

EDUCATING ARTISTIC VISION



藝術視覺的教育

ELLIOT. W. EISNER 著
郭禎祥 譯

藝術視覺的教育

**educating
artistic
vision**

ELLIOT W. EISNER 著

郭頑祥 譯

文景書局 印行

版權所有・翻印必究

中華民國八十年十月初版
中華民國九十一年三月再版

藝術視覺的教育

Educating Artistic Vision

定價：新臺幣陸佰伍拾元正

著者：ELLIOT W. EISNER 著
譯者：郭禎祥
出版者：文景書局有限公司
發行者：文景書局
地址：臺北市和平東路一段91號4樓
電話：(02)23942749・(02)23914280
傳真：(02)23943103・(02)23222676
郵撥：0015791-1（文景書局）
網址：www.winjoin.com.tw
電子郵件：winjoin@ms12.hinet.net
登記證：局版臺業字第6275號

I S B N : 957-9489-00-9

藝術視覺的教育

中文版之序言

「藝術視覺的教育」一書於一九七二年出版，此書所提出的理念，深受美國繼發展人造衛星之後而推行課程改革運動的影響，反映了蘇聯的太空成就，以及美國政府在課程改革上投資十多億美元的情形。當時所發展的理念，確信學校課程所教授的科目不夠嚴謹，而中等學校階段的課程標準偏低。為了強化學校課程中的各種科目，課程發展專家們受到鞭策，特別關注各種智育學科所採用的主要概念和技巧。當我寫「視覺藝術的教育」時，這些理念正流傳著，並催促課程專家訂定藝術教育的計劃。

昔日美國的藝術教育，尤其是在小學階段已將藝術活動視為個人自我表現的基本方式，強調藝術是「捕捉」甚於「教導」的觀念，兒童被看成是創造力與情感需求的寶庫，透過藝術活動可使其潛在的創造力和情感得以解放。如此一來，便很少人注意到藝術在一般教育的獨特貢獻，致使教學課程鬆散、缺乏架構，而藝術的教與學也未能普及於各個學校。「視覺藝術的教育」所推展的理念正好與上述似是而非的態度全然不同。

在「藝術視覺的教育」中所提及的克特林計劃（Kettering Project）即致力於蘊生一種對藝術教育的新態度。此計劃提出一個有組織的課程，主要建立在三項領域之內——創作、批評和歷史——它提供給兒童的學習機會不只是一些創造視覺形式所需的技巧，也讓他們學習如何去觀察自己與他人的作品、去了解藝術在文化中的角色。再者，更體認到學習有用的藝術技巧與複雜的藝術理念是件持續不斷的工作，需要花時間，絕非一蹴可幾的。因此，克特林計劃為兒童提供一套連續而以目標取向的課程。

史丹福大學（Stanford University）在六〇年代末期所發展的概念和

本書所陳述的理念，近幾年在思想派別分明的美國藝術教育界廣為流行，這項研究被命名為「學科取向的藝術教育（Discipline Based Art Education）」。事實上，DBAE的概念早在六〇年代末期我與學生所共同進行的克特林計劃，以及一九七〇年代發表的內容即已反映出來。當然，主要的差異在於蓋迪(J. Paul Getty)藝術教育中心為大規模的課程發展提供財務的支持，並對學區實施DBAE給予經費上的獎勵。雖然某些藝術教育界學者認為這項研究忽略了兒童的創造性（我相信對DBAE的某些責難並不適切），然而八〇年代末期的今天，DBAE的觀念卻正是美國藝術教育界所討論著的核心問題。

這項在史丹福大學和他處所進行的工作，縱使耗時二十年，但我很高興它正處於盛期，當然我也很感謝郭禎祥博士率先將本書譯為中文，嘉惠讀者。凡主張藝術創作是先天遺傳或後天學習都是似是而非的。人類雖然對創造藝術形式有基本的愛好，但也必須具備知識與技巧，才能使他們創造出有意義、有價值的藝術形式。「視覺藝術的教育」一書的方針，除了仍關心兒童的創造天性外，同時也要注意那些可促使兒童以技巧去創作藝術和了解藝術的智慧泉源，我深信此一態度在中國的藝術裡是根深蒂固的。我很高興見到中國文化與美國藝術教育的結合，這一結合將使我們相互學習、彼此分享，這是藝術教育者最佳的學習方式。

