International Journal of Education & the Arts

Editors

Moving Beyond a Human Relations Approach in Multicultural Art Education Practice

Christina Chin
Western Michigan University, USA

Abstract

While literature on multicultural education indicates that Human Relations approaches to multicultural education are the most commonly practiced, such approaches also tend to be the most heavily critiqued by theorists. Scholars often offer speculative theoretical suggestions on how to improve upon Human Relations approaches. However, ethnographic case studies showing how such suggestions are carried out in the artroom at the elementary level are virtually non-existent in the literature. This article aims to provide readers with an illustrative case of how, in practice, an elementary art teacher is moving beyond the most heavily critiqued characteristics of Human Relations approaches. Descriptive detail is provided to paint a vivid picture of how she implements her curriculum, so that other art educators might draw from her practices and apply similar strategies within their own artrooms, as they see fit.

Introduction

While literature on multicultural education indicates that Human Relations approaches[1] to multicultural education are the most commonly practiced, such approaches also tend to be the most heavily critiqued by theorists. Scholars often offer speculative theoretical suggestions on how to improve upon Human Relations approaches, but do not show how such suggestions have been implemented in practice at the K-5 level. 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. This article aims to offer just such an ethnographic exploration.

In this article, I aim to show how Anna, an elementary school art teacher, has implemented a Contemporary Native American Artists curriculum that moves beyond the strongly criticized deficiencies of Human Relations approaches. In fleshing out the details, I hope to bring her case to life so that other art educators might draw from her practices and apply similar strategies within their own artrooms, as they see fit. Key characteristics of her program that will be highlighted and illustrated within her practice include:
- her overarching goals,
- manner of content integration,
- and how she consciously attended to artists'
  - heterogeneity,
  - vitality,
  - multiple dimensions of identity,
  - transformation and resistance of tradition,
  - emic perspectives and voice,
  - and the complex network of influences from which artists drew, culminating in the hybrid nature of their creations.

Methodology

This ethnographic study was grounded in the paradigm of naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln &

---

[1] *Human Relations* approaches are explained in detail in an upcoming section within this article, "What is a Human Relations Approach to Multicultural Education?"

Guba, 1985), and utilized a case study approach[2] (Stake, 1995). 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 a full academic year through a series of methods including non-participant observation of classes, and in-depth, semi-structured interviews with Anna, her students, and key informants (the principal of her school, one of Anna's visiting Native American artists, and Anna's expert consultant on Native American concerns).

I saw transferability – facilitating a reader's ability to make connections between elements of this study and his or her own experiences – 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, Fretz, & Shaw, 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.

It is important to note that Anna had developed this Native American program in response to the lack of counter-hegemonic[3] multicultural art curricula materials available, and the dearth of information illustrating how multicultural art education practice might be transformed to avoid the stereotype-reifying tendencies of commonly utilized Human Relations approaches; 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.

What is a Human Relations Approach to Multicultural Education*?*

A *Human Relations* approach is akin to the *intergroup education* approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Banks, 2004), which was conceived fundamentally as an assimilationist strategy. The intergroup education movement arose during World War II. The war saw the creation of new

---

[2] For this particular research, a *case study* is understood as a strategy that entails an in-depth study into a bounded entity or event (a case), and aims to flesh out its complexities and particulars in detail for the richest and most complete possible understandings.

[3] I view *hegemony* 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 attain people's conscious and/or unconscious assent to this domination (Balibar, 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Williams, 1977). *Counter-hegemony*, then, is to challenge such control and influence.

