The present research aims to investigate lecturer’s feedback over the art curriculum in Tehran, the capital of Iran, and introduce the applicability of Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE), as a new way of teaching art, and its implication of art instruction in studio-based fields of study for undergraduate degree. This study is carried out based on a survey in which fifty art lecturers contributed. The standard questionnaires included 22 questions were used to assess the objectives of the study. The findings revealed that: (a) of the three components of DBAE, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics were not dominated in seven art university studio based classes according to the lecturers’ ideas; (b) all participants were dissatisfied with the current art curriculum; (c) the majority of the lecturers were enthusiastic about further training which would enable them to teach the four components of DBAE. In the conclusion, a novel curriculum might be welcome based on the participants’ responses, and also a discipline-based art education curriculum may be presented as superior method.
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**INTRODUCTION**

In Iran, Modern civilization began in the era of Safavid and continued into Qajar era. Coming European artists' travel to Iran and transferring students to abroad brought new intellectualism to the Iranian artists in Qajar period. Art education in schools was based on European principles that made new senses of art. Tehran University, the first, largest and the oldest institution of higher education in Iran, was established based on European principles in 1940 (Marefat, 1992).

During the last 30 years, the number of schools, colleges, universities and other educational institutions has extraordinary increased and the number of students and lecturers in different levels has also risen (Kiani, 2009). Education has always had a particular significance in Iranian beliefs and culture since the ancient time of Iran. After the Islamic revolution of Iran, philosophy, policies and objectives of the previous educational systems have been modified (Unesco-IBE, 2006-2007).

To analyze the development of higher education in Iran, one should present an internal as well as an external view of its role and function. Unlike other Asian countries whose changing position in the world economy and technology challenged the traditional function of their universities, higher education in Iran has been inward looking, and responsive to the urgent needs of society in rapid transition (Postiglione and Mak, 1997).

Higher education organizations obviously required well-designed academic plans. For their success, they look for high-quality institutions, committed and well-prepared students, and enough sources. Thus, there are some performances for high standards. Issues of quality and insufficient resources are made via realities that higher
education faced with. Extension is one of these issues that higher education struggles to consider. Responding to such a demand without more quality seems to be a daunting challenge (Djeahane, 2000).

In Iranian national universities, higher education is not supported through a high quality evaluation. For many years, Iranian universities could not manage and enhance effective, internal structures of quality. The academics' affairs for internal management were unsuccessful and gave way to a mechanism of bureaucratic supervision and management. Recently, changes have brought novel ideas involving the principle of universities' self-assessment, according to academic autonomy and scientific liberty in Iran. However, the Iranian government still has tendency towards external, bureaucratic supervision (Floor, 2002).

Insufficient learning-teaching processes and research activities show the absence of an appropriate mechanism for quality assurance in higher education in Iranian universities (Farasatkhah et al., 2008). Codified educational system, which has different functions from the traditional educational system, aimed to transfer predetermined data to some extent and gain social status, with no relation to the needs of the community rapidly expanded (Haraty, 2002). However, despite many years of training programs, no modification in the shape and content of the programs has been seen (Ebrahim and Jeyran Izadi, 2009).

Art education has been following a falling in Iran academic level, there are various reasons, including the weaknesses of content, lack of academic ability, lack of use appropriate methods in the field of art (Zadeh Mohamadi, 2005). The aim of this study was to find lecturers' feedback on the art curriculum and introduce the Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) as a new way of teaching art and its implication of art instruction in studio-based class for undergraduate level.

BACKGROUND

Discipline-based art education

Since the 1960s, framework as well as theory for a comprehensive art education has reflected and influenced education. Starting with the works of Manual Barkan at Ohio State University, the organization for art as an area of research was finally identified as multifaceted or including four areas; production, criticism, history, and aesthetics (Zahnner, 2003). In the 1980's, a pattern appeared called Discipline-based Art Education (DBAE) that was founded via several scholars such as Clark et al. (1987) and by the support of Getty Center for research in art. In the 21st century, Discipline-Based Art Education have been rooted in art instructor's preparation, also training instructors employed it as the dominant system (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1993).