Elliot W. Eisner

一九八九年於史丹福大學

Elliot Eisner
School of Education
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Introduction to the Chinese Edition

When Educating Artistic Vision first appeared in 1972 it advanced a set of ideas influenced by the curriculum reform movement that was sweeping the country in the wake of Sputnik. As a reaction to the Russian achievement in space, the United States government invested over \$100 million in curriculum reform. Among the ideas that were developed at that time was the belief that the subjects being taught in the school curriculum were insufficiently rigorous and that standards in all subjects at the secondary school level had fallen. To strengthen the subjects in the school curriculum, curriculum developers were urged to pay particularly close attention to the way in which major ideas and skills were employed in the various intellectual disciplines. These ideas were in the air when I wrote Educating Artistic Vision and provided an impetus to determine what they would mean for art education.

Art education in the United States, particularly at the elementary school level, had regarded art activities as basically a means for personal self-expression. Art was not so much taught as “caught”. The child was seen to be a repository of creative energy and emotional needs and art activities a means through which this latent creativity and emotion could be unlocked. As a result, little attention was paid to the distinctive contributions that art might make to the child’s general education. Programs were loose, relatively unstructured and in many schools not much was either taught or learned in art. The ideas that were advanced in Educating Artistic Vision were a far cry from this liaison fair attitude.

The Kettering Project, which is described in Educating Artistic Vi-

sion, was an effort to operationalize the new attitude towards art education; it provided an organized curriculum built around three major areas—the productive, the critical, and the historical—which provided children with an opportunity to learn not only the skills necessary create sensitive visual form, but how to see what they and others had made and to understand the role of art in culture. Furthermore, it was recognized that learning artistically useful skills and complex ideas about art required time. It was no one-shot affair but needed to be built up sequentially. Hence, the Kettering Project provided a sequential, goal oriented curriculum for children to use.

The ideas that were developed at Stanford University in the late 60s and described in Educating Artistic Vision a few years later are currently at the cutting edge of thinking in the field of art education in the United States. The approach is called Discipline Based Art Education. Virtually all of the ideas in DBAE are reflected in the Kettering Project that my students and I worked on in the late 60s and described in the 1970s. The major difference, of course, is that the J. Paul Getty Center for Education in the Arts has provided financial support for broad scale curriculum development and incentives of a financial kind to school districts for the implementation of Discipline Based Art Education. Although there are some in the field of art education who are concerned about what they believe to be an approach that pays too little attention to the child's creativity (something that DBAE cannot, I believe, be legitimately accused of) DBAE is the most vital issue being discussed in American art education in the late 1980s.

I am pleased that the work that was done at Stanford and elsewhere is finding its day in the sun, even though it has taken two decades for this to occur. I am also grateful, of course, to Dr. Ann C. S. Kuo for taking the initiative in making Educating Artistic Vision available to readers of the Chinese language. Art is paradoxically both natural and learned. Humans have the basic propensity to create art forms, but they also require the knowledge and skills to enable them to do so in a significant and valuable way. The orientation of Educating Artistic Vision is to maintain children's creative proclivities while at the same

time paying attention to the intellectual resources that will enable them to do so with skill and understanding. This attitude is, I believe, one deeply ingrained in Chinese art. It is satisfying to me to see a connection made between the Chinese culture and American art education. Such connections enable us to learn and to share with each other. There is no better way for art educators to learn.

