Room 13 and the Contemporary Practice of Artist-Learners

Dr. Jeff Adams

Lecturer in Art Education

Goldsmiths College, University of London

Email: j.adams@gold.ac.uk

Telephone: +44 207 9197350

Address: Department of Education, Goldsmiths College,

University of London, New Cross, London, SE14 6NW,

United Kingdom.

Room 13 is a Scottish primary school art group that is largely pupil managed, where learners have a designated 'drop in' space (room 13) with artists-in-residence, and make art that is engaged with contemporary practices. Using this example, I argue that this is an artist-teacher and artist-learner configuration that represents emerging resistance to the imposition of tightly governed curricula and regulated pedagogies. With the wider public contemporary art has acquired significantly improved status and popularity; whilst the standing of these practices and their display and dissemination continues to grow, there has not been a similar bestowing of status or even legitimacy upon the production of art in schools. Using cultural, community, and pedagogical theorists, this paper examines ways of analysing classroom art practice as the collaborative art production of artist-teachers with artist learners, and defined as a learning community of art practitioners. The features of this model of learning through contemporary art are explored, with reference to the singular methods and features of Room 13. For these practices to become more widespread, and for the radical development of art education, I argue that it is necessary to challenge institutional orthodoxies by developing new mythologies that insist upon the validity of contemporary artist-teacher/learner production.

Introduction

This discussion of the Room 13, its community of learners, contemporary art practice and collaboration, should be seen in the context of critical writing on art education that has sought to challenge entrenched and expedient orthodoxies. As such it forms part of the wider debate in the US and the UK about transitions within art education towards the broader field of visual culture (Efland et al., 1996; Hughes, 1998). Attending to the social issues raised by engaging with contemporary art through creative and imaginative learning strategies is often problematic, and the difficulty of addressing these new modes of learning has been extensively explored in critical writing on art education in recent years (Atkinson, 2002; Addison & Burgess, 2003; Dalton, 2001; Swift & Steers, 1999). A common theme is the recognition of the need to encourage more extensive learning and communication methods, of the kind that are willing to embrace social and cultural dynamics as an integral, if unresolved, component of the curriculum. In this context the young school artists that comprise Room 13 represent an important development in art education, and one that has international significance. One of the key features that facilitate its distinctive pedagogy is the contemporary nature of its art practices.

I use the capacious term 'contemporary art' to refer to art exemplified in the UK by that of the Young British Artists group (YBA) in the 1990s, and works represented in the collections of a number of high profile galleries, such as London's Tate Modern, Saatchi, and Gateshead's Baltic, all of which are dedicated to displaying recent developments in the field. These developments

constitute a revival in the popularity of contemporary art in Britain (Hopkins,

2000, pp. 237-243), reflected by similar occurrences across the developed world,

responding to such profound events as the cultural control of global capital

(Jameson, 1998), and the expansion of urban cultural and ethnic diversity. The

methods of the contemporary practices to which I refer, such as those of

conceptual and performance art, with their corresponding concern with issues of

cultural identity and the construction of subjectivity (as in the work of Sonia

Boyce or Gillian Wearing, for instance), inevitably elide the boundaries between

author, spectator, producer, and participant, and call into question individual

agency itself. This should prepare the ground for a corresponding pedagogy that

is far less didactic, driven instead by a community, collaborative production

model.

Yet this is usually not the case, with art education sometimes almost erased

from the school curriculum or in constant status flux, having to fight frequent

ideological battles against the centralised prescription of 'core' subjects. Hence

the necessity to demonstrate that the practices that are found in the classroom

may be seen as part of the wider contemporary art movement, and not merely an

obscure adjunct operating within a proscribed institutional pedagogy that often

prohibits both legitimacy and autonomy.

Of particular value to this reshaping is that of the artist-teacher idea, which

represents a significant addition to the conceptual vocabulary of art education

and the descriptive metaphors of classroom practices. As Lakoff and Johnson

(1980) have demonstrated, metaphors like this are not merely the means of

communicating ideas, but also of shaping the way in which the world is

experienced. The effect of inscribing the title artist-teacher upon professional teacher discourse, implying that the teacher is the artist, is revealed by the increasing popularity of term with practitioners (Hyde 2004). Yeomans, former president of NSEAD (National Society for Education in Art and Design), established the ground for this idea when he iterated the principal of teachers retaining their own individual artistic practice (1996, p. 244). This became one of the main principles of the UK Artist-Teacher Scheme: that teachers can improve their effectiveness as educators by maintaining and refreshing their creative activity as producers. The difficulty here is the assumption of a separation between art practice and art pedagogy: that one can still practise as an artist despite practising as a teacher. The idea of the artist-teacher is thus a problematic as well as an enabling concept. It presents a duality of practices: the artist repressed in the dominant discourse of pedagogy and institutional regulation, set up in opposition to the artist 'liberated' by external practices. Nevertheless the artist-teacher idea is a powerful one in art education, since it insists upon an idea that has its foundations in a broader field, and unites teacher with artistic practitioner within a single concept.

