

Wolfgang Schneider / Emily Achieng Akuno /
Yvette Hardie / Daniel Gad (eds.)

Cultural Policy for Arts Education

African-European Practises
and Perspectives



PETER LANG

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

ISSN 1611-700X

ISBN 978-3-631-86679-5 (Print)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-86680-1 (E-Book)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-86681-8 (EPUB)

DOI 10.3726/b19006

PETER LANG



Open Access: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial NoDerivatives 4.0 unported license. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

© Wolfgang Schneider, Emily Achieng Akuno, Yvette Hardie, Daniel Gad 2022

Peter Lang GmbH
International Academic Publishers
Berlin 2022

Peter Lang – Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York ·
Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

Aron Weigl

Independent Performing Arts and Arts Education Cultural Governance of artistic practice

This article focuses on the extent to which funding programmes determine the development of the field of arts education in Germany by setting certain funding criteria. Since arts education is a cross-sectional field, various included and adjacent fields of practice are influenced in this governance process. This applies in particular to independent dance and theatre professionals, who are heavily dependent on various types of project funding and therefore react sensitively and quickly to changes in funding criteria.

The study “Freie darstellende Künste und Kulturelle Bildung im Spiegel der bundesweiten Förderstrukturen” (Independent Performing Arts and Cultural Education in the Light of the Funding Structures in Germany) (Weigl/EDUCULT 2018) carried out by EDUCULT on behalf of the German Association of Independent Performing Arts provides important information on the question of the role of cultural policy control in the practice of arts education using the example of the independent performing arts.

The aim of the study was to analyse the funding landscape for arts education and the relationship of female performers in the liberal arts with respect to arts education. The study focused on the following questions:

- Which funding programmes in the field of arts education that can be used by actors of the independent performing arts exist and which understandings of arts education underlie them?
- What is the relationship between independent performing arts and arts education?
- What forms of discourse on arts education exist between the different actors and how can these be further developed?

The motivation for the implementation on the part of the German Association of Independent Performing Arts was its own increased activity in the field of arts education. For example, the association is implementing its own sub-programme within the framework of the large nationwide programme “Culture Makes Strong” of the German Ministry of Education, which explicitly supports

arts education projects for educationally disadvantaged children and young people. In this context, however, some of the actors of the independent performing arts are also generally aware of a shift in funding from the promotion of the arts to the promotion of participation and participation projects or arts education. Whether this is actually the case could be ascertained within the framework of the study.

The examination of all relevant funding programmes for independent dance and theatre professionals at the federal and state levels revealed a differentiated picture. The perception of practitioners is correct insofar as at the beginning of the 2000s there were fewer and less well-endowed funding programmes for arts education projects than it is currently the case. With an overall budget of 250 million euros for the second funding phase from 2018 to 2022, the “Culture Makes Strong” programme, which has been running since 2013, represents a provisional high point in terms of programme volume (cf. BMBF 2018: 29). In addition, the German Commissioner for Culture and Media has also declared the area of arts education to be a topic of federal relevance. The governance of the cultural and education sector towards an intensified engagement with arts education is becoming clear. This development process is also described by the programmes that have now been set up in many federal states such as North Rhine-Westphalia (“Culture and School”), Berlin (“Project Fund Cultural Education”), Lower Saxony (“School:Culture!”), Hesse (“Culture Case”), Bavaria (“Culture Fund: Education and Culture”), Baden-Württemberg (“Innovation Fund Art: Cultural Education”), etc.

However, no cuts can be observed in the art-related project funding budgets (cf. Blumenreich 2016). There has therefore been no obvious shift in funding at the federal and state levels. With regard to the municipal level, the available data do not allow any conclusions to be drawn.

Now the question would have to be asked whether there is a tendency in the funding criteria for artistic projects towards funding projects that prioritise the promotion of participation in arts and culture of different groups of society. In most federal states – especially those with larger funding programmes for arts education projects – there is a clear separation between funding for the arts and funding for arts education. Some federal states such as Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Schleswig-Holstein and Thuringia, but also Lower Saxony, have actually formulated aspects such as cultural participation, a certain target group orientation, inclusion or integration as optional criteria in their funding criteria for artistic projects. This means that a stronger cultural governance for the support of arts education can be seen at these points. (Cf. Weigl/EDUCULT 2018: 42 ff.)

