

Contributors:

Dr Ruth Bereson, Assistant Professor, Program in Arts Administration, Department of Arts and Humanities, Teachers College, Columbia University

Dr. Michèle Genor, Assistant Professor, Elementary Preservice Program, Department of Curriculum and Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University

Expanding the Imagination!
An Investigation into the Nature of Audience
An Interdisciplinary Collaboration

This study is drawn from a collaborative investigation between two researchers from different fields: that of arts management and teacher education. This initiative is an enquiry into the nature of audience. The researchers recognized that although their fields appeared to be disparate, both institutionally and academically, more similarities exist than at first appeared evident. Both are concerned with Audience: whether it be the audience at an arts event or the audience of a classroom. Neither an arts event nor a classroom can be truly alive without the responsive interaction of all parties present.¹ This study draws upon the views and experience of philosophers, academics, students, teachers, managers of arts organisations and arts policy makers.

The basic premise upon which this study was founded was a realisation between the two researchers that their fields rarely met. In 1996, Michèle Genor, whilst studying at Harvard Graduate School of Education (HUGSE) wished to work with the American Repertory Theatre (ART) (based in Cambridge, Mass.) in order to investigate and develop possibilities for curriculum which integrated the theatre into the classroom. Not surprisingly, she was listened to politely by the theatre management, but they could not

envisage integrating her interests into the central activities of their programme and sent away. However, only one week following this encounter she received a phone call from the theatre management enthusiastically inviting her back. It transpired that in the interim a prominent funding body had asked pertinent questions of management as to how their dollars were being reflected in the education and the development of new audiences. In their desire to appease the funding body, the management of ART invited Genor into the company to work on these tasks.² But the question (which in fact is central to this study) was raised in her mind, that is: why does it appear that arts organisations only seem to tack on education and audience development when funding bodies make such demands of them? Shouldn't these be integrally linked and if they are not so, how could these questions be brought to the surface?

Another element of enquiry which these questions raised was that even though as a teacher, Genor was convinced of the importance of integrating the arts and artistic modes of enquiry into the classroom, such practice was relatively absent in teacher education. Consequently an appreciation and integration of the arts was absent from many tertiary classrooms. What had puzzled and frustrated her was the relative lack of engagement between the institutions involved in the preparation of future teachers, and of managers of arts institutions. As a teacher and academic who specialises in curriculum development and in the preparation of new teachers she wished to find a way to bridge this gap.

Teachers College, Columbia University is a unique institution, as it houses not only those wishing to investigate pedagogic issues but also other areas such as the study of Arts Administration. It was here that in 2001 she approached Ruth Bereson, an

academic in the field of arts management and policy to whom she posed some deep felt questions about education, the arts, audience and enquiry .

Just as Genor had little knowledge of the field of arts management, so too Bereson had a limited understanding of the constraints within which teachers operate, especially in the New York City school system. There are a number of projects within the Tristate area and its boroughs which certainly demonstrate that there is arts based activity at institutional and school levels. For example, the following projects (which are not exhaustive) nurture a relationship between schools and artistic institutions and their product:

- The Lincoln Center *Institute for Arts and Education*
- Carnegie Hall -- *CarnegieKids*, and *LinkUP!* Programs;
- The New York City Opera -- *Opera is Elementary*, *The Middle School Opera and Literacy Project*; and *The High School Partnerships*;
- The Metropolitan Opera Guild -- *Education Department School Programs*;
- The Metropolitan Museum -- *Schools Programs*; and
- The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum -- *Learning Through Art Program*

These and other initiatives demonstrate that there certainly is significant arts based activity. Studies have also been commissioned by organisations such as the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)³ and foundations such as Annenberg to provide assessments of audience development. In most cases these studies limit their enquiry to the environment and perceivable impact of these activities rather than interrogating the relationship that may or may not exist between arts managers and those who receive their services in the schools. Furthermore, we haven't found data which considered the

relationship between teacher education, arts management and the development of audience. However, this study proposes to investigate such activity against Genor's initial question, which was: What is the actual nature of this engagement and how does it affect audience development?