Room 13 and the Artist-Learner

The complementary metaphor to artist-teacher, potentially of equal importance, is that of the artist-learner. Just as the artist-teacher idea encouraged teachers to recognise the expansiveness of their professional practice (Hyde, 2004), the renaming and classifying of the learner into the field of contemporary art encourages and supports practices that are resistant to traditional orthodoxies. This is demonstrated by the advent of the semi-

autonomous, learner-managed, primary school art group Room 13, and its active engagement with contemporary practices. These artist-learners, represent an important example of an emerging resistance in art education to mechanistic and assessment-led curricula.

The community of art workers, teachers, resident artists and learners that constitute Room 13 has relevance in the US as well as the UK, despite its originally specific context of a remote Highlands' town. This international significance lies in its responsive relationship to contemporary art discourses, and in the remarkable autonomy of its learner-managed production, both of which I wish to explore in relation to the concepts of collaboration and learning communities, within the expanded field offered by contemporary art.

In their school (Caol Primary) pupils have a designated space ('room 13') where they can 'drop in' during the school day and make art, in the presence of a resident artist. Art is given a high priority, and older children may leave other lessons to participate in Room 13 activities, provided that they do not fall behind with their work. Room 13's internet presence (a pupil-designed and maintained web site) has helped overcome its geographical remoteness and enables it to maintain an extensive audience, and the project has been the beneficiary of substantial funding from both local government and national arts bodies (Crace, 2002), which has undoubtedly facilitated the diversity of its art production. This includes performance, installation, and digital animation art, supported by seminars on theory and philosophy. Room 13 has also taken on a plurality of forms, as other schools have set up their own 'Room 13s' (Souness & Fairley, 2005, p.41). The presence of artist-teachers (like long-term artist-in-residence

Rob Fairley) has not prevented the learners developing a high degree of autonomy, with pupil management and administration. As pupil Danielle Souness explains:

> We take all the decisions on everything, from when we buy soap
>
> and paint, to when we pay our teachers and how much. (Souness
>
> & Fairley, 2005, p.42.)

It is not these attributes of Room 13 that are important for my argument however, key though they may be to the group's media prominence and endurance. Their innovative ideas on pedagogy and artistic practice are my prime concern; As Souness comments: "What Room 13 does is allow us to take control of our learning" (2005, p.42.). She also offers us an account that alerts us to the centrality of identity to their practices:

> Picasso made some of the greatest works of the last century.
>
> They are beautiful and tell me a lot about what it is like to be an
>
> old man but even Picasso could never paint what it is like to be an
>
> eleven year old girl. (Souness & Fairley, 2005, p.44.)

This suggests that there is degree of awareness of the way their subjectivity as learners is constructed, and how the type of practice they are engaged in can affect this process, through a continual renegotiation of themselves as artists and learners. Important as their economic self-sufficiency and commercial activity is to the identity and character of Room 13, it is secondary to this singular feature of constantly addressing what the concepts of artist and learner mean, and what it is to occupy these subject positions. The acquisition of cultural language, and their willingness to enter into the discourse of contemporary art also

characterises Room 13. As Hughes points out, it is often where learners accept

that the material production of the work is also immersed in discourse that

distinguishes their contemporary practice from more traditional models (1998,

p.43).

To a large extent Room 13 transcends the specificity of its origins – a remote

community school experimenting with pupil authority over aspects of their

learning – by its engagement with contemporary art practices. One of its more

celebrated examples is *9/11,* youngster Jodie Fraser's work on the World Trade

Centre attacks, is a canvas comprised of burnt matches representing each of the

victims, which was exhibited at Tate Modern in London (Room13/ZCZ Films,

2004). Works like these clearly make a contribution to the global discourse: the

issue of how to represent the attacks, the critical debate on the place of works on

canvas, the value conferred on the work by its prominent media reception; all of

these issues have been aired visually and in the associated debates that

constitute Room 13 (Adams, 2004). In doing so their work illustrates a model that

fits Efland's call for middle ground between the visual culture and aesthetic

experience divide, through his concept of a 'post-formal aesthetic' in which

interpretive criticism and aesthetic criticism are frequently combined (2004,

p.249). The artistic discourse that pervades and encapsulates Room 13's

production is characterised by an acute awareness of contextual significance of

the work, in combination with its aesthetic/perceptual aspects. This is apparent in

the following description of their working practice by member Ami Cameron,

where she shifts from a formalist aesthetic reading to a contextual iconography:

Sometimes a piece of work will come from just using

stuff….Rosie's rice paintings started by using shells and food

colouring because she was interested in making a painting without

using paint. When she discovered using rice made a really

beautiful texture she became interested in it as a common food,

and all that meant; she then discovered that words like Honda and

Toyota described rice fields in Japanese…, so her paintings took

on yet a new meaning […] (Adams, 2004)

Collaboration

Room 13 participants can also be collaborators in a number of ways. Firstly

by a cascade of learning, where members teach, share and disseminate ideas

amongst the group; secondly by entering a critical discourse, whereby ideas are

visualised through responding, analyzing and reflecting upon each other's work,

and thirdly, by self-consciously welcoming ideas and concepts from the wider

field of practice: as Cameron explained:

…sometimes the best lessons are from people who come into the

class or studio; we have lots of visitors and you learn from what

they say and sometimes this can lead to an artwork. (Adams,

2004).

The collaborative artistic production of ideas in Room 13 in these senses is

that of a learning community with temporary, strategic and ad hoc collaborations

between teachers, artists, and learners. The legitimacy of such collaborative

practices has an established place within contemporary art, such as those of the

Chapmans, the Singhs, the group performances of Fluxus, or Hirschhorn's *Documenta* (2002) collaborative venture with local communities.

The key relationship in the classroom collaboration is between teacher and learner, insofar as it represents a power differential greater than others likely to be encountered within the group as a whole. Ordinarily this would be viewed as merely the unequal influence of one individual (the teacher) upon another (the learners). Whilst it is difficult to argue against the privilege and inequalities that are enshrined in this teacher-learner configuration, it should be pointed out that such equalities exist in many art practices, not least those between the patron and the commissioned artist-producer. This is how artist-in-residence Rob Fairley assessed the Room 13 working associations of adults and children:

> We are a group of artists working together, with the only difference
>
> being that one or two of us are technically (and arguably
>
> emotionally – although this is dangerous territory) more
>
> experienced. (2005, p. 49)

My use of the term collaboration does not preclude individual agency; it is rather a means of describing the context within which an idea is likely to be formed, tested, and materialised, whether it be through creation, reaction, or critical discourse. I would also suggest that a key feature of any effective collaborative practice is that its theoretical component is displayed in the form of open discourse; it is difficult to see how collaborative practice may proceed effectively if its theoretical premises are concealed from its participants (as they may be in more didactic learning contexts). For members of Room 13, the collaborative acquisition of shared and debated knowledge is a cornerstone of

their project (Adams, 2004), and resembles a dialogical pedagogical model,

whereby the power relationship is ameliorated to some extent from the traditional

hierarchical model (Addison & Burgess, 2000, adapted from Grossberg, pp. 28-

29). This resembles Desai's critical stance in relation to the role and function of

the art teacher, suggesting that classroom practice needs to accommodate 'a

critical dialogue with learners about the role of the artist in the global economy',

and question concepts such as 'artistic authority' (2002, p.319). This seems to

help to open up some of the key issues that determine what the collaborative

practice of artist-learners and artist teachers might be.

　　　To maintain the concepts of individual agency and authenticity, traditionally

central to classroom art practices and assessment, one is forced to call upon

dubious historical precedents, such as the professional status of the artist, the

supremacy of individual agency, patronage, the requirement of a specialist

audience, or the validation by the expert or the 'connoisseur'. Claims that any of

these are natural prerequisites to define and legitimise art practices (as opposed

to being promoted by hegemonic groups) have been questioned and critiqued

often (Williams, 1990; Bourdieu, 1993; Dalton, 2001). Krauss (1986), to pick just

one seminal example, questioned both individual agency and originality as

prerequisites or conditions for an art practice. Discrediting these formerly

cherished notions, her discussion of Rodin's cast sculptures, with their multiple

reproduction and the collaborative nature of the casting process, demonstrates

erosions of individual agency and authenticity at a time when the authority of the

artist was thought to be sacrosanct (pp. 151-170).