Between self-evidence and scepticism

In contrast to the adaptation of existing and already comprehensively established instruments, the relevance of cultural governance through newly created funding programmes depends above all on the extent to which these new offers are used by which actors. The survey among the members of the state associations of the independent performing arts (n=268) conducted as part of the study gives results that not only provide an answer to this question, but also illustrate the extent to which the field is already active in the field of arts education.

In principle, almost three quarters of the interviewed actors of the independent performing arts finance themselves through project funding. The arts education programmes, which are almost exclusively geared to project funding, thus correspond to the way these actors work. At the time of the survey in 2017, 45 % of them were already using funding programmes for arts education projects and almost half of those who had not yet done so stated that they wanted to apply for funding in the future. This is not surprising when around 60 % of the interviewed actors describe themselves as very active or active and 30 % as less active in the field of arts education; only 5 % see themselves as not active.

These figures make it clear that most of the actors of the independent performing arts have long since dealt with the field of arts education in one way or another. For a large part of them, dealing with questions of participation in the arts and the educational aspects of art is a matter in their performing activities. This applies in particular to the actors of the theatre for young audiences. It is above all these independent theatre professionals who make use of funding opportunities for arts education projects and describe themselves as active in the field of arts education. Interestingly, a larger group (41 %) of those surveyed who are not active in children's and youth theatre see their own artistic work per se as arts education than those active in this field (36 %). This shows, as has also become clear from interviews with independent theatre and dance professionals, that among those who do theatre for young audiences there is a need to define their own work as professional art – a challenge with which this sector has been confronted since its inception. (Cf. Weigl/EDUCULT 2018: 88 ff.)

General scepticism exists among actors of the independent performing arts regarding the use of the term “arts education”. The concept of education is spontaneously linked to the political domain of “school”, which many artists are critical of. If, moreover, “education” is not understood in the sense of a humanistic self-education process, but as the simple transfer of knowledge, then defensive attitudes arise on the artistic side. Above all, the independent performing arts

stand for process orientation and openness to results and see these as endangered in goal- and impact-oriented projects. In order to counter this scepticism, it is crucial which understanding of arts education is the basis of funding programmes, which is expressed in setting certain funding criteria.

Funding programmes as instruments of governance

As far as the general use of the funding offers is concerned, the programmes at the level of the federal states (69 %) in particular are used, but so are those at the level of the federal government (60 %). As will be explained below, this is not due to the fact that the eligibility criteria here are most in line with the requirements of the actors, but to the fact that the largest funding budgets exist at these levels. However, funding offers at municipal level (52 %) and in particular by private foundations and initiatives are used less frequently (38 %). At the municipal level and at the level of private foundations, the surveyed members of the associations for independent performing arts are also aware of fewer funding programmes for arts education projects.

Cultural policy aims to control the field of arts education by means of funding criteria. The fact that this control only partially meets the requirements of artistic practice can be seen above all in a comparison with the funding offers of private foundations. While only 26 % of the interviewed actors of the independent performing arts stated that the funding criteria at the federal level fit their projects in principle, 73 % said this with regard to the criteria for funding offers from the private sector. At the level of the federal states and the municipalities, the figures are 52 % and 53 % respectively.

This corresponds to the perception of the actors of the independent performing arts who have not yet received any funding from the respective funding distributors. When asked why this would be the case, some of the respondents attributed the funding programmes of the federal government (29 %) and the federal states (28 %) to: "The funding criteria are too narrow so that our claim to artistic autonomy would be impaired". As far as funding offers at the municipal level are concerned, only 15 % think so; and only 8 % think that the funding criteria of private foundations and initiatives would be inappropriate. The analysis of private funding offers confirms the picture. It becomes clear that the private actors attach importance to establishing funding instruments that are both open in terms of content and as uncomplicated as possible. (Cf. Weigl/EDUCULT 2018: 87 ff.)

