

## The Development of a Professional Association of Art Teachers

### The struggle to achieve professional identity and status.

Derek Hanson

*Middleton St. George College of Education, Co. Durham.*

During recent years, there has been an increase in the number of publications devoted to the development of art education<sup>1</sup>, but in these studies, little attention has been given to the part played by teacher organisations. Stuart Macdonald, for example, spares only a few lines for the National Society for Art Education<sup>2</sup>. In this article (which may be read as a sequel to the previously published study of the art master in the nineteenth century<sup>3</sup>) the development of the Society of Art Masters – later the National Society of Art Masters and eventually the National Society of Art Education – is examined.

T. H. S. Escott, writing nearly a century ago, stated:

“The professions in England are valued according to their stability, their remunerativeness, their influence, and their recognition by the state; i.e. their respectability”.<sup>4</sup>

Although ‘artist’ is included in the 1881 census’ list of professions, Reader has pointed out that this particular category was seen as unreliable, as many within it could be set no formal academic qualifications, and artists as a class were low in public estimation<sup>5</sup> they were not altogether ‘respectable’.

The Art Master, anxious about his status, was therefore unlikely to wish to identify himself with the independent artist. He could at least boast that he held paper qualifications, for he would normally possess the Art Master’s Certificate (3rd Grade) of the Department of Science and Art. Drawing, however, was seen as either a technical skill or as an accomplishment, and neither of these gave it the status of an intellectual activity, but the Art Master, by regulation if not altogether in practice, was teaching artisans of inferior social status to his own, so this was some compensation. It was in this capacity that the Department of Science and Art viewed them as instructors, and not as artists, but among the art masters, there was some ambivalence as to their proper self image.

The founder members of the Society of Art Masters did not demonstrate any indecision publicly. They identified themselves fully with the Department. The first objects of the Society, agreed at the inaugural meeting in 1888, were defined as “To further the interests of Art Education, the Schools of Art and Art Masters” and its first ‘professional’ task was seen as the need to obtain recognition from the D.S.A. in the hope that as a consequence, the Society may improve the lot of its members to the eventual betterment of the schools and the services offered. Mr. E. R. Taylor, Head of Birmingham School of Art and author of *Elementary Art Teaching*, who was the convenor of the first meeting, did state that

"the most important object in the long term, was best served by articles on methods of teaching, on some of the more important subjects taught, on foreign systems of art education and the variations in our own system,"

but whilst such sentiments were well received, the implementation of the principles contained within them was not given urgent priority.

It is no easy task for a voluntary association to transform itself into a professional body, and the Society of Art Masters soon encountered the problem of establishing its credentials with the officers in charge of the Department of Science and Art. Seven resolutions were passed at the inaugural meeting of the Society, and of these six were directed at the Department. Most made reference to payment by results, the inspectorate and registration, and required attention from the administrators. After two years had passed by, the secretary of the Society reported that no satisfaction had been obtained, and further enquiries had resulted in Donnelly responding with the threat that if further similar representations were made, the D.S.A. officers who had previously consented to become honorary members of the Society of Art Masters would immediately sever their links with the Society.

This response acted as a dampener of the more ardent and militant members of the Society of Art Masters, and led to a more diplomatic type of leadership. Mildly critical resolutions were rephrased, and often prefaced with tributes to 'the great Department' or 'the gentlemanly bearing' of inspectors. In 1892, a Council member expressed the hope that the Society (at this time numbering 120 Art Masters, or about half the principals able to become members)

"would not pose before the Department as a grumbling Society which the Department could hold up to ridicule in the House of Commons".

