

**Craft Education in British Secondary Schools in the 1990s:  
Reflection on a Funded Research**

一九九〇年代英國中等學校工藝教育：一個受資助研究計畫的省思

**Rachel Mason** 雷秋·梅森

**Professor Art Education**

**University of Surrey Roehampton Froehel College**

英國蘇瑞羅漢普頓大學佛洛赫爾學院藝術教育教授

## Abstract

This paper reports and interrogates the findings of a national survey of craft in British secondary schools directed by the author in 1994-5. Methodological issues and tensions arising from the fact that this was a funded project have resulted in this critical reflection on the research design, processes and outcomes in which the findings are presented in four different ways. The first part of the paper explores overt and covert processes informing the negotiation and design of the survey questionnaire. The second describes the salient characteristics of British craft education as revealed in the quantitative data, together with the policy recommendations that were the official research outcomes. The third, probes the qualitative data further for insights arising from the subjective experience of the art and design & technology teachers who were the survey respondents. Finally the author reflects on the contribution of the enquiry to her self-understanding of craft and its educational value.

**Keywords: British Education, craft education, secondary schools**

## 摘要

1994-1995 年間，作者主持英國中等學校工藝教育全國普查，本文係報導並質問該研究之結果。由於該研究係受資助計畫，所造成之方法論課題與張力，導致了作者就其研究設計、研究過程及研究結果（以四種方式呈現）的批判式自省。論文的第一部份，探討影響問卷設計之隱性與顯性過程。第二部分透過質性資料，描述英國工藝教育的特徵，以及在官方版研究結果中所提出的政策建議。第三部份則進一步探討質性研究資料，以求洞察被研究者（含美術與設計/科技教師）之主觀經驗。最後，就工藝與工藝教育之價值，作者反思了此一研究對她個人觀念的助益。

**關鍵詞：英國教育、工藝教育、中等學校**

## **INTRODUCTION**

In 1994-5 I directed a national survey of crafts education in British secondary schools. This paper sets out to report and interrogate the findings. Whereas its main purpose is to appraise the nature and function of general education provision that purports to be crafts related, the manner in which the findings are presented is a response to methodological problems arising during the research. It was my first attempt at quantitative survey method and I experienced tension throughout. This tension centered around the need to arrive at generalizations about craft education for the purposes of policy making, and my understanding of the realities of the situation being investigated as multiple or many layered. Also, on the funding body's expectations that the methods and outcomes would in some way be value free, which conflicts with my preference for qualitative modes of inquiry in which the perceptions of the investigator and subjects are included. Because suppression, repression and negation of the subjective experience of researchers and the people they research is a recurring criticism of quantitative survey method (Grumet 1990, Mies, 1993), the findings are presented in this paper in four different ways.<sup>1</sup>

In the first part, overt and covert processes informing the negotiation and design of the survey questionnaire are explored. In the second, the salient characteristics of craft education as revealed in the quantitative data are described, together with the policy recommendations that were the official research outcomes. In the third, the qualitative data is probed further for insights arising from the subjective experience of the respondents (art and design technology teachers). The last part reflects on the contribution of the enquiry to my self-understanding of craft and its educational value.

## **BACKGROUND TO RESEARCH**

### **Personal Agenda**

From a personal perspective, the desire to research craft education originated in a visit to Japan. Like most foreign visitors I was struck by the quantity and quality of traditional, hand-made crafts in everyday use in modern Japan, and the prevalence of artisanal modes of craft training. On returning home to a country in which vernacular crafts have been rendered obsolete by automated modes of manufacture and learning through apprenticeship has all but disappeared, I was keen to update my knowledge and understanding of contemporary forms of craft education in British secondary schools.

A second motivation was the desire to find out which living craft traditions school children were afforded access to and why. A preliminary review of the specialist literature had revealed conceptual confusion surrounding definitions of craft in British society, a wide range of craft categories and practices and a hierarchy, or 'pecking order', of academic respectability in terms of their study.<sup>2</sup> The diversity of traditions identified in this literature was certainly not in evidence in the resources my university library provided for students training to be professional artists, craftspersons and designers. Was this also the case in schools?

Third, I wanted to find out if schools afforded educational value to the community building and social functions of craft. I was aware that, historically, craft had been promoted in both British and American schooling mainly for utilitarian, aesthetic or pedagogical reasons; but in the latter, there was a tradition of promoting it for community building purposes in schools with diverse student populations also (Korsenik, 1992).<sup>3</sup> The recommendation of multicultural education enthusiasts that traditional crafts be included in the curriculum as vehicles for promoting minority cultural identity and self esteem was a relatively recent phenomenon in British education. But it mirrored a trend in contemporary fine art, for Black and minority artists to incorporate 'ethnic crafts' into their painting and sculptures for political and social reasons (Rattansi & Donald 1992, Court, 1994 and Cahan & Kocur, 1996). I was curious as to whether these kinds of concerns had infiltrated mainstream craft education in schools.

### **Public Rationale**

A more public rationale for the survey was the need for policy makers to obtain an overview of the educational status, value and role of craft. Recent research had established that developments in crafts materials and new technologies were effecting changes in educational provision at tertiary level (Ashwin et al. 1988, Crafts Council, 1990, Bennet, 1993), but the situation in schools had not been investigated. Most importantly, there was a need for descriptive data about craft education in the secondary sector following an Education Reform Act (1988) that had effected fundamental changes in almost every aspect of schooling.

Briefly, the situation shortly before and after the Reform Act was as follows. Prior to 1988, opportunities for making one-off individual artifacts in traditional craft materials, such as wood, metal, textiles and clay, had been available to pupils in two school subjects called Art & Design and Craft, Design & Technology (CDT). But the 1988 reforms had ushered in a mandatory National Curriculum with an extended core subject called Technology (later re-named Design & Technology) and a foundation subject, called Art, in which the significance afforded practical learning over all was reduced.

The changes to Craft, Design & Technology were far reaching in that Technology was mooted as a new subject with the declared aims of preparing pupils for the work force in the twenty first century; and drew on knowledge and skills from a wide range of curriculum areas - including science, business studies and mathematics. In Technology, practical craft skills were supposed to be taught within the context of 'principles and practices of good design' and the 'application of theoretical knowledge' and pupils were expected to work with 'a variety of modern materials in use in the commercial and industrial world'. Technology was responsible also for equipping pupils with basic skills in information technology (IT), and developing their awareness of 'the potential use of computer technology in business, manufacturing and commerce'.

The proposals for National Curriculum Art were less radical. But, after heated professional debate, the Secretary of State had come out in favor of two attainment targets called *Making and Investigating* and *Knowledge and Understanding*.<sup>4</sup> This represented a substantial increase in weighting towards what had recently become known as the 'critical and historical component' of Art. There were repercussions for the many schools where practical work was the predominate mode of art learning and teachers were ill-prepared to deliver a critical-historical curriculum domain (OFSTED, 1995).

