

THREE SITES FOR VISUAL CULTURAL PEDAGOGY: HONORING STUDENTS' INTERESTS AND IMAGERY

Brent Wilson
Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

This paper focuses on the educational sites of visual culture pedagogy: the art classroom, the pedagogical visual culture site constructed by children and youth, and the space between school and self-initiated art. Art teachers have to honor the interests of and the imagery by students in order to build an ideal learning environment for students in today's visual culture.

Order and Chaos in Art Education

The original and esoteric thinker Morse Peckham wrote a book titled *Man's Rage for Chaos* (1965). Peckham's claim is that most theories of art are based on the assumption that humans, in their quest for aesthetic experiences, seek for works that possess an orderly, familiar, and harmonious structure. Peckham's central thesis is that the opposite is true; that disorder and chaos are the goals of those who pursue artistic experiences. Of course Peckham acknowledges that disorder is only possible when its opposite,

order, provides the norm from which chaotic disruption might emerge. He sees us existing in a space between our rage for order and our rage for chaos - and that only our range for chaos and the unknown and the unfamiliar can balance our rage for the orderly, the predictable, and the familiar.

It seems that within the field of art education, collectively, we have our simultaneous conflicting rages for order and disorder. Just when the elements and principles of design, or child art and creative expression, or discipline-based art education, each in its turn, seemed to provide all the orderly and familiar solutions to our art education problems, something new has come along. Now, with increasing frequency, we hear that art education should become visual cultural education (Duncum, 2001, Freedman, 2003, Kindler, 2003, Smith-Shank, 2002, Tavin, 2003, Wilson, 2003). Once again art education is thrown into a state of disorder; and now we are attempting to make order out of that chaos.

It is worth noting that the changes that occur in art education are the result of forces and factors that we art educators do not yet understand. Art educators in both the East and the West are affected by a collection of factors beyond our field which currently influence both our theory and practice. The very nature of art, and the critical discourse that accompanies it, has evolved from a modernist to a postmodernist ideology. New art forms are emerging - things such as performance art, installation art, video art, and web art, to name a few. Moreover the study of images is undergoing a drastic and chaotic reconfiguration from carefully defined fields of study with classifications such as, say, art history and film criticism, toward the open-ended and vastly more complex new discipline termed visual culture or cultural studies. Like art, the emerging field of visual culture is destined to remain an "essentially contested concept" (Gaillie 1956) open to multiple definitions, changing boundaries, and normative disputations.

The discipline of visual culture reflects a general tendency to reject the conventional art historical study of a canon of aesthetic masterpieces. It is in its very nature disorderly. Visual culture replaces masterpieces and the canon with a vast range of visual objects and events that are studied in light of their meaning and social significance rather than their aesthetic value. As distinctions among high art, low art, popular art, and mass culture disintegrate, the

potential for both creating and interpreting visual culture within art education increases enormously. Moreover, the vastly enlarged and chaotic field of visual culture virtually demands that we think about new theories and new pedagogies. Can we afford to ignore the forces underlying the movement toward visual culture? Does visual culture demand that we exchange our orderly teaching strategies for new and potentially unsettling pedagogies? Do we have adequate theories to support emerging pedagogies? These are the questions I wish to address.

SPLAT ¥ BOOM ¥ POW: Intertextuality and Disintegrating Borders

I find it useful to think about emerging art educational theory and practice in light of artworks. In this paper, I think that it will be useful to explore emerging art educational theory and practice in the context of an art exhibition - to use the exhibition and its artworks as a metaphor for what visual cultural pedagogy might be.

SPLAT ¥ BOOM ¥ POW: The Influence of Comics on Contemporary Art is an exhibition, organized at the Houston Institute of Contemporary Art (Cassel, 2003), then shown at the Institute of Contemporary Art in Boston,¹ and at the Wexner Center for the Arts in Columbus, Ohio. The exhibition is organized around three basic notions. The first, SPLAT, presents artists such as Mel Ramos, Lisa Lou, and Andy Warhol who made direct appropriations from the comics and other forms of popular imagery. The second, BOOM, includes artists who used the symbols, the techniques, common to popular visual culture; X Lichtenstein's benday dots and bold lettering from the comics provide the paradigm instance. POW, the third category of artworks, represents artists, who in the wake of multicultural forces, abandoned the appropriation of popular imagery in favor of inventing their own images - images that are reminiscent of and influenced by media stereotypes - in order to criticize or problematize conditions present in contemporary societies.

¹ I was invited to give a lecture in conjunction with the Boston exhibition and to conduct a workshop for Boston area teachers in which we explored implications the exhibition held for visual cultural pedagogy. Some of the ideas contained in this paper were originally presented in my Boston lecture and workshop.

Whenever I approach an artwork, I'm in the habit of asking, what's the main idea? What is this work about? What does it mean? What are the big ideas to which it might relate? When I approach an exhibition of artworks, I like to ask the same question. What's the main idea - the main idea that I associate with this exhibition? In some respects, it's a vastly more complex task to interpret an exhibition than it is to interpret a single work. Nevertheless, when I interpreted SPLAT . BOOM . POW as one entity I concluded that the exhibition is a sign that any distinction which may have formerly existed between high and low visual culture has virtually disappeared.

When the exhibition is viewed in terms of disintegrating boundaries, it demonstrates various kinds of border crossings between high art and works from "low" or popular culture. It also reveals how various borders within the realm of visual culture have become increasingly porous and that the art critics and teachers who policed the border, to protect high art from contamination by low images, have become ineffective. The comics, advertisements, cartoons and anime, illustration, cinema, TV, and other narrative forms at first found only little openings in the walls that once protected artworks of high culture. Those walls have now been breached; the fences have fallen and high images have been allowed to interbreed with the lowborn elements of visual culture, so much so that the old high/low distinctions no longer hold - they no longer count.

Of course, the same phenomenon exists in art education. For more than a century, some art educators have tried to keep children's art free from the influence of popular visual culture, and they succeed only through rigid control of what they permit them to draw, paint, and construct. In our postmodern era, is it possible that in art education, as in the art world, the borders between high and low might also disappear? If SPLAT . BOOM . POW reveals that the borders between high and low have disappeared, then the next questions we might ask are so what? What might this mean to art education? If art education were to use the lessons embedded in the exhibition, what would it gain? And yes, what would it lose?

In the SPLAT ¥ BOOM ¥ POW the works of two artists, the Japanese Murakami and Chagoya exemplify not just the dissolution of borders and the subsequent inbreeding of high and low; they are, I think, signs of a new kind

of visual culture. This new visual culture, potentially, has great importance for art education. Let me explain.

Murakami (2000), who both makes artworks and writes theory to explain art, characterizes the contemporary visual cultural situation as "Super Flat." This is what he says:

The world of the future might be like Japan is today - super flat. Society, customs, art, culture: all are extremely two dimensional. It is particularly apparent in the arts that this sensibility has been flowing steadily beneath the surface of Japanese history. Today, the sensibility is most present in Japanese games and anime, which have become powerful parts of world culture. One way to imagine super flatness, is to think of the moment when, in creating a desktop graphic for your computer, you merge a number of distinct layers into one (p. 5).

In his artist-books, the Mexican American artist Chagoya (Gomez-Penna, 2000) objectifies Murakami's "super flat." Chagoya's accordion books bring together on single pages Pre-Columbian, Spanish colonial, 19th century Mexican popular woodcuts, images of North American imperialism - the dollar and Coca Cola, modern art - surrealism and cubism, medical illustration, religious imagery, illustrations from pulp fiction, and the comics - Superman, Mickey Mouse and their Mexican transformations, and more and more and more. Like Murakami's super flat, Chagoya's images, as if in a strange rite of passage, are separated from their usual surroundings, they are leveled so that no image has more status than another. They exist on one level as equals. Chagoya's appropriations permit images to speak in their own voices - to condemn and condone, or not. Images are not just juxtaposed; they interbreed. For example, a human skull proudly wears its mouse-ear hat - with its smiley-face badge; a single character is composed of Pre-Columbian, colonial, and contemporary popular elements. Images are of lust and love; the smutty and the spiritual scream at one another. Fools speak wisdom and the wise utter gibberish. They tell us who we are today, and what our global culture is like. They celebrate contradiction and confrontation and congeniality and conflict. Chagoya's artworks are about bringing images from many different levels together in one omnibus level so that they can commu-

nicate and inform one another. Chagoya's texts composed of a multitude of other visual texts. They are texts of texts. In his and other intertextual artworks, is it possible to find a model for visual cultural pedagogy?