One reason why the funding criteria are sometimes described as challenging is the separation of reception of the arts and artistic activity that goes hand in

hand with a certain understanding of arts education. The analysis of the funding criteria makes it clear that arts education is often equated with active participation in the sense of one's own artistic production, while art is understood as reception. Cultural policy obviously finds it difficult to define purely receptive processes as arts education. In the theoretical examination of this question, however, there is widespread agreement that receptive theatre and dance formats also have inherent educational potential, namely

“because of the polyvalence of the theatrical code, which often eludes unambiguous assignment of meaning and can only be meaningfully deciphered for the audience in comparison with their own experiences. Such artistic learning processes do not follow the aesthetic experience during the performance, but are part and result of the process of reception and interpretation”. (Taube 2012: 620)

Many of the actors of the independent performing arts see this as well, as the survey shows. For them, arts education – regardless of the format of implementation – is above all the interlocking of artistic and pedagogical processes and the empowerment to participate in shaping society (65 % each). Less than half (44 %) link the practical education of acting and dancing skills with the concept of arts education.

In addition to questions regarding the content of funding programmes, formal conditions often present challenges for applicants. The actors interviewed stated that the generally high effort involved in submitting applications or the necessary personal contribution required for many funding programmes at federal and state level, amounting to 20 % to 30 % of the total costs applied for, was difficult. At the municipal level, small amounts of funding or fee rates are challenging, as are funding programmes limited to certain sectors. The general lack of personnel and/or money in particular makes it difficult for the independent actors to use funding programmes for arts education projects. (Cf. Weigl/EDUCULT: 91 ff.)

Challenges through Funding Criteria

By setting funding criteria through the political or administrative side, actors of arts education are confronted with demands, without whose observance it is not possible to award funding. In this way, the field of arts education and thus the included areas, including the arts and education, are controlled, which in turn entails a change in practice. The study and this article do not call into question the fact that a control takes place, but analyse whether and to what extent an adaptation and reformulation of funding criteria and thus a change in the governance behaviour of cultural policy takes place.

Some funding administrations make it transparent that the funding guidelines provide for the cultural governance of the artistic field in a certain direction. The “Berliner Projektfonds Kulturelle Bildung” (Project Fund Cultural Education Berlin), for example, makes it clear: “It is for artists who want to shift their borders – and this from an artistic point of view”. (Quoted from Weigl/ EDUCULT 2018: 132) If, as in the case mentioned above, the arts are defined as the main component of arts education, this comes very close to the understanding of cultural education of the actors of the independent performing arts.

If, in contrast, primarily artless goals such as inclusion, integration or participation are pursued with funding programmes – whether formulated directly in funding criteria or implemented through jury or council decisions – new challenges arise for applicants. Artists deal with these demands in different ways. Current discussions with artists from the African continent show that the critical attitude of the artists is not only a phenomenon in German-speaking countries, but that these demands are also met with scepticism elsewhere.¹

Although the actors of the liberal performing arts who are active in the field of arts education also want to enable participation or work with diverse groups within themselves, a given goal of impact, e.g. on certain groups of addressees, is perceived as restrictive. Schneider rightly poses the question: “Is cultural education a combat term for theatre or does the real art of the actor only open up through the challenge of the audience?” (Schneider 2017: 233) Furthermore he states:

“When it comes to criteria for the promotion of (independent) theatre, it is mostly about the artistic. It must be innovative – and so on ... But since funding is a public process, i.e. financed with taxpayers’ money, it must also be permitted to bring the social dimension of theatre into play. Why does theatre always have to focus on theatre? After all, the essential partner is the audience”. (Ibid.: 233)

In order to be able to focus on the addressees and to implement successful projects of arts education in this sense, conceptual foundations and expertise that support processual quality, openness and reflection formats are necessary.

As far as the conceptual foundations and expertise in the field of arts education are concerned, however, there is a further challenge for the actors of the independent performing arts. The survey clearly shows that only three quarters of those who use funding programmes for arts education projects use a conceptual basis in this area for their work. Not all actors consider their own expertise in the field of arts education to be sufficient. Although 60 % state that they are responsible for dance/theatre pedagogical work or that they have at least one person for this area of responsibility, only 8 % have one person who is exclusively

responsible for it. However, 44 % of these persons have no special dance/theatre pedagogical qualification. The need for further training in the field of arts education is correspondingly high at 79 %. (Cf. *ibid.*: 99 ff.)