Room 13's relationship to its artists in residence, teachers, guests and other contributors and their sophisticated patterns of integrated, collaborative critical production are more aligned with contemporary global art production practices those commonly found in schools.

Communities of Practice

Room 13 may be compared to the government-sponsored Nicaraguan children's mural projects during the nineteen eighties and nineties. In both cases the seriousness and scale of the enterprise was well understood by the children, who responded to the challenge of the projects by greatly increased production. This was facilitated, again in both examples, by the practice of 'open enrolment' (Hopewell & Pavone, 1999, p. 39). This is an important pedagogical structure, in the context of extreme poverty and homelessness (Nicaragua) or a compulsory timetabled schooling (Scotland). The children in both cases were allowed to conditionally 'drop-in' to the art projects as it suited their desire to participate in the work. The resulting transient and temporal alliances that form daily between the artist-learners have profound implications for pedagogy and the reproduction of knowledge within these learning communities. As Hopewell and Pavone explain:

> […] in any given group there will be children who may have only
> been coming to the workshop for a few weeks, painting alongside
> children who may have been coming for several years. This
> makes for very different levels of experience and mastery of
> materials and techniques within the group and therefore produces
> cross learning situations. The more 'advanced' children transmit

their knowledge, either by their example or by directly answering

other children's questions and in turn, are constantly influenced by

the enthusiasm and discoveries of the new kids. (p. 40).

These social learning communities have discrete epistemological structures

that allow for the dissemination of knowledge and for the reproduction of the

community as a learning unit over time. Structures such as these have been

analysed by Lave and Wenger through their concept of communities of practice

(1991, pp. 29-43). They developed their model of 'legitimate peripheral

participation' by analysing learning apprenticeships, from which they defined

communities of practice as modes of learning that occur beyond formal

institutions such as school and college:

A community of practice is an intrinsic condition for the existence

of knowledge, not least because it provides the interpretive

support necessary for making sense of its heritage. Thus,

participation in the cultural practice in which any knowledge exists

is an epistemological principle of learning. (p. 98)

The community of practice is, for Lave and Wenger, a model that enables a

description of learning-communities that are bound together primarily by the

transference and inculcation of knowledge. A key factor in their analysis is

epistemological reproduction, whereby the cycle of the learning community is

completed and the novices attain competence and acquire apprentices of their

own (pp. 98-99). The distinction that Lave and Wenger draw between learning

within the school institution and the learning communities beyond it is crucial

here. They argue (pp.99-100) (using the case of physics), that the community of

practice that is reproduced through the process of studying at school:

> […] is not the community of physicists but the community of
>
> schooled adults. Children are introduced into the latter community
>
> (and its humble relation with the former community) during their
>
> school years. The reproduction cycles of the physicists'
>
> community start much later, possibly only in graduate school […].
>
> (p.100).

Lave and Wenger claim that learning is so fundamentally bound up with

communities of practice that schools' learning environments can only be

facsimiles of learning communities and therefore, in epistemological terms,

cannot reproduce themselves other than as 'schooled adults'. The learning

community that is reproduced in the art classroom need not, however, be that of

merely 'schooled adults'. Within Room 13's transformed pedagogical structure, it

seems that there are good reasons to describe the community that is reproduced

as one of art practitioners, as well as one of schooled-adults. The evidence for

this is to be found in both pedagogy and production – the way that the material

and theoretical production of the artist-learner and teacher serves as a means of

acquiring new insights and expertise – and also in the capability of the learner-

producers to instruct through their acquired competence. This capacity for the

learners to teach their 'apprentices' is a feature of Room 13, as Cameron

explained, when questioned about the process of learning from peers:

> As I am writing this Rosie is teaching [class] P3…. the best
>
> example of one of us teaching younger ones is Danielle (who

works almost totally in words and digital images) showing one of

the younger ones in [class] P4 that cutting and pasting in

Photoshop was just the same as making a collage […] (Adams,

2004).

The new critical pedagogy that occurs, through new productions and

performances, means that 'instruct' need not entail the orthodox method of verbal

didacticism. In the classroom art studio this may be accomplished by the critical

reception of work through observation, experience, and reproduction. I am

thinking here of Greenberg's (1965) idea of self-criticism, which, despite his

application of the term to defend Modernist painting, is nonetheless appropriate

because of his insistence on a critical discourse embedded in practice (p. 9).

