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ABSTRACT

Much of current literature on multicultural art education condemns Human Relations oriented approaches for their propensity to essentialize the art of the groups they attempt to represent, and their implicit reinscription of a hegemonic imperialist discourse regarding non-Western arts. In place of Human Relations approaches, scholars of contemporary literature advocate the use of transformative and social reconstructionist approaches to multicultural education, both of which require engaging students in a confrontation of issues of conflict, such as racism, discrimination, and oppression, in order to promote students’ cognitive knowledge transformation towards more liberating perspectives. Existing literature does not show practicing art educators how such theories have been operationalized, particularly at the elementary school level. Moreover, it is questionable as to how practical these suggested transformative and social reconstructionist approaches are for the elementary school artroom environment.

The study documented herein focuses on the case of one elementary school art teacher who has operationalized the knowledge transformation potential of multiculturalism through her creation and implementation of a uniquely designed Contemporary Native American Artists program. It implicitly works to promote students’ egalitarian perspectives and to challenge injustices in the status quo. While the knowledge transformation that scholars claim is promoted by transformative and social reconstructionist approaches may be desirable, this art teacher’s case reveals why the manner in which scholars suggested that this knowledge transformation be achieved—by engaging students in a confrontation of issues of conflict—may not be suitable, much less ideal, for an elementary school artroom scenario. Her case illustrates one potential strategy for attaining knowledge transformation in students’ understandings without incurring the risks associated with transformative and social reconstructionist approaches. Her approach to
multiculturalism seems to fit into a space currently overlooked by the literature, and
demonstrates an attractive series of strategic multicultural practices that are particularly well
suited for the elementary school arena.
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PROLOGUE

I am five and three-quarters years old. I shimmy into a powder blue parka in the hallway and run out the double doors of the school to join my friends for recess. “Jzzz!” echoes the zipper of my coat in the crisp fall air as I scamper across the lawn that separates me from the playground. My brown eyes widen, breath stops, as I look up and am startled by the obstacle in my path. The cold blue eyes of a boy from another kindergarten class peer at me under hooded lids as he cranes his head out from behind the wide trunk of an oak tree. Strands of his russet hair flail in the snapping wind. Orange freckles blaze high on his cheeks. He darts a sharp tongue out between his grimacing lips, and pulls the outer corners of his narrowed eyes up towards his temples with two fingers. I ball my mittened hands into fists at my sides. Long, straight ropes of my black hair whip my flushed cheeks. He swings behind the tree only to reappear on its other side. “Chink,” he sneers, baring his front teeth and scrunching up his nose. I furrow my brow. I do not know what this word means, but his face tells me that the word is ugly. He again slips out of vision behind the tree. I bite my lower lip in dread. I flinch to run away, but he reappears again on the other side, impeding my progress. “Gook,” he scorns, shoving his lips outward and exaggerating the syllable. This is another baffling word that, paired with his hideous expression, frightens me. I feel a hot tear running down the side of my nose. An involuntary cry escapes my lips as I dash past him and he shoves me, using my momentum as a weapon against me. I stumble, but do not fall. He spits. A montage of thoughts rampage through my mind: For some reason he hates me; I am a little girl, a kind girl, and I do not understand why he hates me; I have done nothing to deserve his mean behavior; he does not even know me.

The above allegory lives on for me as a vivid and painful memory from my childhood. Tears welled in my eyes as I recounted it. I have routinely encountered similar interactions
throughout my life in which people cast me as the Other. Knight (2006) described the Other as “denot[ing] any cultural group different from ourselves” (p. 40). As I have become older, strangers’ discriminatory assumptions have become better cloaked with more polite, though still intrusive, interrogations. Just the other day I was in the grocery store, and a white haired man tracked me with a stare of grey eyes magnified into binoculars by the lenses of his gold-rimmed glasses. “Where are you from?” he took the liberty of asking as he swash-buckled up to the other side of the produce bin at which I was standing. I had to look around to make sure that he was actually talking to me. My ancestors are from China. I was born in Kingston, Jamaica. I was raised in the Midwest of the United States of America. I have attended three Big Ten universities located across the States. I have worked on the East Coast, Southern Panhandle, in London, Beijing, and a plethora of countries in South and Central America. I have never known how to answer that question because I have never understood what people are asking, much less why. Instead of granting him any of this personal information, I named the town in which I resided, which was also the town in which the store was located. “What are you doing here?” he continued his interrogation. “Shopping for groceries,” I responded in American English, and shrugged. The hackles on my neck bristled under the collar of my blouse. I dusted my palm on my khaki Capri pants, eager to disengage. The last question he managed to insert before I wheeled my cart away was: “When are you going back to your home country?” To him, based on my biological physical attributes, I did not belong in the United States. I was the Other.

It is this notion of “othering,” and the oppressive ideas associated with it, that have motivated me to explore ways in which art education might contravene some of the attitudes and beliefs that underlie these types of hostile interactions.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem and Keyword Definitions

The impetus for this study began with my belief in the strong potential value of multicultural art education practice. I see this as particularly important in this age of globalization in which people increasingly encounter individuals, items, and ideas from different parts of the world (Boughton, 1999; Chalmers, 1999; Davenport, 2000, 2001; Desai, 2005; Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996; Mason, 1999, Mitchell, 2001). I believe it can help to strengthen interpersonal relations as well as promote egalitarianism in U.S. society. My interest persists in a search for practical multicultural approaches for the elementary school artroom that promotes these ideas.

Although many educators still strongly associate multicultural education with race and ethnicity, which Banks (1994b) distinguished as multiethnic education, multiculturalism has become an overarching concept that focuses on educational concerns related to a broader range of cultural dimensions including not only race and ethnicity, but also religion, language, socioeconomic status, gender, sexuality, disability and their interaction (Banks, 1994b, 1996a, 2004; Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1993, 1995; Garcia, 1991; Gollnick & Chinn, 1990; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The idea of culture as a distinguishing way of life for a grouping of people (Barnard, 1998; Connor, 1996; Williams, 1981) in this age of globalization has become more complex: Ethnicity and race as indicators of culture, and as correlated with geographic or national borders as cultural demarcaters, have lost much of their validity as societies have become more porous (Anderson, 1991; Anzaldúa, 1987; Boughton, 1999; Chalmers, 1999; Connor, 1996; Davenport, 2000, 2001; Desai, 2005; Efland et al., 1996; Giroux, 2005; Mason, 1999; Mirzoeff, 1999; Mitchell, 2001; Mohanty, 2003; Pratt, 1992). In multicultural art
education theory, the exploration of heterogeneity, the diversity of individuals, within such borders is emphasized (Bastos, 2006; Dash, 1999; Desai, 2003, 2005; Dunmire, 1998; Gall, 2006; Hernandez, 1999; jagodzinski, 1982, 1999; Kuster, 2006; Mason, 1999; Yi & Kim, 2005). Furthermore, scholars stress the idea of hybridity (also known as syncretization), an understanding that individuals continually draw on and combine a diversity of experiences and dynamically transform them into something new (Berry & Martin, 2003; Pratt, 1992), and underscore that artists are influenced by and incorporate a plethora of experiences in life that transcend cultural groupings and geographic borders in their creations of artworks (Ballengee-Morris, 2008; Barbosa, 1999; Bastos, 2006; Carpenter II, Bey, & Smith, 2007; Chalmers, 1999; Dash, 2005; Desai, 2000, 2003, 2005; Gall, 2006; Jaddo, 2007).

My participation in teaching multicultural art education curricula in K-12 school settings, as well as my investment in the theory surrounding multicultural education during graduate studies, has led me to reflect on my own multicultural practices and understandings of culture. I have taken serious note of challenges to my past applications of multicultural art education within the classroom, particularly in light of contemporary theory on multicultural art education that advocates for transformative and socially reconstructive approaches (e.g., Ballengee-Morris, Mirin, & Rizzi, 2000; Barbosa, 2007; Bastos, 2006; Chalmers, 1996; Daniels, 2005; Dash, 2005; Desai, 2000, 2003, 2005; jagodzinski, 1999; Mason, 1995; Neperud, 1995; Neperud & Krug, 1995; Stuhr, 1994, 1995). A social reconstructionist approach to multicultural education includes five dimensions, as advocated by Banks (1994b, 1995b, 1996d, 2004): content integration, equity pedagogy, prejudice reduction, knowledge construction and transformation, and empowering school culture and social structure. Content integration deals with the way information about diverse groups—that addresses a complex understanding of culture—is
integrated into the curriculum. *Equity pedagogy* refers to how teachers modify teaching tactics and strategies to address individual students’ learning styles. *Prejudice reduction* relates to the ability of instruction to decrease a tendency to stereotype and to increase the students’ potential to see each individual human being as a valuable contributing member of society. *Knowledge construction and transformation* emphasizes the promotion of critical thinking in order to help students to recognize that knowledge is socially constructed and influenced by a source’s frames of reference. *Empowering school culture and social structure* addresses components of the school structure and system, and encourages students to take social action based on knowledge from transformational reflections related to issues of oppression. A *transformative multicultural approach* similarly addresses these dimensions, but does not call for students to take social action with the last dimension as social reconstructionism does. Interpretations of these approaches and dimensions in multicultural art education will be elaborated upon in Chapter 2.

Awareness of theoretical transformative and social reconstructionist recommendations for multicultural education has developed into a plethora of concerns and issues that I wish to see resolved. This concern applies to my own multicultural art education practice, as well as that of other art educators. Chief among these concerns are: 1) the failure to implement any multicultural art education curricula, and to instead maintain a Eurocentric formalist curriculum, actively works to further Eurocentricity and to promote ethnic stereotypes rather than undermining them; and 2) the lack of resources available to art teachers that illustrate how to operationalize theory in a manner that promotes knowledge construction and transformation in students’ understandings to encourage more egalitarian perspectives and to challenge injustices in the status quo, as suggested by advocates of transformative and social reconstructionist multicultural approaches.
As indicated by a number of art and general educational theorists, knowledge and the construction and practice of curricula, is not neutral and has political ramifications (e.g., Apple, 1979, 2002; Atkinson & Dash, 2005; Banks, 1993, 1995a, 1995b; C. A. M. Banks, 1996a; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Cohen Evron, 2009; D’Souza, 1992; Dash, 2005; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Efland et al., 1996; Giroux, 1981, 1983; hooks, 1994; Nieto, 1996). A curriculum implicitly forwards ideology. I refer to ideology here as both the unconscious and conscious beliefs, values, or ways of thinking that impel individuals’ thoughts, interpretations, and interactions with the world (Decker, 2004).

In the absence of multicultural art curricula, art education theorists assert that art educators are inherently promoting a Eurocentric, monolithic view of what art is and should be, without challenge or openings for alternative perspectives (Efland et al., 1996; Jagodzinski, 1999; Mason, 1995). This tendency has been noted in both art education as well as general education. Akin to cultural imperialism, this Eurocentricity in curricula constitutes an act of hegemony (Chalmers, 1999; D’Souza, 1992; Hart, 1991; Haynes Chavez & Haynes, 2001; Hicks, 1994; Hillis, 1996b; Wolff, 1995). According to Hillis (1996b), “A Eurocentric curriculum is a reflection of dominant group hegemony; groups outside of the mainstream community are marginalized and stripped of voice. The result is a monocultural curriculum—a curriculum that breeds arrogance and ideas of racial superiority” (p. 289). Hegemony is the perpetuation of a dominant group’s control and influence over others through either physical force or the spread of ideology that serves to attain people’s conscious and/or unconscious assent to this domination (Balibar, 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Williams, 1977). The strength of Eurocentric ideology underpinning U.S. art education will be further examined in Chapter 2.
However, the practice of multicultural art education today is commonly Western ethnocentric, often utilizing a *Human Relations* approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1988), which includes what Banks (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) would call a contributions or additive approach. A *contributions approach* (Banks, 1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) is akin to a superficial *four-F’s* (food, festival, fashion, and folklore) approach (Cai, 1998), in which the artworks that are brought into the classroom focus on a celebration of ethnic traditions. Or art educators may go a step further and utilize an *additive approach* (Banks, 1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) in which exemplars from other cultures are incorporated to add to the Western canon, but these exemplars are viewed and drawn from using a Western ethnocentric gaze; that is, from a heterosexual, White, European, male, perspective of dominance (Collins, 1995; Desai, 2000; Dissanayake, 1988; Freedman, 1991; Unseld, 1998). Such practice takes a superficial look at the art of a culture, and promotes a stereotype of its members as a homogenous, static, encapsulated entity, commonly harnessed under a label of race, ethnicity, or nation, that is presented as inactive in society and the artworld today. Numerous multicultural art education theorists have voiced this critique (e.g., Ballengee-Morris, 2002; Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Chalmers, 2002; Collins & Sandell, 1992; Dash, 2005; Delacruz, 1995b; Desai, 2000, 2005; Efland et al., 1996; Gude, 2007; Gunew & Rivzi, 1994; Kader, 2005; Mason, 1995; Stuhr, 1995, 2003). It is evidenced in practice (based on observations of my own early preservice applications of multicultural art curricula, the classrooms of preservice art teachers, and the classrooms of in-service art teachers), is corroborated by teacher presentations of their multicultural curricula at National Art Education Association (NAEA) conferences, and is perpetuated by the commercially available materials, kits and curriculum books and magazines that are utilized by practitioners to guide incorporation of multicultural art lessons into the classroom. This phenomenon will be discussed in greater
detail in Chapter 2. While perhaps well intentioned, such multicultural presentations are harmful rather than beneficial. Instead of reducing stereotypes, they propagate them. This is in itself reductionist and demeaning to the culture purportedly represented (Chalmers, 2002; Mason, 1995). Furthermore, with the ethnocentric Western gaze as the evaluator of all cultures’ art, such practice furthers hegemony and undermines efforts towards egalitarianism (Duesterberg, 1998; Haynes Chavez & Haynes, 2001; jagodzinski, 1997, 1999; Wainright, as cited by Mason, 1995).

My interest in finding potential approaches that do not forward stereotypes and ethnocentric perspectives—that are counter hegemonic—continued as I was joined on the journey by Anna (pseudonym), an elementary school art teacher. She too has been critical of the hegemony perpetuated in art education practice in the absence of multicultural curricula, and with the use of additive and contributions approaches. I was initially made aware of her dedication to multicultural art education programming by an art education professor and an art museum educator. She was exalted by them as a phenomenal art educator who is devoted to improving her own practice in the classroom, professional development, and in her endeavors to continually integrate different approaches to artistic creation from different parts of the globe into her ever expanding art curriculum. Her continuing path towards improving multicultural curricula for her artroom will be elaborated upon in later chapters. I had the opportunity to talk with Anna during the 2008 NAEA conference, and to attend her first presentation of the “Native American” art curriculum unit she had developed the previous year.

However, I was stubbornly resistant to the potential learning that I, and the art education community, might glean from Anna’s journey. I was tenaciously fixed upon my own journey to develop a program for practice that was responsive to the call of multicultural education theory that advocates more transformative and social reconstructionist approaches. But there was a
stumbling block for me in developing a program straight out of theory—would teachers even want such a program? A key question kept arising for me: Why aren’t art teachers practicing the recommended courses of action proposed by theorists who advocate transformative multicultural and social reconstructionist approaches? A few scholars offer suggestions for potential art exemplars to use within such a curriculum (Bastos, 2006; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Iok, 2005; MacPhee, 2004; Parks, 2000, 2004). These exemplars focus on contemporary artworks that confront social issues of hegemony, and speak out to the world from a critical position. In addition, several theorists offer suggestions for what a multicultural social reconstructionist curriculum in art might entail (Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001, 2002; Efland et al., 1996; Stuhr, 1994), but it is unclear as to how these curricula play out in K-12 practice or are received by artroom teachers.

The implied assumptions embedded within the question (“Why aren’t art teachers practicing the recommended courses of action proposed by theorists who advocate transformative multicultural and social reconstructionist approaches?”), are twofold: a) There are no art teachers at the K-12 level who, in practice, have been making progress towards transformative and socially reconstructive approaches in multicultural art education; and b) a transformative multicultural or social reconstructionist approach is ideal for the K-12 classroom.

Intent on discovering the validity of assumption number one, I sought to find out if there were any teachers making progress towards a transformative or social reconstructionist approach; and, if there were, what their practice entailed. Through a review of the literature in multicultural art education, I discovered a slim few cases that describe transformative and social reconstructionist practices in the K-12 artroom (see, for example, Albers, 1996, 1999; Cohen Evron, 2005, 2007). There is a wealth of theory that criticizes multicultural practice at the K-12
level, and a plethora of theoretical recommendations. In contrast, and in line with several art education scholars’ contentsions (Cohen Evron, 2005; Garber & Costantino, 2007; Mason, 1995; Milbrandt, 2002; Stockrocki, 2004), I have found that there is a dearth of ethnographic research describing the initiatives of K-12 art educators’ who are making progress towards multicultural art education practice that is more transformative or social reconstructionist. This deficiency is particularly visible at the K-5 level.

I thought it salient at this time to speak to Anna, as well as other art educators at the K-12 level1. I engaged in exploratory interviews with practicing art teachers to find out how they were approaching multicultural art education in the field, and the challenges that they were facing. Their insights have led me to understand the need to address several issues with my research: a) explaining how art education practice is political and, in the absence of multicultural art curricula, forwards Eurocentric hegemony; b) critiquing theoretical multicultural art education approaches and curriculum packages available to practicing art teachers; c) offering insight into scholarly literature that might inform art teachers’ practices in a transition towards more transformative and social reconstructionist approaches in multicultural art education; d) showing how an art teacher is developing and currently implementing practices that attempt to avoid reifying Eurocentric hegemony and instead promote knowledge transformation towards more egalitarian perspectives and understandings that challenge status quo inequities; and e) negotiating this art teacher’s practice in light of theoretical recommendations that advocate for transformative multicultural and social reconstructionist approaches, keeping in mind that assumption number two (a transformative multicultural or social reconstructionist approach is ideal for the K-12 classroom) may be false, and such approaches may not be practical for the elementary school art room. The first three issues will be explored in Chapter 2. The study I

1 IRB approved interviews
conducted and have detailed herein was constructed to provide an illustration that addresses issues four and five by focusing on Anna’s multicultural art education program.

Anna is actively dedicated to developing multicultural approaches less stifled by the stereotyping and Eurocentric implications of additive and contributions approaches. The Contemporary Native American Artist program that she has developed is the most recent in a series of artistic approaches from around the world that she has integrated into her K-5 art curriculum. Anna recognized some of her past attempts at multicultural art education to be flawed by Eurocentricity, and believed that her current Native American artist program was strong, but had room for improvement. She was particularly interested in what contemporary multicultural art education theory might have to offer her practice.

The study aimed to explore how her multicultural program manifested, or failed to manifest, each of Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) five dimensions, to the extent that they were deemed necessary for a transformative multicultural and socially reconstructive multicultural curriculum (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b). In addition, I conducted a post-intervention program evaluation of how her approach aligned relative to other approaches in multicultural art education. To do this, I utilized a typology amalgamated from both Banks’s (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) and Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b) classifications of multicultural education approaches. These typologies will be examined in greater detail in Chapter 2. This evaluation, in light of both Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) dimensions and a contextualization relative to other multicultural art education approaches, was discussed with Anna. Through this post-intervention dialogue, together we discovered what directions contemporary multicultural theory could provide her program. Furthermore, based on Anna’s reflections in regards to these theory-based
recommendations, we assessed how implementation of such theory might or might not be feasible for her elementary school artroom environment.

This exploration revealed a unique approach to multiculturalism, which I believe is a highly attractive possibility for practicing elementary school art educators. The approach does not suffer from the essentializing flaws of commonly practiced multicultural approaches that are so often critiqued by scholars, nor does it subject teachers to the risks associated with explicitly confronting issues of conflict with their students, an activity prescribed in theory by advocates of transformative and social reconstructionist approaches. As such, it offers teachers an illustration of how a possible multicultural approach of strong potential might be operationalized within an elementary school artroom.

Significance of the Research

What can the U.S. art education field—particularly in-service and preservice art teachers—learn from Anna’s journey to develop her Contemporary Native American Artists program, its present status, and its directions for the future? Art educators can garner practical possibilities for how to construct, implement, and revise multicultural curricula for the artroom that move away from the hegemonic, stereotyping, Eurocentric practices so prevalent in today’s K-12 artrooms.

As an instructor of preservice art teachers, I believe this study also has implications for how faculty in art teacher education programs might address theory and practice regarding multicultural art education in higher education, and offer preservice teachers greater direction for multicultural practice based on an actual intervention.

Importantly, insights can be gained from Anna’s practitioner perspective and negotiations with contemporary theory that advocates for multicultural education that is transformative or
social reconstructionist. This is relevant to both scholarship and practice, as this element of the study focuses on the areas in which theory and practice intersect. This study engaged Anna in critical reflexivity regarding the ideology she is implicitly forwarding with her multicultural practice, and in doing so, highlights a path for readers in the field to be similarly conscious of the ideologies they are reinforcing.

In addition, I believe others interested in qualitative collaborative ethnographic research regarding art curriculum interventions may glean insights from this example. I believe this study serves to elucidate how practice and scholarship, when aligned as cohorts, can be mutually beneficial to forwarding understandings in the field.

This study did not aim to produce a model for implementation across many schools, but rather focused on the path of development, implementation, and continued revision of an approach, so that other art educators and scholars might gain insights and understandings as they move to develop their own multicultural art education programs and extend theory. I believe this study can help to discourage oppressive practices in multicultural art education, and encourage empathic and emancipatory ones.

Research Questions

In light of this discussion, the overarching question for this case study research was: How can multicultural art education practice in an elementary school artroom be improved in light of an analysis of Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program and her negotiations with theoretical recommendations and their practicality (or lack thereof)?
Towards answering this question, I will attempt to show that:

1. Speculative-theoretical transformative multicultural and social reconstructionist approaches may not be ideal for practice in the elementary school artroom.

2. Anna’s program does not fit into any of the categorical approaches described in existing theoretical typologies of multicultural education approaches. Instead, her program opens up an arena for practice that has been overlooked by these theoretical typologies.

3. Anna’s “Contemporary Native American Artists” program helps to break down stereotypes of a Native American grouping and shifts attitudes and conceptions of this particular grouping.

4. Art educators may not need to engage their students in dialogues that confront issues of conflict—a practice recommended by advocates and considered integral to transformative and socially reconstructive approaches—in order to promote the knowledge construction and transformation that is a desired by these approaches.

5. There may be a way to avoid the essentializing deficits that are so strongly critiqued of Human Relations approaches, while simultaneously circumventing the practical concerns and risks associated with implementation of transformative and social reconstructive multicultural approaches, and Anna’s program illustrates a strategy for accomplishing this possibility.

Methodology

This study is grounded in the paradigm of naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and it utilized a case study approach (Stake, 1995) that reflected the structure of one cycle of
action research\(^2\) (McKernan, 1996). In accordance with a critical-emancipatory educational action research model of Kemmis, Carr, and McTaggert (1986, 1988), this cycle of action research entailed the plan (leading up to and culminating in Anna’s current Native American artists program), action (implementation of program within an authentic K-5 environment), observations of the action, and reflection on and evaluation of the action\(^3\) (as cited by McKernan, 1996). In this case, the evaluation was based on Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) five dimensions of multicultural education, and was contextualized relative to transformative multicultural and social reconstructionist approaches within a typology of approaches.

The fielding of this study took place from October 2008 to August 2009. In an effort to provide for triangulation as well as comprehensive, detailed, contextualization of the case particularly for the purposes of promoting transferability, data collection took place over this extended period of time through a series of methods. These included non-participant observation of classes; a brief student survey; semi-structured interviews with Anna, students, and key informants; and my own maintenance of a self-reflective journal throughout the process.

In my analysis of data I utilized an inductive process towards categorization, as suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985), McKernan (1996), and Stake (1995). I reviewed data on a continual basis throughout the study to keep track of emergent issues, salient themes, and categories as indicated by their recurrence. In addition, as evaluation of the program was along Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) five dimensions that constitute a social reconstructionist approach to multicultural education, relevant data was collected with these five pre-designated categories in mind.

---

\(^2\) While the configuration of this study reflected the structure of one cycle of an action research case, it was not what might traditionally be considered action research: This ethnographic case study focused primarily on an assessment of Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program relative to theory, and improvement and refinement of her program was not the primary aim.

\(^3\) The evaluation eventuated in Anna’s construction of a revised plan, but this was not the primary goal of the study.
IRB approval for this case study research was secured, and reflected Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) recommendations for informed consent, voluntary participation, and protection of participant anonymity and confidentiality (p. 255). This study hinged on the trust and openness between Anna and me, and it aimed for full overtness, as recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985) for naturalistic inquiry. Our relationship exhibited, and continues to maintain, this quality.

Limitations of the Study

As with any naturalistic inquiry, some facets of this research were emergent (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For example, classroom observations in the third grade were not appropriate for the study and were replaced by observations in the first grade, and an opportunity for an additional interview with another key informant arose. Furthermore, student participant numbers were limited by an inclusion criterion that required parental consent and student assent for participation, in accordance with IRB protocol. In addition, researcher intervention was unavoidable as I was inherently a factor in the research environment; this has been reflectively documented for reader consideration as part of the contextualization of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

This case study focused on one cycle of action research. Though I understood that multiple cycles would generate more data, I believe that this singular case, entailing one cycle, has been greatly insightful nonetheless. This was an authentic situation in which the timeline could not be condensed: Anna taught at a genuine elementary school, on a real academic curriculum timeline, with actual students. Investigation of this singular cycle has provided her, the field, and myself with invaluable direction for how one might possibly proceed away from additive and contributions approaches, and potentially towards a multicultural art education practice that is more transformative and social reconstructionist.
I do not advocate Anna’s approach or any of the U.S. approaches to multiculturalism unilaterally for use in other countries or communities, particularly in which the sociopolitical conditions (such as mass immigration) may be far removed from those that gave rise to it in the United States. Countries throughout the world such as Brazil (Barbosa, 1999), Ghana (Ross, 2004), Kenya (Somjee, 1999), Portugal (Moura, 1999), and Hungary (Kárpáti, 1999) have utilized their own versions of multiculturalism to unify and promote a strong homogenized national identity to overcome European colonist ideology that served to erase the voices of the colonized. Kuo (1999) and Hwang (2006) have advocated this same development of a core, unified, essentialized national identity to be self-actualized in Taiwan, also recently liberated from imperialist forces. At the same time, critiques from within some of these countries are also arising in light of these essentializing practices. Iwano (1999) described a historically bicultural approach in art education in Japan, which integrated Japanese and Western art education into the curriculum. More recently, Japan’s focus has shifted to global cultures to cultivate tolerance and respect for others (Iwano, 1999). It has not recognized a multiethnic approach, asserting its monocultural constituency despite the near ten-percent minority population residing within its borders (Iwano, 1999). In Brazil, Barbosa (1999), and in Portugal, Moura (1999), were similarly critical of these homogenizing practices. They underscored the hegemony of dominant discourse as it reinforces social stratification, and erases the voices of the marginalized in each country. Each country is following its own path to multicultural art education.

In addition, Irwin, Rogers, and Farrell (1999) were critical of multicultural education policies imposed on societies that are not necessarily the product of immigration, such as the Aboriginal cultures in Australia and Canada. They see it as indoctrination into the policies of dominant society. I see it as similarly problematic if such a program were to be forced upon
communities in the U.S., not just Native American societies, and I firmly believe the choice should be that of each community. The ethnographic portrait that I offer in this document highlights a strategic option that might be chosen from among many, and is informed by a context of varying approaches to multicultural art education; these approaches will be detailed in Chapter 2. None of these may seem suitable to a given community. The decision is theirs.

Furthermore, the individual artists in Anna’s program were specifically selected by her with the express intent to break down stereotypes of Native American artists and artistry. Each of the artists in her program aligned ideologically with Anna in this respect, and similarly voiced this same desire to challenge stereotypes of Native Americans. This ideology is but one perspective, and is not one that all members of all Native American communities necessarily embrace. Akin to some of the colonized countries and communities noted in the previous two paragraphs, there is the possibility that some members of some Native American communities may seek to maintain and promote strong, core, unified identities. In light of this, it is important to understand that Anna’s program is not meant to speak for all Native Americans, but rather represents one potential strategic alternative for elementary school artroom practice from which other art educators might draw if their intent is to break down stereotypes of cultural groupings.

This study provides an in-depth exploration of a path that other art educators may choose to draw from piecemeal as they construct, implement, and evaluate multicultural art curricula of their own. I underscore that this is not a universal model to be followed lockstep, but an experience that can be learned from as readers in art education variously interpret and draw from the study. As Efland et al. (1996) have stated, no universal homogenized curriculum can meet every individual art educator’s needs. It is important that each educator consider Anna’s strategy
in relation to their context—the time, place, climate, practicalities and so on—of their particular situation.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this literature review, I will address a number of key issues raised by art educators during exploratory research. The first issue that these veteran art teachers brought to light was that art educators might be resistant to incorporating multicultural curricula within the artroom for various practical reasons⁴, and that these resistant teachers would need to be provided with a substantial reason to justify the inclusion of multiculturalism. I offer the following argument: If art teachers do not include multicultural content, they are acting to implicitly forward Eurocentric hegemony, and hence are actively participating in a form of oppression. To substantiate this argument, I will provide a brief history of art education to underscore the pervasive strength of Eurocentric ideology underpinning the field since its inception in the U.S., and to illustrate how art education has been used as a strategic political tool to maintain domination for Anglo-Europeans. I will follow this with a synopsis of multiculturalism that explicates how multicultural education aims to counter this hegemony, and I will further unravel how this intent is met through a detailed examination of the various dimensions of and potential approaches to multicultural art education, as well as a critique of these approaches.

The second major issue that art educators voiced was that teachers needed appropriate materials, and direction selecting these materials, to help guide their development and implementation of multicultural curricula. Towards this end, I will analyze a broad series commercially available multicultural art packages and curricula that teachers might be tempted to utilize, review speculative-theoretical literature relating to multicultural art education practice, and look at cases documenting classroom practice itself. While classroom practice lags behind

---

⁴ Teachers voiced practical reasons for not integrating multicultural curricula, such as, “I don’t want to touch multiculturalism because I don’t want to offend anyone,” “I don’t have the time to do the research required to create adequate multicultural curricula,” “I feel underprepared to address issues of social justice with students,” “I don’t have the time in the classroom because I have to cover other material, and manage students, and…”
contemporary literature that advocates for more transformative and social reconstructionist approaches, it is also apparent that scholarship does not currently offer teachers illustrations of how these two theoretical approaches have been or can be operationalized in practice.

A Brief History of U.S. Art Education and its Eurocentric Underpinnings

To broach the first issue, I will begin by showing how, in absence of multicultural curricula, the most common status quo art curriculum is likely to forward Eurocentric hegemony.

*European Roots of Art Education in the United States*

The European roots of U.S. art education are underscored throughout the historical accounts presented by a number of scholars (e.g., Efland, 1990; Efland et al., 1996; Smith, 1996; Stankiewicz, 2001). European ideology underpins three philosophies evident in U.S. art education: representational art, self-expressionism, and particularly, formalism (Smith, 1996).

Smith (1996) contended that the Greco-Roman tradition of mimesis (imitation of the appearance of the real world) has provided the basis for representational art. This representational style grounded the art academy in Europe, and was the model for U.S. art education throughout the 1800s (Stankiewicz, 2001). In this model, a mastery of skills of representation is emphasized, and the techniques of European master artists of the past are copied to perfect these skills (Smith, 1996). One sees its influence in U.S. art education in the hailing of European master artists, and the practice of art instruction that emphasizes representational study such as life drawing, and perspective (Efland et al., 1996; Stankiewicz, 2001).

Stemming from German Romantic Idealism, the child-art or self-expressionism movement emerged in art education in the late 1800s and continued through the mid-1900s
Children were perceived as innocent, innately creative, and capable of drawing with unpressed, pure, emotional expression—they were the purveyors of uncorrupted morality (Efland, 1990; Stankiewicz, 2001). Self-expressionism drew on Freudian psychology, which emphasized that it was destructive to repress childhood (Efland et al., 1996). According to Watson, a preservice teacher in training in the mid-1900s, Lowenfeld’s (1947) *Creative and Mental Growth*, which advocates self-expressionism, was the seminal text for U.S. art teacher education throughout the late 1940s-1950s (as cited by Smith, 1996). The movement was influential in shifting art education practice from the study of ornamental, leisurely pursuits to one that was imbued with moral purpose (Efland, 1990).

Formalism, and the universal principles of art implicit within it, has strong roots in European scientific rationality. Walter Smith, an acolyte of the British educational system, brought a South Kensington industrial drawing approach to U.S. schools in the late 1800s (Efland, 1995; Smith, 1996; Stankiewicz, 2001). He used drawing samples from France and England as his exemplars for teaching (Stankiewicz, 2001). His industrial drawing method was based on a series of scientific rules and principles to govern drawing, such as linear perspective (Stankiewicz, 2001). In the late 1800s, Arthur W. Dow, trained in the European academy, conducted a comparative analysis of the arts across time and nations to arrive at a theory of *Composition* (1899) underlying beauty (as cited by Efland, 1990; Efland, 1995; Efland et al., 1996; Smith, 1996). The theory proposed a universal set of elements and principles of design, considered the ‘alphabet of art,’ that was intrinsically tied to a work’s form (Smith, 1996). The theory underscored that through the study of formal design one could “understand the basis for beauty” (Efland, 1990, p. 218), and learn to appreciate the physical, sense-stimulating power of art (Stankiewicz, 2001). Dow’s disciples and books carried on his universalistic theory in art
education throughout the 1900s (Stankiewicz, 2001). In the mid-1900s, the German Bauhaus movement emerged in the United States. Like Dow’s theory of composition, the movement drew on a highly systematic and rational approach to design, and emphasized formal elements as the basis for art (Efland, 1990; Efland et al., 1996). The theory promoted the idea that form follows from function (Efland, 1990). In line with this philosophy, the Art-in-Daily-Living movement put art at the service of function and utility for the home, factory, and marketplace (Efland et al., 1996). The formalist approach of the Bauhaus was a forerunner of art teaching methods in elementary and secondary levels in the United States (Efland, 1990).

*Eurocentric Ideas of Art and Beauty in U.S. Art Education*

Efland (1990) asserted that Western civilization started in Greece, and provided art education with its origins in Plato’s and Aristotle’s advocacies of art as a means for teaching morality and appreciation of beauty. Universal conceptions of what constitutes the beautiful in art emanate from European derived formalist principles and elements of design, as indicated above. Through the eyes of the dominant European culture, non-European art was judged as inferior (Stankiewicz, 2001). Artworks from Native Americans, Africans, and Asians were described as primitive, lacking in control of media and technique, and an outcome of bizarre taste (Stankiewicz, 2001). “Primitive art” was likened to children’s art: Both were discounted for their lack of cognitive intention and sophistication, and their failure to portray what was thought to be beautiful (Stankiewicz, 2001). Furthermore, the spoils seized from these areas by cultural imperialists was put on exhibit in museums in the U.S. as fetishized objects for a Eurocentric gaze: European settlers privileged universal design theories as lenses to evaluate these artifacts, and disregarded their contextual significance, intended functions, and standards for evaluation in
their original contexts (Dewey, 1934; Stankiewicz, 2001). They marginalized and erased the perspectives of non-European artists and cultures.

This pattern of erasing the contributions of marginalized populations is also evident in U.S. art history education: Both art history textbooks and lectures have emphasized Western art (Chalmers, 1978; Stankiewicz, 2001; West, 1998). Art appreciation appears to be a major goal of art history, but what is being judged, and by whose standards, is not questioned: Appreciation is based on the assumption that formalist elements and principles can be used to evaluate any artwork, as these principles are considered universal (Chalmers, 1978). Students are taught to value European artistic styles and traditions, and they are inculcated into a homogenous aesthetic taste that holds European artistry superior to all others (Stankiewicz, 2001). Furthermore, students are implicitly taught that artistry improves in a linear fashion from that of primitive cultures to that of increasingly refined civilizations in the West (Stankiewicz, 2001).

For example, my art history classes at the university level, which are required for art teacher education, have included three levels devoted to exploring predominantly Western arts. *Art History I, Ancient to Medieval,* was a chronological survey of Western visual culture from the remote past through to the High Gothic. The remote past included ancient Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Minoan, and Mycenaean arts, and constituted less than 15 percent of the lectures. The remaining 85 percent focused on the arts of Europe, particularly Greece, Rome, and Northwestern Europe. *Art History II, Renaissance and Baroque,* focused on a chronological survey of visual arts created in Europe from the late 13th century to the mid-18th century. *Art History III, Modern and Postmodern Art,* included a chronological survey of visual arts created in Europe and the U.S. from the mid-18th century to the present.
To underscore the implicit dominance and positioning of Western art as superior to others in art history texts, it is worth noting that the images in the “What is art? What is Beauty?” section of Stokstad’s (2002) *Art History* introductory chapter include sixteen artworks of Western European origin and seven from the United States. In contrast, only five are from non-Western areas. Two are labeled as emanating from Japan, one from Egypt, one from India, and one from “Africa.” Egypt is categorized as distinct from Africa, allowing the Western artworld to erase its ‘African-ness.’ In addition, Africa is presented as a category, and this framing further serves to erase the diversity, livelihood, and agency of the people within it.

Furthermore, my first day of classes in art history at two Midwestern universities focused on the first chapter of the art history text of choice: Two widely used texts in art history at the university level are Stokstad’s (2002) *Art History*, and *Gardner’s Art History* (Kleiner, Mamiya, & Tansey, 2001). These texts instruct the reader about how art is to be appreciated: In terms of perceiving and evaluating an artwork, a process in which students are being trained, emphasis is on stylistic impressions based on formalist principles, or what Stokstad (2002) called “the basic properties of art” (p. 18). According to both texts, analysis of the form of an artwork includes elements such as line, color, texture, and spatial attributes; composition is to be looked at in terms of proportion and scale, pictorial depth through perspective, and picture plane and ground; and content is to be considered as either representational of reality, or non-representational. Art history is presented as a set of knowable facts, and it is implied that one’s ability to appreciate art depends upon one’s knowledge of these facts: Style, the texts say, is a combination of form and content. In line with Chalmers’ (1978), Stankiewicz’s (2001), and West’s (1998) claims, art history education in the U.S. teaches students to value European art as superior, and to judge art using Eurocentric standards that apply universal formal principles to all art.
European Morality as U.S. Virtue in Art Education

European ideas of morality have come to represent U.S. virtues through art education. German Romantic Idealism, as seen in self-expressionism, was thought to contribute to the teaching of freedom and morality (Efland, 1990). Whose morality was it? According to Greer (1972) and Spring (1986), visual arts education forwarded the values of a select few—the earliest, “native,” European immigrants to the U.S.—White middle-class Protestants (as cited by Smith, 1996, p. 23). In addition, both the picture study and school decoration movements of the late 1800s to early 1900s in the U.S. similarly drew from German Romantic Idealism (Efland, 1990). With these two movements, art reproductions were brought into the classroom for the purpose of training students in morality, and inculcating ‘American’ virtues into children, particularly newer immigrant children (Efland, 1990; Stankiewicz, 2001). According to Stankiewicz (2001), a premise underlying both movements was that master artists were thought to exemplify high moral character; these master artists heralded from Europe. This philosophy reflects that of the mimetic representational style of the European academy, as indicated earlier. Study of the ‘great works of art’ of these master artists was seen as “one way to reach immigrant children who could learn American values by reading the universal language of great art” (Stankiewicz, 2001, p. 116).

In addition, holiday arts were used to inculcate desirable virtues in children, and were particularly targeted at training the newer immigrant population about what U.S. Americans should value (Stankiewicz, 2001). For example, Bailey’s monthly School Arts magazine quoted poetry by authors including Whitman, Blake, and Shakespeare, and featured the birthdays of artists like Monet (Stankiewicz, 2001). In other words, it included the traditions of persons with ancestral roots in Britain and Northern Europe, the earliest immigrants to the U.S., and excluded
others: It promoted a U.S. culture with strong ties to Europe, and grounded in its Anglo-Saxon, Protestant values (Stankiewicz, 2001). Pageants and festivals to celebrate holidays were directed by this cultural elite, celebrated their old world heritage, and underscored the contributions of Britain and Northern Europe to the creation of a Christian, Protestant, U.S. culture (Stankiewicz, 2001).

Art Education is a Vehicle to Perpetuate Bourgeois European Values and Build the Nation

With U.S. industrialization in the 1800s, designers were increasingly needed in U.S. factories. Drawing was seen as a commercial skill that promoted a disciplined work ethic that could be capitalized upon to contribute to U.S. economic success (Efland, 1990; Stankiewicz, 2001). Furthermore, elite society in the U.S. believed the working class needed something to do after work: To curb the purportedly surly behavior of the working class during leisure time, reformers sought to teach workers, from youthhood, what were thought to be more civilized, constructive, and refined recreations, such as appreciation of the arts (Stankiewicz, 2001).

With the Cold War atmosphere of the 1950s-1960s, national defense arose as the issue at the forefront, and U.S. competitiveness in the arenas of science and technology were emphasized. The moralistic pursuits of self-expressionism “vanished in the fearful atmosphere built up in reaction to Soviet threats and boasts and through manipulative actions and rhetoric of American politicians” (Smith, 1996, p. 207). Smith (1996) asserted:

The appearance of menace was sufficient to win support for change, as long as the changes had nothing to do with questioning mainstream American values. Of course, so-called American values were the values of the dominant white middle-class culture. (p. 207)
The launch of Sputnik in 1957 further focused U.S. concerns on the nation’s science and technology competence (Efland, 1990; Efland et al., 1996; Smith, 1996). Curriculum reforms were called for by the nation, privileging empirical scientific rationality, and the discipline-based form of art education emerged and strengthened in response to these demands. This discipline-based version of art education was designed to incorporate the rationality of scientific and technology-oriented disciplines, and to delimit a set of knowledge that could be acquired by students. Bruner (1960) was credited with setting the direction of the discipline-based curriculum reforms in art education (Efland et al., 1996; Smith, 1996). Like the professionals in the disciplines of math and science, Bruner argued that art should be based on the practice of professionals in the disciplines of art (as cited by Efland et al., 1996; Smith, 1996). In 1966, Barkan drew on Bruner’s advice, and argued for structured art inquiry based on the practices of professionals working in the field—artists, art critics, and historians—who could serve as models for learners (Efland et al., 1996).

Furthermore, the accountability movement of the 1970s reified positivist conceptions of knowledge: Knowledge was seen as a static entity that a teacher or textbook contained, which could be imparted to students and scientifically measured (Efland, 1990). In the 1970s, Bruner’s and Barkan’s guidelines were used by the CEMREL corporation to make curriculum packages, but met with limited success (Efland et al., 1996). According to Efland et al. (1996), “Bruner had grossly oversimplified the characteristic differences between the way novices form their understandings and the ways that more accomplished learners do” (Efland et al., 1996, pp. 66-67); a structural sequencing element that took into account children’s developmental levels of understanding seemed to be missing.
In the 1980s, economic competition on the world markets continued the focus on science and technology in the U.S. In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation at Risk*. In this publication, the call for curriculum reforms was even stronger, again emphasizing science and technology, and stressing accountability. In response, Greer further developed a discipline-based approach, and is credited with coining the term *Discipline-Based Art Education* (DBAE) (Efland, 1990). Greer’s (1984) formulation of DBAE reflects Bruner’s and Barkan’s idea that adult professionals in the arts were to be used as a model for artistic inquiry. Unlike Barkan’s (1966) version of discipline-based art study, Greer’s (1984) adaptation advocated a sequencing of knowledge from simple to complex that was to be documented in a written curriculum; thusly, it reinforced the ideas of static, objective knowledge, and universally applicable curricula. Furthermore, it drew on Madeja and Onuska’s (1977) concept of aesthetics as a means of training the senses to become more perceptive in an effort to enhance a perceiver’s aesthetic experience. This is reflective of Hume’s (1757/1965) *Standards of Taste* in which students’ faculties of sense could be educated towards greater acuity to perceive the physical qualities of an artwork through practice, and hence underscored the formal elements to be perceived in an artwork. Greer (1984) added aesthetics to the disciplines of art history, art criticism, and studio production. His version of DBAE emphasized the content of art: perceivable formal attributes, facts, concepts, processes, and skills related to the disciplines of art. In other words, Greer’s DBAE advocated a static knowledge set that students might acquire, and for which they could be held accountable.

Greer headed the Getty Trust Institute, which aimed to “help classroom teachers teach art to elementary school children,” (Efland, 1990, p. 253). The DBAE approach of the Getty Trust was an attempt to make art seem more valuable—more like the subjects of math and science
Propelled by the resources of the Getty, DBAE was on the national table. Reminiscent of the picture study and school decoration movements, DBAE was used in the service of nation building. It was a transmitter of dominant cultural values and morals to the disenfranchised in U.S. society: Efland (1990) pointed to a Getty conference in 1987 at which Secretary of Education William Bennett stated how important it was that “disadvantaged children learn about great works and artists that are part of our common culture” (as quoted by Efland, 1990, p. 254). This resonates with Hirsch’s (1987) argument for cultural literacy, and his claims that a European descended “mainstream culture [is] the basic culture of the nation” (p. 22). DBAE was a guiding ideology that forwarded the idea of assimilationist policies in education.

According to Watson, an art educator who had attended a DBAE training seminar, the formalist evaluations of artworks advocated for practice in DBAE reduced artworks to mere eyecharts (as cited by Smith, 1996). The model put the student learner in the position of an objective observer, a mode that drew from the European model of scientific rationality (Smith, 1996): The universal formalist qualities ascribed to artworks are a set of perceptible, knowable facts. Furthermore, one needed to be familiar with a defined canon of masterpieces—by European masters—in order to be considered literate in art. DBAE was particularly apropos in light of curriculum reforms that stressed the value of accountability and scientific positivism.

Art Education is Political: U.S. Art Education is a Vehicle for European Hegemony

Throughout U.S. art education history until the 1990s, the influence and strength of Eurocentric ideology is apparent. The roots of art education were portrayed as stemming from European philosophies; universal principles of art surfaced, based on European judgments of beauty; and notions of the inferiority of non-European art developed. Eurocentric ideology
became American virtue and morality—the ‘good’ in life to be pursued through art education. Particularly in the case of DBAE, this four-pronged Eurocentric conception of art (production, history, criticism, aesthetics) was presented as concrete knowledge. It was a set of knowable processes, concepts, facts, and skills that allegedly applied universally—what Giroux (1981) would have aligned with a “culture of positivism” (p. 8). As unquestionable knowledge, it was naturalized through an indoctrinating *banking style* of education in which a teacher deposited knowledge into a student’s mind, and this currency was taken-for-granted as unalterable fact and truth (Freire, 1970/1993). This European derived ideology, naturalized as objective knowledge, drove curricular reforms, promoted assimilationist perspectives, and perpetuated and legitimated this ideology. This is what Apple (1979) described as the ideological hegemony often hidden in curricula. Giroux (1981) asserted, “Inherent in any educational design are value assumptions and choices about the nature of humankind, the use of authority, the value of specific forms of knowledge and, finally, a vision of what constitutes the good life” (p. 129). This is what has been reflected in the above discussion of U.S. art education history.