The researchers of this study combined the skills and knowledge of their respective fields to further investigate these core questions and to ask some others more directly of concern to the field of arts management. That is, what is the nature of audience? Why do arts institutions incorporate education programs? What are the similarities and differences between such programs? And how are their success or failure evaluated by the arts institutions, the funding bodies and participants. Furthermore, over what period of time are such programs assessed and how might modes of qualitative assessment better inform the enquiry?

The incorporation of education in arts institutions could be seen as simply a way to siphon income from foundations, funding bodies, donors and the like, thus seeming to be extraneous to the artistic purpose of the arts organisations. Likewise, the development of audience in schools could be seen as a futile activity, given the emphasis on the increasingly specific demands of the school system and the national standards based movement.⁴ Assessment of absolute knowledge as subscribed by the notion of these testable standards is not generally a field in which the arts play a role nonetheless civilised societies do tend to place a value on the need to develop such life-skills of a qualitative rather than empirical value.

So why undertake such an enquiry? And how could a collaborative enquiry more effectively inform these questions? The researchers were driven investigate the

parameters of collaboration and this cross-fertilisation of approach would soon become an integral part of the study. Instead of merely phasing in a quantitative and longitudinal methods (the answers for which though untested were relatively predictable) they decided to act as conduits focussing on processes and bringing together many disparate voices in their fields. To this end, the questions were brought back into their university classrooms and graduate students were invited to participate in the formulation of the mode and manner of enquiry, as were academics from other fields such as aesthetic philosophy and art education. This process changed the nature of the study and is what this paper will focus upon.

The study has thus many disparate parts and asks the question: Is there a correlation between the audience of today, or tomorrow, with the efforts that schools and arts institutions expend on their development? Furthermore, do the boundaries of our understanding of audience change dramatically as our social and technological environments respond to change? Above all, how, as researchers do we measure these environments and how might we best describe them? As technology becomes an increasing part of our lives and non-formal experiences are credited with also being important cultural, if not artistic components in our lives, can we expand our definition of audience to reflect these factors?

Thus a study of audience is a complex domain but a critical tool with which we might evaluate the evolving contemporary culture, and interrogate the notion of spectator and participator. From an arts management perspective this is becoming an increasingly important arena for debate as we prepare our graduates to work in arts institutions which will be facing ever changing audience demands. The quest to put 'bums on seats' may

indeed be a formalised and outdated endeavour, inextricably linked to contemporary notions of development and marketing but not necessarily in tune with the socio, political and cultural needs of the audience, let alone the current context in which teachers facilitate learning for students in an environment that places more and more emphasis on standardised tests.

This study incorporates the notion raised by Maxine Greene, (Philosopher in Residence at the Lincoln Center Institute for Arts and Education and Professor Emerita at Teachers College) of social imagination⁵ in order to discover whether as arts managers we are simply responding in a knee jerk fashion to accepted notions put forth as truisms but which actually no longer give us a complete picture of audience. As our societies find other sources of cultural and artistic endeavour, it is hypothesised that so too will the manner in which the audience ‘congregates’. The questions therefore have ramifications beyond the field of management into the field of public policy of arts, culture and education.

Phases of the Study

In this paper, we present a narrative account of our findings from our ongoing research. The implementation and process of the project is divided into three phases:

- Phase 1: Collaboration within the disciplines at Teachers College March 2002-March 2003. (to be elaborated in detail later in this paper) This phase limits itself to the preparation of teachers and arts administrators.
- Phase 2: This phase of the study will look at the changing nature of the presentation and reception of art and the parameters of school curricula. This phase includes the identification and establishment of relationships between cultural institutions and schools under study. There will be a qualitative and quantitative investigation into possibilities of audience and curriculum

development with preservice teachers, arts administration students, New York City schools and arts institutions. August 2003 – May 2004.

Phase 3: Collection and analysis of data (from phase 2). Presentation of the findings on audience, education and schools. June 2004- November 2004. Final written report December 2004.

Post script: The project's timeline is distended due to the nature of the academic year. We are restricted in our work with students (which forms a core of our collaborative ethos) to do this in our classes in the fall term. Nonetheless our focus group has carried on between semesters.

