86

(Pre)determined Occupations: The Post-Colonial Hybridizing of Identity and Art Forms in Third World Spaces

Amanda Alexander
University of Texas–Arlington
amandaa@uta.edu

Manisha Sharma
University of Arizona
msharma1@email.arizona.edu

Abstract

In this article, we present the effects of globalization on art forms in Peru and on teacher identity in India while exploring hybridization as an ongoing global paradigm in both contexts (Bhabha, 1994; Said, 1979). Peruvian art forms are continuously shifting as global cultures meld and become more technologically connected, which ultimately brings about questions of authenticity. The identities of Indian art educators are evolving, and shifting indicating an assemblage or structure containing many parts working together to perform a particular function. In realizing its function, the structure can be named or its form made visible (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). This article examines some of these functions through post-colonial lenses to explore the notion of authenticity. In a process of self-reflexivity, both authors ponder how we occupy and are pre-occupied by our identities, roles as art educators and researchers, and how this affects power dynamics in our work. Both researchers' accounts are important as a means to study the changes of cultures, identity, and art forms (inter)nationally, and to enable equitable processes of cultural exchange and learning in art education.

Introduction

The world is on the move with temporary and permanent migration, immigration, exchange, and mobility of peoples and ideas occurring across physical and virtual places. This movement is affecting ideological, political, and economic spaces. National, cultural, and consequently personal, as well as communal identities, take on new dimensions within the fluidity of postmodern discourse. In this process, discussions of fixed notions of authenticity[1] and tradition in culture are rendered problematic. This condition of flux that the human world is currently undergoing has been named globalization. As researchers concerned with the discourse on this condition, we find it linked inextricably with the condition of post-colonialism and the effects of colonization on cultures and societies (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1998). The work of post-colonial theorists often reflects and informs current literature on globalization (Bhabha, 1994; Diversi & Moreira, 2008; Said, 1979; Spivak, 2003). Using the terms of Deleuze and Guattari (1987), we define post-colonialism as a state of becoming or constant evolution that nation-states and cultures exist in—as they reinvent themselves physically, mentally, emotionally, and economically in an ongoing response to the event of being colonized. We refer to post-colonialism throughout this article with a recognition that its discourse includes geographical countries and political-ideological nations that are still being colonized and are living under the influence of colonization in avatars of military, economic, and ideological occupation and influence, both direct and indirect (Chibber, 2013; Nair, 2002; Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012). This article reflects our processing of theoretical assumptions within post-colonial discourses in our cross/trans-cultural work as artist-educator-researchers in communities in Peru and India.

There is a rich body of research in art education on the naming, knowing, and claiming of traditional and contemporary cultural knowledge in the process of exchanging and disseminating information. The themes in this research consist of new ways that art education and pedagogy connect to the world not only through visual culture (Duncum, 2000; Tavin & Hausman, 2004), but also through attempted decolonization (Ballengee-Morris, 2000, 2010; Ballengee-Morris, Sanders, Smith-Shank & Staikidis, 2010; Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012); Indigenous identity (Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001; Bolin, Blandy, & Congdon, 2000); tourism (Ballengee-Morris & Sanders, 2009); the problematic authenticity of various art forms (Ballengee-Morris, 2002); and geography (Desai, 2005). In unpacking our own hybrid identities as culturally mobile workers—transnational, transcultural, and transdisciplinary—we examine our response-ability to enable equitable exchanges of ideas and information in art education practices while studying and teaching the 'other' and our own cultures.

Unpacking our separate experiences working with artists and educators in Peru and India, we provide a brief overview of globalization. We explore what it means, and how this global paradigm has led to hybridization (Bhabha, 1994; Said, 1979) of people, cultures, and the arts. We then discuss hybridization and its effects on peoples' identities and the arts from cultures worldwide. Subsequently, we share our own experiences with hybridity focusing on Peruvian artists and Indian artist-educators by drawing on the issues and tensions

---

[1]For the purposes of this article, we define authenticity beginning with Clifford's (1988) definition of "that which has not changed" (p. 97). We expand on Clifford's definition, noting that authenticity should be self-determined by a particular culture of people and their own ideological framework in a manner that reflects critical relevance.

