

Warning Concerning Copyright Restrictions

The Copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyright material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction not be "used for any purposes other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

Chapter 21

Multiculturalism and the Tender Years: Big and Little Questions

Elizabeth Manley Delacruz
University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign

Art educators are currently reexamining the content and methodology of their programs of study, and reasserting basic questions about the nature and function of the visual arts curriculum with respect to an emerging focus on multiculturalism. As a larger social movement, multiculturalism is a framework for thinking about American society in which ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity are recognized as social realities to be embraced (Banks, 1984). Within the context of public and private schooling, multicultural education is dedicated to the realization that we live in a pluralistic society, one that is based, at least in principle, on the ideals on which our nation was founded: freedom, equality, and opportunity (Chapman, 1978).

Multiculturalists advocate a reconceptualized program of art education that deals specifically with the concepts of pluralism, globalism, and multicultural education as ways to focus on questions about knowledge, values, aesthetics, and opportunity. These concepts, although related, need to be distinguished (Daniel, 1991).

Pluralism refers to the idea that there are many truths, many lifestyles, and many products of human productivity and aesthetic sensibility that merit study (Blandy & Congdon, 1991). Pluralists look at art from a variety of perspectives and consider varying points of view. Globalism focuses on the world at large and the many unique peoples who inhabit it. Enhancing positive interhuman relations is an educational goal of globalism. Multicultural education generally refers to teaching children about the diverse ethnic groups that make up this country (Daniel, 1991). Cultural and ethnic diversity are celebrated and nurtured as unique and positive features of American society. A framework based on democracy, equality, and social responsibility underlies the multiculturalist's agenda as does fostering such a conceptual framework in the minds of students.

Art and Human Thought: The Humanities

Democracy, regard for individual differences, celebration of human potential, and a desire to explore questions and possibilities—these are the themes of a multiculturalist art program. These themes become clearer and more coherent when children interact in meaningful and connected ways with the intellectual, social, spiritual, and artistic endeavors of the diverse cultures that make up humankind. These endeavors are embodied in the humanities: the arts, philosophy, religion, and history. The organization of the humanities into coherent bodies of knowledge is the accomplishment of culture. Art educators may derive meaningful content and instructional strategies from these bodies of knowledge in developmentally appropriate and intellectually honest ways for children of all ages (Bruner, 1960; Katz & Chard, 1989).

Like their counterparts in the other humanities, art educators apply the best and most challenging ideas from various fields of professional inquiry. These include not only selected art disciplines (Clark, Day & Greer, 1987), but also related areas which inform and are informed by these art disciplines: archaeology, anthropology, psychology, mythology, structural and poststructural linguistics, and political science (Beyer, 1987). These disciplines, like the arts, are undergoing major revision (Margolis, 1987): Concepts and propositions once held to be immutable are now open to question, notably by those not in power. Approaching knowledge itself as provisional and contextual, multicultural educators may promote the advancement and proliferation of worthy ideas and make a lasting contribution to the storehouse of human thought.

Art works—as exemplars of cultural knowledge and desire, selected with diversity in mind—provide teachers with a rich source of human thought about the big and little questions of life, a source that should be

shared with young learners before their attitudes become solidified in early adolescence (Chapman, 1978). Multicultural thinking may become the foundation on which young children build regard for the inherent potential of others and develop the motivation to act upon these beliefs. First and foremost, teachers must model the dispositions they wish to foster in their students (Katz & Chard, 1989).

The Moral Mandate: Diversity, Intercultural Understanding, and Social Action

Art education in a multicultural curriculum is morally committed to intercultural understanding (Lanier, 1980). Understanding art through culture and understanding culture through art are the educational objectives that reinforce multiculturalist goals. The multicultural art educator explores the ways in which values and meanings in art operate in the lives of people from both familiar and unfamiliar ethnic cultures, both within and outside the United States, understanding that these cultures are arenas of both stability and change (Clifford, 1987; McFee & Degge, 1977). Glaeser (1973) calls this a "celebration of cultures," a means of cherishing the uniqueness and integrity of cultures while also recognizing the shared dimension underlying all human experience.

