Failure to Be a "Real American"? → Challenging Failure: An Impetus to Shape Scholarship and Teaching

CHRISTINA CHIN
Western Michigan University

"I wanted to change the system through my research and teaching of future K-12 art educators, and I envisioned multicultural art education as a vehicle with a strong potential to do so."

The author reflects on personal experiences, highlighting vignettes of her perceived "failure to be a 'real American,'" and recounts these stories through her own voice. With the hopes that her journey might inspire, inflame empathic frustrations with an inegalitarian status quo, and remind others of how important it is for us to participate in fighting for justice, she shares her experiences and developing understandings as she has learned to embrace more counterhegemonic scholarship and practices. She describes how her childhood experiences and daily life experiences as an adult have shaped her work as a researcher and teacher of art education. The author supports these discussions with a review of key concepts from postcolonial theory, new racism, and multicultural education theory, to inform the journey.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to the author: cdchin2000@yahoo.com

Not-so-fond Memories

I am five and three-quarters years old. I shimmy into a powder blue parka in the hallway and run out of 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 his forefingers.

Frozen in place, 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: He is a blockade of terror. "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, and the glob leaves a slimy darkened trail staining the back of my parka as it oozes downward. 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.

Setting the Stage

The above incident was the first of many such confrontations that led me to believe that I somehow was failing to be a "real American." As I grew up, I struggled to negotiate this perceived failure. With critical reflection as I entered graduate studies in my adulthood, I came to better understand the hegemonic dynamics leading up to such encounters, and came to recognize the underlying injustices promoted. These understandings sparked my anger. I used this rage as a catalyst to take action, speak out, resist, and challenge this injustice and inequity: I find myself fighting back through my scholarship and teaching. In our privileged positions as scholars and educators, I believe we have a responsibility to do so. In the passages that follow, and with the hopes that my journey might inspire, inflame empathic frustrations with an inegalitarian *status quo*, and remind others how important it is for us to participate in fighting for justice, I share my experiences and developing understandings as I have learned to embrace more counterhegemonic scholarship and practices.

Throughout this article I include brief narrative vignettes relaying my childhood and adult experiences with racism. The intent of these narratives is to "*show* rather than tell" (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995, p. 32) readers about my experiences as a non-White individual in the U.S., so that they might empathize and glean an understanding as close to a "lived experience" (p. 63) as possible, and thereby spark an emotional connection. I will point out how my childhood experiences and daily life experiences as an adult (discussed next) have shaped my work as a researcher and

teacher of art education. I support these discussions with a review of key concepts from postcolonial theory, new racism, and multicultural education theory that inform this journey. Let us fast-forward from my childhood, to adulthood.

Continuing Oppression

I have been a U.S. citizen since age five, am of Chinese ancestry, and was born in Kingston, Jamaica. My physical features reflect my Asian ancestry. The above story lives on for me as a vivid and painful memory from my childhood. Growing up in the U.S., I have routinely encountered similar interactions throughout my life in which people have cast me as the *Other*. Reflecting the work of Said (1977/2003, 1985), Knight (2006) described the Other as "denot[ing] any cultural group different from ourselves" (p. 40). In Said's (1977/2003) seminal postcolonial work on *Orientalism*, he emphasized the Orient as one of Europe's "deepest and most recurring images of the Other" (p. 2). Said (1977/2003) asserted that, as the Other, the "Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience" (p. 2). As a device of hegemony[1] used to forward the imperialist intentions of Europe to conquer and own the East, European scholars' objectification of the Orient as a distinct Other (self-)authorized Europe to position itself as superior and dominant to the Other (Said, 1977/2003). Situating the concepts of hegemony and the Other concretely within the United States, hooks (1996) characterized U.S. society as a "white supremacist patriarchy" (p. 10). She

emphatically defined the Other as the "non-white 'Other'" (hooks, 2015, p. 26). hooks (1996) argued that colonization "as a structure of domination that is defined as the conquest and ownership of a people by another" transpired in the U.S. as slavery (p. 108). As a means that could be construed as continued colonization, racism in the U.S. was used as a device for hegemony, a "consciously mapped-out strategy of domination that was systematically maintained," and served to position Whites as superior and dominant to a non-white Other (p. 108).

As a tool of hegemony, racism is not always clearly visible. While the blue-eyed boy's jibes in the opening vignette reveal overt racism, as I have become older, strangers' discriminatory assumptions have become better cloaked with more polite, though still intrusive, interrogations. Scholars have coined this less blatant form of racism the *new racism* (Bonilla-Silva[2],

---

[1] I view hegemony here as the propagation of a dominant group's control and influence over others through either physical force or the spread of ideology that serves to garner people's conscious and/or unconscious submission to this domination (Balibar, 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Said, 1977/2003; Williams, 1977)

[2] Bonilla-Silva heralds from the field of Sociology, and has become a principal scholar on "New Racism." In his 1997 work, cited here, Bonilla-Silva delineated an argument to establish the need for a structural framework to analyze racism, explained how we are all actors within a racialized social structure that benefits the dominant, and introduced components of what he would later assert under the term, *new racism*. This set the foundational groundwork for further conceptualization of this "new racism," which he fleshed out in greater detail with colleague Lewis, in 1999. In 2003, Bonilla-Silva extended the argument for why a structure of new racism is particularly necessary to understand how racism functions in our post-Civil Rights era, explained how color-blind ideology serve to uphold this new racism, and proposed the potential evolution of a U.S. racial structure that would eventually resemble that of Latin America (comprised of a three-tiered hierarchy: White, Honorary White, and Collective Black at the bottom). In a later work with Lewis and Embrick (2004), they presented and analyzed White racial narratives illustrating frames of color-blind ideology that embody this new racism. Also in 2004, he published the first edition of a major work, *Racism Without Racists*, in which he further deconstructed and detailed the major frameworks and

1997, 2003, 2010; Bonilla-Silva & Lewis, 1999; Bonilla-Silva, Lewis, & Embrick, 2004; Bonilla-Silva & Ray, 2009; Desai, 2010[3]). Bonilla-Silva (2010) argued that in our post-Civil Rights era, "Contemporary racial inequality is reproduced through 'New Racism' practices that are subtle, institutional, and apparently nonracial" (p. 3). Such hegemonic practices maintain White domination and superiority "in a way that defies facile racial readings" (p. 3). Underscoring that prejudice reflects "*individual psychological* dispositions" (p. 8), Bonilla-Silva (2010) asserted, "Whereas for most whites racism is prejudice, for most people of color racism is systemic or institutionalized" (p. 8). This "new racism" reflects the deeply embedded, subtle, and omnipresent forms of racial ideology that often remain invisible and unchecked in U.S. society, and serve to quietly and persistently reinforce the status quo of White dominance.