Art Teaching and Visual Cultural Pedagogy: An Important Distinction

I have used the term pedagogy without defining it. There is a useful and highly important distinction which may be made between the terms teaching and pedagogy. I wish to use teaching to designate situations where teachers are seen as authority figures who possess predetermined knowledge and art skills that primary and secondary school students should acquire. Typically, art teachers are empowered by the authority vested in national curricula and national standards to transfer to students these predetermined bodies of art knowledge and specified art skills. Precise educational goals and learning outcomes are posited by those who have power and authority and the flow of information is one-directional - from powerful educational authorities to powerless students. In this situation of power and control, the teacher is obligated to teach and the student is obligated to learn.

I wish to use the term pedagogy to designate communities in which proposals and initiatives relating to learning agenda may originate with any individual and with any text within a community. The visual cultural pedagogy which I imagine is a network of relationships. Those relationships consist of teachers and their interests and students and their interests. These interesting relationships also consist of visual cultural texts - artworks and artifacts - which members of specific visual cultural pedagogical learning communities deem sufficiently important to interpret or create. Both interpretations and creations provide occasions for discussion, debate, negotiation, and modification; they each provide opportunities for the exchange of knowledge, values, and meaning. I have just characterized democratic pedagogical sites where teachers, students, texts, images, interpretations and conflicting interpretations each has a voice. Indeed, I have characterized a visual cultural pedagogy for which Chagoya's codices and Murakami's theory of the super flat serve as metaphors. In Chagoya's works images representing differing interests and conflicts of interest, images representing differing cultures,

eras, points of view, values, and purposes, images representing high art and popular visual culture are honored equivalently - or flattened as Murakami would have it - so that they may present and represent their points of view and criticize other points of view. The visual cultural pedagogy I envision is a process of honoring the other - other individuals and images representing the other. This is a performative (Garroian, 1999) visual cultural pedagogy in which humans and visual texts are active participants in an open quest for meaning. Meaning produced in visual cultural pedagogical sites is as variable as the texts and their interpretations. Meaning, however, is always open for modification and reinterpretation. Meaning also emerges through new visual texts which are created by students and teachers - texts that almost always come into existence through a process of reinventing and extending the texts brought to visual cultural pedagogical sites by either teachers or students.

The visual cultural pedagogy I have posited is similar to that found in Reggio Emilia. The theory underlying Reggio pedagogy is characterized by Dahlberg, Moss, and Pence (1999). They see

pedagogical work as co-construction of knowledge and identity and opening up new possibilities for democracy [which] can be viewed as contributing to the exercise of freedom, understood in a Foucauldian sense as being able to think critically - to think opposition, to promote "reflective indocility" - and by so doing to take more control of our lives, through questioning the way we view the world and increasing our ability to shape our own subjectivity. Thinking critically makes it possible to unmask and free ourselves from existing discourses, concepts and constructions, and to move on by producing different ones (p. 79).

They continue by quoting Foucault who writes that pedagogy is:

a matter of flushing out . . . thought and trying to change it; to show that things are not as self-evident as one believed, to see that that which is accepted as self-evident will no longer be accepted as such. Practicing criticism is a matter of making facile gestures difficult . . . As soon as one no longer thinks things as one formerly

thought then, transformation becomes very urgent, very difficult and quite possible (Foucault quoted in Dahlberg, Moss, and Pence, 1999, p. 79).

Visual Cultural Pedagogical Sites

My conception of the development of a variety of desirable forms of visual cultural pedagogy is utterly dependent upon art educators gaining a clear view of the different sites in which pedagogy is performed. This is because the sites themselves powerfully influence the kinds of pedagogy that will be enacted within them. I wish to characterize three primary sites. They are: (1) the transformed traditional art classroom; (2) the many self-initiated visual cultural sites that children and youth construct for themselves outside and beyond schools; and (3) a third site - a space between the school and self initiated visual cultural sites students construct themselves. (There are, of course, other sites in which visual cultural pedagogy is enacted, which I do not have time to discuss - the museum, private art classes, individual tutoring, and the many sites in which young people instruct one another.) As I characterize the three primary sites I will point to only a few of the many forms of visual cultural pedagogy which might be performed within them.

The Art Classroom as a Site for Visual Cultural Pedagogy

This site is typically the only one to which art educators attend. And, just as typically, it is an art teaching site rather than a pedagogical site. That is to say, art teachers usually decide in what media students will work, the topics of their paintings, drawings, prints, and sculptures, the skill, media, and design problems students will solve and the steps they will follow to achieve solutions.

I've recently analyzed transcripts from Cizek's teaching (Wilson, in press). In these transcripts the "Father of Child Art," while appearing to give children many choices, like so many other art teachers, manipulated virtually everything his students produced. He provided an ongoing set of instructions that are so precise that all his students were directed to paint pictures of Santa Claus and his opposite, Krampus who punishes bad children at Christmas

time. Cizek's words, given as "suggestions" guided children so that they oriented their pages horizontally, divided their sheets in half, were sure to have the tops of the Santa and Krampus heads touch the top of the page and their feet touch the bottom - so that the figures will be really big. Cizek instructed children to avoid making eyes with a simple dot of the brush, to fill all the spaces with color, and in many other ways controlled virtually every feature of his students' artworks.

In short, Cizek's teaching is not visual cultural pedagogy; like much art teaching in both the East and the West, Cizek's children were like little machines programmed to do just what he wanted them to do. This kind of directed teaching severely limits children's choices - and yet teachers and parents often survey the results and then conclude - "ah, children are so creative." The methods used by Cizek's and Lowenfeld's followers appear expressive and creative. Ironically, children's artworks that result from directed teaching - the works generally thought to most fully represent childhood creativity - are actually among the most highly controlled. Directed imagery is entirely contrary to desirable forms of visual cultural pedagogy in which students have a choice in determining what they will do and how they will do it.

Let me point to an instructional unit in which a desirable form of visual pedagogy begins to emerge. In the *Quiet Evolution* (Wilson, 1997 c, pp. 176-179) I describe how a group of Florida high school students visited the Ringling Museum of Art in Sarasota where they looked at a portrait painted by Lucas Cranach the Elder. Cardinal Albrecht of Brandenburg had asked Cranach to depict him as if he were St. Jerome because the cardinal, it seems, wanted viewers of his portrait to believe that he personified the religious piety and scholarly values of the saint. At one point in the complex instructional unit which extended over a period of ten weeks time, the teacher asked the students, "if the cardinal were alive today, whom do you think he would wish to be depicted as?" The students responded with a set of playful suggestions, but then agreed among themselves - in an example of the iconoclastic ironic absurdity high school students are capable of producing - that if the cardinal were alive today, he would wish to be portrayed as Arnold Schwarzenegger. (Of course, students were saying something like, "Arnold is one of our heroes - he's someone we would like to emulate.") Rather than

rejecting the idea as improbably absurd, the teacher and her museum educator collaborator said, in effect, "Okay, if that's what you want to do, paint the cardinal as Arnold." This is precisely what the students did. In a large collaborative acrylic painting, 20 students began by appropriating the composition of Cranach's portrait of the cardinal as they depicted the muscular Arnold seated behind his desk. They depicted him surrounded by all the signs and symbols that inform viewers of his life and his values. In the students' painting a portrait of Maria Shriver, Arnold's wife - and the niece of president J. F. Kennedy - hangs behind his desk taking the place of the Virgin Mary in the cardinal's portrait. A child in a wheelchair symbolizes Arnold's work with handicapped children, barbells represent his body-building, posters show his movie roles, and he is surrounded by sleek cars and other symbols of his wealth, and president George H. W. Bush is present to signify Arnold's membership in the Republican political party.

In this unit the students were given the opportunity to integrate their interests relating to a popular movie star (and the various ways his image has been shaped by popular visual cultural symbols of status, power, and wealth) with the teacher's and the museum educator's interests in the portraiture and symbolism of Northern Renaissance Europe. As the students developed the signs and symbols to represent Arnold's life and values, they simultaneously interpreted and reinterpreted the collection of two-dozen signs and symbols that Cranach had painted to represent Cardinal Albrecht's life and values. And as students conducted their extensive research into Arnold's life they uncovered things such as reports of his sexual harassment of women - the same information that would be revealed during Schwarzenegger's 2003 campaign for governor of California. In other words, they discovered that there are things about heroes that are not typically revealed by the images of popular visual culture. Even more importantly, the students had the opportunity to study the ways in which perceptions of a celebrity's character are shaped by the popular media.