Art education, in this sense, is political: It is strategically used as an instrument to gain or maintain power and domination for Anglo-Europeans in the United States. Under this dominion, social inequities in power and oppression are inherent; hence, in a democratic U.S. society, this inequality is what is being contested through various versions of multicultural art education, which will be discussed in upcoming sections of this chapter.

The teaching of Eurocentric, universal, formal design elements and principles persists as the predominant method of teaching art in the U.S. classroom (Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Hamblen, 1995; Hart, 1995; jagodzinski, 1999; Keifer-Boyd, 2000; Milbrandt, 2002; Neperud & Krug, 1995). In art history, the Western canon continues to be held as the epitome of great art, as
indicated above, and the standard to which all works of art are compared (Dissanayake, 1988; Hart, 1998). These phenomena are not limited to the United States. In the U.K., this Eurocentric, formulaic approach to art education in elementary and secondary schools is pervasive (Dash, 1999, 2005; Ward, 2005). Dash (1999) argued that adherence to a Eurocentric canon was racist: For example, the canon alienated African Caribbean minority students in the U.K. by constructing “their educational experience around European theories of knowing which serve[d] only to reinscribe a system of repression that denie[d] their right to be” (p. 140), and underscored the idea that Blacks were not meaningful contributors to a shared societal community. Gundara and Fyfe (1999) recognized the same dominant canon being played out in the broader region of the European Community. Classical art tradition, hearkening back to ancient Greece and Rome, was being pushed forward as the ideal (Gundara & Fyfe, 1999). As Chalmers (1999) declared, “Art education was (and is) a major agent of colonization and cultural imperialism” (p. 176). A study by Richards (1988) enacted exactly this colonization: He conducted an experiment in which students in Jamaica were ‘taught to draw’ utilizing Western methods of focused perceptual training, and assessed based on Western tests of drawing ability that underscore ‘good’ drawing as representational mimesis (Still-Life Drawing Test and Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test). He concluded that Jamaican students could learn to draw—based on Western standards of excellence. Using this example as a metaphor, consider this same colonizing effect on a non-Anglo-European population of students in the United States. Breaking this Eurocentric hegemony is the intent of multicultural art education; however, not every approach accomplishes this, as will be discussed in the following sections of this chapter.
A Brief History of Multicultural Art Education

To elaborate upon how multicultural art education aims to counter European hegemony, I offer a brief history outlining the foundations of multicultural education. Though multiculturalism has its roots in the late 1800s, the oppressive environment warranting its creation still exists today, and with globalization creating an ever more diverse U.S. population, the need for multicultural education is even more relevant. Today, the United States is experiencing its greatest immigration levels since the early twentieth century (Suárez-Orozco, C. Suárez-Orozco, & Quin, 2005). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2000), immigrant students comprise the fastest growing population in U.S. public schools today (as cited by Banks, 2006b). Multicultural education serves to address this diversity. Its primary goals are to promote justice, equity, and respect for all by teaching students the attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to participate in multiple cultures within their community, the nation, and the globe (Banks, 2006b).

Scholars in art education frequently draw on Banks’s extensive work in general education (e.g., Adejumo, 2002; Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001, 2002; Efland et al., 1996; Kantner, 1994; Kuster, 2006; Mason, 1999; Noel, 2003; Stuhr, 1994, 2003; Young, 1999). Considered the “father of multicultural education” (World Library of Educationalists, 2006), I turn to Banks for the foundations of multicultural education.

A number of scholars in art education point to the Brown v. Board of Education decision of the 1950s and Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s as the starting point for multicultural education curriculum reform (e.g., Adejumo, 2002; Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001, 2002; Davenport, 2000; Delacruz, 1995b; Kantner, 2002; Stuhr, 2003). However, Banks (1991, 1994b, 1996a, 2004; Banks & C.A.M. Banks, 1995) explained that the impetus for reforms began much earlier, in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Banks (1996a) underscored the African American

Prior to the 1950s, the work of these Black scholars was largely unrecognized by mainstream White academia, and before the 1960s Civil Rights Movement they could only find jobs in predominantly Black schools and colleges (Banks, 2004). With their literature, these scholars fought against this type of pervasive erasure and discrimination. They argued that by creating and presenting a more accurate depiction of African Americans in U.S. history and life, the racism, discrimination, and stereotypes that proliferated mainstream U.S. constructions would be undermined and invalidated (Banks, 1996a, 1996d). They challenged the incompleteness of metanarratives that, in their partiality, “suggest[ed] not only that some parts of the story don’t count, but that some parts don’t even exist” (Banks, 2004, p. 49). The problem was that the “canonized place” of metanarratives in school curricula, and their validity, were rarely contested; early African American studies aimed to bring this problem to light by focusing on the perspectives and contributions of African Americans to the culture of the U.S. (Banks, 2004). Thus, the first phase of multicultural education was African American ethnic studies (Banks, 1996a).

As noted by art education scholars (Collins & Sandell, 1992; Delacruz, 1995a; Smith, 1996), critics of multicultural education have voiced the concern that multiculturalism is derived from middle-class European values and tradition, and to forward its practice would be to further European hegemony. The underlying assumption of these critics’ arguments is that multiculturalism has European roots. In contradiction to this argument, as we have just seen,
Banks (1996a) traced the roots of multicultural education to the work of early African American studies scholars who developed their works to counter White European hegemony and domination. His scholarship refutes these critics’ assertions. Critics’ claims that multiculturalism is derived from European values seems to be a Eurocentric, hegemonic attempt to yet again silence the voices of marginalized Blacks and their contributions to the formation of multicultural education, and to instead credit Europeans with the origins of multiculturalism.

With African American studies as the pioneering venture to counter European hegemony in U.S. education, multicultural education continued to develop as scholars with interests in other marginalized groups (such as women, disabled peoples, and other ethnic groups) asserted their voices (Banks, 1996a; Young, 1999). In line with the momentum of ethnic studies, Gay (1983) asserted that three forces converged in the mid-1960s to further drive curriculum reforms: the Civil Rights Movement, critical analysis of textbooks, and challenges to the deficiency orientation (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The cultural deficiency orientation would serve as a justification for assimilationist practices in educational reform throughout the 1960s (Duesterberg, 1998; Sleeter & Grant, 1988), and will be addressed in a following section of this chapter.

Art educator June McFee (1961/1970) published Preparation for Art, in which she utilized an anthropological approach to studying cultures, and showed that art and its practice varied by cultural grouping in their efforts to maintain distinct cultural identities. Furthermore, individuals within cultural groups differed. This put an initial dent in the commonly held notion of universal truths about art (Smith, 1996).

In the mid-1970s critical conflict theorists in education, drawing on Marxism or neo-Marxism, looked at socioeconomic hierarchies and argued that curricula served to reproduce
social inequities in society based on class (see, for example, Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Willis, 1977). Conflict theorists began with the premise that there are social inequities in U.S. society; thus, their primary concern was with the betterment of this situation for the disenfranchised. Through school, they asserted, hierarchies of domination-subordination existing in the social structure were reinforced (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Willis, 1977). They argued that schools are socializing forces, and that schools could not change unless society changed. The underlying assumption of conflict theorists was that individuals will adapt to their environment (adaptation theory) in the absence of conflict, and schools were not seen as forums for broaching issues of conflict, but rather for indoctrinating students into societal norms. Recognizing the hegemonic function of schools, Apple (1979) elaborated on the implicit ideologies often hidden in curricula and the structuring of schools. He argued that the curriculum served as a vehicle for hegemony by reinforcing dominant cultural values and dispositions in a conservative manner. Furthermore, the structure of schooling and positioning of schools as disseminators of objective knowledge served to promote dominant ideology as natural, an unquestionable given, and hence avoided conflict. Knowledge, presented as objective fact, “cannot enable students to see the political dimension of the process by which one alternative theory’s proponents win out over their competitors” and become so-called objective knowledge (p. 89).

In line with this philosophy, multicultural scholars in art education began to highlight the elitist conceptions of art stemming from DBAE in the 1980s (Efland, 1990), in which art was taught as a universal set of knowable skills, processes, and facts within a European canon, as explained earlier. In contrast to the universalist approach to art advocated in DBAE, McFee and Degge’s (1980) scholarship again endorsed an anthropological approach to cultural study, and emphasized a diversity of cultures and subcultures (as cited by Kantner, 2002). The 1992 Getty
Center Discipline-Based Art Education and Cultural Diversity conference provided a forum for multicultural art education advocates to voice their concerns. They criticized DBAE for its elitist, Eurocentric, universal formalist approach to art education, and lack of sensitivity to cultural diversity (Kantner, 2002). Kantner (2002) argued that this provided a stimulus for multicultural reforms in DBAE curricula. The Getty Center was the first to produce a Multicultural Art Print Series. The problematic nature of this curriculum kit will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

National mandates for inclusion of multicultural components in art education curricula are now in place in the United States. In 1987, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education issued standards that included multiculturalism, and these have been updated and reasserted in 2000 and 2002 (Banks, 2004). The National Art Education Association (NAEA) aligns its goals with that of the National Visual Arts Standards, and both contain a multicultural requirement. The NAEA revised the Standards for Art Teacher Preparation in 1999 to require accredited art teachers to be attentive to multiculturalism (Kantner, 2002). What form these multicultural approaches might take in the artroom, however, is not specified. Various approaches to multicultural art education, and potential components of a multicultural art education curriculum, are the focus of the next sections of this chapter.

Five Dimensions of a Multicultural Education Curriculum

To guide educators’ integration of multicultural programs into their classrooms, Banks (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) detailed a series of dimensions that build towards transformative and social reconstructionist approaches to multiculturalism. These dimensions include content integration, equity pedagogy, knowledge transformation, empowering school culture and social
structure, and prejudice reduction (see Table 1). Each dimension will be elaborated upon below. As my intent is to provide guidance specifically for art educators, I will highlight how scholars in art education have addressed these dimensions in theory as well.

Content Integration

In terms of content integration, Banks (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) indicates that a curriculum would be transformed to integrate exemplars from diverse groups to highlight different perspectives on key themes, issues, concepts, and theories. The perspective from which content is viewed is key: Casting a Western gaze upon content originating from a non-Western area, as noted earlier, is hegemonic. The nature of the content is also important: Ideally, accurate, contextualized information (perspectives, histories, contributions), voiced by members of the group in study, are integrated into the curriculum (Banks, 1991, 1994b, 1996b; Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1995; C. A. M. Banks, 1996a).

To address these two issues, multicultural art education scholars stress the firsthand, emic perspective of artists and members of the community from which an artwork has emanated (e.g., Adejumo, 2002; Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001, 2002; Chalmers, 1996, 2002; Congdon, 1985; Dunn & Occi, 2003; Gundara & Fyfe, 1999; Irwin & Miller, 1997; Spang, 1995; Stuhr, 1994; Stuhr, Petrovic-Mwanicki, & Wasson, 1992). As suggested by Stuhr et al. (1992), to investigate this point of view, the teacher may need to meet and consult with an artist, invite an artist into the classroom, or gather information and explanations about an artwork that are written by its artist. For instance, Irwin and Miller (1997) and Spang (1995) asserted that First Nations artists and Native Americans must be consulted when constructing instruction about artworks from these cultural groups. A case study in art education by Lee (2007) illustrated how first-person narratives of insiders enabled her preservice art teachers to empathize with artists and make
Table 1
Five Dimensions of a Multicultural Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Integration</th>
<th>Equity Pedagogy</th>
<th>Knowledge Transformation</th>
<th>Empowering School Culture &amp; Social Structure</th>
<th>Prejudice Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Content woven into overall curriculum, not appendage</td>
<td>• Attention to individual learning styles: students seen as multidimensional individual who reach different by time and context, teaching needs to adapt to the shifting social environments and individual students within those contexts</td>
<td>• Structure: Diverse perspectives shared by different groups about key issues, concepts, themes, etc.</td>
<td>• Students confront and research social issues of conflict, take a stance, and take action (which can be the creation of an artwork)</td>
<td>• A goal/desired outcome rather than a tactic or strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content available to all students (not targeted students assumed to be part of group in focus)</td>
<td>• Begin from students’ lifeworlds: draw from their real life experiences, help shape curriculum</td>
<td>• Artworks as the sites of knowledge, the texts for deconstruction</td>
<td>• Systemic reform of school culture to embrace and reflect equity and non-oppressive strategies</td>
<td>• Curriculum decreases the tendency to stereotype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diverse perspectives shared by different groups about key issues, concepts, themes, etc.</td>
<td>• Modeling equity: self-reflection of teacher</td>
<td>• Artists as creators of this knowledge: positionality, ideology, context of creation explored</td>
<td>• Implicit ideology of curriculum used for liberation</td>
<td>• Increases propensity to see each individual as a contributing member of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accurate, contextualized information shared</td>
<td>• Cooperative grouping strategies: heterogeneous groups structured by teacher to work toward common goals</td>
<td>• Critical dialogues confronting issues of conflict (racism, stereotypes, other’ism) advocated as primary methodology for deconstruction</td>
<td>• Multiple artists and artworks from group shown to dispel stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Voiced by members of group in study—emic perspectives</td>
<td>• Live interactive visitors: insider perspective, active engagement, living example of an exception to a stereotype</td>
<td>• Assessment: less competitively structured, no ranking against a norm, process of negotiated understanding and modification</td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personal connections with the cultural meanings of artworks from Korea in her classroom. Art would be experienced as it is practiced in real life, and as part of a sociocultural context (Efland et al., 1996; Stuhr, 1994).

In addition, cultural representations would be highly contextualized, and artists and artforms would be explored using ethnographic methods drawn from anthropology (Efland et al., 1996). “The unique contributions of individuals within these diverse social and cultural groups are stressed” (Efland et al., 1996, p. 82), thereby underscoring heterogeneity within the cultural grouping, and attending to multiple dimensions of an individual’s identity (such as gender, ethnicity, race, sexuality, age, and disability). As such, the hybridity of cultures and multidimensional influences on an artwork and artist would be underscored. Multiple artists and artworks from a cultural group might be studied to dispel stereotypes (Stuhr, 1994).

Content would be interdisciplinary, drawing on different subjects (Banks, 1996e, 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b). In the world of multicultural art education, this crossover is likely to be with social studies (Chalmers, 1981; Efland et al., 1996; Stuhr, 1994). It would also entail cooperative planning among teachers from different subjects (Stuhr, 1994).

How content is integrated—that is, where it is located in the curriculum—is another factor: Is content woven into the core curriculum, or is it presented as a separate course as an add-on to the mainstream curricula? (Banks, 2004). The audience for the curricula also needs to be taken into account: The content would be made available to all students, and would not be targeted at students who are assumed to be tied to a group under study by criteria such as race, ethnicity, gender, and class (Banks, 2004). An art teacher who embraces a multicultural approach might present a lesson and relay it to all students from the perspectives of diverse cultural
groups, and incorporate exemplars from these groups (Andrus, 2001; Chalmers, 1996; Efland et al., 1996). As such, the perspectives and artworks of diverse cultures would be woven into the core curriculum, which is structured around concepts.

*Equity Pedagogy*

*Equity pedagogy* refers to the modification of teaching techniques, methods and strategies to accord with the diverse learning styles of students.

*Individual Student Learning Styles*

This does not imply that educators should assume that a particular learning style will accord with a student based on his or her race, gender, and/or class. In the recent past, general education researchers tended to conclude that particular cultural groups have particular learning styles. For instance, Aronson and Gonzalez (1998) surmised that African Americans and Mexican Americans respond more positively to cooperative teaching styles more so than competitive ones (as cited by Banks, 1996e). John (1972), More (1989), and Tharp (1989) concluded that Native American students are more passive and less responsive, and learn by quietly observing rather than listening and speaking (as cited by Wills, Lintz, & Mehan, 1996). In contrast, cases in art education have been explored to dispel the myth that one should use specific teaching strategies and formulate expectations based on a reductionist stereotype of a group. Generalizing teaching strategies to all individuals within an ethnic population or other cultural grouping is essentialist and problematic, and does not attend to the needs of the student within varying contextual situations. Ethnographic studies in art education by Hickman (1999), Andrus (2001), Neperud and Stuhr (1993), Wolcott (1967, as cited by Chalmers, 1981), and McFee (1961/1970), all underscored that educators need to relate to students as multidimensional individuals who react differently in different contexts and change throughout time. They found
heterogeneity within cultural groupings, as well as differences in a singular individual, depending on the contexts in which the student is involved. They concluded that it is inappropriate for educators to develop expectations and to attribute particular learning styles to students based on stereotypes of the cultural group to which a student is assumed to belong. For instance, art teachers who hold to the myth that figural representations are prohibited in visual artistry for all Muslims, under all circumstances, and approach students of Muslim backgrounds with this understanding as truth, would be misdirected: Hickman’s (1999) investigations with his students of Muslim backgrounds found that attitudes towards figural representation varied by individual student, and by context of use, such as life drawing versus sculpture. Research by Soganci (2006) focused on this same issue, and corroborated Hickman’s conclusions. This indicates that teaching methods need to adapt to the shifting social environments in which they exist, and to individual students within those contexts.

*Beginning From Students’ Lifeworlds*

In line with teaching to individual learning needs, the curriculum would draw on students’ real life experiences (Banks, 1996e). In art education, students would be empowered to help shape the curriculum, and the curriculum would reflect interests from their daily life experiences and environment (Efland et al., 1996; Stuhr, 1994, 1995).

*Modeling Equity*

The teacher would also need to model the attitudes and behaviors he or she is teaching (Banks, 1996e, 2004). In art education, Andrus (2001) asserted that the art teacher should model equity in every teaching moment. Self-reflexivity is key to the formation of this non-prejudicial attitude and behavior: Art educators need to be particularly self-reflexive about their own biases
Cooperative Grouping Activities

Heterogeneous grouping practices would be utilized (Banks, 1996e, 2004). According to Cohen (1972), cooperative learning involves activities in which heterogeneous groups—students from diverse groups—work together toward common goals (as cited by Banks, 1996e). The equal status of all members, particularly minority members, is prestructured prior to the cooperative learning activity. That is, the teacher is aware of the strengths of each individual student, and members for each group are selected so that all can capitalize on their strengths in contributing to the group. In art education, Efland et al. (1996) and Stuhr (1994) advocate for these types of cooperative learning activities.

Live, Interactive Visitors

Members of different cultural groups would be invited into the classroom to share their cultural experiences and interpretations of events in-person (Banks, 1996e). Theorists in multicultural art education have often suggested inviting individuals from diverse backgrounds for live interaction with students in the artroom (Adejumo, 2002; Andrus, 2001; Carpenter II et al., 2007; Chalmers, 1992, 2002; Garber, 1995; Hart, 1991; Stuhr, 1994; Stuhr et al., 1992). In the rationale for direct contact with individuals, these authors often highlight that such an individual can provide an insider’s perspective that is more accurate than that of an outsider to a cultural group. In general education, this direct and active engagement with a live person is seen as a more stimulating and concrete experience than reading from textbooks (Asher, 2007; Banks, 1996a; Donaldson & Martinson, 1977; Grambs, 1968; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). In art education, Carpenter II et al. (2007) also stressed the inspirational influence of in-person artist visits to their
classrooms, which brings the abstract into reality. Furthermore, in contrast to texts, which promote the idea that knowledge is a set of static facts, live interaction with individuals helps students to understand the complexities of social reality and that knowledge is socially constructed (Banks, 1996a).

In addition, these in-person interactions may serve to reduce prejudices (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Allport (1954), considered an authority on prejudice development, utilized cognitive development theory to explain that people have the tendency to function in line with a principle of least effort (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988). That is, people will not change an established system of categorization, such as a stereotype, unless they are repeatedly challenged to do so. Exceptions to the categories challenge the system in place. Increased exposure to exceptions and repetitive challenges promote the modification of categories once held as true. When a student makes direct contact and has interaction with an individual from a stereotyped group that does not fit the stereotype existing in their system of categorizations, it challenges this preconceived stereotype. It moves the student from an abstract stereotype to a concrete experience that could serve to undermine the stereotype. In this sense, development of non-prejudicial behavior can be seen as akin to breaking a bad habit (Devine, 1989).

However, caution is necessary when inviting visitors into the classroom. A critical approach to their perspectives would be advocated—as addressed next in knowledge construction and transformation (Banks, 2004); otherwise, as Desai (2005) cautioned with respect to art education, assumptions might be made that “forms are located in one culture—the culture of origin” (p. 294).
Assessment

Assessment processes in a multicultural approach that aims towards egalitarianism would be less competitively structured (Banks, 1996e). This would run contrary to mainstream assimilationist approaches to evaluation in which students are judged and ranked against a norm or standard (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). In art education, Boughton (1999) argued against standards-based testing, and asserted that it is not possible to determine beforehand what an ideal performance in art would be. Hence, there is no standard that educators should employ to judge students. Boughton (1999) and Freedman (2000) advocated the use of more holistic approaches to evaluation, and stressed the value of students’ interpretations and judgments of artworks as a process of negotiated understanding in which ideas can be challenged and are open to modification.

Knowledge Construction and Transformation


The structure of a curriculum that incorporates knowledge construction and transformation is centered on concepts, events, and issues that are presented from the perspectives of a diverse series of groups: men and women from varying social classes, different
ethnic groups, ages, and so forth (Banks, 1996e). These counterstories are critical to decentering dominant, hegemonic ideologies (Golding, 2005; Haynes Chavez & Chavez, 2001). As a “pedagogy of critical thinking” (Giroux, 1981, p. 125), the process teaches students to question and deconstruct what is presented as undisputed knowledge and truth—to challenge Western-centric, mainstream, hegemonic constructions of knowledge that reinforce existing power hierarchies (Banks, 1996b). Power relationships are interrogated as students investigate a source’s purposes and who benefits from such a perspective (Banks, 2004; C. A. M. Banks, 1996a; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000).

Knowledge construction and transformation pushes students to explore underlying biases and assumptions of a source’s creators, and asks students to examine a creator’s frame of reference and positionality (Banks, 1993, 1995a, 1996b; McLaren, 1986; Weiler, 1988). *Positionality*, as defined by feminist scholar Tetreault (1993), is about how one’s context interacts with various dimensions of one’s identity (such as gender, class, and ethnicity) to effect how one interprets the world. In deconstructing knowledge, students are involved in a self-reflexive process of knowledge construction themselves. They are involved in the critical examination of their own positionality and taken-for-granted assumptions, and how these shape their interpretations of the world in the process (Atkinson & Dash, 2005; Asher, 2007; Banks, 1996b; Golding, 2005; Giroux, 1981; hooks, 2000). Knowledge is presented as something that is created. It is “dynamic and interactive rather than static” (Banks, 1996b, p. 10).

Banks (2004) underscored that the process aims to help students understand how many diverse cultural groups have interacted and contributed to the development of U.S. society. It

---

5 Critical pedagogy encouraging students towards social reconstruction has been criticized by scholars (such as Tomhave, 1992) for its elitist tendencies in its potential to induce students to advocate for one particular position as correct; that is, one vision of how the world should be socially reconstructed. I also see this as problematic, and will address this critique in greater detail in an upcoming discussion of “Multicultural Social Reconstruction/Action.”
fosters critical thinking in individuals, as well as helps them to see how ideology is shaped and perpetuated and influences their world today and their unequal positions in it. Key to this understanding is the issue of representation (Banks, 1996e; Desai, 2000; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Miller, 1996). It empowers students to recognize and deconstruct representations that reify stereotypes, that separate out groups as “others,” and that perpetuate stratification in U.S. society (Banks, 1996e; Miller, 1996). Without knowledge deconstruction and transformation, multicultural understandings will be superficial and shallow (Duesterberg, 1998; Nieto, 1996). The underlying belief is that if students are armed with the skills to deconstruct knowledge and “interrogate the assumptions of the knowers,” they will be less likely to fall victim to “knowledge that produces hegemony and inequality” (Banks, 1996c, p. 84).

In multicultural art education, artworks become the sites of knowledge, the texts for deconstruction, as does the Eurocentric canon, and students’ and teachers’ preconceived assumptions and stereotypes about categories of art and what is considered art (see, for instance, Atkinson & Dash, 2005; Ballengee-Morris, 2002, 2008; Bastos, 2006; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2005, 2007; Dash, 2005; Davenport, 2000; Desai, 2000, 2005; Efland et al., 1996; Klein, 2008; Knight, 2006; lok, 2005; Parks, 2000, 2004; Staikidis, 2005; Ward, 2005). As advocated by these scholars, this implicates the artists, the sociocultural environment, and various power structures in play in the creation and reception of artworks. It emphasizes the importance of in-depth contextualization and ideological deconstruction. It also implicates the viewing audience, and interrogates their positionality in their interpretations of an artwork. It underscores what Adejumo (2002) called the non-material expression of an artwork, the ideology associated with its creation and reception. For Dewey (1934), such an engaged perception, “an act of
reconstructive doing… [in which] consciousness becomes fresh and alive” (p. 53), is paramount for the aesthetic experience (p. 53).

Stuhr (1994) suggested that if artists are invited into the classroom, they should be encouraged to talk about their social positions within the various cultural groups to which they belong. Furthermore, the class could be engaged in conversations about issues related to discrimination along various dimensions such as race, gender, ethnicity, and nationality (Efland et al., 1996; Stuhr, 1994). For example, students might explore the underrepresentation of Native American artists in galleries and museums across the U.S., and research different issues to uncover values and assumptions in arguments related to the issue (Efland et al., 1996). Through knowledge construction and transformation, students are educated to become critical thinkers who are able to examine their own life experiences (Stuhr, 1995).

As advocated by multicultural art education theorists (Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Efland et al., 1996; Golding, 2005; Stuhr, 1994, 1995; Ward, 2005) and exhibited in the few transformative multicultural art education cases on classroom interventions to be found in the literature (see Albers, 1996, 1999; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2005, 2007; Knight, 2006; Staikidis, 2005), the primary method for deconstruction of knowledge is engagement of students and teachers in critical dialogues that confront issues of conflict such as discrimination, stereotyping, racism, and oppression. This type of critical dialogue about issues of conflict is emphasized by critical pedagogy theorists such as Giroux (1981) and Freire (1985, 1992/2004, 1970/1993), and is exemplified by Freire (1992/2004) in Pedagogy of Hope. In the cases documented by Albers (1996, 1999), Chung (2008), Cohen Evron (2001, 2005, 2007), Knight (2006), and Staikidis (2005), art classes focus on the interrogation of stereotypes and assumptions, and their relationship to hierarchical structures of oppression. These dialogues
deconstruct students’ own preconceptions and underlying ideologies, as well as those found in and forwarded by art. In this dialogue, both the teacher and students are involved in the process of questioning and presenting potential interpretations. Teachers are reflective about their own dispositions, and ask critical questions that challenge students to think more deeply and question their assumptions and beliefs. Art is viewed as a receptacle and a vehicle for ideology. In line with Banks (1996b) and Giroux (1981), Greene (1995) argued that, in the absence of critical dialogue, students become passive receivers of allegedly undisputable facts, and are not challenged to question the norm. Stagnancy and reproduction of these stale facts are promoted. Students are not encouraged to challenge elitism and objectivism, nor given agency to liberate their imaginations and envision and shape their world and future. This is the antithesis of the vibrant potential of the arts (Greene, 1995).

Knight (2006), Staikidis (2005), and Chung (2008), each engaged students at the university level—all preservice teachers—in critical dialogues about issues of conflict that encouraged self-reflection about their own understandings and biases, and explored the negative impacts of stereotyping. Knight (2006) described her experiences teaching a graduate-level teacher education seminar entitled, “Using Contemporary Art to Challenge Cultural Values, Beliefs, and Assumptions” (p. 40). She enlisted discussion as her primary instructional format, rather than lecturing, in order to set the stage for members of the class to share and hear a variety of perspectives. They began by sharing their earliest “memories of human difference” (p. 42). They were asked to consider what they observed, felt, and what features of these observations generated positive or negative affect. They contemplated: “Were my reactions reality-based, or was I reacting to a stereotype?” (p. 42). Knight asserted that such explorations potentially encouraged students to discover the sources of their biases. Next, her class engaged with
contemporary artworks from artists of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds who were “primarily residing in the United States” (p. 42). Many of the artworks confronted controversial issues such as “racism, sexism, classism, ageism, ableism, and other ’isms’” (p. 42). Students were asked to view the works through alternative viewpoints—through the eyes of another classmate, or from differing ideological perspectives. They deconstructed the images for stereotype references, and “also questioned the individuals and institutions that create, control, and disseminate racist mediated texts” (p. 43). They considered the connection between stereotypes and prejudice, how these might influence behavior, and how such images might “provoke loathing or contempt of ‘the other’” (p. 43). Knight asserted that these discussions encouraged students “to question the assumptions reflected in each other’s positions” (p. 43). Furthermore, she contended, “They started to find out that what some consider as truth largely depends on the various assumptions they hold” (p. 44).

Similarly, Staikidis (2005) prompted her students to interrogate their assumptions. In her class, preservice teachers’ critical discussions confronted issues of conflict and explored their assumptions about contemporary art and artists in a postmodern arena. They debated the “philosophical European birth and shaping” of these ideas, and “began to dismantle stereotypes about terms such as contemporary art and artists in a postmodern art world” (para. 19). Platformed by these discussions, Staikidis introduced her preservice teachers to a variety of teaching structures that she learned under the mentorship of a male Tzutuhil and a female Kaqchikel Mayan painter with whom she had studied. Students utilized these teaching structures to inform and transform standardized lessons prescribed in the texts for the course. Staikidis reported: “Students stated that, at first, based on prior experiences with teaching multiculturally from an essentialist perspective, they felt this lesson would involve painting or weaving like
Mayans” (para. 24). Instead, they came to recognize that the lesson incorporated alternative approaches to teaching and painting utilized by two Mayan painters. These alternative approaches to teaching and painting, these counterstories to a dominant Western narrative, provided students with a means to review, reconstruct and transform assumptions typically presented as static knowledge, and to recognize instead a plurality of dynamic understandings.

In Chung’s (2008) class, preservice elementary teachers also engaged in dialogues confronting issues of conflict as they proceeded to dismantle stereotypes. The class began with a discussion in which students shared their personal experiences with stereotypes, and contemplated how the media capitalizes on stereotypes in their daily life. Chung reported that these students surmised that stereotypes “contain layers of discrimination and dehumanization, and embody how the perpetrator of stereotypes considers others inferior and therefore disenfranchises them to be a subject of ridicule” (p. 24). The students contrived adjectives associated with stereotypes, listed these singularly on pieces of paper, applied these labels randomly to each student’s forehead, and students then conversed with one another to “find out their partner’s personal information… and if relevant to speak to their partner in a way that increased the visibility of the label on the other person’s forehead” (p. 24). Chung contended, “The majority acknowledged that they were constantly aware of the label during the interaction” (p. 24). Students reported that, as labeled beings, “I felt different from the rest of my peers,” “It allowed me to feel how people feel when we label them negatively,” “This process makes me feel uncomfortable. I didn’t really like being labeled,” and “I have a better understanding as to why we shouldn’t stereotype people” (p. 24). Students then created comic strips that illustrated an existing stereotype, and their participation in this creative process “enabled them to consider how stereotypes are social constructions and are purposefully manipulated” (p. 33). They
followed this artmaking exercise with a critical dialogue using the artworks as “a point of departure for disrupting stereotypes” (p. 33).

Albers (1996, 1999), and Cohen Evron (2001, 2005, 2007) documented cases at the K-12 level. Albers (1996, 1999) illustrated how a sixth grade class engaged in discussion about issues of conflict related to sexism. In an exercise in which students were shown a series of artworks and asked to predict the gender of the artists, “the results revealed that many students held sexist views of what males and female artists are capable of creating” (Albers, 1996, p. 9). These sexist (and heterosexualist) beliefs were explored in a 40-minute discussion that accompanied the exercise, in which Ms. Wolf “carefully and thoughtfully asked questions that challenged students to think more deeply” (p. 9). Albers (1996) contended that the exercise “enabled students to reflect upon and transform their present sexist assumptions about the capabilities of males and females in art” (p. 206). Albers (1999) asserted that students were “affected by the conversation and are not the same people after these experiences” (p. 10). As evidence, she cited the reflections of a sixth grade girl: “I’ve learned that male and female artists think in almost the same way. Just because they are male or female doesn’t mean that they should or do think in a particular way. I think that men and women seem much similar because I have found out that the only way they are different is basically their physical appearance” (p. 10).

Cohen Evron (2001, 2005, 2007) detailed three high school classes in which the idea of “otherness” was deconstructed through critical dialogue, and approached via three different means. These scenarios will be discussed further in the next section, as these three lessons broached into the dimension of empowering school culture and social structure through students’ active creation of politically oriented artworks.
Empowering School Culture and Social Structure

With this dimension of multicultural education, social action is promoted as students research and reflect on social issues, select and justify a stance, and are encouraged to take action on this position (Banks, 1996e, 2004; C. A. M. Banks, 1996a; Grant, 1992; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b; Nieto, 1996; Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1988; Sleeter, 1991). Multicultural education, in this sense, is a call for individuals to “engage in social action to improve the social circumstances of all people” (C. A. M. Banks, 1996a, p. 55). This social action might take the form of small demonstrations of justice in the elementary grades. For example, elementary students might make friends with individuals from other cultural groups, and participate in community projects to achieve a sense of political effectiveness; in this manner, students begin to learn that they can propel changes for a better world (Banks, 1996e).

In art education, students would aim to challenge existing preconceptions on particular art related issues, negotiate viewpoints and take a stance on an issue, and take action to reflect this stance (Efland et al., 1996; Stuhr, 1994). This provides an opportunity for students to engage in democratic action (Efland et al., 1996). This action might take the form of creation of an artwork, as in the three cases presented by Cohen Evron (2001, 2005, 2007) in which high school students created photographic and videographic pieces in their explorations of the idea of “otherness.” In one project, 10th grade students were asked to videotape interviews in which they learned something new about someone they labeled as “other.” In doing so, they were encouraged to investigate their understandings and experiences of “otherness,” and potential positionality as the “other” in relation to this person. Students interviewed diverse people including an Arab woman from Jaffa, a street sweeper, and newcomers from the former USSR. According to Cohen Evron (2007), the exploration helped to blur the dichotomy between “us”
and “them;” and “contributed to the students’ understanding that everyone, including themselves, can be the Other, and that Otherness is situated” (p. 1040).

In another high school class documented by Cohen Evron (2005), Picasso’s *Guernica* (1937) was presented as a political artwork with thematic ties to high school students’ lifeworlds: The artwork addressed conflict and victimization, ideas that resonated with students as they were surrounded by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Students compared and contrasted *Guernica* to a newspaper photograph of a Palestinian being taken into custody by the Israeli Army in the Gaza strip, and then to “staged photographs of Palestinian victims of the Intifada, taken by a famous Israeli photographer, Micha Kirshner” (p. 316). Through critical discussion, students investigated how the artists of these works manipulated elements of their visual compositions in their representations of victimization. In evaluating these images side-by-side, “students learned how the subject of war and its victims can be interpreted differently through the use of media and techniques, and that artists can express different perspectives and focus on various aspects of their topics” (p. 316). For these students, who were surrounded by a discourse in which Israeli’s were presented as “heroes” and Palestinians as the perpetrators of violence, these photographs presented a challenge to the dominant hegemonic narrative. The images presented counterstories with Palestinians as victims. Students had to re-examine the dominant narrative, consider a repositioning of the “other” as victims, and then create their own political artworks. Cohen Evron (2005) asserted that the project “troubled the objectivity of the knowledge and raised the question of constructing meaning by an audience in a specific political context” (p. 317). Rather than presenting *Guernica* as an artifact of a distant past, the teacher “confronted the students with its meaning in the learners’ present” (p. 317). As in the previous project, in viewing the alternate narrative, the “dichotomy of ‘us’ as good and ‘them’ as evil” (p. 317), was challenged.
Similarly, in a lesson with 11th graders, students again examined images of war, and deconstructed the hegemonic discourses presented in mass media’s depictions of Palestinian Arabs as the “other.” Through critical discussion of the photographs, the teacher encouraged her students to recognize the stereotypes, and “to analyze the photographer’s position regarding the event documented as well as the ideology and discourse within which it was constructed” (Cohen Evron, 2005, p. 318). Through these discussions, “students discovered that the ways events and people were photographed influenced viewers’ understandings and interpretation of them” (p. 318). They then created staged photographs themselves, focusing on their personal attitudes in their depictions of heroes and victims of war, and alternative perspectives to the dominant narrative began to arise in which students began to interchange Arabs and Israelis as victimizers and victims, as well as showed them in images of neutrality. In one image “they staged a scene of a sheep, and an Arab and an Israeli drinking coffee together” (p. 318). Through the course of the project, students were challenged to reconsider the idea of “otherness,” and to contemplate how visual portrayals could be used to manipulate viewers’ positions. Cohen Evron (2007) argued, “Dealing with the concept of Otherness is particularly important because it provides an alternative view of the Other as a stereotype, a homogeneous and unitary group which is different from us” (p. 1039). It broke down “us” versus “them” binary thinking, and instead promoted a recognition that a plurality of understandings exists (p. 1040).

In each of these cases, students engaged in critical discussions that confronted conflict and challenged the idea of “otherness.” They additionally empowered their artistic social voices through construction of an artwork that conveyed their positions, and in the process they were asked to contemplate the negotiability of these positions.
In addition to investigating social issues and taking action, scholars (Baker, 1981; Banks, 1996b, 1996e; Hillis, 1996a) indicated that systemic reform of the school as a structural unit would need to be addressed to empower school culture and social structure. Banks (1996e) explained that a number of factors would need to be attended to for potential change, such as the “social climate of the school, extracurricular activities and participation, and staff expectations and responses to students from diverse cultural, ethnic, racial, and income groups” (p. 338). General education conflict theorists have long argued that inequities in social stratification are built into the structural system of schools, which serve to reproduce these inequities (Apple, 1979; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; hooks 1994; Meier, 2002; Oakes, 1985; Willis, 1977). They underscored the idea that students adapt to societal expectations, and that U.S. society is fundamentally inegalitarian in structure (that is, society expects less from particular cultural groups, such as lower classes, ethnic groups, and so on). For example, Meier (2002) and Willis (1977), through ethnographic observation and interviews with students, found that societal expectations shaped lower class students’ expectations of and aspirations for themselves, and reinforced a cycle of reproduction of class hierarchies, much like a self-fulfilling prophecy. This reproductive rationality, however, allows little room for the agency of individuals as actors who can change their world. Nor does it recognize the active role of schools in both sustaining and resisting dominant ideology (Giroux, 1981). In line with Freire’s (1970/1993) work on critical pedagogy, Giroux (1981) and hooks (1994) saw the potential of schools to be a liberating force for society, rather than a hegemonically indoctrinating one. Freire (1985, 1970/1993) advocated that, through a process of conscientization, people learn to become critical of society, to deconstruct propositions of truth that serve to oppress individuals, and to act towards undoing these oppressive circumstances. In this sense, schooling can be seen as a vehicle that forwards
either domination or liberation (Giroux, 1981, 2005). The libratory path requires students and teachers to be actors working toward emancipatory change through engagement in transformative knowledge construction as well as social action. The school, as another active component within students’ and teachers’ educational lifeworlds, also needs to embrace non-oppressive strategies. All parties are engaged in recognizing the hidden curriculum—the implicit ideologies—embedded in school knowledge and structure (Giroux, 1981, 2005). They are asked to challenge oppressive ideologies, take a stance, and take action upon these positions in an effort to move society towards egalitarianism.

Prejudice Reduction

In terms of prejudice reduction, Banks (2004) asserted that instruction would decrease the tendency to stereotype, and increase the propensity to see all individuals as valuable contributing members of society. This appears to be a goal of an overall multicultural education curriculum, rather than a didactic tactic or strategy. An approach may aim at prejudice reduction, and this may be an art educator’s underlying intention. However, whether it is achieved is questionable, a caution that will be reviewed in a later section of this chapter. Banks (1996e) concluded, “to implement multicultural education effectively, educators must attend to each of the five dimensions described above. . . . Although the five dimensions. . . are highly interrelated, each requires deliberate attention and focus” (p. 338). In the next section, I will investigate various approaches to multicultural education that incorporate these dimensions to differing degrees.

A Taxonomy of Multicultural Education Approaches for Art Education

I found a taxonomy of multicultural education approaches, particularly as applied to the field of art education, useful for contextualization and critique of Anna’s Contemporary Native
American Artists program. In a similar manner, art educators can reference these various approaches to help better understand how their own multicultural practice meshes within a schema of theoretical approaches. In addition, by reflecting on the merits and critiques of each type of approach, educators may also be able to glean insights indicating opportunities for improvement of their multicultural practice.

A number of scholars have presented typologies of multicultural approaches to curriculum in general education, including Gibson (1976), Banks (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a), and Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b). Within art education, Smith (1983), Collins and Sandell (1992), and Tomhave (1992) have been contributors of classifications. Smith (1983) focused on the disposition of the multiculturist in his or her approach to foreign cultural groups and artifacts. Collins and Sandell (1992) described the political motivations and implications underlying different types of presentations of multicultural components. Tomhave (1992), after reviewing 54 art education literature sources, categorized them into six types. He drew on both Gibson’s and Sleeter and Grant’s (1987) typologies.

Multicultural art education theorists (e.g., Collins & Sandell, 1992; Kadar, 2005) have drawn on Banks’s (1988, 1996e, 2004, 2006a) classification of approaches to multicultural curriculum. A number of art education scholars (e.g., Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001, 2002; Efland et al., 1996; Stuhr, 1994; Tomhave, 1992) have drawn on Sleeter and Grant’s typology (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b). Gibson’s (1976), Tomhave’s (1992), Collin’s and Sandell’s (1992), and Smith’s (1983) typologies revealed a high degree of concurrence with Sleeter and Grant’s and Banks’s categorization of approaches to multicultural education. I have found Sleeter and Grant’s, and Banks’s explanations to be more robust and detailed in their explanations of how each approach might be exhibited in practice. As I intend to
utilize a taxonomy to locate Anna’s practice of multicultural curricula, I have found these two taxonomies to be the most suitable for the purposes of this study.

Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988, 2007b) reviewed and classified approaches found in general education multicultural literature, and present five different categories for multicultural education: Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different, Human Relations, Single-Group Studies, Multicultural Education (Transformative Multicultural), and Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist (Social Reconstruction/Action) (see Table 2). They indicated that these categories are not mutually exclusive; instead, they may overlap. Banks (1988, 1996e, 2004, 2006a) presented a four category typology of multicultural education approaches to curriculum, including a contributions, additive, transformation, and social action approach. There is a strong degree of concurrence between Sleeter and Grant’s and Banks’s typologies, as well as a few differences.

*Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different/Assimilation*

Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988, 2007b) explained that *Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different* is an assimilationist approach that aims to fit children from non-dominant cultures into the dominant, mainstream culture. The underlying assumption of the approach is that there is a standard body of knowledge/content that all children in the U.S. should know (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The approach is based on a stance in the social sciences and anthropology, such as that advocated by Baratz and Baratz (1970), that middle-class Anglo culture is the standard and model to judge all others against, and those who do not meet up to this standard are *culturally deficient* (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Based on norm-referenced judgments, students are rank-ordered in terms of particular characteristics or dimensions, a line is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Dif.</th>
<th>Human Relations/ Additive/Contributions</th>
<th>Single-Group Studies</th>
<th>Transformative Multicultural</th>
<th>Social Reconstruction/ Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>To assimilate marginalized students into the mainstream culture</td>
<td>To promote a shared U.S. culture</td>
<td>To inform students about a group’s oppression and encourage them to move towards remedying injustices and promoting equity for that group</td>
<td>Students encouraged to challenge social inequities and take action for justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Content Integration</td>
<td>Equity Pedagogy</td>
<td>Knowledge Transformation</td>
<td>Empowering School Cul. &amp; Soc. Struc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No multicultural content</td>
<td>Addresses different learning styles</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May or may not be accurate</td>
<td>May or may not address</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasizes core static traditions of an ethnic group</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Western exemplars selected using a Eurocentric lens/standard</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special units added to mainstream curricula as an appendage</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies a single marginalized group (ethnic studies, women’s studies, etc.)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May be studied superficially or in-depth</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigated impact of oppression on the group</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasizes emic perspectives from that group</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confronts issues of conflict/oppression of group under study</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All components addressed (confrontation of issues of conflict is integral)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some school structural reform</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(social action emphasized)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
drawn between “normal” and “deficient,” and diversity is considered deviance (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Banks, 1996a, 2006e).

Banks (1988, 1996e, 2004, 2006a) has not included this category in his typology. I surmise this is because it does not contain any multicultural content. In terms of equity pedagogy, however, Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988, 2007b) asserted that teachers who use this approach may address students’ different learning styles by adjusting instructional strategies, though curriculum content is not changed.

I would argue, as have Stuhr (1994), and Efland et al. (1996), that a discipline-based approach to art education would be an example of a Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different assimilationist approach. As explained in the art education history section of this chapter, a discipline-based approach utilizes professionals from the contemporary Western art world as models for disciplines of study (studio artist, art historian, art critic, and aesthetician). The selection of exemplary works of art for investigation is dominated by artworks from Western Europe, and these artworks are selected through a European lens of what constitutes great art. Discipline-based approaches emphasize Western formal design principles throughout the evaluation and production of art; thus, art is presented as an objectively knowable set of facts, concepts, processes, and skills that a teacher might impart to students in a one way delivery system of what is right and good in art—an unquestionable set of knowledge that can be assumed without conflict, naturalized, and taken-for-granted as truth. Viewing the world through a Western lens and ideology, a discipline-based approach serves to naturalize a Eurocentric vision of art in the United States. It inherently marginalizes the perspectives of others, and is implicitly assimilationist and hegemonic in nature: It forwards Anglo-European dominance.
Human Relations/Contributions/Additive

The second category explained by Sleeter and Grant (1988) is a Human Relations approach. It is akin to the intergroup education approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Banks, 2004), which was conceived fundamentally as an assimilationist strategy. The intergroup education movement developed in the World War II era. During this time, industrial job opportunities were created in the urban areas of the North and West, and drew Southerners and rural inhabitants to these areas (Banks, 2004; Taba, Brady & Robinson, 1952). As diverse peoples increasingly came into contact with others from different backgrounds, much like this age of globalization, racial tensions arose, and the need for improving interpersonal relations between diverse peoples was given attention. The ensuing urban race riots of the early 1940s created a sense of national urgency to attend to racial conflict, and the intergroup education movement arose to respond to this need (Banks, 1996a, 2004; C. A. M. Banks, 1996b, 2004; Cook & Cook, 1954). The primary goals of the intergroup education movement were to promote a shared U.S. culture, reduce prejudice and stereotyping, increase interracial understanding, ameliorate racial conflicts, promote ethnic pride among minority and immigrant groups, and ease their assimilation into U.S. society (Banks, 1996a, 2004; C. A. M. Banks, 1996b, 2004; Cook & Cook, 1954; Taba & Wilson, 1946).

