one is unable to "read" them and, therefore, is reliant on realism to interpret them. In Bourdieu's account, the interpretation of art based on subject matter alone is considered inferior compared to the "disinterested" approach which recognises art as form and not simply as function. Furthermore, when those who do not possess this code enter art galleries they are often reliant on the information provided by the galleries such as written information or a tour guide, in order to gain an understanding and appreciation of the artworks.

The research shows, in the absence of a cultural disposition generated through habitus, that the education students receive in school can be effective in developing their ability to appreciate art, if they are given access to the "code" of art discourse. This means sustained explicit teaching and discussions of art styles, methods and social contexts. However, not all schools provide this code. Most schools' art programs are based on making and creating art, not appreciating art. By recognising schools as social fields, it can be understood that schools present a certain ethos, where attitudes, habits, expectations and values impact upon those who enter the field. Certain schools value the arts, recognising the importance of being competent in cultural practices, such as appreciating art, because this form of cultural capital can be transferred to other fields. The private elite school in the study recognised the importance of participating in legitimate cultural practices. As discussed, the teachers in this school understood that legitimate cultural practices act as signs of distinction and permit membership in the dominant and "cultured" group. Therefore, within this kind of school, the valuing of art is inculcated in students, developing a cultured disposition and valuing investment in cultural practices. Hence, with the development of a cultural disposition, students develop cultural awareness, or cultural obligation and aspiration.

However, education draws on and extends a familial attainment of cultural competence that is implicit and developed from early immersion in a world of art. In this sense art
education, particularly the requirements of art appreciation in the CSF: The Arts, presupposes that all students enter school with adequate and equal levels of cultural capital, acquired through their families' connections. This study shows that for some students, especially from working-class schools, this is not the case. In comparison, students from School Four in my study had a distinct advantage as the majority possessed both 'acquired' and 'inherited' cultural capital from their scholastic experience and family backgrounds.

The research showed that students from differing social backgrounds participate in cultural practices very differently, either valuing participation or failing to see the significance of participation. Students partake in culturally legitimate practices of the art field when they have acquired the appropriate doxa, that is, the value and belief in the required practices and adherence to them. Through the examination of students' participation in cultural practices—such as attending art galleries, collecting artworks, discussing art, reading and playing musical instruments—the value placed on art in the home was evident and indicated the accumulated related cultural capital. Valuing the arts allows one 'to enter the game' and have a belief in the need to participate in these cultural practices, to develop cultural obligation. I have shown how those students who have high cultural capital have strong levels of cultural obligation, whereby they realise the necessity to continue to participate in legitimate cultural practices when they are older. However, those students who have lower levels of cultural capital generally have lower levels of cultural aspiration and fail to enter the art field. Furthermore, they do not see the significance of art appreciation, because it is not a valued practice within their class habitus.

In this study it was made apparent that, for those who do not possess the appropriate cultural disposition, participating in cultural pursuits, such as attending art galleries, leads them to feel 'out of their depth'. This cultural experience does not mesh with their habitus. Furthermore, they are restrained by their own subjugation with the notions of 'become what you are' and 'that's not meant for us'. Knowing their 'sense of limits' assists people in eliminating themselves from many culturally legitimate practices, as they feel uncomfortable participating in these practices. Consequently, these cultural practices feel irrelevant and contradictory to their lives. Therefore, participation in such practices as the arts is not valued and consequently not pursued.

The ability of students to partake in cultural practices is further aided or hindered by their 'distance from necessity'; that is, sufficient money and time are factors that allow one to participate in cultural practices. Therefore, adequate funds and time are vital elements regarding the ability to acquire cultural capital and a cultural disposition.
Consequently, social class distinctions based on economic divisions affect the ability of students to obtain the required cultural disposition to appreciate art. However, the notion of ‘universality’ means that all are expected to partake in cultural acts and are judged accordingly. As recognised though, the ability to participate effectively in aesthetic experiences remains the privilege of a few and the potential for the acquisition of a disinterested cultural disposition is produced under certain social and economic conditions. Hence, the requirement that all students participate in art appreciation in education has social, cultural and economic consequences that further reproduce class distinctions. However, the ideology of the gift of nature allows for the denial between the correlation of education and social and cultural privilege.

Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) explain:

In order for culture to fulfil its function of legitimating inherited privileges, it is necessary and sufficient that the link between culture and education, at once obvious and hidden, should be forgotten or denied. The unnatural idea of a culture given at birth, a cultural gift bestowed on certain people by nature, supposes and produces a blindness to the functions of the institution which ensures the profitability of the cultural inheritance, and legitimates its transmission by hiding the fact that it fulfils this function. The school is in fact the institution which...transforms socially conditioned inequalities in matters of culture into inequalities of success, interpreted as inequalities of talent (p. 111).