The unit illustrates how the art classroom may become a site in which the high art of the European Renaissance was permitted to engage in an intertextual dialogue with American popular visual culture. The unit represents the complexity of that dialogue between two very different and very complex visu-

al cultural artifacts - one created by an old master and one created by students. The emergence of the intertextual dialogue must be attributed to the collaborative actions of both the students and teachers. Moreover, the intertextual dialogue continued long after the project ended. The museum educator at the Ringling persuaded the museum's director to display the students' painting next to Cranach's painting in the Renaissance gallery. The students' artwork, at least for several months, was given a place and a status similar to that of an old master. The students' artwork based on a popular visual cultural iconic hero was honored; students values and preferences were also honored.

Pedagogical Visual Cultural Sites Constructed by Children and Youth

For more than four decades I have been more interested in the kinds of visual culture kids create for themselves outside school. In the 1970s, sometimes in collaboration with Marjorie Wilson, I began publishing case studies of American kids who drew complex graphic narratives based on comic book superheroes and other forms of popular illustration. An Iowa boy, J.C. Holz, created Birdman, and an amazing cast of characters comprising the United Earth Legion (Wilson, 1974). The novelist Julian Green drew nudes based on Dore's illustrations for Dante's *Inferno* (Wilson, 1976). Bobby Goldman drew the origins of "Goldman" and then inspired his friend Andy to create "The Theme and the Red Glob." Tami drew stories of Three Hawaii Spies, and Kelly created an imaginary world in which her friend "Smiling Jack" could live. Dirk drew "Mr. And & the Change Bugs" who administered electric shocks to humans in order to contort their bodies and limbs and persuade them to steal money from all the banks in the world (Wilson & Wilson, 1982 a). Lois drew thousands of horses running races and also sipping soda through straws and sitting at tables eating their lunches (Wilson, Hurwitz & Wilson, 1987). John Scott created a universe of Star War space ships that were more elegant and detailed than the ones in the movies (Wilson & Wilson, 1980).

My interest in the self-initiated visual culture produced by children and youth led me to Japan (Wilson, 2000, Wilson, 2002) and then Taiwan. In Japan, Masami Toku and I began to study *dojinshi* manga - the comics

drawn by individuals and by groups of teenagers (Wilson & Toku, in press). In Taiwan I continued my investigation by studying the way teenagers organize themselves into groups, assume the role of editors, writers, and artists in order to publish dojinshi manga on specific topics. For example, a group in Taiwan created a dojinshi manga with ten original stories relating to Harry Potter in just a few months. Once dojinshi artists' graphic narratives are completed, they have them printed, and then they sell their publications in the 2000 or more comic markets held in Japan and Taiwan each year. In the largest Comic Market held in Tokyo twice each year, as many as 100,000 young dojinshi artists show and sell their work to over 400,000 other young people.

These examples from my research, about young people who make artworks privately to please themselves, and others, like the dojinshi groups who seek wide public attention, provide two examples of the complexity and variety of visual culture created by young people. The works they create have several common characteristics. First, and perhaps most importantly, they are made because young people wish to make them. These non-obligatory artworks of visual culture are almost always directed toward the production of narratives. I should also note that many of these works are made with great skill. The kids who create graphic narratives draw well, they understand plots and complex narrative grammars. Their narratives are massive intertextual compilations of the character types, plots, topics, conventional grammars, styles and themes of comics, movies, television, video games, and other forms of popular visual culture. The stories present the big issues of life - birth, growth, trials, success, failure, love, hate, inner life, aspirations, romance, combat, deprivation, and villainy. They narratives are pervaded with moral imperatives and ethical dilemmas (Wilson & Wilson, 1982). They provide opportunities for young people to experiment symbolically with the kinds of selves they might become, with their futures, with the realities of the worlds in which they live, and to test the consequences of following or not following society's rules, norms, and laws. Some narratives are profound and others are trivial. Nevertheless they are continually fascinating to the kids who create them. And one of the primary reasons for their fascination is that they provide for the exercise of agency in the pursuit of knowledge in the form of stimulat-

ing entertainment.

These self-initiated forms of art-making are generally overlooked by elementary and secondary school art teachers. This raises the question, why have I labeled this a visual cultural pedagogical site in which teachers should work? It is because I believe that every art teacher should know as much about his or her students' self-initiated visual cultural production as students' are willing to reveal. Why? Let me speak from personal experience. Every young maker of visual culture I have studied has willingly invited me into his or her life. They have shared with me their works, their sources, and their aspirations. In turn I have offered my encouragement and my thoughts about a their artworks. In one way or another they have indicated that they appreciate my interest. Others have said, in one way or another, you are the first adult who has paid attention to what I do and what I care about.

My interaction with young creators is a form of visual cultural pedagogy. This pedagogy is characterized by young people choosing to make visual culture and my choosing to recognize and, in a non-judgmental way, to appreciate and often to celebrate what young people have created. Moreover, I believe that my attention and my support has encouraged at least some young people to continue creating visual culture longer than they would have otherwise, to produce more, and to gain deeper insights into the significance, importance, and meaning of their own productions than they would have without my attention.

I have just characterized a form of visual cultural pedagogy that, for at least some students, is far more meaningful than classroom art instruction will ever be. I believe that every art teacher should become a connoisseur and appreciator of the self-initiated visual culture created by their students. Every art teacher should practice a pedagogy that consists primarily of awareness and encouragement - and sometimes in this self-initiated visual cultural pedagogical site we pedagogues can help students to clarify their goals pertaining to art. Mostly, however, in this learning community, we should appreciate the opportunity to learn - to learn about the marvels of kid's minds.

A Third Visual Cultural Pedagogical Site: The Space between School and Selfinitiated Art

When I talk about kid's self-initiated production of visual culture, in one way or another, teachers often raise this point: if their self-initiated art is so important, meaningful - and sometimes profound - then shouldn't we teach something like it in school? My usual answer is an emphatic no! kids' self-initiated stuff is frequently disorderly and sometimes subversive. When we obligate kids to do what they have chosen to do themselves, frequently we destroy their interest. We make ours what was theirs. We also tend to emphasize our interest in skill development over kids' interest in things such as character development and the creation of their stories. We try to make unnecessary order out of kids' delightful disorder. We tame what should not be tamed.

Nevertheless, there is a visual cultural pedagogical site located between the school and self-initiated realms where art teachers' and students' interests may converge - if they are facilitated sensitively and knowingly. Let me provide an example.

In 2002 while working with graduate students at the Taipei Municipal Teachers College, I showed two sets of young peoples' graphic narratives. The first consisted of self-initiated works, which I described in the previous section. The second set of drawings were selected from an ongoing research project. It consisted of a large group of elicited narratives where I have gone into many classrooms, in both the East and the West, to ask students to draw stories. I give students sheets of paper on which six frames have been printed. My instructions are simple:

You can tell stories with the pictures you draw. Please draw a character, place that character in a setting, show what happens, what happens next, and finally show how things turn out. You may use as many or as few of the frames as you wish. If you want paper with more frames, so that you can draw a longer story, please ask for it.

Because the narrative task is like drawing a comic or manga, students often appropriate characters and plots from manga. Nevertheless, I have discovered that the stories kids draw frequently deal with the same deeply profound themes and issues found in their self-initiated narratives. I suggested to the Taipei teachers, "why don't you collect some story drawings from your

students?" The responses were something like, "oh, we couldn't do that; we have to follow the curriculum." Then one teacher said, "but we could assign students to draw stories for their homework." Others agreed that such an assignment would be acceptable.

These homework narrative drawing activities took place in a site that exist between the school site and self-initiated visual cultural sites (Wilson, 2003). And just as interestingly, students' drawings reflected influences from both these sites. Students felt obligated to complete the assignment, but they also felt at liberty to include a great many features - characters, plots, themes, graphic narrative grammatical structures, word and thought balloons, and other features from the comics. In a few instances the stories were about their classrooms and friends - but presented in critical and satirical ways. Their stories addressed problems of personal relationships, romance, longing and desire. If these narratives were drawn in school, the results might have been viewed as inappropriate. In this betwixt and between space their narratives were acceptable.

This is only one modest illustration of a visual cultural pedagogical site which could probably be expanded in many different ways. It is the site in which students could be shown how to connect and blend the visual cultural interests represented by school art programs with opportunities to practice integrating those interests with personal visual cultural interest. This site, like the self-initiated sites, holds the potential for students to practice integrating the creation and interpretation of visual culture within their everyday lives.