The situation for would-be researchers of 'craft' was extraordinarily complex given its hidden location in two practical subjects with long-standing ideological differences. Broadly speaking, in the decade preceding the 1988 reforms, art & design teachers had tended to emphasize cultivation of creativity in the individual, whereas craft, design & technology (CDT) teachers had promulgated a more

utilitarian, skills-based approach. An additional complication was the tendency of design during the 1980s, to extricate itself from its art connotations to ally with industry and engineering (Attfield, 1984, p. 13) resulting in a corresponding emphasis on design in CDT. In 1988, there were proponents of a design education philosophy teaching in both Art & Design and Technology who varied in the extent to which they adhered either to a 'creative' or 'problem-solving' approach to practical education and/or craft in schools. In the statutory orders for Art and Technology, this historical overlap was reflected in a common emphasis on 'making and designing' and 'knowledge and understanding' in the attainment targets (ATs) for the two subjects, but the programs of study and end of key stage statements pointed to sharply divergent content, pedagogy and aims.<sup>5</sup>

In planning the survey, events that took place shortly after the national curriculum was introduced, when government and teachers' unions were involved in head-on confrontation, had to be taken into account (Simon, 1992). Technology received a particularly rough ride with teachers claiming the mandatory core curriculum and national testing procedures were unworkable (HMI, 1992); and that inadequate resources were making it impossible to offer pupils opportunities to work with even the minimum range of requisite resistant and non-resistant materials (Design & Technology Association, 1994). Additionally, the requirement that all pupils should be entered for national examinations in the subject at the end of Key Stage 4 proved problematic. Consequently, and at the time the survey took place, the original orders for Technology were being revised. A major constraint for Art was the lack of time available for anything other than the so-called core and extended core subjects at Key Stage 4. When the Secretary of State eventually conceded that the national curriculum at this stage **was** overcrowded, the order that Art (but not Technology) be compulsory was rescinded causing loss of professional morale.

Together with a new national curriculum, the 1988 Education Reform Act introduced local management of schools. The transfer of finances from regional education authorities (LEAs) to individual schools and governing bodies had led to increased awareness of resource issues in two practical subjects that are costly in terms of specialist accommodation, staffing, equipment and time. 'Tribal warfare' between the various proponents of 'Art & Design' and 'Craft, Design & Technology' had long been endemic in the British education system (Steers, 1991) and the increased

competition for diminishing resources was likely to have exacerbated these traditional skirmishes between rival factions.

### **Negotiating and Designing the Survey**

In February 1994, I proposed to the Crafts Council that there was a need for a national survey of craft education at Key Stages 3 and 4 (for pupils aged 11-16) for the reasons identified above. After deliberation, financial support was approved on the grounds that it would contribute to the education sector's existing research program called *Why Teach Craft?*<sup>6</sup> and, on condition it was monitored throughout by a national survey committee. Details about the distribution of the questionnaire and returns, together with the content, will follow.

### Questionnaire design

The survey was targeted at all schools in England and Wales delivering national curriculum Art and Design & Technology at Key Stages 3 and 4 (approximately 6,000). Separate, but very nearly identical questionnaires were produced for the two subject areas and posted to head teachers for distribution to relevant department heads in October 1994. Initially, the returns constituted only 16.3% but, after follow-up questionnaires had been sent out, a 22% response rate was achieved.

The stated aims of the survey, hotly contested during planning meetings, were to:

- Determine the nature and extent of learning through craft activity;
- Determine the extent to which knowledge and understanding of craft inheritance is included;
- Establish the degree to which such learning is valued by teachers and,
- Identify the quality and quantity of provision for this learning.

The definitions of 'craft' and 'craft inheritance' eventually agreed were:

- **Craft activity:** Pupils should be actively involved in the designing and making of one-off individual artifacts, encouraging the development of imaginative and practical skills, visual sensitivity and a working knowledge of tools and materials.
- **Craft inheritance:** Learning targeted at developing knowledge and understanding of the historical, technological and cultural contexts in which artifacts have been/are made.

The questions were clustered into six sections, or themes. Questions in the first section, called *General Information*, were designed to elicit factual information about the teacher-respondents, their schools and art and design & technology departments. Questions included in *Pupils' Knowledge and Understanding of Craft* inquired into the opportunities they gave pupils to acquire historical, technical, cultural and contextual knowledge of crafts and into relevant external and internal resources. In *Pupils' as Makers*, the nature, extent and range of practical activity in ceramics, metal, textiles and wood was probed through questions about specific craft processes, techniques and skills and the quantity and quality of specialist resources available. Since the major objectives of the Crafts Council were to (i) clarify in which national curriculum subject the four kinds of crafts was actually taking place and, (ii) to establish the current situation regarding specialist resources, the teacher-respondents were asked to comment on the extent to which their Art and Design and Technology departments collaborated with each other on matters such as staffing, accommodation and equipment. Questions under the same heading also asked about the craft options available for pupils studying national examination courses. Those included in the section called *Teachers' Views of Craft Education in General* enquired into the purposes and value of craft education, the significance afforded different sorts of criteria for assessing pupils' craftwork and factors impacting on successful delivery. Finally, questions in *Further Information* were open-ended and invited comments on the impact of the national curriculum on craft education in general, how it should develop in future and the survey definitions of craft.

### Design Issues

That there were weaknesses in the research design is undeniable. A disadvantage of obtaining public funding for research is that sponsors often know what they want in advance (in line with government and internal policies). This makes it well nigh impossible for researchers to introduce new categories and concepts into the area being investigated, or to attempt a radical critique. The vagueness of the term craft and the need to phrase the survey questions in a manner that would be meaningful to both art and design & technology teachers was particularly problematic; and I was unprepared for the extensive debate, at committee meetings, about 'politically correct' terminology. Some of the categories of craft eventually arrived at were very unpopular with teachers.<sup>7</sup> That steering committee members were unwilling to associate craft education with anything other than professional, avant-garde, or



contemporary designer-type crafts was particularly frustrating given my personal agenda.

Some criticisms notwithstanding, I believe the survey findings were sufficiently representative to enable some generalizations to be made about craft education in British schools. A limitation of the data, apparent on receipt of the returns, was that the views ascertained were mainly those of heads of art and design & technology departments, aged 40 and over. The problem of selecting terminology appropriate for teachers of both subjects was not resolved, since there were complaints that the questionnaire was biased towards art. A more significant weakness, in my view, was the wording of the checklists used for rating purposes that assumed congruence between the views of government and teachers on matters such as assessment of pupils' practical work and the educational value of craft. These points aside, I believe the survey was successful in answering at least some of the Crafts Council's concerns.

Whereas my personal agenda undoubtedly lost out in the negotiations over the research design, the survey supplied me with substantial insights into all three areas identified as personal concerns. My knowledge and understanding of contemporary forms of craft education, methods of instruction and perceived purposes was advanced not only by the qualitative and quantitative data arising from the survey, but also by the wrangles over the questionnaire design. Most significantly, my suspicions about the limited range of craft practices in schools were confirmed before the research even began.

## **SURVEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is impossible to do justice to the survey findings here given their complexity, quantity and variety. The majority of the data was analyzed to produce statistical results using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and a coding schedule of 213 variables per questionnaire. Responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed using content analysis, then qualitatively into themes. The outcomes were published in a lengthy project report, written by the research officer and myself (Mason and Iwano, 1995) together with a shorter, executive report produced by the Crafts Council. The next section of this chapter constitutes a descriptive summary of the findings derived from the quantitative data that acknowledges the need to take up

a pragmatic relation to whatever educational phenomenon is being researched (Grumet, 1990).