Applied to collaborative production, this critical discourse becomes the means by

which the productive activity – at once theoretical and practical – is organised

and modified. As Hopewell and Pavone articulated when describing the concept

of collective work:

> […] Real collectivity implies a qualitatively different level of
>
> consciousness in terms of a commitment to a jointly produced
>
> work. (1999, p. 59)

This is a key idea in the discourse of the collaborative art production, and a

marker of actual critical/creative exchange, as opposed to the passive reception

of received knowledge.

A community of contemporary art practice may be said to be reproduced

within the school classroom once the ownership of ideas is collaborative, and the

status of new ideas is valued within the pedagogical process. If the exploration of

a concept by the learners is forced into a secondary level, relative to the initiation

and development of the idea by the teacher, then the community fails to

reproduce as one of practitioners, and we are left with a community of schooled

learners again. The Room 13 community of artist learners and teachers is

effectively reproducing itself as contemporary art practitioners, and symbolic

boundaries are sufficiently weakened to allow its entry into the cultural arena of

contemporary art. Events like Room 13's exhibition at London's Tate Modern

(Room 13/ZCZ Films, 2004) provide a means of calibrating this symbolic

transgression of boundaries.

Symbolic Value

The school institutional context can be a major problem for the unfettered

and radical development of classroom practice of the kind proposed here. This is

illustrated by Dalton (2001) in her critical analysis of art education in the UK

school context:

> [Art teachers] have the executive role of carrying out and
>
> 'managing' the delivery of curricula that have been written and
>
> structured centrally, by unknown others, 'elsewhere'. (p. 123.)

Steers (2003) makes a similar analysis by using the metaphor of the teacher-

proof curriculum (p. 22), whereby government and their administrative bodies

attempt to wrest control from classroom practitioners. The idea of fostering a

learning community of artist-teachers and learners in such a highly regulated

environment seems slim. These critiques provide a picture of a pernicious cycle

of deterioration for the status of classroom art practices, highly compromised by

the imposition of the teacher in the 'service' model (Dalton, 2001).

Another way of analysing value in school art is established in Bourdieu's (2003) work on the field of art production. He draws attention to the importance of belief on the value of the work (p.37), and, significantly for the artist-teacher/learner concept, he argues that one of the key questions in the designation and definition of cultural production is the struggle for:

> […] the monopoly of the power to say with authority who are
>
> authorised to call themselves writers; or, to put it another way, it is
>
> the monopoly of the power to consecrate producers or products
>
> […]. (p. 42)

In the case of the artist-teacher/learner the 'consecration' of practices hitherto recognised as exclusively pedagogic may be achieved by the attribution of the concept 'collaborative contemporary art', thereby increasing its symbolic value. In Bourdieu's terms the Room 13 construction of teacher and learner may be seen as fundamental to conceptions about their function and value, in that it resists classification as an interior pedagogic practice divorced from the art practices that are external to the school institution.

Bernstein's analysis (2000) of framing, classification, and boundaries that govern the social relations in the school institution suggests the more an epistemological area like school art is 'insulated' against others the more strongly classified it becomes, and the greater its integrity as a discrete entity (2000, p. 6-9). Applying his model, the conceptual task here is to weaken the well 'insulated' boundary between classroom art production and the cultural field of contemporary art practice, to allow its strategic entry into this wider community, dismantling the institutional blockade that imprisons and maintains much

classroom art practice in a devalued state. Room 13 represents a powerful example of this dismantling, and in this sense the learner-manager aspect of Room 13 acquires symbolic significance.

Conclusion

Admission of pedagogic art practice into the field of contemporary art has therefore to be accomplished primarily through developing new mythologies that insist upon the validity of artist-teacher/learner production, even within the tightly regulated institutional environment, much as Room 13 has been able to transcend the ideology that renders so much classroom art anodyne. Williams rightly identified the issue of value as one of the major difficulties in this area, affecting art practices that occur outside of the still powerful categories of the individual or the validating force of the art institution (1981, p. 318). He argues that the individual celebrated for practising the unorthodox has been highly valued in the mythology of the avant-garde (p.318). In this same system of values teacher and learner practices are relegated to cultural categories like 'school art', in the pejorative sense. Room 13's production offers some resistance to this in that they establish a new set of values within school art; this is achieved in part by the combination of the specific physicality of the site and space of production, the 'Room' metaphor, with the intellectual discourse of global contemporary art is now also signified by 'Room 13'.