The Celebration of Intertextuality and Students' Interests

I have posited two major ideas. The first is that we live in an era of democratization of images. That is to say, with dissolving visual cultural borders exemplified by the exhibition *SPLAT . BOOM . POW* (Cassel, 2003) and the works of artists like Chagoya (Gomez-Pena, 2000) and Murakami (2000), almost any image may encounter as an equal any other image. This relating of images is facilitated by things such as digital technologies and the internet because it is possible for any individual with a computer to have nearly instant access to millions of images which may juxtaposed, modified, and

combined. I have characterized this situation as rhizomatic (Wilson, 2003). In other words, visual cultural pedagogy unfolds in a territory which is impossible to diagram in the manner in which we typically map conventional art education content. In contemporary visual culture images are like an enormous patch of grass, continually spreading by sending out new shoots, new roots, and by broadcasting seeds. The images not only come to rest momentarily alongside one another, they interweave and fuse, producing endless variations. Every image, as theorists of intertextuality such as Kristeva (1980) and Barthes (1977) have noted, carries with it the residue of other images. But this is not all; every image, it seems, may be related to any other image, any other text, any other idea through our interpretations. Art teaching today exists in the era of intertextuality.

Of course this situation of the leveled, or super-flattened collections of images characterized by Murakami, makes the task of the art teacher ever more difficult. With millions upon millions of choices regarding the content of art and visual cultural education, it becomes less and less viable for teachers to make the only decisions regarding the content of art education. Of course every teacher should be acquainted with a wide array of traditional art and contemporary art forms, artworks, and art theories. Of course every teacher should also be acquainted with an array of popular visual cultural images in the form of cinema, TV, video art, the comics, advertising, music videos, anime. But with all this acquaintance notwithstanding, no teacher can know enough images. No teacher can know of all of the interests of his or her students (Wilson, 1997 a, Wilson, 1997 b).

In the rhizomatic realm of visual culture, however, in any one of the three pedagogical sites, students should pursue their own interests. Even in the formal art classroom site where the teacher proposes the images that students should create and study, students must always be permitted to place their own images and their own ideas alongside teachers' choices. In the betwixt and between site where students are invited to address school assignments through their own choices of images, there is an even greater opportunity for the expression of students' choices pertaining to visual cultural imagery and the ideas that surround them. Finally, in the self-initiated site, students make almost all the choices - albeit conditioned by popular visual

culture. It is in the self-initiated site that popular visual cultural imagery, ideas, and students' interests in them flourish most fully.

Conclusion

Let me return to the artwork of Chagoya and Murakami's theory, *super flat*. In the three visual cultural pedagogical sites I have envisioned, with the boundaries obliterated between old and new, high and low, comic and profound, there is a opportunity to encourage students and teachers to bring images and ideas from all levels of visual culture to one level where they can interact. This interaction of artworks, texts, and ideas, however is merely the means which enables each visual cultural pedagogy participant to create rhizomes of meaning.

Readings (1996, p. 145) speaks of "the pedagogical relation as dissymmetrical and endless," where students and teachers function as colleagues who are caught in a "dialogic web of obligations to thought . . . [representing] the voice of the other." He also claims that "pedagogy is "the listening to thought." To which we art and visual culture pedagogues might add something like a dialogic web of obligations in which images and the ideas that surround them are endlessly celebrating and debating one another, agreeing and disagreeing, playing and replaying, revealing and hiding - doing all the things that images do when they are honored. Surely it is the case that images in the three visual cultural pedagogical sites have the potential, through their encounters with one another in a myriad of expected and unexpected ways to enriching our lives and our humanity in ways that we cannot now imagine.

References

- Barthes, Roland (1977). *Image-Music-Text*. London: Fontana
- Cassel, V. (2003). *SPLAT BOOM POW: The influence of cartoons in contemporary art*. Houston: Contemporary Arts Museum.
- Dahlberg, G., Moss, P. & Pence, A. (1999). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Postmodern perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Duncum, P. (2001). Visual culture: Developments, definitions, and directions for art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 42 (2), 101-112.
- Freedman, K. (2003). *Teaching visual culture: Curriculum, aesthetics, and the social life of art*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gallie, W. B. 1956. Essentially Contested Concepts, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 56, 167-220.
- Garoian, C. (1999). *Performing pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gomez-Pena, G., Chagoya, E. & Rice, F. (2000). *Codex espangliensis*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Kristeva, Julia (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Murakami, T. (2000). *Super flat manifesto, Super flat*. Tokyo. Madra Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Peckham, M. (1965). *Man's rage for chaos*. Philadelphia: Chilton Company.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in the ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith-Shank, D. (2002). The semiotics of community celebrations. *Visual Arts Research*, 28 (2), 57-63.
- Tavin, K. (2003). Wrestling with angles, searching for hosts: Toward a critical pedagogy of visual culture. *Studies in Art Education*, 44 (3), 197-213.
- Wilson, B. (1974) The superheroes of J. C. Holtz plus an outline of a theory of child art. *Art Education*, 16 (1), 2-9.
- Wilson, B. (1976). Little Julian's impure drawings. *Studies in Art Education*, 17 (2), 45-62.

- Wilson, B. (1997 a). Child art, multiple interpretations, and conflicts of interest. In A. M. Kindler (Ed.), *Child development in art* (pp. 81-94), Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Wilson, B. (1997 b). Types of child art and alternative developmental accounts: Interpreting the interpreters. *Human development*, 40, 155-168.
- Wilson, B. (1997 c). *The quiet evolution: Changing the face of arts education*. Los Angeles: The Getty Education Institute for the Arts.
- Wilson, B. (2000). Empire of signs revisited: Children's manga and the changing face of Japan. In L. Lindstrom, (Ed.). *The cultural context: Comparative studies of art education and children's drawings* (pp. 160-178). Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press.
- Wilson, B. (2002). Becoming Japanese: Manga, children's drawings, and the construction of national character. In L. Bresler, & C. M. Thompson (Eds.) *The arts in children's lives: Context, culture, and curriculum* (pp. 43-55). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Wilson, B. (2003). Of diagrams and rhizomes: Visual culture, contemporary art, and the impossibility of mapping the content of art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 44 (3), pp. 114-129.
- Wilson, B. (In press). Child art after modernism: visual culture and new narratives. In E. Eisner & M. Day (Eds.), *Handbook for research and policy in art education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Wilson, B., Hurwitz, A. & Wilson, M. (1987) *Teaching Drawing from Art*. Worcester, MA: Davis.
- Wilson, B. & Toku, M. (in press). Boys' love, yaoi and art education: Issues of power and pedagogy. In D. Smith-Shank (Ed.), *Semiotics and art/visual culture*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Wilson, B. & Wilson, M. (1977). An iconoclastic view of the imagery sources in the drawings of young people. *Art Education*, 30 (1), 4-12.
- Wilson, B. & Wilson, M. (1980) Beyond marvelous: Conventions and inventions in John Scott's Gemini. *School Arts*, 80 (2), 20-26.
- Wilson, M & Wilson, B. (1982 a) *Teaching children to draw: A guide for*

THREE SITES FOR
VISUAL CULTURAL
PEDAGOGY:
HONORING
STUDENTS'
INTERESTS AND
IMAGERY

teachers and parents. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Wilson, B. & Wilson, M. (1982 b) Dimensions of meaning in children's story
drawings: From theory to therapy. Art therapy: A bridge between worlds
(pp. 69-80).

The proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Conference of the American Art
Therapy Association.