Based on Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b) descriptions, the approach is targeted mainly at feelings and attitudes. It is premised on the belief that if educators increase students’ knowledge about diverse cultures, they will care more about them and recognize all individuals as equal humans, regardless of cultural background. Furthermore, advocates believed that if students’ positive feelings about others increased, they would simultaneously increase positive notions about themselves. In forwarding positive feelings and
decreasing stereotyping and prejudice, the underlying belief was that social unity and tolerance would be promoted, and “eventually other social problems will be solved” (Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 165).

According to Sleeter and Grant’s descriptions, a Human Relations approach addresses some elements of Banks’ (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) dimensions of equity pedagogy and content integration to varying degrees. For example, equity pedagogy may or may not be used. In terms of content integration, though multicultural information is included, it may or may not be accurate and may or may not be superficial.

Two approaches of Banks (1988, 1996e, 2004, 2006a), a contributions approach and an additive approach, align well with this Human Relations approach. According to Banks (1996e, 2004), these are the two most commonly used approaches to multicultural education. With a contributions approach, an educator would insert discrete celebratory facts, cultural artifacts, heroes and heroines, and holidays connected with various cultures into the mainstream curriculum. These additions would be selected using the same criteria and standards used to select heroes and heroines, and cultural artifacts for the mainstream curricula. It provides a superficial, positive, view of a cultural community and is a four-F’s (food, festival, fashion, and folklore) approach (Cai, 1998). Considered tokenism, it trivializes and exoticizes cultural communities, and forwards stereotypes and misconceptions (Banks, 1988, 2006a). It is commonly used during “ethnic revival movements” (Banks, 2006a), such as those inspired in newly liberated nation-states that are seeking a unified identity distinct from that of their former colonizers (e.g., in art education, see Barbosa, 1999, for Brazil; Hwang, 2006, for Taiwan; Kárpáti, 1999, for Hungary; Kuo, 1999, for Taiwan; Moura, 1999, for Portugal; and Somjee, 1999, for Kenya). It is commonly the approach employed by schools that are first attempting to
integrate multicultural content into the curricula (Banks, 2006a). With an additive approach, teachers might add content about concepts and themes from various cultural communities. Special units on different cultural groups might be added to the curriculum as an appendage. Content might be investigated with more depth than in the contributions approach. Both approaches, contributions and additive, do not substantially change the basic assumptions, structure, nature, characteristics, or goals of the mainstream curriculum, and information about diverse groups remains on the margins. In addition, both use “mainstream-centric and Eurocentric criteria and perspectives” to select items for inclusion (Banks, 2006a, p. 141). In Grant and Sleeter’s (2007a) more recent typology, they drew on Banks’s version, and called this category Contributions, add-and-stir, or human relations.

Critique

Though this approach may decrease prejudice and stereotypes, critics assert that a Human Relations approach does not address injustices related to social problems and structural inequalities encountered by marginalized persons, and in limiting itself thusly, it implicitly accepts the status quo, and is assimilationist: “It asks people to get along within the status quo rather than educating them to change the status quo” (Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 99). It fails to recognize the historic and present inequalities and injustices existing in U.S. society, and presents the idea that everything is fine the way it is (Sleeter & Grant, 1988).

Banks (2006a) argued that the additive approach could be a first step towards a transformative approach (discussed below) in which the content, perspectives, and positionality of perspectives would be interrogated. Similarly, Sleeter and Grant (1988) believed that a Human Relations philosophy can be incorporated into other approaches to break down stereotypes and prejudice.
In Art Education

There is a potential for advocates of this approach to forward stereotypes, exacerbate prejudices, and do more damage than benefit towards eradicating prejudices and promoting social harmony. For example, art teachers might forward the idea that Mexican Americans should make piñatas rather than oil paintings because piñatas are more Mexican. Grant and Sleeter (2007a) asserted that this type of approach is so common because “it doesn’t require much rethinking of curriculum” (p. 178). It is also the version of multicultural education so heavily criticized by art education theorists (e.g., Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Chalmers, 2002; Collins & Sandell, 1992; Delacruz, 1995b; Efland et al., 1996; Garber, 1995; Gude, 2007; Gunew & Rivzi, 1994; Hochtritt, 2005; Kader, 2005; Mason, 1995; Smith, 1994; Stuhr et al., 1992) for its propensity to forward stereotypes and misconceptions about cultural groups, and to view materials from a Western ethnocentric perspective. Art educators and scholars who utilize this approach will be investigated in more detail in a later section of this chapter.

Tomhave (1992) uses the term Bicultural/Cross-cultural; Collins and Sandell (1992) use the terms Repair, Escape, and Attack; and Smith (1983) uses the terms Agnostic and Exegetal to denote versions of approaches that correspond with a Human Relations category: All include the superficial presentation of cultural groups and their artifacts, and evaluation of these through a Western lens. The Human Relations approach is a tolerance strategy with no room for issues dealing with conflict, oppression, or controversy (Cohen Evron, 2007).

Hurwitz (2002; Hurwitz & Day, 2006) drew a parallel between Adejumo’s (2002) distinction between material culture and non-material culture, which is useful in understanding the distinction between a Human Relations approach and more transformative approaches to multicultural art education. A Human Relations approach focuses on understanding material
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culture—comprehending the contextual functions, media and techniques used in production, and formal properties of a material artifact. In contrast, transformative approaches (which will be explained shortly) move further towards understanding the non-material expression and ideology conveyed by a work (Hurwitz, 2002; Hurwitz & Day, 2006).

Single-Group Studies

The third approach described by Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007b) is the Single-Group Studies approach. This includes curricula such as ethnic studies, women’s studies, and so on. In some versions of their typology, Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007b) included in this category single-groups studied at superficial levels, which is akin to the contributions or additive approaches explained by Banks (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a), as well as single-groups studied in-depth. In another version of their typology, Grant and Sleeter (2007a) have renamed this category “Ethnic studies, women’s studies, or single-group studies” (p. 178), and it exclusively involves in-depth study of a marginalized group, and emphasizes the emic perspectives of that group: Study directed in this manner investigates the group’s whole way of life and history in-depth, and tackles issues such as stereotypes, myths, institutional biases, and contemporary issues of concern. The mainstream curriculum is targeted for modification to include the perspectives of the single-group of interest. A belief underlying a Single-Group Studies approach is that if students become informed about the impact of oppression and discrimination on a particular group, they will be encouraged to move towards remedying injustices and furthering social equality for that group (Sleeter & Grant, 1988).

I find a Single-Group Studies approach problematic as a separate category. It can be categorized as a Human Relations approach if superficial studies of a group are employed, or, it is potentially a transformative approach (explained next) that focuses on one group, rather than
multiple groups (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b). For example, Banks (1996a) contended that contemporary Afrocentric scholarship places emphasis on investigating positionality in terms of a source’s value claims and objectives, and stresses the importance of interrogating knowledge construction. These are characteristics integral to a transformative approach. Furthermore, Banks (2004) indicated that in African American studies, the encouragement of social action towards reform is a strong component. This would place the Single-Group Studies category even further into the area of a Social Reconstructionist/Action approach (to be explained shortly).

Banks’s (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) taxonomy of approaches does not include a separate category similar to Single-Group Studies, perhaps because of its concurrence with other approaches. According to Banks (1973, 1976, 2006f, 2006c), ethnic studies aims towards comparative approaches between ethnic groups. However, if a single-group is studied focusing on that group’s singular perspective without relations to other groups (for instance, studying the culture to appreciate it and foster pride within members of the group), there is the potential for the promotion of Balkanization and separatism (Banks, 1973, 1976, 2006f, 2006c, 2008); and it is not really a multicultural approach, but rather an assimilationist approach into a non-dominant cultural group. If, as Sleeter and Grant (1988) asserted, the perspectives of the single-group of interest are added into mainstream curricula, then two groups, not one, are considered: a mainstream group, and a non-mainstream group. In addition, if the focus is a single-group’s perspectives on sociocultural issues such as oppression, this would indicate the study of an oppressor in narratives, a second group for comparison. A Single-Group Study could be considered a step towards more transformative approaches, particularly as more groups’ perspectives are added to the curriculum. Banks (2006a) acknowledged this possibility, as “the
move from the first to higher levels of multicultural content integration is likely to be gradual and cumulative” (p. 143).

*Multicultural Education (Transformative Multicultural)*

The fourth approach explained by Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988, 2007b) is *Multicultural Education*. This approach focuses on promoting equal opportunity and cultural pluralism. It rests on the premise that “each student should be given equal opportunity to learn, succeed, and become what he or she would like, with full affirmation of his or her sex, race, social class background, sexual orientation, and disability, if any” (Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, p. 177). Cultural pluralism underscores the understanding that “there is no one best way to be a U.S. resident” (p. 178). The approach rests on the belief that in order to achieve the social relations and equity goals of multicultural education, affect and attitudes need to be encouraged to become more embracing of all, and students’ critical thinking skills need to be developed to interrogate existing power hierarchies and inequalities in society in order to challenge them.

A Multicultural Education approach aligns well with Banks’s (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) *transformation* approach, which encourages *multiple acculturation* (Banks, 2006a): By enabling students to understand multiple perspectives as they relate to each concept studied, students learn how society has been constructed by a diversity of groups throughout its history towards a “common, shared U.S. culture” (Banks, 2006a, p. 143) in which the core culture is more inclusive (Banks, 2006d). In addition, both Multicultural Education and transformative approaches emphasize critical thinking. Banks (1996b, 1996c, 1996e, 2004) discussed critical thinking as a knowledge construction and transformation process: It interrogates frames of reference, positionality, and assumptions embedded within portrayals of reality, as discussed
earlier. In Grant and Sleeter’s (2007a) recent explanation of this approach, they drew on Banks’s (1993) typology and called this approach *Transformative Multicultural*.


**Critique**

There are potential critiques to this approach from the perspectives adopted by advocates of other approaches. Those who embrace an assimilationist, Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different approach believe that a Transformative Multicultural approach spends too little time on the skills students will need to succeed in the mainstream (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Human Relations advocates believe that attention to issues of oppression and injustices will exacerbate tensions between groups, and detract from the encouragement of harmonious interpersonal relations (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Advocates of Single-Group Studies believe that if more than one group is addressed, attention to each group is diluted, and cannot be studied in as much depth (Sleeter & Grant, 1988).

Sleeter and Grant (1988) also indicated potential problems related to implementation of a Transformative Multicultural approach. Sleeter and Grant (1986) observed that educators using this strategy often treat dimensions such as gender, ethnicity, class, and disability as separate and non-interactive (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988). They investigated oppression along one dimension between groups, such as racism, and were ignorant of concurrent oppressions within each group, such as sexism and classism. Furthermore, emphasis on cultural information may supercede attention to social inequalities existing within society, and the skills needed to change
these. “The biggest limitation of this approach is that it does not prepare students to take steps to change ‘rules of the game’ that structure sexism [or other-ism] into society” (Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 209).

**In Art Education**

Approaches in art education would include everything mentioned in the previous section for Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) dimensions of equity pedagogy, content integration, knowledge construction and transformation, and systemic reform of the school structure. To forward knowledge construction and transformation, critical dialogues confronting issues of conflict as they relate to art would be a strong emphasis.

**Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist (Social Reconstruction/Action)**

The fifth approach to multicultural education described by Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007b) is *Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist*. A foundational belief for this approach is that the distribution of resources in U.S. society is not equal, but should be. Social issues of conflict (racism, sexism, and so forth) are a focus of study, and the representation of oppressed groups is requisite. Students are encouraged to think of ways to challenge present injustices, arrive at positions on issues through critical investigation, and to take action collectively for justice (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). If students are not taught to challenge the inequalities present in the world, the belief is that they will adapt to the inegalitarian status quo (Sleeter & Grant, 1988).

This approach incorporates all elements of Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) dimensions of equity pedagogy, content integration, knowledge construction and transformation, and empowering school culture and social structure. Banks’s (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) *Social Action* approach parallels this Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist
strategy. It includes everything from a Transformative Multicultural approach, and goes a step further to include decision-making and social action. Rather than political apathy and passivity, the goal is to impel students to political action. Critical thinking skills combined with social action skills enable students to “understand the inconsistency between our ideals and social realities, the work that must be done to close this gap, and how students can, as individuals and groups, influence the social and political systems in US society” (Banks, 2006a, p. 143). In Grant and Sleeter’s (2007a) version of this approach, they drew on Banks’s (1993) work and called the approach *Social action, social deconstructionist, or antiracist*. In another recent version, Grant and Sleeter (2007b) called this approach *Multicultural and Social Justice Education*.

In Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b) version of social reconstructionist multicultural education, the approach emphasizes coalescence of oppressed groups across dimensions such as race, gender, and class, to empower groups with greater numbers. They also contend that students need to be taught social action skills through practical experience. How does one teach these social action skills? According to cognitive development theorists Piaget (1952) and Dewey (1938), learning “is a process of constructing knowledge through the interaction of mind and experience” (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 182). Therefore, students need concrete experience practicing the process of critical knowledge deconstruction, decision-making, and social action in order to become competent in their use (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Study needs to focus on group relationships of conflict, competition, oppression, and resistance to oppression: Sleeter and Grant (1988) explained that in order to ameliorate oppression in society, students need be aware of it, confront it critically, and to take overt action to change it. Furthermore, this is best achieved as a collective group, as there is power in numbers (Sleeter & Grant, 1988).
Critique

The same critiques leveled against a Transformative Multicultural approach by advocates of Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different, Human Relations, and Single-Group Studies approaches apply to this method. Furthermore, Transformative Multicultural advocates see a Social Reconstructionist/Action approach as even more challenging to implement, as Transformative Multiculturalism is already difficult enough to convince teachers and administrators to incorporate. In addition, a Social Reconstructionist/Action strategy is idealistic in nature, and would require in-depth understanding of each cultural group represented in the curriculum (Bergen, 2006).

In Art Education

Building on a Transformative Multicultural approach, multicultural programs in art education that are socially reconstructive would additionally include Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) dimension of empowering school culture and social structure, with particular emphasis on social action, as described in the previous section.

Tomhave (1992) recognized a Social Reconstructionist strategy in his typology of multicultural art education approaches, and was highly critical of it: He asked, “Whose vision of reconstruction are we to choose?” (p. 56). Sleeter and Grant (1988) argued that some social reconstructionists may have an elitist tendency and advocate one specific vision of what society should be, but asserted that this does not need to be the case. Instead, they hold a more pluralist perspective, and contend that a Social Reconstruction/Action approach helps students to understand that “people should not have to adhere to one model of what is considered ‘normal’ or ‘right’ to enjoy their fair share of wealth, power, or happiness” (Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 176).
Efland et al. (1996), and Barbosa (2007) cautioned that this type of approach is not simple to implement. It would require major curriculum revisions, stretching outside the field of art into other disciplines, in-service training, and more time in the classroom to conduct (Efland et al., 1996). Parents, administrators, and the community might object to the discussion of controversial issues in the classroom. For example, in the case documented by Albers (1999) in which sixth graders explored issues of sexism and sexuality, discussed previously, she concluded, “Not all students transformed their beliefs” (p. 10). Albers (1996) speculated that the social climate of the community might have served as a limiting factor in knowledge transformation for the students as Ms. Wolf’s “attempts to politicize the classroom dialogue were limited by the possible repercussions of challenging widespread discriminating beliefs and policies” (p. 217). Regardless of these limitations, Albers (1999) contended, “The experience of talking about issues of social location may have opened up and raised a consciousness that was not there before” (Albers, 1999, p. 10).

In addition, Efland et al. (1996) cautioned that students may become frustrated when change is not forthcoming despite their efforts. Moreover, they may not take action that forwards justice. In the high school art classes documented by Cohen Evron (2005, 2007), she noted that the instructors hoped to encourage students to “take up concerns of social justice” (p. 321). However, “At the same time, they had to face students who hold on to repressive and racist discourses” (p. 321). While Cohen Evron explained that these repressive and racist views were “re-examined and modified during the layering process of creating artworks,” and when it came to the creation of final artworks “only one out of the 20 students still thought that she should write a racist slogan in her work (and, in the end, decided not to write it)” (p. 320), these positions may still be encountered by instructors.
Furthermore, studies have indicated that Social Reconstructionist/Action approaches in school may fail to affect desired change. Stockrocki and Coutinho (2000) found that a Brazilian art educator’s implementation of Freire’s emancipatory pedagogy (a Social Reconstructionist/Action approach) with preservice teachers fell short of achieving liberatory goals. Ballengee-Morris et al. (2000) found that an indigenous Guarani art educator’s attempt to establish an art school in Brazil based on a multicultural social reconstructionist pedagogy failed due to resistance from governmental factions. May (1994) similarly found institutional structures limiting to emancipatory pedagogical goals. With Social Reconstructionist/Action approaches to multicultural education, educators need to be aware that “reformation requires reflection, patience, critical analysis, and an understanding that change is a collaborative process” (Ballengee-Morris et al., 2000, p. 113).

An Amalgamation of Multicultural Education Approaches

In light of the previous review and analysis, I believe there are three constructive categories amongst which to locate Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program, and of relevance to art educators who seek to locate their own multicultural education endeavors: Human Relations, Transformative Multicultural, and Social Reconstruction/Action (see Table 3). The assimilationist Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different category is not a multicultural approach, but rather a mainstream approach. A Single-Group Studies approach is redundant with other approaches, and falls in line with other categories depending on the context of its application.

The three categories, Human Relations, Transformative Multicultural, and Social Reconstruction/Action, are an amalgamation of both Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b) and Banks’s (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) typologies. In conjunction with
Table 3
A Taxonomy of Multicultural Education Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Dif.</th>
<th>Human Relations/ Additive/Contributions</th>
<th>Single-Group Studies</th>
<th>Transformative Multicultural</th>
<th>Social Reconstruction/ Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To assimilate marginalized students into the mainstream culture</td>
<td>To assimilate marginalized students into the mainstream culture</td>
<td>To inform students about a group’s oppression and encourage them to move towards remedying injustices and promoting equity for that group</td>
<td>Focuses on promoting equal opportunity and cultural pluralism</td>
<td>Students encouraged to challenge social inequities and take action for justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No multicultural content</td>
<td>May or may not be accurate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A goal that may or may not be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May or may not be superficial</td>
<td>May or may not address</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasizes core static traditions of an ethnic group</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Western exemplars selected using a Eurocentric lens/standard</td>
<td>Confronts issues of conflict/oppression of group under study</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special units added to mainstream curricula as an appendage</td>
<td>May be studied superficially or in-depth</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies a single marginalized group (ethnic studies, women’s studies, etc.)</td>
<td>Investigated impact of oppression on the group</td>
<td>Some school structural reform</td>
<td></td>
<td>All components addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasizes emic perspectives from that group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(social action emphasized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n/a means the dimension was not addressed in the literature
Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) dimensions, I found I was better able to identify components in Anna’s multicultural approach, and to locate her strategy within a context of approaches. This offered me a more comprehensive and in-depth understanding of her program, and a framework within which to critique and deconstruct her program. My hope is that art educators who deconstruct their multicultural programs in a similar manner, utilizing this framework, will also be able to discover constructive insights regarding their own multicultural programming.

No One Approach is Better than Another?

The categories of the typology, as indicated by both Banks (2006a) and Sleeter and Grant (1988), may overlap. Banks (2006a) asserted that approaches (contributions, additive, transformation, and social action) are commonly mixed and blended in practice. He suggested that easier approaches can be used as stepping-stones up to more transformational approaches. Both Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b), and Banks (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a), advocated for these more transformative approaches towards social reconstruction. They argue that these strategies are the most efficacious means of driving social changes that are necessary to reform the social inequalities present in U.S. society today.

In regards to ideology, a Human Relations approach is conservative, and tends to maintain the status quo (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). It is therefore assimilationist in nature (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). In terms of relational power, it seeks tolerance and acceptance of differences within the structure of an established inegalitarian U.S. society (Grant, Elsbree, & Fondrie, 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Human Relations advocates assume that U.S. societal structure will become more egalitarian if individuals’ attitudes and beliefs change to become more accepting of all (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social
Reconstruction/Action argue that if students only learn to appreciate and celebrate the culture of a particular group, as advocated by a Human Relations approach, there is no compulsion to work for change, but rather to accept the world as it is (Grant et al., 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). “If people adapt to the world, accommodating themselves to situations, they become passive and unable to change” (Ballengee-Morris et al., 2000, p. 112). It therefore serves to mask the inequities, and the conflict, existing in U.S. society (hooks, 2000).

In contrast, Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist/Action approaches confront conflict and encourage social change (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). A Social Reconstructionist/Action approach aims to empower students with the critical thinking and social action skills necessary to work towards justice, equity, and human dignity (Grant et al., 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). A Social Reconstructionist/Action approach, to a strong degree, is based on the belief that individuals adapt to their circumstances, and existing circumstances are inegalitarian (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Hillis, 1996b). In order to change existing circumstances, first the inequalities need to be recognized, and then overt action must be taken to change them (Grant et al., 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The ultimate goal is to “free our educational system from oppressive and racist tendencies” (Hillis, 1996b, p. 288).

Sleeter and Grant (1988) argued that none of the approaches can be considered the “right one” or the “wrong one” (p. 200). However, one’s choice may have political implications: One can either maintain the inequalities in U.S. society that are structured to oppress particular cultural groups and maintain the dominance of an Anglo-American, heterosexual, mid-upperclass male constituency, or actively work to change the status quo towards equality. According to scholars, it appears that only Multicultural Transformative and Social Reconstructionist/Action means may meet this latter end (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Stuhr, 1994).
However, I do not believe that these are the only approaches that will induce societal change towards egalitarianism. A Transformative Multicultural approach relies on self-reflexivity, and modifying one’s beliefs as one is confronted with issues of conflict, particularly those related to oppression in U.S. society. A Social Reconstruction/Action approach depends on both this cognitive transformation in the face of conflict, and action in accordance with this transformation. Advocates of both of these approaches assume a conflict/adaptation theory. They assume that societal change will not occur unless conflict is confronted; that is, a problem of inequality between cultural groups in U.S. society exists and needs to be challenged cognitively (knowledge construction and transformation), and particularly through overt behavioral opposition (Ballengee-Morris et al., 2000; Grant et al., 2004; Hillis, 1996a; hooks, 2000; jagodzinski, 1999; Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Sleeter, 2000).

A Human Relations approach depends on attitudinal change in the direction of prejudice reduction. It relies on a theory of cultural transmission in which attitudes and beliefs are passed down from generation to generation, such as Allport’s (1954) psychodynamic theory in which a tendency towards prejudice formation depends on how one’s family raises one; Bandura and Walter’s (1963) social learning theory, in which individuals learn social behaviors by watching that of parents and adult role models; Sherif and Sherif’s (1966) reference group theory in which one shapes identity from group associations; and Purvey and Novak’s (1984) self-concept theory, in which identity is formed based on how one sees oneself within a group formation (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988). It also relies on cognitive dissonance theory (Watts, 1984). Cognitive dissonance occurs when an individual holds two conflicting opinions or beliefs and must cognitively reorganize their beliefs in order to resolve this conflict (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The assumption is that eventually society will become less prejudiced over time as
non-prejudicial attitudes and beliefs are transmitted through culture to younger generations (Sleeter & Grant, 1988).

Advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist/Action approaches argue that by informing individuals about other ways of life without regard for conflict, a Human Relations approach masks the conflict of inequalities inherent in U.S. society. But does it really? Or do advocates perhaps give too much credit to the power of schools to shape a student’s reality? While a conflict of inequity (say, racism or sexism) is not necessarily confronted in the classroom, I believe students in the U.S. may encounter this conflict in society, as adaptation theorists claim. Advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist/Action approaches seem to assume that individuals do not have the power, in these instances, to convert their attitudes into overt behavioral action to resist inegalitarian manifestations within the system. In the same instance, they seem to claim that individuals do have the power to transform critically deconstructed beliefs into action.

Moreover, I believe the fundamental critique against Human Relations approaches is not so much that they mask the inequalities in society in their cultural transmission, but that they contribute to these inequalities by forwarding hegemonic perspectives. That is, they reinforce of a sense of social stratification and othering by encapsulating the cultures allegedly represented in such programs, and implicitly treat these cultures as inferior addendums to a Western art canon. They portray the members and art of cultures as homogenous and static entities, trapped in a distant and romanticized past, incapable of progress, and inactive in the contemporary world. They bracket these cultures under a unifying label by ethnicity, race, nationality, and the like, and assume these unidimensional labels of identity as unerring predeterminants of what artwork from these cultures will purportedly be comprised. In such cases, knowledge—supposed defining
features and facts about these cultures and their art—is also treated as something that is static rather than dynamic and evolving.

In regards to both Human Relations and Transformative Multicultural approaches, there is no conclusive evidence to indicate that either attitudes or beliefs will change behavior. As such, there is also no conclusive evidence that attitudes and beliefs do not change behavior. According to social science theory on attitudes and beliefs (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Devine, 1989; Greenwald, 1989; LaPiere, 1934), there is no direct positive correlation between attitudes and beliefs, and behavior. Scholars who focus on the null correlation argue that behavior is mediated by a number of variables; people may say one thing, and do another (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Devine, 1989; Greenwald, 1989). However, on the positive side of the correlation, I would like to stress that people may say one thing, and then do what they said they were going to do. If individual human agency is to be taken into account as a factor that may play a role in changing the system, as Social Reconstructionists argue (see, for instance, Giroux, 1981, 2005), then this latter view (people may do what they say) also needs to be taken into account.

Furthermore, while advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action may focus on the existing social inequalities in society, I believe some attention has to be paid to the changes that have been made in regard to inequality. Garber and Costantino (2007) stated, “While gains have been made in women’s equity in U.S. art education, parity has not been achieved” (p. 1057); they then present statistics to underscore the lack of parity. In contrast, I would like to point to the gains made. To what are they attributable? One cannot ascertain that a transformational cognitive recognition of injustice was a stronger (or lesser) influence than an attitudinal reduction in prejudice, in the promotion of the behaviors that generated these structural gains.
In light of this understanding, that is, we do not know from research whether behavioral changes towards egalitarianism are motivated by attitudinal shifts or cognitive knowledge transformation, the key question that can be answered becomes, “What is it that art educators are implicitly and explicitly teaching students?” Are art educators reinforcing cultural stereotypes, and Eurocentric ideology and superiority, or are they moving away from Eurocentric ideology and hegemony with a multicultural approach that does not stereotype based on culture? And, are art educators presenting knowledge as static, with one right answer, or are they presenting it as dynamic and open to change? It is these questions I investigate in the following section of this chapter in an examination of multicultural art education curricular materials, literature that might guide practice, and multicultural art education practice itself.

Multicultural Materials that are Currently Available to Practitioners

To assist art teachers in making informed choices regarding multicultural programs for the artroom, within this section I will review and critique a broad range of multicultural art education materials that are currently available to practitioners.

Commercially Available Multicultural Art Curricula and Kits

In art education, scholars have long underscored the need for practical teaching materials, from Hamblen (1990) and Zimmerman (1990) nearly two decades ago, to Kuster (2006) more recently. Unfortunately, the practical materials available tend to take a superficial look at cultural groups, and reify stereotypes. This is an enactment of the Eurocentric devaluation of non-European art so common in art history, as described earlier. In addition, these commercially available materials further the idea that culture is determined by biology or geographic boundaries—that “otherness” can be determined by these characteristics: This is in itself a perpetuation of a
European imperialist ideology. In a tracing of the evolution of race-based ideology, Banks (1996c) demonstrated how pseudo-sciences like phrenology and craniometry have been used in the past to legitimate the superiority of the Caucasian race, and thereby justify European religious evangelization and colonization of Africa, Asia, Australia and the Americas: The “native ‘savages’” needed to be saved and civilized (p. 67). Young (2003) indicated that cultural evolutionist theory in anthropology served to legitimate and advance the idea that the people of these colonized worlds were inferior. Chalmers (1992) showed how race-based ideology has manifested itself historically in European art education. For example, Zerffi (1876), a South Kensington art history professor, produced the art history text used in National Art Training Schools in Britain (as cited by Chalmers, 1992). The text included a chapter called “Ethnology and its Bearing on Art.” Arguments based-on craniometric theories were used to position the Caucasian race, and its art as superior to others (Chalmers, 1992). In addition to race-based theories, geographic determinism also served to legitimate claims of White superiority. Leclerc (1985), one of the first to assert the theory, contended that humans progressed in a linear fashion from sloth to vigor as one moved from south to north on the globe, in accordance with the temperature of the climate (as cited by Chalmers, 1992). White Protestants residing in the colder parts of Europe were considered to be more vigorous and productive, and were hence cast as superior. The claims were promulgated by 19th century European literature in which stereotypes of the “noble savage” and “lazy native” were advanced (Chalmers, 1992, p. 140).

In addition, commercially available practical materials emphasize Western design principles and elements, and promote the use of a Eurocentric lens to evaluate and judge the artworks of non-Western cultural groups. A universalist perspective of art is embraced, and
European standards advanced. These are examples of Human Relations/Contributions/Additive approaches, discussed earlier, that promote a Eurocentric, imperialist ideology.

Crayola’s® multicultural line of markers, crayons, colored pencils; Chenille Kraft’s® pipe cleaner stems in multicultural colors; Creativity Street WonderFoam’s® multicultural sheets; Liquimark’s Global Colors® marker sets; and Pacon’s® and Riverside’s® multicultural construction papers promote skin color as the primary indicator of culture, and hence reinforce the idea that culture is only skin deep and is biologically determined according to race.

Royalco’s® Multicultural Face Forms, in my opinion, stereotype, and exaggerate the facial features they present as characteristic of five ethnicities: For instance, one has thin, closed, slants of eyes that rise at thirty-degree angles from the flattened bridge of a nose; another has a broad bridged nose that expands into wide spreading nostrils, along with large protuberant lips, and round bulbous cheeks. Royalco’s® African Masks focus on formal design, trivialize the contextual significance of such artifacts, and forward a stereotype of Africa as a homogenous culture with only masks to offer as artwork. Hochtritt (2005) has similarly criticized Nasco’s® Multicultural Mini-Mask Kit.

Shuman’s (1981) *Art from Many Hands, Multicultural Art Projects* is one of the earlier versions of a commercially available multicultural art curriculum. Lessons focus on the technique, process, and materials used to create an artwork. Little attention is paid to contextual significance of the artforms. Artworks are used as a formal exemplar to be duplicated with available materials. The arts of cultural groups are stereotyped and locked in a traditional past. For example, “Japanese arts” are encompassed by lessons on Haiku, sumi-e, and fish prints.

Kohl and Potter’s (1988) *Global Art: Activities, Projects and Inventions from Around the World* divides the artworld into continents, offers minimal contextualization, and focuses on
artifacts as formal examples for students to duplicate. Collar necklaces from “Central Africa” are to be duplicated as paper plates with a hole cut out, and colored with markers and crayons. “Easy Fiesta Piñatas” help to stereotype the artwork and culture of “South America.”

The High Museum of Art (1996) offers *Rings: Five Passions in World Art, Multicultural Curriculum Handbook*. Produced by the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games, and supported by the Getty Center, this curriculum guide utilizes a Western derived DBAE structure (art production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics) to investigate the artworks of other cultural groups. It contained a series of “high art” exemplars, works selected for museum exhibition through a Western lens, as exemplary and representative for each culture.

In Merrill’s (1997) *Hands-on Latin America Arts Activities for All Ages*, projects heavily emphasize production and draw on the formal design elements of artifacts. Ancient vessel forms are replicated with toilet paper rolls and juice containers. Cortés and Pizarro are listed as Spanish conquerors who, “easily won allies and overpowered resistance” (p. 12). The idea that Latin American art can be just as easily mastered by U.S. children with a bowl of pasta and lump of salt-dough is forwarded. Merrill (1997) also offers “Integrated Learning Kits” for $1,500. These kits are organized around Western formal elements (there is one kit for color, one for form/shape, one for texture, and one for design), and underscore formalism’s legitimacy to evaluate the works of other essentialized cultural groups.

*Culture Smart! Ready-to-Use Slides & Activities for Teaching Multicultural Appreciation Through Art* (Rodriguez, 1999) focuses on tradition. Problematically essentialistic, lessons are designed to homogenize cultural groups by offering “the essential nature of the culture through its art” (p. v), and hence negate diversity within each culture it purportedly represents. Davenport (2000) similarly criticized this kit for its failure to address within culture diversity. According to
Davenport (2000), the kit is basically a repackaging of *Exploring Global Art* (Needler & Goodman, 1991). Furthermore, the artworks are “appreciated” art through a Eurocentric lens of elements and principles, as Rodriguez (1999) subscribes to the idea that all cultural groups adhere to “universal artistic values” (p. vi) when creating art.

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts began offering its *Multicultural Art Print Series* in 1989. In the introduction to one of their series, the Center (1992) stated, “The enthusiastic response to the first series, as reflected by sales and classroom use, confirmed that teachers are broadening the content of art education to embrace the arts of diverse cultures” (p. 5). Underscoring the breadth of its influence, it would seem that many art educators are learning to embrace these arts through a Western DBAE lens. The back of each poster organizes analysis by aesthetics, art criticism, art history and production. High art selections are included as exemplars, and have been selected through a Western museum aesthetic lens. jagodzinski (1997) argues that cultures and their arts, which Getty categorizes by race, are prepackaged for ownership, and reinscribe the “master’s narrative.” He deconstructed through a critical lens the contents, labeling, and packaging of the series, as well as an advertisement for it, and concluded, “Getty’s multicultural programs are a paradigmatic example of neo-racism” (p. 80). Getty (2008) additionally forwards Eurocentric elitism with *ArtsEdNet*, an online resource for teachers. It offers lesson plans that privilege ancient Western art, such as mythological narratives inspired by the life of Perseus, and one centered on the stories related to Greek and Roman characters depicted in sculptures. Flemish illuminated manuscripts, French decorative arts, and so on are also included.

Crizmac’s *Art and Cultural Education Materials*, produced in the 1990s, consist of a series of audiovisual programs for the classroom. They include videotapes, teacher guides, a
duplicable student work packet, and printed art reproductions. With titles such as *Haitian Visions, Australian Dreamings, and Oaxaca: Valley of Myth and Magic* reflecting the positive, nostalgic, and exoticizing slant of their contents, these kits “other” the cultures of those purportedly represented, and harness these romanticized cultures by geography. For example, the video for *Island Worlds: Art & Culture of the Pacific* begins with a long, deep tonal chant and the thumping of animal skin covered drums. Men and women dance as fronds of foliage wrapped around their waists and crowning their heads bounce rhythmically with the beat of the drums. One of the few times viewers see members of the community in shorts and shirts is during a brief scene in which children are sitting in a classroom learning English from a White European teacher. “When the Europeans came, they wanted children to learn things necessary for living in a Western lifestyle,” the narrator coos over the image. The superior imperialist undertones that run throughout the video are made explicit. While the syncretization of arts is noted in a lesson on Hawaiian quilts, the flow of influence is markedly unidirectional. The quilts European missionaries brought with them are credited with influencing this “islander” artform. In contrast, there is no indication of how this community’s arts have influenced those of others. Europeans are credited for ‘civilizing’ the natives of the community. The hegemony continues as the arts of the community serve as objects to be criticized and reproduced using a Western elements and principles of design formula: background, middle ground, foreground, repetition of pattern, contrasting colors, symmetry, and so on.

In Grant and Sleeter’s (2007b) *Turning on Learning: Five Approaches for Multicultural Teaching Plans for Race, Class, Gender, and Disability*, I was hoping to find art lessons in the Social Reconstruction category. None were offered. Art lessons at the Transformative Multicultural level tended to stereotype and essentialize by race as culture. For example, Native
American art, as a category, is supposedly infused with “spirituality” and “energy” (p. 201), and is made from natural plant materials.

*Multicultural Literature in Art Education that Stereotypes*

Commercially available kits are not the only culprits forwarding such reductionist, stereotyping, and trivializing curricula. This ideology is found in the multicultural literature of the art education field as well.

*Trivializing Multicultural Art Education Literature*

Kadar (2005) analyzed 33 years of *SchoolArts* magazine issues in terms of their multicultural content and found that lessons described for the classroom lacked contextual and historical depth, treated cultures superficially, and portrayed stereotyped, often exoticized, and homogenized views of cultural groups and their arts. *SchoolArts* is a nationally circulated resource that teachers often turn to for lesson ideas, with ninety-percent of the content submitted by practicing teachers rather than academic theorists (Kadar, 2005). As such, it can be viewed as reflective of current practice in K-12 artrooms across the nation. Kadar’s review reveals that teachers are commonly utilizing an additive approach to multicultural art education.

Gombe (2007) provided a step-by-step formalist design lesson on how to construct Ugandan mats made by indigenous residents. She conveyed little information regarding the significance of patterns to be duplicated, other than their mathematical design quality. She underscored the need to share the heritage—apparently confined to a mathematical design model—so that the patterns could “be exploited commercially within Africa and beyond” (p. 123).

The “Art Lunch Project” (Fukumoto, 2007) sought to forward peace and underscore the heterogeneity of humanity, but in doing so, reinscribed a homogeneity of nations as cultures. It
emphasized “culturally specific food” and aimed to correlate this specific food with a national culture (p. 208). Similarly, West (2008) offered a brief description of an around-the-world type of passport related art curriculum that explores and categorizes art by continent and nation, as though culture can be limited and determined by a geographic boundary. Both curricula are celebratory, contributions approaches to art.

Each of these curriculum guides promote the “tourist image” that is so often forwarded in art education practice “by having students vicariously voyage to a smorgasbord of selected and safe exotic places to make trite and decorative copies of various decontextualized crafts” (Chalmers, 1999, p. 178). It is the token, trivializing practice so strongly criticized by many multicultural art education theorists, as indicated in Chapter 1.

**Contextualizing Multicultural Art Education Literature that Stereotypes**

However, even if arts are well contextualized, presenting them as bound by ethnicity or nationality is problematic. Such practice imparts only the shallowest layers of culture, that of race and geographic origin, and belies the complexity of cultural formation (Jagodzinski, 1999). The scholars who forward these visions assume the authority to define new rules of inclusion and exclusion for ethnic identification. In doing so, they perform a hegemonic function in themselves, adverse to the goals of multiculturalism: Dunmire (1998) explained that with these generalizations, these purported factors of distinction for an ethnicity, assumptions are made that individuals of that ethnicity will manifest these characteristics. According to Araeen (1987), in this sense multicultural art education becomes a means of “ethnic determinism” (as cited by Jagodzinski, 1999).

An example of this would be an article by Chung (2006), which forwarded the conception of East Asian brushwork as the traditional epitome of art in China and Japan.
According to Chung, it continues to guide Chinese and Japanese artists today, and is robustly imbued with spirituality. Chung asserted that Chinese and Japanese “generally [stereotypically] believe that all living beings and natural phenomena contain chi energy” (p. 34). There is no mention that only a select few artists practice/d this art. That is, a “feudal literati… completely out of kilter with everyday reality” (Kuo, 1999, p. 253) in China and Japan. The art is appreciated for its homogenous formal and spiritual constitution and serves to essentialize the art of an East Asia comprised of China and Japan. Its presentation hegemonically erases diversity (and a number of nations) within the region and its arts.

Romanticizing the traditional, and essentializing the art of a geographically bound nation is common. Yi and Kim (2005) asserted, “The characteristics of traditional Korean paintings are mysteriousness, quietness, emptiness, calmness, vitality, and lifelikeness” (p. 21). Utilizing a Human Relations “attack” approach (Collins & Sandell, 1992), they condemned contemporary society’s tendency toward the devastation of the current environmental climate, and nostalgized the spiritual embrace of nature allegedly epitomized in traditional Korean painting.

Oweis (2002) portrayed a similarly romantic, unilateral view of Islamic art. She proffered the “quintessential,” “timelessness,” and “spirituality” of Islamic art (p. 18). She claimed, “Islamic art contains visual characteristics that make it ‘Islamic’. . . [These are] Arabic calligraphy, the use of geometrical patterns, and Arabesque (floral and vegetable motifs)” (p. 18). There is an erasure and implicit denouncement of artistry that does not conform to this set of criteria, which is put forward as a standard6 for what is considered “Islamic” – for what “make[s] it ‘Islamic.’”

---

6 Standard: A level of quality (whether or not it meets certain characteristics) by which actual attainments are judged.
Strauch-Nelson (2008) presented a lesson on *emaki*, Japanese picture scrolls, which was designed to “introduce American students to emaki and to present and honor how Japanese art students live and study art today” (p. 26). Later, in contradiction to this statement, she commented, “Students studying emaki may or may not ever engage in hand-on artistic response to their investigation” (p. 31), though American students will be duplicating the artform. Why then, is emaki being presented as a homogenizing artform that contemporary art students in Japan would be using? The essentializing framework is problematic.

Irwin, Rogers, and Wan (1999) ethnographically investigated three Aboriginal communities (one in South Australia, Canada, and Taiwan). While they cautioned that “it would be fallacious to assume research findings from work with one Australian Aboriginal people could apply to other Australian cultures” (p. 199), they simultaneously harnessed the three Aboriginal peoples and their art with an underlying commonality of “relationship with their traditional lands,” and “other” them by distinguishing them as “uniquely different from those of Westerners or Chinese” (p. 199).

Wang and Ishizaki (2002) challenged Parsons (1987) universal linear development theory for appreciating Western art with a cross-cultural study. They asserted that there are differences in development between Japan, Taiwan, and the U.S. Like Irwin, Rogers, and Wan (1999), they also underscored a sense of bordered homogenous cultures, and assert “characteristics peculiar to each culture” (p. 387).

Hart (1991) ethnographically studied Kumaoni ritual art practiced by Hindu women in South Asia. She challenged the Western canon’s emphases on form, permanence, originality, and individuality in art by showing a contrasting alternative Kumaoni model. In doing so, however, she prescribed a uniform recipe, a set of standards, for what Kumaoni ritual art is: mythic,
temporal, containing symbolic elements significant to ceremony, and collective production.

While I agree with Hart (1991) that it is important to challenge the canon, simultaneously projecting a uniform reductionist canon over another culture to harness that culture as distinct is counterproductive and forwards a hegemonic ideology by promoting that model as the standard for all members of the imagined group to adhere to. Gundara and Fyfe (1999) explained that in these instances, artworks and processes are:

Judged as expressions of some notional essentialised racial/ethnic identity, and evaluated by whether or not they conform to its allegedly inherent standards. . . . Aesthetic judgments [are made] on the basis of conformity/nonconformity to a predetermined set of values. (p. 90)

It is a strategy of authorizing a standard, and highlighting “otherness.” Desai (2000, 2005) and Ballengee-Morris (2002) saw the search for authenticity in art as similarly problematic. Ballengee-Morris (2002) investigated the history of the ‘tourist’ arts of two marginalized cultural groups: These cases exemplify that specific, stereotypical criteria are being used to define what constitutes the authentic. The hegemony of who decides what is authentic, and why, are left in tact and forwarded by such visions. The civilization game plays out as a uniform set of standards are applied to determine the authentic. It locks artistry in an objectively knowable, nostalgized and static state, shackled by hegemonic ideology.

**Multicultural Art Education Practice**

A number of theorists in art education (Hamblen, 1993; Kantner, 2002; Mason, 1995; Stuhr, 2003; Zimmerman, 1990) as well as general education (Ascher, 2007; Banks, 1996a, 2004; Ferrance, 2000; Gay, 2001; Grant et al., 2004; McKernan, 1996; Sleeter & Grant, 1988) have indicated the gap between theory and practice in multicultural education. They asserted that the
development of multicultural theory has outpaced that of practice in the classroom. There appears to be a lag in the discourse of some scholars as well, as evidenced above. I have personally witnessed that this lag also manifests itself in the continued portrayal of stereotypic representations of race-based and geographically defined cultures in art education practice. Kadar (2005) has found, as have I, through conversations with preservice art education students and in-service colleagues, that teachers often feel underprepared and uncomfortable about teaching multicultural art, something they know little about. Daniels (1998) speculated that teachers may also lack the time to do research to find out more, and my exploratory interviews with practicing teachers corroborate this assertion. Kadar (2005) has witnessed stereotyping practice in K-12 preservice teachers’ artrooms, as have I: Undigested, stereotyped cultures have run amuck as stimuli for Western formalist based art production lessons. Texture rubbings are made from Ancient Egyptian reliefs, African masks are duplicated in shape and pattern out of paper, black ink-brush painting from China is used for contour line demonstrations, and a plethora of other such instances. Throughout the last several years of NAEA conferences, I have witnessed teacher and scholar presentations on multicultural art lessons that advocate these superficial and homogenizing practices. Egypt and King Tut surface during Black History Month. Piñatas are made on Cinco de Mayo. Dragons and lanterns are made to celebrate Chinese New Year. In one case, I bristled as images made by students were flashed upon the screen, and depicted supposedly Chinese figures in coolie caps with slanted lines for eyes. The teacher was using a Crizmac kit for her lesson planning. The Crizmac lesson was having an exponential impact as this teacher promoted its implicitly demeaning and essentialistic ideology in her classroom as well as through the conference presentation. In all of these classroom examples, discussions about contextual relevance have been scant. Stereotyping beliefs have not been
broached, much less challenged, and the hegemonic ideology underlying stereotypes remains invisible. Stereotypes are forwarded by such practice, and serve to propagate a hegemonic cycle. But how does one move away from this in practice, without abandoning multiculturalism altogether? The following discussion may lend some insight.

*Ethnographic Literature in Multicultural Art Education*

Multicultural art education scholars have suggested that to avoid essentializing tendencies in portrayals of culture and art, anthropological ethnographic methods of inquiry can help to show the particular, bring dynamic contexts to life, and reveal how there are multitudes of influences on individuals (e.g., Abu-Lughod, 1991; Ballengee-Morris, 2008; Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001, 2002; Chalmers, 1978, 1981, 1996; Efland et al., 1996; Gall, 2006; McFee, 1995; Neperud & Krug, 1995; Neperud & Stuhr, 1993; Stuhr, 1994, 1995, 2003; Stuhr et al., 1992). Scholars in art education and general education have stressed the need to attend to the heterogeneity of cultural groupings (e.g., C. A. M. Banks, 1996a; Bastos, 2006; Dash, 1999; Desai, 2003, 2005; Gall, 2006; Hillis, 1996a; jagodzinski, 1982,1999; Kuster, 2006; Mason, 1999; Nieto, 1999; Saravia-Shore & Arvizu, 1992). Ethnographic case studies in multicultural art education illustrate these assertions.

For example, in contrast to the superficial presentations of traditional art as an essentialist unifying element of a race’s or nation’s art, Shin and Choi (2006) critically deconstructed *Minhwa*, Korean folk painting. They showed how *Minhwa* has been used as an indoctrinating force into ruling class virtues, and a means of forwarding dominant class hegemony throughout Korean history and in Korea today. While Shin and Choi (2006) argued that the value of their study is its in-depth contextualization to promote cultural understanding, I believe it also offers insight into how teachers might begin to look at artforms that have been promoted as the
transformations of a nation. Through such narratives, students can begin to deconstruct issues of representation and power hierarchies associated with tradition. In doing so, they can begin to question an ideology that frames ethnicity as a determinant of artistic identification. This case, as well as the following cases, offer information that might serve as a starting point for such an investigation.