In view of the defensive power of the officials, the Society was obliged to consider some means of outflanking the opposition. As has been mentioned, it had been hoped that the disbursement of honorary memberships to several 'worthy and eminent gentlemen' would lead to recognition by the Department. Whilst this had not brought about the desired results, it was considered that this may have been due to the persons selected rather than any fault in the policy. If D.S.A. officers and minor titled gentry were insufficient, then some more eminent person must be secured. F. M. L. Thompson has suggested that a Royal Charter can convert a minor or unofficial collection of individuals into a pillar of society exercising moral authority over its members,<sup>6</sup> and whilst this was beyond the reach of the S.A.M. in the 1890's, the next best alternative was secured. In 1898, a Council member, Mr. East, Art Master, Freemason and later Mayor of Dover, proposed that 'a gentleman of high position' should be appointed as Patron and thus enable the Society to obtain a Royal Charter. Shortly afterwards, it was announced that H.R.H. the Prince of Wales had acceded to the Prayer of Petition and had accepted the position of Honorary President. While the Charter was never obtained, the association of a member of the royal family was as valuable to the Society at the turn of the century as it appears to be seventy years later when Universities seek chancellors.

It was not until after the second world war that the Society was assured that full recognition had been granted, when the Ministry of Education officially regarded it as



## representing Art teachers in general, further, and higher education.

The need for recognition by the Department of Science and Art, and later the Board and Ministry of Education, was closely related to the amount of recognition granted by the art specialists who the Society claimed to represent. The Society of Art Masters, as a 'subject based association',<sup>7</sup> suffered from a number of difficulties, for the potential membership was spread thinly over a variety of educational institutions; although in the early years, the only persons who properly qualified were those in charge of art schools. The process through which the Society came to accept as members teachers in general education who had lower qualifications provides an interesting illustration of the internal strains which develop within a numerically weak organisation existing in competition with stronger associations. The Society of Art Masters found itself having to balance the need for a larger membership against the desire to maintain high entrance qualifications. During the final decades of the nineteenth century, the problem was not so acute, as teachers in elementary schools were rarely art specialists, and in any event were regarded as a separate and inferior race, possessing, at best the despised 'D' certificate of the Board of Education. The development of the new secondary schools in the first part of the twentieth century, however, resulted in the appearance of a higher status group of art teachers. Many of these were women, and a considerable number were joining the recently formed Art Teachers' Guild. In this changed situation, the National Society of Art Masters was pressured into lowering entrance standards to incorporate this growing class of teachers to increase its own strength and to combat the growth of a potential rival. The Society has never been able to claim the allegiance of the majority of art specialists, although in recent years it has claimed that 90% of art school principals and about 50% of other teachers have been associated with it.

The Society was aided in its bid to attract members when it obtained the right to award academic dress. Originally, certification was in the hands of the D.S.A. and later the Board or Ministry of Education, but the Council of S.A.M. was anxious that extra symbols of status and professional respectability should be obtained — namely academic dress and initials to place after one's name. It was decided that the Fellowship of the Society (F.S.A.M.) should be awarded to members who produced evidence of their artistic competence and ability to pay a fee. Later, the ability to prepare a dissertation upon an acceptable theme was made compulsory. In 1907, when the project was introduced, nine Fellowships were granted, but several Council members had few illusions about the worth of the award. A Mr. Fisher stated

"We know the initials are a sham, but they carry weight with non-intellectual bodies" (he was referring to L.E.A.'s and governing bodies)

Another member justified the system by stating that if Art Masters were seen at Prize Distributions, "parading in robes like University men", membership would increase. As the Society was unable to obtain Incorporation, it could not award gowns or hoods, so during the inter-war years there was continued pressure upon the Board of Education to allow the use of 'academic symbols' by art specialists. Full support was given to the Registration Council (later the Royal Society of Teachers) in its plan to win the right to supply and to permit non graduates the right to academic dress.

After the second world war, the Ministry of Education conceded the right for holders of the Ministry's A.T.D. and N.D.D. qualifications to use those initials, and art teachers possessing the Art Teacher's Diploma were able to obtain, through the medium of the N.S.A.E., the long awaited gown and hood. In 1950, the treasurer of the Society commented that this last mentioned reform had resulted in increased membership and a most beneficial improvement in the finances of the N.S.A.E.. Such changes did not affect the continuance of the Fellowship of the Society, but in 1960, the view was expressed that it was felt inappropriate for the Society to offer what may be regarded as an academic qualification, and so the granting of a Diploma in Art Education was discontinued.