within these communities as we examine how our own researcher selves impact these communities. Finally, we offer recommendations for studying art education through the lens of the hybridization of cultures, people, and the arts so as to enable equitable processes of cultural exchange and learning, rather than mere re-tellings or appropriations of another's story. We realize that as researchers we occupy spaces of privilege, and we hope to utilize these spaces to support the growth and bring forward inaudible voices of others such as our research participants, Peruvian artists and Indian artist educators. In doing so, we focus on ways in which we recognize how fresh solutions and inaudible voices might be suppressed through our own pre-determined outcomes and how we define ourselves and the scope of our occupations.

Defining Globalization and its Connection to Post-Colonialism

Al-Rodhan and Stoudmann (2006) define globalization as "the process that encompasses the causes, course, and consequences of the transnational and transcultural integration of all human and non-human activities" (p. 2). Although many definitions of globalization exist, most often it is associated with the process of international integration and interchange of ideas, products, worldviews, culture, technologies, and economic activity.

Within discourses of post-colonialism, there is a distinction made between first, second, third, and fourth world peoples based on post-colonial definitions of migration and economics. These distinctions are based on whether a colony is exploited (as in the third world—like India and most of East and South Asia) or expropriated (as in the fourth world—like South Africa, U.S.A., and South and Central America—where the Natives or aboriginals are sent away to reservations or other small sites). In this sense, post-colonialism might be understood as similar to globalization in that issues of authenticity and the idea of "Native" belonging are brought into question. Thus we might understand the core concerns of these discourses as intertwined, which is why in some instances we refer to post-colonial globalization. For the purposes of this article, we will focus on the idea of hybridity in globalization, the dynamic among different cultures, which through their interaction, both give to and receive from each other (Bhabha, 1994).

Hybridity, Identity, and the Arts

More than the exchange of cultural goods and artifacts, hybridity commonly refers to "the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1998). In its most basic sense, hybridity refers to mixture, and the term originates from biology to classify offspring from racial mixing. For much of history, hybrids were seen as an inferior dilution of a pure race (see Robert J. C. Young's *Colonial Desire*, 1995).

In post-colonial discourse today, hybridity focuses on the effects of mixture upon identity and culture (Bhabha, 1994, 1995, 2004; Hall, 1980, 1992, 1997; Spivak, 1990, 2003). A new or hybrid identity is formed from influences from more than one location, usually drawing upon dual influences of the colonizer and the colonized. Homi Bhabha (2004) proposes that it is not only the colonized world that is affected by imperialist contact; the colonizer's world is also irrevocably altered. In Bhabha's utopian notion of a Third Space, he envisions knowledge construction in a way that does not allow an automatic dominance of any one cultural ground.

With increases in globalization and the movement of people, objects, and ideas, hybridity now appears commonplace and reflected in personal and communal identities as well as language, music, visual/material culture, pop culture, and the arts. Languages undergo linguistic cross-breeding when words are loaned to and from both the colonizer and the colonized. Pidgin, Creole, Swahili, Aborigine, Irish, and variations of the English language are all examples. Linguistic hybridization is commonplace in the U.S. with the increase of immigrants, workers, refugees, and tourists; the most notable changes are a mix between Spanish and English or Spanglish. Even as we offer this example, we recognize that the hybridization of language does not go without problems—much of the world feels colonized through the use of language. This is not a value-free construct. In fact, this example of hybridity allows an examination of the definition of authenticity as a process indicating enduring relevance, rather than a static or irrelevant marker of a nostalgic past defined from a particular perspective.

There are many hybridizations taking place in art forms including artists' media and material, technique, personal, and cultural identity, and interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary work. Many artists cross cultures by moving beyond national or ethnic identities to speak in more (inter)national terms incorporating images and objects from different locations. One can find examples that encompass hybridization in contemporary artworks by Chris Ofili, Huang Yong Ping, Dieter Roth, and more (Chris Ofili, 2010; Huang Yong Ping, 2011; Dieter Roth, 2004).