Stuhr (1995) presented an Odanah Powwow and Midsummer Indian festival through the emic perspective of participants, as well as her own. The transformation of these traditions, and the sociocultural factors influencing this transformation are explored. The events are looked at in terms of social, political, and economic relations. Issues of power hierarchies are addressed as individual perspectives from various genders, ethnicities, classes, ages, disability, and so forth, are considered. In another cross-cultural study with Wisconsin Chippewa and Menominees, Neperud and Stuhr (1993) revealed that the art and values relating to art among the Native Americans they studied tend to be more heterogeneous than homogenous. Furthermore, they are shifting and dynamic. They begin to unravel stereotypical preconceptions of so-called Native American art and aesthetics, and caution against unilateral assumptions of homogeneity.

The “West,” too, has been deconstructed. Kindler and Darras (1998) presented a study in which they found that students, ages 7-14, who could be “described as representative of the ‘Western world’” (p. 162), showed a diversity of values regarding what constitutes a good drawing. They argued that holding to Piaget’s theory of linear stage-like progression towards realism in drawing development, and indoctrinating students into a canon of Eurocentric art and aesthetics is limiting. They underscored the need for a variety of instructional strategies outside of the canon. Neperud and Krug (1995) offered a series of ethnographies about outsider-artists in the U.S. including descriptions about how they entered into artmaking, their creative sources for
ideas, values, social structures that influence their lives, and how they see their futures. They challenged Eurocentric, bounded notions of culture and art through their explorations with these outsider-artists.

Furthermore, art education scholars have stressed the hybridity of art, and have underscored its multidimensional, multicultural influences (Ballengee-Morris, 2008; Barbosa, 1999; Bastos, 2006; Carpenter II et al., 2007; Dash, 2005; Desai, 2000, 2003, 2005; Gall, 2006; Jaddo, 2007). Ethnographic research by art education scholars brings these hybridities to life. Carpenter II et al. (2007) detailed in-person visits with diverse ceramicists from around the world. They explored how ceramicists have consistently borrowed from styles and techniques of others in cross-cultural exchanges of ideas. Jaddo (2007), in a reflexive narrative, examined her hybridity as a female, Turkumani, Arab, American artist. Staikidis (2005, 2006) revealed the hybridity of her painting both prior to, during, and after her cross-cultural experience with two Mayan artists. Bastos (2006) focused on four contemporary artists in Brazil, and highlighted the syncretization of cultural influences on each artist, as well as the diversity in each artist’s work. In addition, she underscored the heterogeneity amongst the artists. In contrast to static, essentialized notions of tradition, she elaborated on how one artist intentionally reinterpreted and transformed tradition, and explained how three artists confronted the issue of stereotyped “Brazilianness” in their art. Based on these understandings, Bastos (2006) proposed a transformative approach for understanding artworks that investigated the social construction of an artwork. She advocated utilizing the concept of hybridity as an analytical framework that focused on the inequitable social climate in which the works were made, as well as the multiplex influences, borrowed across borders, that were visible in artists’ works.
Theory Is a Great Resource, but What Do Art Teachers Do with It?

Such information is a valuable resource, but how do art teachers integrate it into their curriculum? Herein lies the problem. While a number of scholars offer speculative-theoretical suggestions for transformative and social reconstructionist curriculum implementation (e.g., Desai, 2005; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Stuhr, 1995; Efland et al., 1996), there is little indication of how such suggestions have played out in the classroom. After reviewing research literature in general education, Banks (2004) and Sleeter and Grant (1988) indicated that there is a need for multicultural curriculum intervention studies. Willis, Lintz, and Mehan (2004) more specifically reviewed ethnographic studies in multicultural education, and found that ethnographic research on multicultural curricula practice in actual classrooms is virtually nonexistent.

After a review of contextual research studies in art education literature, Stockrocki (2004) argued that the field needs to supply more “translations of theory into practice” (p. 461). Cohen Evron (2005), Mason (1995), and Milbrandt (2002) similarly underscored the need for ethnographic studies of art teachers’ multicultural classroom interventions. In my search through the literature in multicultural art education, I did manage to find a scant few transformative and social reconstructionist multicultural art education cases that document praxis in the artroom, all of which were discussed in detail earlier. Albers (1996, 1999) described a case in a sixth grade class. Cohen Evron (2001, 2005, 2007) documented three lessons at the secondary level, in which students interrogated the idea of “otherness” in art. Knight (2006), Staikidis (2006), and Chung (2008) elaborated on dialogic practices used in their preservice art education classrooms to unravel stereotypes and their underlying ideologies. I have not found any ethnographic studies that document these types of transformational interventions in artrooms at the K-5 level.

Funneling in more narrowly with each category: There is a dearth of ethnographic research on
Transformative Non-Confrontational Multicultural Education

classroom interventions in general education, art education, multicultural art education, and transformative and social reconstructionist multicultural art education. Such research is non-existent at the elementary school level.

Transformative Multicultural Art Education May Be Possible at a Young Age

I am not certain that transformative and social reconstructionist practices are possible with elementary school students, due to the level of critical thinking required. But perhaps believing that youths are unable to think critically is a myth that art educators need to overcome. There is evidence that elementary school students are able to engage in critical thought processes needed for transformation. Take, for instance, Room 13 at Caol Primary School in Scotland. It is an extraordinary art organization founded, funded (students apply for grants and work for resources themselves), directed and managed, and promulgated by elementary school art students. The group believes the teaching of philosophy, from as early as 8 years old, to be important to their creation of artwork. Eleven-year-old Danielle Souness, 2002-2003 managing director of Room 13, chastised adult art educators:

“...In school you are only allowed to learn things up to a standard that a teacher thinks you can understand. ... It teaches you how to think about how to answer questions but it doesn’t tell you why the question exists. ... Can you remember what it was like for adults to treat you as if you were something slightly different from a human being? ... Obviously someone somewhere is telling me what I should know, what I should think. ... They [teachers] should look at what they filter because filtering knowledge is not educating. ... I know that some adults think that teaching children to think is wrong and that it does not prepare them for the real world where all they will have to do is to do as
they are told. So at what age *are* we allowed to think?” (Souness & Fairley, 2005, pp. 42-44)

Of their own volition, students in the organization created contemporary artworks to speak their critical opinions to the world (Adams, 2005; Souness & Fairley, 2005), and in this sense they are taking action to change it. Implicit in this is an understanding that art is a vehicle for communicating ideology.

Furthermore, I believe there is a need to begin countering, at an early age, the development of stereotypes that provide the foundation for the formation of prejudices towards entire races and groups of people. According to attitudinal development studies by Allport (1954), Ashmore (1970), Katz (1976), and Proshansky (1966), stereotypes and the racial and ethnic attitudes that relate to them are learned early in youth (as cited by Divine, 1989). By the time children are toddlers, they often show evidence of racial awareness, and by early elementary, these categories are well established (as cited by Divine, 1989). Mason (1995) observed that children in art classes voluntarily raised questions about physical racial differences, but teachers shied away from discussing these issues. Allport (1954) indicated that dispositions towards ethnic groups—prejudices—are often learned through socialization and conformity to expected behaviors in the child’s environment (as cited by Divine, 1989). As noted in the prologue, I am of Asian descent, and children taunted me as early as kindergarten because of my skin color and physical features. If students can learn to stereotype and be prejudiced this early, perhaps we should be doing something to dismantle the stereotypes, and the attitudes related to such stereotyped groups, before they solidify or even have a chance to be generated.

According to Katz (1996), and Aboud and Doyle (1996), it is much easier to modify the racial attitudes of younger children than it is to shift that of older students and adults (as cited by
Studies on multicultural education interventions indicate that “students’ racial attitudes can be modified and made more democratic” (Banks, 2004, p. 23). For example, in *A Class Divided*, third grade teacher Jane Elliot managed to teach her students about prejudice and its negative impact through a concrete experience in which discrimination was cast by eye-color (see Peters & Cobb, 1985). It is a lesson her students have carried with them into adulthood, and are passing on to their children: a non-prejudicial ideology. It is a clear demonstration of reference group theory, in which individuals develop allegiance to groups through associations of commonality (Sherif & Sherif, 1966, as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988).

In the case of *A Class Divided*, this was a common defining characteristic of eye-color. According to Sherif and Sherif (1966), when one or more groups come into contact, each group tries to demarcate and maintain their group’s boundaries, and “to encourage group members to stay within the group and loyal to the group, they begin to picture themselves as superior to out-groups and try to convince one another that this is so” (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 84). If groups perceive themselves to be competing (say, for instance, in terms of limited resources or positions of superiority), hostility toward and rejection of the other groups may emerge. In Elliot’s class, armed with the “fact” of unilateral blue-eyed superiority, blue-eyed students ostracized and bullied brown-eyed children. Forwarding essentialist traits of arts based on ethnicity serves the same purpose of bordering reference groups. In a game of replacing one hegemonic model for another (Cohen, 1996, as cited by Gundara & Fyfe, 1999), affixing models or defining traits to the artforms of cultural groups is akin to grouping children by eye-color. Furthermore, teaching a Eurocentric art curriculum that implicitly advances the idea that the white race is superior is analogous to telling children they are superior because of their blue-
eyes. Naturalizing this superiority as static, objective knowledge through art education reifies it as taken-for-granted truth and contributes to hegemony.

As argued earlier, by avoiding multicultural education, Eurocentric ideology and notions of superiority are supported, and an assimilationist ideology is maintained. Furthermore, multicultural art education practice and literature, as illustrated earlier, commonly tends to stereotype by ethnicity and nationality. This bounded notion of culture underscores “otherness,” and exacerbates problems of prejudice and discrimination rather than relieving it. This leaves practicing art teachers in a difficult position: Without multicultural practices they forward European hegemony; if they use commonly available multicultural art education instructional kits and curriculum, or themselves create curricula that homogenizes cultures by ethnicity or nationality or other like grouping, they forward hegemony. In addition, literature in multicultural art education that offers more transformative and social reconstructionist approaches to art does not illustrate how this information has translated into elementary school practice: There is a lack of information showing art teachers how Transformative Multicultural or Social Reconstructionist/Action art education practice might be developed and put into practice. Is Transformative Multicultural, much less Social Reconstruction/Action, feasible at an elementary school level? And, if so, in what way is it practicable, and to what extent? This is an important part of the information I investigate with the case study to follow, for which a detailed methodology is described in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Study Design

Grounded within the paradigm of naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the evaluand, or case that was evaluated in this study, entailed one action research cycle7 that investigated Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program for grades one through five8. The study evaluated the program’s merit (intrinsic value) in terms of exhibition and promotion of multicultural dimensions towards social reconstructionism within the context of Anna’s art classes: content integration, equity pedagogy, knowledge construction and transformation, and empowering school culture and social structure (Banks, 1994, 1995b, 1996e, 2004). The program’s worth (extrinsic value) was investigated in terms of its potential to reduce prejudice (another of Banks’s dimensions). It was also evaluated in relationship to a taxonomy of multicultural art education approaches. In addition, it was explored in regards to its utility to the field of art education, detailing what art educators can learn from it, particularly as related to of the creation and implementation of multicultural art education approaches for the classroom.

With an inherent ambition to tie multicultural art education theory to practice in this study, the most suitable methodology to investigate this case reflected researcher-driven (Clark et al., 1996) collaborative action research9, or formative research (Bresler, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; McKernan, 1996; Walker, 1992), which, in addition to the above investigations of her program’s merit and worth, provided constructive information to guide refinement of Anna’s

---

7 While the configuration of this study reflected the structure of one cycle of an action research case, it was not what might traditionally be considered action research: The study focused primarily on an assessment of Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program relative to theory, and improvement and refinement of her program was not the primary aim.

8 Grade 3 was omitted from the study due to a curriculum conflict that pre-empted their participation in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists lessons during the year in which this study was conducted.

9 While the study reflected the methodology employed in action research, and eventuated in Anna’s construction of a revised curriculum, the refinement of her practice was not its primary aim. As such, the study was not what might traditionally be considered as action research.
Native American art education program\textsuperscript{10}. I employed a case study approach (Stake, 1995) to investigate one cycle of action research (McKernan, 1996). Drawing on a critical-emancipatory educational action research model of Kemmis and McTaggert (1988, as cited by McKernan, 1996), this cycle entailed the plan (Anna’s path to developing this Native American contemporary artists program), action (implementation of the program), observations of the action, and reflection on and evaluation of the action towards construction of a revised plan and negotiation of theory that recommends for Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches. It is important to note that Anna had developed this Native American program in response to the lack of counter-hegemonic multicultural art curricula materials available, and the dearth of information illustrating how multicultural art education practice might be transformed to avoid stereotype-reifying tendencies; these concerns paralleled my own. We were particularly concerned about the elementary grade levels, as these are the grades that Anna taught, and for which there seemed to be no practical material of this kind available. After participating in dialogues with me about the multicultural educational approaches she had developed for her classroom, Anna invited me to conduct this evaluation, and asked for its appraisal in terms of contemporary multicultural theory, which pointed towards the ideal of social reconstructionism. Hence, the questions were developed collaboratively. While I was responsible for the study design, data collection, analysis, and reporting, her consultation about such considerations as the salience of issues, and key informants and sources, were critical throughout this study.

\textsuperscript{10} While the study eventuated in Anna’s construction of a revised curriculum, this was not its primary aim. As such, the study was not what might traditionally be considered as action research.
Rationale for Case, Participant, and Source Selection

Unique cases, as indicated by Stake (1995), are rare opportunities for learning. I believed that, as the extreme or “odd case” (Becker, 1998, p. 86), Anna’s Native American artists program would be able to provide an exception to the generalization that practicing art teachers are not making any progress towards the recommendations advocated by multicultural social reconstruction theorists in art education. Hers was a promising program that, based on exploratory interviews with Anna as well as an initial review of her curriculum materials, appeared to address a number of the dimensions indicated by Banks (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) as necessary for multicultural education that reflected more transformative or social reconstructionist approaches. In addition, this case provided an authentic situation and environment, and was highly accessible in terms of my opportunity to observe the program in action and the openness of collaboration between Anna and I. Both authentic situation and accessibility are coveted traits by the formative researcher (Bresler, 1994, p. 22).

Furthermore, during exploratory pilot research¹¹ (June-August 2008), what Lincoln and Guba (1985) have called the “Orientation and Overview” phase of naturalistic inquiry, I investigated a conceptual problem or “perplexing and enigmatic state” (p. 88), the disjuncture between the recommendations of multicultural education social reconstruction theorists and the practice of actual teachers in the field, as so strongly criticized in theory. During this time I conducted in-depth interviews with three K-12 art teachers (Anna, at the elementary school level; and one middle school; and one high school teacher). In line with Dexter’s (1970) recommendations for interviewing, these interviews probed these teacher’s past, present, and projected future applications of multicultural art education in their classrooms (see Appendix A for specific questions asked).

¹¹ IRB approved research
Based on the literature in multicultural art education, I expected practicing art teachers to either be excluding multicultural elements entirely (as was the case with the middle school teacher), or utilizing highly Eurocentric and stereotype forwarding approaches to multicultural art education (as was the case with the high school teacher). However, with Anna, the elementary school teacher, things were not as I had imagined them to be. First, she included multicultural programming that explored a series of contemporary Native American artists. Second, her multicultural programming appeared neither additive nor contributions approach oriented; instead, it aimed to break down the category of Native American art by emphasizing the heterogeneity of artists and the hybridity of their work, and showing them as dynamic agents who contributed to the artworld today, as voiced through each artist’s emic perspective. According to Patton (1980), a purposive sample includes the “extreme or deviant case” (as cited by Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I believed Anna’s Native American contemporary artists program constituted such a case. Unlike commonly criticized Human Relations/Contributions/Additive approaches to multicultural art education, her program appeared to be particularly promising in its development towards multicultural education that was more transformative and social reconstructionist in nature.

Anna identified for me several key informants who were familiar with her program and its development, including her school’s principal, one of her visiting Native American contemporary artists, and a Native American expert she had continually consulted with in the development of the contemporary artist program. In addition, she invited me into her classrooms for observation of her classes: She indicated that grades 2-5 would be appropriate, as these were levels for which her program was designed and which she felt would be able to offer me the most insights. She asked me to evaluate her Contemporary Native American Artists program in light
of theoretical recommendations in multicultural art education literature. Though she had not read the literature herself, my consistent references to scholarship during our preliminary interviews in the pilot study had sparked her interest. In line with the recommendations of Lincoln and Guba (1985), each of these components for investigation had been “chosen so as to complement the earlier units, in accord with the need to extend, test, or fill in earlier information” (p. 234).

As with any naturalistic study, however, study design was emergent and subject to change (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To accommodate for “continuous refinement or focusing” as the study progressed and more salient aspects surfaced, sample elements were culled and added to be “more and more to be in line with these aspects” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 234). I was vigilant for such openings as they presented themselves, and was not disappointed. For instance, during the course of the study, an opportunity arose for a face-to-face interview with one of the Native American artists highlighted in Anna’s program: I seized an opportunity to speak one-on-one with Kay WalkingStick, who happened to be presenting at a conference I attended, and was also able to hear her present about her background, work and experiences as an artist. WalkingStick’s insights provided further contextualization for Anna’s representations of this artist’s emic perspectives. In addition, while I had originally planned to investigate grades two through five, it turned out that first graders also participated in several lessons inspired by a Native American artist in the series, and third graders did not participate in any this year. I was able to observe and engage in interviews with first graders regarding these lessons, in lieu of those planned with third graders.

\[\text{12 The academic year that I observed was slightly unusual in that Anna’s third graders were unable to participate in Contemporary Native American Artists lessons due to prior curriculum commitments. Instead, two of the artists that would normally have been presented to third graders were added to the fourth graders’ curriculum.}\]
Data Collection Procedures

The fielding for focused exploration of this case (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) took somewhat longer than planned, and extended from an original timeframe of October 2008 - June 2009, to its completion in August 2009. This equated to three quarters in the academic calendar year of Anna’s school. This prolonged engagement in the field accounted for 1-2 weeks (prior to Anna’s Native American artist program implementation) of acclimation of the researcher to the classroom so that the teacher, students, and myself as researcher had a chance to become accustomed to one another. It included time for natural implementation of Anna’s Native American artist program within her overall art curriculum: Anna had indicated that lessons were woven into the curriculum over the course of approximately seven months. In addition, in the weeks after program implementation, evaluation of her program based on theoretical recommendations that advocated for transformative and social reconstructionist approaches was conducted. Anna and I discussed this evaluation in-depth, and I gathered her reflections and intended actions towards the construction of a revised plan. This theory-based evaluation, and pursuant interviews with Anna, accounted for the extension in fieldwork time.

I used a series of methods in my data collection process (see Figure 1). This aided in triangulation of data, as well as provided for a comprehensive, detailed, contextualization of the case to promote transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stake, 1995). As Lincoln and Denzin (2000) advocated, “We need to employ many perspectives, hear many voices before we can achieve deep understandings” (p. 1055). My use of multiple methods assisted in providing a multitude of perspectives on Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program.

---

13 This extension was approved by the IRB.
Case: One cycle of action research with Anna’s Native American Contemporary Artists curriculum as the intervention (her planning/development of the program, implementation of intervention, observation of implementation, evaluation of program in terms of Banks’s 5 MCAE dimensions and within context of MCAE approaches and Anna’s negotiation of recommendations).

Timeframe: October 2008 - August 2009

Activity I:
Classroom observations w/Native Amer. lessons
- 2 class groups per grade
  - 1st = 3 lessons
  - 2nd = 2 lessons
  - 4th = 4 lessons
  - 5th = 1 lesson
- 20 lessons @ 1-4 sessions per lesson
  = 40 sessions

Activity II:
Classroom observations w/o Native Amer. lessons
- 2 class groups per grade
  - 1st = 9 lessons
  - 2nd = 8 lessons
  - 3rd = 8 lessons
  - 4th = 6 lessons
  - 5th = 6 lessons
- 58 lessons @ 1-6 sessions per lesson
  = 176 sessions

Document Review:
Anna’s Native American Contemporary Artists curriculum materials

Researcher-reflection:
- Emergent design, issues
- Evolving path in MCAE understanding

Key Informants:
- 60 min interviews on understanding of program and benefits and areas for improvement
  - Principal (also about school culture)
  - Visiting Native American artist
  - Artist included in program series
  - Expert consultant on Native American concerns

Context:
- School/Community environment (“Chief” mascot issue)

Students:
- Survey (2 class groups in each grade 1-5): for pre-intervention understandings about a Native Amer. grouping
- Interviews (20-30 min) for post-intervention understandings
  - 2-4 students in each class group after each lesson, 2 groups per grade: 53 total interviews (1st=12; 2nd=15; 3rd=n/a; 4th=17; 5th=9)

Interviewees/Mini-Cases
Anna/Teacher Interviews:
- In-depth (3, 2-3hr) pre-intervention: about program development
- Interim (continual, after/between classes, and 8, 8-10 min after completion of lessons on each artist): for reflections during intervention
- In-depth (2-3, 2-3hr) post-intervention: for program evaluation and Anna’s response/future plans

Relevant research on MCAE:
- AE history
- MCAE curriculum
  - Dimensions
  - Approaches
- Current MCAE theory, curriculum materials, and practice

Figure 1. Case Study Data Collection Methodologies
Classroom Observation

Recognizing that “environing conditions of an event or organization or phenomenon are crucial to its occurrence or existence in the form it eventually takes place” (Becker, 1998, p.55), I have offered descriptive observations of class sessions in which the Contemporary Native American Artists program was implemented, as well as noted the types of lessons that occurred before and after each Native American artist inspired lesson, for the purposes of contextualization within Anna’s overall art education curriculum. One of Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) five dimensions for a multicultural curriculum was “content integration,” and called for particular attention to how Anna’s program was woven into her overall curriculum. All five of Banks’s dimensions (content integration, equity pedagogy, prejudice reduction, knowledge construction and transformation, and empowering school culture and social structure) required attention to classroom activities, interactions between the teacher and students, and the environment in which it took place.

I engaged in non-participant observation of Anna’s classes (see Table B1 for a detailed enumeration of class groups, lessons, and sessions observed by grade level). This included three lessons with two of her first grade classes, two with two of her second, four with two of her fourth, and one with two of her fifth (a total of 20 lessons14); each of these lessons was inspired by one of the Native American artists in her series. Lessons ranged from 1-4 forty-minute class sessions (a total of 40 sessions). It is important to note that the program was designed to integrate particular Native American artists and their artworks into the curricula for particular grade levels. That is, not all grade levels participated in lessons inspired by the same artists. The underlying

---

14 Additionally, a lesson inspired by the work of Pueblo potters (which took two sessions) with two of her first grade classes, and a lesson inspired by the quilts of Seminole artists in one of her first and one of her third grades (which took one session) were also observed (a total of 4 additional lessons, accounting for 6 additional sessions). These lessons, though inspired by Native American artists, were not official modules in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum.
belief, as stated by Anna, was that students would be engaged with a series of Native American artists over the duration of their tenure at the elementary school. I also observed a series of 6-9 lessons with two class groups in each of her first, second, third, fourth, and fifth grade classes (a total of 74 lessons, which equated to 176 forty-minute class sessions) in which Anna’s Native American program components were not implemented: These entailed lessons in which both Western and non-Western art was incorporated. Originally planned to be a maximum of four lessons with one class in each grade (for a total maximum of 16 lessons, and 64 sessions), I found it beneficial to observe a greater number of lessons, primarily accounted for those of a “Japan” unit. I took advantage of an opportunity to observe a complete “Japan” unit that Anna was conducting with her classes prior to implementation of her Contemporary Native American Artist series. This afforded a more in-depth perspective into the way in which Anna presents the artwork of other non-Western cultures in her classroom, and also allowed for further acclimation of Anna, the students, and myself as a researcher, to one another.

*Student Survey, Administered Before Intervention*

Anna shared that one of her motivations for development of a curriculum specifically focused on Native American contemporary artists was her discontent regarding a continuing “Chief mascot” issue and its gross perpetuation of a superficial and demeaning mass stereotype of Native Americans. She was compelled to break down the stereotype of Native Americans as one homogenous group, and to show individual artists as living, breathing, and contributing to the artworld today. As such, an emic issue (Stake, 1995) had emerged: Did the contemporary Native American artists program help to break down stereotypes of a Native American grouping and shift attitudes and conceptions of this particular grouping? A student survey prior to program

---

15 An image of a purported Native American garbed in feather headdress served as the emblem and mascot for a large Midwestern university, and became an issue of contention in the campus community and beyond.
intervention (see Appendix A), and interviews with students following intervention (described below), aimed to flesh out some insights into this issue. Furthermore, “prejudice reduction” was a key component of Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) five dimensions for a multicultural curriculum that was social reconstructionist. The survey aimed to gauge pre-program intervention attitudes and beliefs about Native Americans in the U.S, and was a means to “quickly tap responses of large numbers of people” (McKernan, 1996, p. 128).

Two classes in each grade first through fifth completed surveys. Across these ten classes, a total of 115 students provided consent for participation. Of these students, 106 completed an initial survey regarding their understandings of Native American art and artists (see Table B2 for detailed participant numbers by grade level). The gender and race/ethnicity distributions of students participating in the survey reflected that of the school population (see Table B3).

The bulk of students self-administered the survey (80%), while I found it more appropriate to read aloud the questions to a number of students (20%), particularly in the first grade (see Table B4). I noticed that a number of first graders were having difficulty reading survey questions, and writing responses. I found it more efficacious to read the survey aloud to these students, and to record their answers verbatim on the survey. This occurred less frequently in the upper grades, and only in a few cases in which students lagged behind others did I seek to secure their completion of a survey by reading aloud the questions to them, and recording their answers.

Due to what I like to call a “happy accident,” while all surveys were initially designed to be administered before any lessons on Native American artists began, just over half were completed before the first Native American artist lesson was introduced, and the remainder (45%) were completed after lessons had begun (see Table B5). The surveys were handed out before
L.M.N. Tarry’s winter break had started, and a majority completed the survey at that time, before any Native American artist lessons had begun. The remainder, however, completed the survey after they returned from winter break, at which time Anna was introducing her first Native American artist lesson in all but her third grade classes. In contrast, all student interviews (detailed below) were conducted after students had completed a lesson inspired by a Native American artist. This “happy accident” allowed for some interesting analyses along two questions\textsuperscript{16}, by stage of students’ participation in a lesson inspired by a Native American artist: before participation in, during introduction to, and after completion of a lesson. The two questions were: “Is Native American art still\textsuperscript{17} made today?” and “Have you ever had an art lesson that included a Native American artist?” The results of these questions will be elaborated upon in Chapter 4.

\textit{Student Interviews After Each Native American Artist Lesson}

An in-person, open-ended, semi-structured interview (see Appendix A) was conducted with 2-4 students in each of two first, two second, two fourth, and two fifth grade classes, following their completion of a lesson inspired by a Native American artist. A total of 53 interviews were conducted (see Table B2 for detailed participant figures by grade level). The gender and race/ethnicity distributions of students participating in interviews reflected that of the school population (see Table B3). While these interviews were originally estimated to take 10-15 minutes for completion, they lasted, on average, about 20-30 minutes. This was partially due to the incorporation of member checking in which I repeated back students’ responses to them for confirmation that I had recorded their words correctly.

\textsuperscript{16} Both were dichotomous response questions, yielding sufficient base sizes for analyses.

\textsuperscript{17} The inclusion of the word “still” in the question, “Is Native American art still made today?” has some leading implications, and I would choose to remove it in future iterations of similar research.
I asked each student for permission to interview him or her prior to engaging in questioning, and I only interviewed if permission was granted. Interviews regarding each lesson inspired by a Native American artist were conducted towards the end of the last class session of that lesson, or on the subsequent class session after its completion (no more than 3-4 weekdays later, as each class met 1-2 times a week according to a scheduled rotation). All interviews were conducted during class time while students were working on finishing up their assigned projects, or as they were working on self-selected projects during “free-art” time. During the interviews, I sat down next to students wherever they were engaged in their activity of choice—this was at their table or on the carpet in the reading alcove of the room—in an effort to meet them at their same eye level. By allowing students to choose their activity and location while we talked, and to work on projects without considerably interrupting the natural flow of their classroom activities, I found that their conversation was more relaxed and less inhibited. Furthermore, to accustom the students and Anna to my presence and to the interviewing process, I was an observer in the classroom, and engaged in interviews with students for the ten weeks prior to Anna’s presentation of any lessons inspired by a Native American artist. As Anna noted, I had become “embedded” within the tapestry of the classroom, and students were familiar with me.

In these interviews, I aimed to gather understandings about students’ learnings from each lesson, particularly in terms of attitudes and conceptions about a Native American grouping. These interviews were follow-ups to a student survey, and explored shifts in student perceptions as related to a Native American grouping, especially in terms of how they indicated a subsiding of stereotypes. I believed individual interviews were the best method for me to gain a more detailed and “in-depth understanding of [each] person’s opinions and experiences” (Morgan, 1988, p. 11).

---

18 Free-art is a time in which students can work on a creative project of their choice.
Interim Interviews with Anna/Teacher

Though Anna and I had originally scheduled 30-60 minute, open-ended, semi-structured interviews (see Appendix A) for the second and forth Thursday of every month during the program’s implementation (for a total of approximately 6-8 interviews), I found the rigid timing of these interviews too limiting, and the enforcement of these timeslots unnecessary as Anna informally shared with me her reflections on a continual basis during breaks between classes, and at the end of each class day. We additionally conferred about her reflections on each Native American artist inspired lesson after its completion with all the classes with which she had implemented it: a series of eight\(^{19}\) 8-10 minute, open-ended, semi-structured interviews (see Appendix A). As noted by McKernan (1996), reflexivity is key in action research, and these conversations served as a forum for Anna and I to debrief about her reflections on the program and its implementation, as well to conduct interim member checking on data collected, as recommended by McKernan (1996).

In-Depth Interviews with Anna/Teacher.

In addition to the in-depth, open-ended, semi-structured interviews already conducted (3 interviews of approximately 2-3 hours) regarding her program development to date (see Appendix A), I also conducted post-program implementation interviews (2 interviews of 2-3 hours each) to complete the action research cycle (McKernan, 1996). As I sought in-depth understanding of her opinions, perceptions, and reflections, interviews were the most appropriate method, as recommended by Morgan (1988).

During these interviews (see Appendix A), Anna and I discussed an evaluation of her program in accord with Bank’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) five dimensions for a social

---

\(^{19}\) While there were ten lessons conducted in the Contemporary Native American Artists series, three of these were inspired by the work of Lowe (all in first grade classes), and Anna and I debriefed only once about these lessons after the completion of the third lesson inspired by the Lowe.
reconstructionist multicultural education curricula, in terms of strengths and potential areas for improvement. To contextualize the program within the field of multicultural education, we also discussed how Anna’s Native American artist program was situated in terms of a typology of multicultural art education approaches discussed earlier: Human Relations/Contributions/Additive, Transformative Multicultural, and Social Reconstruction/Action. This analysis offered further potential for critique and direction within the broader context of various multicultural art education approaches. We dialogued about her perspectives (especially her appreciations and concerns) regarding these theoretical recommendations, particularly in terms of their utility, as well as their feasibility for her elementary school art room. We investigated how she foresaw herself acting upon these recommendations, if at all, and her rationale behind decisions either way. Closing out the action research cycle (McKernan, 1996), these interviews culminated with how she planned to incorporate this information to modify her Native American artists program, and potentially her overall art education program (which particularly addressed content integration issues, one of Banks’s five dimensions).

In-depth Interviews with Key Informants

One 60-120 minute, open-ended, semi-structured interviews (see Appendix A) with each key informant was conducted. Key informants included the principal of the school, one of Anna’s visiting Native American artists, and Anna’s expert consultant on Native American concerns. I was also able to garner an interview with one of the artists highlighted in Anna’s Native American artist series, Kay WalkingStick. These key informants were identified by Anna, and had been selected because they were particularly well “informed about the issues and tasks [of the program] because of their experience and cultural background” (McKernan, 1996, p.
Focus was on their understandings of the program offerings, and perceptions of the program’s importance, benefits, and areas for potential improvement. These interviews provided further contextualization of the case, and triangulation of information (McKernan, 1996). These key informants were able to provide further insights into how the Native American artists program aligned with each of Bank’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) five dimensions for a multicultural education practice that was social reconstructionist. The principal, in particular, was able to provide greater insight into the dimension of “empowering school culture and social structure.” As I was focusing on their opinions and experiences, and sought in-depth understanding of these, interviews were the most appropriate method to use (Morgan, 1988).

**Researcher Self-reflection**

I documented self-reflections throughout the research process, as advocated by Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) and Lincoln and Guba (1985). This included a log of personal reflections, developing constructions, evolving questions and hypotheses, methodological decisions that affected the emergent design, concerns, and so forth (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Emerson et al. (1995) asserted, “the field researcher does not learn about the concerns and meanings of others all at once, but in a constant, continuing process in which she builds new insight and understanding upon prior insights and understandings” (p. 13). I continually reflected upon and analyzed emergent issues and ideas along my path towards insights, and found that I was able to “deepen… understanding of those experiences” (p. 13). Furthermore, by detailing how I have come to my understandings and revealing my path, I hoped to facilitate readers’ journeys down similar paths as well, aiding them in seeing my biases in perspective, and in development of understanding of the phenomenon. As an art educator, I believed reflections on my own developing understandings of multicultural art education practice and philosophy were
likely to resonate with other art educators who were struggling with similar issues, and perhaps
they would offer some potential paths educators might embark upon to resolve those issues.

Data Recording Modes

With all of the above data gathering techniques (interviews and observation), I used the
handwritten “jotting” method described by Emerson et al. (1995) to record key words about
actions, dialogue, sensory details, expressions and gestures, and so on. These notes were used to
prompt my memory as I wrote up fieldnotes after each day of interviewing, observation, and
investigation. While audio/video taping may have offered greater fidelity, Lincoln and Guba
(1985) and Stake (1995) indicated a number of advantages to fieldnotes in lieu of taping.
Justifications to which I particularly subscribed, and found to apply in this study, included: it was
not as threatening to participants, I was able to return to previous notes to capture recurring
themes and jog my memory, I could note particular issues to return to and probe more deeply,
and I was able to note my reflections along the way. Furthermore, I could capture sensory details
in writing that audio could not. I also sketched context maps to detail the physical scene and
arrangement of the environments in which I was engaged (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I took
straightforward anecdotal running notes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and I categorized these in later
analyses.

Data Analysis

I analyzed data utilizing an inductive process towards categorization and recognition of
patterns, as suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985), McKernan (1996), and Stake (1995). As
recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985), I reviewed data on a continual basis throughout the
study to keep track of emergent issues and salient themes as indicated by their recurrence. In addition, as evaluation of the program was along Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) five dimensions that constituted a social reconstructionist approach to multicultural education, data was culled with these five dimensions as pre-designated categories: content integration, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, knowledge construction and transformation, and empowering school culture and social structure. I found that the best method for me to work towards such categories was to code my notes, as suggested by Stake (1985); I coded to note emergent categories, as well as to detail correspondence with pre-existing categories.

Critical evaluation of multicultural education deals very strongly with underlying assumptions and implications. As this was an evaluation of a multicultural approach, and in line with critical theory, I engaged in deconstruction of what was said during interviews and observations, as well as what was written in curriculum materials and in surveys. I employed Fairclough’s (2003) discourse analysis techniques, and specifically looked at what was implied in terms of three categories. These included 1) “existential assumptions: assumptions about what exists,” 2) “propositional assumptions: assumptions about what . . . can be or will be the case,” and “value assumptions: about what is good or desirable” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 55). I was specifically interested in “what was thought to be” offered by the program (existential assumptions), and what Anna’s students’, and key informants’ expectations (“what can or will be”) were for the program (propositional assumptions). As I was seeking to find out what benefits Anna’s Native American artists program provided, and how it might be improved, value assumptions (those asserted by multicultural theory) were also important. The intent of this type of analysis, in this case, was to determine if there were inconsistencies between what values were
implied, what was thought to be, what was expected to be achieved, and what appeared to be happening in reality.

Any statistics reported in the body of this document are meant to show directional shifts and relative comparisons between the groups evaluated, and are to be interpreted as anecdotal indicators rather than statistically significant figures. The participant numbers for response groupings were limited by the qualitative emphasis of the study design, and did not provide adequate base sizes for statistically significant quantitative analysis. Towards transparency in this regard, participant numbers for each grouping analyzed are indicated in each chart or table presented herein.

Criteria for Assessment

Adhering to the guidelines for evaluating qualitative naturalistic work, as advocated by Lincoln and Guba, (1985), McKernan (1996), Stake (1995), and Walker (1992), this research was designed to meet the criteria of transferability, credibility, and confirmability.

I saw transferability as critical to this study. Through thick description (Geertz, 1973) embroidered with rich sensory details, I aimed to afford readers with a vicarious experience (Bresler, 1994; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Emerson et al., 1995; Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997; Lincoln & Denzin, 2000; Stake, 1995), and to enhance the level of transferability of the story told to each reader’s own situation. My aim was to be able to “show rather than tell” (Emerson et al., 1995, p. 32) readers about what was observed so that they might empathize and be afforded an understanding as close to a “lived experience” (p. 63) as possible from which to derive their own interpretations. As Stake (1995) has indicated, unique cases have utility. This study aimed to help readers imagine similar hurdles and achievements associated with their own past, current,
and potential multicultural art education practices in their own environments. I hoped to inspire educators to critique and discover their own path towards developing multicultural art curricula in the future.

Credibility was supported through a number of means. First, it was bolstered by systematic inquiry, as indicated by the above design. Second, triangulation was achieved through the member checking of all interviews; Anna and all key informants were sent a copy of relevant sections of a draft of the case study for their review, and I confirmed students’ responses by repeating back their words to them to ensure I had recorded their answers correctly. Triangulation was additionally secured through the use of multiple methods to obtain multiple perspectives on the program and to cross-validate findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Third, my prolonged engagement (11 months) in the field allowed for acclimation of both participants and myself as the researcher to the classroom environment of study, reducing distortions from researcher presence (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Fourth, persistent observation of two different classrooms in each grade during lessons with Native American artists as the focus (40 sessions), as well as during lessons before, in-between, and after these lessons (another 176 sessions), permitted for further contextualize of the program. It also allowed for salient issues to emerge and be explored in detail (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lastly, Anna’s expert consultant on Native American concerns graciously reviewed this document in its entirety to ensure that I had reported responsibly and respectfully. It garnered her approval.

Confirmability was attained through my maintenance of an audit trail of raw data, data reduction and analysis products, data reconstruction and synthesis materials, process notes, reflexive notes and emergent ideas, and instrument development evidence (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
In addition, I understood that the research process was interactive and that, as the researcher, I was complicit in the research environment (Fontana & Frey, 2000; Lincoln & Denzin, 2000). Neither neutrality nor objectivity was possible, as qualitative research is both constructive and interpretive in nature (Becker, 1988; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Fontana & Frey, 2000; Richardson, 2000; Stacey, 1991). For this reason, when reporting the case I have used the first person “I” to tell the story through my own voice, have included myself in the interactions, and have revealed and implicated my personal perspective in the interpretations, as suggested by Emerson et al. (1995). I aimed to underscore the understanding that the documentation “represents [my] knowledge and understanding others’ experiences” (p. 59) and is a “construction… rather than simply record[ed] reality” (p. 64). I sought to make this as apparent as possible to readers, because, as Becker (1988) noted, “It is, in principle, impossible to avoid all interpretation” (p. 77).

Ethical Considerations

Lastly, strict ethical guidelines were followed, as advocated by Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Emerson et al. (1995). IRB approval for this case study research was secured, and was in alignment with Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) recommendations for informed consent, voluntary participation, and protection of participant anonymity and confidentiality (p. 255). This study hinged on the collaboration, trust, and openness between Anna and me, and aimed for full overtness, as advocated by Lincoln and Guba (1985) for naturalistic inquiry. Our collegial relationship has exhibited this quality throughout the process, and continues to date. Furthermore, the study aimed to benefit not only Anna and I as art educators in pursuit of multicultural art curricula less flawed by stereotyping and Eurocentricity, but also preservice and
in-service art teachers, and scholars of similar dispositions to ours. In addition, the ultimate intent was that K-12 art students would benefit from improved multicultural art education programming and efforts in the future.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

As we saw in the literature review (Chapter 2), if art educators do not incorporate multiculturalism into their curricula and instead continue with a strictly Western European art dominated curricula, they forward Eurocentric, hegemonic perspectives. Naturalizing the superiority of Western European art as static, objective knowledge through art education reifies it as taken-for-granted truth and contributes to hegemony. Multicultural curricula are necessary to counter such hegemony. How, then, might art teachers responsibly integrate multiculturalism into their curricula? A review and amalgamation of the approaches suggested by Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b) and Banks’s (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) yielded three approaches for consideration: Human Relations, Transformative Multicultural, and Social Reconstruction/Action (see Table 3).

In terms of multiculturalism in art education, current practice, commercially available kits, and literature for the field often reflect Human Relations approaches to multiculturalism, and forward essentializing notions of the cultures purportedly represented within them. While perhaps well intentioned, such Human Relations oriented approaches tend to promote stereotypes and misconceptions about cultural groups, and view the material from a Western ethnocentric perspective. They run contrary to the desired goals of multiculturalism: Rather than promoting social harmony and strengthening interpersonal relations between persons of diverse backgrounds, Human Relations approaches tend to reinforce a cycle of hegemony by essentializing and further othering the groups portrayed.

As potential alternatives to essentializing Human Relations approaches, scholars have theorized that multicultural approaches would need to promote knowledge transformation in students by embracing counterhegemonic narratives and forwarding the dissolution of
stereotypes. Scholars suggest that two multicultural approaches might achieve this:

Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action. Advocates of Transformative Multicultural approaches indicate that critical dialogues that explicitly confront issues of conflict, such as racism and oppression, would be necessary to promote the desired knowledge transformation in students. Additionally, advocates of Social Reconstruction/Action approaches requisite that students research such issues of conflict, and take social action to address these issues. While theorists advocate Transformative and Social Reconstructionist approaches based on speculative-theory, they do not show us how to operationalize\(^{20}\) these theoretical approaches within the elementary school environment.

Moreover, it is questionable as to how well such approaches would fare in a K-5 arena. While Brameld (1956, as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 176) suggested that a Social Reconstruction/Action approach is a “utopian” ideal, I disagree with this notion for two reasons. First, though it may take much work and time to accomplish, several cases in secondary and higher level education show that it can be done (Albers, 1996, 1999; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2001, 2005, 2007; Knight, 2006; Staikidis, 2005), and therefore it is not an unattainable utopian imaginary. Second, scholars (e.g., Efland et al., 1996) as well as documented secondary school cases (Albers, 1996, 1999; Cohen Evron, 2001, 2005, 2007) reveal that there are potential drawbacks to the confrontational nature of both the Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches. As both of these approaches call on students to engage in critical dialogues that confront issues of conflict such as racism and oppression, there is a potential that community members (parents, administration, and so on) may object to such

\(^{20}\) Criticisms regarding the difficulties of translating similar critical pedagogical proposals into practical teaching strategies have also been noted in other disciplines relevant to art education, such as media education. See, for instance, Buckingham (1986, 2003) and Williamson (1985).
sensitive issues being broached in the artroom\textsuperscript{21}, as in the sixth grade classes documented by Albers (1996, 1999), in which issues related to sexism and sexuality were explored. Social Reconstruction/Action approaches extend the potential for concern, as such approaches further call on students to engage in social action. There is an apprehension that students may take social action on a stance that forwards oppression\textsuperscript{22}, as in the high school classes documented by Cohen Evron (2005), in which some students held on to “repressive and racist discourses” (p. 321). These are drawbacks that may be threatening to a teacher’s status and livelihood within a school\textsuperscript{23}, and therefore may not be ideal to implement.

In light of this review of the literature, it would seem that a more ideal and practical multicultural strategy for the elementary school artroom would: 1) avoid the essentializing pitfalls of a Human Relations approach, 2) would instead foster students’ knowledge transformation to challenge hegemonic ideologies and reduce prejudices, and 3) would not incur the threats associated with the confrontation of critical issues suggested for Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches. This sounds appealing in theory, but how might it be operationalized?

In the following discussion, I will introduce you to an elementary school art teacher who uses a non-confrontational strategic approach to multiculturalism that encourages knowledge transformation in her students without the explicit confrontation of issues of conflict that are suggested by Transformative Multicultural approaches, and without requiring the social action suggested by Social Reconstruction/Action advocates. Hence, it avoids the potential threats of

\textsuperscript{21} This drawback—the potential that community members might object to sensitive issues being broached in the classroom—has also been observed in other areas of study that involve critical pedagogical practices. For instance, in media education, see Buckingham (2003) and Williamson (1981/1982).

\textsuperscript{22} This potential for students to forward oppressive ideologies has also been noted in other disciplines that engage students in critical pedagogical practices, such as literacy and media education. See, for instance, Buckingham (1986, 2003), Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1994), Ellsworth (1989), and Sefton-Green and Soep (2007).
incorporating such approaches. Furthermore, her program does not exhibit any of the characteristics so commonly criticized in Human Relations approaches.

Anna: Driven by Her Deeply Embedded Beliefs and Working Outside of the Literature

Anna, the teacher who will be showcased, did not arrive at her Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum through an immersion in scholarly literature on multiculturalism. “I don’t know as much about the writing and research that’s been going on—I’ve been figuring it out on my own,” Anna asserted. In lieu of the literature, Anna’s deeply embedded beliefs, and alternative research resources, seemed to have guided the development of her Contemporary Native American Artists program.

One of the key ideas stressed as essential for transformative and socially reconstructive multicultural education approaches is that teachers engage in self-reflexivity in the development of their multicultural practice (Albers, 1999; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2005; Knight, 2006; Staikidis, 2005; Stuhr, 1994; Stuhr et al., 1992). Through her self-reflections, Anna discovered a conflict between her own beliefs in egalitarianism, and the stereotypical portrayals of Native Americans being proliferated in her community. She took action to counter these essentializing representations of Native Americans through the creation and implementation of her Contemporary Native American Artists program, and she engaged the support of her school principal. During an interview with Anna’s school principal, the principal shared, “One of the things she [Anna] and I had [was] this discussion about was the ‘Chief’ thing—the stereotype.” Anna’s program aimed to challenge the stereotype. Anna emphasized that her Contemporary Native American Artists unit was “always the one [curriculum] I was reaching for because it is so needed in this area.” “This area,” to which she referred, has seen a heated and ongoing debate
about a local university’s recently retired mascot, the logo of which consists of a disembodied head wearing a feathered headdress, entitled “The Chief.” During football and basketball games, a white man, face painted with red, white, and blue stripes, and dressed in supposed Native American war regalia including a leather costume, woven breastplate, and feathered headdress, would parade around and dance. In light of the stereotypes of Native Americans that this mascot proliferated, Anna shook her head and lamented, “You say Native American, and everyone thinks that it’s the same tribe.” She rolled her eyes to the ceiling and tossed her hands out to her sides in exasperation. She wanted to challenge this idea of homogeneity with her program. Her hazel eyes widened as she leaned forward and explained that she sought to teach her students how “to be more open-minded and see where the bias lies—to have another message out there and break the paradigm.” She chastised: “The dominant culture should not use another culture as an image that stereotypes.” The “Chief” mascot, she grimaced, “Reeks of stereotyping—brave, warrior.” She shook her head, “Nobles would not dance around a field. The dominant culture is appropriating” in a way that “is very offensive to Native American people—those who work here at the Native American House, faculty, and visitors—are offended.” As a resident in the area, I have personally heard numerous constituents from the community, of Native American ancestry and otherwise, repeatedly voice concerns about the stereotyping, trivializing, and downright incorrect representation of Native Americans that this mascot portrays. In a conversation I had with Sam Montan²⁴, a key spokesperson on Native American issues in the community, and one of Anna’s visiting artists for the Contemporary Native American Artists series, he shook his head in disappointment at such “co-opting of Native images for use.” Anna winced, “It’s a big stereotype—Native American is being used as a minstrel.” In light of this, she asserted that she

²⁴ In-person interview with Sam Montan (pseudonym), May 19, 2009
was very sensitive, “tentative about stepping on” an individual’s culture through her representations within the artroom.