It will be seen, therefore, that certain of the educational functions stressed by Mr. Taylor in 1888 did come to form a part of the Society's activities, but the *educational* content was not conspicuous as the main element. Whilst there were, from time to time, verbal testimonies about the intrinsic worth of the awards, their economic purpose was certainly the main reason for their continuation. Even the F.S.A.M. was more of a source of income for the Society and means of obtaining some dubious status for the holders than an instrument for stimulating important research into the wider field of art in education, yet through the award of the Fellowship, the Society could have identified itself with the new approaches into art teaching which were reaching elementary schools during the early decades of this century. How it was that the Society failed in this respect is shown below.

Art masters did not lack experience in administering examinations for the Department of Science and Art. It was the custom of the Department to appoint outside superintendents in order to ensure the proper conduct of examinations in the schools. There were many complaints about these lay people in the art rooms. In 1895, the secretary of the Society described some as 'dockyard men'. Two years later, one was reported to have cancelled the work of a student who he had observed measuring proportions by using a knitting needle instead of a pencil, and another gained notoriety by refusing to allow students to turn their sheets of drawing paper 'on account of the noise obtained'. Most criticisms were thus directed at defects in the organisation than at the content of the syllabus. Objections to payment by results were based upon traditional hostility to the merger of Science and Art Departments which was seen as a contributory factor to the 'crippling breaking down of the distinctive character of the School of Art', and the Society proposed that the *necessary* reform should be that grants should be determined after results had been declared so that the two may be kept separate. The system of payment by results continued to be operated by the D.S.A. after it had been abandoned by the Board of Education, and its end coincided with the replacement of the military by civilian administrators.

Another instance of the way the Society took greater account of the internal political considerations than the educational values inherent in certain issues can be observed in the matter of Geometric Drawing. This subject was normally an important part of the curriculum for students preparing for D.S.A. examinations, but in 1889, the subject was transferred from Art to Science. As a consequence, Science classes showed an increase,



more Science Examinations were passed, and so more grants went to Science, to the disadvantage of Art. What made the pill even harder to swallow was a statement from General Donnelly that all students intending to gain the Art Master's Certificate must sit for a Science Certificate in Geometric Drawing. The Society of Art Masters reacted predictably with instant protests, and then went on to produce its own Geometry syllabus for use in Art Schools. This was almost identical with the official D.S.A. syllabus and contained no important modifications. When this was presented to General Donnelly, he told the Society that he would have no objections to Art Masters using the S.A.M. syllabus, but he pointed out that they would receive no grants if they did. To rub salt in the wound, he stated that since Geometric Drawing had been transferred to Science classes, examination results had been excellent, and the N.U.T. had given the reform their full support. The debate ended eventually when the Board of Education, without any advice from the S.A.M., decided that the educational value of Geometric Drawing was insufficient to justify its place in the syllabus.

The Society of Art Masters carried on a long correspondence with the Department and later the Board of Education about the administration of the National Competition. This was organised by the D.S.A. each year, and during the 1880's over 350,000 drawings from the Art Schools would arrive at South Kensington for assessment. (in 1877 the total was double this amount and the volume of work was so great that the officials had to admit defeat and modify the rules in order to reduce the number of entries). Members of the Society were concerned about the method of judging the works. One suggestion was that the papers were sent up into the air and those that landed face upwards passed the standard, but General Donnelly refused to give any information about how the work was assessed and firmly opposed a request that all marks should be published on the grounds that this would cause expense, delay the announcement of results and 'entail endless controversy and correspondence'. The Society then appointed a neutral assessor who promised to judge any work sent to him by Art Masters which in their view had been unjustly failed by the Department, but he was not kept very busy, and in most cases submitted, supported the decisions of the D.S.A. It seems evident that the standard of much of the work cannot have been high, for in 1910, by which time it was considered that the method of assessing had improved, 72% of the drawings were classified as below the standard expected for *submission*, and so were not even regarded as worthy of consideration for the grant. Some Masters reported that they collected more in fines for the submission of poor work than they received in grants, seemingly implying this to be due to some fault at South Kensington rather than a reflection of their own teaching.