The above understandings in mind, I believe that what Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, and Torino (2007) term *racial microaggressions* exemplifies well one common disguise of this new racism. Racial microaggressions are "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or

environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of color" (p. 271). While there are intentional forms of microaggressions (these take the form of explicit, overtly racist actions, environmental conditions, and slurs), unintentional forms of microaggressions are most akin to the parameters of new racism in their seeming invisibility (Sue et al., 2008), as will be discussed shortly. In the examples that follow, we see how such unintentional forms of racial microaggressions were pervasive at my home institution, and negatively impacted non-white Others like me, on a routine basis.

Check Your (White) Privilege

The first account calls attention to the omnipresence of microaggressions in an environment that many readers may be familiar with: a (predominantly White) college campus.

In October 2014, on crisp fall day on a Midwestern university campus, actors in a student performance entitled *Check Your [White] Privilege* recounted an onslaught of racial microaggressions that students of color had endured on campus: A professor expressing surprise that a black student had offered the correct response; a girlfriend asking a Chinese girl if she could see as well as White people, explaining, "You know, because your eyes are so small"; someone snapping at her black friend, "Yeah, but you don't *act* black"; a co-worker at the library commenting with shock, "Man, you speak English so good!" to his Latino American colleague (who thought bitterly, "speak English so well…"); someone asking at a social gathering, "So, like, what *are* you?" of a multi-racial student; and on and on. The lines delivered by the performers were verbatim quotes and recounts of incidents

---

narratives showcasing a color-blind ideology that serves to advance this new racism. This book is currently in its fourth edition (2nd ed. 2007; 3rd ed. 2010; 4th ed. 2014). Significantly, the 3rd edition (2010) included a chapter that addressed issues of new racism in relationship to the 2008 election of President Barack Obama, as did his 2009 article, co-authored with Ray. The election of an African American President has exacerbated claims that we are living in a post-racial U.S. society, and Bonilla-Silva's arguments regarding new racism are primed to contest these claims.

[3] In the field of art education, I first encountered the concept of "new racism" in Desai's (2010) article, *The Challenge of New Colorblind Racism in Art Education*. Specific applications of her arguments about new racism in relationship to art education will be discussed later in this article, under "Human Relations."

from interviews that the actors had conducted with fellow university students during the past year. I began to perspire as the heat of anger rose because I so closely empathized with the endurance of such affronts. The performance aimed to bring to light the rampancy of these otherwise rather invisible racial offenses. They are invisible in the sense that "they are not usually expressed intentionally by perpetrators because the racial biases and prejudices that underlie these behaviors are outside the perpetrators' conscious awareness" (Sue et al., 2008, p. 331). In other words, these racial biases have become such deeply ingrained beliefs—racial ideologies—of White superiority and White as the standard to live up to, that they are no longer questioned consciously.

Perpetual Foreigner to the U.S.

More intimately, the following account reflects a personal experience with racial microaggressions. It also reveals how such microaggressions extended beyond the microcosm of my home institution, and additionally flourished in the broader local community within which I resided.

Based on my own experiences as a person of color in the U.S., racial microaggressions are an all-too-common daily experience. For instance, just the other day I was in a grocery store, and a white-haired White man tracked me with a stare of grey eyes magnified into spooky largeness 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. A Jamaican-born Chinese American, 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 lived and 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 – "Where are you from?" – because I have never understood what people are asking, much less why. Instead of granting him any of this personal information, I named the Midwestern suburb in which I resided, which was also the town in which the grocery store was located. "What are you doing here?" he continued his interrogation. "Shopping for groceries," I responded in U.S. 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 impose before I wheeled my cart away was: "When are you going back to your home country?" I furrowed my brow and frowned. To him, based on my biological physical attributes, I did not belong in the United States. I was the non-white Other. I had failed to be an "American." This man's microaggressions were confirming his belief in the assertion by hooks (1996) that America is a "white supremacist patriarchy" (p. 10).

The above interrogation stemming from, "Where are you from?" so commonly happens to Asians in America that it was categorized as a distinct theme of microaggressions in theory: *alien in own land* (Sue et al., 2007, p. 73-74). The underlying belief is that Asians are considered "perpetual foreigners" in the U.S. (p. 73). However, Sue et al. (2008) indicated that this is not a theme that arose in a study amongst Black participants. Based on this observation, as well as the understanding that microaggressions typically reflect stereotypes of particular groups, Sue et al. (2008) indicated that different racial/ethnic groups would likely experience different types of microaggressions. Nevertheless, a number of

studies spanning different racial/ethnic groups have shown that, overall, racial microaggressions served to denigrate targets' sense of self-worth (Sue et al., 2008). They had "a cumulative and harmful impact on people of color by assailing their sense of integrity, invalidating them as racial/cultural beings, sapping their spiritual and psychic energies, and imposing a false reality on them" (Sue et al., 2008, p. 331). Racial microaggressions foster a sense of inferiority amongst the non-white Other in America. Fanon (1952/1967) emphasized that colonizing societies secured "stability from the perpetuation of this [inferiority] complex" (p. 100) in the colonized. Returning to hooks' (1996) argument that Whites have colonized the non-white Other in the U.S., this maintenance of White superiority and dominance as the unshakable status quo in the U.S. is exactly what such racial microaggressions serve to secure.

