

Approaches to Multiculturalism in Art Education Curriculum Products: Business as Usual

ELIZABETH MANLEY DELACRUZ

The purpose of this article is to examine the relationship between multicultural art education theory and multicultural art education curriculum products. The current proliferation of multicultural art prints, books, videos, audiocassettes, slides, transparencies, postcards, packaged lessons, and other instructional materials signals industry response to our growing interest in multicultural art education. Despite extensive work in multicultural art education theory development, research, curricular recommendations, and advocacy, serious problems persist in the curriculum products industry. As this article indicates, many educational products appear to be advocating multicultural art education practices that may not be supportable, perpetuating stereotypical misconceptions, reinforcing monocultural myths, and miseducating students about art and artists.

Multicultural Theory and Research in Art Education

Theoretical and historical writings dealing with multicultural art education reflect varying interests. A review of these writings reveals commonalities worth noting: (a) a call for greater diversity of artists considered in programs of study and for an effort to engage students in historical/contextual inquiry, (b) a need to expand and revise central notions in art history, criticism, and aesthetics and the manner in which we study the artistic exemplars of diverse cultural groups, and (c) a concern for the underlying frameworks that perpetuate patterns of social injustice.¹ The following discussion highlights these commonalities.

Diversity and Contextual Understanding

Proponents of multicultural art education call for the inclusion of more diverse art in programs of study. For Paulette Spruill-Flemming, this means

Elizabeth Manley Delacruz is Assistant Professor of Art Education, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She has most recently published articles in *Visual Arts Research* and contributed essays to *Art Education: Elementary and Evaluation in Art Education*.

that “art educators must seek out exemplars that help students appreciate different categories of aesthetic objects, understand cultural traditions, and provide transnational linkages to connect students to the diversity of the cultural heritage of all members of our society.”² An important feature of such an approach is the need to examine the context of artistic production and valuing, rather than focussing on the isolated artist or object. Graeme Sullivan contends that the stereotype of the artist working alone outside of a social framework is a myth.³ Laurie Hicks argues that the decontextualization of objects, removing them from their ongoing social, political, and community life, denies access to their meanings.⁴

As Flemming, Sullivan, and Hicks suggest, expanding potential content for study and reformulating what we teach requires a shift in thinking about the nature and value of art. Merely adding a few art objects from previously overlooked cultural groups is not the goal. Rather, broadening our concept of what we believe is worth knowing about art is at the heart of multicultural education.

Revising the Art Disciplines

Concomitant with an interest in diversity and context, the literature on multicultural art education examines and revises content and inquiry processes in the art disciplines: art criticism, aesthetics, and art history. Underlying this interest in these particular art disciplines is an interest in the manner in which inquiry processes in art criticism, aesthetics, and art history shape educational programs. This work provides a variety of viable alternative pedagogical models for the teaching of art.

Doug Blandy and Kristin Congdon recommend that the criticism of art should be done in a way that “recognizes the cultural, political, sociological, ecological and economic aspects of art.”⁵ A variety of perspectives and models for doing this are suggested in Blandy and Congdon's *Pluralistic Approaches to Art Criticism*.⁶

Adrienne Hoard examines the notion of a Black aesthetic and concludes that visual perception develops along culturally determined understandings and biases.⁷ In contrast, Deborah Ambush recasts aesthetic discourse as self-inquiry, linking aesthetics to the notion of *centering*. She advocates curriculum structures that “nurture ideas about not only the nature of art but also the nature of self.”⁸ Both perspectives, culturally centered aesthetic inquiry and self-centered aesthetic inquiry, shift the focus of aesthetic inquiry from the object to the inquirer, or from the object to the context of its production, or, finally, from the object to the context of inquiry.

Norman DePillars and Jacqueline Chanda recast art-historical inquiry, addressing the missing or misrepresented histories of previously devalued cultural groups. DePillars maintains that in the larger scheme of history, Africans and Native Americans have been grossly misrepresented. He surveys the artistic and cultural contributions of African-descended people

in many parts of the world, contributions overlooked in popular art history texts.⁹ Jacqueline Chanda also observes our lack of reliable information and historical treatment of African art and culture.¹⁰ She attempts to dispel monocultural notions about sub-Saharan Africa by distinguishing cultural groups from one another and describing their artworks with regard to political, religious, ceremonial, and commemorative themes.¹¹ Revisionist art histories such as those offered by DePillars and Chanda not only enlarge the body of knowledge about art, they question the nature and function of historical inquiry itself and suggest a slightly different view of the process and products of history writing. This questioning and reviewing of historiography is, in itself, potential content for study.