For all its criticisms of the National Competition, the Society was anxious above all that it should not be abandoned — mindful, perhaps, that Art Masters as well as students could submit work and win prizes. When the Competition came to an end in 1916, it did so as a casualty of wartime economics. By this time, it had few friends outside N.S.A.M. and one observer had described it as

"The great ingathering of cabbages ..... the masters working by machine power supplied by the South Kensington Boiler Department, turning out drawings like sausages, according to pattern."<sup>8</sup>

Notwithstanding criticisms from outside, and unaffected by the obvious relief displayed by the Board of Education when the Competition had been ended, the Society renewed its plea for it to be restarted after the war, and in 1926, the Board of Education passed the baby to the Royal Society of Arts, but the Society was not prepared to accept this body as having any connection with the Art Schools and so in 1931, when the Competition caused a financial loss of £500, it was terminated and no tears were shed. The Board of Education had declared opposition to the idea of centralised examinations in circulars 786 and 798 in 1912, claiming that they took away the individuality of the teacher. Favour seemed to be given to some form of internally set and assessed examinations, but the Council of the N.S.A.M. voiced strong opposition to such notions, seeing the status of the Art Master – such as it was – as being based upon the official and national administration of art examinations. It is interesting to note that Art examinations were conducted by the Ministry of Education until 1957, by which time they had been for many years the only awards made by the central government agency for education.

When the Society determined to set up an Examination Board; with the declared purpose of 'raising the Society in the estimation of the public', the past experiences of the masters of payment by results and the arbitrary and mechanical syllabi of the D.S.A. were ill-suited to incline them in favour of adopting more progressive and liberal approaches when they had the power to do so, particularly when the matter was inextricably bound up with status and recognition. In any event, the circumstances under which the Examination Board was given birth were anything but auspicious, for it was intended that the Society should occupy territory abandoned by the Board of Education when it relinquished control over certain examinations for pupils in general education. Whilst some Society members, such as Mr. Hatton, of Kings College, Newcastle upon Tyne, felt less than enthusiastic about the N.S.A.M. continuing an examination system 'from which the Board had liberated many students', the majority were of the opinion that if the Society went in to fill the gap, it would prevent other bodies from doing so. One Council member was quite explicit in justifying the action by declaring that if the Society was in control of art examinations in general education, it would ensure that certain new-fangled ideas could not be introduced; this tactic being to the obvious advantage of those who had as their bread and butter the traditional drawing exercises.

In 1906, the Secondary Schools Art Examination syllabus was sent to 2,000 secondary schools, but after ten years, only thirty of these schools had registered to take the examination, and even in the peak year, 1932, only seventy-seven schools participated. The syllabus was based upon drawing skills and was of a most formal nature, and changed little over the years. In 1940, a revised and slightly more imaginative syllabus was created and new examiners appointed, but such moderate reforms came too late, and in 1946 an officer of the Society described the examinations as 'obsolete in form and taken only by schools of not very high standing.' Two years later they were abolished, it being reported that little financial advantage was then accruing to the Society. It is plain that the N.S.A.M. paper, competing in later years with the Art papers set by University Matriculation Boards, suffered from unofficial status and did not offer a radical



alternative to schools who felt that the University papers were unimaginative and too traditional.