Advocate of DBAE state that it represents an extensive method in art education than any other methods. People appreciate its qualities, situate it's in culture, and argue and justify their ideas about its essence and significance (Eisner, 2002). The objectives of DBAE are in the knowledge and perception into one's world extracted from the motifs and content of art produced and investigated in academic centers (Wilson and Rubin, 2000).

Stewart and Walker (2005) argued DBAE changed art instruction towards thorough comprehension of art shapes, for different kinds of learning and thinking as well as teaching approaches nurturing and guiding arts skills and insights. Also, DBAE represents framework for appearing instructors with confined art experience when learning to make art curriculum. Learners in a DBAE art class consider the area by these four elements for creating, understanding, and appreciating art and artist, the artistic affairs, and the role of art in culture.

DBAE appeared as a model to reform programs used via several schools (Delacruz and Dunn, 1995). To found consistency in content, state curriculum guides have been prepared by the content of DBAE as well as the national visual arts standards (Sabol, 2004). Furthermore, according to Goldberg (2006) the Getty initiatives have structured the function of art in schools, particularly in relation to history, criticism, and aesthetics. The art provides such influential landscapes of opportunity that it seems complicate to determine what to do in particular cases. Getty gives us a guideline that shows how our National Standards for Arts in Education have been made.

Siegesmund (1998) cites DBAE, as a specific type of art education curriculum, which emerged during the 1980’s, as exhibiting scientific rationalist tendencies. DBAE curriculum advocates for a fundamental content delivered through hierarchical sequences (Delacruz and Dunn, 1996; Stankiewicz, 2000). The element in the rationale for DBAE is the recognition that art is a cultural phenomenon and must be taught in the content of whatever culture produced the artwork studied (Jooyon, 1992).

Art production

According to Greer (1987), art production helps students develop their expressive abilities. Art-making is acquiring the skills and concepts to create visual arts. The opportunity to convert a material into a medium, a substance that conveys the ideas, images, and feelings of a child enlists and develops a range of important cognitive skills (Eisner, 1987).

Walker (2001) has expanded DBAE approach with a more reflective view of art production that emphasizes on art making as a “meaning making endeavor” (p. 1). Stewart and Walker (2005) stated that art process or art making is taught to develop technical skill, knowledge
about design, and personal expression. It is also “...a means for exploring the world, self, and others” (p. 51).

Art criticism

According to Greer (1987), the work of critics is to explicate the meaning of particular works of art and to arrange them on a scale from the least to the most important ones. Eisner (1987) viewed art criticism as a means for developing visual sensitivity, observing, describing, analyzing, and evaluating the subtle and complex qualities of art.

Art criticism wants students to question what they observe; also, it tends to convince them to explain, interpret, and assess based on the Stewart and Walker (2005). The study of art in a DBAE program (Hamblen, 1993) was divided into four disciplines including studio production, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. Integrated study of these four areas was promoted, but not the co-mingling of art with other subjects.

Art history

Like art criticism, art history studies the artwork itself and includes its temporal-cultural context, as well (Greer, 1987). For some advocates of DBAE, knowledge of art history is a basic prerequisite for the ability to appreciate and recognize art (Al-Muhanna, 1989). This appreciation and knowledge could begin with works from a student's culture and lead to the study of other cultures as well.

Stewart and Walker (2005) argued that an art history “...is about time, chronology, classification....artworks, aesthetics, style, intellectual ideas, interpretation, analysis, evaluation, iconography, social and cultural context, and change” (p. 45).

Aesthetics

Greer (1987) said that the discipline of aesthetics leads to reflection on our experiences and understanding of art. In the past, aestheticians mostly inquired nature of an individual's experience with artistic beauty. Today, however, aesthetic inquiry, as a philosophical discipline, is more concerned the nature of an artistic work as the product of an artistic creation and as a focal point of aesthetic appreciation (Crawford, 1987).

Bachtel-Nash (1985), reporting on "The Aesthetic Eye Project," examines student responses to reproductions of original paintings. Her primary assumption was that skills and values are needed to experience satisfaction through stimulus.