New methods for engaging in critical inquiry, broadened notions of “the aesthetic,” and revisionist historiography enhance our knowledge of diverse artists and cultures, offer rich content for curriculum development, and suggest alternative modes of interaction with the artistic accomplishments of diverse cultural groups.

Social Interests and Issues

A concern for the underlying frameworks that perpetuate patterns of social injustice pervades much of the literature on multicultural art education. Recommendations made by art educators center on the development of programs and activities designed to foster students' skills in critical self-study and analysis of their own cultural assumptions.¹² Elizabeth Sacca maintains that art teachers must recognize the political forces working against art, community, and the environment. For Sacca, art teachers play a vital role in the preservation of cultures.¹³ Kristin Congdon and Doug Blandy address the manner in which social institutions, including schools, may foster equality of opportunity by undertaking a critical evaluation of undemocratic practices.¹⁴ Vincent Lanier and Norman DePillars argue that art education should be centered on contemporary social issues and not individualized art-making activities.¹⁵ For Jan Jagodzinski, art education must be directed toward emancipation coupled with radical social action.¹⁶

These recommendations, each progressively suggesting, perhaps, a more radical vision of art education, demonstrate the expanding mission of our field as we come to terms with multiculturalism. The mandate for social action is, in fact, part of the larger multicultural education reform movement advocated by prominent scholars and multiculturalists such as Eugene Banks, Christine Sleeter, and Carl Grant.¹⁷

Multicultural Art-Educational Products

The concerns discussed above formed the basis of a review of curriculum products conducted by this writer. Central to this review was the question:

What is the degree of congruence between research and writings about multicultural art education and multicultural art curriculum materials produced for the schools?

Parameters of the Study

Curriculum materials examined in this study were analyzed according to the following five broad educational parameters: *Objectives and outcomes*—stated multicultural goals and objectives and outcomes, stated and unintended; *Content*—artworks and artists included; *Context*—kind of information given about artworks and artists; *Philosophical orientation*—approach to philosophical, pedagogical, and aesthetic theories underlying approaches to art,¹⁸ and *Student activities*—the manner in which students are asked to act upon selected content. These parameters were examined with regard to how well they reflected the multifaceted missions of multicultural art education, that is, an interest in diversity, revision, and social reconstruction.

Criteria for the selection of art education curriculum products to be examined in this study included: (1) advertising or promotion as multicultural (materials advertised as multicultural in the school supply catalogues, promoted at national and state conferences, or described in their prefaces or introductions as serving multicultural aims); (2) collection of a wide range of types of curriculum materials produced for teachers and students (texts, activity books, prints, slide sets, video tapes) and developed for varying age groups K-12; (3) availability of these products, and (4) recentness of publication of these products.¹⁹

Approaches to Multicultural Art Education Found in Curriculum Products

Given the focus of this study of curriculum materials, it became evident that in most cases school texts and activity books were more comprehensive in dealing with the pedagogical parameters indicated earlier (objectives and activities) than were slide sets, print sets, and audio and video tapes, which tended to be more focused on selected art, artists, and cultures. These materials were less developed in terms of pedagogy but better developed in terms of content, history, and context. For this reason, it became necessary to think differently about these kinds of materials, focusing more on their treatment of art and artists, on cultural and contextual concerns, and on philosophical orientation.

In both kinds of materials—the art activity books and those materials focused more exclusively on selected artists and cultural groups—four approaches to multicultural art education were identified: *Ethnic tourism*—culture hopping or art-around-the-world; *Design and media literacy*—exploration of selected design concepts, materials, and processes as evidenced in ethnic and cultural exemplars; *Understanding cultural heritage*—exemplars from diverse cultures studied with attention to universal humanistic themes and

historical concepts; and *Social issues*—attention to cultural values and ethics with emphasis on moral and civic responsibility. Features of these four approaches, with regard to the five pedagogical parameters identified earlier, are shown in table 1.²⁰

Discrepancies between Curriculum Theory and Curriculum Products

A comparison of approaches to multiculturalism found in selected art education curriculum materials with approaches advocated in the professional art education literature reveals widely varying degrees of congruity. Discrepancies between theory and products were greatest among the art texts and activity books produced for school use at the elementary level. Discrepancies include a preoccupation with formal design and limited aesthetic concerns, superficial treatment of artists and their works, a lack of attention to social and cultural context, and an absence of difficult subject matter. The following comments describe these discrepancies in greater detail.