industrial urban centers in the North and the West. Southerners and rural populations migrated to find work in the burgeoning industrial urban centers of the North, Midwest, and West (Banks, 2004; Taba, Brady & Robinson, 1952). Hence, the war brought new industries, new ideas, and new people into close contact with one another, much like this age of globalization. As diverse peoples increasingly came into contact with others from different backgrounds, racial tensions arose. By the early 1940s, these conflicts and tensions precipitated into urban race riots, and signaled a pressing urgency to address racial conflicts. The intergroup education movement was designed to help meet this need (Banks, 1996a, 2004; C. A. M. Banks, 1996, 2004; Cook & Cook, 1954). In light of this context, the primary goals of the intergroup education movement were to promote the idea of a shared U.S. culture; reduce stereotypes and related prejudice; engender empathy and understanding between races; deflate conflicts and tensions between races; and, within minority and ethnic groups, foster a sense of ethnic pride and facilitate their assimilation in U.S. society (Banks, 1996a, 2004; C. A. M. Banks, 1996, 2004; Cook & Cook, 1954; Taba & Wilson, 1946). Banks (1988, 1996b, 2004, 2006), considered the "father of multicultural education" (World Library of Educationalists, 2006), offered two approaches that align well with a Human Relations approach and reflect key elements of its characteristics: a contributions approach and an additive approach.

With a *contributions approach*, an educator would sprinkle information connected with various cultures into their mainstream curricula, such as isolated celebratory items and facts, heroes and heroines, holidays and festivals, food and folklore, and the like. These discrete additions would be selected through a Western lens, using the same criteria and standards used to select heroes and heroines, and cultural artifacts for the mainstream curricula. Such an approach reflects a tokenistic, superficial, positive representation of a cultural community, and serves to trivialize and exoticize it. In doing so, it breeds stereotypes and propagates erroneous beliefs (Banks, 1988, 2006). It is commonly used during "ethnic revival movements" (Banks, 2006), 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 frequently the approach employed by schools that are first attempting to integrate multicultural content into the curricula (Banks, 2006).

In terms of an *additive approach*, an educator might add special units on different cultural groups as an appendage to a curriculum. Content for these additive units might include concepts or themes associated with particular cultural groups, and might be explored in greater depth than a contributions approach. However, 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[4] and translated into what a dominant culture dictates/authorizes is to be perceived as that culture's art (Gundara & Fyfe, 1999).

With both approaches, contributions and additive, information about different cultural groups is resigned to the margins of a curriculum, and the mainstream curriculum remains intact and essentially unchanged. In addition, both use "mainstream-centric and Eurocentric criteria and perspectives" to view artifacts and select items for inclusion (Banks, 2006, p. 141). According to Banks (1996b, 2004), these are the two most commonly used approaches to multicultural education. They are characteristic of a Human Relations approach to multiculturalism.

Why is a Human Relations Approach Potentially So Damaging*?*

Though a Human Relations approach may aim for the positive understandings indicated earlier, critics assert that a Human Relations approach does not broach social issues related to status quo (existing state of affairs) structural inequities and injustices endured by marginalized individuals. In limiting itself thusly, it is fundamentally assimilationist as it implicitly asks individuals to accept and adapt to the existing inegalitarian situation: "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).

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 support a Western-conceptualized "Mexican" aesthetic and/or art experience. 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 strongly criticized by art education theorists for its propensity to forward stereotypes and misconceptions about cultural groups, and to view materials from a Western ethnocentric perspective (e.g., Buffington, 2014; Ballengee-Morris & Taylor, 2005; Bequette, 2007; Cahan & Kocur, 1996; Chalmers, 2002; Chin, 2011; Collins & Sandell, 1992; Delacruz, 1995; Desai, 2010; Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996; Garber, 1995; Gude, 2007; Gunew & Rivzi, 1994; Hochtritt, 2005;

---

[4] Assumed to have core essential qualities shared universally within a grouping that is presupposed to be homogenous.

Jackson, 2012; Kader, 2005; Kraehe, 2010; Kuster, 2006; Lai, 2012; Mason, 1995; Reisberg, 2008; Stankiewicz, 2001).