視覺文化教學法的三大場域： 尊重學生的興趣與影像

布朗德·威爾森
賓州州立大學

摘要

本文試以藝術教室為視覺文化教學法的場域、兒童與青少年視覺文化、以及學校與主動創作之間的空間等三大場域，構築視覺文化教學場域的三大主體。同時，在尊重學生興趣與影像前題下，共構視覺文化教學的豐富內涵。

藝術教育的秩序與混亂

觀念獨樹一格卻又深奧難解的思想家 Morse Peckham 曾寫過一本書《人對混亂的渴望》(1965)，他說藝術理論的基本假設，大多是認為人類為追求美學經驗，都喜歡有秩序、熟悉、和諧的結構。而他的中心主旨則是主張事實正好相反，追求藝術經驗的人，目標其實在於混亂沒有秩序。當然 Peckham 也承認，混亂失序唯有在它的反面，也就是「秩序」對照之下才可能存在，要有秩序的常態，才能凸顯混亂失常。他認為人活在對秩序的渴望與對混亂的渴望之間的夾縫，唯有我們對混亂未知的渴望，才能夠平衡我們對秩序、已知、熟悉的渴望。

在藝術教育領域，我們整體而言似乎也是渴望秩序，同時又渴望混亂失序。設計要素與原理，或兒童藝術與創意表達，或學科取向藝術教育相繼出現，似乎能夠為藝術教育的所有問題提供熟悉、有秩序的解決方案，但是隨即又有新的理論出現。現在，我們愈來愈常聽到藝術教育應該成為視覺文化教育 (Duncum, 2001, Freedman, 2003, Kindler, 2003, Smith-Shank, 2002, Tavin, 2003, Wilson, 2003)，藝術教育再一次陷入無秩序的狀態，我們又再一次努力從中整理出秩序來。

有一點應該特別提出，也就是藝術教育所經歷的許多改變，其促成的力量與成因，藝術教育人士至今並未能完全瞭解。不論東方或西方社會，影響藝術教育理論與實務的因素，除了我們自己的專業領域之外，還有其他許多成因。藝術的本質，以及與藝術相關的批評論述，已經從現代主義的意識形態演變為後現代主義。新的藝術形式不斷出現，例如表演藝術、裝置藝術、錄影藝術、網路藝術等等；此外，對意象的研究也開始經歷劇烈又混亂的重新結構，原本定義嚴謹、界限分明的領域，例如藝術史、電影批評等，逐漸變成了開放式、無比複雜的新學科，稱為視覺文化或文化研究。就像藝術一樣，新興的視覺文化領域，必然也會一直是「本質上備受爭議的概念」(Gaillie 1956)，有多重的定義，界限不斷改變，規範也多所爭議。

視覺文化這個學科領域，反映著普遍的趨勢，不願意再依循傳統的藝術史，只鑽研美學經典傑作。視覺文化的本質，就是沒有秩序的。視覺文化不再強調經典傑作，而著重於範圍極廣的視覺物體與事件，探討其意涵與社會意義，而非其美學價值。隨著精緻藝術、低俗藝術、流行藝術、大眾文化等區別逐漸模糊，藝術教育中創造及詮釋視覺文化的潛能也就大幅提高。此外，視覺文化的範圍如此龐大而混亂，迫使我們不得不思考新的理論與教學法。視覺文化的驅動力量，我們是否有本錢忽略不管？視覺文化是否要求我們放棄過去井然有序的教學策略，改採新的、可能紛亂不安的教學法？我們是否已有適當的理論，以支持新的教學法？這些正是我所要探討的問題。

SPLAT ¥ BOOM ¥ POW：互文性與消失的界限

我發現，討論藝術教育的新理論與實務，可以用藝術作品來比喻。本文就以藝術展覽的情境，來探討新興的藝術教育與實務，以畫展及其中的藝術作品為比喻，想像視覺文化教學法會是什麼樣子。

「SPLAT¥BOOM¥POW：漫畫對當代藝術之影響」是波士頓現代美術中心所舉辦的一項畫展 (Cassel, 2003)，而後又轉往波士頓現代美術館及俄亥俄州哥倫布市 (Columbus) Wexner 藝術中心展出。畫展有三項基本概念，首先是 SPLAT，展出 Mel Ramos、Lisa Lou、Andy Warhol 等藝術家的作品，他們直接借用漫畫及其他形式的流行影像。其次是 BOOM，這一組的藝術家是利用流行視覺文化中常見的象徵和技巧，Lichtenstein 採用漫畫的平網點狀和英文大寫字母，就是最典型的例子。第三組 POW 的藝術家是在多元文化的力量之後，不再採用流行影像，而著重於發明他們自己的意象，反映媒體的刻板印象，以批判當代社會的情況或呈現其中的問題。

每當我看到一件藝術作品，我總會問：它主要的概念是什麼？它想說些什麼？有什麼意義？作品可能關於哪些大觀念？每當我看到展覽中的作品，我也會問同樣的問題。它主要的觀念是什麼，這次展覽讓我聯想到什麼？在有些層面，要解讀整個展覽，遠比解讀單獨的一件作品複雜多了；然而，在我將 SPLAT¥BOOM¥POW 視為一個整體來解讀的時候，我的結論是這次展覽是一個象徵，代表過去精緻與通俗的視覺文化之間如果有任何區分，現在也已經完全消失了。

從界限逐漸消失這個觀點來看這次展覽，可以顯示通俗文化正逐漸以各種形式，越過界限進入精緻藝術的領域。展覽中同時也可見到視覺文化領域當中的不同界限，愈來愈模糊，原本嚴守這些界限的藝術批評家與教師，愈來愈無法保護精緻藝術不受通俗意象的污染。漫畫、廣告、卡通與動畫、插圖、電影、電視及其他敘述形式，本來在精緻藝術的高牆中只找到一些小洞；現在這些高牆已經被侵入了，圍籬也倒了，高高在上的藝術意象，開始與視覺文化中的低俗成分混合雜交，甚至磨滅了高／低之間的區分，界限已不具意義。

當然，藝術教育中也存在著同樣的現象。一百多年來，有些藝術教育人士一直保護兒童藝術，避免兒童藝術受到通俗視覺文化的影響，他們唯一有效的做法，就是嚴格控制孩子能夠畫些什麼、創作什麼。到了我們後現代的

¹ I was invited to give a lecture in conjunction with the Boston exhibition and to conduct a workshop for Boston area teachers in which we explored implications the exhibition held for visual cultural pedagogy. Some of the ideas contained in this paper were originally presented in my Boston lecture and workshop.

時代，藝術教育是否可能像藝術界一樣，精緻與低俗之間的界限也會消失？如果 SPLAT ¥ BOOM ¥ POW 顯示高／低的界限已經消失，那麼接下來我們也許要問，那又如何？這樣的發展對於藝術教育可能代表什麼意義？如果藝術教育也採行這次展覽中所得的啓示，會有什麼收穫？又會有什麼損失？

在 SPLAT¥BOOM¥POW 展覽中，日本藝術家村上隆與美國畫家 Chagoya 的作品不但凸顯出界限逐漸消失，也呈現了高／低藝術之混雜結合，我認為這是一種新型視覺文化的象徵。這個新型的視覺文化，對於藝術教育很可能有極大的影響。以下是我的理由。

村上隆 (2000) 從事藝術創作，也出書說明自己的藝術理論，他將當代視覺文化的特色稱為「超扁平」。他說：

未來的世界也許會像今天的日本—超扁平。社會、習俗、藝術、文化：一切都是極端的平面、兩度空間。尤其是在藝術界，這種感受顯然一直潛伏於日本歷史的表面之下。今天，這個感受最顯著的是在日本的遊戲與動畫，日本遊戲和動畫已經成為全球文化中極為重要的一部分。要想像超扁平，一個方式是在創造電腦桌面繪圖的時候，將數個分明的層次融合變成一個層次 (第 5 頁)。

墨西哥裔美國藝術家 Chagoya (Gomez-Penna, 2000) 在他的藝術著作中，將村上隆的「超扁平」更客體化。Chagoya 的手風琴著作，在同一頁面中結合了哥倫布發現新大陸以前、西班牙殖民時代、19 世紀墨西哥通俗木刻、北美帝國主義的意象 (美元、可口可樂、現代藝術)、超現實主義、立體派、醫療插圖、宗教影像、通俗小說插圖、漫畫 (超人、米老鼠與墨西哥版的變化等等)。正如村上隆的超扁平，Chagoya 的意象彷彿出現在奇怪的儀式中，脫離了平常的背景，而且各個意象一視同仁，地位都相同，同在一個層面上。Chagoya 的借用手法，讓意象各自發聲—或譴責、或寬恕，或是都沒有。意象不只是同時並列，更混合雜交。例如一個骷髏頭得意的戴著米老鼠耳朵的帽子，加上笑臉標誌；還有一個人包括了哥倫布以前、殖民時代和當代的流行要素。這些意象是關於性和愛；猥褻與精神要素對叫吶喊。愚人開口充滿智慧，智者滿口胡言亂語。這些告訴我們，我們今天是什麼人，我們的全球文化是什麼模樣，歌頌著矛盾、對立、同質、衝突。Chagoya 的作品將許多不同層次的意象放在齊一的層面，讓意象之間彼此溝通、呈現意