Preoccupation with Design and Technique

Many of the multicultural art/activity books examined in this study are focused almost exclusively on the transmission of formal design concepts and on providing exploratory experiences with a variety of traditional or exotic art materials and processes. Student-teacher discussions about ethnic art, especially at the elementary level, are concerned with discovering examples of selected design conventions or with looking at uses of media, as a prelude to having students make something employing these design concepts and media.

A popular example of this kind of practice is the traditional mask-making lesson, found at all levels of instruction, in which students make a mask after a brief introduction to Native American or African masks. The purpose of the activity is the creation of a decorative, expressive mask, often utilizing three-dimensional materials. The purpose of using African or Native American masks is to inspire students in their own mask making (a mask that will not be worn or used by their makers) and not the contemplation or appreciation of those masks, artists, or cultures selected to motivate the lesson. In a similar manner, yarn-painting studio activities (based on the sacred and visionary works of Huichol shamans of central Mexico) are often translated into simplistic student explorations with brightly colored acrylic yarn and glue on paper, sometimes with an animal theme.

The educational significance of activities such as the making of masks, yarn-paintings, sand-paintings, gods-eyes, rattles, paper weavings, Indian headdresses and headbands, and a host of other replicas of Native American and African art is questionable. In practices such as these, and there are many more, art production lessons are either imitations of ethnic art or

	Ethnic Tourism	Design and Media Literacy	Cultural Heritage	Social Issues
Objectives	Personal enrichment Recreation or entertainment	Learn about elements and principles of art Explore media, develop media skills	Enhance understanding and appreciation of the art and cultures of others	Raise social consciousness Motivate social action
Artworks & Artists	Traditional folk art & non-western artifacts from exotic cultures Enjoyable content & imagery Artists rarely named	Enjoyable content Artworks are examples of selected design concepts Artworks are examples of use of materials Artists' backgrounds scant	Artworks are exemplars of western styles Artworks are examples of universal themes Artists' brief bios given	Disturbing content & imagery More contemporary works Artists' background important Artists often quoted
Context	Brief cultural background sometimes given A-political Religious functions & meanings devalued Artworks and cultures isolated and decontextualized	Brief cultural background sometimes given A-political Religious functions & meanings devalued Artworks and artists related by design or media, decontextualized	Benign historical and intercultural influences Emphasis on conventions of style Some attention to artists biographic backgrounds	Context, influences, and social structures Social concerns of artists and cultures Political and economic interactions between and within cultures
Orientation	Personal fulfillment Universalist	Cognitive processes Skill building Modernist	Expanded academic rationalism Anthropological	Reconceptualism Revisionist Social reconstruction
Activities	Make replicas Imitate cultural artifacts, symbols, themes Explore novel materials	Learn about and apply design concepts to own work Master a variety of media Work expressively on projects	Learn about and research cultures, artists, art Factual historical info. tested Explore similar themes in own art	Examine issues as conveyed in artworks Make work of art about issues of concern

Table 1: Approaches to Multicultural Art Education

conceptually incongruent with the multicultural content used to motivate the activity.

Decontextualized Inquiry

When multicultural works are utilized primarily to teach about preselected design concepts and media, students are rarely engaged in open-ended, sustained activities devoted to the consideration of the aesthetic significance, meanings, functions, or social value of the selected art exemplars. Students are rarely given opportunities to examine and discuss the variety and diversity of styles within particular art forms or within particular cultural groups. In many multicultural curriculum materials, selected objects are introduced as broad representatives of a type of art form, giving students a static conception of art, artists, and culture. This manner of dealing with art objects misleads students into thinking that masks, sculptures, weavings, pottery, or the other objects being studied that are produced by diverse cultures embody the same aesthetic criteria, meanings, functions, and values because they *look* similar. Students learn very little about these artifacts or the people who made them.