Such challenges in mind, I believe that fundamental critiques against a Human Relations approach extend beyond a masking of inequalities in society: I propose that such an approach contributes to status quo inequities in its implicit endorsement and propagation of hegemonic ideology. Privileging a Western ethnocentric lens, programs employing this approach encapsulate and objectify a cultural group under a unifying label (be it race, ethnicity, nationality, or the like), and presume the power to authorize this label of identity as a supposedly indisputable predeterminant to dictate what the artwork from these groups allegedly entails. Additionally, in its exoticizing and essentializing of the cultural groups that are purportedly represented in such programs, these cultural groups are differentiated from the mainstream and are effectively separated out as a distinct other. Moreover, in its relegation of material about such cultural groups to the margins as inferior addendums to a mainstream curriculum that heralds a Western art canon, cultural groups are not only separated as an other, but as an inferior other. This serves to reinforce a social stratification that positions these cultural groups on the lower rungs of society. Furthermore, with its portrayal of cultural groups' members and art as homogenous and unchanging, nostalgized to a romantic and distant past, the implication is that such groups are incapable of progress, that they are inactive in the contemporary world, and that they are therefore incapable of contributing to the contemporary artworld. This again promotes as sense of inferiority in its implication that these cultural groups lack progress. Such Human Relations approaches breed ahistoric[5], essentialist visions of the cultures supposedly represented, and promote misunderstandings and stereotypes imbued with inferiority, instead of undermining them.

The proliferation of such perspectives is problematic, particularly in the midst of an era of globalization in which the U.S. is becoming a more diverse nation. Based on projections from 2010 U.S. Census data[6], the United States is expected to become more racially and ethnically diverse in upcoming decades (Colby & Ortman, 2015, p. 2). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2012), minorities[7] comprise just over a third (37%) of the U.S. population, and projections indicate that this proportion is expected to grow significantly over the next half

---

[5] Without regard for history or historical development; disregarding of change or development over time

[6] This was the most recent census data available at of the time of publication.

[7] Minorities are defined by the U.S. Census Bureau (2012) to include "all but the single-race, non-Hispanic white population" (para. 12).

century, with minorities comprising 57% of the population by 2060. The minority population is expected to become the majority (greater than 50%), eclipsing the non-Hispanic white population by 2043 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). However, "no group will have a majority share of the total, and the United States will become a 'plurality' of racial and ethnic groups" (Colby & Ortman, 2015, p. 9). The multiracial (two or more races) population is projected to be the fastest growing of all the groups, and is expected to more than double in proportion over the next half century. Furthermore, the increase in the foreign-born population is expected to outpace that of the native-born in the U.S., with foreign-born reaching from 13% in 2014 to 19% of the population by 2060.

More specifically relevant to the case herein, those under 18 years of age, comprising the bulk of the U.S. K-12 student population, are even more racially and ethnically diverse than the total U.S. population. This group is already "nearly a majority-minority" (Colby & Ortman, 2015, p. 10), with minorities comprising approximately 48% of the under 18 population in 2014. By 2060, nearly 2 out of 3 youth (64%) are projected to be minorities, outpacing the minority population growth within the total population.

These statistics in mind, similar to the U.S. environment precipitating the intergroup education movement (the forerunner to Human Relations approaches) in which, "diverse peoples increasingly came into contact with others from different backgrounds," it becomes apparent that contemporary times continue to press the need for ways to negotiate the growing diversity of the U.S. population, particularly the U.S. K-12 student population. Multicultural education seeks to address this need. However, Human Relations approaches to multicultural education are unsuitable for task, as previously discussed. Whereas the alternative approach that follows, which transcends the deficiencies of Human Relations approaches, offers much promise.

Moving Beyond a Human Relations Approach in Practice

Let us now look at an alternative to such potentially damaging Human Relations approaches. In the following discussion, I will introduce you to Anna, an elementary school art teacher who uses an approach to multiculturalism that transcends the characteristics so commonly criticized in Human Relations approaches.

Overview of Anna's Curriculum

Anna designed her program to integrate particular contemporary 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 belief, as stated by Anna, was that students would be engaged with a series of artists of Native American ancestry over the duration of their tenure at the elementary school. Anna 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[8]; 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.

Anna shared that one of her motivations for the development of a curriculum specifically focused on Native American contemporary artists was her discontent regarding a continuing "Chief mascot"[9] 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.