義。Chagoya 的文本是由許多不同的視覺文本所構成，是文本的文本。從他及其他的互文性藝術作品中，是否可能找到視覺文化教學法的模式？

藝術教學與視覺文化教學法：一個重要的區別

前面提到教學法，我一直未做定義。「教學」與「教學法」之間，有一個實用而且非常重要的區別，我所謂的「教學」是指以教師為權威角色，掌握了既定的知識與藝術技巧，是小學及中學學生都應該要學會的。典型的情況下，藝術教師憑著全國課程標準的授權，負責將這些特定的藝術知識與技巧傳授給學生。握有權威的人訂定明確的教育目標及學習成果，資訊流動也是單向的，從教育權威流向毫無權力的學生。在這樣的權力與控制情境中，教師有教的義務，學生有學的義務。

我所謂的「教學法」則是指有關於學習議程的提議及活動，社群中任何人都可以表示意見，可以採用任何文本。我所想像的視覺文化教學法，是各種關係的網絡，包括教師及其興趣，以及學生及其興趣。這些有意思的關係也包含視覺文化文本（藝術作品與人為製品），是整個視覺文化教學法的學習社群認定值得詮釋或創作的重要文本。詮釋與創作都能夠提供討論、辯論、談判、修正的機會，促使社群中各成員交流知識、價值觀與意義。這些就是民主的教學法場域，教師、學生、意象、詮釋、衝突的看法，都有機會發聲。事實上，這也正是視覺文化教學法的特色，Chagoya 的規範、村上隆的超扁平理論，都可以做為比喻。在 Chagoya 的作品中，意象代表不同的興趣、利益衝突，代表不同的文化、時代、觀點、價值與目的，代表精緻藝術與通俗視覺藝術同樣受尊重（或是村上隆所謂的扁平），因此各意象之間能夠呈現各自的觀點，批評其他的觀點。我所想像的視覺文化教學法，是一個尊重他者的過程，包括其他個人以及代表他人的意象。這是一種實現式 (Garolán, 1999) 的視覺文化教學法，其中人與視覺文本都能主動參與，公開追尋意義。透過視覺文化教學法的場域所產生的意義，正如其文本與詮釋一樣，可能千變萬化。然而意義總是開放的，能夠再做修正、重新詮釋。意義也能夠出現於教師與學生所創作的新的視覺文本，這樣的文本幾乎都是來自重新發明、延伸既有文本的過程，而既有文本可能由教師所提供，也可能由學生所提供。

我所提議的視覺文化教學法，類似於 Reggio Emilia 的理論。

Dahlberg、Moss、Pence (1999) 歸納出 Reggio 教學法的理論特色，認為：

教學作品是知識與認同之共同建構，開啓民主的新可能，可以視為對自由之落實有所貢獻，從福寇的觀點來說，也就是能夠批判思考（想到反面對立、反思而不盲從），質疑我們對世界的看法、培養我們塑造本身主體性的能力，藉此而更能夠掌控我們的人生。批判思考才能夠揭開面具，讓我們擺脫既有的論述、概念、建構，產生不同的論述與概念（79 頁）。

他們繼續引述福寇的話，認為教學法是：

去除……思想，設法將之改變，凸顯事物並不一定那麼不證自明，能夠瞭解以前視為理所當然的，已經都不能成立了。做批評就是將容易的姿勢變得困難，人一旦突破舊有的想法，轉型就會變得非常迫切、非常困難，而且很可能做得到（Dahlberg, Moss and Pence (1999) 引述 Foucault, 79 頁）。

視覺文化教學法場域

對於發展各種可行的視覺文化教學法形式，我的概念完全取決於藝術教育人士必須對教學法不同的實施場域有明確的認識。因為場域本身對於實際採行的教學法，會造成明顯的影響。這裡我提出三種主要場域：包括 (1) 轉型後的傳統藝術教室；(2) 兒童與青少年在學校以外自行成立的視覺文化場域；(3) 第三場域—介於學校與自行成立的視覺文化場域之間。（當然還有其他場域也會採行視覺文化教學法，但本文無法深入討論，例如美術館、私人繪畫教室、個別教學，以及年輕人互相教導的許多場域。）談到這三大場域的特徵，我只指出這些場域可能採行的一些視覺文化教學法形式。

以藝術教室為視覺文化教學法的場域

通常藝術教室是藝術教育人士唯一關注的場域，而且通常也只是一個教學場域，而不是教學法的場域。也就是說，藝術教師通常決定了學生要用什麼媒材創作，畫圖、版畫、雕塑的主題，技巧、媒材、設計上的困難，以及學生要用什麼辦法解決這些困難。

我最近分析了 Cizek 教學的詳實記錄 (Wilson, 付印中)，在這些記錄中，這位「兒童藝術之父」表面上好像給了孩子很多選擇，但就像許多的藝

術教師，其實卻是操控著學生所創作的一切。他持續的說明教導，內容精確詳盡，結果所有的學生最後都是畫聖誕老公公，以及聖誕老公公的對手、專門懲罰壞孩子的 Krampus。Cizek 給孩子的「建議」要孩子把畫紙橫著放，從中間分成兩半，聖誕老公公和 Krampus 的頭要碰到畫紙的上緣，腳要畫到紙張的下緣，這樣才能把圖像畫得很大。他還告訴孩子最好不要把眼睛畫成太小的點，要把空間都塗滿顏色等等，學生作品中幾乎每一個細節都完全照他的意思。

總而言之，Cizek 的教學不是視覺文化教學法；就像東方與西方大多數的藝術教學，Cizek 的學生就像一個個小小機器人，完全遵照他的指揮。

這種指導式教學，嚴格限制了孩子的選擇，但教師和家長往往看了孩子的作品，最後說：「啊，小孩子真有創意。」Cizek 和 Lowenfeld 所提倡的方法，看起來似乎很有創意、善於表達，但諷刺的是，指導式教學所產生的兒童作品（一般以為最能代表兒童創意的），其實卻是受到嚴格控制的東西。指導式影像與視覺文化教學法所追求的形式完全相反，視覺文化教學法強調讓學生自己決定要做什麼，要怎麼做。

在此我要舉一個課程單元的例子，其中已經開始浮現理想的視覺教學法形式。在《Quiet Evolution》(Wilson, 1997, 176-179 頁)中，我談到佛州的一班高中生參觀 Sarasota 的 Ringling 美術館，看了 Lucas Cranach 的一幅肖像畫。那幅畫是畫家應樞機主教 Albrecht of Brandenburg 之委託，將他畫成聖徒 Jerome，似乎是主教希望看畫的人將他視為宗教虔誠與學者價值的典範。這個複雜的課程單元持續了十個星期，當中有一次教師問學生：「如果主教到今天還在，你們認為他會希望畫家把他畫得像誰？」學生提了許多好玩的點子，不過討論到最後，決定主教如果還在人世，他會希望自己像阿諾史瓦辛格的形象——這是高中生打破偶像、諷刺荒謬一個典型的例子。（當然，學生會說：「阿諾是我們英雄，我們希望模仿的對象。」）這樣一個提議，教師和美術館長並沒有斥為荒謬，反而說：「好，如果你們決定了，那就把主教畫成阿諾吧。」結果學生真的這樣去創作。廿位學生集體創作了大型的壓克力畫，首先是套用 Cranach 本來的構圖，將主教畫成坐在書桌後面，只是現在主教像阿諾一樣肌肉結實。畫面上還加上許多符號與象徵，讓觀者知道他的生平與價值。學生還把原畫中掛在牆上的聖母圖，換成了阿諾的妻子，也就是甘迺迪總統的姪女 Maria Shriver。一個坐輪椅的孩子，象徵

阿諾對殘障兒童的關懷活動，槓鈴代表他的健身運動，海報顯示他拍過的電影，還有許多時髦的名車和其他象徵，代表他的財富；最後還有布希總統，表明阿諾在共和黨中的政治地位。

在這個單元中，學生得以結合他們對知名影星的興趣，以及教師和美術館長對肖像畫和歐洲北部文藝復興的興趣（還有影星如何透過流行視覺文化象徵，建立其地位、權力、財富的形象）。學生描繪各種符號與象徵，來代表阿諾的生平與價值，同時也是在詮釋及重新詮釋 Cranach 筆下的二、三十種符號與象徵，瞭解他如何呈現 Albrecht 主教的生平與價值。而隨著學生深入研究阿諾的生平，他們也有其他的發現，例如他對婦女性騷擾的報導，這樣的傳聞在 2003 年阿諾競選加州州長的時候，必然會被挖出來。換句話說，學生發現關於英雄人物，有些事情在流行視覺文化的形象中通常是不會浮現的。更重要的是，學生也得以研究流行媒體如何左右一般人對於名人的觀感。