Practices such as these devalue the art of represented groups and mis-educate children about the nature and role of their own art. Although the literature advocating multiculturalism rejects an *exclusive* preoccupation with decontextualized, ahistorical inquiry, many multicultural art educational products foster just such an approach.²¹

Cultural Consumerism

Many multicultural art programs and curriculum products attempt to promote intercultural appreciation, but teacher procedures and student activities take the form of "ethnic tourism" (a term used by Ralph Smith in 1983).²² Sometimes entire multicultural art programs are comprised of a smorgasbord of studio activities, one per culture, based on a selection of cultures from around the world. This relegates the artistic and symbolic expressions of unfamiliar or exotic peoples to the status of recreational *cultural consumables*, revealed in a superficial manner to students as anthropological specimens and aesthetic curiosities. Such practices trivialize art at best, they perpetuate cultural stereotyping and racism at worst.

Hit and Miss

A limited range of kinds of multicultural artistic exemplars have been selected for study by students in many of the curriculum products examined. Attempts to include the art of diverse cultural groups often result in the selection of older traditional objects produced by male artists of favored cultural groups. Within this limited range, some attempt has been made to add information about unfamiliar or historically remote cultures and to pay cur-

ricular tributes to handy ethnic groups, but such endeavors remain sporadic and unwieldy, lacking the broader critical view provided by a clear philosophical framework.²³

Whitewashing Art

Works of art selected for study exclude art that deals with problematic subject matter or controversial social issues, issues that are prominent both in the literature pertaining to multicultural education and within the contemporary art world.²⁴ Such practice devalues the aesthetic and artistic significance of these works, denies students the opportunity to examine the nature, purpose, content, and meanings of an important body of work, and miseducates students about the nature of art itself. The selection of “nice works of art” for study literally whitewashes art, making it noncontroversial, clean. This practice may reflect the reality of public school education, where curriculum self-censorship is a survival rule of thumb in many communities. But art in the real world is anything but tidy. Norman DePillars makes this point abundantly clear, “Art is not universal, it is not value free, it is not apolitical, and it is not fun and games. Art is serious.”²⁵ Vincent Lanier goes so far as to call art dangerous, by definition.²⁶

Beyond Creating, Part II

Despite extensive efforts to move teaching practice and curricula toward historical inquiry, most of the classroom activities suggested in many of the curriculum materials focus on studio production, to the virtual exclusion of developing knowledge and skills in responding, appreciating, judging, researching, interpreting, looking for meaning, or contemplating the sociohistorical parameters of art.

Nonstudio art lessons, especially at the elementary level, seem marginally concerned with the artists' lives or with critical art-historical information about selected artworks, serving primarily to enhance students' studio lessons. Lessons at the secondary level deal more effectively with general historical concepts. But little attention is paid to key aspects of the social history of the artists and cultures included. Almost no attention is paid to economic or political issues of concern to artists of color. The message here is that elementary-age students either don't need or can't understand history and that problematic contextual issues associated with particular works of art are irrelevant to the education of older students.

Why Such Discrepancies?

Multiculturalism, by definition, refuses to be just one thing. Proposals, advocacy, and curricular approaches are extensive and profuse. Multiple and sometimes contradictory concepts and premises characterize what appears

to be a polyvocal, amorphous field of inquiry. The literature on multiculturalism lacks conceptual clarity at present. Are we educating for connoisseurship or for social action? Familiar issues of breadth versus depth also confound curriculum development and programming. Multicultural art education involves teaching multiple aesthetic and artistic perspectives,²⁷ no easy task and, perhaps, reason enough for the confusing array of multicultural curriculum products.

The fact that curriculum products that have more well-developed pedagogical material were found to be more incongruent with multicultural theory and research is not surprising. It may be less problematic to engage in focused historical, critical, and aesthetic research on diverse art and artists than it is to design high-quality, broadly focused, developmentally appropriate curricula for public school use—that also meet the multifaceted mission of multicultural art education. The discrepancies between multicultural theory and educational products may be attributed, then, in part to the wide range of approaches and agendas congruent with multicultural education, and in part to the difficulties associated with curriculum development.