This paper documents the development of modes of enquiry, resulting from a complex dialogue between the parties mentioned above and draws on several data sources. The methodology documents the collaboration amongst academics, students, arts managers, artists, critics, funding bodies and the general community. It informs both theories and practice in the field of audience development and allows us to entertain a dialogue which transcends the traditional boundaries which a discipline specific approach necessarily entails.

The complete study incorporates data gathered at Teachers College and in arts institutions and schools in New York City. The research could be further developed to find out whether the findings are culturally specific or if these questions are of a global nature. Certainly, the methodology is not culturally specific and has been set up as a framework which, if proven successful, should be useful to other arts and cultural researchers.

PHASE I

During Phase 1 we investigated whether it would be possible to have a critical dialogue between many of the component areas which form tomorrow's audiences:

- the schools (meaning the development of teachers and curriculum);
- the agencies: (meaning the arts institutions which undertake developmental outreach programs);
- the funding bodies: (meaning those foundations and agencies which fund arts organisations and demand a certain percentage of educational outreach in their programs);
- government (meaning federal, state and local which have policies that affect the presentation and reception of artistic product);
- the artists (meaning:
 - those who work as participating artists within schools and institutions,
 - as well as those who create any art which is received by the public);
- the university and research institutions (meaning:
 - those who study audience development and audience behaviour,
 - those who prepare future professionals, and
 - those who introduce theoretical propositions as a means by which we might understand the totality of the environment which creates audience).

The Collaborative Process

Given that our work was collaborative in nature we wished to expand on this idea further. In our view, it would give diverse perspective to the subject under investigation, initiating conversations across groups with intersecting interests in arts and education. By bringing together students and professors of arts administration and teacher education, a philosopher of aesthetics and education, and an artist and arts educator, we embarked

on a series of formalized discussions that we entitled *Expanding the Imagination: The Classroom, the Community, the Audience*.

We were interested in identifying the issues that were raised within these discussions and exploring whether the process of eliciting multiple perspectives and actively engaging in collaboration might help to inform our work. Most importantly, our intention was to involve our participants in working towards creating a shared understanding of the fields and the influences they can have upon each other. We sought to explore ways in which we might more successfully integrate the arts in teacher education and heighten an awareness amongst arts managers of the resources available in classrooms. Children will one day become audiences, artists, managers, patrons or to paraphrase T.S. Eliot in Notes Towards the Definition of Culture⁶ and the value of the process may simply be to give meaning to life.

While integration of the arts in the general curriculum may be seen by some as a way to improve academic performance, this cannot be a fundamental reason for the teaching of the arts. Such an orientation relegates the arts to a secondary position and treats them as objects of transition rather than as subjects in their own right. This argument has often been fashionable in the fields of education and arts management, but from our perspective it essentially devalues the inherent qualities of the arts. This study is an exploration of the way in which the explicit value of the arts can become part of the learning process for both preservice teachers and students of arts administration.

In schools of education, such as Teachers College, where the principal aim is to critically investigate issues of pedagogic practice, we noticed a paucity of argument concerning the engagement of novice educators and the arts. Arts administrators rarely

engage in this dialogue. Moreover, education programs are often salves to satisfy funding bodies rather than a means of communicating the value of art to their audience. We were concerned that the students in our fields held narrow and ill-informed notions concerning the subject. In general, preservice teachers expressed the view that integrating the arts as a subject matter into their classrooms could be an imposition on their already crowded day. They also felt intimidated by the art forms themselves as they neither saw themselves as arts advocates, nor arts practitioners and had little or no relationship with arts institutions. Students of arts administration, driven by the demands of a market economy, were often motivated purely by the need for acquisition of ‘bums on seats’ by whatever method proved expedient. If these were the parameters within which tomorrow’s professionals would be working, what then could be the outcomes of audience development?

This paper emphasises the impact which the process of collaboration, formalized discussions and our academic enquiry had on students, instructors and professors within the arts administration and preservice teacher education programs. Other papers, presented to education conferences specifically discuss the impact of this research in terms of that field.