### **Pupils' Knowledge and Understanding of Craft**

Questions in this section were directed to finding out how much opportunity pupils were given to acquire knowledge and understanding of crafts, as distinct from hands-on making. Historical, contextual and cultural learning objectives were included in the statutory orders for both Art and Design & Technology;

**ART:** Pupils should understand and appreciate art in a variety of genres and styles from a variety of cultures, Western and non-Western. (DES, 1992, p. 3)

**D&T:** Pupils should be able to know that in the past and in other cultures people have used design and technology to solve familiar problems in different ways. (DES, 1990. p. 4)

But there were important differences. First, the statutory orders for Art stated quite explicitly that art should be interpreted throughout to mean 'art, craft and design'; whereas the term 'craft' scarcely appeared in the Design & Technology document. Second, the knowledge base for Design & Technology was understood to be interdisciplinary, whereas in Art it was subject specific:

**D&T:** Pupils should be taught to draw on their knowledge, understanding and skills in other subjects, particularly the foundation subjects of science, mathematics and art, to support their designing and making activities. These activities should also reflect their growing understanding of the needs and beliefs of other people and cultures, now and in the past. (Ibid., p.19)

**ART:** The development of visual literacy and understanding of art craft and design, including the history of our diverse artistic heritage and a variety of artistic traditions, together with the ability to make a practical connection between this and pupils' own work. (DES, 1992)

Third, the examples of specific learning objectives for knowledge and understanding included in the programs of study for Design & Technology were exclusively contemporary, not historical.

The most significant finding from this section was that teachers afforded very little importance to helping pupils develop knowledge and understanding of craft, especially in Design & Technology. It was a majority response, for example, that pupils had little or no access to professional craftspeople in or outside schools and that visits to craft collections in galleries and museums were the exception, not the

rule. Also, the range of secondary resource materials for teaching the critical and historical component of the craft curriculum appeared limited given technological developments such as video, multimedia and CD-ROM. (More than 80% of respondents said they only used magazines, books, wall charts or posters). Again, the data confirmed my suspicion that the range of living craft traditions pupils learn about in schools was limited in that contemporary crafts', was the only category to receive a high rating (50% of respondents in both subjects said their courses offered a great many opportunities to study contemporary crafts). Apart from a shared preference for curriculum content related to contemporary crafts, the data suggested that pupils studied different crafts in Design & Technology and Art. For example, ethnic crafts and crafts of other times, were reported to feature in some, but not all Art courses, whereas trade-crafts and women's crafts were mentioned most frequently in Design & Technology (probably because this national curriculum subject incorporates food technology and/or home economics). Rural crafts were a neglected area altogether with 80% of respondents reporting that pupils had no opportunity to study them.

### **Pupils as Makers**

The responses to the questions about craft activities confirmed they occurred in both subjects but were dealt with separately. It was clearly the case that ceramics was almost exclusively located and resourced in Art and wood and metal in Design & Technology. There was no predominant location for textiles, which was reported to be either in one or other of the two subjects, in both or, in some schools, in neither. Likewise, whereas both art and design & technology teachers seemed reasonably content with their specialist accommodation, equipment and tools for ceramics, metal and wood, there was a problem with textiles. 50% of all teachers said their tools and equipment for textiles were inadequate and there was no possibility of sharing them.

Responses to the question about craft materials suggested that schools prioritized them differently from the Crafts Council. Art teachers identified paper, card, clay, textiles and wood as those most commonly in use and design & technology teachers singled out wood, plastics, metal and wire, textiles and card. Differences of opinion about the relative importance of different kinds of craft materials were a recurring feature of responses to the later questions, including the one about definitions of craft.

A positive finding for the Crafts Council was that the majority of Key Stage 3, pupils did have opportunities to work with the four materials targeted for the research; but that at Key Stage 4, access was more restricted because of the optional nature of Art. Surprisingly, no significant differences were reported in the techniques, skills and processes being taught at the two Key Stages. In Art, pupils' use of computer-aided design and manufacture was minimal (only 30% of respondents said they made a little use of it for textiles and almost none for ceramics), whereas 50-60% of design & technology teachers said they did use it for metal, textiles and wood. Over all, Design & Technology appeared better resourced than Art.

The data on examination courses confirmed a tendency for pupils to be expected to work with a wide range of materials rather than develop practical skills in one medium in depth. There was considerable overlap of processes and techniques being taught in textiles in the two subjects, except that there was more sewing in Design & Technology. Regarding options, 90% of respondents considered personal preference the major factor influencing pupils' choices of certain kinds of crafts rather than external factors, such as parents, time tabling or peer group influence. Gender was considered more influential in determining choices in Design & Technology than in Art.

### **Teachers' Views on Craft Education in General**

Over all, the most significant reason for including craft activity in school, according to 80% of respondents, was that 'it gives pupils a sense of pride and achievement'. Other than this, their choices, from the checklist provided,<sup>8</sup> suggested divergent ideologies in the two national curriculum subjects; a significant difference being that design & technology teachers believed that the development of 'problem solving skills for adult life in the home and workplace' was an important justification for craft education, whereas art teachers rated 'developing imaginative and expressive skills' more highly. Teachers of both subjects were evenly divided as to whether or not developing understanding of historical, technological or cultural inheritance was an important learning outcome and whether or not craft education was useful for a future career. Asking them about their preferred criteria for assessing pupils' practical work was another way of trying to ascertain what they valued most about craft. The responses to this question confirmed that art and design & technology

teachers held sharply contrasting views. In Art, evidence of imagination, creative and expressive elements were the highest priorities and designing and problem-solving were considered most important in Design & Technology. Not surprisingly, given the previous findings about the lack of attention given to knowledge and understanding of craft, the criterion considered least important, in both subjects, was 'ability to talk about artifacts'. (21% of respondents afforded it absolutely no significance at all.)

From the checklist of internal and external factors affecting successful delivery, teachers of both subjects opted for 'resourcing' and identified specialist-trained staff, small staff-pupil ratios and adequate budgets for materials as crucial in this regard. Enhancing craft education through external factors, such as bringing in professional crafts people, attending in-service education courses, or linking with national and regional crafts agencies, was not considered important. Significantly, in the space provided for 'other comments', approximately 40% of those who responded to this question referred to a need for increased commitment to craft on the part of school managers and parents.

### **Further Information**

Answers to an open-ended question about the impact of the national curriculum differed in the two subjects also. The majority of art teachers said that it was positive in that it had increased departmental resources, broadened the context of the art curriculum, or extended the range of materials in use. In contrast, design & technology teachers made mainly negative comments stating in particular, that it had reduced the time spent on 'making' and lowered standards of practical work. Their responses to the question about how they would like to see craft education develop in future, implied that change was crucial. But whereas the art teachers were concerned about how best to resource and locate craft in the school curriculum in the future (whether or not it should be a distinct area of their subject, interdisciplinary or, integrated into Design & Technology), design & technology teachers were preoccupied with the relationship of making to designing in their school subject. Two diametrically opposed views were expressed in this regard; one faction wanting a greater emphasis on teaching and learning specific craft skills, so as to ensure quality products and the other stressing the benefits of a broader, more design-based approach;

I have no intention of buying expensive and highly dangerous equipment e.g. for metal casting. Awareness of technique is enough. There is not enough time to involve detailed work with any one material and calls on craftspeople.

Greater emphasis on craft skills. Until pupils have a good basic craft ability and knowledge of materials they are unable to produce realistic design work.

Back to Basics. Fewer lessons on design and more on learning the basic skills. Design can come later when the foundations are laid.

The response rate to a question about our definitions of craft activity was only 30%, but the majority was negative. Common objections were that it was too narrow in terms of content or materials and, too traditional. A recurring criticism of our six categories of craft was that they were unclear. That the inclusion of 'craft inheritance' may, indeed, have been radical is implicit in the comments of some design & technology teachers that they had never heard of the term, disliked it, and considered it irrelevant to their work in schools.

All the earlier questions were revisited in the responses to 'any other comments', the majority focusing, yet again, on resources. Design & technology teachers who wanted to 'go back to basics', seized the opportunity to protest about design yet again. They complained that the so-called design and realization component in the new national curriculum involved them in too much paper work', was too academic, had destroyed practical work and de-motivated pupils. (The impact of the national curriculum on practical work was perceived as 'appalling' by one respondent, who said it only took place now in Art.)