Based on the Stewart and Walker (2005), aesthetics presents the significant questions, “related to purpose, value, meaning, and the nature of art” (p. 54). According to Smith (2002) there are four stages of aesthetic learning that consider creative affairs in the early stages and the cultural, and philosophical attitudes of discipline-based arts education (DBAE) in the second.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An inconsistent utilization of terms considered belief is represented in art education literature too. For example, several art education scholars (Duncum, 2008; Freedman, 1991; Smith, 1983; Swanger, 1981; Wolff, 1990) consider art educators’ ideas. Tomhave (1992) investigates teacher values. Also, McSorley (1996) explores instructors ‘understanding. Maitland-Gholson (1988) analyzed instructors’ epistemological thoughts. Kowlachuk (1999) examined instructors’ knowledge. In educational literature, teacher belief considers imaginations, theories, and knowledge (a) about the area of study that will be taught in the class (b) about the teaching as well as learning processes (Deemer, 2004; Fang, 1996; Kagan, 1992; Kinchem, 2004; Orton, 1996; Schommer, 1990; Tatoo, 1996). People such as, Smith-Shank (1993) and Grauer (1999) used the term teacher belief in art education.

Among those scholars who study the applicability of a discipline-based approach to art education in a multicultural or non-Western environment are Johnson (1988), Fleming (1988), Hamblen (1987) and Al-Muhanna (1989). Christiansen (2007) showed how art teachers trained in the approach continue to use Discipline-Based Art Education. She believed that the tenets of DBAE remain foundational with branches growing in different directions as new notions of what should be included in art curricula.

Furthermore, McConkie (2005) integrated Discipline-Based Art Education with John Dewey theory to emphasize on social context and to enrich the aesthetic. Al-Muhanna (1989) examined the feasibility of implementing DBAE in Kuwait to determine whether it functions cross-culturally. In order to successfully implement DBAE in Kuwait, the author suggests several curricular changes in accordance with the existing Kuwaiti educational system. In Iran, more studies should have been done on DBAE. Kazempour and Ghafrari (2011) compared the current art curriculum in Iranian secondary schools and the DBAE curriculum and found no significant difference between the current art curriculum of the participant in secondary schools and the art production curriculum whereas a significant difference was indicated between the current art curriculum of the participant in secondary schools and the art criticism, art history and aesthetic curricula. Also Mehrmohammadi (2003) introduced DBAE as a new approach in Iranian elementary curriculum.

Several teacher belief scholars consider curriculum or particular subject matter teaching for (Brousseau et al.,
According to Eisner (1972) art education cannot develop theoretically and practically unless we examine educators' belief considering their method of teaching. For Carroll (1997), “Beliefs about art, teacher characteristics, or preparation, affects every day instructional decisions or student learning in art” (p. 180). Although DBAE has been confined to the realms of theory and educational policy in Korea, the seventh Korean education revision focused on how to implement DBAE (Lee, 2005).

**METHODODOLOGY**

This study was based on a survey. The questionnaire aimed at assessing the opinions and attitudes of 50 art instructors over the art curriculum in Tehran universities and introduce the Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) as a new way of teaching art and its implication of art instruction in studio-based field of studies for undergraduate degree. It is assumed that the difference between the current art curriculum in Iran and a DBAE program would be in the content of the curriculum.

To examine the applicability of DBAE to the art curriculum, the researchers concentrated the survey in seven universities in Tehran province. For this particular study, samples were drawn from the painting field of the visual arts departments in the selected universities including Fine Art University, Art University, Azad University, Sooreh University, Science and Culture University, Tarbiat Modares University and Alzahra University.

Participants were chosen based on their instructors’ years of experience and educational levels. All the participants (40 male, 10 female) were teaching in visual art at Tehran art universities. Twenty three of male participants were Ph.D. holder and the rest had master degree (n=17), while for female (n=10), 5 had Ph.D. degree and 5 had master degree. Data for this study were collected through using standard questionnaire of Jooyon (1992).

**Research instrument**

The standard questionnaire was consisted of multiple questions items that were divided into two parts; part one included general information about each participant and part two included 22 questions, solicited information on the existing curriculum of their universities and participants’ general opinion about each element of DBAE: art history, art criticism, aesthetics and art production (studio art). Validity of the questionnaire was measured by consulting with research experts (n=13) and reliability of this questionnaire was measured by Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (α=0.80). The data collection started from March to April 2012.