Furthermore, she was concerned about ahistoric portrayals of Native Americans, which contribute to the stereotypes. “I’ve learned to trust myself, relating ‘traditional’—which implies a dead culture—the idea that it’s a problem.” Her eyes widened as she leaned forward and shared, “Then an ‘aha!’ moment: ‘If I teach it from a contemporary standpoint, I won’t have that issue.’” But even when contemporary art was the focus, bracketing artists by ethnicity remained a concern for Anna. She referenced a “Latino American Artists” show\(^{25}\) at a local art museum, and ground her teeth, “Museum shows—they shouldn’t just put up work because they’re Latin American artists.” In museums, she elaborated, “An artist is referred to as a Native American artist or a Latin American artist, but why aren’t they included in other shows? There’s a force in the artworld that limits by ethnicity.”

Anna further justified that maintaining separations by ethnic or geographic boundaries did not seem to make sense in our ever more global world: “Second and third generation experiences in the U.S., cultural synthesis and merging, what is America?” She related this idea directly to her students: “There is a huge multicultural population at our school, and we want to make all feel welcome.” Anna’s elementary school principal\(^ {26}\) shared with me that they had “432 children” in the school, and “52 languages” were spoken across students’ homes. The racial makeup of the student population was “48.7% Caucasian, 26.3% African American, 2.3% Hispanic, 21.7% Asian, and 0.5% Native American.” Anna, at one point during a class, beamed to her students, “You know what I call L.M.N. Terry? A little U.N. [United Nations].”

\(^{25}\) An exhibition of contemporary artwork by artists of Latin American descent.

\(^{26}\) In-person interview with Principal Vetter (pseudonym), May 29, 2009
Anna sought out a curriculum to help address her concerns. She briefly forayed into the literature in search of a unit that would reflect her beliefs and desire to challenge the stereotypes of Native Americans being forwarded in her community. She sifted through commercially available multicultural art education curricula, but found them unsuitable for her needs. She scrunched up her nose as she conveyed her distaste for them: “They are typical in terms of how they treat Native American cultures as all one, without understanding the nuances within that grouping.” She explained that publishers offered books full of errors that stereotype characteristics across all Native Americans. “I struggled,” frowned Anna. “It really percolated in my brain. I hated the ‘crapmac’ [Crizmac27] stuff. I looked at it and I thought, ‘That’s not going to do anything.’” In contrast, Anna stated, “I wanted to break barriers down. I didn’t want to show dead artists or romanticize Native American art, but show it as very much alive. As soon as I got to that idea of a living culture,” she curled the fingers of her outstretched palm into a fist as though she was holding onto a treasure, and continued, “I thought about living artists.”

Her search took her outside of the literature. In the initial stages of her development of a Native American artists unit, Anna participated in a workshop at a local cultural heritage museum called, “Seeing Red.” She recounted that during this workshop she “learned about stumbling blocks for presenting Native Americans.” She discovered that “the big thing was how to narrow one’s scope without diluting.” She came to an understanding for herself that “one way would be to take living artists and let the art speak for them.” She wanted to “show [that] art comes from all different traditions and [artists] may draw on [their] own or not.”

She took a deep breath, and exhaled, “Then it was, ‘How to find the artists?’ It was really daunting. I didn’t know anything about contemporary Native American artists. And that’s when I

27 Crizmac’s Art and Cultural Education Materials are detailed and critiqued in Chapter 2.
went to the Eiteljorg. She created a portfolio of research that contained a section on each artist included in her Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum. When I perused the portfolio, I noticed that each section overflowed with articles and clippings. “I got all of that from the Eiteljorg,” Anna explained in reference to the research portfolio. She elaborated, “The curator there [at the Eiteljorg], she gave me a bunch of catalogs from the shows. And she suggested that I take a look at the files in their education office.” Anna’s research was culled from a pre-existing compendium found in the museum’s educational resource center, foreshortening her legwork and time to collect it. In her review of the material, she focused on pieces from curators and writers who honed in on each artist’s words and perspective. She wanted to hear the artists speak for themselves. She further extended her understandings by reading, *Children of Native America Today* (Dennis & Hirschfelder, 2003), and underscored that she adhered to the “do’s and don’ts” found on the oyate.org website as an ethical compass.

In accord with the recommendations of scholars (e.g., Irwin & Miller, 1997; Spang, 1995), though she was not privy to their suggestions, Anna additionally worked with an insider consultant on Native American concerns, Erin Montan, to review her curriculum. Montan is an educator and scholar who has written extensively on representations of Native Americans in children’s literature, and who, according to Anna, “Really gets it.” Montan shared with me that her husband of 27 years is Muskogee Creek, and her friend is Pueblo, so she is familiar and empathic with some parts of Native American culture: “I am aware of a lot of the issues when people outside of the group are attempting to do something that is helped a lot by insider knowledge.” Montan explained that from the outset of her collaboration with Anna, it was clear

---

28 The Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art in Indianapolis, Indiana.
29 Oyate.org the website of the Oyate organization, which is devoted to the critical evaluation of literature and curricula focused on Native American concerns, and works to see that Native lives and histories are portrayed honestly.
30 In-person interview with Erin Montan (pseudonym), April 13, 2009
to her that, “Anna knew she needed insider knowledge.” Their discussions focused on “what would be appropriate” for the curriculum. Montan observed, “[Anna] approached it as an endeavor that has ethical considerations.” Departing from “some of the real popular stereotypical things,” Montan explained that Anna explored each artist in-depth to break away from the stereotypes. She added, “[Anna] really gets the damage that can be done with misrepresentations—to Native kids and to non-Native kids—it’s destructive to give a child misinformation.”

In light of the above information, it would seem that Anna’s journey to create and implement responsible multicultural programs began from an internal personal drive and dissatisfaction with the status quo. She saw an injustice in the way Native Americans were being represented in her community, and sought to change this in an ethical and responsible manner. Anna was deeply engaged in self-reflection about issues related to the oppression of Native Americans within her local community, and this contemplation provoked her into taking social action through the meticulous research and construction of a curriculum that would prompt her students to contemplate the injustice of Native American stereotypes, and to break down these stereotypes or prevent their formation before they had a chance to take hold. Her construction of a Contemporary Native American Artists program, and implementation of it in her classrooms, was a social action in itself that aimed to help erode the social injustices existing in her community. Armed with her strong beliefs and guided by informational resources predominantly outside of the scholarly theoretical literature on multicultural art education, Anna developed a Contemporary Native American Artists program that will be elaborated upon throughout the ensuing sections of this chapter.
An Overview of Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists Curriculum

The following is a general overview of how Anna presented her Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum to her students. Details of each lesson will be provided in subsequent discussions. The Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum in which Anna’s classes participated, and which I had the pleasure of observing, introduced eight living contemporary artists of Native American ancestry to her students: Truman Lowe in her first grade; Joe Feddersen and James Lavadour in her second grade; Michael Naranjo, Rick Bartow, Marianne Nicolson, and Nora Naranjo-Morse in her fourth grade; and Kay WalkingStick in her fifth grade. For each lesson inspired by one of these artists, Anna introduced students to the artist with a PowerPoint presentation replete with a series of images of an artist and his or her work as well as contextual influences, often captioned with text, and accompanied by her oral elaborations.

On the title slide of each presentation was a photograph of the artist in contemporary attire, typically at work or in his or her own studio. This was accompanied by text that offered the artist’s name, tribal affiliation, and the geographic location of the tribe. Anna reinforced this information by verbally stating the living status of the artists and their tribal affiliation. She did not always state that the artist was “Native American,” nor was this information found in the text on any of the slides within a presentation.

The remaining bulk of slides for each presentation contained an image archive revealing the works of the artist under study. Artists’ works included contemporary pieces that varied in concept and media from artist to artist. The interspersed images, text, and/or Anna’s narration accompanying each artwork explained the contextual influences that the artist drew upon in his or her creation of that piece, typically utilizing quotes from the artist to speak towards these
ideas. During these presentations, students participated in dialogue with Anna in regards to these artworks, using the artifacts and ideas of the artist as points of focus for their discussions.

Each presentation concluded with Anna verbally linking the artist’s work to the art project the students would be working on in subsequent art sessions. Students’ artworks drew from the conceptual approach, and sometimes additionally the expressive format that each artist employed in his or her own creation of artworks. For example, in Lowe’s creation of freestanding sculptural artworks, Anna’s presentation illustrated how the artist referenced the effigy mounds in the Woodlands region that were created by his Ho Chunk ancestors, which often took the form of simplified animal shapes and profiles when viewed from above. In response to Lowe’s artwork, first graders created clay sculptures that took the form of simplified animals shapes when viewed from above, and also drew topographical depictions of animals and landscapes from a birds-eye-perspective. This was a perspective that referenced the topographical maps that located some of the Ho Chunk effigy mounds, which Anna showed in her presentation.

With her second graders, Anna highlighted that Lavadour drew inspiration from his surrounding eastern Oregon plateaus, where the Walla Walla tribe of his ancestry resided. He painted abstracted landscapes by layering one painted scene over another. In response, second graders created textured monoprints of landscape scenes, drawing from their surrounding Midwestern landscape for inspiration, and watercolored a layer atop their monoprint to complete the artwork.

Like Lavadour, Anna showed that Feddersen also drew from his surrounding plateau landscape, and from the artworks of some of his ancestors in the Okanogan/Colville tribe who distilled this landscape into simplified geometric shapes and patterns. Feddersen created
basketry, glassware, and printmaking, similarly utilizing geometric patterns to represent elements in his surrounding landscape. Like Feddersen, Anna’s second graders created prints depicting a topographical view of their surrounding Midwestern landscape utilizing patterns created by simple geometric shapes.

Anna introduced her fourth graders to Naranjo, a sculptor who was blinded in the Vietnam war. He interpreted the visual world through his fingers. Reflecting Naranjo’s approach to artmaking, students participated in an exercise in which they felt three-dimensional objects that were hidden in a bag, and translated the objects into drawings based on what they interpreted with their fingers.

Like Naranjo, Bartow was also a Vietnam veteran. Anna explained that Bartow used his artwork as a vehicle for healing to help him transition out of the psychological damage he incurred during the war. His subject material often included humans transforming from animals, and his process of making art was very physical. Fourth graders used the visceral material of Craypas to express depictions of themselves transforming from animals into humans, following Bartow’s anthropomorphic concept.

Anna illustrated how Nicolson drew from the familial button blanket motifs of her Dzawada’enuxw ancestors’ traditions, which included depictions of animals representing the character of the family member to whom the blanket was bestowed. A linear pattern of buttons—which Nicolson interpreted as two-dimensional dots—outlined these animal motifs. The artist additionally incorporated red borders with gaps in the top frame to represent shelters with smokeholes, reminiscent of the dwellings of her Dzawada’enuxw ancestors. Drawing on the ideas of Nicolson, fourth graders created two-dimensional drawings and collages incorporating their favorite animal outlined in dots and a photo of themselves with their interpretation of who
their family was, and framed the image with a red border with a gap representing a smokehole at the top.

Anna additionally explored with her students how Naranjo-Morse sculpted ceramic abstractions of faces and figures using simplification to call attention to the character with which she imbued a piece. Fourth graders were similarly called upon to sculpt ceramic reliefs of expressive faces that were abstracted to emphasize their character.

In Anna’s fifth grade classes, she showed how WalkingStick painted diptychs that were inspired by the artist’s own duality and her interpretations of personal experiences. WalkingStick’s were often highly expressive of her emotions and biracialness. Students engaged in painting and drawing diptychs that expressed the duality of their own personalities and identities.

Lessons on each artist typically spanned over multiple days, with the introduction to the artist on the first day of the lesson, and worksessions for students’ own artistic creations inspired by the artist on the following days. These worksessions often included demonstrations and explanations of how to use media. The amount of time devoted to instruction in how to use materials varied by students’ familiarity with the processes; hence, the younger grades received the most instruction in material use and processes, and the fifth graders received the least in this respect.

An Overview of the Arguments

Detailed descriptions of lessons can be found in the following sections as they relate to each of the arguments presented. My arguments are threefold: 1) Anna’s program does not suffer the essentializing deficits highlighted in critiques of Human Relations approaches; 2) Anna’s
Contemporary Native American Artists program is unique in that it promotes knowledge construction and transformation through its intrinsic structure, content integration, and dynamic approach to knowledge, without directly confronting the issues of conflict suggested by advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches; and 3) Anna’s program does not engage her students in study that focuses on group relationships of conflict, competition, oppression, and resistance to oppression, which is required for both Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches, nor does it engage her students in social action, which is required by the latter approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1988); hence, it avoids the risks associated with such confrontational approaches, and therefore has more enduring potential for the transformation of her students’ understandings.

Argument 1: Does Not Have the Deficiencies of Human Relations Approaches

Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists Program does not suffer from the critiques leveled against Human Relations approaches. As discussed in Chapter 2, Human Relations approaches are the most common multicultural approaches utilized in the classroom (Banks, 1996e, 2004). Considered tokenism, they are the approaches to multiculturalism that are most heavily criticized by scholars for their propensity to forward stereotypes and misconceptions about cultural groups (e.g., Banks, 1988, 2006a; Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Chalmers, 2002; Collins & Sandell, 1992; Delacruz, 1995b; Efland et al., 1996; Garber, 1995; Gude, 2007; Gunew & Rivzi, 1994; Hochtritt, 2005; Kader, 2005; Mason, 1995; Smith, 1994; Stuhr et al., 1992). Human Relations approaches tend to provide a superficial, often positive, view of a cultural community and are accorded with a four-F’s (food, festival, fashion, and folklore) approach (Cai, 1998). Such approaches trivialize and exoticize cultural communities
(Banks, 1988, 2006a). Furthermore, even when presentations do contextualize the cultures portrayed with more depth, they tend to bracket that imagined culture’s art with a uniform set of defining characteristics (e.g., “Islamic art consists of X elements.”), creating a hegemonic narrative in which the art of the imagined culture is essentialized and translated into what a dominant culture dictates/authorizes is to be perceived as that culture’s art (Gundara & Fyfe, 1999).

**Different Goals**

In contrast, Anna’s program diverges from Human Relations approaches in a number of ways, including her overarching goal. As discussed in Chapter 2, the Human Relations approach is akin to the intergroup education approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Banks, 2004), and was forwarded during a time in which diverse individuals were converging into urban areas in pursuit of industrial job opportunities. This convergence increasingly brought individuals from different backgrounds into contact with one another, much like our current age of globalization in which people, ideas, products, and so on are rapidly traversing geographic borders. In both situations, an increased urgency to attend to racial and ethnic conflicts came to the forefront. Anna’s development of the Native American artists program was prompted by such a situation (the “Chief” mascot controversy), and aimed towards a few goals that are similar to that of the intergroup movement: to enhance interpersonal understandings; ameliorate prejudice, stereotyping, and racial conflicts; and to recognize a shared U.S. community (indicated as intergroup goals by Banks, 1996a, 2004; C. A. M. Banks, 1996b, 2004; Cook & Cook, 1954; Taba & Wilson, 1946). Unlike the intergroup movement, however, Anna’s Native American artists program did not aim to promote ethnic pride among minority and immigrant groups, nor did she aim to ease their assimilation into the dominant mainstream of U.S. society. She did not
have a constituency of persons of Native American ancestry within her student population; nor did she target her program at a specific population, but instead engaged all of her students in it. In line with Banks’s (2004) recommendation that multicultural curricula should be made available to all students, and not targeted at students who were assumed to be tied to a group under study by criteria such as race, ethnicity, gender, class, or ability/disability, all students in Anna’s art classes participated in lessons inspired by a Native American artist, and all students had the opportunity to draw on these artists’ work for inspiration to generate their own artistic interpretations.

**Approach to Content Integration**

Anna’s program further contrasted with Human Relations approaches in terms of the manner in which multicultural content was integrated into her art curricula. Anna did not add her Contemporary Native American Artists program to her overarching art curriculum as an addendum, nor did she present essentialist and ahistoric portrayals of Native American art and artists. Instead, she focused on the heterogeneity of individual artists of Native American descent, highlighted them as contemporary living artists who may or may not draw on traditions from their tribal ancestry, revealed a multiplex of influences that each artist drew from and underscored the hybridity of their creations, and did not select or view these artists from a Western ethnocentric perspective. Rather than reinforcing stereotypes of Native American art and artists, she instead provided students with perspectives to help them break a stereotyping habitus.

**Woven into Curricula**

While Human Relations approaches are critiqued for tacking-on cultural material as an appendage to the core curriculum (Banks, 2004, 2006a), this was not so in Anna’s case. Instead,
both non-Western and Western art are integrated throughout her curricula. Non-Western and Western art and artists commingle as some of the many arts in the world that are explored for inspiration within her artroom. Anna explained that non-Western lessons are “integrated into lessons throughout the year. More than just one quarter—it’s seamless.” During the academic year in which I observed her classes, I witnessed this to be the case. Prior to implementation of Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum, all students participated in a unit inspired by artistry created in Japan, both historical and contemporary. After participation in lessons inspired by Native American artists, each grade engaged in a variety of lessons inspired by the work of artists from various parts of the world. For example, after their lesson inspired by WalkingStick, fifth graders created ceramic pots inspired by the “Ugly Face Pots” made by African slaves in the U.S., and then learned about Rangoli artwork from India. Following their lesson inspired by Naranjo-Morse, fourth graders created figural collages and drawings inspired by the work of Gustav Klimt.

*Non-essentialist—Heterogeneity and Contemporary Dynamism Underscored*

Unlike the essentialist visions of cultures forwarded by Human Relations approaches, Anna sought to highlight the heterogeneity and vitality of individual artists of Native American ancestry. She wanted her students to understand that “each artist is different.” Rather than presenting Native American art as having a core essence, Anna instead wanted to show that art created by Native American artists was “not a codification in style.” Though all artists were of Native American ancestry, this ethnicity was not a predeterminant for what their artwork would entail.
Attention to multiple dimensions of identity.

Nor did their Native American ethnicity make all of the artists a homogenous set. Underscoring the heterogeneity of these artists, Anna incorporated diversity along multiple dimensions of identity in her selection of artists for the program (as suggested by Banks, 1994b, 1996a, 2004; Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1993, 1995; Gollnick & Chinn, 1990; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). She included three female, and five male artists of varying ages. Not all of the artists were formally trained. Lavadour was a self-taught artist. Anna highlighted for her second graders, “He taught himself to paint. He didn’t go to art school.” Additionally, one of the artists was physically challenged. “Have you ever met a person who was totally blind?” Anna asked her fourth graders. The room was a sea of shaking heads as the syllable, “No,” percolated through the room. “Well, you’re going to meet one today,” Anna chimed. “Michael [Naranjo] became an artist after he was blinded in Vietnam. . . . Disability is not a word in his vocabulary.” While all artists in Anna’s program were of Native American ancestry, the artists were associated with different tribes, and differed from each another in terms of their gender, age, training, and ability/disability.

Focus on living individual artists.

Furthermore, each lesson presented in her curriculum focused on a living individual contemporary artist of Native American ancestry who was contributing to the artworld today (as suggested by Bastos, 2006; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; lok, 2005; MacPhee, 2004; Parks, 2000, 2004). Anna shared with me that Erin Montan, her consultant on Native American concerns, emphasized the importance of including artifacts that showed contemporary life for Native Americans. This was important, according to Anna’s recollections of her discussions with Montan, “Because it’s a living culture—you want to demonstrate that these are all living
cultures.” Anna stressed that this is critical, “Especially if someone is teaching that Native Americans are homogenous.” In Anna’s presentation at the 2008 National Art Educators’ Association (NAEA) conference, she stated that she wanted to “rightly portray Native Americans as living and vital,” in a way that was “devoid of stereotypes” and generalizations. As a standard protocol for herself, Anna admonished that cultural information “can’t be romanticized.” Instead, educators needed to “embrace its context in the fabric of life in today’s world.” Montan was able to observe a few of Anna’s classes, and shared with me that Anna was very respectful about what she presented about Native American histories and stories. She “didn’t overdo their being in the past,” but rather presented the artists, “still living.” In her presentations of each artist, I watched Anna bring the artists to life in the artroom. She began each lesson with a PowerPoint presentation, the title slide of which included a recent photograph of the artist of inspiration at work or in his or her studio, clothed in contemporary attire. As Montan commented, each artist was presented as a real person in the here-and-now: “Not feathers and leathers. They dressed like regular folks.” Above each artist’s photograph, the title provided textual information indicating the artist’s full name, tribal affiliation, and the region of the tribe’s residence. The text did not include the words, “Native American.” Anna’s oral introduction accompanied this slide. Her words emphasized each artist’s living status, and reinforced the textual information.

For example, allow Anna to introduce you to a few of the artists in her program. In her first grade, Anna invited her students to meet Lowe. “I want to introduce you to an artist who is still alive and well,” she began as a fern green screen glowed behind her. “Woodlands, Truman Lowe, Ho Chunk (Winnebago),” was emblazoned across the center of this title slide. A color photograph below the text revealed a man with graying dark hair. He wore large-lens, rimless glasses, and a dark blue short-sleeved, collared shirt. Lowe stood before one of his pieces, a
plywood sculpture of 12-inch by 12-inch squares that covered the wall behind him. Thin bare sticks ran diagonally up its face, like hundreds of twigs floating lazily up a river. “Truman is a Native American artist who has been doing very important work,” commented Anna. Her words underscored Lowe’s continuing contribution to the artworld today, and that he was Native American. “He was influenced by the area that he grew up in, and the Ho Chunk culture that he is a part of,” explained Anna, emphasizing his tribal ancestry, and the inspiration that his environment had afforded him. “Truman is from Wisconsin,” Anna added as a black and white outline of the state was shown, and a red dot indicated the Black River Falls area of Lowe’s residence.

Anna introduced Nicolson to her fourth graders. An aqua blue screen glowed on the whiteboard with the words, “The Northwest, Marianne Nicolson, Dzawada’enuxw Tribe,” centered above a sepia-tone photograph of a smiling woman who had short dark hair parted on the side and slicked back behind her ears so that it flipped up at the ends in short feathery waves. She sported a white tank top beneath an open black hooded sweatshirt. A dark stone dangled from a black cord about her neck. Her neck angled forward, setting her head slightly in front of her shoulders, as though the camera had captured her in the midst of exhaling a laugh. “This is Marianne Nicolson, and we’re going to do a two-day project based on her work,” introduced Anna. “She lives in Canada—she’s not dead folks. She grew up in Vancouver.” Anna underscored the artist’s livelihood and location in the present day. “Her mother and she are a part of the Dzawada’enuxw Tribe,” Anna added, her words stressing Nicolson’s tribal affiliation.

Anna also invited her fourth graders to meet Michael Naranjo. On the whiteboard screen was a slide introducing fourth graders another artist. It read, “The Southwest, Michael Naranjo, Tewa.” Directly below this title a photograph of Naranjo was displayed, a square-faced, white
haired, stout man seated at a plywood workbench in his studio. He wore a grey long-sleeved shirt and blue jeans, and was smiling, his dark lashes arched into half-moons. His left arm angled up in an L-shape to hold the hand of one of his sculptures, a graphite-colored ceramic figure of a woman whose arm rose above Naranjos’ head from its perch on his workbench. “I’d like to introduce you to a living artist,” Anna announced. “His name is Michael Naranjo, and he is Native American from the Tewa tribe in the Southwest,” Anna stated as she clicked the remote to advance to the next slide. On it, the text informed, “This is Michael Naranjo today,” again reinforcing the artist’s living status. The accompanying image showed a recent photograph of Naranjo with close-cropped, peppered hair. His left hand gently cupped the cheek of one of his shiny black figural sculptures. Anna continued highlighting a few other textual points on the slide, underscoring Naranjo’s vitality and artmaking in the present day: “He works in a gallery that he designed in New Mexico.”

In her fifth grades, Anna introduced her students to WalkingStick. The title slide on the screen read, “The Southeast, Kay WalkingStick, Cherokee.” Below the title glowed a sepia-tone photograph of WalkingStick smiling large, her auburn hair falling in waves to just past her shoulders. WalkingStick wore a dark hued short-sleeve t-shirt and jeans. Paintbrushes stood at attention in a square container, next to bottles of paint on her worktable. “We’re going to be studying an artist living right now. Her name is Kay WalkingStick. She’s Cherokee,” Anna introduced as she waved her hand over the portrait of WalkingStick. Anna clicked to the next slide, upon which glowed another color photograph of WalkingStick. Her skin was bronzed as though she had a sunburn that was transforming into a tan, lips were painted red-pink around a full smile of teeth, golden earrings dangled from her ears, a gold necklace from here neck, and a gold bracelet encircled her wrist dotted by red and green gems. Her arms were folded and her
hands were nearly lost in the sleeves of the black, v-neck blouse that she wore. Anna offered, “She works in New York. She is a living artist.” Her words underscored the vitality and contemporary practice of the artist today.

Transforming and resisting tradition.

By presenting contemporary artists of Native American descent who are practicing today, Anna believed, “Besides the living part [that Native Americans are still alive], I think it teaches kids that styles change over time. Some artists integrate, or reject, or don’t think about it [traditional styles] at all.” Unlike Human Relations approaches, Anna’s multicultural programming did not insert discrete celebratory facts, artifacts, heroes, or holidays that emphasized static core traditions into mainstream curricula. Further accentuating the heterogeneity of the individual artists within the program, Anna instead showcased how some artists might draw from traditional influences, and some might not. In cases in which an artist did draw from traditional tropes, Anna underscored how the artist transformed a tradition in his or her appropriation of it. For instance, allow Anna to present to you two artists who were strongly inspired by elements of a tradition of their tribal ancestors, Nicolson and Lowe; and one who rejected tradition altogether and eschewed stereotypes, Naranjo-Morse.

While Anna shared that Nicolson, an artist Anna introduced to her fourth graders, was “really influenced by her Northwest heritage,” Anna additionally showed how Nicolson interpreted and transformed motifs from the button blanket traditions of the Dzawada’nuxw Tribe as the artist appropriated them into her own unique artworks. Let us peek into Anna’s presentation: On the screen was an image of a girl with a blanket shawled over her shoulders that hung like a tapestry from her outstretched arms. “They each have a—sort of a crest—an animal on the back of each blanket,” Anna shared. On the blanket, a figure with a beak, two wings, two
clawed feet, and tail feathers was outlined by light-colored button dots atop a dark background. Anna explained, “The older members think, ‘What animal represents the nature of this child? What animal would be important to this child?’ and they put that on the back.” The animal symbolism related to the identity of the child for whom it had been created.

The next image flashed on screen, and revealed three young adults with their blankets draped over their shoulders like capes. Each blanket displayed an animal: two with bird figures, and one with a more human looking face with eyebrows above round eyes, nostrils, a linear pair of lips. “The buttons outline the design,” Anna pointed out as she followed her finger loosely along each line of dots. She flipped to the next slide, which displayed one of Nicolson’s artworks, a bordered black-and-white photograph of a family surrounded by linear patterns constructed from dots. “I want you to notice this dotted pattern,” Anna said as she followed a finger along the lines of dots that made up floral petals and stems, and the face of a creature with spirals emanating out of both sides of its head. “I want you to look at the shapes that are created by these little circles. They stand in for the buttons on blankets that were on the families’ shelves.” Her explanation highlighted that Nicolson had transformed the buttons into dots in her own work, mirroring a design motif from the button blanket tradition of her Dzawada’enuxw ancestors.

Anna then drew students’ attention to the hand printed word at the bottom, “Am’yaxid.” She pointed out, “She [Nicolson] chooses to use her language of her native people for her titles, to preserve the native tongues of indigenous people.” Nicolson’s artwork was presented as a vehicle for keeping tribal tradition and language alive. On the following slide was an unbordered black-and-white photo of a family. A boy and a girl stood flanking a centrally seated, older bearded man. Two younger boys were seated on the ground at his feet.
two older children who were standing beside him were each wrapped in blankets patterned with button dots. The two younger children wore undecorated blankets. “This is where this all comes from—her family and her tribe all have these button blankets,” Anna offered, again reinforcing that Nicolson was drawing on a familial tradition. “Usually a grandma or an auntie will make this blanket for a child when they reach a certain age,” she said as she pointed to the two older children who wore decorated blankets.

The next image revealed a blanket emblazoned with another bird figure. The bird was outlined in white button dots and filled in with a rust color, contrasting sharply with the dark background within which it was centered. A border of the same rust color ran along the four edges of the blanket, with the exception of a gap at the top center of the border. “This idea right here,” Anna pointed to the gap, “is part of the family tradition. In the old days, they used to have something called a smokehouse, and this would be the hole to let the smoke out. I’m sure they don’t live in smokehouses today, but that is where the idea came from.” I noted that her words simultaneously underscored that the smokehole was a tradition of the past, that members of the tribe are still alive today, and that the design had its origins in a tradition of Nicolson’s tribal ancestors. On the next slide, a two-headed bird was emblazoned on a blanket, along with another smokehole in the red border above its head. “The smokehole was also put in there so that the spirits can come in,” Anna commented, further contextualizing the tradition. She flipped through several more images of blankets with button dot patterns outlining a centralized animal motif. Each blanket was bordered with wide strips of red, and a majority displayed a gap at the top to symbolize a smokehole.

The subsequent images focused on six of Nicolson’s large-scale paintings. “Marianne Nicolson uses the idea of the button blankets as a motif for her paintings. You can see how she’s
utilized the idea of the button,” Anna pointed out as she tapped her fingers along dotted patterns that formed spirals, arrows, triangles, plus signs, floral motifs, circles, and trapezoids within the paintings. “Her paintings are huge. This painting is from here to the wall, and down to the floor,” explained Anna as she gestured from herself to the far wall, and held her hand in a plank above her head to indicate the height. Four of the six paintings also displayed a red border and smokehole, reminiscent of the blankets. “You see this hole at the top?” asked Anna, tapping the gap. “It’s like the smokehole in the home,” she verbally drew the symbolic connection for her students. “She’s purposely chosen her native tongue and her language. She wants to keep her native language alive.” Anna again underscored how Nicolson drew on the traditions of her ancestors in her artwork, noted Nicolson’s appropriation as a means of helping that tradition to survive, and reinforced that art could be a metaphorical language. By making a direct link for students through a strategic juxtaposition of images and narration, Anna demonstrated how Nicolson appropriated motifs from the traditions of her ancestors and transformed them as she incorporated them into her own contemporary artworks.

Like Nicolson, Lowe also drew on traditions from his tribal ancestors. As Anna explained to her first grade classes, “He [Lowe] was influenced by the area that he grew up in, and the Ho Chunk culture that he is a part of.” On the screen, alighted atop a diamond of yellow and brown earth, was one of Lowe’s sculptures, a large skeletal bird with a wingspan of over twenty feet, its frame constructed from pale white sticks. The next slide revealed a picture of a placid river, lined by trees varying hues of orange, red, green and yellow, brightened the screen. “This is what it looks like where he grew up,” offered Anna, visually illustrating a contextual influence on the artist’s work. A series of subsequent images showed how a number of effigy mounds had been integrated into the Woodlands landscape around which Lowe was raised. Anna clarified the
authorship of the artworks shown on screen: “He didn’t do it, but his ancestors built these mounds. Around the river, they made mounds of dirt.” She clicked to a black-and-white topographical map depicting a curving river with banks lined by a parade of simplified four-legged animals stenciled onto the page, revealing another perspective on the location of the effigy mounds. The next image displayed an effigy in relief, a raised berm of green grass shaped in the profile of a four-legged animal and outlined in beige earth and rocks. “This is an effigy mound. It’s a depiction of an animal. Sometimes it’s the shape of an animal, and sometimes it’s not. Sometimes people didn’t know they were there,” Anna narrated. The last effigy mound that appeared on screen was of a wild goose, its wings extended.

Next, a picture of Lowe flashed onto screen. Seated at a workbench, Lowe’s fingertips held a stick similar to the ones from which his bird sculpture, shown earlier, was created. “Truman Lowe is a sculptor. When he made his bird effigy he was thinking about his Ho Chunk heritage and the effigy mounds that he grew up around,” Anna explained. Lowe’s sculpture of a bird, the one that Anna had showed at the outset of the presentation, again flashed onto screen. “That bird there came from his background and his heritage,” informed Anna, pointing to the image on the screen, which was reminiscent of the last effigy mound of a wild goose that was shown right before Lowe’s sculpture. Below the image, the text reads, “Do you see the connection?”

Anna concluded the presentation: “Truman Lowe is an artist. He’s going to make the art his own, but he’s going to take some of the things he learned from his culture as a child.” Her description emphasized Lowe’s inspiration from artforms created by his Ho Chunk ancestors, and his transformation of those concepts as he integrated them into his own contemporary artworks.
In contrast, the work of Naranjo-Morse was shown to diverge from traditions and to challenge expectations about Native American art. “I’m going to introduce you to a woman who loves clay—she even writes poems about clay. This is Nora Naranjo-Morse,” announced Anna to her fourth graders. She directed her students’ attention to the style of Naranjo-Morse’s work: “Let’s talk about realistic and abstract—those are two opposites.” On the screen glowed an image that displayed four cylindrical ginger-colored obelisks that bulged slightly in the middle, and were capped by small cubes that potentially represented a heads. “This is called Four Sisters—their figures are abstracted,” Anna offered. “I met Nora and her sister Edna. Edna works in a very traditional way. Nora and her sister would go to the market, and nobody would buy Nora’s work, and she was very disappointed. They [consumers] wanted the traditional stuff.”

This called to mind for me Erin Montan’s (Anna’s consultant on Native American issues) story about a contemporary artist of Native American ancestry who used to show at the “Indian Market” in Santa Fe, New Mexico, and “the typical leather stuff he had would sell out.” Montan elaborated, “Native people who do art typically find when people are trying to buy from them, it’s got to be leather, it’s got to have beads.” Otherwise, artwork that did not conform to expectations of what was considered “Native American art” would not sell. Though Naranjo-Morse’s work diverged from tradition, she persisted with her own abstract style. Anna explained, “But Nora kept on working in her abstract way that she liked. Nora takes things and she simplifies them—that’s called abstraction. Simplified, but giving the impression of more.”

“This is called Mud Woman,” stated Anna, as a doughy ceramic female figure appeared on a subsequent screen. Around the figure’s waist flowed a sienna colored skirt made from clay. Her pink tinted lips formed an O-shape, as though she was whistling. She had two brown dots high on her head, like gingerbread eyes. The figure mirrored the doughy form of the sculpture
shown on the cover of a book, displayed on the same slide. “She [Naranjo-Morse] wrote books. This one’s called Mud Woman [Naranjo-Morse, 1992].” Anna tapped the image of the book cover that bore the same name as the sculpture. “She writes how she felt rejected because her work was so different than everybody else’s. She grew up in this clay working family, and they would take their work to Santa Fe. Her family made very traditional pottery, and the people there, the tourists who came looking for things to buy, wanted artwork that looked very traditional, but she doesn’t work that way. People rejected her work at first because it wasn’t a typical tourist clay,” Anna reiterated. Naranjo-Morse’s artwork did not conform to, as Montan put it, “The Indian you had in mind.” Anna appeared to be underscoring Naranjo-Morse’s unique individual style as an artist of Native American descent. Her work challenged ahistoric visions of Native American art, and underscored the heterogeneity of artworks created by Native American artists.

As Anna explained, “Sometimes traditional arts influence the artists, sometimes they do not. In some cases, the making of art is passed down from parent to child. It’s a way of preserving a tradition, even though they [the next generation of artists] may have totally reinterpreted it.” With the inclusion of artists who drew from tradition—and transformed it—as well as those who did not, Anna commented that she intended to share various “lifestyles and attitudes about art” that different artists have, and to reveal that traditions are not static, but rather change over time.

*Stressing Hybridity*

Furthermore, Anna highlighted the multiplex of influences that each individual Native American artist drew from in addition to and outside of the traditions of their tribal ancestors, and stretching across ethnic boundaries. In doing so, she underscored the hybridity of these
artists’ creations, which is in accord with the suggestions of scholars (e.g., Bastos, 2006; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; lok, 2005; MacPhee, 2004; Parks, 2000, 2004; Stuhr, 1994).

In her research into each artist, Anna articulated that she sought to answer, “How does each evolve as an artist? What influenced his [or her] choices, [and] thought processes?” Anna underscored, “We are walking experience and impressions and history.” Her words echoed those of WalkingStick (2009)—an artist of Cherokee descent and one of the artists featured in Anna’s program—who commented on her artistic influences during an NAEA conference presentation: “We are affected by everything we see, everything we do, all the people who came into our life.” Both Anna and WalkingStick were stressing the complex network of influences that artists might draw from, culminating in the hybrid nature of an artist’s creations.

*Inspiration from other artists’ works.*

Anna often showed, through visual parallels in her presentations, how the artist she was showcasing was influenced by the work of other artists. As shown in the cases of Nicolson and Lowe above, these influences might be from other artists in the artist’s tribe of ancestry. However, Anna also extended this sphere of influence to include artists from outside of an artist’s ethnic background.

For example, Anna revealed to her second graders that Feddersen drew inspiration from artists from his tribe of ancestry, as well as from contemporary artists outside of his tribal heritage. On the screen glowed an image of a woven chestnut brown parfleche, with a faint beige zigzag pattern that bounced back-and-forth within the rows of a grid of squares. Beside it was displayed a print of Feddersen’s work, whose gridded zigzag patterns mirrored that of the parfleche. “See where he’s incorporating that zigzag into his prints,” commented Anna as she pointed from the bag to the print, then flipped to the next slide, on which another patterned

---

31 A parfleche is a bag made from the hide of an animal.
parfleche was juxtaposed next to another of Feddersen’s prints. “These are traditional bags,” she offered as she circled her palm over the image of the parfleche. “Feddersen’s ancestors are from the Inland Plateau Region of the Columbia Basin. The design comes from the mountain ranges, and the water in between,” she explained as an image of a glistening pond, layered by lily pads, and bordered by tall grass and pines, appeared briefly on the screen to visually reinforce the connection. Another patterned parfleche and photo of Feddersen’s similarly zigzag patterned prints followed to reiterate the parallel.

Anna clicked to the next slide, which revealed two images: “This is a traditional basket, and this is one of his baskets,” Anna commented. On the left was a woven basket textured with rows of shallow pyramids in relief, apexes pointing outward. Their topography gave the two-dimensional appearance of squares divided into four equal triangles. Beneath the basket read, “Old Basket.” Next to it stood an image labeled, “Feddersen’s Basket.” His work reflected that of the “Old Basket,” as it was patterned by drawn rows of squares divided diagonally into beige and darker brown triangles. “Feddersen takes old traditions like basketry and makes it his own,” Anna asserted. While Feddersen drew on a tradition from his ancestors, and took inspiration from the concepts from which they took inspiration—elements of the landscape—he transformed the artistry as he appropriated concepts and motifs into his contemporary artwork.

“This is Joe Feddersen’s printmaking,” said Anna as she clicked to the next slide, on which there was a sienna-colored grid of rectangles layered over a fainter grid of squares that ran on a diagonal. The underlayer of squares glowed from a light blue, to yellow, to a rust color, from left to right. Flags of stained and mottled blues and oranges filled in alternating spaces on the overlaying grid of rectangles. “Joe Feddersen was influenced—also, besides the arts and crafts of his people—by other people like Richard Diebenkorn.” An image flashed onto screen
revealing a large square canvas painted in layers of translucent lavender, purple, aqua blue, teal blue, and beige. It had a few sparse black lines running horizontally, and then crossed by two thin diagonal lines. The label next to it read, “Ocean Park No. 70, 1975.” The image that followed showed another work in Diebenkorn’s series, this time in more opaque pastels and whites, with a pair of thin diagonal lines crossing vertical lines. “Here’s another artist. This is Frank Stella, and he’s a favorite painter of mine, too.” On a rectangular canvas, a pair of yellowish-green tinted white rectangles were shown separated in the middle by a dull maroon stripe. Beneath this part of the composition, the garish white color of the rectangles above alternated with sienna in horizontal stripes. The next image of Stella’s work included a black rectangle with thin grayish outlines of concentric rectangles entering from its top and bottom borders. The juxtaposition of the artworks revealed a link between Feddersen’s work and that of Diebenkorn and Stella. Anna’s narration highlighted Feddersen’s artistic hybridity, as he drew from traditional artistic tropes utilized by his tribal ancestors, his surrounding landscape, and from the work of non-Native American artists.

Anna showed her fourth grade classes that Naranjo took influence from the work of Michelangelo. As Naranjo was pictured standing high on a scaffolding, his left hand gliding over the eye and cheek of the tremendously large head of a pale stone sculpture—its nose was larger than Naranjo’s hand—Anna shared, “The Pope gave permission for Michael to feel Michelangelo’s sculpture, David. It was such a profound experience. From it, he [Naranjo] learned how to articulate the eyes, the features, the muscles.” On the next slide, Naranjo was shown in a similar position, this time his hand stroked the cheek of one of his own figural sculptures. The influence of Michelangelo on Naranjo was made evident through both a juxtaposition of visual imagery that paralleled one another, as well as Anna’s narration.
Anna stressed with her fourth graders that Bartow was also influenced by artists outside of his tribal affiliation. On the screen, two images glowed. On the left panel, a winged fish flew across a swirling blue sky. From behind the fish’s closed jaw, a hand stretched out of a dark blue sleeve towards a floating violin and bow. A golden pendulum dangled within the casing of a mahogany antique clock cabinet that extended out from behind the fish’s belly. Beneath the image read, “Marc Chagall, 1887-1985, Time is a River Without Banks, 1930-1939.” Anna commented, “He [Bartow] likes Western artists. He says he’s more connected to Western artists than any Native American artists. That differs from one artist to another.” Her words highlighted that, though Bartow was an artist of Native American ancestry, his influences were drawn from outside of his ethnic heritage. Moreover, Anna’s explanation exempted Bartow’s experience from generalization to others by stressing the differences between individual artists. Anna continued, “He was influenced by Marc Chagall.” Her words echoed those inscribed above the two panels on the slide. On the right panel was a pastel portrait of a man with a bandaged head. Hues of yellow and pink contrasted with blue, green, and lavender shadows to form the contours of his face. A black bird, wings spread wide, emanated from the face’s mouth. Outlines of two hands rose up on both sides of his face. Beneath it the text read, “Rick Bartow.” Students were provided a visual, textual, and oral reinforcement of the link between Bartow and Chagall’s artistry.

The next slide showed Bartow’s rendition of Vermeer’s “Girl with the Pearl Earring,” alongside a reproduction of Vermeer’s original work. Bartow’s rendition was made with anxious slashes and scribblings of painted color. “Sometimes he [Bartow] takes other artist’s work, and transforms it. Bartow was also influenced by Vermeer.” Anna again highlighted a non-Native
American influence on Bartow’s artistry, and stressed the idea that artists borrow and transform elements from other artist’s work.

*Drawing from personal life experiences.*

Further expanding the multitude of sources an artist might be influenced by, Anna also showed how the artists drew from personal experiences in their lives. These were predominantly experiences that did not reference an artist’s tribal heritage.

For instance, in addition to being influenced by the work of other artists, Anna explained to her fourth graders that Bartow was strongly influenced by events he had experienced in his life. “Bartow is a veteran of the Vietnam War. In the war he was damaged psychologically.” She pointed to the pastel portrait of a man glowing on the screen. “After a while, he began making things. One thing that was hard for him to work through was any transition, change. But he began to like transition and change. He really worked through a lot with his art. He used it as healing.” She shared that she had seen a video of Bartow in which he constructed his paintings in a very physical manner, vigorously using both hands to swash the paint onto canvas to create his pieces. The pastel portrait on the screen reflected the vigorous movements Anna described: It depicted a grey-faced man, skin marred by long slashes of black, lavender, green, and pink, with hard strokes of dark pastel scratches that formed cavernous eyes. From its black cave of mouth, a bird’s head emerged. “He puts things together, like animals and himself,” said Anna, underscoring Bartow’s anthropomorphic theme, one that reflected the idea of transition and change.

Naranjo was also a veteran of the Vietnam War. Anna explained to her fourth graders, “Michael became an artist after he was blinded in Vietnam.” Overcoming his physical challenge, as a sculptor, “He’s learned to feel with his hands, and see with his hands.” His figures evoked a
sense of freedom and playfulness. On the screen was an image of a shiny dark sculpture of a woman with a tank top and shorts on. Her hair was swept up in a short ponytail. She squatted on her right leg, extended her left, and held out her right hand, upon which a butterfly had alighted. “Disability is not a word in his vocabulary,” Anna’s words echoed the text above the image.

In her second grade, Anna shared how Lavadour also drew from his life experiences—particularly the surrounding environment he ventured into regularly. A slide flashed up on screen revealing a photo of a river flowing forward from the background between rocky green river banks. A range of green-grey mountains rose in the background into a stunningly clear blue sky. Above it read, “James Lavadour is influenced by the eastern Oregon landscape.” Anna narrated, “Everyday, everyday, he goes for a walk in nature. All those things find their way into his paintings.” She flipped through a series of landscape images from the eastern Oregon plateau region. The first displayed a dark stream with green mountain ranges that rose in the background and continued past the top border of the photo. The second revealed grassy beige plateaus sprinkled by wild green shrubs, with a ribbon of mountains on the horizon, and an expansive blue sky filled with dramatic cumulus clouds. The third showed a foreground filled with yellow-green shrubbery, midground of expansive glassy river, and background of rolling misty mountain ranges. These landscape images intermingled within a series of Lavadour’s oil paintings. One consisted of sixteen panels juxtaposed together in a square, containing shifting images of cliffs flooded and shadowed by sunlight. The next showed nine panels arranged in a square, each with mountains of striated rock, glowing in coordinated colors of translucent lavender, burnt sienna, ochre, lime, periwinkle, and fuchsia. Another displayed a sunset flowing from peachy-orange, to hot red, to pastel yellow, overlain with striations of deep brown mountain cliffs. Again, the text, and Anna’s words, emphasized the influence that this artist’s personal life experiences had on his
work, and the images vibrantly illustrated the translation of his experiences into his artistic creations.