Chapman (1985) and other advocates of multicultural education believe that the art curriculum should acknowledge the achievements of non-Western cultures, minority groups, and women and reflect the significance of folk art, the crafts, mass-produced objects, and mass-circulated images. These latter art forms until recent years were considered neither "fine" nor "exemplary" enough to merit serious study (Lanier, 1987). Chapman maintains that the underrepresentation of such groups' artistic accomplishments in the traditional art disciplines and in the art curriculum should be remedied because American society itself is unusually diverse and the underlying principle of equity must be served.

The moral mandate underlying multiculturalism will remind art educators of the picture-study curriculum at the turn of the 19th century, with its emphasis on human virtues and moral character (Chapman, 1978). But significant differences also exist. Artists are not romanticized as suffering geniuses, students are not trained solely on the imagery of aristocracies, and appreciation is no longer seen as a frill. Rather, interhuman understanding and an appreciation and support for the "artistry in varied lifestyles" is fostered. Intelligent, informed appreciation of the aesthetic and cultural similarities and differences that exist among us is the multiculturalist's educa-

tional goal. This is a different kind of appreciation, however, because this goal fosters not only purposeful thought but also purposeful behavior (Jagodzinski, 1982). In this view, multicultural education is not only about cultural facts but also about social issues, and the moral obligation of every citizen to work toward the American ideal of equity for all.

Curriculum development, like any institutionalized practice, is inherently a political venture. The programs of study employed legitimize and perpetuate selected beliefs and attitudes for future generations (Cherryholmes, 1987). Interest in this political dimension will continue to grow as more educators realize that when people of different traditions come in contact, differing values must be accommodated. For art educators, interest in multiple definitions of artistic value and significance will likewise grow as understanding increases that:

- The aesthetic framework in lived experience is inseparable from the moral and social frameworks (Lanier (1980).
- Each culture invents and preserves artistic traditions that re-present that culture's important concerns about the meaning and value of life.

Art, Culture, and Knowledge: Questions Becoming Curriculum

Multicultural art education enables children to make important connections between themselves and others by tapping into the rich artistic traditions of different cultures. For teachers, multiple perspectives offer the opportunity to guide young minds on the path of seeking answers to the big and little questions of human experience, questions that artists in every culture have asked (either directly or implicitly): Who am I? Where did I come from? How can I gain better control of my world? What will happen to me, to my family? What are my dreams, my wishes, my fears? Am I loved? Am I safe? These questions, simple and naive, form the basis of human thought and feeling about the nature and meaning of life. They creep—silently or not so silently—into the concerns of young minds and enter centuries-old philosophical, theological, and ethical traditions, perhaps steeped in mysticism, or even organized into dogmas, or made arcane in academic rhetoric, but certainly posed once again in the mute relics that populate the world's ethnological and art museums.

These questions underlie many (if not all) of the greatest intellectual, artistic, and cultural achievements of humanity. They transcend time and place, obliterate the distinctions between East and West, and narrow the gap between young and old. World art embodies these

questions and provokes them in the viewer. Many educators believe that it is the opportunity to explore life's big and little questions that makes the school curriculum a meaningful venture for children (Giroux, Penna, & Pinar, 1981).

If we accept art as the aesthetic embodiment of human concern and desire, then the artistic and aesthetic traditions of all people become content worthy of study, notable not only for their underlying attention to big questions and universal problems, but for the unique and rich solutions presented in a tapestry of tools, bowls, blankets, healing implements, helmets, pendants, statues, paintings, carvings, songs, dances, dramatic enactments, poems, myths, and histories, both oral and written (Vogel, 1986). Art becomes not only the thing, the end product of refined craftsmanship or extraordinary vision, but also the vehicle or medium, the process by which closure is brought, if only temporarily, to human concerns.