### **Future Policy and Research**

Statistical analysis of the data enabled generalizations to be made about craft education at the time of the survey. Whereas it was acknowledged that some of the data conflicted or was ambiguous, some conclusions were drawn in response to the Crafts Council's stated aims (see page 5). They were presented to the national survey committee as tentative recommendations for future policy-making and research. Prominent among the conclusions and recommendations were that:

- (i) Future policies should take account of the fact that craft activity in art and design & technology meant different things.
- (ii) The situation as regards the location and resourcing of textiles, in particular, should be investigated in more depth.

- (iii) Knowledge and understanding of craft was a neglected curriculum domain, reasons for which should be investigated.
- (iv) More substantial justifications were needed for craft activity in view of its high costs and low status in society and schools.
- (v) The antagonism between art and design & technology teachers was unproductive for the future of craft education.
- (vi) External agencies might have to take the lead in promoting craft in secondary schools in future since it was a low priority for art and design technology teachers.
- (vii) Teachers of both subjects should be encouraged to open up debate about the educational value of craft and effective modes of delivery.

## **TEACHERS' VOICES**

Quantitative survey research has limitations. Generalising about present practice across large numbers of cases leads to findings that, because of their vagueness and abstraction, seem almost useless if researchers want to concentrate in depth on specific aspects of the phenomenon in hand. Moreover, the obsession with universality that permeates this research form is a special source of confusion in the study of cultural phenomena like craft (d'Azevedo, 1989). On the one hand, there is little agreement about its nature or place among general subjects of study; on the other, assumptions about its universality continue to appear in generalisations and conventions inherited from earlier theory. A further limitation of the research data in this instance was that it privileged the objective voices and pragmatic motives of educational policy makers concerning the nature of education and craft. To help me understand the reality in schools, I want to look in more detail now at the data from the open-ended questions. In particular, at the individual responses of art and design & technology teachers relating to conflicting practices and values in the two curriculum subjects and the survey definitions of craft.

### **Definitions of Craft**

Close scrutiny of design & technology teachers' comments reveals that their main objection to the Crafts Council's definition of craft activity was that it is old fashioned';

You concentrated too much on old skills and ignore the possibility opening up by the use of electronics and control technology.

I'm surprised you separate food and include textiles. Is the former bad and the latter good? Designing and problem solving in food forms a major part of our delivery.

This survey defines craft along traditional lines.

The segregation of craft into wood, metal and textiles tends to give the subject an old fashioned flavor.

Design and making is a more appropriate term as craft has a very old fashioned connotation, which can give pupils an inaccurate impression of associate subjects.

More concerned with skills than creativity. Backward looking rather than forward looking.

A related objection was that it restricts craft activity to one-off artifacts;

The definition should have included provision for the design and making for work in areas of short production run.

I'm not sure I like the idea of one-off artifacts when quite often-new ideas emerge for extending projects after finishing initial artifacts.

That there are 'traditionalists' in Design and Technology who are sympathetic to the Crafts Council's view is evident also. Some more positive comments about the definition were;

I do not see craft as a dirty word. It's a creative love of processes and materials.

We need to redefine a 20th century definition that fuses crafts skills with modern technology.

In contrast, art teachers appeared much more concerned about the difficulty of distinguishing between art, craft and design;

I do not like the distinction between art and craft. My artists in residence, who are crafts people, quite rightly regard themselves as artists too.

I am concerned that [you think] craft and design can be separated. In the best practice, elements of both will exist in any undertaking.

The visual arts and crafts are so closely linked it is difficult to separate them. Much fine art involves craft skills and most craft pieces involve original skills in design and visuals.

Their criticisms notwithstanding, suggestions for alternative definitions were few and far between. Differing conceptions of craft in Art and Design & Technology were a feature of art teachers' suggestions, whereas the revisions of design & technology teachers allowed for a broader range of technical processes, teaching styles and materials;



Crafts covered in D&T are often taught in a different way than in art where design briefs are generally very open ended. (Art)

Seems to be a vast difference in our school between the art department's concept of craft and the technology department's. They seem to teach skills and processes without any creative flair, with little or no reference to contemporary crafts people. (Art)

Craft work usually results from activity the outcome of which is known in advance to a great degree. Art is usually the result of experimental interaction between skills and imagination the outcome of which is not predetermined. (Art)

(Craft activity) is about the common-sense notion of designing and making to meet perceived needs of yourself or other. It can also be seen as a custom designer relationship, therefore, a logical process. (D&T)

Would refer to any practice of building, constructing, making things from any material. (D&T)

Is conversion of material into artifacts on a small scale ? (D&T)

Relies on the use of hand tools to produce a worthwhile and relevant artifact. (D&T)

### **Image of Craft**

A number of respondents agreed that the definition was problematic because it reinforced harmful stereotypes and popular prejudices about craft. That craft knowledge is not academic, for example, has no vocational relevance or is a leisure time pursuit;

I suspect this terminology will immediately alienate people who wish to see a more academic subject development and status to D&T.

Careers in craft are not well paid. In the present economy, climate and atmosphere it is difficult to encourage pupils to do crafts.

It is unfortunate that craft has so many bad connections for students in their past experience and in the outside world e.g. craft fairs.

The view that craft knowledge is denigrated socially was expressed very strongly by design & technology teachers, who pointed out that it is less acceptable than other forms of knowledge, is considered of minor importance in comparison with other school subjects and, 'does not appeal to the people who hold the purse strings'. Lack of support by local education authorities, head teachers, careers advisers, industry, university entrance boards and parents was cited as evidence;

I have the opportunity and potential enthusiasm and ability laid before me in the children, but my hands are tied behind my back.

Although there is lip service paid to the value of crafts at all level, industry couldn't care less about them unless they have spent their own money training people. Education and management has contempt for crafts subjects and so have parents of bright children. The only custom in this country for craft produced wares is from a minority middle class and even they won't pay a fair price. Pupils perceive this and it influences their approach to D&T, especially at Key Stage 4.

Beware the pitfalls of using the word craft. I have no problem with it, but many do. Academic snobbery persists and we need to solve the vocational issue. (D&T)

Not surprisingly, traditionalists who wanted craft reinstated, argued that action to improve its status was of paramount importance; but acknowledged that the odds against this happening were high;

Before we can go anywhere we have to raise the profile of crafts.

There has been a de-craft or no craft focus in schools for so long that really positive work will need to be done to improve the status of skills.

Craft education needs a major boost to shed its image of market stall work with the school and wider community.

Ability to structure fashion and create is not recognized in schools even though they are of primary importance to survival and a sense of well-being.

On the other hand, the design enthusiasts supported the reduced emphasis on craft in the national curriculum pointing out that the use of the term in the survey promoted a false image of what was actually occurring in schools;

The use of the word gives the wrong image and can denigrate the imaginative use of materials (ART).

People do not use the word craft any more. CDT does not exist. (D&T)

Humans are always inventing and changing things - not always for the better, but the craft of coppicing is not totally relevant to rural craft any more. Some of your questions are loaded and really bring out the worst in me, in that I have to defend design education -all this from someone who passionately believes in craft skill for myself and others. (D&T)

Those who were less sure national curriculum policy had succeeded in reducing the stigma surrounding craft wanted more emphasis on its role in industry;

My school produces engineers, architects, high (status) managers, owners and people in control of industry. More emphasis should be placed on the top end to attract a more serious approach to this area of the curriculum from decision makers in schools.

I am much more keen to develop links with industry than with crafts people. Therefore is a lot of our projects and practical skills are linked to local companies e.g. Rover and vehicle design and modeling; solar system or mass-produced jewelry and architects and environments.