In her fifth grade classes, Anna showed that WalkingStick was influenced by personal events in her life, her emotional responses to these, and her memories of them. On the screen was a diptych, its left panel revealing warm, fleshy rolls of umber and sienna mountain ranges receding into a pale yellow sky. Anna ran her hand along the bottom edge of the image and explained, “There is this ancient grounded feel—a long memory that goes back to ancient times.” On the right panel, in a sandy-toned space framed by a hairline of red, was a dancing amber silhouette, arms spread wide to the sides, right leg kicking backward, head tilted so its chin was thrust skyward. Anna stroked her palm upward on this image as she continued, “And an in the moment snapshot—a snapshot memory.” WalkingStick’s (2009) elaborations on this piece during an NAEA presentation aligned with Anna’s descriptions. Standing on a broad expanse of stage, WalkingStick swept a gold bangled arm up towards an image of this diptych, and shared, “For me, these were about the passing of time.” She pointed to the dancing silhouette, and offered, “That flash of time captured in a second.” She waved her hand to the panel of fleshy mountains, and commented, “The abstraction was about long term memory.” WalkingStick chanted, “They’re about thoughts, they’re about memory, they’re about how things feel.”

Further revealing the expression of emotions in WalkingStick’s work, the next slide revealed another diptych: A hot reddish-fuchsia mountain range angling upward out of a centered valley on the left panel, alongside a silhouetted dancing couple framed within a square space of the same sizzling red-fuchsia color on the right. “It reflects her emotional life,” explained Anna. “Many cultures, I won’t say all, bring emotional life into art.” A subsequent slide showed the silhouetted legs of a couple dancing dangle out of the top of the frame. Prints of
In addition, WalkingStick spoke directly to her ethnic hybridity—her biracialness—with the structure of her work. “She does diptychs,” Anna explained as she scrolled through a series of WalkingStick’s dual paneled works. “She uses these, and examines herself, her duality. Kay WalkingStick is biracial. Her father is Cherokee and her mom is Scotch-Irish.” Anna’s words paraphrased the text on the slide. When I asked WalkingStick how ethnicity had influenced her work, she replied, “I have been influenced by Western art tremendously, and by everything I’ve seen and read. Indian history—I grew up in this [Western] culture and had to find out about my Indian heritage. You can’t say that one thing has been the biggest influence.” She utilized the diptych structure as a metaphor for her hybridity. During her NAEA presentation, WalkingStick (2009) clapped her palms together, “It’s the bringing together of disparate elements that is important to me.” Her work synthesized a multiplicity of influences into artworks that spoke to her own hybrid nature.

These explorations of individual artist’s approaches to artistic creation stressed the ideas of hybridity and syncretization—that individual artists were continually influenced by a diversity of experiences, and dynamically transformed them into something new (as suggested by Berry & Martin, 2003; Pratt, 1992). Rather than focusing on the formal composition of each artist’s work, Anna instead drew students’ attention to how each artist generated the ideas and concepts that shaped their artistic creations. The presentations contextualized these artists’ approaches to
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artmaking, emphasizing the “non-material” aspects of their artworks, as suggested by Adejumo (2002). Importantly, Anna’s presentations highlighted that each of the artists drew on and incorporated a plethora of experiences in life that transcended ethnic and geographic borders in their creations of artworks (as underscored by Ballengee-Morris, 2008; Barbosa, 1999; Bastos, 2006; Carpenter II, Bey, & Smith, 2007; Chalmers, 1999; Dash, 2005; Desai, 2000, 2003, 2005; Gall, 2006; Jaddo, 2007).

**Abandoning a Western Ethnocentric Perspective**

Another strong criticism leveled by scholars against Human Relations approaches is their use of mainstream-centric, Eurocentric criteria to select artworks for inclusion in a curriculum (Banks, 2006a). Due to Anna’s selection of artists from the Eiteljorg Museum’s³³ exhibitions, the artworks in her program could be criticized for similarly mainstream, Eurocentric, museum collection criteria. However, for a number of reasons, I do not believe this would be a just appraisal in Anna’s case.

As a contemporary artist herself, the curator of the Eiteljorg’s contemporary Native American art collection stated her non-conventional position: “I’m not an art historian. . . . I haven’t developed the collection based on theory” (as cited by Lloyd, 2008). Instead, the curator selected artworks idiosyncratically. In line with this, she articulated one of her philosophies, “I want to be on the edge, and I want to be in the fray. I’m not that mainstream. I’m OK with sticking out” (as cited by Lloyd, 2008).

In addition, seven of the eight artists highlighted in Anna’s curriculum participated in the Eiteljorg Museum’s Fellowship for Native American Fine Art³⁴ exhibitions. Works for these
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³³ Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art in Indianapolis, Indiana.
³⁴ Six fellows are selected every two years for a special Fellowship for Native American Fine Art exhibition. The following artists, included in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum, have been Eiteljorg
exhibitions were juried for inclusion by an independent panel that included former Fellows, and each Fellow was an artist of Native American heritage. Bartow, a 2001 Fellow, and one of the contemporary Native American artists included in Anna’s curriculum, discussed his criteria for selecting artworks for subsequent Fellowship exhibitions: “It’s a gut reaction, initially it has to be, because you’re looking at so many slides. Boom, boom, boom, boom, wow… so then we mark it down—the one that made you go, “wow!”” (as cited by Anderson & Manganello, 2008).

Furthermore, the artists that were selected for exhibition, and that Anna included in her program, were not all formally trained, well-known artists. Lavadour was a self-taught artist, aligning him with the series of outsider-artists explored by Neperud and Krug (1995) that served to challenge Eurocentric, bounded notions of culture and museum art. “There are some younger, less recognized artists, and then others who have received greater recognition,” commented Martin, curator of the Canadian Museum of Civilization, regarding Eiteljorg exhibitions (as cited by Anderson & Manganello, 2008).

In sum, the Eiteljorg curator of the exhibitions, from which Anna selected artists, identified herself and her process for developing collections as non-mainstream; fellow artists of Native American ancestry voiced their selections for pieces to be included in the exhibitions using their own criteria for selection; and the chosen artists were both self-taught and formally trained, well-known and less recognized. The selection of the artists for Eiteljorg exhibitions, and for Anna’s program by extension, seemed to challenge the idea that mainstream-centric, Eurocentric criteria had been utilized to determine their inclusion. Moreover, when artworks were presented in Anna’s artroom, they were investigated through the emic perspectives of the artists (detailed in the following section), further dispelling notions of Eurocentricity.

Sharing Each Artist’s Emic Perspectives as Voiced by that Artist

For each of the Contemporary Native American Artists in the series, Anna presented accurate, contextualized information using the firsthand, emic perspectives of these artists, as recommended by scholars (e.g., Adejumo, 2002; Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001, 2002; Chalmers, 1996, 2002; Irwin & Miller, 1997). She offered quotes from each artist about their approach to artistic creation, culling this information from artist statements and published interviews with each artist. Anna explained that her research into contemporary artists was much easier because “there is so much material about contemporary artists.” Anna reasoned, “Who talks better about their work than an artist?” She emphasized, “I like to stay true to the artist.”

Montan, Anna’s consultant on Native American concerns, recalled that all of the artists included in Anna’s program were living, and commented, “She [Anna] was making sure there was a way to get in touch with them.” Anna capitalized on this potential, and was able to supplement her research in several instances by personally consulting with the artist (as suggested by Irwin & Miller, 1997; Spang, 1995; Stuhr et al., 1992). She participated in a workshop with Naranjo-Morse, spent an afternoon conversing on the telephone with WalkingStick, and visited Lowe in Wisconsin. Anna explained, “With living artists it’s a bit easier to get under the surfaces.” She described her interview with Lowe as an example. He walked her through his studio and to the nearby effigy mounds in the surrounding locality. He explained to her that the effigy mounds were a key inspiration for his work. Anna recounted bits of their conversation: “I asked him, ‘Why use wood?’ Well, it reminds him of home. I asked, ‘Why use water images?’ He grew up on the river. ‘What does the water mean to you?’ Flow, flight, he remembered canoeing on the water. All related to his background, his experience
growing up as a Ho Chunk—this connection with the land.” These were the perspectives and ideas that she stressed with her students, as shown earlier.\(^35\)

Anna offered a reason for her preference for introducing students to individual artists through each artist’s own words: “One thing is that each person has a voice.” In Anna’s artist presentations, she strove to respect each individual’s positionality: “If an artist says they do not consider themselves a Native American artist, rather an artist first, I respect their individual identification.” For instance, Anna explained, “Rick Bartow, didn’t really consider himself Native American, and never lived on a reservation.” She has read articles about Bartow, and she reported that this literature did not detail that Bartow was of Native American ancestry. They emphasized, instead, that he was a “Vietnam vet[eran], [who] came back a mess. He uses art as healing and putting these pieces of his life back together.” She raised a brow and asserted, “Would I know he was Native American if I looked at his art? Maybe not.” Hence, she highlighted the influence of the psychological impact of the war on Bartow’s work when she introduced him to her fourth graders, as seen in the previous section.\(^36\)

Anna stressed her respect for the individual artist’s perspective and voice: “I try to zone into the style of that artist, as voiced by that artist.” Her presentations mirrored her beliefs, as revealed in the following selections from her presentations on Naranjo and WalkingStick.

Anna explained to her fourth graders, “I like quotes by artists—it tells us what they were thinking.” Her words underscored the emic perspectives of Naranjo that she was about to share. She scrolled through a series of slides, each of which contained both a quote from Naranjo, and an image of one of his figural sculptures. “Michael says, ‘If we’re true to what we work at, if we give it all we have, then the possibilities are enormous,’” Anna broadcasted as an image of a
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\(^35\) Discussed in the section entitled, “Transforming and resisting tradition.”

\(^36\) Discussed in the section entitled, “Personal life experiences.”
seated cross-legged figure appears in a wolf-skin hood, his head tilted back, gazing skyward. “Michael says, ‘Art is something to be appreciated on a very personal level; it is to be enjoyed while it’s happening and exists to give pleasure to those viewing it,’” Anna narrated as a photo was shown of a figure crouching on one foot, caught in mid-action as he seemed to climb through a hoop. “And Michael believes, ‘When you see someone’s work that excites you, it touches you inside—it might make you happy or make you sad, but whatever feeling it happens to evoke, it is a very emotional experience for both the artist and his audience.’” On the screen, a sculpture of a bare-chested male figure squat, balancing on the balls of his feet, and brandished a thin blade the length of his forearms in each hand. “He [Naranjo] says, ‘I am always excited about what tomorrow may bring in regards to creation of a new piece. Part of the joy of creating my work is sharing it with others, hoping that the viewer experiences as much pleasure in viewing as I do in its creation,’” Anna concluded as another standing shiny black figure tipped his hand and head in the direction of the words.

With her fifth graders, Anna shared, “A lot of times I have quotes from artists, because who better to tell you about them than themselves?” On the screen was a color photograph of WalkingStick. Her tousled long hair was a dark reddish brown and her lips were painted a deep pink around a full smile of teeth. Anna read aloud the text beside the portrait, “Kay WalkingStick says, ‘I’ve always considered myself more of a painter of the human condition than the Native American condition.’” Anna flashed quickly to the next slide, which revealed one of WalkingStick’s diptychs in muted tones, entitled “All of Us.” The words below it expressed WalkingStick’s position on her biracial duality and its relationship to her work: “Kay says: ‘The diptych is a powerful metaphor to express the beauty and power of uniting the disparate, and this makes it particularly attractive to those who are biracial.’”
The next slide displayed another diptych. On the left panel was a darkened golden fan shape striped vertically by a translucent earth brown band. On the right panel were what looked to me like white rushing rapids converging between sharp cliffs of raw umber striations of rock. Anna read aloud the text below the image, “This painting came at a time when Kay WalkingStick was grieving the sudden death of her husband of thirty years. She [WalkingStick] says that it is about the cascading nature of life and death.” During her NAEA presentation, WalkingStick (2009) echoed Anna’s account as she recalled this heartrending event and its relationship to this piece: “I saw the waterfalls as an onrush of time, the unstoppable.”

WalkingStick’s words of inclusiveness for all people within the human condition were again emphasized under the triptych on a subsequent slide. Anna read aloud the quote inscribed: “Kay WalkingStick says that, ‘My goal has long been to express our Native and non-Native shared identity. We humans of all races are more alike than different, and it is this shared heritage as well as my personal heritage I wish to express. I want all people to hold onto their cultures—they are precious—but I also want to encourage a mutual recognition of shared being.’” WalkingStick was a living, breathing exemplar of the hybridity in ethnicity and artistry that Anna sought to implicitly convey to her students with her Contemporary Native American Artists program. WalkingStick expressed this hybridity explicitly, through her own voice, paralleling Anna’s implicit ideology.

*Live, interactive visiting artists.*

Further vitalizing the artist’s emic perspective in her Contemporary Native American Artists program, Anna invited a practicing artist into the artroom to work directly with students (as suggested by scholars such as Adejumo, 2002; Andrus, 2001; Carpenter II et al., 2007; Chalmers, 1992, 2002; Stuhr, 1994; Stuhr et al., 1992). As part of the Contemporary Native
American Artists program in a previous year\(^{37}\), Sam Montan\(^{38}\), an artist who happened to be of Creek ancestry, conducted a series of workshops with Anna’s students. Montan shared with me that he does not like to say, “I’m a Native American artist,” but rather, “I am an artist who happens to be Native American.” Anna explained that this was how Montan introduced himself to her students, underscoring that he privileged his artist identity first in his creation of art.

Challenging a “feathers and leathers” stereotype of Native American art, Montan said he wanted the students to think “outside the box.” Mirroring his own approach to artmaking, Montan asked students to create sculptural artworks by piecing together items from their personal lives, performatively demonstrating that artists were influenced by various ideas from their own life experiences. For his workshop with the students, he asked them to bring in objects of importance to them, things that they really liked, “their favorite this, or their favorite that,” which they could incorporate into their artwork. They talked about why they liked these items, and why they were important to the student.

He talked to the students about the ways in which “diverse things can be brought together to solve a problem.” In their creation of artworks, he explained that students were “working towards a resolution, but not necessarily a complete one.” Montan believed that students were learning how to explore alternative potential resolutions to problems “by considering different things to attach with different solutions.” He explained that sometimes he thought of his own sculptural work as “little nuclear families” in that he brought together an assortment of materials and challenged himself to “put them together in a cohesive way,” finding one possible, albeit potentially incomplete and evolving, resolution to the problem at hand. His work itself seemed to

\(^{37}\) In the year I observed her program, the school’s budget could not support a visiting artist.

\(^{38}\) In-person interview with Sam Montan (pseudonym), May 19, 2009.
me to be a metaphor for creating one continually evolving cohesive U.S. community out of many
diverse parts.

_Summation of Argument 1_

Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program contrasted significantly with
Human Relations approaches to multiculturalism, and in doing so it evaded the critiques leveled
against them. While some of her goals aligned with those of Human Relations approaches (to
enhance interpersonal understandings; ameliorate prejudice, stereotyping, and racial conflicts;
and to recognize a shared U.S. community), some goals differed. She did not aim to promote
ethnic pride among minority and immigrant groups, nor did she aim to ease their assimilation
into the dominant mainstream of U.S. society. In addition, Anna was non-discriminatory in her
integration of the program. She engaged all of her students in it, rather than targeting it at a
specific cultural group of focus, another element critiqued in Human Relations approaches.
Moreover, instead of tacking-on cultural material as an appendage to the core curriculum as was
the case critiqued in Human Relations approaches (Banks, 2004, 2006a), non-Western and
Western art and artists seamlessly commingled as some of the many arts in the world that are
looked at for inspiration within Anna’s artroom.

Furthermore, unlike the essentialist and ahistoric visions of cultures forwarded by Human
Relations approaches, Anna illustrated the heterogeneity and vitality of individual artists of
Native American ancestry through her presentations. Attending to diversity along multiple
dimensions of identity in her selection of artists for the program (as suggested by Banks, 1994b,
1996a, 2004; Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1993, 1995; Gollnick & Chinn, 1990; Sleeter & Grant,
1988), Anna included in her program artists that differed from one another in terms of their tribal
affiliation, gender, age, training, and ability/disability. Undermining ahistoric notions of these
artists, Anna brought each artist to life in the present day in her artroom. She presented students with recent photographs of the artists dressed in contemporary attire, underscored their living status through her verbal explanations, spoke of each in the present tense, and indicated where they currently lived and worked, making art and continuing their contribution to the artworld today. Further challenging ahistoric representations and accentuating the heterogeneity of the individual artists within the program, Anna showcased how some artists might draw from traditions of their tribal influences, and some might not. In cases in which an artist was inspired by traditions, Anna underscored how the artist transformed a tradition in his or her appropriation of it, challenging the idea of static core traditions and instead emphasizing their dynamic evolution.

Stressing the hybrid nature of each artist’s creations, as suggested by scholars (e.g., Bastos, 2006; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; lok, 2005; MacPhee, 2004; Parks, 2000, 2004; Stuhr, 1994), Anna showed that each artist drew on a multiplex of influences in addition to or outside of ethnic traditions and influences, further underlining their heterogeneity. Anna highlighted that artists drew inspiration from Native American and non-Native American art and artists, stretching across ethnic boundaries. Furthermore, artists drew inspiration from personal experiences in their lives, whether they be events, their environment, memories, emotions, challenges and triumphs, or otherwise. By focusing on how each artist generated the ideas and concepts that shaped their artistic creations, Anna’s presentations contextualized these artists’ approaches to artmaking, and showcased the “non-material” aspects of their artworks, as suggested by Adejumo (2002). Her presentations illustrated how a complex network of life experiences that transcended ethnic and geographic borders shaped each of the artists’ creations.
In contrast with Human Relations approaches, Anna’s did not utilize a Western ethnocentric lens in her selection and presentation of artworks for her Contemporary Native American Artists program. Anna selected her works from the Eiteljorg Museums collections, and the pieces for these collections were selected in a manner that challenged Eurocentricity, as discussed earlier. Moreover, Anna shared each artist’s works through the emic perspectives of the artists, further dispelling notions of Eurocentricity. In addition, further embracing the voice of the artist, she introduced her students to a visiting artist who shared his personal approach to artmaking as an artist who happened to be Native American.

In sum, rather than forwarding stereotypes or exacerbating prejudices, a primary critique leveled against Human Relations approaches, each of the Contemporary Native American Artists presentations that Anna shared with her students provided them with vivid counterstories to a Native American stereotype and a dominant Eurocentric art canon.

Argument 2: A Unique Approach that Promotes Knowledge Construction and Transformation Without Confrontation

Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program is unique in that it promotes knowledge construction and transformation through its intrinsic structure, content integration, and dynamic approach to knowledge, without directly confronting the issues of conflict suggested by advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches. As discussed in Chapter 2, there are two potential alternatives to Human Relations approaches suggested by the literature: Transformative Multicultural and Social
Reconstruction/Action. In addition to advocating the manner in which content was integrated into Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program, as discussed in the previous argument, advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches suggest that multicultural programs additionally address Banks’s (1994b, 1995b, 1996e, 2004) dimension of knowledge construction and transformation.

**Structure**

Banks (1996e) suggested that the structure of a curriculum that promotes knowledge construction and transformation would be centered on concepts, events, and issues that would be presented from the perspectives of a diverse series of groups (men and women from different ethnic groups, social classes, and so on). Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum reflected this structure in that it centered on the idea of Native American art as its concept for deconstruction, and presented diverse individual artists’ approaches to this concept. In an exploration of the concept of Native American art, as seen in the previous argument, Anna introduced her elementary school students to eight individual artists of Native American ancestry, each of whom had his or her own unique approach to artmaking. Anna asserted that, for art teachers, the “best service” we can do for our students in a multicultural vein is “present individual artists driven by their own compass. Artists take what their experiences are, their thoughts, etcetera, and express them through representations.”

*Examining the Ideology, Positionality, and Frame of Reference of a Creator of Knowledge*


---

39 I refer to positionality here as how one’s context interacts with various dimensions of one’s identity (such as gender, class, and ethnicity) to effect how one interprets the world (Tetreault, 1993).
transformation as a process that helps students to recognize that knowledge is socially
constructed and reflects the ideology\textsuperscript{40} of its creators.

\textit{Artworks as Knowledge Sites for Deconstruction}

In the field of art education, a number of scholars have indicated that artworks serve as
the sites of knowledge for deconstruction (e.g., Atkinson & Dash, 2005; Ballengee-Morris, 2002,
2008; Bastos, 2006; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2005, 2007; Dash, 2005; Davenport, 2000;
Desai, 2000, 2005; Efland et al., 1996; Klein, 2008; Knight, 2006; lok, 2005; Parks, 2000, 2004;
Staikidis, 2005; Ward, 2005). With artworks as the knowledge texts, artists are then one of the
creators of this knowledge—a partial perspective of the world that is open to further
interpretation in its dynamism. Artists’ ideology, frame of reference, positionality, and social and
contextual influences become relevant areas for investigation.

In her presentation of each Native American artist, Anna utilized each artist’s
compendium of artworks as the sites for deconstruction. She showed that an artist who created an
artwork carries with him or her ideologies (unconscious and conscious beliefs, values, or ways of
thinking that impel an artist’s thoughts, interpretations, and interactions with the world), and
contextual experiences that interact with various dimensions of their identity including, but not
limited to, their Native American heritage (positionality). Anna’s presentations showed how
these ideologies and positionalities, as frames of reference, shaped each artist’s interpretations of
the world as suggested through their artworks.

Sometimes the artist’s ethnic affiliations (a dimension influencing their positionality)
were strongly reflected in his or her work, and sometimes they were not. The artwork of
Nicolson and Lowe strongly reflected their responses to and representations of the traditions of

\textsuperscript{40} I refer to ideology here as both the unconscious and conscious beliefs, values, or ways of thinking that impel
individuals’ thoughts, interpretations, and interactions with the world (Decker, 2004).
their tribal ancestors\textsuperscript{41} and their desire to keep those traditions alive, though as evolved through their own interpretations of them. Naranjo-Morse, on the other hand, resisted expectations of “the Indian you had in mind,” and chose to work outside of traditional tropes with her abstract ceramic figures. Feddersen drew from his tribal ancestor’s tradition of abstracting motifs from the landscape, as well as appropriated from abstract artists outside of his tribal affiliation, like Diebenkorn and Stella, and syncretized these into his own contemporary interpretations.

As indicated in the previous argument, a number of artists in Anna’s program also drew from contextual experiences unrelated to their ethnic affiliations, such as non-Native American artists, as well as events in their personal lives. For instance, Naranjo, blinded during the Vietnam War, had to learn to see with his fingers and became a sculptor after the war. His figural sculptures were additionally impacted by his tactile explorations of the figural sculptures of Michelangelo. Bartow appropriated from the dreamlike works of Chagall, and utilized his artmaking as a vehicle for a transitional process of healing from the psychological damage he incurred during his participation in the Vietnam War. His artworks became outpourings of this process of emotional and psychological transition and often included content depicting transformations from animal into human. Lavadour let the natural elements in his surrounding landscape inspire his artwork as his pieces reflected his interpretations of his contextual experiences walking outdoors as a daily ritual. WalkingStick’s diptychs spoke directly to her biracial duality in their structure and symbolism. They also were manifestations of her perspectives on long-term and snapshot memories. They additionally expressed her emotional interpretations of events in her life like the pain of losing her husband and joy of entering into a new relationship. In each case, the archive of artworks that were shown were deconstructed in

\textsuperscript{41} For Nicolson, it was the button blankets and smokehole structures of her Dzawada’enuxw ancestors; and for Lowe, it was the effigy mounds built by his Ho Chunk ancestors.
terms of the ideologies, positionalities and frames of reference that the artists brought to their creations.

Students’ Performatively Experienced these Artists’ Ideologies and Positionalities

Moreover, the students’ approaches to creation followed that of the artist who inspired their lesson, enabling students to performatively construct their own artworks in a manner that paralleled the artist under exploration. They were called on to self-reflect on a particular ideology, experience a particular positionality, see from a specific frame of reference, and/or to draw on a contextual influence (of which the artist of inspiration became a part), just as the artist of inspiration did.

For example, second graders were called on to respond to their surrounding environment and to paint their interpretations of it just as Lavadour did in the creation of his artworks. After showing a series of photographs revealing Lavadour’s surrounding mountainous landscape from which he drew inspiration, interspersed with a series of his interpretations of them as rendered in layers of oil paint, Anna had students draw from their surrounding environment for inspiration just as Lavadour did. “I’m going to show you Illinois because that’s what I want you to think about,” Anna asserted. She flipped through a series of slides of Central Illinois landscapes. One displayed a road disappearing from the foreground to the horizon, with nothing but acres of flat grassland on both sides—three-fourths of the image was above the horizon line, and was filled with light blue sky and drifting wisps of clouds. Another showed dried brush, leafless branches of shrubs and trees, and a couple of pine trees surrounded an icy pond. The next image revealed rows of trees lining a grassy flatland. The last slide depicted a flat goldenrod parcel of farmland stretched wide beneath a clear blue sky. None of the images included mountainous areas, only flat horizons and blue sky, which was characteristic of the surrounding terrain. “Hey, that’s right
here!” one of the students pointed out enthusiastically as an image of the dry prairie flatland terrain surrounding the school flashed onto the screen. Anna chuckled in response, “I took that just down the street.” She was leading students to draw from their own surrounding landscapes, their contextual experiences, just as Lavadour had pulled from his.

In another example from Anna’s fifth grade classes, a deconstruction of WalkingStick’s ideology and conceptual process were a springboard for students’ subsequent ideation and creative construction in a manner similar to that of WalkingStick. After viewing a series of WalkingStick’s artworks, and deconstructing them in terms of how the artist used her diptychs to express her biracial duality, the duality of her long term memories represented through images from nature in contrast with snapshot memories represented through her use of symbology, her expression of emotional and psychological responses to events in her life, and her use of visually unifying devices to harmonize the two panels of her diptychs, Anna invited students to create a work that would draw on similar concepts. Like WalkingStick’s method of conceptualization, students were called upon to reflect on dualities found within their own identities, to work with images from nature and symbols to express these dualities in diptychs, and to unify these two panels visually as WalkingStick did. “We are going to think about our own dualities,” Anna prompted students. “Now, you might think something easy, like good and bad, but that’s kind of generic. I want us to use more expressive words. After we write about four to five dualities—” Anna’s mouth was open to continue the sentence when she was interrupted. A boy raised his hand and interjected, “What are dualities?”

“Opposites,” Anna explained. “We have, you and I, duality in ourselves. What do I mean by that? Well, for example, sometimes I am lonely,” her voice lowered in volume an octave as she frowned, crossed her arms, and slumped her shoulders. “And sometimes I am gregarious, and
I want to be around a lot of people,” she offered perkily as she smiled and tossed her palms out to her sides. “Sometimes I feel grumpy,” she bared her teeth and furrowed her brows. “And sometimes delighted,” she smiled and bopped her head from side-to-side. She clicked to the next slide and read aloud a series of opposites that were listed on it, “They might be things like order/chaos, symbolic/pictorial, spiritual/material, outer world/inner world, contracted/expansive.” She offered multiple examples to spark their ideation process.

Lit by the glow of the screen, Anna held up a small half-sheet of manila paper, and folded it in half vertically. “This is our working it out idea page.” She jiggled the paper in the air. With this exercise she seemed to be encouraging her students to take time to ruminate and explore their own identities and dualities, without jumping to one simple solution. “I want you to put your laundry list of opposites on the back of the page. Once you have that, I want you to pick a pair. Then, on the other side, you are going to put your images. I want you to find a picture of nature that represents one of your opposites. Now it has to be a nature thing, not a machine or manmade. On your final, good work, you’re going to have to paint this. On the other side of the page, you’re going to represent your other opposite like a snapshot moment in time with a symbol, and you’ll draw this in Craypas. You are making a diptych of your two opposites. As an artist, I’m asking you to think about how to unify the whole thing.” She directed students to investigate visual metaphors, and to draw on WalkingStick’s method of creative conceptualization as well as production.

I circumnavigated a table of three girls. One had juxtaposed two columns side-by-side, listing: “peaceful/wild, scared/bold, tame/ferocious.” Across from her, one of her tablemates pursed her lips as she stared at the ceiling, squinted her eyes, and tapped the end of her pencil on her “working it out idea page.” In a column on the left, she had written “beautiful,” on the right,
“horrifying;” then “give;” and “take;” “love;” and “hate;” “light;” and “heavy;” and “cheap;” and “expensive.” The girl next to her pondered ideas as she too looked up at the ceiling and touched the end of her pencil to her chin. On her paper was listed, “Stressed/relaxed, dark/colorful, rough/gentle, wild/tamed, hyper/sleepy.” These students were reflecting and taking the time to think about the duality of their own personalities. Not settling for “good and bad,” they seem to be contemplating and exploring their ideas.

During subsequent sessions of creation, I meandered around the artroom and admired students’ works in progress. On the left panel of her diptych, one girl had rendered a dull blue sky with a bulging bank of white clouds that set off the silhouette of a mountain range. Beneath this she had written, “Quiet.” On the right side, she had drawn a tremendous sienna volcano with a fiery red top, and yellow and orange dashes of sparks and lava spewing forth from its mouth. She had etched the word, “Loud,” beneath it. Head drooped, cheek resting in the crook of his arm, his nose inches from his paper, one boy used his pencil to sketch a baseball player in repose to swing. This was, for him, “peaceful.” On the other side he drew two crocodiles with their mouths gaping in ‘v’-shapes up into the air, each jaw lined with sharp triangles of teeth. This was his conception of “violent.” Another boy depicted a shark roaring forward with its mouth stretched wide-open and sharp teeth bared on its bottom and top jawlines. Beneath it, he had written, “evil.” On the opposite panel of his diptych, he had drawn a little blue squiggle that, to my eyes, resembled a piece of short string dropped lazily upon itself. This was his interpretation of “pure.”

In each Contemporary Native American Artist lesson, students explored an artist’s archive of works in terms of the ideologies and positionalities of the artist in his or her construction of these works. Students further engaged themselves in experiencing similar
positionalities and ideologies, drawing on parallel frames of reference and contextual experiences from their own lives, and utilizing these contextual influences to shape their interpretations of these experiences as manifested by their artworks.

**Knowledge as Dynamic**

Furthermore, in Anna’s artroom, knowledge was presented as something interactive and dynamic, underscored by Banks (1996b) as critical for knowledge construction and transformation.

**Speculation and Interpretation**

Anna’s fourth and fifth grade students offered speculations and interpretations of the artists’ works presented to them, as opposed to searching for one fixed answer, exhibiting a dynamic flow of knowledge construction and transformation.

For instance, fifth graders pondered about the emotional and psychological states that inspired WalkingStick’s artworks. Anna pointed to the dancing figure on the right panel of diptych displayed on the screen: “What kind of psychological state do you think of with this one?”

“Active,” called out a boy.

“Happy,” clapped a girl.

“Cheerful!”

Anna honored all students’ input with a nod and a smile. She was asking students to draw on their own connections, perceptions, and interpretations of the artwork displayed. She opened the door to many potential responses, and refrained from boxing students into one particular answer. She prompted further exploration and consideration: “And how about for this side?” Anna circled her left palm around the mountains on the left panel.
“Hot,” sighed a boy as he fanned himself with his hand.

Anna chuckled softly, “It touches your mind, your eyes. You see it, and you are psychologically moved.”

The students also contemplated the visual metaphors that potentially represented WalkingStick’s biracial duality. A boy tipped his head to the side and observed, “There’s a ditch or canyon in every one.”

“Oh,” cooed Anna, nodding her head in encouragement. “What might that represent?”

Another boy spoke out, “Maybe it’s the divide between her two parts because she’s part Scotch-Irish and part Cherokee.”

Fifth graders further speculated about the potential meanings and emotional expression of the symbols woven throughout WalkingStick’s works. Another of WalkingStick’s diptychs glowed on the screen. The text accompanying it read, “This painting came at a time when Kay WalkingStick was grieving the sudden death of her husband of thirty years. She says that it is about the cascading nature of life and death.” Anna circled her palm over the golden fan shape striped vertically by a translucent earth brown band on the left panel of the diptych. “A symbol is something that stands for something else. What do you think this is?” Anna pointed at the fan symbol.

“Is that an eye?” posited a girl.

Anna cocked her head to the left and stared a little longer at the image. “Everybody says that, and I’m beginning to see that.” Her interactive, open style, and acceptance of students’ speculations—which further prompted her own speculations—ran contrary to the positivist style
of teaching\textsuperscript{42} frowned upon by Giroux (1981), and the banking style\textsuperscript{43} of education criticized by Freire (1970/1993). Anna continued, “What kind of emotional feeling do you get from it?”

“Sorrow, or,” a boy paused and mimicked the tilt of Anna’s head as he contemplated the picture, then completed his thought, “death.”

“What do you see that makes you say that?” she asked.

“The color black, all around it.”

A girl observed, “The eye, the edge—maybe she means, ‘I’m on the edge.’ How old is the woman now?”

“She’s probably about sixty now, my age,” answered Anna.

Another girl interjected, “I think it may say, ‘My husband has died, and now my heart is broken in half.’”

The girl next to her sat up straight and her eyes widened. “Ooo, yeah, there’s a line through the middle. It’s like two people broken in half.” She raised her left hand like a cleaver and swiftly lowered it in a vertical line.

“Maybe she’s been torn in half—not literally—but maybe she’s been torn apart inside,” commented a girl on the other side of the room.

“She’s using a metaphor. That means you show something, and it conveys something else.” Anna turned their attention to the right panel. “What do you think she’s representing over here?” She touched the image of white foamy strokes that appeared to me as rushing rapids.

“It looks like water, and he starts at the top and now is dead at the bottom.”

“Or maybe the eye represents dying, and the right side is living.”

“Maybe the river means that she’s crying.”

\textsuperscript{42} Adherence to the idea that there is an unimpeachable set of knowable facts that apply universally.

\textsuperscript{43} Like a banker, a teacher deposits unquestionable knowledge/facts into a student’s mind.
Anna smiled, “Look at all the impressions that you have given. And I’m sure we could keep on going, but we have to move on.”

Fourth graders similarly participated in dynamic knowledge construction and transformation as they mused about the potential significance of Bartow’s self-portrait, and why it disturbed them. On the screen was a pastel portrait of a grey-faced man, skin marred by slashes of black, lavender, green, and pink, with hard strokes of dark pastel scratches that formed cavernous eyes. Beneath a black cave of mouth, lined by dashes of short white upper teeth, a bird’s head appeared. Anna explained that Bartow had been psychologically damaged in the Vietnam War, and used his artwork as a forum for healing and transition after he returned from the war.

Anna called on a girl whose hand had shot up into the air. The girl frowned, “It’s artistic, but in a disturbing way.”

A series of students commented in follow up:

“People looked like that in the war.”

“I think it’s horrible—it looks like he got shot in the face.”

“It looks like he’s eating the owl.”

“I think he’s creepy beyond belief.”

“Why do you say that?” asked Anna, focusing her gaze upon the last student.

“Because he has scratches on his face, and he’s bleeding.” The boy dragged his index finger across his chest, replicating the diagonal direction of the bright red slash across the figure’s breast and shoulder.

“Hmm,” Anna contemplated, leaving the question open for further speculation.
As students continued to offer speculations and questions regarding Bartow’s work, Anna commented, “A lot of times, art asks more questions than it answers.” She was opening the door to the dynamic and infinite potential of speculations and interpretations, rather than finite, singular answers.

Fourth graders also deliberated on the possible representations of Naranjo-Morse’s abstract ceramic sculptures. On the screen was an image of seven freestanding cylindrical sculptures in an assortment of hues of yellow—mustard, to tan, to speckled ginger—each accented with black. Abstract shapes topped their cylindrical bodies. Their forms remind me of lint brushes standing on their fat ends, with their handles, stylized in different shapes, pointing upward in the air. “This one’s called Tribe. Is there anything here that would make you think of a tribe?” asked Anna.

“It’s a tribe because they all look like tools they would use—like a knife, like hairbrushes and things. Something you would use to take fur off you.”

“They look like knives and stuff, and some sort of symbols.”

“They all have handles.”

“A family, because she’s in a family with clay.”

“They all work together.”

“It represents all the different members of the tribe—and despite their different features, they all work together.”

“What makes you think that they all work together?” questioned Anna.

“The designs.”

“A logo type thing.”

“I see faces.”
“Oh?” replied Anna, locking eyes with the last student.

He hopped from his seat, walked up to the screen, and touched each element that he interpreted as a facial feature on different sculptures as he called them out: “There’s an eye. There’s an eye. There’s a nose.”

“I think the one—the one in the back on the right,” a girl pointed to a figure with an oblong shaped head and four valve-like shapes extending out of the top of it, then continued, “is the chief because of its hair.”

A boy followed her lead: “And it has the paint on the face for his tribe.” He stroked two lines diagonally down the sides of his cheeks with his index fingers, emulating the angled direction of the painted strokes on the sides of the oblong shaped head of the figure.

“It looks like a face with two squares for eyes,” added another girl, describing more features of the same sculpture.

“I think it’s called tribe because it’s all about the people in the tribe, and their different personalities,” speculated a girl at another table.

“That’s what art makes us think about,” summarized Anna. “We interpret things differently.” Her words again encouraged their speculations, and the openness of interpretation, rather than static and finite answers.

Anna’s classes’ focused attention on the deconstruction of artworks appeared to provide a forum ripe for students to challenge the idea of static knowledge, and to performatively explore the dynamic interactions that transformed and constructed knowledge. Rather than promoting a search for one correct answer, speculation was encouraged about a variety of potential possibilities in terms of what each artist’s communications and influences were in their creation of art. These dialogues with students underscored how the teacher, Anna, was not positioned as
the distributor of undisputed knowledge, and exemplified an alternative to the banking style of teaching criticized by scholars (e.g., Freire, 1970/1993; Giroux, 1981).

*An Atmosphere of Openness Encouraging Students to Challenge the Idea of Bounded Knowledge*

In addition, the atmosphere promoted by Anna’s openness in the artroom seemed to create an environment in which students did not hesitate to question what was presented and actively sought understandings outside of the information shown on screen. First and second graders often interjected their inquiries during presentations. Unlike their older fourth and fifth grade peers, these youths did not participate as much in speculation and interpretation, but they did pave the path for such interactive and dynamic knowledge construction by actively practicing a search for more information than that which was presented to them. In contrast with the open-ended ideation of older students, first and second graders typically voluntarily asked closed-ended questions in their quest for additional information.

For instance, during Anna’s presentation of Lowe’s work to her first graders, a photograph of a winding river banked by strips of sand as it meandered between acres of deep green forest was glowing on screen.

“Did he paint that?” asked a boy.

“Well, no, this is a photograph of the area he grew up in,” replied Anna.

A subsequent slide showed a topographical cartoon drawing of an effigy mound in the shape of a wavy snake with a spiral at its tail. Its curvature followed a turn in the river it banked.

“Who made that?” asked a boy.

“The people in his tribe made that,” Anna responded.

After viewing a series of effigy mounds on the University of Wisconsin campus that were built by Lowe’s Ho-Chunk ancestors, a girl inquired: “Are the people still there?”
“They are,” answered Anna, reinforcing the living status of tribal members today. “These are all over Wisconsin.”

Anna’s second graders began asking questions from the outset of the presentation as Anna introduced them to Lavadour. Behind her glowed a raw umber slide with the words, “Plateau, James Lavadour, Walla Walla,” emblazoned across its center. Beneath these words was a photographic portrait of a smiling man with a peppered-grey beard and wire-rimmed glasses framing his dark colored eyes. He sported a light colored fedora, and wore a plaid shirt layered over a dark-colored t-shirt. “James Lavadour is from eastern Oregon. He’s Native American, and he taught himself to do art. He’s Walla Walla,” introduced Anna.

“What is Walla Walla?” asked a girl.

“It is a tribe that he [Lavadour] is from in eastern Oregon,” responded Anna.

A slide flashed up on screen revealing a photo of a river flowing forward from the background between rocky green river banks. A range of green-grey mountains rose in the background into a stunningly clear blue sky. Above it read, “James Lavadour is influenced by the eastern Oregon landscape.”

“What’s a landscape?” asked a boy.

“Well, there’s a lot of water, there’s a lot of mountains, and there’s a lot of trees,” Anna replied.

As Anna scrolled through a series of Lavadour’s landscape paintings, interspersed with photos of the eastern Oregon scenery that inspired the paintings, a boy asked, “Where did you get all this stuff?”

“Most of these pictures I got off of the Internet,” Anna responded. “I just put his [Lavadour’s] name in ‘Google,’ and did an image search. I collect[ed] them all in a folder, and I
put them together in PowerPoint.” I noted that it was her practice to honor each of the student’s questions with a clear explanation.

“Are we going to make these 3D?” asked a girl excitedly, sitting up stalk straight on her stool.

“No, but we’re going to make them in relief,” replied Anna.

“How does he do that?” a girl asked as she rocked forward on her stool, nudging her chin in the direction of the painting displayed on screen.

Anna raised a fisted hand to the screen, as though she was grasping the handle of a palette knife, and glided it along the lines of striated mountain strokes on the painting. “He uses a spatula to move the texture around.”

A boy interjected, “Does he take those pictures?”

“He doesn’t take pictures,” Anna responded. “He just goes for walks and lets that inspire him.”

“How old is he?” another boy inquired.

“He was born in 1951, so that would make him,” Anna paused to calculate.

“58!” exclaimed a boy who had beaten her to the answer.

“Yeah, that’s right,” Anna confirmed with a smiling nod. The students’ consistent flow of questions indicated to me their active engagement in a quest for information outside of that which was presented to them, and their comfort in posing questions to Anna.

Furthermore, Anna encouraged her younger students to begin speculating, thereby familiarizing them with a process of dynamic knowledge construction. For instance, in her first grade classes, students pondered about the significance of the effigy mounds that inspired Lowe
in his creation of sculptures. “What does this look like?” asked Anna as she pointed to the screen at one of the stenciled animals that indicated the location of an effigy mound along a riverbank.

“What does this look like?” asked Anna as she pointed to the screen at one of the stenciled animals that indicated the location of an effigy mound along a riverbank.

“Cow!” “Horse!” yelled out the students in a cacophony of excited guesses.

Anna nodded and continued, “Sometimes they were burial mounds, and sometimes they don’t know what they were used for.” Her words left the reason for the creation of the mounds open-ended.

“What did they make the sculptures out of?” inquired a boy.

Anna paused to think, “Well, I think they made them out of rocks and earth.”

“Sand,” interjected a girl.

“And maybe sand,” Anna acknowledged the girl’s answer as a potential possibility.

Further prompting students to speculate, during a demonstration for one of their projects inspired by Lowe, Anna encouraged students to think about the diversity of items that might be included in a scene, and how these items might be represented in a drawing from a birds-eye-perspective, a perspective novel to many of them. “What would you see if you were an eagle flying around above a river?” Anna asked the class as she looked out over their faces. She picked up a dry-erase marker, and drew a large rectangle to represent a blank, landscape-oriented page on the whiteboard easel next to her.

“A thin line,” replied a boy. Anna drew a wavy line horizontally across the center of the rectangle of paper on the whiteboard.

“And what if you were closer?” she asked the boy.

“A little wider?” he responded, spreading his palms apart in the air before him.

“Maybe a little wider,” Anna echoed as she added another wavy line parallel to the first line to indicate the two banks of a wider river.
“You might also see people in villages.”

“You could see a mountain.”

“A mountain, people, what else?” Anna prompted.

“Bridges,” cheered a girl, bouncing on her seat. Anna arched two parallel lines vertically across the river, and joined them with straight horizontal rungs.

“Mice,” offered a boy, nodding his head excitedly up and down.

“Mice would be really tiny, wouldn’t they?” Anna nodded with the boy.

“People walking around,” interjected another student.

“What would people look like from the top?” Anna asked as she patted the top of her head with her right palm. “You wouldn’t see the whole body, would you?” A few children shook their heads from side-to-side, “No,” in response. Anna was encouraging students to envision the world from an uncommon perspective.

“What else? We haven’t talked about vegetation,” Anna suggested.

“Trees!” called out a boy triumphantly.

“What would trees look like from the top?”

The students seemed to be stumped into silence. They were unfamiliar with this perspective, but Anna was offering them possibilities. She drew something that looked like a cloud with billowing tufts around its circumference. “How ‘bout that?” she proposed as a question for their reflection. “What else?” She encouraged them to brainstorm freely, and did not condemn any suggestion.

“Fish!” “Water!” “Turtles!” “Shark!” “Rocks!” “Eagle!” the students called out one after another, often overlapping. Anna drew rapidly on the board, depicting a potential representation of each suggestion. As she drew each item, she reinforced with words, “A(n) [object being
drawn] might look like that from the top.” I noticed that she did not say, in absolute terms, that an object “looks like that from the top,” but rather left the possibilities open by preceding the phrase with the word, “might.” The students continued to shout out their suggestions excitedly. They were being invited and encouraged to openly speculate.

*Entertaining Diverse Perspectives*

This practice in entertaining diverse perspectives was additionally reinforced as Anna asked her students to engage in exercises to evaluate their own artworks. One was a “six-foot test” in which students were asked to have a peer hold up their artwork at one side of the artroom while the student artist reflected on his or her artwork from this new distance. Anna explained, “You’ve been working on your piece 22-inches away from your nose.” With the artwork at a six-foot distance, however, “You start to see your artwork in a different way—maybe how your audience might see it.” She additionally had students participate in an “Art Buddies” exercise. “An art buddy is like a book buddy, and is someone you consult about your artwork,” Anna shared with her second graders. She held up a student’s unmounted painting. “You’re going to talk to someone about your artwork. I want you to give one positive comment about their artwork.” She pointed to the first item on a list of “Art Buddies” instructions. “Then you give them a suggestion,” she added as she moved her index finger down the list.

“What is a suggestion?”

“Well, maybe [the artist] glued it like this,” Anna held the painting in her hand askew on a piece of black construction paper that would be used for mounting. “And you say, ‘Well, what would it look like if we did it like this?’” she proposed as she straightened the painting on the mounting paper. “Your idea that could change it or make it better.” Her words highlighted that the artworks were open to modification. She slid her finger down to number three on the list:
“And ask one question.” Anna was again asking students to question an artist’s perspective in his or her creation of an artwork, reinforcing the process of deconstructing an artwork.

Through these dialogues and exercises with her students, which focused on artworks and the deconstruction of artists’ influences and conceptualization processes in their creation of these artworks, Anna was laying a foundation of openness, and promoting the freedom to question the idea of bounded knowledge. She was guiding her students to entertain alternative perspectives, and to engage in the dynamism of knowledge construction and transformation. She had established an environment in which her students did not hesitate to question what was presented, and in which they eagerly sought information outside of the bounds of that with which they were presented. She encouraged them to speculate about potential possibilities, rather than giving them finite answers. In classroom dialogue, artmaking, and with the art evaluation exercises she asked students to partake in, Anna was mentoring students to consider a diversity of different perspectives and possibilities.