Multicultural/ethnic artists' artworks are also able to flow to and from countries with greater efficacy than ever before (Ballengee-Morris, 2002; Desai, 2005). Desai (2005) asserts that art forms are thought of as being located in one culture, the culture of origin; however, with globalization, this is changing. Ethnic art forms are now made outside their cultural context and sold as an authentic artifact or product. The idea of deterritorialization[2] or what Appadurai (1997) calls the "global cultural economy" (p. 27), the movement of people and the shaping of their identities based on the many places they may have grown up, culture to culture, may play a part in artworks being created outside their cultural context (Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001; Desai, 2005). Technology is another factor, and artists all over the world are now able to see and (re)create art forms from the opposite side of the globe.

Ballengee-Morris (2002) argues that "culture for sale" (p. 232) results in conflicts due to inauthentic representations of Indigenous art forms. Questions have arisen about the authenticity of Indigenous products offered in the tourism market, about what consumers are willing to purchase based on their own experiences with that culture, and about what they may assume is authentic (Ballengee-Morris, 2002; Ballengee-Morris & Sanders, 2009; Desai, 2005). Globalization and hybridization are having a dramatic effect on artists worldwide and changing the way we understand, discuss, and see artworks from all cultures. As we work to define ourselves as professionals—the nature and scope of our occupation as art educators, researchers, and artists—it is important that we employ reflexivity about how we view and define the process of interaction with whom we work,

---

[2]Deterritorialization, as discussed by Deleuze & Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987), alludes to the removing (of something) from its original context. When this happens, the original territory as well as that which has been removed is irrevocably altered, as is the location to which it is removed or reterritorialized.

based on the contrast between our pre-determination of who they are and their own authentic self-definitions of their cultural identities, visual art, and artifacts.

Hybridization and Authenticity

With the rapid increases in the deterritorialization of cultures and peoples, which demands new theories of flow and resistance, intellectuals are compelled to rethink research regarding representation (Papastergiadis, 2005). The complex forms of representation incorporating images from different locations that carry symbolic meaning for different cultures also bring about new or competing codes. Papastergiadis (2005) believes, "to do justice to both the complexity of the artwork and the intellectual potential of these new conceptual headings we need to develop frameworks that can address both these signs of difference and the process by which signs are made out of plays with difference" (p. 1). As art educators working both in the U.S. and our research sites, we ask: What do art and identity look like if they are constantly evoking the shuttling between places, both physical and ideological? Do artworks and identity take on new cultural mixes of artistic styles, expressions, and meanings, or through the process, do they become homogenized and Westernized (Khor, 2001). Might they lean more towards certain dominant cultures, for instance, those determined by gender-based occupational recognitions (Guyas, Poling, & Keys, 2013)? Artists are blending and mixing cultures in art; for example, Native artists in the U.S. and beyond have always worked in response to the dominant culture. In other places such as in India the term Native/native itself becomes value-laden as it is intertwined with problematic histories of ethnic and tribal migration and original occupation.

Determining authenticity with hybridized art forms has become critical for many who are establishing policies, working in museums, and studying artworks (Ballengee-Morris, 2002). At times, policies and academe are in conflict with the beliefs and points of view of certain cultural members and their institutions (Ballengee-Morris, 2002). For example, in "They Came, They Claimed, They Named, and We Blame: Art Education in Negotiation and Conflict," Ballengee-Morris (2010) discusses an Ohio policy which allowed a private country club to build a golf course around the Octagon Mound in Newark, Ohio.

Ballengee-Morris (2002) writes that the tourist industry and sometimes governments "sterilize culture to heritage, remove the context of the forms, and view culturally driven forms as noncultural, which is another form of culturecide" (p. 241). Certain cultures and artists manipulate symbols that maintain their culture's ideological framework; this is the way art forms should be examined. Those from the culture should be able to determine their own direction of the culture and the manifestation of cultural forms (Ballengee-Morris, 2002; Graburn, 1976).