On the responsibility of cultural policy

Cultural policy can initiate programmes and projects that promote arts education and encourage more artists to become active in the field. Cultural policy can also adapt the funding criteria of existing programmes to make artistic practice more participatory, regardless of whether it is judged positive or negative. But if the will and goal is to create more educational opportunities in the field of the arts, this cannot be done without sufficient quality assurance.

Quality as a decisive criterion for cultural policy funding can only be guaranteed if not only the mere quantity of projects is formulated as a cultural policy goal, but framework conditions are created that enable the actors to implement quality projects. Because cultural education is not good “in itself”. Not only the orientation towards specific target groups within funding programmes, but above all the nature of cultural education itself must be regarded as a fundamental factor for or against cultural participation (cf. Weigl 2017: 43). Therefore, the first thing to do is to define what quality arts education is at all. Reinwand-Weiss defines a four-dimensional grid that represents a good basis for quality assurance in the field of arts education:

- The first dimension concerns the stakeholders and asks which participants are addressed, what knowledge participants and project implementers should have, what role different stakeholders play, etc.
- The second dimension considers forms of aesthetic expression and thereby processes of perception and design, whereby the arts are in the foreground: “Experience and participation processes can be motivated and structured by qualitative artistic methods”. (Reinwand-Weiss 2017: 60)
- The third dimension with regard to contexts poses organisational questions regarding location, space, equipment, financing, but also regarding the location of the topic, the involvement of cooperation partners, sustainability and transferability.
- The fourth dimension includes organisational and content-related processes within the framework of the other three dimensions.

Cultural governance in the field of arts education would have to take all four quality dimensions into account, whereby the focus should not be placed too strongly on the third dimension:

„The context dimension is important for the success of a project, but external frameworks and contextual factors are often oversimplified and often referred to as the sole measure for assessing the future quality of a project – without taking the other essential dimensions into account.“ (Reinwand-Weiss 2017: 61)

This includes, for example, sufficient opportunities for further and advanced training in the field of arts education, which could again be promoted through cost-neutral offers of such measures. The study has shown that this is indeed a need. Another decisive factor for quality cultural education is the time available for the processes. Stakeholders interviewed in the study stressed that one-off or short interventions in particular are not very sustainable. The fact that arts education is promoted almost exclusively in the form of projects contradicts this idea. Cultural education projects need time to be effective, which is why even longer-term funding periods are a decisive criterion for quality development in the field.

It would be easier for the artists to enter the system of arts education via special funding programmes. This would go hand in hand with control through financed pre-application phases and conception phases or work scholarships in the field of cultural education.

In addition, cultural policy would have to think of arts education not only in terms of schools, but also outside them, since processes of cultural education are not tied to formal learning. However, this cannot be achieved by cultural policy alone. Cultural policy would have to seek links with other ministries – which has been called for years but has hardly been implemented to date – and think together the various levels of regional government. Funding instruments should be coordinated or developed jointly, because arts education is a cross-sectional field that follows practical requirements rather than departmental logic.

Co-creation as a “New Way”

In order to strengthen arts education, therefore, a joint approach by different stakeholders is needed, not just different departmental responsibilities, as the editors of this publication series in the previous volume “Good Governance for Cultural Policy” already formulated: “The state, the market and civil society are not set against each other, but linked together. The focus is on the cultural well-being of every single citizen.” (Schneider/Gad 2014: 7)

For the tasks of cultural policy, for example, this means, as a first step, creating discussion formats between stakeholders of the arts sector and cultural administrations in the field of arts education. The forms of discourse between the actors of the independent performing arts and the state departments for

arts education can be described as capable of development, as the focus analyses of the situation in six federal states within the framework of the study have shown (cf. Weigl/EDUCULT 2018: 109 ff.). They need to be established and further developed. In terms of cooperation, it would also be a sensible option for stakeholders in practice to have a say in the establishment of new funding programmes and criteria.

This co-creation between cultural administrations and civil society actors, in this case the federal and regional associations of the independent performing arts, should be understood as a process: “to promote civic and democratic empowerment, where different citizen groups have better access not only as co-implementers, but also as co-initiators and co-designers of new activities, initiatives and programmes” (EDUCULT 2019: 4).