Despite these caveats, the educational products industry has missed the mark for other reasons. Curriculum materials often misrepresent the art and culture of selected groups as static traditions; works of art are often utilized primarily as motivation for creating replicas or as spin-offs for studio explorations; and students are rarely engaged in the examination of the complex and problematic concepts and issues that selected (and excluded) works offer. The industry ignores the fact that diverse students learn differently, underestimates the manner in which students understand historical concepts of time, place, and social significance, and disregards the potential richness in students' perceptions and responses to the symbolic and cultural content manifest in art.

With regard to talk about art, art-critical and aesthetic inquiry, there is no reasonable explanation for the simplistic, superficial practices recommended in many of the educational products developed for use in elementary schools. We now have a much better understanding of students' capacities for depth and substance in their talk about art. Considerable advancements in thinking about how students of all ages understand and respond to art, coupled with innovative, sound initiatives for teaching, have been made.²⁸

With regard to the popularly recommended practice of asking students to replicate ethnic art, the message seems to be that younger students can only imitate the art, ideas, or techniques of others and that students of all ages lack personal, individual incentives for creating meaning of their own through art. Anyone who has spent time with students knows that this is

simply unfounded. The larger issue of cultural appropriation is rarely discussed, even in the multicultural art education literature.

Finally, on the issue of problematic art, product developers have taken the liberty of censoring curriculum materials themselves, rather than leaving this task where it belongs, with teachers who make content decisions in the context of their own schools and communities. Excluding problematic art from curriculum resources limits teachers' opportunity to utilize the potential of this art, forcing them to conduct their own search/research for usable resources that deal with such art.²⁹

Why all these discrepancies? Perhaps product developers are merely responding to current art education practice, which favors individual art-making activities almost exclusively, which relegates the serious study of art to postsecondary schooling, and which, in its already vulnerable position in the schools, avoids controversy by necessity.

The Mutual Interests of Art Education and Multiculturalism

For some of us, the convergence of multiculturalism and art education seems natural. Art is one of the most powerful and pervasive expressions of meaning and value within most, if not all, cultures. Understanding art requires the integration of contextual/historical knowledge with sustained aesthetic contemplation; again, no easy educational task considering the complexity of these two domains. Smith contends that the best way to understand the art of unfamiliar cultures is to correctly interpret what that culture has to say to us through its symbols. This requires a "wealth of knowledge and endless patience," with sensitive attention to meanings and functions.³⁰ Public schools may not always be places where a wealth of knowledge, sensitive attention to meanings, and endless patience are really possible or even valued, and we may soon become caught up in a growing neoconservative backlash against multiculturalism.

As DePillars observes, multiculturalism is the most controversial and least practiced concept in schools. It is controversial because "the basic roots of America are grounded in the soil of class, religious, and racial privileges."³¹ It is least practiced because teachers lack adequate preparation and appropriate resources, and, as Elliot Eisner points out, because of resistance by those who do not favor the social agenda of multicultural education.³²

It behooves us to remember that the educational products industry is big business. Publishers in the education products industry manufacture and market their products to address the demands of their consumers, in this case, art teachers. Marketing strategies have become increasingly sophisticated and creative over the past twenty years, capitalizing on the trends in the business of educating children. The educational products industry is in

the business of making a profit. To do so, products offered for sale must appeal to the widest possible constituency. This underlying motivation to serve the interests of the majority may not be compatible with the notions of giving redress to the politically disenfranchised or of promoting pluralism.

Perhaps the best that can be said of the curriculum products industry is that there is an *attempt* to address the need for materials and resources for teaching art, including the demand for resources representing a greater diversity of art and artists. But we must not abdicate our responsibility for the quality of educational resources to the educational products industry. Educating future generations about the multifaceted nature, value, and meanings of art is our business. In our demand for resources and materials dealing with the art of diverse cultures, we have apparently not conveyed an interest in tackling the complex issues that go hand in hand with multiculturalism. Perhaps the time has come for art teachers and educators to take a more active role in defining their field to product developers and setting higher standards for quality multicultural art education curriculum materials.