Questions the teacher could ask of students might move from "What is this artist's work about?" and "Where do you think these artists got their ideas?" to "How many ways can we think about art?" and "How does art itself expand our thinking?" Countless examples of children's remarkable capacities for complex intellectual and philosophical reasoning suggest that these kinds of questions can become part of the curriculum (Anderson, 1986; Ecker, 1973; Matthews, 1984). Examining the objects and objectives of many cultures, young children may explore questions of concern not only to philosophers (What is the essence of life? What is truth? What is good? How do I know what I know?) or aestheticians (How is it art?), but questions directly relevant to themselves and to all of us: Am I safe? Am I loved? Is my family secure?

Other fundamental questions underlie the curriculum:

- How do we define art?
- What constitutes an understanding of art and its role in society?
- What learning experiences best foster or promote this understanding?

As we approach these questions, McFee (1987) asks us to consider both universal and culturally specific qualities of art. More importantly, she asks us to consider artistic traditions that support democratic values, including the institutions that sponsor, support, and maintain art: governmental agencies, museums, local civic centers, the mass media, public/private schools, and universities. Katz and Chard (1989) tell us that in the preschool and early elementary years, fostering dispositions, attitudes, and inclinations are primary educational objectives. For early

childhood teachers, elementary teachers, and art teachers this means getting students involved in thinking about works of art in terms of the roles art plays in all aspects of life, particularly in the lives of its creators.

Art embodies important human concerns. In the contemplation of these concerns, as they are posed in aesthetic form, the lines between object and subject, between the objective and the subjective, are delightfully blurred. It is here that questions from many perspectives about art, and the questions of art, become the center of the curriculum. It is from this stance that a viable educational program may progress toward more academic questions such as:

- What does this art mean?
- How does this art form convey meaning?

To children, such questions may be posed in many forms:

- What is my art about?
- What events, experiences, objects, and desires are re-presented?
- What about this other work of art?
- What could it be about?
- How is it like my art?
- How is it different?
- What makes this work of art powerful, gentle, meaningful, enjoyable, disturbing?

These questions then inform and become the content of the curriculum by leading to open-ended and/or more structured studio explorations, the examination of design concepts, the development of skills in materials and processes, the motivations for critical analysis and reflection, and the connections to contextual, historical, and intercultural understanding.

Centering the Multicultural Art Curriculum

In a multicultural art curriculum the art, artifacts, crafts, ritual and domestic objects fashioned by generations of artisans become the subjects of interest that inform and expand children's frames of reference. The subject of interest is not limited, however, to formal and technical accomplishments, but includes meaning, symbolism, intention, function, and both relative and universal values. The subject is the artist, the culture, the purposeful processes and products of human concern. The subject is, finally, the student, centered in her or his own personal space of curiosity and intentionality, and in his or her interactions with others.

The multicultural curriculum does not center on design processes, criticism, history, and social studies per se; rather these disciplines become vehicles, like art-making itself, for enhancing and extending each child's ability to make sense of life, to attach value to certain aspects of life, to seek solutions to the problems of living, and to act upon them. The center is the self as it acts upon and within its intercultural realities. This is the instrumental value of art, and the ultimate goal of multicultural art education programs.

Art becomes the second center of the curriculum as it touches the lives of children and as it both carries and informs philosophy, religion, science, and history. For the very young, art making is a means of acting upon the world within the safety of personal space. Eisner (1978) observes that art making provides children with a sense of their own power to create desired effects and to explore concerns. Art making is inherently pleasurable in that it allows for unrestricted exploratory possibilities and experiences. Smith and Smith (1970) recognize this as the beneficial role of play. These authors see art making as a special mode of thinking and acting upon the world.

Art making is by its nature a construction of meaning and, as such, provides the evidence of meaningful inquiry. This is true for children, for adult artists, for artists and artisans in all cultures. The art of young children reflects "the flow of life around them, including social changes and technological advances" (Lark-Horowitz, Lewis, & Luca, 1973, p. 21). Their early symbol-making activities arise out of their relationships to their world, beginning with family and extending to home and community life and finally to the natural and constructed environments surrounding their homes (Gaitskell & Hurwitz, 1975). They favor themes that center around family, love and security, animals, natural scenery, and fantasy. In their own art, children depict the customs of everyday living, the surrounding world of plants and animals, and the imaginative world of dreams, spirits, and other-worldly entities.