However, identifying authentic symbols of any culture, whether historically defined or in process of determination, can be difficult since internal identifications (within the community) can differ from representations for those outside the community or just entering it—such as tourists, or hybridizing elements, both welcomed or forced (as in colonization). Part of the issue according to Ballengee-Morris (2002) is the effect of tourism and outside power on different cultures that alters their identity, practices, and products:

> Stereotypic representations, the predominant use of outsiders to represent
> insiders, and the institutional representatives' emphasis on romanticized
> heritage versus the reality of cultures has placed cultures and visual forms in

> danger of extermination. The lack of education . . . was the missing link between makers and buyers. (p. 242)

Such research illustrates the need for educational programming to foster the survival of both non-Native and Native understandings,[3] especially given the lack of organizational funding for such programming when it is built upon Native knowledge (Grande, 2004). Most stories of artists, their identity, and products are constructed from touristic or historically specific viewpoints. Often this does not provide room for the artists' or educators' voices, nor for their opinion on how they would like to be represented. Questions then arise: Whose story is being shared, and who determines those stories? What is culturally authentic? How do we represent a person or idea as Native/native to a culture when our own cultural experiences and identities influence how we might (pre)determine the representation of Native voices?

As art education researchers working separately with artists and educators in Peru and India, we believe it is important to acknowledge the hybridization of cultures, identity, and artworks from a multitude of locations. In the next sections of this article, we describe and analyze our individual experiences and approaches with our research participants. We question ourselves about our impact on other cultures' ideas, art, and educational forms. We wonder where the idea of hybridity fits in with this process of self-reflexivity, and we work to understand our position as insider-outsider. One example focuses on the hybridization of artworks in Peru, whereas the other speaks about the hybridization of art educator identity in India.

Hybridization of Tradition and Art Forms in Peru

Amanda's Story: From 2002 to 2005 while living in Cajamarca, Peru as a Peace Corps volunteer, I lived and worked with a wide range of Native[4] artists from the Cajamarca region. There were two main groups of artists—La Collpa, a weaving workshop, and Keramic Makkas, a pottery workshop. Each of these groups consisted of 10 plus artists that ranged in ages from 14 to 65 with a mix of genders. Although these were the main groups, the numbers varied depending on the workload and projects that the artists had at various times of the year. Most of the artists spoke Spanish; however, the older generations (mostly female) spoke Quechua (one of the languages of the people of the Andes). The language in which we communicated was Spanish.

After my time with the artists from 2002 to 2005, I continued to work with them on various projects. From 2007 to 2010, I conducted research for my doctoral dissertation by creating a website with the artists called Colors & Creations, which is currently an ongoing project.

---

[3]We also read Native/non-Native as representative of insider/outsider status; for instance, in ourselves as researchers and culturally located art educators, identifying our positions within the communities with which we work.

[4]I do not like to categorize this population as Indigenous because they would not represent themselves as Indigenous, rather calling themselves *campesinos* or peasants, farmers, or country people. I prefer Native because their families are Native to the Andes Mountains of Cajamarca, Peru. They believe Indigenous peoples are from the Amazon jungle, not the Andes Mountains.

Working in Cajamarca, Peru for the past eleven years with a group of artists, I have come to deeply appreciate and better understand the inner workings of Peruvian[5] cultures and traditions. The beautifully handcrafted pottery, weavings, jewelry, wooden toys, rock sculptures, and baskets are distinctly symbolic of past pre-Incan and Incan cultures. Passed down from a long generation of family members, a traditional process is followed in each piece, including both decorative and utilitarian vessels for multipurpose uses. However, some craft knowledge is new to the Peruvians and has been taught to them by various governmental and nongovernmental organizations for income generation.

In 2003 while working as a Peace Corps volunteer, I shadowed and observed Aid to Artisans (ATA), an international nonprofit organization that is described as "a recognized leader in economic development for the craft sector, [that] by linking artisans to new markets and buyers to culturally meaningful and innovative products… provides needed economic opportunities to artisans to build profitable craft businesses" ("About ATA," 2012). While I acknowledge that ATA had good intentions of important income generation for the artists, the new designs and colors that were being used were more geared toward the Euro-U.S. market than in keeping with tradition. These sometimes good intentions in turn were and still are dismantling the cultural traditions of the Peruvian handcraft. After working with ATA, the artists believed that to sell more products, they needed to use more Euro-U.S. designs, colors, and shapes.

