



THE JOURNAL OF THE
NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION'S WOMEN'S CAUCUS

THE REPORT

Issue No. 4
Editor: Judy Loeb
Assistant Editors: Ruth Beatty and Marlene Keller

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT

PLANNING UNDER WAY FOR THE 1976 CONVENTION PRE-SESSION

Judy Loeb reports: Exciting plans are now being formulated for the 1976 Pre-Session to be sponsored by the N.A.E.A.'s Women's Caucus on April 10 and 11, 1976, the Saturday and Sunday prior to the National Art Education Association's Convention in St. Louis.

Many people have already written to me with suggestions for presentations or panels for the program. If you have something which you would like to present or organize as part of the Pre-Session please write to me immediately.* We plan to have a complete list of the activities we will sponsor in St. Louis printed in the winter issue of THE REPORT.

Ruth Beatty, Secretary of the N.A.E.A.'s Women's Caucus, will be acting as Coordinator of the Nominating Committee. Please send any names of people whom you wish to nominate for office in the N.A.E.A.'s Women's Caucus to her.* The next issue of THE REPORT will contain the names of slate of officers that the Nominating Committee will present at the next general meeting of the N.A.E.A.'s Women's Caucus. This meeting will be held during the regular sessions of the N.A.E.A. convention. We would be delighted to have you volunteer your own name as one willing to give your time and energy to a particular job.

Articles printed in THE REPORT are both solicited and unsolicited. If you have thoughts, ideas or information you wish to share with THE REPORT readers, please type them up and send them to me.*

Sandra Packard, President-Elect and Coordinator of the Position Paper Committee is still seeking ideas to be incorporated in the Position Paper.*

Special thanks are due to Bette Acuff, Coordinator of Publications, who edited the excellent November issue of Art Education devoted to issues raised by the N.A.E.A.'s Women's Caucus and to Sandra Packard who will donate to the Caucus money raised through the sale of her publication "Tottering on the Brink: The Future of Women Art Faculty in Higher Education" (see page II for further information).

And last, and most important of all, we welcome the contributions and subscriptions of any of your interested friends in N.A.E.A. These should be sent to Margaret Hicks, our treasurer.*

*Addresses on Page II

THE MATERIAL IN "THE REPORT" MAY BE REPRODUCED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION PROVIDED THAT EACH SUCH REPRODUCTION CARRIES AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO THE AUTHOR OF THE SECTION BEING REPRODUCED.

THIS RESERVATION IS IN KEEPING WITH OUR DESIRE BOTH TO MAINTAIN AND ENCOURAGE THE HIGHEST PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TO DISSEMINATE THE INFORMATION WHICH WE PRINT.

SPECIAL PUBLICATION BY SANDRA PACKARD TO BENEFIT N.A.E.A.'S WOMEN'S CAUCUS

Tottering on the Brink: The Future of Women Art Faculty in Higher Education , an article by Sandra Packard (Ed.D.), summarizing the research on the present and future position of women in art faculty, which was originally published in the National Council of Art Administrators Report, is now available for order from Sandra Packard (\$1.50). Profits from the sale of this article will be donated to our Caucus by Sandy for the continued printing and publication of material of interest to women.

The article covers most of the research about women in art education, studio and art history areas. It discusses the factors which will affect future employment.

WHERE TO WRITE WHOM ABOUT WHAT

NAMES FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Write: Ruth Beatty
 428 Sunset
 Ann Arbor, Michigan
 Phone: 313-663-6060

IDEAS FOR THE POSITION PAPER AND COPIES OF "TOTTERING ON THE BRINK" (\$1.50)

Write: Sandra Packard
 Department of Art
 Miami University
 Oxford, Ohio 45056
 Office: Phone 513-529-6121

ARTICLES FOR THE REPORT AND IDEAS FOR THE CONVENTION PRE-SESSION

Write: Judy Loeb
 Department of Art
 Eastern Michigan University
 Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
 Office Phone: 313-487-1268
 Home Phone: 313-769-1975

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE REPORT (\$5)

Write: Margaret Hicks, Chairman
 Department of Art
 Navarro Junior College
 Corsicana, Texas 76110
 Phone: 214-874-6501, Ext. 24

STEREOTYPES: THE TYRANNY OF THE WAY OTHERS SEE YOU

Dr. Marylou Kuhn reports: Last April when the Women's Caucus was seeking memberships at NAEA in Miami, I quickly, and as I now recall, fliply, responded that I had been out doing before they began to be self-conscious about women. On reflection, this is true, but it is also true of many others. My story, however, focuses on the woman doctoral student in 1950 and some insights that have come out of my experiences in higher education since that time.