Wilson and Wilson (1982) describe the art making activities of children as a self-defining process devoted to exploring the essential self, its consciousness, memories, desires, experiences, impressions, and feelings. "The questions Who am I? What am I? How am I? and What will I become? however implicitly asked, require a lifetime to answer" (Wilson & Wilson, 1982, p. 28). These questions connect children to artistic traditions and innovations in all times and places.

But art making should be only one part of the curriculum, even in the early years. Heightened and deepened artistic and aesthetic reflection and response are equally efficacious educational goals, and multiculturalists see them as crucial elements in the educational pro-

gram for young children. Looking back upon the experience of constructing their own meaningful art works, children develop personal perspective, attach values, and perhaps are motivated toward further, more refined, inquiry. Contemplating the art of others, children look beyond themselves and enhance their capacities for understanding. Finally, as they glimpse connections between art making and reflection and other organized bodies of knowledge, a bigger picture emerges in children's minds: the realization that things fit together, that people have similar questions all over the world, and that the process of asking questions is perhaps the most human characteristic of all.

Implementation Problems: From Theory to Practice

Although curriculum development has far to go, some notable work has already been done by veteran art educators (Chapman, 1978, 1985; Feldman, 1985, 1987; McFee & Degge, 1977) and others who have dedicated themselves to the idea that, for art education, educational reform means a complete reconceptualization of the art curriculum (Blandy & Congdon, 1987; Daniel, 1991; Stuhr, Petrovich-Mwaniki, & Wasson, 1992). These individuals call for art curricula which are more inclusive and, in multicultural terms, more authentic.

Interest in the meaning and significance of the art of other cultures presents several conceptual and practical problems for teachers. Which cultures and which art forms should be studied, and how should these art forms be studied? Attention to the formal and expressive qualities of these art forms is not enough; exploration of the symbolic meanings intended by their creators is equally crucial to an adequate appreciation of these works.

With the recent deluge of publications centering on one culture after another, the sheer magnitude of choice is enough to paralyze a teacher's attempts to be sensitive to ethnicity and to be authentic to the meaning, function, and artistic value of ethnic art. This problem is compounded by the fact that adequate and comprehensive educational resources dealing with minority, ethnic, women's and other "outsider" art have become available only recently. Teachers interested in implementing multicultural education must filter through seemingly incomprehensible volumes of incorrect, misinformed, or shallow representations of people and their art. These teachers must conduct research themselves in order to evaluate and use these resources, before they begin to design a meaningful and coherent program. Anyone who has taught in the public schools knows

what a formidable task this really is, given the demands of the profession.

This is further complicated by a climate seemingly hostile to any hint of "values education" (Park, 1980; Parkay, 1985) or teaching about the spiritual or belief systems of other cultures. Multiculturalists need to respond cautiously. Indeed, some of the art forms appearing in museum collections and in the vastly expanding literature on world art are profoundly ritualistic objects used in connection with religious practices which Westerners find difficult to appreciate. Should such objects be censored from the curriculum, treated solely as aesthetic objects without attention to their spiritual meanings, or given patriarchal treatment as "practices conducted by less advanced cultures"? Or should they be treated equally, as meaningful objects whose meanings, however controversial, merit full disclosure?

Equally problematic are works of art created by many ethnic-American artists, works that deal with sexism, racism, poverty, violence, destruction of the natural environment, and genocide. Most teachers will look for "nice art," finding it inappropriate to expose impressionable young children to disturbing sexual, religious, or violent content.

Add to these problems the developmental question: What concepts, skills, and dispositions are desirable educational goals for the very young with respect to intercultural understanding and art appreciation? It is commonly held that the very young are not naturally inclined to take the perspective of another, that young children are centered solely on self (Parsons, 1987). Art educators do not even agree that the early learner needs exposure to art in activities beyond their own art making experiences. And if such exposure is deemed important, how much and in what kinds of learning encounters? Motivational and instructional questions now come into play, presenting complex choices.