NOTES

1. The manner in which curriculum materials deal with the problematic nature of the codification of knowledge (a related theme often explored in social reconstructionists' discussions of schooling) was not considered in this study.
2. Paulette Spruill-Fleming, "Pluralism and DBAE: Towards a Model for Global Multicultural Art Education," *Journal of Multicultural and Crosscultural Research in Art Education* 6, no. 1 (1988): 72.
3. Graeme Sullivan, "Art-Based Art Education: Learning that Is Meaningful, Authentic, Critical, and Pluralist," *Studies in Art Education* 35, no. 1 (Fall 1993): 5-21.
4. Laurie E. Hicks, "Social Reconstruction and Community," *Studies in Art Education* 35, no. 4 (Summer 1994): 149-56.
5. Doug Blandy and Kristen G. Congdon, "Art and Culture Collections in Art Education: A Critical Analysis," *Journal of Multicultural and Crosscultural Research in Art Education* 9, no. 1 (1991): 15.
6. Doug Blandy and Kristen G. Congdon, eds., *Pluralistic Approaches to Art Criticism* (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1991).
7. Adrienne W. Hoard, "The Black Aesthetic: An Empirical Feeling," in *Art, Culture and Ethnicity*, ed. Bernard Young (Reston, Va.: National Art Education Association, 1990), pp. 155-68.
8. Deborah Ambush, "Points of Intersection: The Convergence of Aesthetics and Race as a Phenomenon of Experience in the Lives of African American Children," *Visual Arts Research* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 17.
9. M. Norman DePillars, "Multiculturalism in Visual Arts Education: Are America's Educational Institutions Ready for Multiculturalism?" in *Art, Culture, and Ethnicity*, ed. Bernard Young (Reston, Va.: National Art Education Association, 1990): 115-34.
10. Jacqueline E. Chanda, "Alternative Concepts and Terminologies for Teaching African Art," *Art Education* 45, no. 1 (January 1992): 56-61.
11. Jacqueline E. Chanda, *African Arts & Cultures* (Worcester, Mass.: Davis, 1993). History and reference books of this kind were not included in this study,

- although they may have been developed with teachers in mind. Written for a general adult audience, *African Arts & Cultures* is broadly focused, yet not overgeneralized. Readers interested in other books, videos, and periodicals about African art and culture will find Chanda's bibliography and resource list useful.
12. Dan Nadaner, "The Art Teacher as Cultural Mediator," *Journal of Multicultural and Crosscultural Research in Art Education* 3, no. 1 (1985): 51-55; Barbara A. Boyer, "Cultural Literacy in Art: Developing Conscious Aesthetic Choices in Art Education," in *Art in a Democracy*, ed. Doug Blandy and Kristen G. Congdon (New York: Teachers College Press, 1987); Robyn F. Wasson, Patricia L. Stuhr, and Lois Petrovich-Mwaniki, "Teaching Art in the Multicultural Classroom: Six Position Statements," *Studies in Art Education* 31, no. 4 (Summer 1990): 234-46.
 13. Elizabeth J. Sacca, "Art, Native Voice, and Political Crisis: Reflections on Art Education and the Survival of Culture at Kanehsatake," *Visual Arts Research* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 35-43.
 14. Blandy and Congdon, eds., *Art in a Democracy*; and Blandy and Congdon, "Art and Culture Collections in Art Education: A Critical Analysis."
 15. Vincent Lanier, "Misdirections and Realignments," in *Art in a Democracy*, pp. 175-83; and DePillars, "Multiculturalism in Visual Arts Education: Are America's Educational Institutions Ready for Multiculturalism?"
 16. Jan Jagodzinski, "Art Education as Ethnology: Deceptive Democracy or a New Panacea?" *Studies in Art Education* 23, no. 3 (Spring 1982): 5-9.
 17. Banks, Sleeter, and Grant see multicultural educational practices on a continuum or hierarchy, as a variety of evolving approaches, and going through developmental stages. They argue that programs must aspire to higher, more complex levels of educating students for social responsibility, rather than just teaching for awareness, appreciation, and tolerance. See Christine E. Sleeter and Carl Grant, "An Analysis of Multicultural Education in the United States," *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 4 (1987): 421-43; James A. Banks, "Multicultural Education: For Freedom's Sake," *Educational Leadership* 49, no. 4 (1991): 32-36; Carl Grant and Christine E. Sleeter, "Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in the Classroom," in *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*, ed. James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1993); and James A. Banks, ed., *An Introduction to Multicultural Education* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1994).
 18. See Elliot Eisner and Elizabeth Vallance, eds., *Conflicting Conceptions of the Curriculum* (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974); Henry Giroux, Anthony Penna, and William Pinar, eds., *Curriculum and Instruction: Alternatives in Education* (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1981); and Elizabeth Delacruz, "Revisiting Curriculum Conceptions: A Thematic Perspective," *Visual Arts Research* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1990): 10-25.
 19. Although reference and history books were not included in this study, many of these materials have been produced with educators in mind. Readers may contact the author for an annotated list of reference books on African and Native American Art and Culture.
 20. As is frequently the case in categorization schemes such as the one given in table 1, approaches overlap in particular curriculum products.
 21. The literature advocating multiculturalism does not exclude formalism or aesthetic inquiry as it has been traditionally defined over the years in the literature on aesthetic education. Rather, such an approach is considered as one of many viable approaches to the study of art.
 22. Ralph A. Smith, "Forms of Multi-Cultural Education in the Arts," *Journal of Multicultural and Crosscultural Research in Art Education* 1 (Fall 1983): 23-32.
 23. Vesta A. Daniel and Elizabeth M. Delacruz, "Art Education as Multicultural Education: The Underpinnings of Reform," *Visual Arts Research* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1993): v-ix.