Elliot W. Eisner
Stanford University, 1989



艾斯納博士近照

譯者序

「藝術視覺的教育（Educating Artistic Vision）」一書係艾斯納教授（Professor Elliot Wayne Eisner）在藝術教育理論領域的經典著作，它是一本在歐美國家廣為採用的大專藝術教育教科書。曾有日譯本。

艾斯納博士終生致力於藝術與教育，目前執教於美國加州史丹福大學（Stanford University），他對於提昇美國學校藝術教育的貢獻極大，尤其主張透過藝術學習以發展人類智能並促進我們體驗、了解周遭環境與世界。由於艾斯納對這些教育範疇的許多著作與貢獻，他曾獲得諸多獎勵，如：

詹生·帕爾麻紀念獎（the Palmer O. Johnson Memorial Award）、古今漢獎（Guggenheim Award）、傅爾布萊特法案基金獎（Fulbright Fellowships）以及美國教育研究協會所授予之對課程發展層面有顯著貢獻獎（Award for Distinguished Contributions to the Curriculum Field from the American Educational Research Association）。繼1962年在芝加哥大學（University of Chicago）所獲得的教育哲學博士學位，他最近分別又在奧斯陸大學（University of Oslo, Norway, 1986）、哈佛斯特爾大學（Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York, 1988）和瑪麗蘭大學（Maryland Institute, Baltimore, Maryland, 1989）獲得人文及哲學等榮譽博士學位。由此輝煌的成就我們可以肯定艾斯納是當今美國、國際聞名的學者、教育家。

筆者自1986年返國服務於藝術教育界，深感國內有關藝術教育理論、理念書籍等之缺乏，而難以推動、改進正常化的學校、社會、全民藝術教育，以提昇我們的文化建設。因此與師大美研所、大學部學生共研藝術教育之餘，將本書譯成中文，以供關心改進我國藝術教育、文化建設者之參考。

本書之能譯成中文版，承蒙艾斯納博士之鼓勵與指教，在此特申敬意與感謝。吾棣鄭明憲、郭武雄、鐘麗娟、段健發、蔡芷芳、吳介禎、吳介祥、龔玉萍、龔玉圓、王雅雯、王敘倫等在整理、校閱工作熱心參與，亦

特表謝意。並感激文景書局對推廣學術、教育工作的熱忱與支持。此中文版如有未盡理想與周全之處，尚祈學者先進，多多指正。

郭禎祥 謹識

國立台灣師範大學

一九八九年十二月



郭禎祥博士(譯者)與艾斯納博士(著者)合攝於史丹福大學艾氏研究室

Translator's Preface

Professor Elliot Wayne Eisner's *Educating Artistic Vision* is a classic in the field of art education theory, and is widely used in Europe and America as a university and college art education textbook. A Japanese translation is already available.

Dr. Eisner has shown lifelong dedication to art and education. Currently He is a professor at Stanford University, California, he has made an enormous contribution to the enhancement of art education in America. Professor Eisner's special scholarly interests are in the contributions the arts make to the development of human intelligence and the ways in which the arts help us experience and understand the world. For his many contributions and published works in this educational field, he has received numerous awards, including the Palmer O. Johnson Memorial Award, the Guggenheim Award, the Fulbright Fellowship, and the Award for Distinguished Contributions to the Curriculum Field from the American Educational Research Association. In addition to his 1962 Ph. D. in Education from the University of Chicago, most recently he has received honorary doctorates of liberal arts and philosophy from the University of Oslo, Norway (1986); Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York (1988); and Maryland Institute, Baltimore, Maryland (1989). This brilliant accomplishment allows us to confirm that Professor Eisner is an educator and scholar of high distinction, celebrated both in America and internationally.

Since returning from abroad in 1986 to serve as an art educator in the field of art education in Taiwan, I became deeply aware of Taiwan's shortcomings in terms of art education theory, concept, litera-

ture and books, as well as of how difficult it is to promote, improve and normalize art education here among schools, within society and among the general public as part of developing our cultural standards here in Taiwan. Therefore in addition to undertaking joint research into art education and art classes with graduate and undergraduate students of the Department of Fine Art at National Taiwan Normal University, I have also translated the present work into Chinese to make it more accessible to those concerned with improving art education and cultural development in Taiwan.