Modes of Enquiry

The primary characteristic of this mode of enquiry is that it is interactive, dynamic and fundamentally responsive. From the beginning, it was evident that we could not involve all our parties at a consistent level throughout the process, nor that it would be effective to do so. The responsive nature of the discussions meant that we could not have

absolute control of the outcomes but instead were led by the way in which each constituent group expressed their voice. Our approach was to develop multiple opportunities for interactive instruction and dialogue. This involved a series of discussions around the themes of Audience, the Community and the domain of Social Imagination, from very informal small group settings comprising student volunteers, to formalized and required class settings involving the participation of all parties. Discussions were influenced by a number of factors sometimes well out of our control, such as individual student orientation and motivation or connection to the subject at hand. As teachers, this ambiguity was at times challenging. However, the ability to be ‘in the moment’, responsive and to relinquish ownership of the way in which the process unfolded, was valuable. It gave all the parties a sense of ownership and fostered commitment to the project at all levels.

- *Data Collection*

This study draws on several data sources. Field notes were taken during each formal discussion (five in all) and throughout the process providing us with extensive documentation. As well as the documentation of formal meetings there were various informal interactions that took place in which issues relevant to the project were discussed. These interactions were recorded in a project journal. These journal entries also included responses concerning the discussions, questions or concerns that were raised and any suggestions that were offered. Periodically, student participants were asked to reflect on the process in written form. Questions were sent by us to the focus group (comprising students from both programs) and the College’s class web system was

used for the larger group discussions. These reflections were integrated into the ongoing evolution of the project and formed the basis of a student research proposal for further enquiry which is currently being considered for funding by the Dean of the College.

- *The Timeline and Process*

This timeline demonstrates not only the project's sequence of events but also the complex levels of participation and responsiveness. This is not exhaustive but gives the reader an indication of the period of preparation and implementation of the process:

September 2001 – Both professors joined the faculty of Teachers College.

Began conversations about ways in which they might collaborate.

February 2002 – Submission of Project to Dean's Office.

Proposition to explore possible collaborative modes of enquiry and present a project to promote academic understanding of their fields.

March 2002 – Acceptance notification

April– July 2002 – Preliminary discussions amongst collaborators.

July/August 2002 – Curricular planning:

Proposed course readings relevant to both programs for classwork in fall term.
Logistical preliminary inter-college planning for large discussion event.
Identification of experts and negotiation with them.

September–October 2002 – Continuing plans for large group, across program event.

Multiple meetings and discussions with expert speakers about themes for discussion at large group event, aims for our project, development of future lines of enquiry, discussion with our own programs to inform them of our process .

October 2002 – Project raised in class and student volunteers sought.

During the week in which the same readings were set across the curriculum the professors raised the questions which were to be posed to the general group two sessions hence. They explained the mode of enquiry, the field, and why they had chosen to pose these questions to the class. Volunteers were then sought with the only caveat that when a student agreed to the process that they commit themselves to participate once before the event, during the event, and after the event.

Organization of cross-disciplinary student focus group.

Formation of cross-disciplinary student focus group comprised of volunteers from both programs. Intensive discussion process undertaken between organizers and focus group. Our intention was to create a small working group to help us meet the needs of the large group session and also provide a forum to try out our ideas with some students with common interests. At this point, it was not our intention for the group to be more than a sounding board for ideas however during the course of these meetings this group volunteered to act as conduits in the larger event, taking the middle role between teacher led discussion and across program student discussion. They suggested that we form small groups of students across disciplines after the formal session in order to encourage discussion in a less formalized atmosphere so that more students felt comfortable enough to be able to express their views. There was a surprisingly high level of engagement in these discussions which were primarily student led.

One overwhelming response from students in both programs was how delighted they were to find out about each other's fields. Even at a social level, such interaction rarely occurs and certainly there is no formal dialogue between arts administration and preservice teaching. It certainly became evident that this was extremely important and valuable to the students and they expressed their interest in development of further opportunities.

October 17, 2002 – The Event.