This was not the first time that Peruvians had seen a shift in their traditional art making through globalization. The influence of the Spanish, starting in 1532 with Francisco Pizarro's conquest of the Incan Empire, prompted a change, perhaps the cornerstone of colonial hybridization in the Cajamarca region (where Pizarro captured and killed the last Inca[6]). Today one can see a more rounded, vase-like form, instead of molded shapes, in the traditional pottery and textiles produced on a wooden loom, instead of the "callhua," the Quechua word for a backstrap weave (Atwater, 1954; "Peru," 2011; Tidball, 1969).

Not only was Euro-U.S. knowledge contributing to a shift in the Peruvian craft design, but technology was also shaping the process and outcome of the product. For example, many textile workshops were requesting and receiving wooden looms from many nongovernmental organizations. Another shift seen in Peruvian textiles was the change from natural dyes to more chemically based, modern dyes (anilina dyes, mostly purchased in Lima, Peru). These dyes were much easier to obtain, removed several steps of the dyeing process, and promoted a more accurate color balance throughout the product. To appeal more to the Euro-U.S. market, these items were both being pushed on the artists and gladly received by the artists as it simplified the process of weaving.

The history of fading Peruvian artistic traditions could on one hand be seen as hybridity or a rhizome[7] of cultures (Pieterse, 2004), and on the other as an imperial mark or a

---

[5]I am using the word *Peruvian* to designate Native cultures from the Andes Mountains of Peru. The history is long, ranging from Pre-Incan, Incan, to contemporary society. This does not include Indigenous groups from the Amazon basin.
[6]Much of literature is incorrect when referring to the Incan culture. The true designation should be Quechua people/culture as the only person called Inca was The Inca or emperor. Many living today in Peru take umbrage at not being acknowledged as living Quechua (descendants from the Inca) people. They would consider Pizarro's conquest an invasion.
[7]According to Deleuze and Guattari (1987), the rhizome is nonbinary, nonhierarchical, and nonlinear. It is a structure that recognizes and encourages multiplicity of influence and affect. It spreads

modernizing and homogenizing process (Bhabha, 1990, 1994; Pieterse, 2004). The power dynamic in play is a result of 'first world' consumer-driven structures that require the 'third world' producer to accommodate consumer demands. This notion leaves one to wonder about authenticity. In this case, is a Peruvian handcraft item authentic, and who defines what authentic means? One now experiences and sees a more hybridized Peruvian art form coming out of Cajamarca, which mixes tradition, Euro-U.S., and other global cultures.

 The effect that globalization is having on traditional Peruvian social, political, economic, and cultural systems and ways of life can also be seen through mining practices in Cajamarca (Bury, 2004, 2008). Yanacocha, the largest gold mine in South America, is located in Cajamarca, and brings many U.S. citizens to the area. The artists are commissioned by the miners' wives to make an array of products from pictures of artworks found in magazines to coffee mugs as wedding gifts for guests. Many of the artists' traditional products are being pushed out by a dominant, 'first world' culture through designs or images found on the Internet. This is both good and bad for the artists: it provides an income for them and their families as well as advancing technology within the community, but it is also a concrete view of globalization hybridizing century-old traditions.

While working with the artists from 2002-2005, I continuously mentioned the loss of tradition to the artists. Asking them to make both the traditional wares and the modern items, I began questioning myself, asking: Who am I to tell them what might be best for them? As a cultural outsider I was concerned for their loss but soon realized this concern in itself was an imperialistic notion following in the footsteps of other outsiders, both individuals and organizations, promoting the artwork for profit. My concern was legitimate, but my need to change the artists' ways of thinking (to be more like my own) was imperialist. I did not want to fall into that category. Ballengee-Morris and Sanders (2009) ask similar questions regarding authenticity stating, "Who gets to determine and who benefits from defining or reproducing notions of authenticity? How is a made object changed when a maker loses control over meaning, or its significance is wrestled from them?" (pp. 139-140). In many instances, this is the case for Cajamarcan artists.