*Knowledge Construction and Transformation Without Confronting Issues of Conflict*

In their deconstruction of artworks, however, students did not engage in dialogues that confronted issues of conflict such as oppression and racism, a convention advocated by scholars as the primary method for promoting knowledge construction and transformation (e.g., Albers, 1996, 1999; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2005, 2007; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Efland et al., 1996; Golding, 2005; Knight, 2006; Staikidis, 2005; Stuhr, 1994; Ward, 2005).

One reason that such issues were not confronted was because the artists in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program did not focus on such issues in their discussions about their artistic creations. During one of our post-intervention interviews, Anna leaned forward and asserted, “Have I read anything about racism in those artists’ talks? No. They talk
about their work.” Her words reminded me that her research drew from the emic perspectives voiced by these artists.

In addition, she saw her job at the elementary school as preparing students to encounter such confrontational issues when they became older. “Here [at the elementary school] I think I’m setting them on a good course where they’re open to things and have an expanded view of the world and the people in the world.” She reasoned, “You have to start—you have to cultivate the soil before you can plant those seeds [to negotiate conflict]. You start out with the fundamentals, and every year you add more and you add more. If I can teach them to open their minds, then maybe they won’t ever get closed.” By opening students understandings about Native Americans, art, and artists to a plethora of options that were possible, Anna believed that she would be helping her students to avoid bracketing and closing the category of “Native American” into a box built from stereotypes. “This [program] is something that needs to be done because we live in a society where people are still not equal. If we want, we can start here in the artroom, exposing students to other artists, viewpoints, learning acceptance, worthiness. I value all of their viewpoints.” She furthered, “It’s important to start in K-5, and make information adaptable to that age, to set them on the right track.” She added, “As they get older,” she hoped that they would learn to “look past the generalities.” She envisioned her Contemporary Native American Artists program as helpful in “subtly moving them along” this path of understanding in their construction of knowledge.

Though the students did not engage oral dialogues confronting issues of conflict related to discrimination and oppression, or verbally interrogate stereotypes and assumptions, I would argue that some students did undergo processes of knowledge construction and transformation and were challenged to question an inegalitarian status quo, as we will see in the discussion that
follows. By virtue of Anna’s dynamic approach to knowledge, and the structure and content of her Contemporary Native American Artists program, with which Anna aimed to challenge and deconstruct stereotypes of Native Americans by introducing her students to a heterogeneous series of living artists of Native American descent, her curriculum implicitly armed students with understandings that challenged the dehumanizing, homogenizing visions of Native Americans that were being forwarded within society, and particularly within her community.

*Promoted Prejudice Reduction*

As discussed in Chapter 2, a chief aim of multicultural education, and one of the five dimensions of a multicultural curriculum indicated by Banks (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a), is prejudice reduction. Banks (2004) argued that, in terms of prejudice reduction, effective multicultural instruction would decrease students’ tendency to stereotype, and increase students’ ability to see each individual as a valuable contributing member of society. Applying these ideas directly to Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program, if her intervention reduced prejudice, it would decrease the tendency to stereotype Native American art and artists, and her students would be able to see each individual artist as a valuable contributing member of the artworld. Based on interviews with students, it would appear that Anna’s program was successful in these respects for a number of them.

*Native American artists are alive and contributing to the contemporary artworld.*

Overall, after participation in lessons inspired by Native American artists, students were more likely to grasp that Native American art is still made today, and that Native American artists are alive and still contributing to the contemporary artworld. One of Anna’s goals with her program was to challenge ahistoric notions of Native American art and artists as a relic of the
past, and to instead show that Native American artists are living today and are actively contributing members of the contemporary art scene.

Student learnings along these lines appeared to be incremental. Before participation in one of Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists lessons, over half of students were uncertain as to whether or not Native American art was still made today (see Figure 2). During their introduction to a lesson, however, this uncertainty decreased and was instead replaced by an understanding that Native American art was still being created, as two out of three students responded that they thought Native American art was still made today (see Figure 2). After students had completed a lesson inspired by a Native American artist, this awareness was even greater, further shifting students out of uncertainty, as 77% of students reported that they believed Native American art was still made today (see Figure 2).

In follow up to this question (“Is Native American art still made today?”), I asked students who had answered affirmatively, “What makes you think that Native American art is still made today?” (see Table 4). The most common, unprompted rationale volunteered by those who had completed a lesson was that “Native Americans are still alive today and making art” (32%). In contrast, only 10% of students offered such a response before they had participated in a lesson inspired by a Native American artist.

It would appear that participation in one of Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists lessons may have contributed to students increased understanding that Native American artists are still alive today and active in the contemporary artworld. Students’ comments supported this deduction. A fourth grade girl offered, “We’ve seen lots of artists from this day

44 Students were not given a list of responses/prompts from which to select, and were offering open responses to an open-ended question.
Figure 2. Responses to “Is Native American art still made today?” by stage of participation in a lesson inspired by a contemporary Native American artist.

a Students responded to a written survey
b Students were interviewed
c Uncertain = do not know, maybe, no answer

Note. Number of respondents by stage of participation: Before = 58; During Introduction = 48; After Completion = 53.

Table 4
“What makes you think Native American art is still made today?” by Stage of Participation in a Lesson Inspired by a Native American Artist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Before Lesson</th>
<th>During Introduction to Lesson</th>
<th>After Completed Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because Native Americans are still alive, and making art today</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Number of participants “Before Lesson” = 58; “During Introduction to Lesson” = 48; “After Completed Lesson” = 53
that are still alive and making this kind of art.” A fifth grader asserted, “We’ve been learning about Native American art and the people who do it are still alive right now.”

**Decreased tendency to stereotype.**

In addition, rather than stereotyping Native American art and artists, a number of students shared their understanding that Native American art was not one codified style, but instead consisted of a plethora of different artmaking approaches that individual artists might employ. After participation in lessons inspired by a Native American artist, most students (79%\(^45\)) asserted that Native American artists do not make art in the same way\(^46\). A number of students rationalized from the premise that all individuals are different, and therefore one individual’s art would never be the same as another person’s. A second grade girl explained, “Because a lot of people are different in so many different ways. . . . Everybody is different.” Similarly, another second grader deduced, “Because it’s like no one’s fingerprints are the same.” A second grade boy shook his head and stated, “No one makes the same art—unless the person traces the art, but it’ll never be the exact same, even if you trace it. It’ll still not be the exact same.” A fourth grader slid forward her own artwork, inspired by Nicolson, and explained, “Some people make different stuff—like mine,” she tapped her drawing, and continued, “is different from someone else’s in the class.” In addition, older students began to reference the diverse ideas and varying perspectives from which individual artists might be drawing in their creation of art. A fifth grade boy argued, “Because everybody thinks of different things, and everybody has different ideas, different opinions.” A fourth grade girl explained, “Because different people have different ideas and things. They might go out to draw something, and see different things in different ways.”

\(^{45}\) Of the remaining students, 6% said, “Yes, Native American art is all made the same way,” and 15% were uncertain.

\(^{46}\) The question read to students was: “Does every Native American artists make art in the same way?”
More specifically, students reasoned that the diversity of Native American artists would account for the differences between artists’ artworks. A second grader offered, “Because a lot of people—there are a lot of different Native Americans, and everybody does their own thing in their own way.” A first grader reasoned, “Well, they’re different, so they have to do things in a different way.” A fifth grade girl, again focusing on the conceptual process an artist might entertain in their creation of art, leaned forward and asserted, “I learned that they all have different ideas and stuff.” The diversity of Native American artists was particularly noted by fourth graders who had participated in a lesson inspired by Naranjo, a sculptor who happened to be of Tewa descent, and also blind. One boy explained that what led him to believe that Native American artists did not make art in the same way was “because some of them are blind, and they have to use their hands to feel.” Another shared, “I learned that people that make Native American art sometimes can’t see—like the blind guy [Naranjo] who used his hands to feel his art.”

When I asked students what they had learned from the lessons they had participated in, a number of them focused in on the heterogeneity of Native American artists, and the according heterogeneity of these individuals’ artistic creations.

A second grader remarked that he had learned, “That they didn’t do each other’s art. They each do different art.”

Another second grader commented, “That, uh, everybody makes different Native American art.” He looked up at the ceiling, rocked back on his stool, and continued, “That, um, all the Native American art doesn’t have to be the same.”
A fourth grader stopped his marker in the middle of a line he was drawing and rolled it between his fingers as he looked up at me and shared, “There are different kinds of art that they want to make.”

“Who is ‘they’ when you say, ‘There are different kinds of art that they want to make’?” I probed.

“Native Americans,” he smiled at me with a shrug of his shoulders.

“What else?” I prompted.

“They make different designs and different materials.”

“Different than what?”

“Different than other Native Americans.”

A fifth grade boy pressed the end of his pencil to his bottom lip, mouth agape, and stared up at the ceiling for a moment before returning his eyes to me and sharing, “It has so many unique styles among them.” He clarified “them” as “Native Americans.”

One fifth grade girl twisted her lips to the side, and then commented, “I think every Native American artist makes art in a different way. A lot of it is anything that’s coming through their mind. It has a lot of imagination, so Native American art can be anything you can think of.”

Another fifth grader said, “I think that they can have their own unique styles, express their feelings in different ways, make whatever they think.”

What may have contributed to these students’ diversified understandings? A number of students pointed to directly to the presentations in class as the source of their learnings. A fourth grade girl waggled her index finger at the whiteboard onto which Anna projected each PowerPoint, and said, “Because in the screen, they were all Native Americans, but they were all different.” Another fourth grader reflected, “I learned that the artists that we saw on the board,
they were all Native Americans, and I thought they were all different.” A fifth grade girl asserted, “Cuz we’ve been studying Native American art and they’re not all the same.” Similarly, a fifth grade boy detailed, “Because, well, you can see it,” he nodded his head toward the whiteboard, “and it proves that they make different things with different materials, different colors sorted in different ways.”

Moreover, with their participation in various lessons inspired by different Native American artists, each of whom approached artmaking in a different way, students diversified their repertoire of understandings of what art created by a Native American artist might encompass. I believe that this expanded vision of the potential directions that a Native American artist’s work might take helped to erode unilateral stereotypes of Native American art and artists. For instance, fourth graders who had participated in a lesson inspired by the ceramic figures of Naranjo-Morse said they had learned that Native American art could be abstract. One commented that Naranjo-Morse “was creative with her style. She put these eyeballs everywhere. It was different from people—a lot of people did real life and stuff—she had her own style.” Another explained, “I learned that some Native American artists use clay to, um, express their feelings. Like what we just saw: Abstractly.”

After participating in a lesson inspired by the structural installations of Nicolson, a fourth grader said, “I learned that it doesn’t have to be about nature, it can be about buildings or new technology.”

Having participated in a lesson inspired by WalkingStick in which students created diptychs that illustrated contrasting personal characteristics, a fifth grade girl scrunched her brows in contemplation: “I didn’t know that they did opposites like that one we did. I thought they only did, like, people.”
Inspired by the emotional expression also highlighted in WalkingStick’s work, a fifth grader tipped her head to the left, gazed off over my shoulder, and reflected, “Native American art, it doesn’t have to be of all Native Americans. It can be of nature and stuff and some feelings. The lesson we had, Kay Walking Stick made the art, and it was about feelings, like opposites like happy and sad, and it was of nature.” Similarly, another fifth grader took a deep breath and sucked in her lips, then articulated, “I’ve learned that Native American art, like, people create different things like what they just feel, and I thought it was people who go to India to get—to find things—and just put them together.” Along the same lines, another fifth grader said, “I was thinking that it was weapons and tribes, and now I think that it’s about the way they live and expressing themselves.” He tapped the end of his pencil on his temple, and underscored, “I didn’t think they expressed their feelings through art. And now I think that they express it more.” A girl chewed on a side of her bottom lip and explained, “Like Kay Walking Stick, she makes art about her feelings and it inspires people and shows people how she feels, and she goes through hard times like we all do.”

A few fifth graders extrapolated past the expression of feelings in WalkingStick’s work, and shared their understanding that Native American artists could make artwork about virtually anything. A fifth grade boy said, “I thought it was like, clothing, like they made clothes, clothing.” After having participated in the lesson inspired by WalkingStick, he expressed, “I think it’s, um, about landscaping, animals, like what they see in their lives. Everything in their lives. Like symbols, what they feel.” A fifth grader tipped her head to the side and contended, “I thought it was only about the earth and things like that. I didn’t know it was about feelings. Then, after Ms. [Anna] told us about Kay Walking Stick—she painted about feelings. I think it can be many things. I think that it can represent feelings, I think it can be about the earth too—
nature, landscapes. I guess just about what the artist is thinking. I think that they can have their own unique styles, express their feelings in different ways, make whatever they think.” Along the same inclusive lines, she elaborated, “I didn’t know that it could look like anything or be anything. I thought that it was all supposed to be about nature.”

It was as though, before this lesson with WalkingStick, students did not perceive Native American artists as real, living individuals who had feelings and experienced the world. Native American art had been objectified into static homogeneity. Not only did students come to understand the humanity of a Native American artist who has feelings and “goes through hard times like we all do,” but they additionally learned to break out of the box of stereotypical notions that they previously held about Native American art.

In addition, students began to grasp the idea of hybridity in artistic creation, and started to understand that an artist might draw from influences from different times, places, people, and experiences. For instance, on the heels of a lesson inspired by Bartow, a fourth grader paused to contemplate her understandings from the lesson, then shared, “I learned that it doesn’t have to be just boys or girls, and they sometimes work together and they always have something that’s connecting with another artist, and that artist always has something connecting with another artist.” Along the same lines, another fourth grader shared that she believed an artist might draw inspiration “by looking at other people’s artwork, and having ideas.” Anna’s consistent reinforcement of the idea that artists appropriated from other artists’ work seemed to have made an impact. Furthermore, after participating in a series of lessons inspired by Bartow, Nicolson, and Naranjo, a fourth grade girl articulated, “I learned that some Native American artists mix modern art and Native American art.” Ahistorical notions seemed to be dissolving, and understandings of the hybrid nature of artworks across time appeared to be increasing.
Additionally, subsequent to a lesson inspired by WalkingStick, a fifth grader offered that she had learned, “It’s not just about Native Americans—it’s about everybody—and they sometimes use different cultures and put the pieces together and make different kinds of Native American art.” Cultural boundaries seemed to be dissipating.

Furthermore, rejecting the bracketing of artists into a group based on ethnicity, a number of students questioned the efficacy of separating Native American art into a distinct category of its own in art. Students argued that “art is art,” hence, there was no need for separate categorizations: “Because art is art, so art can be any kind of way;” “Because even though they may have differences—Indian is Native American—it’s basically all the same. It’s all art. They shouldn’t have names for different categories because it’s all art;” “Because art is art and there’s all kinds of different kinds of art, but art is art;” “There isn’t a cause for a grouping—there shouldn’t be a grouping—so it’s just, like, art—without anything before it.”

Moreover, students believed that such categorizations were a way of separating out a group of people, and that this was not fair. A fifth grader explained, “I don’t feel that Native Americans should be in a different category than us—they’re still human beings. If I look back and I put it in miniature like I do with most history, I kind of understand it more. I simplify things. If I look back in history, I feel that white people were bullies and black people were being bullied.” He seemed to parallel such categorical separations with a means of ostracization, a form of bullying, and a way of dehumanizing people. Following the same sentiments, a fourth grader pontificated, “There should be no separation. They should all be together, because people in the old days did not like separation, like Martin Luther King, and they fought for the right to be together, and everyone did, and the painters and everyone should not be separated in any kind of way. ‘Cuz we’re all alike in our own ways, and people should not have to be separated.”
Similarly, a first grader stated that he did not think that there should be a separate category, “Because everyone should work together.”

Along these same lines, some students argued that artists should have a choice of how their art is categorized, if it must be categorized at all. A first grade girl argued, “They can do what they want to do, and they don’t need to separate their ideas or mix them up, but they can if they want to. They can call their art whatever they want to call it, and it’s their art that makes them call it what they want to call it.” In other words, the art was the determinant of its categorization, not the ethnicity of the artist. Similarly, a fourth grade girl maintained, “Because they can make art any way they want. Like they can create an animal the way they want. ‘Cuz everybody has a choice. Like everybody can choose which way they want to make something.”

One fifth grader articulated, “If one wants to do a certain type of art, one should be able to. Someone shouldn’t be forced to do a certain kind of art just because of the color of their skin.” He elaborated, “I think that art is still one category in itself, so I think that every artist belongs in their own category. It’s hard to explain. Everyone does their own art, and I think one should not have to be tied to one kind of art.”

To these students, bracketing artists and their art into a separate category based on an artist’s ethnicity perpetrated an act of injustice in its ostracization of these artists from the mainstream artworld, and in its suppression of these artists’ voices. WalkingStick47, one of the artists highlighted in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artist program, referred to this type of segregation by ethnicity as a form of “ghettoization.” Furthermore, such categorizations by ethnicity failed to recognize the potential diversity of individual artists’ works, as one student asserted that “they can make art any way they want.” Moreover, it robbed artists of the right to

47 In-person interview with WalkingStick on April 18, 2009.
choose how their art was represented in the artworld by forcing them into a separate category “because of the color of their skin.”

These students were forming ideas that challenged status quo categorizations of art by ethnicity. This was underscored for me during a conversation I had with one fifth grader. She argued that there was no need for a separate category or grouping in art called Native American art, “‘Cuz I don’t think it’s really fair if it’s the same kind of materials and all. It should be by materials, not group.”

“What do you mean by group?” I probed.

“Ethnicity.”

“What else?”

“Cuz, if there is, then they might put it in two different museums.”

“If there is what?”

“If there is separate categories for different groups,” she clarified. I contemplated that “different museums” did exist for different ethnicities, and ‘separate categories for different groups’ tended to be the norm in many U.S. art museums, art history classes, and multicultural art education. These students were vocalizing a resistance to such stratifications by ethnicity.

Based on the above discussion, it would appear that Anna’s program was successful in promoting prejudice reduction and knowledge transformation for a number of her students. Participation in her Native American artists program seemed to be instrumental in helping some students to understand that artists of Native American ancestry are still making valuable contributions to the artworld today, that their approaches are diverse and call upon a number of influences that transcend ethnic borders, and that stratification by ethnicity was unwarranted. It helped to erode some students’ ahistoric, essentialized stereotypes of Native Americans and
Native American art. These students were traveling along a journey of knowledge construction and transformation as mainstream hegemonic narratives—preconceived stereotypes that serve to other and stratify Native American art and artists—were challenged, and understandings of the dynamism, heterogeneity, and hybridity of Native American art and artists were embraced. Students were formulating ideas that challenged status quo stratifications of art by ethnicity.

Room for Growth

However, if we look at the comments above, it would seem that it was predominantly fourth and fifth graders who arrived at these understandings. This distinction becomes more apparent when we look by grade at responses to two questions designed to explore the two main components of prejudice. “Is Native American art still made today?” was asked to gauge students’ perceptions on the vitality and contribution of Native American artists to the contemporary artworld (see Figure 3). “Does every Native American artist make art in the same way?” was asked to gauge a potential decrease in students’ tendency to stereotype (see Figure 4).

From these two charts (Figures 3 and 4), as well as the comments that students shared above, we can begin to see that most fourth and fifth graders grasped the ideas that Native American art continues to be made in contemporary society, and that Native American artists do not all make the art in the same way. First and second graders, however, have a larger opportunity for a shift in their understandings in these directions, as their level of uncertainty in these two areas was greater. This area of uncertainty presents ample fertile ground for the sewing of new ideas. There is room for growth. Looking at Anna’s fourth and fifth graders as perhaps indicative of the path that these younger students may take, it appears that as students matriculate

48 The inclusion of the word “still” in the question, “Is Native American art still made today?” has some leading implications, and I would choose to remove it in future iterations of similar research.
Figure 3. Responses to “Is Native American art still made today?” by grade.

Note. Number of respondents by grade: 1<sup>st</sup> = 12; 2<sup>nd</sup> = 15; 4<sup>th</sup> = 17; 5<sup>th</sup> = 9.

Figure 4. Responses to “Does every Native American artist make art in the same way?” by grade.

Note. Number of respondents by grade: 1<sup>st</sup> = 12; 2<sup>nd</sup> = 15; 4<sup>th</sup> = 17; 5<sup>th</sup> = 9.
through the grades, their level of understanding may increase. There seems to be an upsweeping arc of understanding that students climb throughout the grades.

*The battle against entrenched views presented a greater challenge.*

However, Anna had a more challenging battle to gain a foothold in the minds of some students who, in contradiction to the information presented in lessons, seemed to retain entrenched stereotypes about Native American art and artists. For instance, after participating in a series of lessons inspired by Lowe, a living artist who took inspiration from his surrounding landscape and the effigy mounds constructed by his Ho Chunk ancestors, a few first graders drew on memories of Native American art and artists that did not seem to accord with the ideas presented during their art lessons. One shared that she did not believe that Native American art was still made today because, “They would be killed by the cowboys.”

“Why else?” I prompted.

“‘Cuz maybe they don’t want to make art anymore.”

I recognized that her statement seemed to imply that there would need to be Native Americans still living in order to “want to make art,” and this appeared to contradict her first claim. So I asked her for clarification, “Are there still Native Americans around today?”

“No,” she replied, heartily rotating her head from side-to side so that her braids whipped against her cheeks.

“So all of them have been killed?”

“That would be a yes,” she confirmed with a strong downward thrust of her chin on the last word.

In line with this thinking, she explained her understanding of Native Americans as: “I do know that Indians fight cowboys.” She added, “They have little feathers.” She expected Native
American art to depict, “A picture of cowboys killing Indians. Or it could be Indians killing cowboys.”

A first grader shared his understanding of Native Americans from an experience he had outside of art class: “We got to go in a parade, and then I was a Native American.”

“What do you mean?” I probed.

“We dressed up.”

“What were you wearing?”

“We wore stuff like, kind of like a scarf around our stomach.” He drew his left hand in a fist across his beltline. He further asserted that a Native American is, “A person that live[s] in the jungle and doesn’t have a mom and dad.”

Tarzan briefly flashed in my mind. I refocused, and asked, “Do Native Americans live in the U.S.?”

He looked down at the carpet upon which we were sitting, and shook his head from side-to-side, indicating, “No.”

“Where do they live?”

“Like in the forest, the jungle,” he replied.

Similarly, after second graders participated in lessons inspired by Feddersen’s and Lavadour’s work, both of which focused abstractions of landscape elements and depicted neither animals nor people, several students spoke about ideas that were not conveyed by the lesson.

Like the first graders above, a few second graders seemed to be holding onto a homogenous bracketing of Native Americans and stereotypes thereof. One shared that she would expect Native American art to depict “Indian animals, people that are Indian, and people—
famous things that are Indian, and Indian kings or queens, Indian people that have, like, really fancy Indian clothes on.”

Likewise, another described that she would expect Native American art to look “like a picture or drawing of Native Americans.”

“What do they look like?” I asked her.

“They’d have brown skin, and they’d have these leaf thingies at the top of their head.” She drew an invisible line vertically out of the top of the back of her head with a finger.

One second grader explained that what led her to believe that Native American art was still made today was “because I see lots of art in the museum.” Citing this source, an influence from outside of the artroom, she elaborated, “I’ve seen lots of Native American baskets when my mom and I went to the ‘Getty Museum.’” She perched her chin on her right hand, and added that she thought Native American art would be about “tribes, tee-pees, baskets, bows and arrows, [and] waterfalls.”

Several second graders held to a belief that Native American art was different from whatever they considered to be American art; hence, Native Americans were different than “us.” One second grader reasoned that Native American art was different from other types of art that he had learned about “because they draw, like, fields and stuff, and that’s not really what we draw.” He tossed his palms up to his sides, “Like, they don’t have the same stuff to look at and draw.” Paradoxically, the artwork students created during lessons inspired by Feddersen and Lavadour asked the student artists to depict their surrounding Central Illinois landscape, which consisted mostly of fields.

“Who do you mean when you say ‘we’?” I asked him for clarification.

“Like people—just other people,” he shook his head.
“What kinds of stuff do ‘we’ draw?”

“Like pictures of castles and stuff.”

He elaborated that he had learned from the lesson, “That they do things differently than us.”

“What do you mean by ‘differently’?” I prompted.

“They don’t have paper and pens and paint.” His assertion contradicted the information about the artists from the presentations as Feddersen drew and printed on paper, and Lavadour painted on canvas.

“Who do you mean by ‘us’?” I probed.

“Like, Americans,” he shrugged.

Similarly, a second grade girl commented, “Native American art is different than art like here.”

“How is it different?” I prompted.

“Like, we put waves and prints and landscapes. They do, like, their items that they own, and Native American bodies, and their homes,” she explained as she added a square green stamp to evolve the grid pattern on her abstracted landscape print inspired by the artwork of, in contradiction to her statement, Feddersen, an artist who happened to be Native American.

A few students also seemed to resign Native American artwork to a distant and static past. In accord with a classmate who had earlier commented, “They don’t have paper and pens and paint,” two second grade boys’ ideas about materials that might be used to create Native American art suggested that they thought that Native American artmaking was a relic of antiquity, regardless of their participation in Anna’s lessons inspired by living, contemporary, Native American artists Feddersen and Lavadour. One asserted, “They drew with pencils that
were made of wood from a tree trunk, but only you could see it, and it would give you a splinter—and they didn’t have erasers.” The other contended, “They don’t really use markers and pencils. They don’t really have markers and pencils in those days—they didn’t even exist yet.”

Although there did appear to be a pattern of increased understanding as students became older, this could not be generalized as an absolute. While entrenched beliefs about Native Americans do seem to be more apparent among the younger grades, they are not limited to these grades. A number of scholars have argued that we should attend to individual student’s learning styles and should not formulate expectations of individuals based on a reductionist stereotype of a group (Hickman, 1999; Andrus, 2001; Neperud & Stuhr, 1993; Wolcott, 1967, as cited by Chalmers, 1981; McFee 1961/1970). While these scholars were speaking about grouping by race, gender, and class, I believe this concept extends to grouping by age as well, and as such we need to allow for individual nuances and diversity within each class level instead of creating generalized expectations by age. In line with this understanding, though most fourth and fifth graders seemed to have a greater grasp of the diversity and vitality of Native American artists, a few of these older students maintained entrenched beliefs.

For example, after fourth graders had completed a series of lessons inspired by Naranjo, Bartow, Nicolson, and Naranjo-Morse, all of whom were presented as living artists of Native American ancestry who were contributing to the contemporary artworld, two fourth grade boys said that they did not believe that Native American art was still made today: “Because the people who made them aren't living. ‘Cuz there's not really any more tribes;” “‘Cuz there aren't any Native Americans. They were all killed by the cowboys. ‘Cuz they all dies, and we took their land.”
A fifth grade boy similarly archived Native American art as a relic of the distant past. He described Native American art by pointing out what he thought Native American art would not include: “Lots of different artworks show their cities and lots of different civilizations. There weren’t any cities or towns when Native Americans were around.” He paused a Craypas in mid-air as he looked up at me from his WalkingStick inspired diptych, and continued, “Another thing is technology—they didn’t have a lot of technology. If they wanted to go fishing or something, they couldn’t just go out and buy a pole. They had to make it. And they didn’t have phones. They didn’t have any contact. They couldn’t look up where they were on a computer.” He pressed the tip of the Craypas to his watercolor paper and resumed drawing his WalkingStick inspired artwork. “They didn’t have any maps or travel materials to analyze where they were. They wouldn’t be able to tell in the painting somehow where they were, or the date in some time in some town somewhere—they couldn’t put that in.”

Similarly, a fourth grade boy considered Native American art as an artifact of antiquity as he asserted, “It’s [Native American art is] old.”

“What do you mean by old?” I asked him.

“Like B.C. something,” he explained.

Furthermore, like the second graders who distinguished Native Americans as different than Americans, a fourth grade boy declared, “That Native American art isn’t the same.”

“Isn’t the same as what?” I inquired.

“American art,” he emphasized with a downward thrust of his chin.

_Potential explanations for these students’ resistance to learning._

Based on the comments above, it would seem that some students were resistant to learning the ideas that Anna had to offer with her Contemporary Native American Artists
program. Several students, both older and younger, held on to entrenched stereotypes and preconceived notions. In addition, her younger grades seemed to be particularly uncertain with regards to what they had learned from these lessons on Native American artists. I can only speculate as to why these students’ ideas were not transformed.

Perhaps students had not heard, or had forgotten, or had never understood that the lesson they had participated in had been focused on a Native American artist. In their zeal to actively make art, maybe students were distracted from the information presented to them. It is possible that they did not consider conceptualization and the presentations to be a part of the artmaking process. Perhaps they did not connect the presentation to the artmaking project that they created. This was particularly evident in her lower grades. For example, though I interviewed students the same day or the day after they had completed a lesson inspired by a Native American artist, six students (three in the first grade, and three in the second grade) said that they had not ever participated in a lesson inspired by a Native American artist49. In addition, when I asked a first grade boy what he remembered about the artist (Lowe) who inspired the art projects he had just participated in creating, he replied that he recalled, “Nothing. I forgot all of the artists.” Similarly a first grade girl claimed, “We never learned, like, a specific Native American artist.” And yet another first grade boy contended, “I don’t think they told us who the artist is.” Recalling Anna’s introduction of these first graders to the artist, the title slide to her presentation read, “Woodlands, Truman Lowe, Ho Chunk (Winnebago),” above a photo of Lowe. “Truman is a Native American artist who has been doing very important work,” Anna had commented. This was not information these students took in, or retained, or connected to their artmaking.

Anna shared an incident in her second grade classes that further exemplified this phenomenon. I interviewed Anna during the academic year subsequent to the one that I had

49 These students’ responses were calculated in under the “no answer” category within interview data.
observed, and she was again implementing her Contemporary Native American Artists program. She recounted an experience she had encountered earlier that day: “I introduced them to James Lavadour, and said, ‘He’s a living artist from Oregon. He’s Native American,’ and all of that.”

She waved her right hand outward from her chest in little circles, as though tossing seeds into the earth, and continued, “And I asked them, ‘Where’s he from?’ And a student answered, ‘Oregon.’ And we went on a little, and then a girl asked, ‘Is he dead?’” Anna sighed, and chuckled, “I mean, come on guys.” Her description highlighted that some students did not hear or recall—mere minutes later—key points overtly shown and stated during presentations.

In addition, particularly in Anna’s younger grades, there seemed to be a greater amount of time spent on disciplining and instruction in the use of media, perhaps detracting students’ attention away from the ideas conveyed in the presentations. Detailing a practicing teacher’s struggle for time in the artroom in light of all the things she aims to accomplish with students, Anna lamented, “And then there’s the talking—the time you have to spend ‘harnessing.’” She shook her head as she exhaled a soft whistle through ‘O’ shaped lips. Based on my observations, the amount of time spent “harnessing” is particularly high in her younger grades. For example, in one of her first grade classes: The first graders jostled into the room and took a seat in rows on the teal green carpet in the artroom’s reading alcove. Anna was seated in a director’s chair before them, with a storybook in her lap, ready for sharing. The first graders were rowdy, sitting tightly packed, “criss-cross applesauce,” on the carpet. A number of them leaned on each other, and rocked side-to-side, ramming their shoulders into their neighbors. Their chattering was ceaseless. Anna had to correct so many students’ behavior that she finally gave up. She rolled her eyes and set aside the book. “Go get smocks on and go to your tables,” she directed. The students hopped
up and jockeyed to grab a smock from the large Tupperware tub by the door before heading to their assigned seats at the worktables.

Anna walked over to the whiteboard and cued up a PowerPoint presentation on Lowe, one of the Native American artists in her series. “Jaleel50, would you please get the lights,” she requested of the boy nearest the lightswitches. He stood to move, but another boy was already darting across the room and swatted his hand down the switches before Jaleel had a chance to. “She told me to get them,” he pouted saucily at the other boy. They exchanged purse-lipped, squinted eye glares, before returning to their seats. Even turning out the lights was a challenge.

“Would you please put the pencils down,” Anna instructed sternly as the clicking noises, which had become white noise to me in their persistence throughout the first half of her presentation, had elevated in level and become distracting. “I need your eyes up here,” she directed several students with a gaze, locking eyes with each of them as they turned their heads to look up at her.

Minutes after returning to her presentation, Anna again had to pause. “A-go,” she chanted to garner students’ attention. She received no response as the children continued chattering, and a few smacked or poked one another. “A-go,” she chanted out more loudly. This time, the two students closest to her replied, “A-may,” the expected response to show that they were paying attention, but then they resumed chattering. Anna held up two fingers in the air, and remained silent. A few students darted two fingers in the air in response, and stopped talking. They began nudging their tablemates. “Shh!” they hissed as they placed an index finger against their closed lips.

“I will not continue until everyone is listening,” Anna said flatly as she arched her gaze around the classroom and locked eyes with students who continued to be disruptive. Hands

---

50 pseudonym
tucked under the table, and mouths closed, as though Anna’s glance had sapped the perpetrators of their motive powers. So much time, and students’ focus, was taken away from her presentation to harness students’ attention.

Anna additionally had to spend more time teaching her younger students how to use artistic media, and students’ focus was further detracted away from artist presentations in classes. Anna worked on building students’ repertoire of skills with different media with each subsequent year. She explained, “Kids remember things they learned before and apply new information.” For instance, in her second grade class during a project inspired by Lavadour, she had to detail how to use watercolor paint. Anna held up an open tray of watercolors, and pointed at the row of rainbow colored cakes. “This is not to be used as thick paint. It’s to be used watery. You can use it like this.” She retrieved a dripping wet brush that was soaking in a water container on the table, and petted the bristles of a wet brush in the paint. “Very watery.” She stirred the brush gently in a tangerine cake of color and it pooled into a reflective translucent orange liquid. “If one of your colors is muddy, you can clean it out by,” she dipped and swirled her brush in a clean container of water, dragging its bristles upward against the lip to remove excess liquid, “lapping it up with your brush.” She stroked the bristles on an area of wet paint on the page, soaking up the pigment, “Like the tongue of a kitty.”

As the students began painting, Anna circulated through the room and observed students’ works in progress. “I’m noticing something,” said Anna, calling everyone to attention. “You haven’t had a lot of experience working with watercolors, and that’s why we’re doing this. If your paint is shiny, then it’s too thick. Add more water.” She continued circulating the room. “I always work from light to dark.” She stressed, “Watercolor is supposed to look like water.” She stopped by a boy’s side. “This is way too much,” she told him as she retrieved the paintbrush
from the boy’s hand and pointed at the thick green glob of paint massed on its bristles. She
pointed to a tree on his painting where the paint has been gobbed on its branches. “It’s shiny.
Way too much.” The green cake in the tray had been gouged out in its surrender to his brush.
“Go in here.” Anna tapped his container of clear water. “Get water,” she instructed as she
swirled her brush in the container.

A significant amount of class time was devoted to development of second graders’
versatility in the use of this medium. In contrast, in her fifth grade classes, which also used
watercolors for a project inspired by the work of WalkingStick, the extent of her instruction in
the use of materials consisted of: “Remember to use your watercolors lightly.” In addition to
paintbrushes, fifth graders also opted to use sponge-painting techniques to create their pieces,
without any prompting by Anna. She did not need to demonstrate watercolor painting
techniques, as these fifth graders appeared to have access a range of techniques that were already
in their artistic cache. The amount of time spent on harnessing and instruction in media was
significantly higher in her younger grades, and therefore may have contributed to these younger
students’ distraction away from the ideas shared with them during the artist presentations.

Furthermore, Anna’s art class was but one event in students’ lives. As a few students
noted, their ideas about Native Americans were coming to them from a plethora of sources
outside of class as well, including museums, parades, and likely a multitude of other sources in
their environment (such as parents, television, movies, and so on). Stereotypes of Native
Americans may have been being reinforced through these vehicles outside of class, and perhaps
conflicted with the ideas that Anna was trying to convey. As discussed earlier, Anna felt
compelled to create her Contemporary Native American Artists program because stereotypes of
Native Americans were rampant in her community, stemming from the “Chief” controversy.
These stereotypes, which challenged the ideas conveyed by her program, may have been too overwhelming for students to overcome in such an environment, and perhaps these alternative sources indoctrinated even more students into such a belief pattern.

Importantly, it is possible that some students entered into her program with much more unlearning to do. With their preconceived notions more firmly rooted, perhaps such students were not inclined to be swayed from these ideas even when faced by counterpoints that challenged them in Anna’s program, as evidenced by their stereotyping comments (above) after they had participated in lessons inspired by diverse, living Native American artists.

**Unique Structure of Program Provides for Repeated Opportunities to Challenge Stereotypes**

While it may be difficult to move students from deeply entrenched beliefs to ones of openness, it is also apparent that there is a significant amount of uncertainty among students, particularly in the younger grades (see Figures 2 and 3). It may be easier to shift students towards openness from this location of uncertainty, as they do not need to unlearn habituated stereotypes. What teachers fill these areas of uncertainty with, however, is crucial. Rather than teaching students that Native American art was a static relic of the past and homogenous in nature, as was critiqued of Human Relations approaches, Anna was intentionally trying to ingrain in students that Native American artists were heterogeneous, drew on many influences that transcended ethnicity, and were vital contributors of diverse artworks to the contemporary artworld. Moreover, whether students held entrenched beliefs or were uncertain, Anna’s program was designed to accommodate any resistance to learning, and to capitalize on incremental shifts in students’ mindsets towards openness, through the unique structuring of her program. Her program was designed to provide students with repeated exposures to new contemporary Native American artists as they matriculate through the grade levels.
As discussed in Chapter 2, Allport (1954), considered an authority on prejudice development, asserted that people would not be likely to change an established system of categorization, such as a stereotype, unless they were repeatedly challenged to do so. With her Contemporary Native American Artists program, Anna seeks to break down stereotypes of Native Americans and Native American art and artists. Allport (1954) explained that exceptions to the stereotypes served to challenge the belief system in place. Increased exposure to exceptions and repetitive challenges, which Anna’s program is designed to provide students with as they matriculate through the grades, would serve to promote the modification of stereotypes once held as true. As Devine (1989) asserted, breaking a stereotyping prejudice may be akin to breaking a bad habit, and repeated exposure to individuals who do not conform to a stereotype may help to erode a stereotype and break the habit. Anna introduces students to 1-2 new contemporary Native American artists a year as they matriculate through the grade levels. In line with these theorists’ assertions, as Anna repeatedly exposes students to new artists of Native American descent who challenge the idea of the homogeneity of Native American artists, she may be helping to break students’ existing, entrenched stereotyping habitus. If students did not connect with the material the first time, perhaps they will connect the second time around, or the next. If their biases are entrenched, perhaps they will climb out of that pit little-by-little with each exposure. Each exposure offers students an alternative perspective that encourages them to question the efficacy of stereotypes, and to challenge the inegalitarian status quo in a community in which defacing oppressive ideologies about Native Americans are rampant.

Furthermore, for those students who are uncertain and who may not yet have formulated stereotypes of Native Americans, Anna helps to replace their uncertainty with an understanding.

51 The academic year that I observed was slightly unusual in that Anna’s third graders were unable to participate in Contemporary Native American Artists lessons due to prior curriculum commitments. Instead, two of the artists that would normally have been presented to third graders were added to the fourth graders’ curriculum.
of the heterogeneity of Native American artists, building a non-stereotypical foundation of understanding from the outset. This accords well with one of foundational Anna’s aspirations for the program: “If I can teach them to open their minds, then maybe they won’t ever get closed.”

**Summation of Argument 2**

Based on the above discussion, we can see that Anna’s program engaged students in developing and practicing the skills of knowledge construction and transformation that so many scholars advocated were essential to dismantling oppressive ideologies (e.g., Adejumo, 2002; Ballengee-Morris, 2002; Bastos, 2006; Desai, 2000, 2003, 2005; Efland et al., 1996; Freedman, 2000; Irwin, Rogers, & Wan, 1999; jagodzinski, 1999; Knight, 2006; Mason, 1995; Neperud & Krug, 1995; Stuhr, 1994, 1995).

To set the stage for students’ knowledge construction and transformation, Anna structured her program around the concepts of Native American art and artists. She shared diverse individual contemporary Native American artists’ perspectives on artmaking to enable students to begin deconstructing this concept, and to provide them with perspectives to challenge dominant hegemonic narratives that forwarded stereotypes about Native American art and artists.

As suggested by scholars (e.g., Atkinson & Dash, 2005; Ballengee-Morris, 2002, 2008; Bastos, 2006; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2005, 2007; Dash, 2005; Davenport, 2000; Desai, 2000, 2005; Efland et al., 1996; Klein, 2008; Knight, 2006; lok, 2005; Parks, 2000, 2004; Staikidis, 2005; Ward, 2005), Anna had students focus on each of these artists’ artworks as sites for deconstruction. With artworks as the knowledge texts, and artists as the creators of this knowledge, each individual artist’s ideology, frame of reference, positionality, and social and contextual influences in their creation of his or her artworks became significant areas of focus for students’ consideration. As such, there was an emphasis on the non-material aspects, the
concepts and contexts, influencing the creation of artworks (as advocated by Adejumo, 2002). Anna further engaged her students in an exploration of these non-material aspects as they performatively utilized these ideas in their conceptualization of their own individual artworks. They were called on to self-reflect on a particular ideology, experience a particularly positionality, see from a specific frame of reference, and/or to draw on a contextual influence, just as the artist of inspiration did.

Furthermore, the dialogues in which she engaged students during lessons illustrated the dynamic quality of knowledge. Anna’s fourth and fifth grade students offered speculations and interpretations of the artists’ works presented to them, as opposed to searching for one fixed answer, exhibiting a dynamic flow of knowledge construction and transformation. In addition, the atmosphere promoted by Anna’s openness in the artroom seemed to create an environment in which students did not hesitate to question what was presented and actively sought understandings outside of the information shown on screen, challenging the idea of bounded knowledge. Through her open-ended questioning strategy, Anna encouraged her younger students to begin speculating, thereby familiarizing them with a process of dynamic knowledge construction. She was helping her students to learn how to contemplate various possibilities, and to consider a diversity of perspectives, rather than giving them finite answers.

Though Anna did not engage her students in dialogues that directly confronted issues of conflict, suggested by scholars as requisite for knowledge construction and transformation (e.g., Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Efland et al., 1996; Golding, 2005; Stuhr, 1994, 1995; Ward, 2005), I believe that students were actively engaged in a process of knowledge construction and transformation throughout their participation in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program. By virtue of her treatment of knowledge as something that is inherently dynamic, and
the unique structure and content of Anna’s program, her curriculum implicitly armed students with understandings that challenged the dehumanizing, homogenizing visions of Native Americans that were being forwarded within society, and particularly within her community.

Moreover, there were a number of students who were led to transform their preconceived notions about Native American art and artists. It seemed that her intervention was successful in promoting prejudice reduction for many of her students, particularly in her upper grades (fourth and fifth). As we could see from multiple students’ comments, they were impelled to reflect on their own taken-for-granted assumptions, and re-shaped how they interpreted the concepts of Native American art and artists in the process. They decreased the tendency to stereotype Native American art and artists, and came to recognize Native American artists as unique individuals who were actively contributing members of the artworld. They embraced ideas about the heterogeneity, hybridity, and dynamism of Native American artists that challenged dominant hegemonic ideologies that served to essentialize and lock Native American art and artists in a distant past. Such transformation in understandings is indicative of the process of knowledge construction and transformation described by scholars (e.g., Atkinson & Dash, 2005; Asher, 2007; Banks, 1996b; Golding, 2005; Giroux, 1981; Haynes Chavez & Chavez, 2001; hooks, 2000).

In contrast, there was a higher degree of uncertainty in her lower grades (first and second). However, if Anna’s upper grades are indicative of the path that her lower grades will take, this area of uncertainty represents a large opportunity for growth in their understandings. It is also worth noting that some students, in both lower and upper grades, held onto entrenched stereotypes of Native Americans, and stated beliefs that directly contradicted information in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists presentations. It may take more time and effort
for these students to unlearn these deeply entrenched beliefs, before they can begin to join their peers along a journey of knowledge transformation. The structure of Anna’s program is uniquely designed to subtly move students along this journey of transformation as they matriculate through the grades. With each new year, as students graduate to the next level, Anna introduces them to new artists of Native American descent who challenge the idea of the homogeneity of Native American art and artists. In doing so, she may be helping to break students’ existing, entrenched stereotyping habits. Additionally, for those students who are uncertain and who may not yet have formulated stereotypes of Native Americans, Anna’s program is aimed at replacing this uncertainty with an understanding of the heterogeneity of Native American artists and the hybridity of their creations which are unbounded by ethnicity, building a non-stereotypical foundation of openness and understanding that challenges such hegemonic status quo narratives from the outset.

Argument 3: Greater Transformational Potential

To encourage knowledge construction and transformation, both Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches require that students be engaged in study that focuses on issues related to group relationships of conflict, such as competition, discrimination, oppression, and resistance to oppression (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). In contrast, Anna’s program does not entangle her students in such provocative study, and thus circumvents the risks associated with confronting issues of conflict in the classroom. Nor does she ask her students to engage in social action, an essential component of Social Reconstructionist/Action approaches. As such, her program additionally avoids the complications associated with having students engage in social action. Hence, I believe that Anna’s Contemporary Native American
Artists program has more enduring potential, and therefore more transformational potential than both of these approaches, as will be explained in the following discussion.

As indicated in Chapter 2, both Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches are based on a belief that individuals adapt to their circumstances, and existing circumstances are inegalitarian (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Hillis, 1996b). In order to change existing circumstances, first the inequalities need to be recognized, and then overt action must be taken to change them (Grant et al., 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Confrontation of conflict is a requisite of both of these approaches.

However, a major risk of incorporating approaches that confront issues of conflict is that parents, administrators, and other community members might object to such controversial topics being addressed in the classroom (Efland et al., 1996). For example, in a case documented by Albers (1999) in which sixth graders explored issues of sexism and hetero/homosexuality, the artroom teacher had to deal with “the possible repercussions of challenging widespread discriminating beliefs and policies” in the community (p. 217). She became a voice of contradiction that challenged dominant community ideologies (such as homophobia), and who eventually relinquished her job as a teacher in light of her struggles52 (Albers, 1999).

In contrast, while Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program implicitly armed students with information highlighting a diversity of individual Native American artists’ approaches that prompted some students to internally reflect about and challenge oppressive ideologies in a deconstruction of stereotypes about Native Americans, they did not overtly engage in dialogues that confronted issues of conflict related to the oppression and discrimination of Native Americans. Anna intentionally avoided confrontation of such issues.

52 The potential threat to a teacher’s position and livelihood should s/he choose to engage students in study that includes exploration of perspectives that challenge dominant community ideologies has also been noted in other disciplines relevant to art education, such as media education. See, for instance, Buckingham (2003).
She was cognizant, and weary, of the risks associated with broaching issues of conflict in her artroom. During a post-intervention interview, I asked her, “What would have happened if you had asked your students to discuss the issue of Native American stereotypes, and the discrimination and oppression of Native Americans? Or had them make artworks that spoke out about these issues?” I was particularly conscious of the heated controversy about the “Chief” mascot issue in the local community as I posed this question.