As a public school art teacher in the mid-West, I accepted with ease the current dominant provision surrounding employment as natural. Married women were not given full contracts because their status made them undependable to complete a school year. I was young and unmarried. I did not think about it. One or two teacher generations earlier the freedom to dress as one considered appropriate (bobbed hair and lipstick) and to live independently of family, had been settled. Truly professional high school teachers often held masters degrees, but not the doctorate. This, according to my female colleagues, made you queer. In what way, I was not sure. I think they meant it had a tendency to make one less willing and/or suitable for the female subordinate social role. They were right.

I had a model, however, in a colleague who taught speech and who had just finished her Ph.D. in aphasia. She went on to teach at a university and she was very excited about her field. It was contagious. I wanted to know so much more about art, about making art, about artists, and particularly about how one could bring about human involvement in art on a larger community scale. When I attempted to justify my desire for this learning as a condition of entrance to a doctoral program of studies, I faced my first hard resistance to a mere girl wanting this advanced degree. "What on earth would I do with it?"

In the twenty-five years since 1950, I have done many things. First, was to attain for the art department of my chosen university an honor they had wanted for some time. The sciences had been dominating all fellowships, (this was before Sputnik). When I was able to obtain this help in a university-wide competition, the fact that an art student won one was just as astonishing as was the fact that I was a woman. I did not think about it until surprise was shown. And so it goes.

This brings me to the center of what I want to say. Many times, more times than not, the fact that I fit a descriptive idea has been the determining factor in response, opportunity and success. But I was seldom aware of it. The surroundings provided by the attitudinal aura one carries around and the attitudinal patterns others fit with anticipated stereotypes are dominant social/personal controls. The attitude of first an artist who is involved in education has been the dominant force behind my professional life. This aura has subordinated the three other descriptive ideas or roles I carry. It is an after-thought that I have become aware that these roles have dominance in differing order for the different people I encounter. They respond in keeping with their stereotype. The women's movement has made me more aware of how others use these designations for me to provide imaginary domains and to anticipate my responses. They, consequently, present opportunities for me in keeping with their attitudes. I have been teaching about the filters through which adults learn for some time. It is just as true of the teacher's domain as of the student's.

The additional three roles I carry are: woman, single, handicap. These, for me, are descriptive. The woman title effects my intellectual realm. I am a whole person who happens to be a woman. This circumstance seriously effects my opportunities and responses to power. Academic life is dominated by male specialists in substantive fields. Some enter the arena of administrative action from this plane. The small numbers of women scholars makes them a minority in any group enterprise based in higher education, particularly in senior ranks. My experience more often than not has been to be the only woman in a group of men working

on almost any group decision. Not to recognize the power factor in such encounters is to ignore the realities of the total milieu.

The single title effects my social/personal realm and my person-to-person relationships. I am an individual who by free choice has maintained a single role. This circumstance has seriously effected opportunities in everyday living. Further, in the insulated and often backward community of academic social life, it has colored my professional opportunities by shutting me out of informal communications channels through social contact. This area of discrimination has been little studied. Maybe a later generation will do it. Some years ago while teaching in the Institute of Education at the University of London, I was able to compare American professional life with the English academic milieu. In male-dominated England, the woman who has achieved professional status appears far more likely to be able to base her actions on requirements of her career than has been true of my personal experiences in the United States. Being a woman, particularly, a single woman, in the American South, is a very real force in professional consideration.

Finally, my third role is that of the inconvenience of residue paralysis from polio. I was a very young child when I had polio, so the norm for me is what I am. Others seldom understand this. Responses are of two kinds. Either no notice is taken, or a very subtle limiting of responses suggest a strange (to me) discomfort. Straight-forward discussion and action in either case is avoided and as a consequence, incoherent responses sometimes result. Awkwardness occurs.

I mention all of these roles because they are so intertwined that one cannot say which is cause, which consequence. The instance of being a woman, for me, and I am convinced for others, is only one of many factors contributing to a tyranny of stereotyped responses.

The women's movement brings to the fore the details of attitudes in regard to this particular role. Other roles need also to be considered. As we bring them into the focus of our awareness we respond differently to them. While they are not in the realm of awareness little can be done about them. Awareness is a direct channel to action. But the great achievers of our time who are women, like Golda Mier, Margaret Mead, and Indira Gandhi, come across first as people, then as many coordinating roles. Care needs to be taken to be aware yet not to distort by over-focus.