The programme “Culture makes strong” is an example of this form of co-creation. The German Association of Independent Performing Arts, for example, has the opportunity to align the specially implemented sub-programme “Dance and Theatre Make Strong” within the framework of the guidelines of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research in such a way that it better meets the requirements of its own practice field.

The funding programme for arts education of the state association of independent dance and theatre professionals in Baden-Württemberg shows that even more is possible. It represents an extreme form of “facilitating co-creation” (EDUCULT 2019: 16) in which the cultural administration merely provides the financial means and entrusts the civil society actor, the state association, with the distribution of funds on its own responsibility. In this way, funding criteria could be developed which, on the one hand, are tailored to the actors of the independent performing arts and, on the other hand, are committed to their own understanding of arts education. Cultural policy, however, thus provides control possibilities out of hand.

It is important to find out which form of co-creation can best bring the various interests of the cross-sectional field of arts education into an exchange. However, enabling the self-empowerment of actors in the field of arts education can already be described as an important task of cultural policy, because strengthening the actors contributes to improving the field of practice. Co-creative approaches that bring together representatives of cultural, educational and youth policy as well as artists, cultural educators and pedagogues or their interest groups already in the establishment phase or within the framework of reforms of funding programmes hold a transformative potential that has so far remained largely untapped. Cultural policy could play the role of initiator of this co-creative cooperation.

Note

- 1 At the conference “Cultural Policy and Arts Education. A First African-European Exchange” at the Federal Academy for Arts Education in Wolfenbüttel on 1–2 February 2018, artists from various African countries also expressed criticism that they feel how artists are called upon to improve social grievances.

References

- Blumenreich, U. (2016). Aktuelle Förderstrukturen der freien Darstellenden Künste in Deutschland: Ergebnisse der Befragung von Kommunen und Ländern. Berlin: Bundesverband Freie Darstellende Künste e.V.
- BMBF (ed.) (2018). Kultur macht stark. Bündnisse für Bildung: Programm, Projekte, Akteure. Berlin. https://www.bmbf.de/upload_filestore/pub/Kultur_macht_stark_Buendnisse_fuer_Bildung.pdf. Viewed April 29, 2019.
- EDUCULT (ed.). Co-Creative Cooperation in the Field of Culture and Heritage: Good Practice Report. http://educult.at/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Co-Create_Good-Practice-Report.pdf. Viewed April 29, 2019.
- Reinwand-Weiss, V.-I. (2017). „Cachet for Sociocultural Projects Dimensions of Quality Development“. In: Schneider, W./Kegler, B./Kofß, D. (eds.). *Vital Village: Development of rural areas as a challenge for cultural policy [Entwicklung ländlicher Räume als kulturpolitische Herausforderung]*. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 59–64.
- Schneider, W./Gad, D. (2014). „Towards Cultural Governance: Preface“. In: Schneider, W./Gad, D. (eds.). *Good Governance for Cultural Policy: An African-European Research about Arts and Development*. Frankfurt am Main u.a.: Peter Lang.
- Schneider, W. (2017). „Bühnen ohne Barrieren: Theaterpolitik für Kulturelle Teilhabe“. In: Schneider, W./Eitzeroth, A. (eds.). *Partizipation als Programm: Wege ins Theater für Kinder und Jugendliche*. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 229–242.
- Taube, G. (2012). „Theater und kulturelle Bildung“. In: Bockhorst, H./Reinwand, V.-I./Zacharias, W. (eds.). *Handbuch Kulturelle Bildung*. München: kopaed, pp. 616–621.
- Weigl, A. (2017). „Das Politische in der Kulturellen Bildung: Warum gesellschaftliche Teilhabe und kritische künstlerisch-ästhetische Auseinandersetzung zusammengehören“. In: Schneider, W./Eitzeroth, A. (eds.). *Partizipation als Programm: Wege ins Theater für Kinder und Jugendliche*. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 37–48.
- Weigl, A./EDUCULT (2018). Freie darstellende Künste und Kulturelle Bildung im Spiegel der bundesweiten Förderstrukturen. Berlin: Bundesverband Freie Darstellende Künste e.V.