Imaginations of a White America

But what does it mean to be "American"? The elderly man who swash-buckled up to me at the produce bin seemed certain that he knew what it meant. Anderson's (1991) discussion of "imagined nations" sheds some light on how this elderly man's beliefs may have been constructed. Anderson (1991) emphasized that a nation is an idea, and defined "nation" as "an imagined political community" (p. 6). While members of the nation may "never know most of their fellow-members… in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (p. 6). This imagined communion is framed within an us/them relationship: "Limited" in nature, Anderson (1991) argued, a nation "has finite… boundaries, beyond which lie other nations" (p. 6). It is autonomous from these other nations, and is characterized by its members' unity in a relationship of "horizontal comradeship" (p. 7). National

imaginations seek homogeneity within a nation to identify itself, and heterogeneity between different nations to distinguish themselves (Anderson, 1991). The characteristics underpinning homogeneity or heterogeneity are not based in a physical reality, but rather in an abstract world based in the imagination (Anderson, 1991). Following this line of reasoning, in a U.S. nation that is dominated and imagined by a colonizer that is White (hooks, 1996), the nation will be imagined ideally as homogenously White. Ideologically, this will become the forwarded reality in the self-service of White hegemony. In such an imagination of the U.S., as a non-white Other, there was no possibility that the U.S. was my home country, as the elderly man had insinuated in the previous vignette. Reflecting this discussion, Sue et al. (2008) indicated that racial microaggressions "often reflect an invisible worldview of White supremacy in otherwise well-intentioned individuals" (p. 337).

Igniting the Fire

In view of the racial microaggressions with which I was consistently assailed, and engulfed by imaginations of the U.S. as a homogenously White nation, how could I ever think of myself as a "real American"? Raised in the Midwest since age five, I used to consider my "Chinese-Jamaican" heritage as the root of my failure to be a "real American." It would take studies at the graduate level for me to unravel the fallacy of this perceived failure, and to recognize the inequities endorsed by continued belief in this failure, as will be discussed next.

During my graduate studies, I was introduced to the concept of hegemony. I first encountered the concept during an East Asian Languages and Culture Studies course. It was mined during our investigations of postcolonial theory,

strategies of resistance and domination, and nationalism and nation-states' struggle for identity in the colonial/postcolonial arena. It was here that I began to critically deconstruct power structures and tools of domination, and hegemony became an underpinning focal concept.

In addition, during my studies in Visual Culture art education at the graduate level, I began to understand the media as one such tool for hegemony. We began to deconstruct the ideologies being proliferated by the U.S. media and other such omnipresent mass communication vehicles. Cloaked by the aesthetic appeal of a vehicle, these alluring disguises were peeled back to reveal underlying messages of racism, sexism, homophobia, xenophobia, and the like. These were ideologies at the service of upholding a White supremacist patriarchal imagination of the nation. hooks (1996), too, underscored television and mass media as "great neo-colonial weapons" (p. 109). I was able to see that my sense that I was different and *inferior*, my feeling of being ostracized from the mainstream, and my apparent failure to fit in due to my color, had been a message that was consistently and persistently reinforced on a daily basis by nearly everything I saw and heard around me in the United States as I was bombarded by media messages. This had, in part, contributed to a normalized self-perception of inferiority to a superior White dominant group of the United States, and the belief that I would always fail to be a "real American."

These realizations, coupled with the constant microaggressions I encountered on a daily basis, made me want to actively fight back. I did not want to passively accept the inferior position I was consistently being resigned to by a White supremacist patriarchy. I became angry about the injustice, and it compelled me to seek to change the system. I found my anger echoed

that of hooks (1996), who argued that rage is a "necessary aspect of resistance struggle. Rage can act as a catalyst inspiring courageous action" (hooks, 1996, p. 16). Conversely, it was logical to me that to continue to do nothing, to remain silent, was to be complicit in perpetuating the status quo – a White supremacist status quo. Similarly, hooks (1996) recounted a day fraught with racial incidents in which she confronted a microaggressor:

> I was compelled to complain because I feel that the vast majority of black folks who are subjected daily to forms of racial harassment have accepted this as one of the social conditions of our life in white supremacist patriarchy that we cannot change. This acceptance is a form of complicity. (pp. 10-11).

We can choose to take action and resist; or, by default of inaction, comply. If we seek to change the status quo, we must take action and resist. hooks (1996) explained that we must transform our rage into "a passion for freedom and justice that illuminates, heals, and makes redemptive struggle possible" (p. 20).

Fighting Back

All of the preceding discussions reveal how I was provoked into fighting back against the injustices of the existing system. So, how did I fight back? The following section explains the progression of a journey that I have undertaken to challenge status quo inequities.

Deconstructing Multicultural Art Education

Following hooks' (1996) advice, I harnessed my rage, and channeled that energy instead into a passion for justice. I committed myself to resisting passive

acceptance of the status quo, and instead taking action and fighting back. I wanted to change the inegalitarian status quo; I wanted equality. According to Banks (2006b), who is known in education as the "father of multicultural education" (World Library of Educationalists, 2006), the primary goal of multicultural education is to promote justice and equity for all in the United States. Hence, I turned to multicultural art education for my graduate research. I wanted to change the system through my research and teaching of future K-12 art educators, and I envisioned multicultural art education as a vehicle with a strong potential to do so.

But the educational system can also be a culprit in hegemonically reinforcing White supremacy. As with the media, hooks (1996) underscored the potential of schools to forward hegemony: "Constantly and passively consuming white supremacist values both in educational systems and via prolonged engagement with mass media, contemporary black folks, and everyone else in this society, are vulnerable to a process of overt colonization that goes easily undetected" (p. 111). For many years, conflict theorists in education have been asserting that schools serve to reinforce and reproduce societal inequities (Apple, 1979; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; hooks 1994; Meier, 2002; Oakes, 1985; Willis, 1977). However, this perspective leaves little room for schools to potentially be a vehicle for resistance as well. Following Freire's (1970/1993) work on critical pedagogy, hooks (1994) additionally recognized the potential of schools to forward ideology to challenge the status quo, rather than as a solely indoctrinating force. Freire (1985, 1970/1993) argued that, through a process he coined as *conscientization*, students could be taught to critique society, identify and deconstruct ideologies that serve to oppress non-dominant groups, and take action to

challenge oppression. Recognizing that both paths were possible—one of resisting oppression and one of complicity in reinforcing it—and armed with Freire's process of conscientization, I firmly embraced that one of my responsibilities as a researcher was to critique and deconstruct multicultural art education, in all of its guises, for both its liberatory potentials as well as its hegemonically indoctrinating ones. This I have done at length (Chin, 2011, 2013). Armed with these understandings, and in line with many other scholars (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)[4] I advocate for a *Transformative Multicultural* education, and eschew typical *Human Relations* approaches to multicultural art education.