The Society's Examination Board became involved also in preparing papers for art teachers as well as for pupils in schools. If the Secondary Schools Art Examination suffered from the circumstances surrounding its birth, the same cannot be said of the course designed to serve students preparing to teach in secondary schools' art departments. At the end of the first decade of this century, a number of women art teachers in secondary schools formed what constituted a ginger group within the Society, and they pressed for the Society, in conjunction with the Art Teachers' Guild (of which more below) and the Association of Headmistresses to agree upon some form of standardised examination designed to serve the needs of students intending to be art specialists. In 1906, these women members had called for Art Schools to include in all teacher training courses, instruction about psychology, physiology and the science of education, and to give greater emphasis to teaching practice in schools. They urged that such training should be of at least three years' duration and that students should have reached a minimum age of 17 before being admitted. Whilst these views were received politely, the Society did not seem to attach much importance to them, and when the plan to join with the other bodies in promoting an examination was put to the Art Teachers' Guild and the Headmistresses, these two did not find the conservative proposals of the N.S.A.M. to their liking and they declined to take part. In the end, and after the first world war, the Oxford Delegacy agreed to take responsibility for such an examination and to co-operate with the three teachers' bodies in providing a 'graduate equivalent' qualification to students who followed a three year course and a further year's teacher training. The Board of Education, responsible for its own Art Teachers Certificate courses in certain Teacher Training Departments established in Art Schools under Rules 109, judged the Oxford Certificate as inferior to, and an unnecessary duplication of, its own. In 1935, when the Board claimed that there was an over-production of Art teachers, the Council of N.S.A.M., feeling its interests lay with the Board rather than with the quarter share on the Oxford course, considered this a suitable opportunity to advise Oxford to end the award. The A.T.G., the Headmistresses and some individual members of N.S.A.M. protested hotly that the Oxford award was superior to that of the Board insofar as it was designed for secondary school teachers specifically, whereas the Board's A.T.C. was oriented to students intending to teach in art schools and lacked the wider educational content of the other qualification. In the event, the Oxford Delegacy continued to provide the qualification until 1941 when numbers dropped to twenty four and wartime conditions added to the difficulties of continuing the system.

An examination for teachers in which the Society had complete control was that which led to the award by the Society of a certificate for teachers in elementary schools who wished to have some paper qualification for teaching art. The Board of Education opposed such an award on the grounds that the needs of such teachers were catered for by the Training Colleges, and in any case, the Board was not in favour of the certification of teachers by teachers' organisations. Predictable opposition was also voiced by the Union of Lancashire and Cheshire Institutes and other regional examination bodies, but

the Society was not deterred by any of these and went ahead with its plan to produce a syllabus for the School Drawing Certificate, designed to provide practicing elementary school teachers with further qualifications. In 1914, 126 candidates sat for 1,914 papers in various art subjects, and numbers rose until 1932 when over 700 candidates took the examinations in 135 different centres. By this time, holders of the School Drawing Certificate were able to progress to the Further S.D.C., and in view of the demand, a Handicrafts Certificate was introduced in 1929. Students desirous of possessing this could take written papers to test their competence in leatherwork, embroidery, writing and illuminating, lettering and signwriting, and bookbinding. Of these, the first two proved most popular (and profitable in terms of fees paid by candidates).

Some members of the Society found it hard to understand why a professional association which had declared the need to insist upon high entrance qualifications should be busily engaged in providing elementary school teachers with a certificate which had no official status and yet appeared to 'qualify' such teachers as art specialists. One District Committee of N.S.A.M. complained 'By our examinations, we are distributing tickets of proficiency to the elementary trained teacher.' In 1937 the North-East District Committee described the syllabus as 'out of date and containing subjects no longer taught' but notwithstanding such criticisms, the examinations continued until 1948 by which time it was accepted that negligible income rather than deficiency in educational content was the ground for abandoning the examinations.