Oluwagbemiga Ogboro-Cole

Arts Education Policy. National interests and the role of civil society

If cultural education policy is entrusted alone on any federal government to prescribe, there would be infectious on the delegation of its policy. Without the involvement of the governing states and other organizations involved in the empowering process of policy, to the benefit of the people in question on artistic fulfillment in the educational sector. Thus, has been the machinery that has popularized the Nigerian cultural education policy then and now due to the involvement of countless organs effort to promote Art and culture and its educational infrastructures.

Arts Education policy in Nigeria today addresses key policy issues specific to the most common global commitments and delivery processes. The failure of the most central government agency for civil society is that the expected features of a common curriculum for educational institutions in Nigeria are lacking. Art education includes education in music, visual art, theater, and dance these part ways to views and emphasizes the significant problem facing the governing organs in Nigeria preference. Nigeria case on Arts Education Policy came from the weak Policy from my view-points where the value of its delegation to art educators fails to provide improving its purpose. These viewpoints on earlier notions, trigger the National interest in forcing the civil society to take up roles which the policymakers should have inherited.

The failure of the Nigerian government to implement the Arts Education policy prompted me to ask the following questions.

- Should policies on the arts and cultural education depend solely on the government of a country, without the collective support of other institutions?
- Or should Arts Education policies be extended to other cultural areas where education has no role to play?

The participation of civil society in the proper functioning of a respectable educational policy was better represented by bodies outside the main central agent. This called into question the role of the Nigerian federal government in failing to perform its core functions. Vital concerns, questioning of the delegated approach to homework for a unitary curriculum, for the implementation and financial expectations of the transferred policy. After examining the views of various Arts Education Policy experts on the Nigerian case study, the Nigerian government

has not been able to obtain good results. The main reason is the perspective of the usual precipitation policy of the federal government of its organ, the implementation of unnecessary changes and policy changes without working for its disciplinary integrity record. This includes the implementation of education policy as logical thinking without having access to its effects on the prospects of Arts Education for civil society.

Based on my findings, there was no formal record or mechanism available to make changes from the previous education policy to new and better prospects for advancement. But, the Nigerian government alone should not be held responsible for this failure, the fault could be passed on to the colonizer, whose main interest was trade, not education. Perhaps, this may have been at the origin of a model and understanding of most leadership styles in Nigeria today.

The legacy of any significant attitude of the colonizer should not be underestimated in the spirit of our policy in Nigeria. Many of them have the colonial education system and mentality, while some do not even have any educational background before he became head of the country. In light of many experts, their beliefs that "the reason for educating people was for easy accessibility of the people, by teaching the English language for communication. This is how education issues in Nigeria set out" a deliberate master-plan plan.

Were pre-colonial education policies fair and equitable in Nigeria?

Before the arrival, Nigeria was educated with its indigenous Arts Education system, with creative music, dance, theater, art and culture of hand and craft have more value invested locally as a functional system. The system has transferred knowledge from one generation to the next, even if the system has no documentary evidence, but it exists and has been appreciated by people for their daily need to educate themselves.

The arrival of the missionary in 1842, was the real culture and development of Arts Education policy according to various experts, even when there is no well-planned model for a school Curriculum called Art. It was called "Design", today known as art in the curriculum of the school. while craft or handicraft work was instead introduced into the school, this was considered to be a way to support colonial domestic needs. With such a reason, we must ask ourselves the question, was it a real cause of the legitimacy of school programs for Arts Education? Not in this position, many people have benefited from a missionary and pre -colonial education.

In 1922, as an art defender and educationalist, part way for Arts Education, Mr. Aina Onabolu formally introduced art education into the school's education system in Nigeria. Through his achievement, many art and cultural institutions emerge in multiple with real infrastructures to promote cultural and art education.

In 1950–1957; National Art and culture infrastructures spring up, the establishment of:

- Government college art school in Lagos.
- College of art, science, and technology in Ibadan and Zaria.
- Two National Museums one in Lagos the other in Jos.

Towards the end of this period, Nigeria prepared and obtained independence on 1 October 1960. The autonomy of its educational policies has been entrusted to Nigerian leaders to delegate, including their own definition of cultural policy and Arts Education. Perhaps we can say that this was a period of derealization, when the struggles of a civil society focus solely on self-control and the exercise of rights through separation to a new national policy through self-refining by decolonizing what happened during confinement.