Both of these approaches are discussed in detail in the paragraphs that follow. To further contextualize them within the framework of this article, we will also look at how they implicitly forward particular racial ideology: "new racism" in the case of Human Relations, and anti-racism in the case of Transformative Multicultural.

Human Relations

The field of art education draws heavily from, and is indebted to scholars in general education with regards to theory and

---

[4] In line with Freire (1985, 1970/1993), these scholars advocate for critical pedagogy, and embrace the liberatory potential of education to challenge inequities in the existing status quo. They place strong emphasis on knowledge transformation through critique of existing power structures, deconstruction of hegemonic ideology, and active resistance against oppression.

practice of multicultural education[5]. Sleeter and Grant (1987) first forwarded the term *Human Relations* to categorize multicultural education approaches that seek to improve communications and relations between students from diverse backgrounds.

The forerunner to a Human Relations approach, and analogous in its content, was an *intergroup education* approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Banks, 2004). The intergroup education movement developed in the World War II era. During that time,

---

[5] The significant works on multicultural education typologies developed by Sleeter and Grant (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b), and Banks (1988, 1996e, 2004, 2006a), in the field of general education, have had strong influence on the development of multicultural education theory and practice for the field of art education. Multicultural art education theorists (see for instance, Collins & Sandell, 1992; Kader, 2005) have drawn on Banks's classification of approaches to multicultural curriculum. A number of art education scholars (for example, Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001, 2002; Efland et al., 1996; Stuhr, 1994; Tomhave, 1992) have drawn on Sleeter and Grant's typology.

In 1987, Sleeter and Grant reviewed and classified approaches found in general education multicultural literature, and delineated five different categories for multicultural education: *Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different, Human Relations, Single-Group Studies, Multicultural Education*, and *Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist*. They significantly expanded upon their analyses in 1988 with their book, *Making choices for multicultural art education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender.* Two decades later, they presented revised and updated versions of this work, publishing two books: *Doing multicultural education for achievement and equity (Grant & Sleeter, 2007a), and Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability (Grant & Sleeter, 2007b).*

Within this same timeframe, in 1988 Banks presented a four category typology of multicultural education approaches to curriculum, including a contributions, additive, transformation, and social action approach. He has since further detailed these descriptions a number of times (see, for example, Banks, 1996e, 2004, 2006).

industrial job opportunities flourished in the cities of the North and West, and drew Southerners and rural inhabitants to those areas (Banks, 2004; Taba, Brady & Robinson, 1952). With this migration, individuals increasingly encountered others from different backgrounds. With these confrontations of difference, racial tensions arose. As such, a pressing need to improve interpersonal relations came to the fore. The consequent urban race riots of the early 1940s enflamed 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, 1996, 2004; Cook & Cook, 1954). Sleeter and Grant (1987) noted that many advocates who wrote about a Human Relations approach (formerly understood as the intergroup education approach) in the late 1970s and early 1980s, had directly experienced desegregation issues in schools. These contextual challenges in mind, it is understandable that the primary goals of the intergroup education movement, which would later become known as a Human Relations approach, were to foster a shared U.S. culture, decrease prejudice and stereotyping, promote interracial understanding and thereby reduce 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, 1996, 2004; Cook & Cook, 1954; Taba & Wilson, 1946).

Based on Sleeter and Grant's (1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, 2007b) descriptions, a Human Relations approach is targeted mainly at generating positive feelings and attitudes about oneself and others. It is based 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. Amidst these positive feelings, and premised on a theory of

cultural transmission in which these positive dispositions towards others would be shared from person-to-person and handed down from generation-to-generation, a key expectation was that social unity and tolerance would spread, and "eventually other social problems [would] be solved" (Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 165).

Accordingly, two approaches described by Banks (1988, 1996e, 2004, 2006a), a *contributions approach* and an *additive approach*, closely align with a Human Relations approach. According to Banks (1996e, 2004), these are the two most commonly used approaches to multicultural education in practice. This is unfortunate, as we will see.

With a contributions approach, teachers drop discrete celebratory facts, cultural artifacts, heroes and heroines, and holidays that are supposed to be representative of the great contributions of various cultures (typically defined as nationality, race, or ethnicity), into the White mainstream curriculum. This approach provides a superficial, positive, view of a cultural community and employs a *four-F's* (food, festival, fashion, and folklore) tactic (Cai, 1998). Considered tokenism, it trivializes and exoticizes cultural communities, and forwards stereotypes and misconceptions (Banks, 1988, 2006a). This runs directly contrary to the proposed goals for this approach. Similarly, with an additive approach, teachers might tack content about concepts and themes from various cultural communities (again, typically defined as nationality, race, or ethnicity) onto their mainstream curriculum as an appendage. Content might be investigated with more depth than in the contributions approach. Echoing Banks's nomenclature for these approaches, and reflecting the analogous nature of a Human Relations approach to contributions and additive approaches, in

Grant and Sleeter's (2007a) more recent typology, they modified the name Human Relations to *Contributions, add-and-stir, or human relations*.

A key factor to consider about a Human Relations approach to multicultural education is that it does not substantially change the basic assumptions, structure, nature, characteristics, or goals of the mainstream curriculum (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Content about diverse groups remains on the margins, as an inferior addendum to a White mainstream curriculum. This structural marginalization reinforces the subordinate status of a non-white Other.

A primary critique of the Human Relations approach, first advanced by Sleeter & Grant in 1987 (and expanded in 1988 and 2007a/b), is that it does not address injustices related to social problems and structural inequalities encountered by marginalized persons. Limited in this manner, they asserted that this approach implicitly accepts the status quo, and is assimilationist in nature. Desai (2010) also condemned this type of multicultural approach, one that celebrates diversity and promotes tolerance of difference rather recognizing or critiquing power structures that sustain inequalities. In doing so, Desai argued that they perpetuate a colorblind racism, a form of new racism, and are ineffective in challenging oppression.

Moreover, in contradiction to the proposed goals of this approach, I believe that a Human Relations approach exacerbates inequalities and misconceptions by forwarding hegemonic perspectives. That is, it reinforces a sense of social stratification and Othering by encapsulating the cultures allegedly represented in such programs (typically construed as nationality, race, or ethnicity), and implicitly treats these cultures' art as inferior addendums to a Western art canon. As Nieto (1992) explained, with the articulation of such a

Western canon in education, "European children… learn that they are the norm; everyone else is secondary" (p. 213).