Different Goals

Anna's program diverges from Human Relations approaches in a number of ways, including her overarching goal. As discussed earlier, the Human Relations approach is akin to the intergroup education approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Banks, 2004), and was forwarded during a climate in which there was a heightened need to attend to racial and ethnic conflicts. Anna's development of a Contemporary Native American Artists program was prompted by such a heated 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, 1996, 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

---

[8] 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.

[9] 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.

she target her program at a specific population, but instead engaged all of her students in it. In line with Banks' (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 Art Curriculum
While Human Relations approaches are critiqued for tacking-on cultural material as an appendage to the core curriculum (Banks, 2004, 2006), this was not so in Anna's case. Instead, both non-Western and Western art were integrated throughout her curricula. Non-Western and Western art and artists commingled as some of the many arts in the world that were 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, following a 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 stated that she wanted her students to understand that "each artist is different." Rather than presenting Native American art as having a core essence, Anna said that she 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, nor did it make all of the artists homogenous.

Attention To Multiple Dimensions Of Identity

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, 1994, 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 word, "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 geographies and tribes, and differed from each another in terms of their gender, age, training, and ability/disability.

Focus On Living Individual Artists

Each lesson presented in Anna's 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[10], 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'

---

[10] Pseudonym

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[11] 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 each title slide, and her words emphasized each artist's living status, and reinforced the textual information.

What follows are a few examples that illustrate how Anna introduced each 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 invited her fourth graders to meet Michael Naranjo. On the whiteboard screen, an

---

[11] In-person interview with Erin Montan (pseudonym), April 13, 2009

opening slide 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 Naranjo's 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 sepiatone 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 her neck, and a gold bracelet dotted by red and green gems encircled her wrist. 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, the two following accounts reveal how Anna introduced an artist who was strongly inspired by elements of a tradition of his tribal ancestors, Lowe; and one who rejected tradition altogether and eschewed stereotypes, Naranjo-Morse.

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. 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." 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 shown 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 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 case of 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[12], 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
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. Clicking to the

---

[12] A parfleche is a bag made from the hide of an animal.

next slide, Anna stated, "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 was 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 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.

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 foliage in maroon-pink, and translucent beige surrounded their legs as they danced within a sponge-textured background of royal blue and soft green. Anna explained that after grieving the death of her husband, "in Italy, she [WalkingStick] met someone new, and they're dancing." With this observation, Anna again underscored how the artist drew from events in her personal life.

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[13] 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 recommended 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 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).

---

[13] In-person interview with Kay WalkingStick, April 18, 2009

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, 2006). Due to Anna's selection of artists from the Eiteljorg Museum's[14] 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 Art[15] exhibitions. Works for these 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

---

[14] Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art in Indianapolis, Indiana.

[15] 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 Fellows: Lowe and Nicolson in 1999; Feddersen and Bartow in 2001; Naranjo-Morse and WalkingStick in 2003; and Lavadour in 2005.

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, 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[16].

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 perspective: "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[17].

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 presentation on WalkingStick.

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

---

[16] Discussed in the sections "Focus on living artists," and "Transforming and resisting tradition."

[17] Discussed in the section entitled, "Personal life experiences."

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 hybidity 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.

Summation

Anna's Contemporary Native American Artists program contrasted significantly with Human Relations approaches to multiculturalism, and in doing so it moved beyond 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, 2006), 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, 1994, 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 (Adejumo, 2002). Her presentations illustrated how a complex network of life experiences that transcended ethnic and geographic borders shaped each of the artists' creations (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).

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 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. In this

way, her approach challenged hegemonic ideologies. Her case *shows how* art educators at the elementary level might move beyond Human Relations approaches that forward hegemony, and embrace multicultural education practices that are counter-hegemonic.

References

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

Anderson, V., & Manganello, V. (Executive Producers). (2008, December 17). *Path breakers: Ten years of the Eiteljorg Fellowship for Native American Fine Art* [Television broadcast]. Indianapolis, IN: WFYI-TV Public Broadcasting Service.

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

Ballengee-Morris, C. (2008). Indigenous aesthetics: Universal circle related and connected to everything called life. *Art Education, 61*(2), 30-33.