During the period of confinement in 1922–1960, policies were inspired by religious perspectives to convert those who find themselves in missionary environments where they control. new arrival of new missionary groups or beliefs such as Baptists, CMS, Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterian, etc. All faiths have led their diverse Arts Education policies, prescribing their own education policies before their beliefs.

Nigeria's autonomy was a sign of maturity in observing the impact of education in general. Immediately after independence, Nigeria recorded many unsuccessful education trials in the first republic. The difficulty of finding common ground on decision-making, particularly in education, has suffered even more when politics has divided the nation. Because of internal leadership struggles, the military took over responsibility for the country. it was not a wise decision, because an education that collapsed to survive after the finding of oil in 1956, raised many heads of state in Nigeria, coupled with the oil boom even stigmatizes the state of education in the 1960s.

The United Nations, UNESCO and other organizations: has their intervention been beneficial for the development of cultural and artistic education policy?

Previous literature on arts and cultural education policy shows that the United Nations and UNESCO are the forerunners of cultural education

policy in Nigeria today. Praises on UNESCO's support for the continuing struggle for equal education for all nations. UNESCO's first success was to solidify education policy before shaking preferences in cultural and art education policy. In 1977, UNESCO's agitation paid off when the "Second World Black and African Festival of Arts and Culture (FESTAC '77)" took place in Nigeria.

The festival was co-organized by the Federal Government of Nigeria ("under the government's military system") and UNESCO as a co-organizing organization. Festac '77, a high awareness and importance of culture and art, not only for the Nigerians, but also for all the other African countries that took part in the festival. New cultural and artistic infrastructures, construction of museums, training of teachers for arts and cultural education, construction of infrastructures where artistic talents have been discovered, organization of seminars on art and cultures, conferences with other agencies, for example embassies of different countries in partnership with their culture attachés from respective countries. These remarkable achievements have contributed to the birth of policies transferred to the education sector as an educational programme from primary to university.

After Festac '77, not many public-school infrastructures have been dammed up today to be used in poultry farming, by hastily built schools. Reason: The government has rushed to comply with UN laws, which prescribe that every human being has the right to education, the policy was called UBE (Universal Primary Education). While Nigerian education policies are nothing to say, any new government that comes to power by the people or by guns rushes to develop its own education policy, erect and demolish the infrastructure without any difference from the previous government. Confusion upon confusion in our school systems.

Since Nigeria's independence, the federal budget allocation has had nothing to say, the highest allocation was 9 % of each government's total budget. Corruption was on the agenda of the budget allocation process for the education sector. Without the intervention of other organisations such as the Goethe Institute, the French Institute, the Russian Institute, embassies of other countries, NGOs and churches, they did their best. For the better state of culture and Arts Education policy today, Nigerians do not currently benefit from the federal government.

Most budget allocation does not leave the Federal government office. They are only spent on employees' salaries or on repairing their offices, schools get nothing for repair that is why many public schools still study in a poultry like an infrastructure. This case is different in the private schools.

Today attitude towards cultural and Arts Education: has this change the early notions?

The old notion of Arts Education was a complex one with the same conviction “that Arts Education does not bring food to the table”, this notion is shared worldwide. It is not only Nigeria, perhaps that is why cultural and artistic education in Nigeria under the military regimes and previous republics in Nigeria was as good as it has been in the past between 1900 and 2000. Today, interest in arts and cultural education has increased and Its acceptance is so intense in the educational programme in Nigeria. With my experience as an Arts Education, on cultural and Arts Education in Nigeria. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, I was technical officer of the Education Unit of the National Museum Education Unit for a few years before the scholarship that led me to continue my studies.

Although policies were developed, the government’s power and willingness to support its policy with final safeguards was a problem, as was the irresponsible mentality of key stakeholders in the government. To delegate my tasks, the weakest problem was the lack of funding to support my program.