這個單元顯示，藝術教室可以成為溝通的場域，讓歐洲文藝復興的精緻藝術與美國流行視覺文化進行互文性的對話。從這個單元可以看到，兩種極端不同且複雜的視覺文化作品（一是古典傑作，一是學生的創作），彼此之間的對話也非常複雜。能夠出現這種互文性的對話，必然要歸功於學生與教師共同的行動。此外，在單元結束後，互文性對話仍然持續下去，Ringling 美術館館長說服了美術館的行政主管，同意將學生的作品放在文藝復興展示廳，與 Cranach 的肖像畫並陳展出。至少有幾個月的時間，學生的作品取得了與古典傑作同等的地位，學生基於流行視覺文化偶像的作品受到尊重，學生的價值觀與興趣也受到尊重。

兒童與青少年所建構的教學法視覺文化場域

四十多年來我一直對兒童在學校以外自行創作的視覺文化深感興趣，在 1970 年代，我開始發表美國兒童的個案研究，有時是與 Marjorie Wilson 合作，探討兒童根據漫畫超級英雄和其他形式的流行插畫所創作的複雜敘事圖畫。愛荷華州一位男童 J.C. Holz 創造了「鳥人」以及眾多的角色，組成「聯合地球軍團」(Wilson, 1974)。寫小說的 Julian Green 根據 Dore's 為但丁的地獄所畫的插圖，畫成他的裸體人物。Bobby Goldman 最早創作「Goldman」，後來啟發他的朋友 Andy 創造了《The Theme and the Red

Glob》：Tami 畫了《夏威夷三間諜》的故事，Kelly 為她的朋友「微笑傑克」創造了一個想像世界；Dirk 所畫的《而且先生與改變蟲》，會對人施電壓，以控制人的身體四肢，讓人去搶劫世界各地所有的銀行 (Wilson & Wilson, 1982 a)。Lois 畫了成千上萬的賽馬，還有馬匹用吸管喝著可樂、坐在桌旁吃著午餐 (Wilson, Hurwitz & Wilson, 1987)。John Scott 創造了一個宇宙，有許多多的星際大戰太空船，甚至比電影裡更詳盡優美 (Wilson & Wilson, 1980)。

由於我對兒童與青少年這種半獨立創作的視覺文化深感興趣，結果到了日本 (Wilson, 2000, Wilson, 2002)，而後又到台灣。在日本，我與岡崎昭夫教授開始研究「同人誌漫畫」，也就是個人與青少年集體創作的漫畫 (Wilson & Toku, 付印中)。在台灣我繼續研究青少年如何組成團體，自己擔任編輯、文案、漫畫家，根據特定主題出版同人誌漫畫。例如台灣有一個團體，根據哈利波特的故事，在短短幾個月內就創作了十個同人誌漫畫的故事。同人誌漫畫一旦畫好，他們就會印出來，在日本或台灣每年 2000 個左右的漫畫市場銷售他們的創作。東京規模最大、一年兩度的漫畫市場，青少年同人誌漫畫家多達十萬人，作品銷售給另外四十萬名青少年。

我的研究中看到的這些例子，有關年輕人創作藝術作品以自娛或娛人，例如同人誌團體尋求廣大民衆的注意，提供了兩個例子，足以呈現年輕人創造的視覺文化無比複雜及多樣。他們創作的作品，有數項共同的特點，首先應是最重要的特色，就是這些作品是青少年主動的創作。這些視覺文化藝術作品不是別人規定要做的，而且幾乎都是傾向於敘事性質。我也應該指出，這些作品中，很多技巧非常純熟，圖畫得很好，也明白情節發展與複雜的敘事原則。他們的敘事大量採用互文性的角色類型、情節、主題、原則慣例、風格、漫畫主題、電影、電視、電腦遊戲，以及其他形式的流行視覺文化。故事內容談到是人生的重大議題—生死、成長、考驗、成與敗、愛與恨、內心生活、啓發、感情、戰鬥、剝奪、惡人壞事等等，敘事中充滿了道德原則與矛盾考驗 (Wilson & Wilson, 1982)。這些創作讓青少年有機會象徵性的試驗他們將來希望成爲什麼樣的人、有什麼樣的發展，或是未來的世界會是什麼面貌，以及遵循社會規範、原則、法令會有什麼後果，遵循之後又是什麼結果。有些敘事很有深度，有些則很膚淺。然而，對於創作這些作品的青少年，卻是一直深具魅力，其中一大原因就在於這樣的創作成爲追求知識的代

理機制，而且是趣味無窮的形式。

這些獨立的創作形式，小學與中學藝術教師通常都不重視。這就引發了一個問題，我為什麼認為這是一個視覺文化教學法場域，值得教師注重？這是因為我相信學生主動創作的視覺文化作品，只要他們願意讓別人知道，每一位藝術教師都應該同樣瞭解。為什麼？我可以從我個人的經驗來說明。我所研究過的每一位視覺文化年輕創作者，都非常樂於邀我進入他們的生活，他們與我分享他們的作品、來源、靈感，而我則給他們鼓勵，以及對他們的藝術作品有什麼看法。儘管方式不同，但他們都會讓我了解，他們很感謝我的興趣。有些人說，你是第一個成人注意到我在做什麼、我關心些什麼。

我與這些青年創作者的互動，就是一種視覺文化教學法。這個教學法的特色，在於年輕人自己選擇要創造的視覺文化，我則肯定、欣賞他們的成果，往往更有讚揚。此外，我相信我的關心支持，至少鼓勵了一些年輕人繼續創作視覺文化，畫得更多、對他們自己的成果能有更深入分析，瞭解其重要性及意義。

這樣一種視覺文化教學法的形式，至少對於一部分學生來說，遠比教室裡的藝術教學有意義多了。我相信每一位藝術教師都應該成為鑑賞家，多欣賞學生所主動創造的視覺文化。每一位藝術教師採用的教學法，主要應該包含自覺與鼓勵—有時候在這個主動創作的視覺文化教學法場域，教師可以幫助學生澄清他們的藝術目標。然而，在這個學習的社群，我們最主要的還是要感謝學習的機會—學到孩子的心靈與想像何其美妙。

視覺文化教學法第三個場域：學校與主動創作之間的空間

每次我談到兒童主動創作的視覺文化，教師往往會提出一個問題：如果主動創作的藝術如此重要、有意義，甚至深刻複雜，那麼我們在學校裡是不是該教學生類似的東西呢？我的回答是絕對不可以！兒童的主動創作，往往雜亂無章，甚至有破壞性；他們本來自己想做的事情，一旦變成了教師的規定，就會抹煞他們的興趣，把他們的東西搶過來變成我們的。我們也很容易太強調培養技巧，反而忽略了兒童更感興趣的事情，例如人物個性發展，以及創造他們自己的故事。孩子雖然亂無章法而樂在其中，我們卻會強求秩序，不該馴服的卻硬要馴服。

不過，在學校與主動創作之間，有一個視覺文化教學法的場域，教師與

學生的興趣可能有所交集—但是要以敏感、瞭解為前提。以下我舉一個例子來說明。

2002 年我在台北市立師院指導數名研究生，讓他們看了兩組年輕人的圖畫敘事作品。第一組是我前面討論過的主動創作，第二組是從一項持續的研究計畫中挑選出來的作品，包括許許多多的引導式敘事，是我在東方和西方各地學校要求學生畫的故事。我把紙張發給學生，上面已經印好了六個格子。我的說明非常簡單：

各位可以用圖畫來說故事，請畫出一個角色，把這個角色放在一個情境裡，畫出發生了什麼事，後來會怎麼樣，以及最後的結果。要畫成幾格都可以，如果還需要更多的格紙，請舉手，就可以畫出比較長的故事。

由於敘事就像畫漫畫，學生往往採用漫畫裡的角色，甚至情節。然而，我卻發現孩子的故事所探討的主題，往往跟主動創作的敘事一樣，是關於非常深刻的議題。我向台北師院的教師提議：「你們怎麼不收集一些學生所畫的漫畫？」他們的回答大概都是：「不能這樣子的，我們必須照課程標準。」後來有一位教師說：「但是我們可以指定學生畫圖的作業。」其他人也同意，家庭作業是可以接受的。