### **Advocacy**

The most significant reason for including craft in general education, according to respondents, was that it gives [pupils] a sense of pride and achievement. A weakness of this rationale is that pride and achievement can be developed through other school subjects. Also, there is no consensus as to whether or not pupils enjoy craft;

Kids like making things (Art).

National Curriculum has sadly reduced the time that was previously available to practical activity. The joy of making things should be made available again to the nation's young.

Crafts skills do not excite the majority of kids. (D&T)

Currently they are not interested in craft activity - why should they be when there is so much poor craftwork around them? They are more seduced by what is technologically produced. However, I expect there to be a swing back to doing as an activity and crafts will re-emerge. (D&T)

Pupils love to make artifacts in any material and enjoy acquiring new skills. (D&T)

I have found my pupils are much more interested in craft work than fine art or drawing and painting. Perhaps this is because I put more emphasis on crafts; also the economic, social type of this area is more craft oriented. (Art)

What a mess D&T has been in since 16+ days. Pupils enjoy mostly the practical aspect of work and this has been taken away.

The tendency of teachers to deny that craft knowledge has intrinsic value and denigrate traditional crafts was very marked. There was only one comment to the effect that 'craftsmanship' is an important general educational virtue and the concept of a skills-based curriculum for craft was very unpopular. The argument that designing is equally or more useful than making was expressed very forcefully;

There is no educational value in traditional craft activities i.e. cutting a dovetail joint by hand, when pupils know there are inexpensive machines that will accurately complete the task.

I do not want to see woodwork and metal work again. A good design and realization course in wood metal, plastics and whatever else is necessary for the design.

Awareness of technique is enough. There is not enough time to involve detailed work with any one material or call on professional crafts people.

Additional reasons for including craft in the school curriculum implicit in the comments of traditionalist teachers of design & technology tended to be practical (it supplies knowledge of life and life-skills and improves fine motor skills) or psychological (builds confidence). In addition to developing 'creativity' and 'expression' in individuals, a few respondents in Art suggested it is valuable for social or cultural reasons;

Crafts must be celebrated, encouraged and resourced. They are one of the few antidotes we have to the instantaneous consumer society.

We learn a great deal from having students from places like Malaysia. Thailand, Hong Kong and Africa etc..... we believe strongly in keeping out students in touch with crafts in their own cultures. Our department is built on the desire to try new skills as well as ones already learned and, although it is a major exam subject, it plays a large part in the recreational facilities. The art room is open as much as possible and they find it very beneficial to learn a skill, either for later life or as a relaxing alternative to their academic life.

### **Competing Ideologies of Craft**

Several art teachers pointed out that the separate ideologies of Art and Design & Technology are reflected in their physical location in schools;

Art is still a discreet area in this school and not linked physically to Design & Technology, little dialogue or co-operation takes place.

As a department we are physically isolated from the Technology workshops so are not able to make use of specialist workshops. Cross-curricula projects are employed, but there is a different emphasis in Technology and Art project work.

That working together and keeping a separate identity is possible is clear nevertheless, from the following remarks;

In this school, Design & Technology is a separate department and offers good opportunities in wood, metal, plastics and textiles and complements our work in ART.

I think that Art and Design [& Technology] departments should work under one umbrella whilst still keeping a separate identity but benefiting from each other's knowledge and techniques.

One argument for closer liaison between the two subjects is the low status and public image of craft. Indeed, fifteen respondents asserted that collaboration is essential for its future survival whereas, for a minority of teachers this was already a reality, for the majority it was an ideal;

We work closely with the Art department and utilize their skills and equipment and vice versa. We also have good working relationships with Business Studies and IT.

D&T and Artwork closely together - many cross curricula links - also shared resources and facilities for clay work and textiles.

There is a dependence in this school on links with Art and Technology which are good and which allows exploration and expansion in certain areas.

The boundaries between Art and Design should be very integrated and this forms the basis of most of our work.

More emphasis should be put on D&T and Art working together. The next curriculum development must be to move art and D&T close together.

But the antagonism, noted by Steers, appears very deep rooted. The comments from art teachers about perceived inequalities in curriculum delivery and resources made this very clear;

The Authority have decided to build a new school and although they know the current provision for the subject is totally inadequate in terms of space, staffing, time tabling etc., the new school will have worse art facilities, including room space for art of 3 meters per pupil whilst in D&T they will have 8 meters per pupil.

Design and Technology has a lot to answer for. Art and design trained people are still the best designers. Where are the skilled craft workers to come from?

Technology seems to de-skill students compared to the level or standard that used to be achieved - design work with an art basis is always better than design work in technology.

Most significantly for this inquiry, art teachers accused design and technology teachers of selling out to a conceptual form of education that left them wholly responsible for delivering practical knowledge, otherwise understood as craft;

It is being left to art and design to provide practical crafts experiences more and more because D&T is becoming more theoretical.

CDT was responsible for design and craft going into new technology departments which are not necessarily visually oriented. While structure and innovation can work together - the tight structure of the D&T curriculum can result in craft exercises of the kind that is separated from design. Craft is better taught in the art department with design and on into sixth form towards FE and HE. Otherwise, craft and art are endangered species in the state sector. Funding should be adjusted so we can deal with wood and metal and afford to do ceramics.

## **REFLECTION: MEANING AND VALUE OF CRAFT**

That there is conceptual confusion about craft in Britain education is abundantly clear. A confusion that is exacerbated by the insistence of policy makers on distinguishing it from art and design in terms of materials. In the final part of this paper, I want to draw on anthropological and sociological theory to speculate about art and craft as components of a technical domain in culture that advanced technological societies tend to play down. In particular, I shall draw on Gell's (1989) theory of productive and magical forms of technology; together with Giddens' (1993) analysis of late modern social institutions and Friedman's (1992) typology of postmodern cultural strategies for survival. From this perspective, it could be argued, the survey uncovered three distinctive yet interrelated forms of technical expertise being transmitted in British secondary schools geared to different social processes of production and consumption and indicative of the different cultural life-strategies of the teachers concerned.

### **Making, Conceiving and Aesthetic Forms of Technical Education**

In Design & Technology it uncovered making and conceiving forms of education in productive technologies that are interdependent yet mutually antagonistic.<sup>9</sup> Whereas both forms emphasize practical action in relation to everyday artifacts, materials, processes and products, they reflect the productive technique of the division of labor; have different historical origins, and transmit different kinds of practical knowledge and expertise.

The making form originated in instruction in trade crafts and house craft introduced into early elementary schools as pre-vocational training for manual and domestic workers (Eggleston, 1976). Later, education in woodwork,

metalwork and handicraft was introduced into secondary education, again on predominantly vocational grounds. (In its late modern manifestation, the making tradition is oriented towards systems, materials and processes of production typical of advanced technological societies including electronics and IT.) The knowledge and skills it sets out to transmit are variously described as tacit knowing, knowing how to make something and knowing how. Acquiring a specific body of practical knowledge and skills is a slow, empirical process since it has to be passed on from skilled person to novice and the method of instruction is the apprenticeship mode I witnessed in Japan. A problem with this kind of knowledge, given the extreme dynamism of modern industrial systems and social organizations, is the speed with which it gets out of date. On the other hand, teachers operating within this tradition in British schools have always endeavored to develop not just narrow vocational specialisms but also socially approved values such as honesty, integrity and respect for work (Eggleston, 1976). That the Education Reform Act reduced the time allocation for this form of technical education is a source of extreme concern to traditionalist teachers of design and technology who continue to maintain an interest in 'craft'.