Venue: Teachers College, Time 5pm – 7pm:

In attendance: approx 120 people comprising 2 visiting experts, 2 designers of the project, 6 professors from the college, 8 instructors from preservice program, 5 PhD students from across the college, 70 preservice students, 30 arts administration students.

- 2 hour interactive forum in four parts:

- 5pm – 5.45 pm. *Presentation by experts.*

The question ‘What is the importance of the Audience, Education and the Arts’ was posed to two eminent scholars. This question was debated from their relative disciplines as well as their perspectives on the role of education in life and the arts.

- 5.45 – 6.15 pm. *Large group discussion. Questions and responses.*

Whilst still in the large group formation the focus group asked questions to the expert speakers and invited other students to participate in this process.

- 6.15- 7.00 pm. *Focus group led discussion.*

Small pre-designated break-out groups were held in classrooms throughout the college. Focus group leaders raised questions emanating from the session and reported back to us in written form. These groups were varied and lively, demonstrating that there is much work to be done and debate to be had on these issues. Discussions became in some cases very heated. Arts Administration students could not seem to believe the arguments of preservice students that they had not much time nor many resources, nor much preparation to involve their students with the arts in a meaningful fashion. Preservice students became for the most part very defensive, feeling themselves to be accused by arts administration students about a situation which was well beyond their control. Arts administration students displayed a remarkable degree of intolerance and a lack of understanding of the complexities which teachers face on a daily basis.

- 7.30 – 9.00 pm. *Follow-up with Experts.*

Meeting between the researchers and experts in which the event was debriefed. The proposal was made and supported by all parties that a follow-up between experts, focus group and ourselves be held. This is important because experts had not been considered by us to be included in any follow-up session. They were very involved in this discussion and immediately recognized its value and wanted to participate meaningfully in its future direction.

October 21, 2002 -- Focus group reports handed to researchers.

Written reports on small group discussion handed in by focus group. Each focus group member agreed to prepare a written report on their session. These form part of the data on which we are basing the study.

October 25, 2002 -- Follow up meeting with focus group.

Follow up on written reports and a request from the group that there be a further meeting with experts. They also wished to work on a preliminary proposal to take the project further. We gave them our agreement that we support their endeavours.

October/November, 2002 -- Discussions.

Ongoing exchanges both written and verbal between the researchers, the experts, and the focus group about possible ways in which the project could move forward.

November 17, 2002 -- Further follow up.

Follow-up with focus group, experts and researchers. Collaborative proposal put forward by students: interaction in the arts between educators and arts administrators.

November 2002 – mid-January 2003 -- Compiling and analysing data.

Compilation and analysis of data gained from the project.
Ongoing discussion with focus group about the implementation of their proposal.

January 2003 – Report

Presentation of preliminary report to the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education conference (New Orleans January 2003).

March – April 2003

Preparation of report for the American Educational Research Association conference (Chicago April 2003) which elaborates on the data and modes of enquiry of this model.

At this stage of the project we are turning to yet another audience: those who did not participate actively in the project to date. By presenting an outline of our process and some preliminary findings we are exploring ways in which this process can be further developed and how the educational importance of work of this kind can be communicated to both our fields before embarking on Phase II of the project.

Analysis

If the ultimate aim of a successful and inclusive education is for people to have lives which incorporate qualitative values⁷, then the arts must be included in that education, not to mention teacher education and in the preparation of arts managers who are both intimately concerned with the nature of audience.

In order to achieve this objective, our method of creating an open dialogue amongst academics, students, artists, and the general community has proven itself to be a genuinely collaborative approach which informs both theory and practice. Phase I of the project has demonstrated that the classroom thus has been turned into an opportunity to reach future arts audiences, obviously something that arts managers have high stakes in nurturing.

There were distinctive and surprising outcomes of this process:

- transferring ownership of the idea from teachers to students;
- enabling networking and collaboration;
- confronting assumptions between the fields; and
- transcending traditional boundaries within the college and challenging the meaning of the term collaboration within a college context.