I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my respectful appreciation to Dr. Eisner for his encouragement and guidance in the preparation of this Chinese edition of his book. My special gratitude must also go to my students Cheng Ming-hsien, Kuo Wu-hsiung, Chung Li-chuan, Tung Chien-fa and Tsai Chih-fang for their enthusiastic participation at the sub-editing and proof-reading stage. I am also most grateful to the Wen Ching publishing Co. for their dedication to the dissemination of learning and for the support they have given to educational work. If this Chinese edition should fail to match up to the ideal in any respect, readers' suggestions for corrections or improvements will be gladly welcomed.

Ann Cheng-shiang Kuo

7 December, 1989

Department of Fine Art

National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei

目 錄

第一章 為什麼要教藝術 1

Why Teach Art ?

第二章 當今藝術教育的特質、地位和目標 17

Art Education Today: It's Character, Status, and Goals

第三章 學校藝術教育的起源：溯古談今話沿革 29

The Roots of Art in Schools : An Historical View from a Contemporary Perspective

第四章 藝術學習的啓蒙 61

How Artistic Learning Occurs

第五章 藝術學習的實徵研究 107

Empirical Studies of Artistic Learning

第六章 設計藝術教育課程可能實現的展望 143

Building Curricula in Art Education : Some Promising Prospects

第七章 意義與隱喻：藝術教學的藝術與學理之分析 165

The Metaphor and the Mean : Some Observations on the Art and Science of Teaching Art

第八章 兒童的藝術成長能予評量嗎？ 185

Children's Growth in Art : Can It Be Evaluated ?

第九章 藝術教育的研究工作有何期待？ 219

Research in Art Education: What Can Be Expected ?

第十章 從科學時代到藝術時代 237

From an Age of Science to an Age of Art

第一章

爲什麼要教藝術

欲了解並促進任一學科的教育過程所遭遇的問題，可能以藝術這門最難。以科學方法研究人類的行爲與經驗是近百年來才有的事；而有關於教育他人的問題很少有合乎科學的解答。由於藝術的學習與美感經驗是人類最精妙的感覺與行爲，我們更無法寄望科學的解答。本書的目的即是與讀者分享對這些問題的透視，並分析評述一些已知的事情，同時提供行動方針以建立可望成功的藝術課程。

爲了提出和分享這些見識與了解，至少得先檢視四項知識來源：

(一)培養處理問題的見解是非常重要的，究竟爲什麼要教藝術？憑什麼花時間、精力和金錢在人類經驗中的這個特殊的領域呢？

(二)有什麼能證明在美國公立學校中教授藝術必要性？前人對他們的任務使命有什麼看法？曾想要達成什麼？爲什麼要達到這些？忽視過去實非明智，儘管了解過去並不能保證舊事不重演，但歷史確可爲現狀的考量提供一種實用的參考架構。

(三)社會科學對視覺藝術和影響個人創作與體悟視覺藝術的條件有何意見？實際上，人是如何對視覺形式有所感觸的呢？對社會或個人皆具重要性的視覺形式，洞察力、敏感度及技巧是如何產生的？

(四)從課程發展的實務、藝術的教導和在校執教藝術者可能有用的藝術學習評鑑中可以蒐羅到些什麼呢？

本書內容大部分取材自哲學、歷史、社會科學方面的知識，以及實際教學與課程制訂上的實務。

美國學校的藝術教學，向來就鮮爲學校課程的重心，迄今猶然。大部

分美國人把藝術課當作是教育歷程的周緣而非中心科目，得在校方施捨之下才能存在。重視藝術和具有經驗和內涵品味的人，得考慮藝術教育在學校課業中的地位是否能鞏固無虞？誠摯的證言常為藝術在教育活動中做重要的辯護，然而證言雖感人，卻往往缺乏說服力；但又該如何辯護呢？大眾有何理由得支持它成為正式教育中的要項？

教導藝術的正當理由 (Justifications for the Teaching of Art)