The conceiving form of education in productive technologies is rooted in a concept of design introduced into schools in the 1960s that developed at quite an astonishing speed (APU, 1991). Design education aims and objectives seem to be both general and vocational in intent. According to Baynes (1982) the primary aim was to develop 'design awareness in all pupils' and the secondary aim was to provide 'a seed bed for professional designers'. The knowledge and skills it sets out to transmit have been variously described as a critical-conceptual or creative way of thinking about shaping or controlling the environment and it affords technical issues a secondary role (Baynes, 1982, Rutland, 1993, Smithers & Robinson, 1992). The method of instruction is through 'design and realization' projects that feature practical problem solving tasks in which the learners' attention is focused on the form and function of things yet-to-be-created in response to perceived social and human needs. Progressivists among design & technology teachers argue that providing pupils with general insights into contemporary technologies, expert systems and fields of action is more appropriate than transmitting knowledge of specific processes of production and consumption. Some criticisms of the design concept, however, are that it lacks a

substantial knowledge base (Smithers and Robinson, 1992); is elitist (Baynes (1982) and that learning is difficult to assess (DES, 1992).

In Art, the survey uncovered an 'aesthetic' form of technical education with which 'craft' has increasingly become identified (Ashwin et al.,1988). Its nature and function is difficult to unravel, possibly because of a false tendency in industrial and post industrial societies to ascribe transcendent values to art (Gell, 1992, d'Azevedo, 1989). Aesthetics and transcendent belief systems aside, anthropologists like Gell explain what pupils are doing in lessons in which they engage imaginatively, expressively and creatively with art processes and materials, as 'learning how to exploit the virtuosity of technical systems so as to be able represent the real world in enchanted form'.<sup>10</sup> As is the case with productive technology, the practices associated with 'enchanted', or 'magical' technology are becoming increasingly more conceptual (Dormer 1994).<sup>11</sup> Perhaps because the role of art and artists in modern and postmodern societies is ambiguous (half demagogue and half technician), this form of technical education has received considerably less attention than productive ones in recent British education reforms. But anthropologists like Gell believe that the evolutionary reason art persists is that it is social. Art mobilises, coordinates and unifies members of social groups, thereby ensuring they work together in a common cause.<sup>12</sup>

### **Traditionalists Versus Progressives**

The research identified a tension between 'progressive' and 'traditionalist' teachers of productive technologies. In one sense this can be explained as a failure of policy makers and teachers to resolve how to communicate the conceptual element of design whilst, at the same time, retaining its technological foundations. In another, it is a manifestation of an increasing concern in education, at all levels with 'academic culture' as the dominant source of pupils' value systems and intentions. With reference to conceiving and making traditions in architectural education, Willey (1989) has remarked that the postmodern movement in design has resulted in a massive shift in emphasis towards the visual appearance of products, environments and artifacts, but has failed to provide any theoretical insights as to how that appearance is to be derived. He is sympathetic to the view of traditionalist teachers that making ought to predominate;



Despite the attraction of offering both traditions to students and allowing them to draw their own conclusions, the need to offer a clear and coherent course suggests that one tradition should dominate. Perhaps because of the recent history of Schools of Architecture, the making tradition demands the central role for at least four reasons. First, the making of a building is necessary for it to become a reality and to demonstrate its qualities. Second, careful making can become a virtue that transcends simple realisation. Third, a building form can be derived from a direct response to technological issues. Fourth, *making is* the architect's particular skill. (p. 21)

Why is the dispute between the traditionalists and progressives so acrimonious? Possibly because their different views about culturally relevant forms of knowledge and expertise are indicative of rival choices of life strategy.<sup>13</sup> Anthropologists have been interested for some time in the idea of cultural strategies as a form of defense against the alienation and loss of identity they associate with Western modernism in decline (Douglas, 1996, Friedman, 1992). They argue that notions of self-identity and lifestyle have taken on a new significance in a postmodern period characterized by global restructuring, in which individuals everywhere are out to save themselves.

One reading of the progressivists, could be that they are holding fast to the evolutionist-developmental concept of self, society and the world that Friedman identifies as characteristically modern; in which case they are likely to classify the traditionalists' preference for established social institutions and technologies as pathological or, underdeveloped. (Another is that they are postmodern-consumptionists cynically distancing themselves from all self-identification or, narcissistically dependent on the commodity construction of identity and self.) Traditionalist design and technology teachers who continue to orient themselves towards patterns of knowledge and instruction that are modern, (even pre-modern), are not necessarily 'old fashioned'. They could be reacting to the lack of identity caused by the failure of the modern project, and deliberately choosing to adhere to technologies, rules and values that are concrete and localized; irrespective of external changes in social conditions, personal mobility and success.

Why is the tension between tradition and modernity less marked in art? Perhaps because art is regarded as an idealized mode of technical production that is outside

the prevailing commodity system of work and monetary exchange; and because social alienation is nothing new for artists (Douglas, 1996). On the other hand, Gell argues that the tendency of advanced technological cultures to regard art objects as transcending the technical schemes of their creators and spectators and to afford creativity, and the authentic value of whatever it is that art is supposed to represent more status and value than technique, is a distorted view of its function. (He explains this as a by-product of the quasi-religious and cult like status of art and the fact that cults are subject to stringent requirements to conceal their real origins.) The esteem, value and moral significance society affords art is derived from its technical excellence, not the creativity or individual artists or, its so-called aesthetic merit, according to Gell. Moreover, artworks are inherently social in the way that they mediate between artists and spectators, creating a social relation that, in turn, provides a channel for further social relations and influences.

Reflecting on craft education this way leads me to conclude that distinctions such as art, craft and design are unhelpful and that education in productive and magical forms of technology are intertwined. More helpful has been the discovery of three forms of technical education in British secondary schooling that afford craft (understood as making) varying degrees of significance; and in only one of which it is afforded a central role.<sup>14</sup>

### **Educational Benefits of Craft**

A persistent theme in this inquiry has been a crisis of confidence in the meaning and educational value of craft. Now that teachers' views on the matter have been established, it may be helpful to reconsider Korzenik's utilitarian, aesthetic, community building and pedagogical purposes for arts and crafts. In the utilitarian tradition, she says they were understood as a form of manual labor that prepared pupils to be employable; in the aesthetic tradition, they were viewed as morally and personally uplifting for individual pupils, aside from any association with labor or art; in the community making tradition, they were used instrumentally to integrate peoples of diverse cultural backgrounds, languages and traditions; and in the pedagogical tradition, they were used to build pupils' understanding of other subjects in schools.

The original purpose for craft education in British secondary schools was utilitarian. When the term 'craft' acquired the stigma of manual labor, it became more closely

associated with art (Markowitz, 1994). In a confused sort of way, the national curriculum seems to be attempting to promote a rationale for craft in the subject of Design and Technology that is both utilitarian and pedagogical. Korsenik's aesthetic rationale is the one the art teachers participating in the survey aspired to; but what they have patently failed to recognize is the social and community building potential of art.

Unfortunately, I am unable to pursue the issue of the utilitarian and pedagogical value of craft in Design & Technology any further without recourse to theories of cognitive psychology and/or economic anthropology pertaining to commoditization, culture and exchange. My arguments in favor of craft, at this particular point in time, rely on knowledge and understanding of its social function derived from anthropological theories of art.<sup>15</sup>

I end with an unashamedly partisan case for the evolutionary benefits of craft, resting on a thesis about the pleasure and meaning of making put forward by Ellen Dissanayake in 1995. Dissanayake is concerned about the psychological and spiritual benefits which making things artfully by hand brought to pre-industrial societies and believes that postmodern societies deny this at their cost.