24. Suzi Gablik, "Deconstructing Aesthetics: Toward a Responsible Art," *New Art Examiner* (January 1989): 32-35; Lucy R. Lippard, *Mixed Blessings: New Art in a Multicultural America* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1990).
25. DePillars, "Multiculturalism in Visual Arts Education: Are America's Educational Institutions Ready for Multiculturalism?"
26. Lanier, "Misdirections and Realignments."
27. Sullivan, "Art-based Art Education: Learning that Is Meaningful, Authentic, Critical, and Pluralist"; Karen A. Hamblen, "Beyond Universalism in Art Criticism," in *Pluralistic Approaches to Art Criticism*, pp. 7-14.
28. Including but not limited to: David W. Ecker, "Analyzing Children's Talk about Art," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1973): 58-73; Ralph Smith, "Teaching Aesthetic Criticism in the Schools," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1973): 38-49; Mary Erickson, "Teacher Talk: Teaching Art History as Inquiry Process," *Art Education* 36, no. 5 (September 1983): 28-31; Ralph Smith, "From Aesthetic Criticism to Humanistic Understanding: A Practical Illustration," *Studies in Art Education* 25, no. 3 (Spring 1984): 238-44; Michael Parsons, *How We Understand Art* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987); Dennie Palmer Wolf, "Child Development and Different Cognitive Styles," in *Issues in Discipline-Based Art Education: Strengthening the Stance, Extending the Horizons* (Los Angeles: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1987); Laura Chapman, *Approaches to Art in Education* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978); Sally Hagaman, "The Community of Inquiry: An Approach to Collaborative Learning," *Studies in Art Education* 31, no. 3 (Spring 1990): 149-57; Michael Parsons, "Aesthetic Literacy: The Psychological Context," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 24, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 135-46; Marilyn Stewart, "Teaching Aesthetics: Public Art Issues and Philosophical Inquiry (Presentation at the 1991 National Art Education Association Annual Convention); Terry Barrett, "Critiquing Art with Others," in *Pluralistic Approaches to Art Criticism*, pp. 66-72; E. Louis Lankford, *Aesthetics: Issues and Inquiry* (Reston, Va.: National Art Education Association, 1992); and Mary Erickson, "Evidence for Art-Historical Interpretation Referred to by Young People and Adults," *Studies in Art Education* 35, no. 2 (Winter 1994): 71-78.
29. Although such work seems reasonable to expect of teachers (especially to those who don't currently teach in the public schools), these kinds of additional demands on teacher time and expertise often take a back seat to more immediate pressing responsibilities and issues.
30. Ralph A. Smith, "Forms of Multicultural Education in the Arts," p. 29.
31. DePillars, "Multiculturalism in Visual Arts Education: Are America's Educational Institutions Ready for Multiculturalism?" p. 117.
32. Elliot W. Eisner, "Revisionism in Art Education: Some Comments on the Preceding Articles," *Studies in Art Education* 35, no. 3 (Spring 1994): 188-91.

An annotated list of art curriculum products and multicultural instructional resources examined for this study is available from the author (Department of Art Education, 118 Art and Design Building, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL 61820).