“Oh!” her eyes widened as she vigorously shook her head. She sliced the flat plank of her right hand across her neck, and narrowed her eyelids as she responded, “I would have lost my job.”

While Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program seemed to work implicitly to convey an ideology that challenged stereotyping by diversifying notions regarding Native Americans, it simultaneously circumvented confrontation. A confrontational approach was intentionally avoided as it might have had particularly menacing consequences for her. Such consequences present a significant risk and are a practical consideration that educators need to be aware of should they seek to follow theorists recommendations to incorporate Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches into their curricula.

A Social Reconstruction/Action approach further extends the risk that might be encountered by teachers. Social Reconstruction/Action approaches require students to not only confront issues of conflict, but to additionally take a stance on these issues, and to take action to shape the world to reflect this stance (Grant et al., 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The goal is to impel students to political action (Banks, 2006a). A significant risk faced with such an approach is that students may not take action that forwards justice, but instead pursue a path that promotes oppressive ideologies and furthers injustice. This risk was underscored in the high school art
classes documented by Cohen Evron (2005, 2007). Cohen Evron (2005) noted that while the instructors she had observed had hoped to encourage students to “take up concerns of social justice” (p. 321), they lamented that “they had to face students who h[e]ld on to repressive and racist discourses” (p. 321). To have students create artworks that voice these oppressive ideologies would run contrary to the multicultural agenda of promoting egalitarianism for the disenfranchised and oppressed. Furthermore, the visibility of such social actions would likely bring these activities to public light, and such an art program might face even stronger criticism from the community and school administration.

In light of the above discussion, I believe that requiring students to confront issues of conflict, and to take social action, as is suggested for Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches, could be threatening to a multicultural goal of promoting social change in the direction of egalitarianism. Anna’s program circumvents these risks, and yet is still effective in developing students’ skills of knowledge construction and transformation (discussed in the previous argument). Her program works to reduce students’ prejudices, and to promote more equitable perspectives, without confronting issues of conflict.

Anna’s development and implementation of her Contemporary Native American Artists program was in itself a social action to help resolve an injustice in society. She saw an inequity in the status quo in the minstrel-like treatment of Native Americans within her community. She recognized the oppression of Native Americans as a heated issue within the community. She took action to change it this oppression by implementing her program within her artroom without overtly confronting issues of conflict related to the controversy. If Anna were to have broached issues of conflict directly with her students, such as the oppression and discrimination of Native
Americans, she believed she would have lost her job. This would have left her social action without an activist/protagonist, and therefore impotent to propel changes to the status quo.

Advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action may suggest that Anna’s multicultural programming would be strengthened by integrating dialogues and activities that engage her students in the confrontation of issues of conflict and social action. However, based on the discussions and comments from her students (see “Argument 2”), I believe that there is deeper transformation potential without this addition. Because she does not broach issues of conflict, nor ask her students to take social action regarding controversial issues (which may additionally forward oppressive ideologies), she does not incur the risk of having community members object to her programming. Therefore, her program has more enduring potential for existence, giving her social action more longevity and time to reach greater numbers of students, and extending its potential for the transformation of students’ understandings. This enduring potential is particularly important, because it appears that transformation of students’ understandings may take time to sink in and incrementally increase as students complete additional lessons with each year that they matriculate through the grades (see “Argument 2”).

Moreover, Anna is able to start freshly developing students’ perspectives regarding Native American art and artists at an early age. As discussed in Chapter 2, stereotypes and the racial and ethnic attitudes that relate to them are learned early in youth (Allport, 1954; Ashmore, 1970; Katz, 1976; Proshansky, 1966; all as cited by Divine, 1989). Therefore, it is important that educators begin addressing the concepts of race and ethnicity at an early age, as Anna has done and continues to do. Allport (1954) further explained that dispositions towards ethnic groups—prejudices—are often learned through socialization and conformity to expected behaviors in the child’s environment (as cited by Divine, 1989). In the community environment in which her
students’ were being socialized, oppressive stereotypes of Native Americans were being forwarded. With her program, Anna was providing students with alternative understandings to challenge these hegemonic ideologies that were being perpetrated by the dominant culture. In Anna’s own words, she sought “to have another message out there and break the paradigm,” so that her students might “be more open-minded and see where the bias lies.” Shifting students out of an area of uncertainty in regards to the concepts of Native American art and artists—an area that was particularly large amongst her younger first and second graders—she began to fill in this area of uncertainty with perspectives that embraced the diversity, hybridity, and contemporary vitality of Native American art and artists. The unique structure of her program allows her to build this understanding with every subsequent year that students matriculate through the grades as she introduces them to new contemporary Native American artists. Her program, not only has the potential to transform a wider breadth of students with its endurance, but also to transform them more deeply by starting at the root of their understandings and reinforcing this throughout the years of their elementary schooling.
CHAPTER 5: IMPLICATIONS

Implications for Multicultural Art Education Scholarship and Practice

_A Space in Practice Overlooked by the Literature_

Anna’s approach appears to fit into a space overlooked in existing typologies of multicultural education approaches that delineate Human Relations, Transformative Multicultural, and Social Reconstruction/Action categories.

_Surpassed Human Relations Approaches_

Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program clearly diverged from Human Relations approaches in a number of significant ways, thereby escaping the critiques leveled against them. Eschewing the essentialist and ahistoric visions of cultures forwarded by Human Relations approaches, Anna illustrated the heterogeneity and vitality of individual artists of Native American ancestry through her presentations. To challenge ahistoric notions of Native American art and artists, Anna brought each artist to life in the present day in her artroom, underscoring their living status and their active contribution to the artworld today. Rather than trapping artistic traditions in a static past, she showed how some of the artists drew from and transformed a variety of traditions from their ancestral heritage. This demonstrated that there was no one core, static tradition of Native American art, and stressed heterogeneity from the outset.

Focusing attention on the hybrid nature of each artists creations, as suggested by scholars (e.g., Bastos, 2006; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Lok, 2005; MacPhee, 2004; Parks, 2000, 2004; Stuhr, 1994), Anna showed that each artist drew on a multiplex of influences in addition to or outside of ethnic traditions and influences, further pointing to their heterogeneity. In line with the suggestions of Adejumo (2002), Anna showcased the “non-material” aspects of each artist’s works to contextualize them, concentrating on how each artist generated the ideas and concepts
that shaped their artistic creations. She illustrated how each of the artists drew inspiration from Native American and non-Native American art and artists, and a complex network of personal experiences in their lives, stretching across and disregarding ethnic boundaries (as advocated by Ballengee-Morris, 2008; Barbosa, 1999; Bastos, 2006; Carpenter II, Bey, & Smith, 2007; Chalmers, 1999; Dash, 2005; Desai, 2000, 2003, 2005; Gall, 2006; Jaddo, 2007).

Furthermore, the artists and artworks included in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program were selected in a manner that challenged Eurocentricity. Moreover, Anna shared each artist’s works through the emic perspectives of the artists, further renouncing a Eurocentric lens. Rather than forwarding a hegemonic narrative promoting stereotypes and exacerbating prejudices, a primary critique leveled against Human Relations approaches, each of the Contemporary Native American Artists presentations that Anna shared with her students provided them with vivid counterstories to a Native American stereotype and served to stanch prejudices, thereby promoting more egalitarian perspectives.

*Operationalized Knowledge Transformation in a Manner Novel to the Literature*

While her program could not be considered a Human Relations approach for the aforementioned reasons, nor could it be considered a Transformative Multicultural or Social Reconstruction approach as they are currently described by the literature.

While Human Relations approaches are based on a theory of cultural transmission in which attitudes and beliefs are shifted to become less prejudicial as they are passed down from generation to generation, 53 Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action
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53 For example, Allport’s (1954) psychodynamic theory in which a tendency towards prejudice formation depends on how one’s family raises one; Bandura and Walter’s (1963) social learning theory, in which individuals learn social behaviors by watching that of parents and adult role models; Sherif and Sherif’s (1966) reference group theory in which one shapes identity from group associations; and Purvey and Novak’s (1984) self-concept theory, in which identity is formed based on how one sees oneself within a group formation (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988). It also relies on cognitive dissonance theory (Watts, 1984). Cognitive dissonance occurs when an individual
approaches assume a conflict/adaptation theory that relies on cognitive knowledge transformation. These latter two approaches are based on the premise that societal change will not occur unless conflict is confronted (particularly those issues of conflict related to oppression in U.S. society), and one’s cognitive beliefs are thereby modified, as people will otherwise naturally adapt to the existing status quo, and the existing status quo is inegalitarian. That is, a problem of inequality between cultural groups in U.S. society exists, and, in order to change this inequality, it needs to be directly interrogated and challenged cognitively (knowledge construction and transformation) and through overt behavioral opposition in the form of social action (Ballengee-Morris et al., 2000; Grant et al., 2004; Hillis, 1996a; hooks, 2000; jagodzinski, 1999; Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Sleeter, 2000). Engaging students in dialogues that confronted such issues of conflict was advocated and demonstrated as the primary means to achieve cognitive knowledge construction and transformation to challenge inegalitarianism (Albers, 1996, 1999; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2001, 2005, 2007; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Efland et al., 1996; Golding, 2005; Knight, 2006; Staikidis, 2005; Stuhr, 1994, 1995; Ward, 2005).

Anna appeared to have confronted conflict (the inegalitarian treatment of Native Americans within her local community) in the process of her self-reflections and the development of her beliefs, and took social action in the form of the creation and implementation of a Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum to implicitly address this conflict with her students. Unlike Human Relations approaches, which are critiqued for their failure to recognize the historic and present inequalities and injustices prevalent in U.S. society, and for their tendency to transmit the idea that everything is fine the way that it is (Sleeter & Grant, 1988), Anna created her program in response to an injustice that she saw, and implemented it in

__________
hold two conflicting opinions or beliefs and must cognitively reorganize their beliefs in order to resolve this conflict (as cited by Sleeter & Grant, 1988).
an effort to address this injustice with her students. The process of cognitive knowledge
transformation and construction that she experienced aligned with a conflict/adaptation theory
assumed by advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action
approaches.

However, in the application of her program, Anna appeared to be relying upon the idea of
cultural transmission to elicit the changes towards egalitarianism that she desired for her
students. In line with a theory of cultural transmission, Anna seemed to be working with the
understanding that eventually society would become less prejudiced over time as non-prejudicial
attitudes and beliefs were transmitted to younger generations (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). This
underlying link to a theory of cultural transmission would put her program in the realm of
Human Relations approaches. But, in contrast with Human Relations approaches that were
criticized for teaching students to be complacent and accept the inequities existing in the status
quo (Grant, Elsbree, & Fondrie, 2004; Hillis, 1996b; hooks, 2000; Sleeter & Grant, 1988), Anna
seemed to be establishing a foundation of understanding for her students that underscored an
alternative to the status quo, and implicitly challenged it.

Her program taught students the skills associated with knowledge construction and
transformation suggested by Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action
advocates, but operationalized the theoretical approach in a way that was novel to the literature:
She did not engage her students in a confrontation of issues of conflict. Instead, by virtue of her
treatment of knowledge as something dynamic, and the unique structure and content integration
of her program, Anna implicitly encouraged knowledge construction and transformation in her
students without the need for direct confrontation issues of conflict. Her curriculum armed
students with a plurality of perspectives to stave off stereotypes of Native Americans before they
had a chance to set in, and to challenge and erode any preconceived stereotypes that may have already existed in some students’ minds.

Structured around the concepts of Native American art and artists, Anna introduced students to a diverse series of Native American artists and their approaches to artmaking to help students begin to deconstruct these concepts. Each of the artists’ artworks became sites for deconstruction, and the creation of these artworks was linked to each artist’s ideology, frame of reference, positionality, and social and contextual influences for contextualization. Students were brought to reflect on these ideas, and to performatively experience them as they drew on these artist’s conceptual approaches in their own student created artworks.

In their dialogues about these artists and their works, students were encouraged to speculate and interpret, engaging in the dynamic construction and transformation of knowledge. Students did not hesitate to question what was presented to them, challenging the idea of bounded knowledge. Through such interactive dialogues and activities, Anna was helping her students to learn how to speculate about potential possibilities, and to consider a diversity of perspectives, rather than reinforcing the idea of finite answers. Though Anna did not engage her students in dialogues that directly confronted issues of conflict, suggested by scholars as requisite for knowledge construction and transformation (e.g., Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Efland et al., 1996; Golding, 2005; Stuhr, 1994, 1995; Ward, 2005), students were actively engaged in a process of knowledge construction and transformation throughout their participation in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program. There were a number of students who were led to transform their preconceived notions about Native American art and artists. Her intervention was successful in reducing the prejudices of many of her students, particularly in her upper grades (fourth and fifth). These students decreased the tendency to stereotype Native American
art and artists, and came to recognize Native American artists as living human beings who were actively contributing to the contemporary artworld. They embraced ideas about the heterogeneity, hybridity, and dynamism of Native American artists that challenged dominant hegemonic ideologies that served to homogenize and resign Native American art and artists to a static and distant past. Such growth in understandings reflected the process of knowledge construction and transformation described by scholars (e.g., Atkinson & Dash, 2005; Asher, 2007; Banks, 1996b; Golding, 2005; Giroux, 1981; Haynes Chavez & Chavez, 2001; hooks, 2000), but operationalized it in a manner that was absent from the literature.

Unique Structure of Anna’s Program Addresses Unlearning and Learning Over Time

However, not all students underwent a process of knowledge construction and transformation. A transformation in understandings was less evident in Anna’s lower grades (first and second). These young students, for the most part, remained in an area of uncertainty regarding the concepts of Native American art and artists, even after participation in lessons inspired by Native American artists. In addition, several students across both lower and upper grades held onto entrenched stereotypes about Native Americans, and vocalized ideas that directly contradicted the information presented in Anna’s lessons. As Sam Montan, one of Anna’s visiting artists of Muscogee Creek ancestry, indicated, “Some kids will get it, and some won’t. Some might not get it until years later.”

The structure of Anna’s program was uniquely designed to accommodate an incremental transformation of these students’ mindsets over time. As they matriculate through the grades, Anna introduces these students to new artists of Native American descent who challenge the idea of the homogeneity of Native American art and artists from a distant past. Exposures to such artists accumulates with each year, chipping away at any of the students’ existing, entrenched
stereotyping habits (unlearning these essentializing notions), and incrementally replacing students’ uncertainty with an understanding of the heterogeneity and vitality of Native American artists, and of the hybridity of their creations which are unbounded by ethnicity and time (learning afresh).

An Attractive Practical Alternative to those Suggested by Existing Multicultural Theory

Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program is an attractive multicultural strategy that illustrates an alternative to the approaches suggested by the literature. It demonstrates a number of potential strategic practices that elementary school art teachers can select from, tailoring a program to their particular contextual considerations (time, place, students, community climate, practicalities, and so on), as they move to integrate multicultural programs into their curricula.

Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program is an illustration of what I would like to call a Transformative Non-Confrontational Multicultural approach. This is a strategic approach to multiculturalism that seems to provide a highly attractive series of practices for in-service elementary school art teachers. It provides counterstories to a Western Eurocentric canon of art; but, in doing so, it does not entertain the essentializing and ahistoric portrayals of cultures for which Human Relations approaches are so strongly critiqued in the literature. Instead, it promotes a deconstruction of stereotypes and a reduction of prejudices through an engagement of students in a process of dynamic knowledge construction and transformation. However, it does not do so by embroiling students in a confrontation of issues of conflict, as is called for in Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches.

It is important to keep in mind that, with the heated controversy regarding Native American representations (the “Chief” mascot issue) in her community, Anna believed that she
would have jeopardized her job had she chosen the confrontation of Native American oppression as a mode of inquiry within her artroom. Her concern was warranted, as the sixth grade case documented by Albers (1996, 1999), in which the teacher felt pressured to resign, revealed. This is a significant concern that needs to be considered for practicing art educators who wish to maintain the longevity of their careers. Confronting issues of conflict such as racism and discrimination is a potential risk, particularly in (though not limited to) a community in which there is much debate and division about these issues. Yet, I believe it is in just such communities that multicultural understandings are especially necessary. It was the injustices surrounding the “Chief” mascot that issue compelled Anna to take social action in the creation and implementation of her Contemporary Native American Artists program. With it, Anna seemed to have found a way to address the issues of stereotyping and discrimination of Native Americans in her community in a manner that would serve to potentially ameliorate the injustices over time, in an ethical and respectful manner, without confronting the issues overtly.

In light of this understanding, the risk of community criticism is more likely to be encountered with the implementation of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches as they are currently described and suggested by the literature, as both require confrontation of issues of conflict. Therefore, the potential of these two approaches appears limited for practice, particularly in an elementary school arena. In contrast, Anna’s program, which promotes knowledge construction and transformation without confrontation of issues of conflict, avoids these risks. Without jeopardizing her job, Anna is able to continue her social action of implementing her program and allowing its implicit liberating discourse to slowly seep into students’ understandings, and thereby extends her program’s potential to transform the minds of more students along the way in its longevity. Her program is
more enduring, and hence has more potential to transform students’ understandings now and well into the future. Furthermore, without asking her young students to entertain critical thinking regarding provocative issues of conflict (for which they may or may not be emotionally or mentally prepared), she begins to build a foundation of understanding of the diversity, vitality, and hybridity of Native American art and artists in students’ formative years. This is important, as students begin to form their prejudices in these early years (Allport, 1954, as cited by Devine, 1989). With her Contemporary Native American Artists program, she is helping to “open their minds” from the outset, in the hopes that “they won’t ever get closed.”

This enduring potential is important, because transformation of students’ understandings may take time, as evidence from Anna’s own artrooms would suggest (see Figures 3 and 4). The structural design of Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program, which accommodates repeated exposures to new artists of Native American ancestry as students matriculate through the grades, negotiates this issue.

*Teaching Is a Political Act that Can Be Used for Liberation*

At this point I would like to circle back to an argument discussed in Chapter 2: Teaching and the construction of curricula is a political act. As a curriculum implicitly forwards ideology, educators’ construction and practice of curricula is not neutral and has political ramifications (Apple, 1979, 2002; Atkinson & Dash, 2005; Banks, 1993, 1995a, 1995b; C. A. M. Banks, 1996a; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Cohen Evron, 2009; D’Souza, 1992; Dash, 2005; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Efland et al., 1996; Giroux, 1981, 1983, 2005; hooks, 1994; Nieto, 1996).

Art educators who do not integrate any form of multiculturalism into their curricula are implicitly forwarding European hegemony through their use of a Western ethnocentric lens to
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54 I refer to ideology here as both the unconscious and conscious beliefs, values, or ways of thinking that impel individuals’ thoughts, interpretations, and interactions with the world (Decker, 2004).
assess the rest of the artworld, and their flaunting of Western European artworks as the epitome of the artworld. The most common way that art educators do integrate multicultural content into their curricula is through the use of Human Relations types of approaches (Banks, 1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a). Critics of Human Relations approaches condemned the manner in which these approaches implicitly forwarded oppressive ideologies that reinforced hegemony in their use of a Eurocentric lens to envision the art and members of a culture as a homogenous, static, encapsulated entity, commonly harnessed under a label of race, ethnicity, or nation, and presented as inactive in the artworld today (Ballengee-Morris, 2002; Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Chalmers, 2002; Collins & Sandell, 1992; Dash, 2005; Delacruz, 1995b; Desai, 2000, 2005; Efland et al., 1996; Gude, 2007; Gunew & Rivzi, 1994; Kader, 2005; Mason, 1995; Stuhr, 1995, 2003).

As an alternative to such hegemonic Human Relations approaches, advocates of Transformative Multicultural and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches described an alternative path to multiculturalism, one that underscored the fundamental necessity of knowledge transformation and construction. To operationalize these two approaches, theorists suggested that art educators promote knowledge transformation and construction by engaging students in dialogues that directly confronted issues of conflict such as racism and discrimination.

However, as Anna’s case has shown, this confrontation of conflict with students may not be necessary or desirable, in K-12 practice, to promote knowledge construction and transformation. Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists program demonstrates how the implicit curriculum can be effectively utilized to undermine oppressive ideologies existing
within the status quo, and hence serve as a counter hegemonic and liberating force (as suggested by Giroux, 1981, 2005), without directly confronting issues of conflict with students.

Anna’s approach to knowledge as something dynamic, and the structure and content of her curriculum, are capitalized upon for their emancipatory power within her artroom. She introduces a liberating ideology incognito. It is one that dismantles stereotypes regarding Native American individuals and Native American art. Anna’s implementation of her Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum is a political action itself, and it is an action that could potentially forward egalitarianism and reduce oppressive ideologies. Faced with an issue of conflict within her community in which a blatant inequity in the status quo was revealed—the “Chief” mascot debate—she seeks to arm her students with understandings that counter these oppressive ideologies. Perhaps this is where confronting issues of conflict, as advocated by theorists of Transformative and Social Reconstruction/Action approaches, can be more effectively addressed by K-12 teachers—by reflecting on their own beliefs, contemplating the inegalitarian status quo, recognizing the implicit ideologies they are communicating to their students through their curricula, and shaping their curricula to promote emancipatory understandings that challenge the injustices existing in the status quo.

To operationalize her curriculum’s liberating potential, Anna fortifies her students with understandings of diverse individual artists of Native American ancestry that can help them to challenge any stereotypes of Native Americans that they might be presented with outside of the artroom, thereby providing her students with insights to help them to negotiate such defacing, hegemonic, racist discourses should they ever encounter them. To explore a diversity of individual artists’ perspectives in this manner is not to detract from the distinctive historical
realities and oppressions of any Native American grouping, but rather to emphasize contextual understandings in an effort to challenge further oppression.

Furthermore, like Freire’s (1985, 1970/1993) process of conscientization in which people learn to become critical of society, to deconstruct propositions of truth that serve to oppress individuals, and to act towards undoing these oppressive circumstances, Anna is preparing her students for this process of conscientization by arming them with information that challenges the oppressive status quo, and by having them practice key skills of knowledge construction and transformation. Her open dialogic pedagogical style is accustoming her students to speculating upon numerous possibilities, entertaining diverse perspectives, and to seeking understandings outside of that which is presented to them. She is implicitly habituating students to the idea that knowledge is dynamic, open to question, and that there is no one right answer, but rather that different perspectives exist and are plural and shifting.

Instead of teaching her students that knowledge and cultures are static, and advancing stereotypes and oppressive ideologies that forward hegemony, as Human Relations approaches have a tendency to do, Anna engages her students in a dynamic transformation of knowledge, and offers them humanizing and liberating perspectives. Teaching is a political act, and Anna capitalizes upon its emancipatory potential with her Contemporary Native American Artists program. This in mind, my hope is that other art educators will similarly be compelled to capitalize upon this liberating potential of a multicultural curriculum, and draw from some of the highly attractive strategic practices highlighted in Anna’s artroom to tailor a multicultural program to their particular contexts. I see Anna’s program as comprised of a series of strategic practices—components—that are particularly effective for her community’s political climate and
educational environment. Each teacher’s context may be different, and one’s time, setting, environment, and practicalities may call for a varied configuration of these strategic components.

Implications for Art Education More Broadly

*Questioning a Focus on the Physical Making of Art in Art Classes*

As discussed earlier (see “Argument 2”), one possible reason that some students’ understandings about Native American art and artists were not transformed after participation in Anna’s lessons was that these students may have been detracted from the ideas conveyed in presentations by the prospect of physically participating in the making of art. For me, this calls into question a skills-based focus, a focus on how to physically construct an artwork, in the subject of art. Are we teaching students that art is predominantly about the physical skills that are necessary for the hands-on creation of art pieces, and treating the conceptualization and creative processes as relatively less important?

Highlighting this issue, Sam Montan, one of Anna’s visiting artists in her Contemporary Native American Artists program, recounted a story of a young girl who spent her leisure time closely observing the details of different flowers—she loved looking at flowers outdoors. Then she went into the artroom, and her teacher said that they were going to draw flowers. So the little girl began to draw flowers as her she remembered seeing them during her hours of observation outside. The teacher came around to the girl’s desk, saw her drawing, and chastised, “You can’t draw flowers until I show you how!” Then the teacher proceeded to show the students how to draw stock cartoon flowers with a circle in the middle and curly cues surrounding it in mock-petal fashion. “That was so destructive,” Montan critiqued. As an extreme case of a formula approach to artmaking, it concisely illustrated the point that he was trying to make: Montan
explained that with a lot of skill-based art classes, the students who excel are those for whom “their talent goes as far as their elbow.” He held up his forearm and drew a line up his arm with his index finger, traveling upward towards his head. Tapping his temple, he concluded, “They’re machines, they have no creativity.” Do we, as art educators, seek to create machines of our students, ones with little or no capacity to be creative? If our objective is not to create skills-based automatons, then our focus in the artroom needs to expand to emphasize the non-material aspects of artmaking as well. That is, we need to additionally focus students’ attention on the diverse contexts that influence the conceptualization of artworks, have students performatively utilize these understandings in their creative conceptualization and ideation of artworks, and have them actively reflect on the artmaking process to encourage them to understand conceptualization as a significant part of that process.

This is can be a difficult challenge in a real world artroom. While Anna has already structured the creative conceptualization process into her curriculum as a significant component, as evidenced through her incorporation of the extensive artist presentations she included for each lesson, she wants to push this understanding of the importance of creative conceptualization even further. Anna explained, “The problem is time with kids. I have to admit I’m partly to blame—I have things I want to accomplish with the kids, and it’s [self-reflection is] something I want to structure into my lessons more. There has to be more self-reflection in the process: What are they learning from that artmaking process? But something is always cutting in—field trips, assemblies.” Though it may be a struggle, Anna intends to try and devote more time in her curriculum for this self-reflection process, which will potentially help to reinforce students’ understandings of the conceptualization process, and to alert Anna to any misunderstandings. She indicated that there are key points that she additionally intends to underscore in an even
more poignant and repetitive manner within her presentations (each artist’s vitality, the plethora of experiences that influence artistic creation and are not constrained to ethnic background, and so on). Such presentations about artists, as examples of potential paths to approaching art and as inspirations for students’ art conceptualization and creation, are a consistent component within all units in her art curricula, and are not limited to her Contemporary Native American Artists program. Through such a pedagogical tactic, repeated again and again throughout students attendance of her classes over several years, she is incrementally guiding her students to understand these presentations—their illustration of possible approaches and inspiration for conceptualization—as an inherent part of the artmaking process. Based on the comments from her students (see “Argument 2”), it was her fourth and fifth graders who were directly connecting the presentations to their artmaking and their understandings about Native American art and artists. As discussed earlier, in her younger grades Anna had to devote more time to instruction in materials use and harnessing her students’ attention, making the time they engaged in artist presentations during lessons proportionately less relative to her older grades. This detraction in time, energy, and focus from the artist presentations dissipates as students matriculate to the upper grades. As indicated earlier, it may take her younger first and second grade students repetitive training with this kind of strategy throughout their elementary school years to start to understand how the presentations are connected to the artmaking process. If their older peers are any indication of the direction these younger students might take, they too will eventually begin to recognize the relevance of these presentations and their implicit significance in the creation of art, as they matriculate through the grades.

If art educators intend to orient students to the subject of art as more than a set of physical skills to make a tangible art piece, then we would do well to follow Anna’s strategy and
emphasize, on a consistent and recurring basis, creative conceptualization as an essential part of the artmaking process. This de-emphasizes focus on the physical making of artworks, and underscores other idea generating creative activities (presentations, dialogues, research, etc.) in the artroom as critical components of the subject of art. In addition, the limitation of time that practicing art educators struggle with might be negotiated by recognizing that, particularly in elementary schools, there are a number of consecutive series years in which to guide students to such understandings. Students’ learnings across these formative years, in continuity, may help to build foundations that they will hold well into the future.

A Focus on the Individual Artist

Anna focused on the individual artist within her Contemporary Native American Artist curriculum with the express intent of deconstructing stereotypes of Native American art and artists. For me, this raises two significant issues relevant to the field of art education: 1) Does this focus on individual artists mean that no individual artist represents a singular artistic cultural tradition? 2) Does this mean that in art education we need to be weary of all stereotypes to the point of focusing on only individual idiosyncrasy?

No Individual Artist Represents a Singular Artistic Cultural Tradition?

Does a focus on individual artists imply that no individual artist represents a singular artistic cultural tradition? I believe that the series of artists in Anna’s program served to illustrate that no artist does completely represent a singular cultural tradition. She deliberately “chose artists for the strength of their individuality,” and “unique and clear voice.” This is not to say that individual artists who claim to represent a particular cultural tradition do not exist. However, the following discussion aims to offer an alternative perspective for consideration regarding such a claim.
One of Anna’s objectives was to teach her students “that styles change over time. Some artists integrate, or reject, or don’t think about it [traditional styles] at all.” Nicolson and Lowe appropriated and transformed elements found in artworks created by their tribal ancestors, Naranjo-Morse eschewed stereotyped traditions and expectations for the art of the “Indian you had in mind,” and Bartow drew from predominantly from experiences unrelated to his tribal heritage. Anna implicitly countered the idea of static core traditions with her program. She emphasized that even when an artist does draw from a tradition, s/he transforms it as it is integrated in some way into his or her own artwork. To claim that any individual artist represents a singular tradition would be to deny the diversity and change over time of his or her work, and would also negate the hybridity of contextual experiences that influenced the creation of his or her artworks.

Furthermore, one would need to define one’s understanding of what is meant by the term tradition, and whom a specific tradition is meant to represent. The narrative of “tradition” seems to be a discourse meant to delineate expectations of what a particular group of people’s artwork consists of, as Naranjo-Morse’s resistance to tradition suggested. But, as Naranjo-Morse’s resistance also illustrated, such traditions do not represent all of the members of a group.

The case of Naranjo-Morse, in particular, also leads me to question who is authoring the narrative—who delineates what counts as a tradition and sets the criteria of expectations for something considered a tradition, and why? Towards this end, Gluck (1998) described tradition as a “historical imaginary” (p. 262) to which nations (or other imagined groupings) returned “almost obsessively . . . to find in it whatever they were missing in the present” (p. 263). In this sense, tradition can be seen as a form of selective nostalgia. Similarly, Hobsbawm (1983) forwarded the concept of “invented tradition,” which he explained as “a set of practices” of a
primarily “symbolic nature” that “seek to inculcate certain values” and try to maintain “continuity with a suitable historic past” (p. 1). The authoring of traditions can be seen as an attempt at “structuring at least some parts of social life within [a nation or other such imagined grouping] as unchanging and invariant” (Hobsbawm, 1983, p. 2). Focusing on traditions constructed as such forwards a vision of an imagined group’s (a nation’s, culture’s, ethnicity’s, etc.) art as static, locked in a distant past, and impermeable to influences of the present. Hobsbawm (1983) elaborated, “The ideology of a nation [or other imagined grouping] is not what has actually been preserved in its memory, but what has been selected, written, pictured . . . and institutionalized” as tradition, and thus claimed as legitimate representations of a sovereign national or other imagined group’s identity (p. 13). He argued that invented traditions are disseminated through the imaginations of the masses to promote the idea of a unified bond of community, reinforce status structures, and indoctrinate citizens into a common set of values or beliefs. That is, narratives of tradition function hegemonically to forward dominant ideologies and to support existing power structures. Whether these traditions are forwarded by dominant parties within a group upon its own marginalized members, or are cast upon the group by a larger dominant society within which a disenfranchised group is embedded, a narrative of static core traditions as representational of the art of that group functions hegemonically to indoctrinate a stereotypical, or common defining feature, for all members of that group.

In light of the above discussion, if our intent as multicultural art educators is to dismantle oppressive ideologies, reduce prejudices, and to challenge status quo inegalitarianism, then a focus on static core traditions, and a presentation of any individual artist as an all encompassing representation of an imagined culture’s traditions, would run counter to these objectives. To claim that an artist is wholly representational of an imagined group’s tradition, would seem to be
a hegemonic narrative in itself, one that erases the nuances and voices of the non-represented members of that imagined grouping.

Dissolving Stereotypes into a Focus on Only Individual Idiosyncrasy?

Does a focus on the individual artist imply that art educators need to be weary of all cultural stereotypes to the point of dissolving into a focus on only individual idiosyncrasy? Aboud (1988) defined stereotypes as “rigid, overgeneralized beliefs about the attributes of ethnic group members” (p. 5). Lester and Ross (2003) further stressed that a stereotype is “a shorthand way to describe a person with collective, rather than unique characteristics” (p. 2). Stereotyping is a way of organizing and thereby reducing the world into a manageable set of categories. According to Allport (1954), children are aware of visible differences between individuals by age 3-4. They begin to categorize by late childhood, and use characteristics to create these categories and fit people, items, activities, and so on into them. To perceive a group as a category, certain characteristics are highlighted as common. Seeing the utility of this system of organization and simplification, they tend to overuse it unquestioningly. That is, they might overgeneralize sameness to all those within a category without further discrimination (e.g., all blue-eyed people are the same in all ways). Stereotyping is a shortcut way to making sense of the world around us. However, it is a shortcut that we can recognize as particularly flawed in its dehumanizing potential when applied to individuals of the human race. While it might seem ridiculous to an adult to say that all blue-eyed people are the same in all ways, based on this one specific characteristic of eye-color alone, this overgeneralization from a singular characteristic is essentially what art educators do when they use a characteristic of race, or ethnicity, or nationality, or the like to homogenize and bracket all of the art made by people with that characteristic into a category.
Ross (2003) contended, “We too frequently find it far simpler to evoke a stereotype than to engage in the detailed explanation and description necessary to fully and fairly represent the complex and unique individuals with whom we interact. As long as this is true, stereotypes will persist” (p. 138). With the limited amount of time that practicing teachers have in the artroom to teach their students, as well as the limited time they have for research outside of the artroom, it is not difficult to understand that stereotyping would be the most accessible route taken to approach multiculturalism. But stereotypes—whether positive or negative—are damaging and dehumanizing. Stereotypes serve to “convert real persons into artificial persons and, and as consequence, treat human beings as objects. . . . [Thereby] strip[ping] others of their dignity” (Enteman, 2003, p. 18). In the act of stereotyping, “the other is imagined as and transformed into a (sur)face, a sheer exterior” (Chow, 2002, p. 66). If the aim of multiculturalism is to promote justice, equity, and respect for all humans (Banks, 2006b), then the objectification and dehumanization of the persons purportedly represented through stereotyping in multiculturalism is counterproductive. It forwards a hegemonic narrative that further reduces the status and voice of those who are already marginalized in society.

Lester and Ross (2003) asserted, “The simplest key to avoiding stereotypes is to perceive richness. . . . [and] see the unique abundance of an individual” (p. 4). While in art education this would suggest a focus on individual artists, it does not mean a focus solely on the idiosyncrasies—the peculiarities as distinct from others—of an artist. Such a strategy does not aim to deny the historical realities and oppressions endured by any Native American group, but rather to encourage looking at each case contextually. As Anna’s program illustrated, each of the artists drew from a plethora of experiences and other artists in their creation of art. There were lines of connection and similarity that were drawn as each artist transformed and appropriated
from a milieu of contextual influences, sometimes including, but never limited to, ethnic heritage.

To stereotype is to perceive people as inhuman—as objects. In contrast, to look at an individual artist is to humanize, personalize, and deepen understanding of the person. Sam Montan, one of Anna’s visiting artists offered, “Any time you can foster understanding of the humanness of people, the better off you are.” He contended that exploring the humanness of individual artists is necessary, “because it’s a constant barrage of Native American people being lumped together.” WalkingStick’s (another of the artists in Anna’s series) words supported this idea, as she offered, “I’m trying to get people past that if you’re an Indian you have to paint with feathers and beads.” If we want our students to treat the other individuals with whom they share the world with justice, equity, and respect, it would behoove us to help our students to understand these individuals as members of the same humanity of which students are a part.

For Further Consideration and Research

Anna’s case offered but one way to approach multiculturalism in a manner that broke down stereotypes and taught her students the skills of dynamic knowledge transformation. Other cases likely exist, and warrant further ethnographic research to share their potential within the field of art education. Theory offers suggestions, however they may not be practicable for an art educator’s real world artroom, and this is a significant consideration for both theory and practice. Scholars and practitioners need to be critical of speculative theory if we seek to utilize scholars’ advice for guidance in practice, and if we seek to forward theory into yet undiscovered territory.

As Anna’s case exemplified, it is within our power as scholars and art educators to take social action towards promoting social justice in our K-12 artrooms. I hope that this report will
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guide additional art teachers in a journey towards recognizing, avoiding, and eliminating any potentially oppressive practices from their artrooms, and inspires them to incorporate more empathic, emancipatory, and transformative multicultural approaches.

This study was an example of a qualitative research collaboration between Anna as practitioner, and myself as a researcher. In our efforts together, Anna and I broke through the barriers between practitioners and scholars, pedagogy and theory. Working together, we were able to see theory in a more comprehensive light, particularly as seen through the eyes of a practitioner, Anna, who had the power to turn theory into action—or to revoke it. The practitioner’s perspective was woefully absent from existing literature on multicultural education. Together we found that recommendations based on theory that advocated for more transformative and socially reconstructive multicultural curricula were useful in some ways, and were impractical for the elementary school artroom in other ways. With her Contemporary Native American Artists program, Anna has shown us how a multicultural curriculum can be structured and operationalized to promote knowledge transformation and reduce prejudices without the risky prospect of confronting issues of conflict that might be objected to by a community and jeopardize a practitioner’s career. It is a practicable path to knowledge transformation that was unacknowledged by previous multicultural education scholarship.

Innovative programs such as Anna’s remain invisible to the larger art education community without vehicles for sharing and showing how such programs can be operationalized. By ethnographically documenting and reporting such efforts, researchers can play a pivotal role as a conduit to broader audiences within the field. As practicing art educators and researchers in collaboration, we can work together, implementing liberating ideologies through curricula and sharing these novel approaches with broader audiences through a forum of scholarly
publications, presentations, and discussions, as a form of social action that itself works to further social justice. In doing so, we might cultivate the soil in greater numbers of students’ minds to prime them for more egalitarian perspectives, and stave off oppressive ideologies before they have a chance to take root.
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APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW AND SURVEY QUESTIONS

In-depth, Exploratory Interviews with K-12 Art Teachers (including Anna)

Two to three 2-3 hour, in-depth, in-person interviews with 3 local K-12 (one elementary, one middle school, and one high school teacher) art teachers who have sought to implement multicultural art programs into their curricula.

1. What does the term “multicultural art education” mean to you?

2. Describe the multicultural art endeavors you have pursued for the classroom in the past few years. (Probe for those desired, and those implemented.)
   a. How are multicultural art lessons woven into your curricula? (Probe for timing/frequency, pre- and post- lessons.)

3. Why have you sought to implement these lessons/programs? (Probe for motivations.)

4. What have you found to be the rewards to implementing these lessons/programs?

5. What have you found to be the challenges to implementing multicultural art lessons? In an ideal world, what could be provided to you to alleviate some of these challenges?

6. Regarding visiting artists for your multicultural art lessons:
   a. How do you find these artists? How do you select these artists?
   b. What challenges do you face in getting these artists into your school? Is it difficult/easy?
   c. How do you prepare yourself, artists, and students for their visit? (Probe for research, discussion points, and activities.)
   d. What do you, artists, and students do during their visit? And after their visit?

7. What do you envision as the ideal multicultural art education program?
Student Survey, Administered Before Intervention

One open-ended written survey (see next page “Student Survey of Opinions”) given to all students who have parental consent, prior to the implementation of the Native American artists program. (Note: to accommodate for differing reading levels, this survey and its introduction will be both read aloud to participants, as well as handed to them on a sheet of paper.)

Thank you for taking a few minutes to fill out this survey. This is not a quiz or test, and in no way will affect your grade or status in the class. We are interested in your opinions, and these will help art teachers to create better art lessons for you. There are no right or wrong answers. Please do not put your name on the page: all answers will be kept anonymous and will not be linked with your name in any way.

- What do you think of when you hear the words “Native American”?
- What do you think of when you hear the words “Native American” art?
- Describe what you think “Native American” art is in terms of who makes it, how is it made, why is it made, what is it about, what materials are used, whether it is it still\(^{56}\) made today, and anything else you would like to add):
- Have you ever had an art lesson that included a “Native American” artist? If yes, please describe it.

\(^{56}\) The inclusion of the word “still” in the question, “Describe what you think ‘Native American’ art is in terms of . . . whether it is still made today . . .” has some leading implications, and I would choose to remove it in future iterations of similar research.
Student Interviews After Each Native American Artist Lesson

30-40 minute interviews with students (randomly selected from those with parental consent) in each grade level (K-5) after lessons inspired by a Native American artist (see Table B2 for detailed participant figures by grade level)

Think specifically about the lesson you just participated in…

1) What have you learned about Native American art?
   a) What did you think Native American art was before this lesson?
   b) What do you think Native American art is now?
      i) Is Native American art still made today? PROBE FOR: What makes you think it is or isn’t?
      ii) Does every Native American artist make art in the same way? PROBE FOR: What makes you think it is or isn’t?
      iii) If I were to tell you that a certain artist was Native American, what would you expect his or her artwork to look like?
         (1) What makes Native American art the same as any other types of art you have learned about?
         (2) What makes Native American art different than any other types of art you have learned about?
         (3) Do you think there needs to be a Native American grouping in art?
            Why or why not?

2) What have you learned about how artists make art? PROBE FOR:

---
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a) What are some of the **reasons or purposes** an artist makes Native American art?  
b) What are some of the **things artists make** Native American **art about**?  
c) What are some of an artist’s **influences and inspirations** in his or her creation of Native American art?  
d) What kinds of **creative processes and techniques** can an artist use to make Native American art?  
e) What kinds of **materials** can an artist use to make Native American art?  
f) What have you learned about Native American art that you *didn’t know before*?  

3) What have you learned about **who** makes art from this lesson? **PROBE FOR:**  

   a) How is this artist the same or different from other artists you’ve learned about?  

Interim Interviews with Anna/Teacher  

Thirty-minute interviews with Anna conducted every two weeks throughout program implementation (for a total of 6-8 interviews).  

i) Reflections on the Native American artists lessons implemented  
   (1) What went well, what she would like to improve  

ii) Member checking on fieldnotes constructed since the previous interim interview  
   (1) Reflections on these
In-depth Interviews with Anna/Teacher, after Program Implementation

Two to three, in-depth (2-3 hour), open-ended, semi-structured interviews with Anna, after completed implementation of her Native American artists program.

(1) Researcher discusses with Anna what was found terms of program’s reflection of Bank’s five dimensions for a social reconstructionist multicultural education curricula, in terms of strengths and potential areas for improvement:

(a) content integration

(b) equity pedagogy

(c) prejudice reduction

(d) knowledge construction and transformation

(e) empowering school culture and social structure

(2) Researcher discusses with Anna where this situates her in a typology of multicultural art education approaches, for contextualization within the field of multicultural art education, particularly as related to multicultural education that is social reconstructionist:

(a) Human Relations/Contributions/Additive

(b) Transformative Multicultural

(c) Social Reconstruction/Action

(3) Critique of the existing Native American artists program in light of this information

(4) Anna’s reflections and responses will be gathered throughout this dialogue.
(a) What are her perspectives (especially her appreciations and concerns) on these theoretical recommendations, particularly in terms of:

(i) Helpfulness/Utility

(ii) Feasibility

(b) How does she foresee herself acting upon these recommendations, if at all, and why or why not? How does she plan to incorporate this information to modify her:

(i) Native American artists program

(ii) overall art education program

Interviews with Key Informants

One 60-120 minute interview with each of 4 adult colleagues familiar with the Anna’s Native American artists program and its development: School principal, a past visiting Native American artist, a Native American artist included in the Contemporary Native American Artists series, her Native American expert consultant

iii) What do you know about the Native American artist curricula developed by the teacher? PROBE FOR:

(1) How did you hear about it?

(2) How was it developed?

(3) What is does it consist of?

iv) Why do you think such a program is important in art education? PROBE FOR:

Potential benefits to students, community, school, art education field, education field in general
### Table B1

**Number of Classes, Lessons, and Sessions Observed by Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American Artist Program&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes/Groups</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Lessons (Artists)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lessons&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Sessions&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sessions&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Additionally, a lesson inspired by the work of Pueblo potters (which took two sessions) with two of her first grade classes, and a lesson inspired by the quilts of Seminole artists in one of her first and one of her third grades (which took one session) were also observed (a total of 4 additional lessons, accounting for 6 additional sessions). These lessons, though inspired by Native American artists, were not official modules in Anna’s Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum.

<sup>b</sup> Total Lessons = No. of Lessons x No. of Classes/Groups

<sup>c</sup> Each lesson may have accounted for multiple sessions

<sup>d</sup> Total Sessions = No. of Sessions x No. of Classes/Groups

### Table B2

**Number of Participants in Each Study Element by Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental consent</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The values represent number of participants for each group.
### Table B3

**Demographic Percentages: School vs. Survey vs. Interview Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B4

**Survey: Self-administered vs. Interviewer Administered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of survey administration</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-administered</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The values represent number of participants for each group*

### Table B5

**Survey: Completed Before Beginning Native American Artist Lesson vs. During Introduction to Lesson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When survey was completed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Lesson</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Introduction</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The values represent number of participants for each group*
Table B6
Survey: Responses to “Have you ever had an art lesson that included a Native American artist?” by Stage of Participation in a Lesson Inspired by a Native American Artist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Before Lesson</th>
<th>During Introduction to Lesson</th>
<th>After Completed Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertaina</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Uncertain = Do not know, no answer

Table B7
Comparison of Survey and Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveya</th>
<th>Interviewb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Describe what you think “Native American” art is in terms of:</td>
<td>2d) What kinds of <em>creative processes and techniques</em> can an artist use to make Native American art?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) how it is made</td>
<td>2a) What are some of the <em>reasons or purposes</em> an artist makes Native American art?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) why it is made</td>
<td>2b) What are some of the <em>things artists make Native American art about</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) what it is about</td>
<td>2c) What kinds of <em>materials</em> can an artist use to make Native American art?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) what materials are used</td>
<td>1bi) Is Native American art still made today? (probe for: what makes you think it is or isn’t?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) is it still made today, and what makes you think it is or isn’t?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Written surveys were completed prior to or during the first day of introduction to a lesson inspired by a Native American artist.

*b Interviews were conducted with students after they had completed a lesson inspired by a Native American artist.
Table B8
“*What makes you think Native American art is still made today?”* by Stage of Participation in a Lesson Inspired by a Native American Artist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Before Lesson %</th>
<th>During Introduction to Lesson %</th>
<th>After Completed Lesson %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s good, nice, pretty, beautiful, unique, famous, important, people like it</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because Native Americans are still alive, and making art today</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because people (unspecified) can reference Native American lifestyles, ideas, and art to make new art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I saw or still see it</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To carry on tradition/It’s been passed down</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because artists (unspecified) continue to make art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because we are making it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is enjoyable and fun to do</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because teachers are teaching it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain(^a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Uncertain = Do not know, no answer