It matters that this practice is acknowledged, legitimated and valued, since it forms part of the wider debate upon who has the authority to speak as 'the artist', and how this power is conferred. Taken as an example of reclamation of some of this lost authority, the collaborative practice of the artist-teacher and artist-learner

does acquire additional significance. The way that collaboration, open theorising, and critical discourse are features of Room 13 is one particularly significant aspect of the artist-learner formation. Strategies like these represent resistance to the imposition of the instrumentalist and formulaic pedagogic models that so effectively replicate social inequalities. This resistance may be found in the procedures of Room 13's emerging contemporary practice.

References

Adams, J. (2004). Interview with Ami Cameron, managing director of Room 13, 17 May, 2004. (Interview by email, unpublished.)

Adams, J. (2003). The Artist-Teacher Scheme as Postgraduate Professional Development in Higher Education. *International Journal of Art and Design Education 22*(2), 183-194.

Addison, N. & Burgess, L. (Eds.). (2003). *Issues in Art and Design Teaching*. London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Addison, N. & Burgess, L. (2000). Contemporary Art in Schools: Why Bother? In Rickman, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Art Education 11-18: Meaning Purpose and Direction*. London and New York: Continuum.

Atkinson, D & Dash, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Social and Critical Practices in Art Education*. Stoke on Trent, UK, and Sterling, USA: Trentham.

Atkinson, D. (2003). Forming Teaching Identities in Initial Teacher Education. In Addison N. & Burgess L. (Eds.). (2003). *Issues in Art and Design Teaching*, (pp.188-198). London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Atkinson, D. (2002). *Art in Education: Identity and Practice.* Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique.* Maryland USA and Oxford, UK: Rowman and Littlefield. (Originally published 1996).

Bourdieu, P. (2003). *The Field of Cultural Production.* Oxford: Polity Press. Edited and introduced by Randel Johnson. (Originally published in 1993).

Crace, J. (2002). Living Colour. *Guardian* Newspaper. London: 18th June.

Dalton, P. (2001). *The Gendering of Art Education: Modernism, Identity and Critical Feminism.* Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Desai, D. (2002). The Ethnographic Move in Contemporary Art. *Studies in Art Education. 43*(4), 307-323.

Efland, A. (2004). The Entwined Nature of the Aesthetic: A Discourse on Visual Culture. *Studies in Art Education. 45*(3), 234-251.

Efland, A., Freedman, K. & Stuhr, P. (1996). *Postmodern Art Education: An Approach to Curriculum* Virginia: The National Art Education Association.

Greenberg, C. (1965). Modernist Painting. In Frascina, F. & Harrison C. (1988) *Modern Art and Modernism: A Critical Anthology*, (pp.5-10). London: Open University Press.

Hopewell, D. & Pavone, J. (1999). *The Children's Mural Workshops*. Managua, Nicaragua: Esteli.

Hopkins, D. (2000). *After Modern Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hughes, A. (1998). Re-conceptualising the Art Curriculum. *Journal of Art and Design Education*, *17*(1), 41-49.

Hyde, W. (2004). The Impact of the Artist Teacher Scheme on the Teaching of Art and on the Continuing Professional Development of Art and Design Teachers. DES Best Practice web site. At: http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/professionaldevelopment/opportunities/bprs (accessed 28 May 2004).

Jameson, Fredric (1998) *The Cultural Turn: selected Writings on the Postmodern 1983-1998.* London: Verso.

Kruass, R. (1986). *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and other Modernist Myths Cambridge.* Massachusetts/London: The MIT Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Room 13. (2004)*.* Caol Primary School, Fort William, Scotland: http://room13scotland.com (accessed 23.4.04).

Room13/ZCZ Films for Channel 4. (2004). *What Age Can You Start Being An Artist?* UK: Channel 4 Television. January 2004.

Steers, J. (2003) Art and Design Education in the UK: The Theory Gap. In Addison N. & Burgess L. (Eds.) (2003). *Issues in Art and Design Teaching*, (pp.19-30). London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Souness, D. & Fairley, R. (2000) Room 13. In Atkinson, D & Dash, P (Eds.). (2005). *Social and Critical Practices in Art Education*. (pp. 41-50). Stoke on Trent, UK, and Sterling, USA: Trentham.

Swift, J. & Steers, J. (1999). A Manifesto for Art in Schools. In *Directions*, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, *18*(1), 7-14.

Williams, R. (1981). The Works of Art Themselves?. In Frascina, F., & Harris, J. (1992). *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts,* (pp. 315-318). London: Open University Press and Phaidon.

Williams, R. (1990). *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists* London: Verso.

Yeomans, M. (1996). Creativity in Art and Science: A Personal View. *Journal of Art and Design Education*, *15*(3), 241-250.