Furthermore, as Human Relations approaches forward celebratory stereotypes in their tokenism, 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. This enacts a hegemonic game of authoring what an alleged culture's artwork should look like and of what is should be comprised, and enables the Othering of such groups as distinct from a White European "norm." Mirroring our earlier discussion of Orientalism and European scholars' objectification of the Orient as a distinct Other (Said, 1977/2003), such a strategy self-authorizes mainstream Whites in the U.S. to position themselves as superior and dominant to a non-white Other.

A Human Relations approach becomes an instrument of "new racism" with its implicit, deeply embedded, subtle use of racially biased ideology, and is daunting in its omnipresence as the most common form of multicultural education in practice. It is a practice that seems to remain invisible and unchecked in U.S. society, as evidenced by its commonality, and serves to quietly and persistently reinforce the status quo of White dominance. With Human Relations as the prevailing multicultural education practice in schools, students are implicitly taught that the "imagined nation" of the U.S. is White. Such teachings legitimize the racial ideology leading to the barrage of racial microaggressions endured by non-white Others like me, everyday.

In contrast, more transformative multicultural education approaches are anti-racist in that they aim to help students recognize and challenge social injustices and structural inequalities of the status quo, as will be discussed next.

Transformative Multicultural

In 1987, Sleeter & Grant[6] used the term *Multicultural Education* to categorize more transformative approaches to multicultural education. In striking contrast to a Human Relations' goal of promoting assimilation into a White U.S. mainstream, a Multicultural Education approach focuses on promoting cultural pluralism and equal opportunity. Cultural pluralism underscores the understanding that "there is no one best way to be a U.S. resident" (Grant & Sleeter, 2007a, p. 178). The approach is founded upon 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" (p. 177). Here, we can see that unlike a the typical focus of a Human Relations approach on culture as defined by race, ethnicity or nationality, a Multicultural Education approach aims to recognize the multidimensionality of each individual's identity.

The approach stems from 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 (Sleeter & Grant 1987, 1988; Grant & Sleeter 2007a, 2007b).

---

[6] These authors rearticulated and expanded descriptions of a Multicultural Education approach in 1988 and 2007a/b.

A Multicultural Education approach corresponds with what Banks (1988, 1989, 2004, 2006a) calls a *transformation* approach. Like the cultural pluralism described above, Banks's explained that a transformation approach encourages *multiple acculturation* (Banks, 2006a): By enabling students to understand a diversity of 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, 2006c). Importantly, both Multicultural Education and Banks's transformation approach emphasize critical thinking, which will be discussed shortly. In Grant and Sleeter's (2007a) recent description of this type of approach, they drew on Banks's (1993) typology and replaced the term "Multicultural Education" with *Transformative Multicultural*.

As mentioned above, critical thinking is a crucial component of a Transformative Multicultural education approach. 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. With this process, students investigate and are led to understand how ideology is shaped and perpetuated, and how it influences their world today and their unequal positions in it (Banks, 2004). This includes not only racial ideology, but also all ideologies related to oppression and discrimination. In direct contrast to the Othering and "new racism" promoted by a Human Relations approach (discussed earlier), a Transformative Multicultural approach is anti-racist and instead guides students to recognize and deconstruct representations that reify stereotypes, that separate out groups as Others, and that perpetuate stratification in U.S. society (Banks, 1996d; Miller, 1996).

To encourage this type of critical thinking, scholars recommend a variety of strategies for implementation of a Transformative Multicultural approach. In what follows, I will review several examples of how I have attempted to take action against oppression, a culminating phase in Freire's (1985, 1970/1993) conscientization process, by applying scholars' strategic suggestions to the graduate and undergraduate art education classes that I teach.

Reflection and modeling equity. In addition to critical deconstruction of multicultural art education with my research, my learnings and ideological alignment with the aims of Transformational Multicultural approaches compelled me to critically reflect on my curriculum and teaching at the university level. An important component of a Transformative approach is modeling equity. Banks (1996e, 2004) stressed that a teacher committed to a Transformative approach needs to model the attitudes and behaviors he or she is teaching. In art education, Andrus (2001) asserted that the art teacher should model equity in every teaching moment. Self-reflexivity is key to the delivery of a program that fosters equity rather than reinscribing hegemony, and scholars have underscored that teachers must be self-reflexive about their own biases and assumptions when developing curricula and teaching strategies (see, for example, Albers, 1999; Chung, 2008; Cohen Evron, 2005; Knight, 2006; Staikidis, 2005). I reflected on how I educate, and have found that my zeal to fight inequality manifests itself in how I shape my curriculum and teach my students, as highlighted in the below descriptions.

Structure: Diverse perspectives centered on concepts. Banks (1996e) explained that the structure of a Transformative curriculum, which interrogates knowledge construction, is one that focuses upon on concepts, events, and issues that are presented from the perspectives of a diverse series of groups. Such counterstories are critical to decentering dominant, hegemonic ideologies (Golding, 2005; Haynes Chavez & Chavez, 2001). To bring my students a diversity of perspectives, rather than have them work from a set text, we engage with theory from a plethora of authors of different backgrounds (gender, age, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, paradigm advocacy, and so on). We focus on comparing, contrasting, critically analyzing and synthesizing across these multiple perspectives regarding focal concepts such as curriculum development, engaging students with art, critiquing and talking about art, diversity and inclusion, and so on.

Live Interactions with Individuals. Additionally, to further extend the range of perspectives to which students are exposed, I encourage them resist holding theory in a privileged position, and ask them to instead critique practice and its alignment or discord with theory. Undergraduates accomplish this by visiting live K-12 art classrooms and comparing, contrasting, critically analyzing and synthesizing across what they have experienced and what they have read. The art teachers and student populations observed also represent a broad scope of backgrounds, as above. In addition, the art teachers run the spectrum from exemplary to challenged in their artroom environments, and first-year art teachers to veterans of decades. Graduate students, all practicing art teachers, additionally critique theory in relationship to their own artroom experiences, as well as those of their colleagues. Theorists in multicultural art

education have often suggested the need to extend perspectives via live interactions with individuals from diverse backgrounds (Adejumo, 2002; Andrus, 2001; Carpenter II, Bey, & Smith, 2007; Chalmers, 1992, 2002; Garber, 1995; Hart, 1991; Stuhr, 1994; Stuhr, Petrovich-Mwaniki, Wasson, 1992). In the rationale for direct contact with individuals, these authors often highlight that such individuals can provide an insider's (in this case, a practioner's and student's) perspective that is more accurate than that of an outsider (non-practicing theorist/scholar) to a group.