She points to the pleasure infants and young children everywhere experience in handling, using and making objects to support her argument that making is a critically important human biological drive that has sustained humans for millennia. Among the many social benefits ordinary, workmanlike repetitious craft actions can bring to individuals and postmodern society Dissanayake cites (i) the irreducible materiality, elementary sanity and satisfaction of handwork; (ii) pleasure at having an effect on a world in which pretence and reality have become hard to distinguish; (iii) the contemplative state of mind associated with making that is important to human mental processes and (iv) the discipline and carefulness making things artfully requires.

In closing, perhaps I was wrong to assume that the art and design & technology teachers in this research did not value the community building and social functions of craft, given that their predominate rationale for its existence was that it gives pupils a sense of self achievement and pride. After all, self-pride and a sense of personal achievement are essential prerequisites for social integration. The

burgeoning interest in amateur arts and crafts in British society at the present time suggests that Dissanayake was right to claim that finding pleasure and meaning in making things by hand will not go away. But her observation that young children only continue to make as they grow up if they see adults' doing it is salutary given the marked tendency away from practical work in Art and Design & Technology. I am left wondering who will provide instruction in the many, varied and complex technical systems anthropologists believe are essential to the survival of the human species, given its evident decline in British schools?

## NOTES

1. In writing this paper, I was influenced by Madeleine Grumet's idea of 'voice' as a metaphor for feminist theory and pedagogy. In arguing a case for education researchers to 'stretch their identities over multiple levels of consciousness and discourse', she refers to Giddens' tripartite model of the subject and Habermas' tripartite theory of communicative action. Accordingly, she proposes situation, narrative and interpretation as a triad of voices that are essential for educational theory, each of which becomes a location through which the other is heard and none of which are privileged. (Voice: the search for a feminist rhetoric for educational studies in *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 20, No. 3, 1990. pp.17-282).

2. Hogbin (1992), mentioned four sorts of crafts workers earning a living in manually controlled technologies. Johnson (1993) reported that artist-crafts workers were involved in country crafts, crafts concerned with tradition, contemporary applied arts allied to style and fashion, interiors, architecture and the theatre and 'expressive work' that 'articulates ideas, deals in metaphor and attempts to produce meaning using craft materials' (p. 43). Colchester (1995) mentioned an explosion of interest in amateur crafts and Hill (1992) commented on a recent revival of vernacular crafts (such as basket-weaving and blacksmithing). Frayling (1990) distinguished between elitist or avant-garde traditions in contemporary craft and noted that craft in adult education is offered under diverse categories (art, construction crafts, women's studies, sport, cookery, technical crafts, home crafts, creative activities etc). Conspicuously absent from his discussion is any mention of the trade-crafts associated with architecture (e.g. building, carpentry and thatching). For discussion of hierarchies of crafts, see Atfield and Kirkam's book *A View from the Interior: Feminism, Women and Design* (London: The Women's Press, 1989).

3. According to Korsenik, the community making objective for art emerged in the nineteenth century because of the diversity of populations migrating to the United States. Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr, in Chicago, realized how art and crafts of different cultures could weave a community of dissimilar people, interrelate people who lacked a common language or common holiday rituals and life cycle traditions. People taught each other the practices of their own countries by exhibiting the precious crafts they carried with them: weaving, embroidery, ceramics. (in Thistlewood [Ed.] *Histories of Art and Design Education*, London: Longman, p. 39). In 1995, Eldon Katter argued, once again, that crafts programs in American schools have potential for multicultural curriculum reform (see his 'Multicultural Connections: Craft Community', *Art Education*, Vol. 48, No.1, pp. 8-13.)

4. The *Education Reform Act* defined attainment targets (ATs) as 'the knowledge, skills and understanding which pupils of different abilities and maturities are expected to have by the end of each key stage' (p. 23). The term key stages refers to 'the four periods into which the years of compulsory schooling are divided for the purposes of teaching and assessing the national curriculum'. Programmes of study are 'the matters, skills and processes which must be taught to pupils to enable attainment targets in the various subjects to be met'. (Emerson, C. & Goddard, I. *All About the National Curriculum*, London: Heinemann, 1989, p. 128.)

5. At Key Stage 3, for example, pupils in Technology were expected to use 'design briefs to guide their thinking' and 'generate design proposals in order to communicate and develop their design ideas'. They were required to 'make products' using 'resistant and compliant materials and/or food and work with 'control systems', such as electronic, mechanical, pneumatic structures. In Art, on the other hand, teachers were directed to introduce pupils 'to the work of artists, craftspersons and designers' (drawing, painting, printmaking, photography, sculpture, photography, graphic design, and architecture); and pupils were expected to 'learn about visual and tactile elements'. Additionally, they were expected to 'develop ideas from direct experience and imagination', and 'realize intentions in a range of media' (Department of Education and Science [1990] *Technology in the National Curriculum*, London: HMSO)

6. The Crafts Council was founded in 1977 for the purposes of promoting craft, as distinct from arts and design. In 1994/5, the Council's funding for research into craft education was focused on inquiry into benefits of 'learning through making' in a project called '*Why Teach Crafts*'.

7. Agreement was reached on an operational definition of 'craft activity' quite early on; and that the craft materials targeted would be ceramics, metal, textiles and wood (because they were most commonly in use in schools). Categories of craft I was keen to include, such as 'traditional crafts', 'domestic crafts' and 'country crafts' were resisted strongly. The categories finally agreed were contemporary crafts, crafts of other times, ethnic crafts (Britain), ethnic crafts (global), trade-crafts, women's crafts and rural crafts. They were a compromise in terms of the expressed interests of the Crafts Council and the research team and the need to categorize crafts using terminology and/or professional jargon with which practicing teachers were familiar.

8. Possible reasons included in the checklist were: builds self confidence; gives a sense of pride and achievement; develops understanding of the made world; gives first hand knowledge of tools and materials; develops imaginative and expressive skills; develops understanding of the historical, technological and cultural inheritance; helps to determine future career choices; provides for leisure pursuits; fosters pedagogical visual and or problem solving skills for adult life (i) in the home and (ii) the workplace.

9. Willey (1989) distinguishes the two traditions in architecture education, as follows: In the making tradition, a building's technological means, its materials, erection and performance are the focus of attention, while in the conceiving tradition, the focus is almost exclusively on the building's form. The conceiving tradition also sometimes adds an additional tenet - namely that aesthetic ideas are paramount. (pp. 15-16)

10. The problem with aesthetic theory is that it ascribes transcendent value to art in much the same way as to religion. The power of an art object, has nothing to do with its transcendent value or

the creativity of the artist according to Gell. It comes from the technical processes that give rise to it and the fact that it was created by another person. In this connection, he refers to the attitude of the spectator to a work of art as fundamentally conditioned by the notion of the technical processes that give rise to it and the fact that it was created by another person. He explains the moral significance art is afforded as arising from a mismatch between the spectator's internal awareness of his/her own power as an agent and the conception he/she forms of the powers possessed by the artist. In reconstructing the processes that brought the work into existence, he/she is obliged to posit a creative agency that transcends his/her own and, 'hovering in the background, is the power of the collectivity on whose behalf the artist exercised his technical mastery' (Ibid., pp. 51-2).

11. Dormer, (1994), has written extensively about a flight from practical knowledge in contemporary fine art that he links to a post second world war urgency for individuality and self expression. In his view, the automatic rejection of skills for skills' sake, that typifies the modernist conception of art, is a 'twentieth century shibboleth that ought not to be accepted (p. 39).

12. The reason the art system persists, according to Gell, is that it contributes to securing the acquiescence of individuals in the network of social relations and intentionalities in which they are enmeshed. As a technical system, art is oriented towards the production of the social consequences which ensue from the production of these objects. (Ibid., p. 43.)