Some Provisional Recommendations

For those teachers who, like me, are perplexed by the magnitude of the task of developing and implementing a multicultural curriculum, I can only offer the simplest of advice. Center your instruction on the reasons children make art (Leeds, 1986). Focus on those timeless human concerns posed as questions in this chapter, and build learning activities around the exploration of these themes and questions.

Start with a few good books written by contemporary scholars in the art of other cultures and become familiar with some of those scholars who have focused on multicultural education for the past two or three decades. Contact area agencies and individuals with a background

in ethnic studies. Purchase some reproductions, audiotapes, videotapes, and children's books that deal with ethnic art and culture. Publishers are discovering that there is a market for these instructional resources and more resources are rapidly becoming available. Borrow ideas from the published art curricula that address, if only peripherally, the art of other cultures but do not be limited to their content and structure. Reshape your curriculum to fulfill your own educational goals.

It is not enough to just do art with the very young. It is also important to talk about art with them. Educators should value questions as much as answers (Giroux, Penna, & Pinar, 1981) and encourage children to pose their own questions. "Teacher talk" (Good & Brophy, 1978) should not drown out what children have to say.

Multicultural curricula must be infused into the art and school curricula throughout the academic year, throughout the early elementary years, and throughout the K-12 program and not, as Feldman (1987) advises, added on as occasional tokens, separate projects that give "special attention" to the "exotic" art of "other people." Nothing could be more irrelevant, even racist, than asking a group of little white kids to make "African" masks or "Indian" sand paintings. Focus each child on the richness of her or his family heritage, the wonders of the neighborhood, and the many kinds of people who live there. Let children tame the wild and untamed animal world and pay tribute to the delicate and powerful ecology in which they thrive.

Bring children's art making back to their own lives, as these lives are motivated by, and made more meaningful in, their own cultural contexts. The contextual perspective makes the familiar more meaningful and the unfamiliar more concrete. It is a manner of approaching art works that allows children to see art in its own light. Finally, return again and again to the art of diverse cultures to explore commonalities and differences.

For multiculturalists, a major goal of art education is to teach students about the role of art in all aspects of life:

- To help them understand the relevance and significance of art in the larger context of human experience.
- To consider perspectives posed by people of different backgrounds.
- To develop a sense of both the commonality and the diversity of humankind.
- To reinforce each student's own sense of personal power and the social responsibility that comes with power.

The goals of multicultural art education reinforce those of the nation as a whole as it struggles and strives toward its original democratic ideals: freedom and equity based on an abiding respect for the integrity and dignity of every individual life (Chapman, 1978). Such regard for the inherent potential of the individual is made concrete in the art of the very young and underlies a multicultural art curriculum.

Note: The author wishes to acknowledge and thank Mary Stokrocki for her thoughtful commentary and generous assistance on an early draft of this paper.