照我的看法，有兩大理由可說明教導藝術的合理性：

(一)強調藝術工作的工具效益，把學生或社會的特定需要作為訂定目標的主要基礎。此謂之「環境論」(contextualist justification)。

(二)強調惟有藝術才能提供對人類之經驗與理解的貢獻，並強調藝術所固有獨特的層面，此謂之「本質論」(essentialist justification)。

先看第一項理由，在公立學校整個的藝術教育史上，這種能證明藝術教學之合理性的方法，曾被廣為運用。

引用環境論的參考架構，在教育方法與目標上，唯有了解其運作的環境才能主張一項教育活動。在這點上，學生特質和大環境的需要都在考慮之列。例如，假設校方正在處理住在受歧視地區的貧苦黑人兒童。再進一步假設，這些學生所喪失的事物之一，是他們不知其祖先的高度藝術成就在世界文化中的貢獻。再者，這些孩子需要有人來幫他們建立民族自尊，而美國社會卻使他們難於達成。使用環境論的參考架構，在這樣一所學校的藝術課程，可能還得強調 Benin, Ibo 等非洲民族及其他美國黑人的藝術。這所學校的藝術課程也可能要藉藝術來培養自尊心。其出發點不在藝術，而在提供學生一種帶有教育價值且合適他們的藝術。下列是有關這種特殊情況下藝術教育的例子。

我們所要的——在此我只想論及藝術教育——是藝術行為模式的新觀念，以及組成藝術課程的新構想。這些新課程必須有意義，並且和學生有關——不僅考慮到境遇差的學生，也得顧及到所有的學生。這些新構想得加入年輕人的「勇氣與希望」(guts and hopes)，透過這種情操激發他們

在智力方面的努力與成長。同時也必須讓藝術課程在急速變遷（目前是急速惡化）的社會環境中，探索社會關係並發展可替代的人類行為模式。

這裡我們所看到的是對藝術在教育上運用的要求，（只有一部分源自藝術特有的本質）。藝術在這方面的運用主要是基於對人類一些重要事物的考慮。這種關於藝術課程的目標與內涵的決定並非創新；事實上，它似乎比我們大多數人所理解的更具角色功能。掌理校務的人的價值觀不只影響到藝術教育，也影響到教育本身。前不久一件鮮明的實例，就是蘇俄人造衛星史普托尼克號(Sputnik)昇空，對美國中學科學課程的內容、目標及重要性的影響。一九五七年十月七日，當蘇俄發射史普托尼克號環繞地球時，美國教育評論家便藉機為所謂的學術科目（特別是數學和科學）辯護。如同其他許多情況，亞軍似乎還不夠好。因蘇俄科技而起的社會需求，促使科學和數學在高中課程中，受到支持與重視。

藝術教育也受到人們所認定的重要社會需求所影響。在大蕭條年代的末期，俄瓦特那(Owattona)計劃（容後再述）便致力於應用藝術來改善社區生活和室內裝潢。二次大戰期間，公立學校經常運用藝術來製作海報支援戰事。美國的學校是社會機構，所以要反映它的社區價值與需要。迫切的需要與受到威脅的價值，往往可以成就或阻礙教育計劃的變更。

今日的藝術教育活動應有的目標與內容是什麼呢？環境論者認為應視情況而定：得視學生是誰，社區的需求型態以及大環境所面臨的問題而定。對持環境論立場的人而言，任何一種教育活動的目標，都應取決於包括學生及教職員在內的資源。這個方法，最近稱作「需求的評估」(needs assessment)，常用為大規模課程計劃的第一步，評估學生或社區乃至於國家的需求，使人覺得這些需求總是「在那裡」，而適當的社會分析會將其突顯。然而這只是事情的一部分而已，惟有在涉及到一連串的價值觀時，方能決定所需為何。因此，住在相同社區的兩個人可能對社區的需求持相反的結論。譬如說，孩子們要藝術教育做什麼？是培養他們的創造能力呢？還是學習欣賞純藝術？或者是熟習創作藝術品的技巧？對藝術在教育上的角色持有不同價值觀念的人，研究一羣兒童，會對兒童的需求下不