Along this same line of insider-outsider reasoning, just as Nieto (1992) employed case studies that provided verbatim accounts from individual marginalized students regarding their educational experiences, voices which are not typically heard "in the debate surrounding school failure and success" (p. 5), these visits to live K-12 artrooms provide an opportunity for individual art teachers' and students' voices and experiences to be heard. These are individuals whose voices, like the disempowered students Nieto interviewed, are commonly the object of theory and debate, but are often absent in the literature on art education theory. As Nieto further argued, her integration of individual students' verbatim accounts also aimed to encourage readers to challenge assumptions, preconceived notions, and biases. In a parallel manner, this is the intent and power of my undergraduates' visits to a diversity of live artrooms: To challenge and negotiate any assumptions, preconceived notions, and biases that they may have held, as gleaned from theory and from recollections of their own experiences in an artroom as teachers and/or students.

Furthermore, as asserted by Banks (1996e), unlike texts, which foster the belief that knowledge is a concrete set of unchanging facts, such live interactions with

individuals guides students to grapple with the complexities of social reality, and reinforces an understanding that knowledge is socially constructed. Participation in this practice helps to establish a climate for students' critical deconstruction of art education theory.

Deconstruction of art education theory. As advocated by multicultural art education theorists (Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 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 cases documented by Albers (1996, 1999), Chung (2008), Cohen Evron (2001, 2005, 2007), Knight (2006), and Staikidis (2005), art classes focused on the interrogation of stereotypes and assumptions, and their relationship to hierarchical structures of oppression. Within these dialogues, students deconstructed their own preconceptions and underlying ideologies, as well as those found in and forwarded by art.

Paralleling this deconstructive strategy, in my art education classes students do the work of deconstructing curricula for its decontextualized (universalizing rather than specifying a limited scope and applicability for concepts), missing (lack of

representation of certain groups' voices), and hidden (underlying biases) communications (Gude, 2000). They additionally look at various paradigms of art education, their own educations in art, and their own beliefs about teaching art, and similarly excavate these for the underlying ideologies being communicated.

Transformation

My use of all the above teaching and curricular strategies have aimed toward the transformation of students understandings and dispositions regarding art and art education to embrace more liberatory perspectives. The below reflections exemplify students journeying towards development of such understandings.

A first year art education undergraduate student's reflections after a synthesizing a diversity of readings for our classes:

> I agree that we often hold artistic aesthetics to one standard within one culture and fail to step outside of that viewpoint. In stepping out, we could see the beauty in the art of other cultures more easily, whereas now there is an ingrained standard in my mind of what makes an artwork impressive. In fact, I see it instilled especially in my university level courses. Each beginning level Art History course I have had only briefly touches on the artworks of countries outside of Europe. I have never heard anyone refer to the artists behind beautiful African masks or the painters behind Japanese ink paintings[7] as "masters."

---

[7] Note: This student was in the early stages of transforming her understandings. While her reflections were beginning to evoke more critical perspectives on the Eurocentricity of her education in the visual arts, she was still in the process of

When someone says, "Have you seen the work of the masters?" I automatically assume they are referring to Renaissance painters. Maybe I can help change this as a future educator, as I don't like the idea of holding a certain art form above another. (T. Plumb[8], personal communication, November 25, 2014)

A first semester graduate art education student's reflection on the meaning of an artwork that she created at the end of our Foundations in Art Education Theory course:

At the bottom of the piece is an arrow engulfed with words and images that represent the ways in which art education was used to maintain the status quo of inequality. The aesthetic and moral values of upper class America were often communicated through art education as well as through museums. I represent this through a melting (Americanizing) pot, which symbolizes the way in which art has been used to create a culture

determined by the upper class. Stankiewicz (2001) describes this as such: "By studying fine arts, teachers and students learned to value European artistic traditions and to construct one version of the common ideals and homogenous culture that Charles Elliot Norton had found missing from the United States" (p. 112). A history of discrimination and abolition of other cultures in our country only deepens this inequality. Educating children about "holiday art" and "aesthetic ideals" cheapened art education and used it to serve other purposes. (M. Apel[9], personal communication, December 7, 2014)

Such critical reflections and understandings, though still under development, provide me with hope that my Transformative Multicultural approach to curricula and teaching is having some constructive impact.

Conclusion: Fighting a Fallacy of Failure to be a "Real American"

During the course of this article, we have seen how I have been Othered and plagued by racist experiences across the course of my life, and how I now fight back. As a Jamaican-born U.S. citizen of Chinese ancestry, I was consistently treated as a non-white Other. I have faced overt racism and new racism throughout my years growing up in the United States. Daily racial microaggressions, and bombardment by media replete with underlying hegemonic messages of White patriarchal supremacy, led me to believe that I had failed to be a "real American."

Critical deconstruction of hegemonic ideology during my graduate studies led me to understand the fallacy of my "failure to be a 'real American.'" It was a belief that I had systematically been convinced to take for

understanding the erroneous nature of conceptualizing culture as demarcated by geographic borders, and essentializing and ahistorically romanticizing stereotyped artforms of these alleged cultures (hence, her assertion of "African masks" and "Japanese ink paintings"). While we discussed such issues at length within our art education seminars, it has been my experience that it takes some time for students to effectively grasp these concepts. This is, I believe, in great part because they have typically been taught within a "Human Relations" framework that legitimized and promoted these notions in their art classes since their elementary years. As such, it is an evolving understanding. As Nieto (1992) asserted, multicultural education is an ongoing process that "must be accompanied by 'unlearning' conventional wisdom," and this takes time (p. 218).

[8] Pseudonym

[9] Pseudonym

granted as my truth, particularly through mechanisms of new racism. Recognition of the injustices and inegalitarianism entailed with the maintenance of this fallacy ignited the flames of my anger. Following the lead of hooks (1996), I used my rage as a catalyst to spur my active resistance, and to fight back against these injustices. I do this through my scholarship and my teaching by endorsing anti-racist Transformative Multicultural theory and practice, and denouncing Human Relations approaches that promote new racism.