References

- Anderson, T. (1986). Talking about art with children: From theory to practice. *Art Education*, 39 (1), 5-8.
- Banks, J. A. (1984). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (3rd ed.). Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Beyer, L. E. (1987). Art and society: Toward new directions in aesthetic education. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 7(2), 72-98.
- Blandy, D., & Congdon, K. G. (1987). *Art in a democracy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blandy, D. & Congdon, K. G. (1991). *Pluralistic approaches to art criticism*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chapman, L. H. (1978). *Approaches to art in education*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chapman, L. H. (1985). Curriculum development as process and product. *Studies in Art Education*, 26 (4), 206-211.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1987). A social project for curriculum: Post-structural perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(4), 295-316.
- Clark, G. A., Day, M.D., & Greer, W. D. (1987). Discipline-based art education: Becoming students of art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21(2), 129-197.
- Clifford, J. (1987). Of other peoples: Beyond the "Savage" paradigm. In H. Foster (Ed), *Discussions in contemporary culture* (Vol. 1, pp. 121-130). Seattle: Bay Press.
- Daniel, V. A. (1991, September). *Beyond the traditional in art: Facing a pluralistic society*. Address given at the United States Society for Education Through Art Symposium, Columbus, OH.
- Ecker, D. W. (1973). Analyzing children's talk about art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 7(1), 58-73.
- Eisner, E. W. (1978). What do children learn when they paint? *Art Education*, 31(3), 5-12.
- Feldman, E. B. (1980). Anthropological and historical conceptions of art curricula. *Art Education*, 33(6), 6-9.
- Feldman, E. B. (1985). *Thinking about art*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Feldman, E. B. (1987). *Varieties of visual experience*, (3rd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gatskell, C. D., & Hurwitz, A. (1975). *Children and their art*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Giroux, H. A., Penna, A. N., & Pinar, W. F. (1981). *Curriculum & instruction: Alternatives in education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Glaeser, W. (1973). Art, concepts of reality, and the consequences of "The Celebration of Peoples." *Studies in Art Education*, 15(1), 34-43.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1978). *Looking in classrooms*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Jagodzinski, J. (1982). Art education as ethnology: Deceptive democracy or a new panacea? *Studies in Art Education*, 9(3), 5-7.
- Katz, L. G., & Chard, S. C. (1989). *Engaging children's minds: The project approach*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Lanier, V. (1980). Six items on the agenda for the eighties. *Art Education*, 33(5), 16-23.
- Lanier, V. (1987). Misdirections and realignments. In Blandy, D., & Congdon, K. G. (Eds.), *Art in a democracy* (pp. 175-183). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lark-Horovitz, B., Lewis, H., & Luca, M. (1973). *Understanding children's art for better teaching* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Leeds, J. A. (1986). Teaching and the reasons for making art. *Art Education*, 39(1), 17-21.
- Margolis, J. (1987). *Philosophy looks at the arts: Contemporary readings in aesthetics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Matthews, G. (1984). *Dialogues with children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McFee, J. K. (1987). In D. Blandy & K. G. Congdon (Eds.), *Art in a democracy* (pp. ix-xii). New York: Teachers College Press.
- McFee, J. K., & Degge, R. M. (1977). *Art, culture and environment*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Park, J. C. (1980). Preachers, politics, and public education: A review of right-wing pressures against public schooling in America. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61, 608-612.
- Parkay, F. W. (1985). The authoritarian assault upon the public school curriculum: An additional indicator of risk. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 57, 3-9.
- Parsons, M. J. (1987). *How we understand art: A cognitive developmental account of the aesthetic experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, R. A., & Smith, C. M. (1970). Justifying aesthetic education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 4(2), 37-51.
- Sruhr, P. L., Petrovich-Mwantki, L., & Wasson, R. (1992). Curriculum guidelines for the multicultural art classroom. *Art Education*, 45(1), 16-24.
- Vogel, S. M. (1986). *African aesthetics*. New York: Center for African Art.
- Wilson, M., & Wilson, B. (1982). *Teaching children to draw: A guide for parents and teachers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Additional Resources

- Bancroft-Hunt, N., & Forman, W. (1979). *People of the totem: The Indians of the Pacific Northwest*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Beardsley, J., & Livingston, J. (1987). *Hispanic art in the United States: Thirty contemporary painters and sculptors*. New York: Abbeyville Press.
- Heller, N. G. (1987). *Women artists: An illustrated history*. New York: Abbeyville Press.
- Lippard, L. R. (1990). *Mixed blessings: New art in a multicultural America*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Roselle, R. V., Wardlaw, A., & McKenna, M. A. ((1989). *Black art, ancestral legacy: The African impulse in African-American art*. New York: Abrams.
- Sullivan, C. (1991). *Children of promise: African-American literature and art for young people*. New York: Abrams.
- Wade, E. L., & Strickland, R. (1981). *Magic images: Contemporary Native American art*. Tulsa, OK: Philbrook Art Center.
- Young, B. (Ed.). (1990). *Art, culture, and ethnicity*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.