這些圖畫敘事的家庭作業，就是介於學校和主動創作之間的場域 (Wilson, 2003)。同樣值得注意的是，學生的圖畫反映出兩個場域的影響。學生覺有義務完成作業，但是也覺得有一些自由，可以加上很多自己的特色—角色、情節、主題、圖畫敘事結構、文字對話泡泡，以及其他的漫畫特色。少數一些學生以自己的班級和朋友為主題，但是用批判、諷刺的方式來呈現。這些故事探討人際關係、感情、欲望等等議題。這些敘事如果是在學校課堂上畫的，這樣的內容也許就會變成不恰當；但是在介於其間的空間，這樣的敘事就可以接受了。

這只是一個很簡單的例子，證明視覺文化教學法場域可有許多不同的方式繼續擴展。在這種介於其間的場域，學生可以試驗學校藝術課程中的視覺文化議題，與個人的視覺文化興趣，兩者之間如何連結整合。這個場域，就像主動創作的場域，可以讓學生練習將日常生活中視覺文化的創作與詮釋整合起來。

互文性與學生的興趣

我提出了兩項主要觀念，首先是我們今天的時代，是意象民主化的時代，也就是說，視覺文化界限逐漸消失，SPLAT ¥ BOOM ¥ POW (Cassel, 2003) 美術展、或是 Chagoya (Gomez-Pena, 2000)、村上隆 (2000) 等藝術家的作品，都是明顯的例子，幾乎每一個意象都可以視為與其他意象完全平等。這種意象的新關係，是受到數位科技、網際網路等技巧所帶動，因為只要透過電腦，任何人幾乎都可以立即取得幾百萬、幾千萬個意象，任何並列、修改，結合。我將這種情況稱為「淺根現象」(Wilson, 2003)，換句話說，視覺文化教學法是展現在一個非傳統的地帶，無法以我們過去描繪藝術教育的方式來理解。在當代視覺文化中，意象就像一片龐大的草地，新芽、細根不斷向外蔓延，種子也不斷四處傳播。這些意象不只是暫時相鄰並列，更交錯融合，產生無數的變種。正如 Kristeva (1980)、Barthes (1977) 等人的互文性理論所指出，每一個意象都帶著其他意象的痕跡；但是還不只如此，透過我們的詮釋，每一個意象似乎也可能與其他任何意象、任何文本、任何概念相關聯。今天的藝術教學，是存在於互文性的時代。

當然，這個水平化或超扁平的情況，正如村上隆所強調，令藝術教師的工作更加困難。藝術與視覺文化教育的內容，實在有太多太多的選擇，教師已經愈來愈不可能獨自決定藝術教育的內容。當然每一位教師都應該熟悉各種不同的傳統藝術和當代藝術形式、藝術作品及藝術理論；當然每一位教師也都應該熟悉各種不同的視覺文化意象，不論是電影、電視、電腦遊戲，或是漫畫、廣告、MTV、動畫等等。但即使是這一切都很熟悉，教師所知道的意象還是不夠多，也不可能清楚學生所有的興趣 (Wilson, 1997 a, Wilson, 1997 b)。

然而在視覺文化的淺根性領域中，在這三個教學法場域中的任何一個，學生都應該探求自己的興趣；即使是在藝術教室的正式場域，由教師提議該創作、研究哪些意象，仍然應該永遠讓學生有機會、有權力在教師的選擇之外，也可以採用自己的意象、自己的觀念。在介於其間的場域，學生可以用自己選擇的意象來完成作業，甚至更有機會表達自己，照自己的意思來選擇身邊視覺文化的影像與概念。最後，在主動創作的場域，學生幾乎自己做所有的選擇，只是當然也受到流行視覺文化的制約。正是在主動創作的場域，

流行視覺文化的影像、觀念以及學生的興趣，最能夠充分發展。

結論

我再回到 Chagoya 的藝術作品與村上隆的「超扁平」理論，在我提出的視覺文化教學法三種場域中，新與舊、高與低、滑稽與深奧的界限已經消失，讓我們有機會鼓勵學生與教師，將所有層面的視覺文化意象與觀念都放在同一個層面，彼此互動。但是藝術作品、文本、觀點這樣的互動，只是一個手段，目的仍然在於促使視覺文化教學法當中的每一位參與者，都能夠創造是意義的淺根網絡。

Readings (1996, p. 145) 曾經談到「毫不對稱、無窮無盡的教學關係」，其中學生與教師是同事的關係，共同處在「思維的對話網...他者的聲音。」他也指出「教學法是『傾聽思想』。」我們藝術與視覺文化教學法也許可以再做補充，這個義務的對話網絡中，意象與觀念不斷互相支持，又互相爭辯，或隱或現；時而有所共鳴、時而有歧見，交錯影響、反覆循環，意象如果受到尊重，這一切交流互動都有可能。這三種視覺文化教學法場域的意象，可能透過各式各樣交互的作用，不論是預期中或預期外，都能豐富我們的人生與人性，只是確實的方法我們還無法想見。

參考文獻

- Barthes, Roland (1977). *Image-Music-Text*. London: Fontana
- Cassel, V. (2003). *SPLAT BOOM POW: The influence of cartoons in contemporary art*. Houston: Contemporary Arts Museum.
- Dahlberg, G., Moss, P. & Pence, A. (1999). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Postmodern perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Duncum, P. (2001). Visual culture: Developments, definitions, and directions for art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 42 (2), 101-112.
- Freedman, K. (2003). *Teaching visual culture: Curriculum, aesthetics, and the social life of art*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gallie, W. B. 1956. Essentially Contested Concepts, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 56, 167-220.
- Garcian, C. (1999). *Performing pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gomez-Pena, G., Chagoya, E. & Rice, F. (2000). *Codex espangliensis*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Kristeva, Julia (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Murakami, T. (2000). *Super flat manifesto, Super flat*. Tokyo. Madra Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Peckham, M. (1965). *Man's rage for chaos*. Philadelphia: Chilton Company.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in the ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith-Shank, D. (2002). The semiotics of community celebrations. *Visual Arts Research*, 28 (2), 57-63.
- Tavin, K. (2003). Wrestling with angles, searching for hosts: Toward a critical pedagogy of visual culture. *Studies in Art Education*, 44 (3), 197-213.
- Wilson, B. (1974) The superheroes of J. C. Holtz plus an outline of a theory of child art. *Art Education*, 16 (1), 2-9.
- Wilson, B. (1976). Little Julian's impure drawings. *Studies in Art Education*, 17 (2), 45-62.

- Wilson, B. (1997 a). Child art, multiple interpretations, and conflicts of interest. In A. M. Kindler (Ed.), *Child development in art* (pp. 81-94), Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Wilson, B. (1997 b). Types of child art and alternative developmental accounts: Interpreting the interpreters. *Human development*, 40, 155-168.
- Wilson, B. (1997 c). *The quiet evolution: Changing the face of arts education*. Los Angeles: The Getty Education Institute for the Arts.
- Wilson, B. (2000). Empire of signs revisited: Children's manga and the changing face of Japan. In L. Lindstrom, (Ed.). *The cultural context: Comparative studies of art education and children's drawings* (pp. 160-178). Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press.
- Wilson, B. (2002). Becoming Japanese: Manga, children's drawings, and the construction of national character. In L. Bresler, & C. M. Thompson (Eds.) *The arts in children's lives: Context, culture, and curriculum* (pp. 43-55). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Wilson, B. (2003). Of diagrams and rhizomes: Visual culture, contemporary art, and the impossibility of mapping the content of art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 44 (3), pp. 114-129.
- Wilson, B. (In press). Child art after modernism: visual culture and new narratives. In E. Eisner & M. Day (Eds.), *Handbook for research and policy in art education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Wilson, B., Hurwitz, A. & Wilson, M. (1987) *Teaching Drawing from Art*. Worcester, MA: Davis.
- Wilson, B. & Toku, M. (in press). Boys' love, yaoi and art education: Issues of power and pedagogy. In D. Smith-Shank (Ed.), *Semiotics and art/visual culture*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Wilson, B. & Wilson, M. (1977). An iconoclastic view of the imagery sources in the drawings of young people. *Art Education*, 30 (1), 4-12.
- Wilson, B. & Wilson, M. (1980) Beyond marvelous: Conventions and inventions in John Scott's Gemini. *School Arts*, 80 (2), 20-26.
- Wilson, M & Wilson, B. (1982 a) *Teaching children to draw: A guide for*

視覺文化教學法的
三大場域：
尊重學生的興趣與
影像

teachers and parents. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Wilson, B. & Wilson, M. (1982 b) Dimensions of meaning in children's story drawings: From theory to therapy. *Art therapy: A bridge between worlds* (pp. 69-80).

The proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Conference of the American Art Therapy Association.