I encourage readers, reflecting on the understandings considered in this article, to empathize with and be emotionally provoked by my experiences, to critically contemplate their own beliefs and teaching, and to scrutinize the ideologies forwarded by them. I urge those who have not already done so, to embark on a path of conscientization (Freire, 1985, 1970/1993), take action to eradicate oppressive ideologies and practices, and to guide their students to do the same. I believe that our scholarship and our teaching are potent vehicles that we can leverage to help us to advance more liberatory perspectives and practices. My students' words reflect that this is perhaps possible.

Many years later, as an adult who has critically deconstructed her lifelong experiences with oppression, "Jzzz!" echoes the zipper of my laptop case as I pack-up after submission of another piece of scholarship that aims to encourage readers to join the fight for justice and equality for all.

References

Adejumo, C. O. (2002). Considering multicultural art education. *Art Education*, *55*(2), 33-39.

Albers, P. M. (1996). *Art as literacy: The dynamic interplay of pedagogy and gendered meaning making in sixth-grade art classes.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Albers, P. M. (1999). Art education and the possibility of social change. *Art Education, 52*(4), 6-11.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). London, U.K.: Verso.

Andrus, L. (2001). The culturally competent art educator. *Art Education, 54*(4), 14-19.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum.* London, U.K.: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Balibar, E. (1996). Nation form: History and ideology. In G. Eley & R.G. Suny (Eds.), *Becoming national* (pp. 132-149). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ballengee Morris, C., Mirin, K., & Rizzi, C. (2000). Decolonization, art education, and one Guarani nation of Brazil. *Studies in Art Education, 42*(2), 100-113.

Ballengee-Morris, C., & Stuhr, P. L. (2001). Multicultural art and visual culture education in a changing world. *Art Education, 54* (4), 6-13.

Ballengee-Morris, C., & Stuhr, P. L. (2002). Multicultural art and visual culture in a changing world. In S. G. La Pierre & C. Ballengee-Morris (Eds.), *The evolving theme of teaching multicultural art education. Monograph series* (pp. 25-37). Niwot, CO: United States Society for Education through the Arts.

Banks, C. A. M. (1996). Intergroup education movement. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action, historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 251-277). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, C. A. M. (2004). Intercultural and intergroup education, 1929-1959: Linking schools and communities. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 753-769). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (1988). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. *Multicultural Leader, 1*(2), 1-3.

Banks, J. A. (1989). Integrating curriculum with ethnic content: Approaches and guidelines. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 189-209). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher, 22*(5), 4-14.

Banks, J. A. (1996a). African American roots of multicultural education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action, historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 30-45). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1996b). Canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action, historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 3-29). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1996c). Historical reconstruction of knowledge about race: Implications for transformative teaching. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action, historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 64-88). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1996d). Preface. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action, historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. vii-xi). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1996e). Transformative knowledge, curriculum reform, and action. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action, historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 335-348). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 3-29). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (2006a). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Race, culture, and education: The selected works of James A. Banks* (pp. 140-144). New York, NY: Routledge.

Banks, J. A. (2006b). Democracy, diversity, and social justice. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Race, culture, and education: The selected works of James A. Banks* (pp. 199-213). New York, NY: Routledge.

Banks, J. A. (2006c). Multicultural citizenship education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Race, culture, and education: The selected works of James A. Banks* (pp. 193-198). New York, NY: Routledge.

Barbosa, A. M. (2007). Research on social issues in Brazil. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in art education* (pp. 1071-1073). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Bastos, F. M. C. (2006). 'Tupy or not tupy?' Examining hybridity in contemporary Brazilian art. *Studies in Art Education, 47*(2), 102-117.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 62*(3), 465-480.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). "New Racism," color-blind racism, and the future of whiteness in America. In A. W. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism* (pp. 271-284). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and inequality in contemporary America* (3rd Ed.). Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bonilla-Silva, E., & Lewis, A. E. (1999). The New Racism: Racial structure in the United States, 1960s-1990s. In P. Wong (ed.), *Race, ethnicity, and nationality in the USA: Toward the Twenty-First Century* (55- 101). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Bonilla-Silva, E., & Ray, V. (2009). When Whites love a Black leader: Race matters in Obamerica. *Journal of African American Studies, 13*, 176-183.

Bonilla-Silva, E., Lewis, A., & Embrick, D. G. (2004). "I did not get that job because of a Black man...": The story lines and testimonies of color-blind racism. *Sociological Forum, 19*(4), 555-581.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Cai, M. (1998). Multiple definitions of multicultural literature: Is the debate really just "Ivory Tower" bickering? *The New Advocate, 11*(4), 311-324.

Carpenter II, S., Bey, S., & Smith, M. M. (2007). Inspirational clay studio practices and visiting artists: Products and altar installations. *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education*, *25*, 25-37.

Chalmers, F. G. (1992). Origins of racism in the public school art curriculum. *Studies in Art Education, 33*(3), 134-143.

Chalmers, F. G. (1996). C*elebrating pluralism: Art, education and cultural diversity*. Santa

Monica, CA: The Getty Education Institute for the Arts.

Chalmers, F. G. (2002). Celebrating pluralism six years later: Visual transculture/s, education, and critical multiculturalism. *Studies in Art Education*, *43*(4), 293-306.

Chin, C. (2011). Critiquing commonly available multicultural art education resources. *International Journal of Education through Art, 7*(3), 299-313.

Chin, C. (2013). Key dimensions of a multicultural art education curriculum. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 14*(14), 1-28.

Chung, S. K. (2008). An exploration of the issue of stereotyping in the artroom. *Art Education, 61*(3), 22-24, 33-35.

Cohen Evron, N. (2001). *Beginning art teachers' negotiation of their beliefs and identity within the reality of the public schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Cohen Evron, N. (2005). Students living within violent conflict: Should art educators "play it safe" or face "difficult knowledge"? *Studies in Art Education, 46*(4), 309-322.

Cohen Evron, N. (2007). Conflict and peace: Challenges for art educators. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in art education* (pp. 1031-1054). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Collins, G., & Sandell, R. (1992). Politics of multicultural art education. *Art Education, 45*(6), 8-13.