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.

Ballengee-Morris, C. & Taylor, P. G. (2005). You can hide but you can't run: Interdisciplinary and culturally sensitive approaches to mask making. *Art Education, 58*(5), 12-17.

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: Teachers College Press.

Banks, C. A. M. (2004). Chapter 36: 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: Macmillan.

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

Banks, J. A. (1994). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

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: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1996b). 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: 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: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (2006). 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: Routledge.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York: Macmillan.

Barbosa, A. M. (1999). Cultural identity in a dependent country: The case of Brazil. In D. Boughton & R. Mason (Eds.), *Beyond multicultural art education: International perspectives* (pp. 185-198). New York: Waxmann.

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

Bequette, J. (2007). Traditional arts knowledge, traditional ecological lore: The intersection of art education and environmental education. *Studies in Art Education,* 48(4), 360-374.

Berry, C., & Martin, F. (2003). Syncretism and synchronicity: Queer'n'Asian cyberspace in the 1990s Taiwan and Korea. In C. Berry, F. Martin, & A. Yue (Eds.), *Mobile cultures: New media in queer Asia* (pp. 87-114). London: Duke University Press.

Bresler, L. (1994). What formative research can do for music education: A tool for informed change. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 5*(3), 11-24.

Buffington, M. L. (2014). Power play: Rethinking roles in the art classroom. *Art Education, 67*(4), 6-12.

Cahan, S., & Kocur, Z. (Eds.). (1996). *Contemporary art and multicultural education*. New York: The New Museum of Contemporary Art.

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. (1996). Ce*lebrating pluralism: Art, education and cultural diversity*. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Education Institute for the Arts.

Chalmers, F. G. (1999). Cultural colonialism and art education: Eurocentric and racist roots of art education. In D. Boughton & R. Mason (Eds.), *Beyond multicultural art education: International perspectives* (pp. 173-184). New York: Waxmann.

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 resources. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 7*(3), 299-313.

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.

Colby, S. L., & Ortman, J. M. (2015). *Projections of the size and composition of the U.S. population: 2014-2060.* Washington, DC: United States Census Bureau.

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.

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.

Delacruz, E. M. (1995). Multiculturalism and art education: Myths, misconceptions, and misdirections. *Art Education, 48*(3), 57-61.

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.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Gall, D. A. (2006). *National Art Education Association 2006 conference proceedings: Appropriate sharing: A visiting Indonesian artist helps turn students around with shadow puppets.* New York: National Art Education Association.

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

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz, *Interpretation of cultures* (pp. 3-30). New York: Basic Books.

Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (1990). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

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

Gude, O. (2007). Principles of possibility: Considerations for a 21st-century art and culture curriculum. *Art Education, 60*(1), 6-17.

Gundara, J., & Fyfe, C. (1999). Intercultural visual literacy and art history. In D. Boughton & R. Mason (Eds.), *Beyond multicultural art education: International perspectives* (pp. 87-102). New York: Waxmann.

Gunew, S., & Rizvi, F. (Eds.). (1994). *Culture, difference and the arts.* St. Leonard's, NSW Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Hochtritt, L. (2005). Pre-packaged multiculturalism: A cause for concern in the art classroom. *Electronic Magazine of Multicultural Education, 7*(2). Retrieved from www.eastern.edu/publications/emme/2005fall/hochtritt.html

Hwang, R. (2006). Integrating Buddhist doctrine into art education. *International Journal of Education through Art, 2*(2), 93-103.

Irwin, R., & Miller, L. (1997). Oral history as community-based participatory research: Learning from the First Nations women artists. *Journal of Multicultural and Cross-cultural Research in Art Education, 15*, 10-23.

Jackson, T. (2012). Introducing Charly Palmer: Tar Baby and culturally responsive teaching. *Art Education, 65*(6), 6-11.

Jaddo, L. (2007). Reclaiming my Turkumani identity through making art. *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education*, *25*, 105-114.