**RESULTS**

The participants had 24.5±9.8 years of teaching experience. Also, the average of instructors’ age was 56.3±9 (Table 1). All participants (100%) saw the significance of some changes in their current art curriculum. 16% of participants who offered their views on what was missing in the art curriculum of their department reported that the curriculum failed to satisfy students’ needs in approaching art. 24% of them said that appropriate time and course allotment for art practice and art theory was needed.

Furthermore, 30% participants agreed that various art theory courses related toart criticism, art history and aesthetics needed. Although, integration was needed between art practice and art theory according to the 16% of the instructors and the rest (14%), believed that various teaching methods in studio art should be introduced.

Given the opportunity to provide specific views on how the instruction could be improved, nearly all of participants agreed the current Iranian art instruction should be changed to the developed art theory in studio-based classes and also 24% agreed that the curriculum should improve students' creative thinking and expression rather than increase students’ art production skills or techniques (Figure 1).

Furthermore, 12% participants asked for more multipurpose audiovisual aids and other materials or equipment for teaching art. Participants indicated that the art instruction and the college entrance exam for art students have been the barriers for developing creative thinking and expression.

To improve the art curriculum 66% of them suggested that the curriculum should be more flexible in selecting and planning classroom activities and teaching methods. Fifty six percent of instructors also suggested that most art-theory courses should be included. An integrated course for artistic practice and art theory came into request by 18% of the participants, because art-practice and art-theory courses are pursuing two different directions (Figure 2). There are no courses related to both art theory and art practice, unless studio-art. Lecturers occasionally introduce the various traditions, cultures and arts of mankind as well as aesthetics and art criticism into class, or students have an extensive understanding and knowledge of these things through their individual studies.

Art lecturers were asked whether they have taught skills or concepts in the three elements of DBAE, in their art classes. Most of them had no experience in teaching these elements (Table 2). Almost all of them showed interest in finding out more about how to include these three elements in the art program.

To examine what was emphasized the most and the least in their teaching, they stated that the most important concerns in their teaching were developing creativity/originality (52%), artistic skill or techniques (40%), and the concept of art (8%).

The following question determined that how often art instructors had activities such as taking students to museums or galleries, using audiovisual aids, and having class discussion. Among such activities, 80% was devoted to class discussion; 76% of the participants used audiovisual aids more than a semester and 12% said they had never field trips to museums or galleries.

Ninety-four percent of the participants said they never invited guest speakers, and some of them observed some difficulties in holding a conference or seminar and
Table 1. The average of age and length of total university-teaching experience of professors in this study by gender and degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master (17; 34%)</td>
<td>PhD (23; 46%)</td>
<td>Master (5; 10%)</td>
<td>PhD (5; 10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors age</td>
<td>58.3±9.6</td>
<td>56.2±9.1</td>
<td>54.6±15.2</td>
<td>51.4±5.5</td>
<td>56.3±9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-teaching experience</td>
<td>26.7±9.9</td>
<td>24.5±9.3</td>
<td>22.8±15.1</td>
<td>19±4.8</td>
<td>24.5±9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Professor’s idea about art history, art criticism and aesthetic in discipline-based art education (values are frequency and percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think your curriculum should be changed?</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The element of art history is considered an important content?</td>
<td>35 (70%)</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ knowledge of art history helps them on producing artwork</td>
<td>38 (76%)</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The element of art criticism is considered an important content?</td>
<td>28 (56%)</td>
<td>22 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ knowledge of art criticism helps them on producing artwork</td>
<td>26 (52%)</td>
<td>24 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The element of aesthetic is considered an important content?</td>
<td>42 (84%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ knowledge of aesthetic helps them on producing artwork.</td>
<td>37 (74%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you taught skills or concepts in art criticism, art history or aesthetics in your art class?</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>39 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you known or heard of DBAE before?</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>46 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want more information on DBAE?</td>
<td>45 (90%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Art instructors respond for improve the instruction.

inviting outside personnel because of lack of support by
their departments, thus they occasionally recommended
students to visit galleries or to go to seminars held
outside of their institutions. However, the instructors
talked directly about lack of facilities and preparations.
They also indicated that the instructors did not try to keep
their knowledge up to date.