In all these matters, and on such occasions as when the Society produced evidence for Government committees (for instance for the Prime Minister's Reconstruction Committee in 1917) a protective line was taken regarding the existing activities of Art Masters, and the need to strengthen the finances of the Society was often the cause of some 'unprofessional' activities. Emphasis upon Drawing was paramount, but the development of the creative faculties was largely ignored. This bias was all the more regrettable in view of the fact that important developments in art teaching in England date back to the time the Society of Art Masters was founded, and were there to be seen by those who wanted to see. T. R. Ablett was appointed Inspector to the London School Board in 1882, and in the year S.A.M. was born, he founded the Royal Drawing Society to further his educational aims and to loosen the hold the Art Schools had over the teaching of Drawing in elementary schools. The Royal Drawing Society conducted examinations which contained innovations such as 'snapshot' drawing, and encouraged the use of colour. Ablett was interested in child development and commended a visual approach to learning in spelling, arithmetic and writing. Another L.C.C. Inspector, P. B. Ballard favoured Montessori methods and in 1912 and 1913 published studies of "*What Children Like To Draw*". Gatterson-Smith, Head of Birmingham School of Art from 1908 to 1920 introduced memory drawing and 'shift eye' drawing in Birmingham Schools. One of his students, Marion Richardson, who later became a Lecturer in the London Training College in 1924 and an L.C.C. Inspector under R. R. Tomlinson from 1930, was impressed by paintings seen in one of the exhibitions of work done by children working under the direction of Professor Cizek, and helped by Roger Fry, publicised the importance of imaginative work, 'mind pictures' and free pattern and colour work. When



one realises that the first Cizek exhibition was on view in London in 1908, and his views about expression work and the evils of compulsion and copying became familiar soon afterwards, and the Board of Education Circular of 1911 *'The Teaching of Drawing'* emphasised that children's needs should have precedence over the development of mechanical skills, the educational activities of the National Society of Art Masters seem to have existed in isolation from the revolution taking place. The 1927 edition of *'Suggestions for Teachers'* contained reference to the need to allow spontaneity in expression work, but the N.S.A.M. examination syllabus did not allow opportunity for this quality to flower or even show itself.

Many progressive teachers joined the Art Teachers' Guild, seeing in it a more appropriate vehicle for furthering their educational objectives. The Guild was formed from women teachers in the London area in 1901. Later, men were admitted and membership rose to over 700, for whom a journal *'The Record'* was published. Regular conferences were held, and a register of qualified teachers in secondary schools was maintained. In 1941, it combined with the four-year-old New Society of Art Teachers to form the Society for Education In Art (renamed the Society of Education Through Art in 1952). *'The Record'* became *'Athene'* in 1939 and Sir Herbert Read's book *"Education Through Art"*<sup>9</sup> provided later an accepted ideology for members who stressed in their approach to teaching the development of the personality through imaginative experiences. The S.E.A. cannot properly be regarded as a professional association of teachers, however, for membership is open to all sympathetic and interested persons. Since the second world war there has been some liaison between the N.S.A.E. and the S.E.A., but the affiliation of the S.E.A. to the N.U.T. in 1948 was not seen as a friendly act by the N.S.A.E. The existence of the Art Teachers' Guild did serve as a rallying point for disaffected N.S.A.M. members who found the older body unresponsive to new trends in art education and over-protective in regard to the autonomy, status and curriculum of art schools. Had the N.S.A.M. allowed separate sections for teachers in secondary schools or in general education at an earlier date, it may have been possible to retain the membership and make fuller use of the talents of the female ginger group which made itself known over a period of a few years before 1914.

The Society, of course, has always demonstrated its anxiety to increase the status of its members, but it has seen the way to achieve through supporting the raising of academic standards of entry to full-time Diploma courses and the raising of the graduate equivalent N.D.D. and A.T.D. and the degree equivalent Dip.A.D. As a result, art masters have obtained symbols of academic respectability and higher salaries. The Society has not regarded approval of, and identification with, the views of innovators as an appropriate means of raising the status of members, but since full recognition was granted by the Ministry of Education, the N.S.A.E. has devoted more of its energies and interests to educational matters, as may be noted by the contents of the *'Journal'* and the transformation of the Annual General Meeting into an Annual Conference based upon some general educational theme. This process would seem to be similar to that outlined by Vollmer and Mills<sup>10</sup> in the 'bootstraps hypothesis' by which as a profession gains recognition, it then works to raise the economic status and security of its members, and

these in turn help to ensure that a higher standard of entrants into the profession is determined and research into the subject matter which concerns members is then promoted. In consequence, the occupation is seen as a profession by those outside as well as those inside it, and the services it offers to the community are improved. It need come as no surprise, therefore, that the N.S.A.E. today should display little sympathy for the demands from radicals that 'O' and 'A' level entry qualifications for Dip.A.D. courses should be removed and the courses restructured to be less academic.<sup>11</sup>

On March 14th, 1934, Mr. William Gaunt was delivering a lecture to the Royal Society of Arts. He said

"Art schools seem to me to be sunk in the stagnant waters of tradition, and strangled in the intricacies of decayed academicism."