The tyranny of stereotype can come from any direction. It is still effecting individuals at the professional level. HEW has just published a comparison between the education of men and women in the United States, (American Education, July, 1975). Up to and including the master's level, there are very slight differences. But the attainment of Doctor's and professional degrees are still clearly dominated by men. In the early 1980's, it is anticipated that one in 200 women will receive the Ph.D. and that four in 200 men will receive it. Of those women who do, a large portion will still face the tyranny of stereotypes in their effort to achieve professional status.

Dr. Marylou Kuhn, Professor of Art Education at Florida State University, Tallahassee, specializes in teaching community and continuing art education. She has done research in philosophical studies. She is Editor of Studies in Art Education (1970-75) and she paints in encaustic and watercolor.

WOMEN AND WORK

Patricia Sloan reports: The notion of equal rights for women often expresses itself through the insistence that more high-level jobs be opened up, that more jobs be opened up, that training be made available for those hitherto excluded from the job market. We can see, in these interconnected demands, the status symbols and social stratifications by which we live. If happiness is a warm puppy, success is a good job. For some people, even, a job. More success is a better job. And "better" jobs may merely mean "more important" jobs, rather than work which is individually meaningful to those who perform it. Senators are more important than sanitation workers, doctors and lawyers are more elevated personages than plumbers, and so on, ad nauseum. An invisible tag attached to every job in our society quietly proclaims its status, or its ranking within a hierarchy which also includes all other jobs. Racial and sexual discrimination operation in terms of this system of job stratification. In Vedic India, the Sudras, or servants, formed a low-level caste which included primarily persons of Dravidian, rather than Aryan, ethnic descent. In modern America, the victims of discrimination cluster in low status jobs, and rarely manage to gravitate upward from them. "Fighting discrimination," a loosely defined activity, initially implies that we ought to strive for a more random sprinkling of people-types in job-categories. More black women should be corporation presidents. More white men should be typists for these corporations. Along this line, the resistance of some men to equal opportunities for women, or of some whites to equal opportunity for non-whites, may not really stem from a reluctance to share. It arises more basically, I think, from a terror of being deprived. The much maligned "tokenism" of past job markets had its positive aspect, since it served as a symbol for a wholesome acknowledgment that high-level jobs can be filled by persons of any color or gender. We loved George Washington Carver, Madame Curie, and Queen Victoria, because they seemed to be heralds of some finer world. If that finer world is now upon us, it seems to have brought pains as well as triumphs. Whether women and members of ethnic minorities can fill high-level jobs raises quite different issues than whether or not they will fill them. An influx of non-males and non-whites into high level jobs creates stressful competition for those who may have viewed these jobs as their perquisites. Brahmins may be forced to accept employment scrubbing latrines, and, most interesting of all, are likely to view the process as if it were humiliating. Like the redistribution of wealth, the redistribution of jobs and status elevates some while depriving others.

In wondering about alternatives to this process, I think of the various housewife's leagues which make newspaper headlines from time to time, noticed largely because of their lobbying against the Equal Rights Amendment. If they seem lunatic fringe (and they do to me), this may be because we've come too far to accept "biology as destiny" theories. All women don't have to be housewives, any more than all Chinese have to run laundries. I, personally, find tantalizing the lack of pride expressed by spokespersons for some housewife's groups. The gesture almost starts to make sense, but ends by being all wrong. If, like bees in a hive, we all subordinated ourselves to the general good, this would probably be preferable to woman pride, black pride, yellow pride, red pride, white pride, Italian pride, Jewish pride, et al. But subordination has to be universal to work, and has to be undertaken for the sake of the general good. Abnegation of one group in our society before another is quite a different matter, and enough to make a reasonable person throw up. Still, I like to think a germ of brilliance can be seen beneath the nonsense about whether men ought to be masters in the home. Why shouldn't people be happy to be housewives, if this is what they do? What brought us to think of housewifery as such a low status job? How can status attach to jobs, if all work is meaningful? Some of the most fascinating insights into the silliness of job status come through reports leaked out from the Communist world, where individuals and populations can apparently be shifted more readily. Prime ministers and presidents who fall into disfavor may be sent to dig ditches. Would a ditch-digger be

punished equally by being forced to do the work of a prime minister? And why, even in these instances, are subtle taboos never transcended? Prime ministers may be sent to dig ditches, but not to clean, cook, keep house and tend children for ditch-diggers. Would a woman politician or scientist who fell into disfavor be demoted to housewifery? These are freaky questions, which probably means the answers are important.