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 1 of 3 -



You have printed the following article:

Approaches to Multiculturalism in Art Education Curriculum Products: Business as Usual

Elizabeth Manley Delacruz

Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. 30, No. 1. (Spring, 1996), pp. 85-97.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-8510%28199621%2930%3A1%3C85%3AATMIAE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H>

This article references the following linked citations. If you are trying to access articles from an off-campus location, you may be required to first logon via your library web site to access JSTOR. Please visit your library's website or contact a librarian to learn about options for remote access to JSTOR.

Notes

³ **Art-Based Art Education: Learning That Is Meaningful, Authentic, Critical and Pluralist**

Graeme Sullivan

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 35, No. 1. (Autumn, 1993), pp. 5-21.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%28199323%2935%3A1%3C5%3AAAELTI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S>

⁴ **Social Reconstruction and Community**

Laurie E. Hicks

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 35, No. 3. (Spring, 1994), pp. 149-156.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%28199421%2935%3A3%3C149%3ASRAC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K>

¹⁰ **Alternative Concepts and Terminologies for Teaching African Art**

Jacqueline Chanda

Art Education, Vol. 45, No. 1. (Jan., 1992), pp. 56-61.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0004-3125%28199201%2945%3A1%3C56%3AACATFT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3>

¹² **Teaching Art in the Multicultural Classroom: Six Position Statements**

Robyn F. Wasson; Patricia L. Stuhr; Lois Petrovich-Mwaniki

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 31, No. 4. (Summer, 1990), pp. 234-246.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%28199022%2931%3A4%3C234%3ATAITMC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9>

NOTE: *The reference numbering from the original has been maintained in this citation list.*

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 2 of 3 -



¹⁶ **Art Education as Ethnology: Deceptive Democracy or a New Panacea?**

John J. Jagodzinski

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 23, No. 3. (1982), pp. 5-9.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%281982%2923%3A3%3C5%3AAEAEDD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-G>

²⁷ **Art-Based Art Education: Learning That Is Meaningful, Authentic, Critical and Pluralist**

Graeme Sullivan

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 35, No. 1. (Autumn, 1993), pp. 5-21.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%28199323%2935%3A1%3C5%3AAAELTI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S>

²⁸ **Analyzing Children's Talk about Art**

David W. Ecker

Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. 7, No. 1. (Jan., 1973), pp. 58-73.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-8510%28197301%297%3A1%3C58%3AACTAA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E>

²⁸ **Teaching Aesthetic Criticism in the Schools**

Ralph A. Smith

Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. 7, No. 1. (Jan., 1973), pp. 38-49.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-8510%28197301%297%3A1%3C38%3ATACITS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W>

²⁸ **Teaching Art History as an Inquiry Process**

Mary Erickson

Art Education, Vol. 36, No. 5. (Sep., 1983), pp. 28-31.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0004-3125%28198309%2936%3A5%3C28%3ATAHAAI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S>

²⁸ **From Aesthetic Criticism to Humanistic Understanding: A Practical Illustration**

Ralph A. Smith

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 25, No. 4. (Summer, 1984), pp. 238-244.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%28198422%2925%3A4%3C238%3AFACHTHU%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1>

NOTE: The reference numbering from the original has been maintained in this citation list.

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 3 of 3 -



²⁸ **The Community of Inquiry: An Approach to Collaborative Learning**

Sally Hagaman

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 31, No. 3. (Spring, 1990), pp. 149-157.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%28199021%2931%3A3%3C149%3ATCOIAA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

²⁸ **Aesthetic Literacy: The Psychological Context**

Michael J. Parsons

Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. 24, No. 1, Special Issue: Cultural Literacy and Arts Education. (Spring, 1990), pp. 135-146.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-8510%28199021%2924%3A1%3C135%3AALTPC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-7>

²⁸ **Evidence for Art Historical Interpretation Referred to by Young People and Adults**

Mary Erickson

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 35, No. 2. (Winter, 1994), pp. 71-78.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%28199424%2935%3A2%3C71%3AEFAHIR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-%23>

³² **Revisionism in Art Education: Some Comments on the Preceding Articles**

Elliot W. Eisner

Studies in Art Education, Vol. 35, No. 3. (Spring, 1994), pp. 188-191.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-3541%28199421%2935%3A3%3C188%3ARIAESC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-4>