At about the same time, the N.S.A.M. 'Journal' carried an editorial comment

"Mr. Henry Moore's work is a menace from which Royal College of Art students should be protected."

It was also stated that sixty N.S.A.M. members were exhibiting at the Royal Academy. Is it the case that in order to win recognition, a voluntary association is impelled to identify its interests with those of appropriate elite groups? Given the social structure of the period under review, the Society has inevitably seen its best interests served by identifying itself with the royal family, with the L.E.A.'s (demonstrated in the formation of the Association of Art Institutions in which college principals and L.E.A. representatives share certain common ground) with the needs of industry (Britain needs designers) and with the broader policies of the D.S.A. and the Board and Ministry of Education. At all costs, the Society had to appear respectable in the eyes of those it identified as being in positions of power. In 1934, the Royal Academy was respectable and Henry Moore, outside a tiny minority of the *avante garde*, was not.

In conclusion, it is possible to summarise the foregoing in this way. For the S.A.M., the needs to obtain recognition and to survive whilst so doing, led to servile attitudes towards powerful institutions, forgetfulness regarding its educational interests, and a dependence upon obtaining income which led to a denial of its proper educational and professional principles. Once recognition was obtained, some reordering of priorities was possible, but by that time, the really significant changes in art education had taken place outside the organisation, and with no assistance, but some opposition, from it.

To what extent the first concerns of a subject-based professional association of teachers delay or prevent the full development of its wider professional aims is not easy to assess. Concern for status, which Kenneth Prandy has claimed to lie at the centre of the process by which an occupational association becomes professionalised<sup>12</sup> does not necessarily or directly lead to improved services, particularly when there is no agreement as to whether the client is the employer or the student. Perhaps it is when the needs of the *student* are brought more fully into consideration that the educational character of the paid activity of art specialists will then become the more central concern of the professional association.



## References

1. Carline, R., *Draw They Must*, E. Arnold, 1968 — a historical account of art teaching.  
Sutton, G., *Artist or Artisan?* Pergamon, 1967 — a description of the development of art examinations.  
Field, D., *Change in Art Education*, Routledge, 1970.
2. Macdonald, G., *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*, University of London Press, 1970.
3. Hanson, D., 'The Art Master', British Journal of Ed. Studies, Spring 1971.
4. Escott, T. H. S., *England, Its People, Policy and Pursuits*, 1885.
5. Reader, N. J., *Professional Men*, Weidenfield & Nicholson, 1966.
6. Thompson, F. M. L., *Chartered Surveyors; The Growth of a Profession*, Routledge, 1968.
7. Lieberman, M., *Education as a Profession*, Prentice Hall, 1956.
8. Lee, T. S., *Municipalities In Their Relation to Art Schools*, Address at the 1891 meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Art and Its Applications to Industry, Birmingham.
9. Read Herbert, *Education Through Art*, Faber, 1958.
10. Vollmer, H. M. and Mills, D. L., *Professionalisation*, Prentice Hall, 1966.
11. Hanson, D., 'The Art School Imbroglio', *New Society*, 13.8.70.
12. Prandy, K., *The Professional Employees*, Faber, 1965.

Other factual material was found in minute books of the S.A.M., N.S.A.M. and the N.S.A.E. and in the various publications to members of these bodies. I am most grateful to the N.S.A.E. for co-operation regarding the loan of such documents.

A large part of the material of the article is based upon the final section of a dissertation by the author *The Development of a Professional Association for Art Specialists in Schools and Colleges*, School of Education, University of Leicester, 1969.