If I were to write an affirmative action program for women as a group, I'd probably plan it in two stages. First, more women would be moved from low status to high status jobs, to break up the clustering which now exists. Second, we'd have to disabuse ourselves of the notion that some jobs are "better" than others. Sending banished prime ministers to dig ditches is an insult to ditch-diggers, because it implies that their work is degrading. An amazing anachronism in nations which nominally profess deep respect for all members of all working classes. We cannot claim greater sensitivity ourselves, when TV newscasters moan over the possibility that tight job markets may force college graduates into jobs which are supposedly beneath them. There has to be something a little bit crazy about nations like our own, in which people wash their own underwear, but would think it demeaning to take jobs washing other people's underwear.

Very definite dangers exist if the two steps I propose were to be undertaken in reverse order. One hesitates to even suggest that job status is not all that important, for fear of being quoted out of context. If no job is more meaningful than any other, it follows--some might argue--that women might as well be content to be housewives, typists, and telephone operators. But that, as T. S. Eliot said, is not what I meant at all. Not at all.

The teaching profession provides, of course, one of the purest examples of the links between sex discrimination and job status. College teaching is thought more prestigious than high school teaching, which in turn has more status than elementary school teaching. Women are still a small minority on faculties of institutions of higher education, but are found clustered more and more densely as one descends into the lower reaches of what I suppose must be called lower education. We ought to apologize to children for this system of stratification, in which a teacher's status is proportional to the ages of the students he or she teaches. Moving from one level of the teaching system to another is difficult, largely because separate college systems have been set up to train people for the various levels. Elementary school math teachers rarely move on to teach in college, unless to enter departments of education, where they teach how to teach elementary school math. College teachers, if they move to lower grade levels, may have a sense of failure if the move were enforced, an inflated sense of benevolence if it were voluntary. More often, they cannot make the move, because of the rigid system of degrees and licenses. I'd like to see the entire system more uniform, with people taught to teach a particular subject at any grade level, and professionally free to move from college to pre-college. It would also be ideal, of course, if we could purge ourselves of the feeling that higher status adheres to teaching older students. Potential teachers fall into their own ordained slots when taking their college degrees. And--let's face it--normal schools generally are considered to have lower status than other types of colleges, departments of education lower status than other departments in individual institutions of higher education. Why this ought to be so is unclear. But it may be simply another case of association between low status and the presence of a preponderance of women. Do certain jobs acquire low status because women move into them? Or are women forced towards them because the jobs were already low status? In Russia, where most physicians are women, is the status of this category lower than in the U.S., where most doctors are men? I wonder.

Patrician Sloane is a painter and filmmaker. She teaches at New York City Community College. She recently spent a year as a Guggenheim Fellow writing a book about color.

 FEMALE CLIQUE!

Renee Sandell reports: My exhibition entitled "Female Clique!" which was first shown in November 1974 at the Hopkins Hall Gallery of the Ohio State University, presents representations (images) of women. It uses photography and painting in an unconventional manner to reflect my concern with many separate and related issues surrounding female roles and images, the process of art creation and art education.

The paints in the exhibition contain fragmented images. These were taken from photographs and translated into painted responses in which they are broken up and superimposed onto each other. Each painting is paired with a related slide sequence and the individual slides show fragments and whole images belonging to the source photographs as well as to the paintings themselves. The slide sequences related to the genesis, conceptualization and visual form of the paintings.

The exhibition takes place in a special environment; the room is darkened. Through electronically-programmed manipulation of the intervals of light, the audience is directed to focus alternately between the paintings and the slide sequences. This procedure attempts to make the viewer see, or synthesize, the fragments of the total exhibition in a gestalt.

The title, "Female Clique!" reflects my four-fold interpretation of the exhibition. First, this is a relatively small show, four painting and four slides sequences, a select, exclusive and unusual group (clique) of art works. Second, the theme of female-image confrontation is connected to the Ms. magazine term for cautious awareness of sexism; "click!" Third, the word "clique" refers to the audio aspect of the exhibition--the rhythmic clicking of the projectors and gallery lights. Fourth, "clique" refers to the click of the camera shutter which captured the original female images on film.

The paintings and their paired slide sequences (entitled "Maternal Instinct," "Femmes Fatales," "Three Generations of Women, NOT Ivory," and "Family Portrait,") attempt to reflect the fragmented and synthetic existence of women. Together, the gallery environment, paintings and slides supply clues and cues, some of which intensify, some of which clarify ambiguities of the images with regard to time, place and identity, producing conflicts for each viewer to personally resolve. My main objective is to provoke viewer involvement.



VIII

I have approached this project incorporating three important aspects of my identity: as a woman, an artist and art educator.