This thesis has aimed to make transparent the connections between cultural practices and socially obtained levels of cultural capital that are enhanced by ‘legitimate’ scholastic experiences in art education. It has shown how familiarity with artworks and modelling of the art discourse enable the attainment of a cultural disposition and hence the ability to appreciate art. The study reveals that when students value involvement in cultural practices and have the legitimate linguistic capital—the art ‘code’—they are able to interact comfortably and knowledgably in the world of art where they feel at home.

Furthermore, this thesis shows that teachers realise the difference in student social background as a factor for differing interpretations of arts appreciation and teach accordingly. However, teachers are also affected by their own understanding of art appreciation perceived through their habitus. The habitus preserves existing practices, and therefore teachers’ practices were minimally altered to accommodate the outcomes of the CSF to their existing teaching. Teachers often argued that they were already implementing the CSF: The Arts’ outcomes. They saw that they had taught that way
before the CSF was introduced. However, detailed analysis in this study shows that some teachers were not fully implementing the CSF outcomes in their art programs. In fact, their teaching or their lessons' contents had changed little.

Through applying the notion of habitus to teacher practice, it is recognised that 'practice' is learnt in action and, therefore, becomes ingrained in the body forming the habitus. Their existing practice was driven by their habitus and so become 'second nature'. Reflection on practice is consequently minimal and altering it is extremely difficult. Furthermore, the habitus acts to protect current practice by rejecting change and conditions that call into question these practices. Therefore, via their habitus teachers choose fields that are favourable to their practices while avoiding conflicting situations.

Through this study I have examined the factors that either assist or impede the implementation of a policy into practice. Specifically I have examined the CSF: The Arts, and in particular the required outcomes of the substrand 'arts criticism and aesthetics'. With this research it is apparent that, when educational policy is preoccupied with measuring the outcomes of students, such as through outcomes-based education, it fails to recognise that the inputs are vital elements affecting policy implementation. The significance of this thesis, therefore, is in understanding the social forces at work in both educational policy development and implementation. If the implementation of the policy document was to be achieved at a teaching and learning level, there needed to be greater consideration given to the notion of habitus, or the accumulated histories of teachers and students. Further, the cultural capital of students needed to be recognised as a key factor in the achievement of high cultural practices in art education.

When a policy imperative is based on cultural practices, such as the implementation of art appreciation, the cultural and social implications need to be considered. If art appreciation is to remain as an assessable outcome in future art curriculum policy, the high humanistic approach to art appreciation needs to be reassessed in order to attain relevance to all students. Art appreciation needs to come from the experience of students and build on their existing understanding, not force a view that is irrelevant and condescending. Art appreciation needs to be concurrent with art making and not applied as separate areas of study as the CSF: The Arts presents.

Furthermore, achievement in a disinterested appropriation of the arts requires a certain level of linguistic capital which can be achieved only through familiarisation with artworks and knowledge of the code for art discourse. Therefore, if students are expected to achieve the outcomes of art appreciation, it is necessary to recognise that
teachers need to have knowledge of the code in order to teach it effectively. As this study has shown, though, many teachers do not have knowledge of this art code. Also many teachers are resistant to change due to their habitus, which this study has shown is developed from within their practice. Therefore, if change is to be effective, policy initiatives need to consider teacher habitus from within the perspective of teacher practice. However, the reasons for change also need to be examined closely in order to assess whose interests are being served.

Cultural capital is not equally distributed among the social classes. Consequently, the introduction of art appreciation in the CSF: The Arts has far reaching social implications whereby the distinctions of class are perpetuated. When cultural heritage is a determining factor for scholastic achievement, the social order of class divisions in modern societies will be maintained. Effectively, I have attempted to show in this thesis that the prevailing class divisions in Australia are existent and pervasive and preserved through cultural reproduction in education.

While this thesis has specifically examined the relevance of the CSF: The Arts to social and cultural reproduction, it can be recognised that other subject areas need to be examined to ascertain the impact they have on maintaining social class divisions. The preoccupation with 'analysis' appears to be evident in other recommended Key Learning Areas. Therefore, the application of the scholastic viewpoint appears to be driving all curricula. If this is the case, the extent to which education perpetuates the preservation of the social order is extremely pervasive and needs to be critically re-examined.

When education is in the hands of the middle class, they will ensure their class interests are served, especially when the education policy is absorbed by the dominant ideology. The curricula will embrace their values and impose them on all others who enter the field of education, in effect discriminating against others, not just the working-class, but all who do not possess the required cultural capital. The development and implementation of an inclusive curriculum is a challenge not only for research, but also for policy makers and practitioners in the classrooms. However, we need to be aware of not swinging the pendulum too far the other way and moving toward a narrow view of vocational learning. Therefore, it is vital to recognise the importance of having an 'inclusive curriculum' and not a curriculum that basically serves the interests of one group. If this continues to be the case, the privileged fractions of class society will be preserved at the cost of the dominated, and the social order will be maintained via the existence of cultural reproduction through education.
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