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

Kárpáti, A. (1999). When pedagogy becomes politics: Folk art in Hungarian art education. In D. Boughton & R. Mason (Eds.), *Beyond multicultural art education: International*

perspectives (pp. 151-171). New York: Waxmann.

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.

Kraehe, A. (2010). Multicultural art education in an era of standardized testing: Changes in knowledge and skill for art teacher certification in Texas. *Studies in Art Education, 51*(2), 162-175.

Kuo, A. C. S. (1999). Localisation, internationalization, and art in Taiwan. In D. Boughton & R. Mason (Eds.), *Beyond multicultural art education: International perspectives* (pp. 249-262). New York: Waxmann.

Kuster, D. (2006). Back to the basics: Multicultural theories revisited and put into practice. *Art Education, 59*(5), 33-39.

Lai, A. (2012). Culturally responsive art education in a global era. *Art Education, 65*(5), 18-24.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J. (1997). *Art and science of portraiture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Chichester, Wiley.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Denzin, N. K. (2000). Seventh moment, out of the past. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1047-1065). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lloyd, C. (2008, February). *Q&A: Eiteljorg curator Jennifer Complo McNutt*. Retrieved from http://www.indy.com/posts/q-a-eiteljorg-curator-jennifer-complo-mcnutt

lok, S. P. S. (2005). Outtakes. In D. Atkinson & P. Dash (Eds.), *Social and critical practices in art education* (pp. 103-116). Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.

MacPhee, J. (2004). Celebrate people's history project. *Democracy & Education: Teaching the Arts for Social Justice, 15*(3), 121-122.

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

Milbrandt, M. K. (2002). Addressing contemporary social issues in art education: A survey of public school art educators in Georgia. *Studies in Art Education, 43*(2), 141-157.

Moura, A. (1999). Art patrimony in Portuguese middle schools: Problems of cultural bias. In D. Boughton & R. Mason (Eds.), *Beyond multicultural art education: International perspectives* (pp. 115-134). New York: Waxmann.

Naranjo-Morse, N. (1992). *Mud woman: Poems from the clay*. Tuscon, AZ: University of Arizona 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: Teachers College Press.

Parks, N. S. (2000). The industrial and cultural history of Indiana murals by Thomas Hart Benton: A context for examining racism with preservice teachers. *Journal of Multicultural and Cross-cultural Research in Art Education, 18,* 74-85.

Parks, N. S. (2004). Bamboozled: A visual culture text for looking at cultural practice of racism. *Art Education, 57*(2), 14-18.

Pratt, M. L. (1992). *Imperial eyes: Studies in travel writing and transculturation*. New York: Routledge.

Reisberg, M. (2008). Social/ecological caring with multicultural picture books: Placing pleasure in art education. *Studies in Art Education,* 49(3), 251-267.

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

Somjee, S. (1999). Learning to be indigenous and being taught to be modern: The ethnography of lessons in art and material culture in Kenya. In D. Boughton & R. Mason (Eds.), *Beyond multicultural art education: International perspectives* (pp. 199-212). New York: Waxmann.

Spang, L. B. (1995). The process of self definition within the Native North American art movement. *Journal of Multicultural and Cross-cultural Research in Art Education, 13*, 49-66.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *Art of case study.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Stockrocki, M. (2004). Contexts for teaching art. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day, *Handbook of research and policy in art education* (pp. 439-466). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

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.

United States Census Bureau. (2012, December 12). U.S. Census Bureau projections show a slower growing, older, more diverse Nation a half century from now. In *United States Census Bureau newsroom archive (news releases)*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb12-243.html

WalkingStick, K. (2009, April). *Second general session: Kay WalkingStick*. Presented at the National Art Education Association annual conference, Minneapolis, MN.

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

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: Routledge.

About the Author

Christina D. Chin is an Assistant Professor of Art Education in the Frostic School of Art at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Dr. Chin's research focuses on the issue of marginalization, particularly as it applies to multicultural art education, creativity, and the place of the visual arts within U.S. society. Her aim is to bridge art education theory with practice. She has therefore devoted numerous years to observing and researching in K-12 artrooms.