Cook, L. A., & Cook, E. (1954). *Intergroup education*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Daniels, B. (2005). Transforming performing arts curricula into effective multicultural pedagogy: An African American perspective. *Electronic Magazine of Multicultural Education, 7*(1). Retrieved June 2, 2007 from www.eastern.edu/publications/emme/2005fall/daniels.html

Dash, P. (2005). Cultural demarcation, the African diaspora and art education. In D. Atkinson & P. Dash (Eds.), *Social and critical practices in art education* (pp. 117-125). Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.

Desai, D. (2000). Imaging difference: The politics of representation in multicultural art education. *Studies in Art Education, 41*(2), 114-129.

Desai, D. (2003). Multicultural art education and the heterosexual imagination: A question of culture. *Studies in Art Education, 44*(2), 147-161.

Desai, D. (2005). Places to go: Challenges to multicultural art education in a global economy. *Studies in Art Education, 46*(4), 293-308.

Desai, D. (2010). The challenge of new colorblind racism in art education. *Art Education, 63*(5), 22-28.

Desai, D., & Chalmers, G. (2007). Notes for a dialogue on art education in critical times. *Art Education, 60*(5), 6-12.

Efland, A., Freedman, K., & Stuhr, P. (1996). *Postmodern art education: An approach to curriculum*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks.* (C. L. Markmann, Trans.). New York, NY: Grove Press. (Original work published 1952).

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation* (D. Macedo, Trans.). South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: Anniversary edition* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1970)

Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (R. R. Barr, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1992)

Garber, E. (1995). Teaching art in the context of culture: A study in the borderlands. *Studies in Art Education, 36*(4), 218-232.

Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology culture and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Golding, V. (2005). Museum clearing: A metaphor for new museum practice. In D. Atkinson & P. Dash (Eds.), *Social and critical practices in art education* (pp. 51-66). Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (2007a). *Doing multicultural education for achievement and equity.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (2007b). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Gude, O. (2000). Investigating the culture of curriculum. In E. Fehr, K. Fehr, & K. Keifer-Boyd (Eds.), *Real-world readings in art education: Things your professor never told you* (pp. 75-82). New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Hart, L. M. (1991). Aesthetic pluralism and multicultural art education. *Studies in Art Education, 32*(3), 145-159.

Haynes Chavez, J., & Chavez, R. (2001). Storied lives, dialog, retro-reflections: Melding cortical multicultural education and critical race theory for pedagogical transformation. *Simile, 1*(4), 1-21.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress, education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

hooks, b. (1996). *Killing rage: Ending racism.* New York, NY: Henry Holt and Co.

hooks, b. (2015). *Yearning: Race, gender and cultural politics* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

jagodzinski, j. (1999). Thinking through/difference/in art education contexts: Working the third space and beyond. In D. Boughton & R. Mason (Eds.), *Beyond multicultural art education: International perspectives* (pp. 303-330). New York, NY: Waxmann.

Kader, T. (2005). *SchoolArts*: DBAE and multicultural art education in the USA. *International Journal of Education through Art, 1*(1), 65-84.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279-312). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Knight, W. B. (2006). Using contemporary art to challenge cultural values, beliefs, and assumptions. *Art Education, 59*(4), 39-45.

Mason, R. (1995). *Art education and multiculturalism* (2nd ed.). Corsham, U.K.: National Society for Education in Art and Design.

Meier, D. (2002). *In schools we trust*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Miller, C. (1996). Chapter 8: Mediation and authority: The Native American voices of Mourning Dove and Ella Deloria. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action, historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 141-155). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Neperud, R. W. (1995). Transitions in art education: A search for meaning. In R. W. Neperud (Ed.), *Context, content, and community in art education* (pp. 1-22). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Neperud, R. W., & Krug, D. (1995). People who make things: Aesthetics from the ground up. In R. W. Neperud (Ed.), *Context, content, and community in art education* (pp. 141-170). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity. The socio-political context of multicultural education*. New York, NY: Longman.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Said, E. W. (1985). *Orientalism reconsidered*. Cultural Critique, (1), 89-107.

Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism*. London, UK: Penguin. (Original work published 1977).

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review, 54*(7), 421-443.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1988). *Making choices for multicultural art education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. Columbus, OH: Merill.

Staikidis, K. (2005). Artistic mentorship with two Mayan artists as a source for curricular and pedagogical transformation in higher education. *Electronic Magazine of Multicultural Education, 7*(2). www.eastern.edu/publications/emme/2005fall/staikidis.html

Stankiewicz, M. A. (2001). *Roots of art education practice.* Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.

Stuhr, P. L. (1994). Multicultural art education and social reconstruction. *Studies in Art Education, 35*(3), 171-178.

Stuhr, P. L. (1995). Social reconstructionist multicultural art curriculum design: Using the Powwow as an example. In R. W. Neperud (Ed.), *Context, content, and community in art education* (pp. 193-221). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Stuhr, P. L., Petrovich-Mwaniki, L., & Wasson, R. (1992). Curriculum guidelines for the multicultural art classroom. *Art Education, 45*(1), 16-24.

Sue, D. W., Bucceri, J., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L., & Torino, G. C. (2007). Racial microaggressions and the Asian American experience. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13*(1), 72–81.

Sue, D. W., Nadal, K. L., Capodilupo, C. M., Lin, A. I., Torino, G. C., Rivera, D. P. (2008). Racial microaggressions against Black Americans: Implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86*, 330-338.

Taba, H., & Wilson, H. E. (1946). Intergroup education through the school curriculum. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 244*, 19-25.

Taba, H., Brady, E. H., & Robinson, J. T. (1952). *Intergroup education in public schools*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Tomhave, R. D. (1992). Value bases underlying conceptions of multicultural education: An analysis of selected literature in art education. *Studies in Art Education, 34*(1), 48-60.

Ward, H. (2005). Championing contemporary practice in the secondary classroom. In D. Atkinson & P. Dash (Eds.), *Social and critical practices in art education* (pp. 31-39). Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor.* New York, NY: Columbia University.

World Library of Educationalists. (2006). Race, culture, and education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Race, culture, and education: The selected works of James A. Banks* (pp. i). New York, NY: Routledge.