Another question of the survey explored the instructors’
overall opinions about DBAE. Only a few had known or
heard of DBAE and almost all the participants wanted
more information on DBAE (Table 2). Some instructors
said the basic ideals of DBAE were not new, and they
had been using them for years even though they had
never heard or known of DBAE.

Sixty eight percent of the instructors did not believe the
existing art curriculum required for teaching DBAE
component. Aesthetics was considered as an explicit
ignores part of the curriculum by a large group of
Art instructors respond to improve the art curriculum.

More than half of the instructors believed art history should be included in the curriculum (Table 2). Studio art received a great deal of attention. A substantial number of instructors agreed that they must teach these subjects, especially art criticism, and aesthetics; they tend to see these as essential and mandated parts of the program.

More than half of the participants agreed that instructors should go through pre-service and in-service training programs. The majority of the instructors complained that the curriculum was unclear and unable to supply material for teaching art criticism, and aesthetics, and had lack of flexibility.

They asked that new development in informative art, locally and internationally, should be incorporated into the curriculum. They asked for art textbooks written especially for both the students and instructors’ guides to assist them in their instruction. A most important suggestion was that an entirely new curriculum should be developed, with input from the instructors who would give equal attention to theoretical and practical aspects of art education. The instructors showed that these concerns are probably common to most of the art instructors in Iran.

DISCUSSION

About one-fourth of the participants in the present study believed that current art curriculum has some problems such as lack of art theory and suitable time and practical courses. But some researchers opposed to DBAE with assuming that it will reduce the available time for studio art if art theory includes the art practice (Ewens, 1988). But it might be true that time is needed for introducing the students to ideas from the world of art, discussing art in depth, exploring influences, and demonstrating methods of inquiry including art production techniques. Nevertheless, by the help of DBAE, art students can understand the values and objectives of the present art, and the construction of future values of a changing humanistic, democratic society, and they can learn how to analyze the objectives of the artist and the values projected by the work of art in relation to society and its values (Stinespring and Kennedy, 1988).

Around one-third of the participants indicated that different art theory courses were essential for art curriculum in studio-based class. Also, some of them agreed on the necessity of integration between art making and art theory. The four components of DBAE are brought together in reciprocal effect and are conceptually related by means of the ordinal structures mandated by DBAE. Students ‘experiences in art making and in critical, historical or aesthetic inquiry are improved by the integration of art learning. Thus, studio attempts to acquire additional importance as documents of students’ evolution in comprehending historical, critical and aesthetic principles (DiBlasio, 1985).

Nearly, all of the participants believed that art instruction needs to be revolutionized to increase art theory in practical classes in Iran. Eisner (1965) suggested curricular modification in which students would not only become familiar with art media and method, but also would learn about the world of art.

For developing the art curriculum, the participants asked for more equipment. To improve an art program, Feinstein (1989) suggests that existing courses can be modified or new ones can be developed in teaching studio art, art history, art criticism and aesthetic courses that integrate that the four disciplines According to her, the existing undergraduate program in an art or art education department must be refocused for
implementing the DBAE. More than half of the participants suggested that flexibility is needed for choosing art program activities and teaching methods. Therefore, a DBAE approach has been studied to examine its feasibility in a variety of fields.

According to the participants, art theory does not integrate with studio-based class; however, some instructors occasionally introduce art history, aesthetic, and art criticism. Al-Amri (2010) indicated that, the Art Education Department of Sultan Qabos University (SQU) should implement a philosophy of teaching and learning in and through art and that the art content for the Art-based courses must be derived from the DBAE.

Approximately all of the participants were interested in knowing about DBAE domains and added it to art program. According to Hagaman (1988), art teachers are not currently well prepared in three of four major components of the discipline: art criticism, aesthetics, and art history. Art educators have taken art history courses and at least know sources for historical information, although they may not include art history in a significant manner in their programs. Art criticism, on the other hand, has achieved curricular attention during the past 15 to 20 years.