Transferring ownership of the idea from teachers to students

Prior to the October event we knew that we wanted to have greater and more incisive input from students on what the event itself and the questions asked, should be. We spoke with both of our classes and briefly outlined the project and asked for volunteers. At that point, all we emphasized was physical presence. We asked that they attend one meeting to prepare and one meeting to debrief. Nine students agreed to take part as a focus group to assist us in our planning for the event. In preparation for this focus group meeting we considered a number of questions we deemed to be important. We thought that this session would be critical to the success of the larger project but little did we realize that our introduction which summarized the process and our perspective about the arts would in fact trigger an unexpected reverberation within the students. Our formal questions were never tabled as one of the preservice students interjected and asked the question : What is Art? Soon the group was exploring issues related to this question which they seemed to find refreshing as they grappled with issues of contextualisation of art. They suggested that they act as facilitators during the event itself, mediating small group discussions and reporting them back to the focus group. The questions which they posed to the students of preservice and arts administration programs at the main event were:

- How would you describe the significance of arts integration into a teacher preparation program?
- What is the value of bringing the skills and philosophy of arts administration together with teacher education?
- How can teacher education inform arts administration?
- Who is our audience and how can we both act as general educators and specific advocates of the arts?
- Do artists play a role in your classroom?

After the event the focus group requested further meetings not only with us but with the invited experts. They co-ordinated the responses from the small group discussions and also came up with suggestions for student initiated projects. For example, we received the following email after the main event from a student of arts administration:

“Dear... groupies,

After our last discussion, I cooked up a rough plan for an arts education workshop. I'd love to get your feedback on this idea.

...Those of us interested in finding common ground between the arts and education have two major questions to address: how do we bring artists and students together, and how can artists motivate students in cultural and academic spheres?

An arts education workshop could generate answers to both these questions. Such a workshop would allow artists to help educators devise methods for integrating artistic experiences effectively into school curricula. It would also allow arts administrators to consult with educators about higher-level policy and budgeting implications of arts education.”⁸

The email continued by outlining a variety of workshops which both groups might implement involving arts administration and arts education. This proposal demonstrates how ownership was transferred from our concept to very definite outcomes that were student led and yet still involved the major tenets of our conceptual framework.

Enabling networking and collaboration

It was surprising to find that the students who volunteered for this focus group were not necessarily those identified by us as being likely candidates. More specifically, there were instances where the students had been grappling with the traditional subject but seemed to blossom with these questions. The outcome was that their general work improved to unexpected levels in our subjects. It was also a valuable opportunity for

students to undertake work which was not ‘grades driven’. The only criterion for involvement was a spirit of enquiry as no one gained any external credit for participation. Nonetheless, there were tangible outcomes such as preservice students who asked for placements in classrooms where there might be a willingness and flexibility to bring arts into a more central role. Some arts administration students became engaged in dialogue with us as to how they might introduce collaborative projects. Both groups benefited from the dialogue:

“If as students of TC, we could get to dialogue frequently, we could establish collaborative relationships that pursue common goals”⁹

The privilege of working with other scholars was beneficial and we received helpful mentorship and guidance. We had asked them to participate in only one event and so their interest in supporting the ongoing project was an unanticipated bonus. Furthermore, our students also developed relationships with these scholars which will no doubt impact upon their work.

Confronting assumptions between the fields

Another important outcome was very simply the fact that for the first time students in two distinct areas were seated at the same table and discussed issues which concerned them. It became very obvious that they were entirely ignorant of each others’ professions, as expressed by a student:

“this was truly a depressing situation. There is a total disconnect between Arts Administration and Teacher Education students’. They do not know who we are or what we do and vice versa.”¹⁰

Arts administration students were particularly up in arms as they were shocked by the current conditions found in schools and in the preparation of preservice teachers:

“My group, which consisted of three arts administration students and five student teachers had an intense conversation about the rigidity of the education system in New York City and the lack of integration of arts into the curriculum. Out of the five teachers only one said that teachers in her school had any sort of flexibility in their curricula. Some of the others were required to adhere to specific guidelines when teaching and their class was completely scripted. This was the first time that the arts administration students had ever heard of such strictness within curricula and it was, of course, incredibly disheartening to hear that this left no space for any creativity whatsoever.”¹¹