13. In the decline of modernist identity, which he explains as a 'progressive-evolutionist development of self and society and the world', Friedman posits the following three post-modern life strategies: (i) a cynical distancing from all identification, but an acute awareness of the lack of identity; (ii) a narcissistic dependency on the presentation of self via the commodity construction of identity; and (iii) traditionalist, religious or ethnic solutions to the lack of identity. In the latter, the individual feels the acute need to engage themselves in a larger project in which identity is concrete and fixed. (see 'Narcissism, roots and postmodernity: the constitution of self hood in the global crisis, in Lash, S. and Friedman, J. (Eds.) *Modernity and Identity*, Blackwell: London, 1992, pp. 331-367).

14. Houghton defines the technology of craft as 'the application of human skills and knowledge and simple machinery to practical tasks' (in Cross, A and McCormack, B. (Eds.) *Technology and Schools*, 1989 pp. 2-9??)

15. As Sally Markowitz (1994) points out, we have become quite used to phrases like 'arts and crafts' in everyday life and assume that the arts and crafts are, at one and the same time, similar and different. Getting clear about this is another matter, however. (The distinction between art and craft, *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 55 -70). In a very real sense, 'getting clearer about craft' is what this chapter is all about.

## REFERENCES

- ASSESSMENT PERFORMANCE UNIT (1991) *The Assessment of Performance in Design and Technology*, London: HMSO.
- ASHWIN, C., CHANNON, A. & DARRACOT, J. (1988) *Education for Crafts: A Study of the Education and Training of Craftspeople in England and Wales*, London: Crafts Council.
- ATTFIELD, J. (1984) Design for learning, *Times Educational Supplement*, 10.8.84, p. 13.

- ATTFIELD, K. & KIRKHAM, P. (1989) *A View from the Interior: Feminism, Women and Design*, London: The Women's Press.
- d'AZEVEDO, W. (Ed.) (1989) *The Traditional Artist in African Societies*, Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.
- BAYNES, K. (1982) Beyond Design Education, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 1. No. 1, pp. 105-114.
- CAHAN, S. & KOCUR, Z (Ed.) (1996) *Contemporary Art and Multicultural Education*, London: Routledge.
- COLCHESTER, C. (1995) Taking Stock, *Crafts*, January- February edition, p. 29.
- CROSS, A. & McCORMICK, B. (Eds.) (1986) *Technology in Schools*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- CROUCH, C. (1990) A culture of objects, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 85-9.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1990) *Technology in the National Curriculum*, London: HMSO.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (1995) *Design and Technology in the National Curriculum: England and Wales*, London: HMSO.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (1995) *Art in the National Curriculum: England*, London: HMSO.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (1992) Circular 9/92. The Education Reform Act 1988. National Curriculum Section 2, Order Art, London: COI.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (1992) *Technology, Key Stages 1, 2 and 3 HMI Report*, London: HMSO.
- DESIGN & TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION (1994) *A Survey of Capitation Allowances for Design and Technology in Primary and Secondary Schools*, Wellesbourne, Warwickshire: DATA.
- DISSANAYAKE, E. (1995) The pleasure of making, *American Craft*, Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 40 -45.
- DORMER, P. (1994) *The Art of the Maker*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- DOUGLAS, M. (1996) *Thought Styles*. London: Sage.
- EFLAND, A. (1995) Culture, society, art and education, in a postmodern world, unpublished paper, INSEA Regional Conference, Taiwan.
- EGGLESTON, J. (1976) *Developments in Design Education*, London: Open Books.
- EMERSON, C. & GODDARD, I. (1989) *All About the National Curriculum*, London: Heinemann.
- FELDMAN, E. (1982) *The Artist*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall Inc.
- FRAYLING, C. (1990) The crafts in the 1990s, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 91-100.
- FRIEDMAN, J. (1992) Narcissism, roots and postmodernity, in Lash, S. & Friedman, J. (Eds.) *Modernity and Identity*, London: Blackwell, pp. 331-367.
- GELL, A. (1992) The technology of enchantment and the enchantment of technology, in Coote, J. & Shelton, A (Eds.) *Anthropology, Aesthetics and Art*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 40-67.
- GIDDENS, A. (1990) *Modernity and Self Identity: Self and Society in Late Modern Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

- GREENHALGH (1993) Making history, *Crafts*, March-April edition, p. 16.
- GRUMET M (1990) Voice: the search for a feminist rhetoric for educational studies, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 20. No. 3. pp 277-82.
- HILL, R. (1992) Nostalgia or new wave, *Crafts*, July-August edition, pp. 16-19.
- HMI (1992) *Technology Key Stages 1, 2 and 3*, London: HMSO.
- IWANO, M. & MASON, R. (1995) *Final Report of National Survey of Craft in Art and Design & Technology Courses and Curricula at Key Stages 3 and 4*, London: Crafts Council of Great Britain and Roehampton Institute London.
- JOHNSON, P. (1995) Naming of parts, *Crafts*, May- June, pp. 42-6.
- KATTER, E. (1995) Multicultural connections: craft & community, *Art Education*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 8-13.
- KORZENIK, D. (1992) Foreign ideas for American originals, in Thistlewood, D. (Ed.) *Histories of Art and Design Education*, London: Longman, pp. 38-55.
- KONDO, D. (1990) *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- MACDONALD, S. (1970) *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*, London: University of London Press.
- MARKOWITZ, S. (1994) The distinction between art and craft, *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 55-70.
- MASON, R. (1990) Art and multicultural education: The new ethnicity in the UK, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 327-337.
- MIES, M. (1993) Towards a methodology for feminist research, in *Social Research: Philosophy and Practice*, Hammersley. M. (Ed.) London: Sage.
- MOERAN, B. (1990) Japanese ceramics and the discourse of tradition, *Journal of Design History*, Vol. 3, No. 4. pp. 213-225.
- NOTT, C.A. (1994) *Crafts in the 1990s*, London: Crafts Council.
- OFSTED, (1995) *Art: a Review of Inspectorate Findings 1993-4*, London: HMSO.
- PYE, D. (1968) *The Nature and Art of Workmanship*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- RATTANSI, A. & DONALD, D. (1992) *Race, Culture and Difference*, Sage: London.
- RUTLAND, M. (1993) An MA student's critical evaluation of D&T, *Design and Technology Teaching*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 25-28.
- SANDERSON, M. (1993) Vocational and liberal education: a historian's view, *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 189-207.
- SAUSMAREZ-SMITH, C. (1993) Artful persuasion, *Crafts*, November-December pp. 44-7.
- SEMPLE, M. (1993) Physical education and dance, in King, A. & Reiss, M. (Eds.) *Multicultural Dimensions of the National Curriculum*, Falmer, London.
- SCHOFIELD, K. (1995) Objects of desire: by design, in Prentice, R. (Ed.) *Teaching Art and Design* London, Cassell Education, pp. 65-80.
- SIMON, B. (1992) *What Future for Education?* London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- SMITHERS, A. & ROBINSON, P. (1992) *Technology in the National Curriculum: Getting it Right*, London: Engineering Council.



- STEERS, J. (1990) Design and technology in the national curriculum, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 9-22.
- STEERS, J. (1991) Current issues in art and design education: an overview, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 9-21.
- STEERS, J. (1993) New realities for art and design education: an overview, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 9-24.
- THISTLEWOOD, D. (Ed.) (1990) *Issues in Design Curriculum*, London: Longman.
- WILLEY, J. (1989) Concepts in concrete: the teaching of technique and idea in architectural education, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp.15-22.