Although art educators have not had formal coursework in art criticism, they have participated in studio critiques and probably read critical reviews in art periodicals. Barrett (1988) suggests that art educators improve their chances of success in the teaching of art criticism by examining and discussing through studio critique and reading. However, critics of the DBAE approach argued that it is not realistic to expect the instructors who are not trained in arts disciplines to be able to teach disciplines in an authentic way (Hamblen, 1989).

Based on the participants’ idea developing creativity/originality was the most concern of the instructors in their teaching in this study and developing the concept of the art was their least concern. As a branch of philosophy, aesthetics deals with general questions about art, beauty, and creativity (Halstead, 2008). Although, Walker (2001), at Ohio State University, implemented DBAE a step further by emphasizing on “meaning making” as a constructivist approach to art learning.

In this study, 12% of the instructors indicated that they never had field trips to museums or galleries. Many museums have increased their educational programs for school groups. Incorporating DBAE into these programs can enhance their effectiveness and help ensure that museum field trips, which require considerable effort and may be costly to arrange, are productive educational experiences (Dobbs, 1998).

Results of the current study revealed that instructors suffer from lack of outside reading and preparation on areas that they are weak. On the other hand, concern about the preparation of art instructors who were trained in teaching art making was also apparent (Hagaman, 1988; Parks, 1989).

Although for all of the participants, DBAE was not familiar, and they were interested to know more about it, some of them had been using this method without knowing about DBAE program. Kaplan (1998) stated that art teachers who teach DBAE are more focused and cognizant on their teaching.

About two-thirds of the instructors stated that the current art curriculums are not included DBAE component. Smith (1989) proposed a curriculum that would contain four components of DBAE with theories of art such as Emotionalist, Formalist, or Imitative theories of art.

A significant numbers of participants agreed that art criticism and aesthetics should be part of the teaching program. Stinespring (1992) stated that the DBAE approach aims to raise students’ understanding about the history of art and the criteria for judgments made about the art and to expand their qualitative experience of art production and also to make art more respectable as an academic subject.

The participants claimed that there is a need for training programs for instructors through both pre-service and in-service. Lovano-Kerr (1985) states that the comprehensive approach of DBAE, with its prescribed balance, sequencing, and integration of content and skills in the four art disciplines, in which art education is presented in the larger context of aesthetic education, calls for a different structure for art teacher preparation.

Results of this study showed that participants asked for a new improved informative art, locally and internationally, combined into the curriculum needed. Johnson (1988) and Hamblen (1988) express concern over the real applicability of DBAE to the art of all cultures. With regard to this issue, Eisner’s (1988) replies to this question: Hamblen’s claim that DBAE emphasizes Western art is true. Given our culture, why not? What would be unfortunate is if it paid exclusive attention to Western art.

Finally, from the results of this study, most of the instructors believed that for improving the instruction, in general, curriculum should be changed to a developed art theory in studio based class. Deficiencies in the academic preparation of the professors may be the greatest barrier to the introduction of DBAE in Iran. The findings of current study indicated several problems in the general art program in Iran. Thus, there is a need for developing training both pre-service and in-service programs. Also, the practice of giving the instructors some tasks that are not related to teaching and curriculum was unclear and did not provide instructional guides. This was cited as a problem regarding the instructors.

Conclusion

Apparently, vast dissatisfaction with the existing curriculum indicates a tendency towards a new curriculum.
It is necessary to convince that (a) the curriculum should be changed according to the participants respond, and (b) a discipline-based art curriculum might be superior to other options.

A discipline-based approach in art could lead the students to greater understanding of their own culture. The four discipline areas are included in a formal, nation-wide curriculum and art is a required subject. The increased attention to criticism and aesthetics would come through DBAE and could also heighten creativity. Timing is another positive indicator that a discipline-based art program would be accepted in Iran. The current curriculum is almost thirty years old. It has been with little revision or updating except its introduction. In that decade, there were many advances in the theory and technology of education. This new knowledge needs to be incorporated in the curriculum. As the curriculum needs revision, the time may be right for proposing the discipline-based art education.
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