Preservice teachers felt attacked and intimidated because it appeared to them that arts administration students were holding them accountable for conditions within which they were required to work. In some groups discussion was quite confrontational and never moved beyond that, whilst in others there was considerable cross-fertilisation of ideas:

“I left feeling energized and excited about the possibilities of the arts. ... The discussion focused mainly on how teachers can help children to see the importance of the arts. I feel that the discussions I’ve had as part of this dialogue have helped me as a teacher and as a person to re-evaluate the importance of art in my life and in the lives of others.”¹²

Arts administrators even had some subversive notions about practice in the field of education and suggested undercover action be taken against the New York City Board of Education:

“The evening was a real eye opener and offered incredible new perspective ... what are we going to do about this complete disregard for arts? How can we help educators integrate arts into education? What can we do outside of class time to help teachers? Should we infiltrate the Board of Ed and stir things up over there?”¹³

Most importantly some major shifts from both perspectives took place as well as contributions towards shared understanding:

“These discussions helped me to question my role as an arts administrator and have started to reconstruct my vision of where I see my role in the arts.”¹⁴

Transcending traditional boundaries within the college and challenging the meaning of the term collaboration within a college context.

One surprising outcome of this research to date is we have found significant meaning and potential in the collaborative processes of our work. During the course of this paper we may have given the impression that such collaboration is a natural and easy thing to do. We have found, however, that at almost every juncture we have had to critically examine this term and its meaning. Not only did we need to learn to work together and have a relatively harmonious and constructive dialogue, but our programs, our departments and our fields were required to join us in this endeavour. This is an understated but important point. It is not always possible to reach across institutional boundaries and effectively achieve cohesive academic work that is uniformly respected and received. We both, individually, and collectively spent much time fielding resistance to our ideas, and our capacity to implement them. We consistently dealt with minor issues, such as space and time scheduling, as well as larger issues such as integration of the question into our focused curricula, articulating the importance of raising questions which are perceived to be non-essential and to find modes of enquiry which satisfy all parties. At times these and other issues made the whole notion of collaboration seem impossible, nonetheless this project gained from employing this methodology.

Concluding Remarks:

There is considerable evidence of arts based activity aimed at today's youth. These activities occur both in schools and in arts institutions. Historically, researchers in the fields of arts management and teacher education have identified value in these endeavours but have very different reasons for holding them significant. This study raises the question of how these two fields can inform and assist each other in our attempts to understand and nurture audience. It engages not only the classroom and the arts institution but challenges the limitations of our fields reminding one that the Audience of tomorrow is formed partly within the schools of today.

Notes and References

¹The English critic F.R. Leavis discusses the notion of the Third Realm which is an element of debate. The audience (reader, spectator, student) says silently to him or herself 'this is so isn't it' and answers the enquiry with 'yes, but', thus bringing the area of criticism intimately into an understanding of art and education. The audience, here is our working definition of 'audience' during this study, that is the person who encounters art and asks themselves such questions.

² This initial integration of a curriculum specialist into the ART has since become a more formal arrangement. An internship has been established between the Arts in Education program at HUGSE and the ART.

³ NEA Publications. Research Division Report #36 Effects of Arts Education on Participation in the Arts.

⁴ National Standards for Arts Education: What Every Young American Should Know and Be Able to Do in the Arts developed by the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations. 1994

⁵ Greene, Maxine. Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change 1995 Jossey-Bass

⁶ T.S. Eliot Notes Towards The Definition of Culture 1948 Faber and Faber p. 31

⁷ Fowler, C. (1996). Redefining the mission. Value centered arts education. In C. Fowler (Ed.), Strong Arts, Strong Schools. New York: Oxford University Press

⁸ Arts Administration Student 2002

⁹ Arts Administration Student 2002

¹⁰ Preservice Teacher 2002

¹¹ Arts Administration Student 2002

¹² Preservice Teacher 2002

¹³ Arts Administration Student 2002

¹⁴ Arts Administration Student 2002