As a woman, I aim for PSYCHO-SOCIAL response by visually striking feminine consciousness in presenting data fragments on the female essence, emphasizing woman as subject, not object. I do this by synthesizing the fragments within the paintings and slide sequences as well as in the mysterious environment, created to simulate an aura of ambiguity and instability, an intrigue comparable to the conception of the feminine mystique.

As an artist, I strive to reveal my AESTHETIC response to fragmentation and synthesis in reality through the use of multi-media. My total exhibit is designed to confront the viewer and make him/her "real-ize" by supplying his/her own mental connections between the various images presented. The viewer is thus involved in the creation of his/her own "vision" around my theme.

As an art educator, I am for APPRECIATIVE response--visual and conceptual--by getting the viewer to comprehend art works through the dynamic study of the whole and its parts (details.) I have used the camera to develop audience readiness for understanding the artist's viewpoint, by cropping photographic images and sequencing them to operate with my paintings. The controlled environment is my classroom; it acts as an educational and aesthetic "massaging" medium for my message.

Renee Sandell is currently working on her Ph.D. in Art Education at The Ohio State University and is an instructor of Art and Art Education at The Ohio State University Newark Campus.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT ELECT

Sandra Packard reports: We hope to have the Position Paper ready to present to the Women's Caucus at the general business session during the convention in April. So far I have received no suggestions from the membership. This paper should reflect the views of as many of our Caucus as possible. Please, now, write down your ideas and mail them to me.

REPORT FROM THE TREASURER

Margaret Hicks reports: The current balance in the treasury, prior to this issue of THE REPORT was \$333.47.

REPORT FROM THE COORDINATOR OF PUBLICATIONS

Bette Acuff reports: The November issue of Art Education is devoted to an exploration of the roles and some of the problems of women in our profession. It contains articles by June King McFee, Cindy Nemser, Judy Loeb, Linda Bastian, Stephen Dobbs, Virginia M. Brouch and Jessie Lovano-Kerr.

SEND INFORMATION about research on women or sexism to:

Dr. Mary Rouse
Art Department
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

THE AEG EXPERIENCE: A COOPERATIVE COMMITMENT TO ART

Shirley Woodson Reid reports: In 1951, Arts Extended Group of Detroit was organized with a nucleus of artists who wished to extend their art involvement beyond formal training. Two major shows a year were held--one a spring exhibition and the other a Christmas exhibition and sale. These shows usually lasted for one weekend as the group had to rent space for the exhibitions.

Art in America takes peculiar turns as it structures itself around the racism and classism of Euro-American society. That is to say for Arts Extended, a group of Black Artists, obtaining space for exhibitions within existing gallery or showroom situations in the nineteen fifties (as well as in the nineteen seventies) was very difficult.

The group saw the need for an art gallery that would serve the existing membership as well as represent other local artists. An education program for the Black community could also be realized in a new gallery. In 1959 Arts Extended Gallery was opened.

Our art coop immediately provided for continued professional growth of its artists. Solo exhibitions were organized by the artist members and soon the stable of artists grew. Art classes for children and adults were held at the gallery. The workshops continued and annual art camp weekends and art tours to other cities became a part of our education program. We received support from our associate membership of patrons who began their art collections with works by Arts Extended Artists.

The consensus of our Black traditions, environment and visionary outlook make a manifesto unnecessary. Our commitment was to work and to encourage each other to work to produce art for our community. Our group was small, determined and consistent. The common art teaching experience we shared made community outreach a very natural activity. The group promoted a closer relationship of the arts to our lives enabling us to develop within a total art context.

In 1965 we left our out-of-the-way quarters for a busy downtown area at 1549 Broadway, Detroit, where the gallery is presently located.

Our collective efforts provided us with invaluable experience and developed our expertise in management, administration, organizational systems, exhibition installation, typography, public relations, etc. Above all Arts Extended gave us personally further insights into the Black aesthetic and Afrikan tradition. The freedom and flexibility of Arts Extended group enabled each member, never over fourteen at any given time, to pursue personal art endeavors. The unity of these artists still exists and their contribution and commitment to art for our community is invaluable.

Shirley Woodson Reid, a former member of Arts Extended, is an instructor of art at Highland Park Community College, Highland Park, Michigan and a painter who will have a solo exhibition at Howard University this year.

JESSIE LAVANO-KERR has been named Dean for Women's Affairs for the Bloomington Campus of Indiana University. Jessie had been an Associate Professor of Art Education at that university.

II

III

IV

V

VI

VII

VIII

██████████
EL ██████████
██████████
██████████

Tom