

**Arthur D. Efland.** *A History of Art Education.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1990. Pp. 305.

There has been a growing interest in North America in the history of art education. Conferences on the topic at Pennsylvania State University (November 1985, October 1989) have been indicators of that interest and a stimulus to further research. A common comment at the first conference was that a new text on the history of art education in the United States was long past due. Frederick Logan's 1955 book, *The Growth of Art in American Schools*, needed to be replaced and the thirty years since he had written it needed to be chronicled and analyzed. The debt owed to Logan was acknowledged, but time and changing fashion tarnish history books and perhaps historians.

*A History of Art Education* is clearly an attempt to replace Logan's work, made by a writer with the experience and reputation to achieve that aim. Or so one would have thought. Efland fails lamentably in his task.

Efland brings an interest in history to his passion for art education, but his knowledge of the writing of history does not equal his knowledge of art. He claims in his preface that the book will provide "a more adequate interpretative perspective" than does Logan's (p. ix). He wishes to examine whether changes in art education stem from "social realities of the times [or]...changes in pedagogical fashion" (p. ix). In fact Efland provides very little analysis of the events he chronicles with the exception of a few

vague comparisons thrown in for good measure. If history it is, the book is narrative history in a style that was outdated thirty years ago. He relies heavily on old secondary sources, with some sections so dependent on a single source that they resemble poor paraphrases rather than original work. There are some small oases of writing based on primary materials and then other tracts without any attribution of any kind. One is forced to assume that in these sections the author may be relying on secondary sources that he does not acknowledge.

After a brief opening chapter, the book follows a chronological pattern. In a chapter of thirty-eight pages Efland moves from the Ancient Greeks to the Age of Enlightenment. To a large extent he relies on one book published in 1961 for his information on the Classical era (E.B. Castle, *Ancient Education and Today*) and later in the chapter switches his allegiance to a slightly more recent work (N. Pevsner, *Academies of Art Past and Present*, 1973). His shallow synopses of these two works lead him to make unsupported generalizations that I doubt either Castle or Pevsner would acknowledge.

Matters do not improve as the book progresses. Efland steams through the industrial revolution with whistle stops at a variety of European art and craft movements, both in and out of schools, in an attempt to show their influence on United States art education. His facts are muddled and his analysis is lacking. I will take several examples from one specific period within this section.

When speaking about the development of art education in nineteenth-century Britain he overlooks the fact that he should be talking only about England and Wales. This might be unimportant if it were not that the Scots have a somewhat different educational and intellectual tradition. He speaks about the drawing course introduced in 1857, then attempts to illustrate it with three figures from the 1895 syllabus. Not only was the 1857 course different from the 1895 course, but he combines the three figures into one without identifying their particular significance (pp. 59-60). Even more importantly, Efland assumes that, because there was an official syllabus for drawing, the subject was taught in the schools. In fact, it wasn't. In 1887, for example, only 505 out of 19,154 schools reported teaching the subject. In other words, the official prescription for the teaching of drawing had little relevance to what children were actually taught. Looking at art education beyond school, Efland makes the remarkable unsupported statement that "Britain solved the problem of training artisan designers by devising a two-tiered system of professional art education" (p. 60). The evidence suggests, and most writers agree, that the two-tiered system failed to solve the problem.

If I were complaining about any one of these errors alone, then I might justifiably be accused of being somewhat picky. However, there are so many errors of this type throughout the book that the whole work is suspect. Efland simply has not done the research necessary. He has relied too much on secondary sources—and out-

dated ones at that—and he has accepted what their authors have said without exercising critical judgement and without checking their primary evidence.

Efland's final chapter looks at the period after World War II. Consequently one expects him to break new ground if the book is to be any sort of worthwhile replacement for Logan's 1955 work. Instead, the chapter is more a compilation of writings about art education and education in general and it never comes to grips with what was actually happening in the schools and colleges.

A problem for those concerned about the history of art education is that there is a dearth of historical publications on the subject and that even those have serious flaws. I looked to this book as promising to provide a refreshing new look at the history of U.S. art education. Unfortunately, it fails to do so.

Tony Rogers  
University of South Australia

**Michael Gauvreau.** *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991. Pp. xviii, 398, illus. \$39.95.

Explicitly confronting the treatment Richard Allen, Brian McKillop, Carl Berger, and Ramsay Cook give