I had to contact private organizations to get help with the art materials needed for the same government institutions. To achieve my goal as an art educator, the only way was to make as many artistic collaborations as possible with the Goethe Institute and the individual in civil society before I can comply with the rules and regulations of arts education policy to develop a sense of politics. Notwithstanding the pressure of some powerful opposition of cultural and art education. Today, Arts Education is a necessity for children, from infancy to university. The efforts of the private sector in Arts Education and organizations have borne fruit in all areas of cultural and Arts Education today. Nigeria can be very proud of its Nollywood film industry, the largest in Africa, now the 3rd largest in the world in the film industry. It has to be known that most actors and actresses. From the production process to the finished product, university graduates, not to mention today’s music industries, unlike what this industry was Thirty years ago, they all benefited from this new awareness: galleries of artists were created in every nuclear bomb in Nigeria. Infect today most industry can’t function reaching buyers of their products, without the involvement of an artist has his company ambassador. The cultural and artistic policy of education now has its glory and develops thanks to the organizations mentioned.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I suggest that we pay particular attention to what we define as Arts Education policy. I think its definition should not be limited to musical

instruments used in school as the first or basic contact with Arts Education but including all other aspects of arts. I believe that Arts Education policy should focus not only on participation in education, but also on others who, in some cases, do not have access to education, because of certain social aspects, languages, religion, tradition and interest in Western education. These aspects should also be examined in the context of the actual process of arts and cultural policy in education. Friedrich Nietzsche, (German Philosopher) generations of theologians, philosophers, psychologists, poets, novelists, and playwrights.. Whose great achievement is based solely on his gifted talent said *“Art comes from skill. If it were of want, it would be called bread”*.

The word “skill” here could mean to be talented or educated as such is the case of all the customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious, or social group this is the characteristic features of everyday existence including Nigerian. Education policy on Art and culture today in Nigeria.

To show awareness since FESTAC ’77 by UNESCO and Nigeria in 1977, a growing interest kept Arts Education more support from civil society changing their old understanding. in 2017, 40 years after FESTAC ’77, a reminder ceremony was organized by the Federal Ministry of Information in collaboration with Centre for Black and African art and cultural civilization (CBAAC) was filled with a colourful cultural parade that included all artistic and cultural areas, including all of Nigeria as a whole. The first Nigerian Head of State to approve the host of the FESTAC ’77 with UNESCO art and culture branch in 1977 was General Olusegun Obasanjo. who attended the occasion, made a remarkable statement on the importance of culture he said on the anniversary of (FESTAC) in 2017 that *“Culture is the global way of life of our peoples, their food, their dancing, their singing, the way they celebrate their funerals, etc. to kill a group of people the easiest way is to take their culture away then they will be left without an identity”* This shows the importance of the arts and cultural education policy enjoyed by civil society.

The following organization, which had an impact on Arts Education in Nigeria, could not be appreciated for its involvement in all areas of the arts. United Nation, UNESCO, Goethe Institute, French Institute, Russian Cultural Center, American Women’s Club Nigeria, USIS, Rotary Club, and other organization that I have not been able to list, among individuals, businesses, organized clubs, that is the governance mechanism of Arts Education in Nigeria today.

References

- Aliu, Y.O. (1997). Introduction to Manual on University Management. Abuja: National University Commission.
- Buchmann, C. (1999). Poverty and educational inequality in sub-Saharan Africa. *Prospects – Quarterly Review of Comparative Education* 29 (4), pp. 503–515.
- Buchmann, C./Hannum, E. (2001). Education and Stratification in Developing Countries: A Review of Theories and Research. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, pp. 77–102.
- Dike, K.O. (1980). “100 Years of British Rule in Nigeria: 1851–1957”. In: I. Obaro (Ed.). *Groundwork of Nigerian History*. Ibadan: Heinemann.
- Fabunmi, M. (2005). Historical Analysis of Educational Policy Formulation in Nigeria: Implications for Educational Planning and Policy. *International Journal of African and African American Studies* IV (2), pp. 1–7.
- Fafunwa, A. B. (2004). History of Education in Nigeria. Ibadan: NPC Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1973). Report of the Seminar on a National Policy on Education. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Education.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1977). National Policy on Education. Lagos: Government Printer.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1979). Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1981). National Policy on Education (2nd Edition). Lagos: Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1998). National Policy on Education (3rd Ed.). Lagos: Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999). Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). National Policy on Education (4th Ed.). Lagos: Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2006). Education Sector Report. Abuja: Federal Ministry of Education