Recently, I attended the 2012 Inclusive Museum conference at the University of the West Indies, Barbados, where I presented this issue and put forward questions of authenticity based on hybridization and outside influence on Peruvians. A Barbadian woman working with artists in her own country argued that I should speak with the artists about the loss of tradition. She referenced similar happenings to traditional art forms in Barbados and told me that artists sometimes do not realize the impact globalization and hybridization are having on them until it is too late. After years of my own internal conflict about this issue, this Barbadian woman made me feel that perhaps education and some outsider suggestions for the artists might work toward supporting preservation of traditions. Upon reflection I realized that the website that I had been working on with the Peruvian artists since 2007 has been an attempt to preserve Peruvian artistic traditions.

Through this process, my own ideological framework has continued to change, morph, and become realized through the eleven years of visiting Peru and the artists. As a researcher, I have more fully understood my role, a role of privilege that could support and open boundaries for the artists on their terms and be a benefit for all involved. But I have also

---

outwards rather than upwards or downwards. In this sense, there is less judgment and rigidity, though more chaos.

acknowledged that there are complexities and complications when representing others (Ballengee-Morris, Sanders, Smith-Shank, & Staikidis, 2010). Through this research, many of these complexities came to light. I am continuing to work through the complications, as I am sure many others in this position do.

The idea behind the website (which was a request directly from the artists) was to develop it with them on their terms. This collaboratively created website demonstrated the evolution of a consistent narrative between researcher and participant. I became more of an insider than an outsider, and at times, the artists told me that they trusted me more than their counterparts. However, I continuously questioned this and am cautious about saying this. Many of the trust issues among artists in Cajamarca emerged from conflict about idea generation for new products, technology development, and who could increase profit. Since my position with them as researcher was to ensure confidentiality and to support the entire group, they began to see me as trustworthy (Alexander, 2010). I understood that my position with them as researcher was the power position, and they likely saw me as a bridge to a 'better life.' However, I felt that the real trust was not through the research or work but came through the relationships that I built through eleven years with them (Tuhiwai Smith, 2012). We consider each other friends.

Through this project, I was not only able to gain trust but also to provide information to the artists about globalization and expertise about website development. With the website as a focal point of conversation, we were able to discuss the ideas of a global market, the Internet, and the business concepts of a web platform. Through the process, the artists became more aware of their position in the global marketplace and were better able to understand and educate themselves on the issues at hand. They spoke for themselves and decided how they wanted to be represented on the website (Alexander, 2010). The main goal of the research was to acknowledge that I, as a researcher, am not always correct, and that the artists knew best how to represent themselves and their products. This idea was counter to what I saw during the beginning days of working with the artists and ATA. Today, the artists continue to struggle with sales and finding the correct products to promote to consumers, but since 2002, they have learned a lot through trial and error in this global arena.

I believe, as does Ballengee-Morris (2002), that education for researchers, artists/producers, and any entity working in a 'first/third world' capacity is key to understanding art forms in a global marketplace and hearing those voices that are most often inaudible. In my experience working with artists in Cajamarca, the biggest differences made were through mutual education, patience, trust, and a sharing of assets and knowledge.

Form and Expression in the Hybrid Identities of Indian Art Education and Educators

Manisha's Story: Moving from India to the United States for graduate studies in art education, I often encountered questions about the nature of art education in India and found myself in the position of Native Representative or ambassador for Indian art education, as it were. Over the decade that I was away from India, my familiarity with Western discourses in art education as a discipline grew as did my distance from practice and discourse in art education in India. I became increasingly uncomfortable with this assumption of my Native-ness to the field and the authenticity of my representation of those

that actually worked "back home." In order to understand whether I could authentically call myself (or answer to) the label of "Indian art educator," I needed to understand who art educators in India were, and whether an all-encompassing and singular term like "Indian art education" was even valid. This quest for what I now recognize as an authentication of identity is what led to my dissertation research.

During this research I found that the development of Indian schools of artmaking has been recorded by scholars who have mapped traditions of art and craft from ancient to modern, from pre-colonial to post-colonial transitions, and the hybridity of methods and materials that resulted from encounters with colonialism and globalization. However, I found a paucity of research investigating the development of pedagogy from the perspectives of the teachers themselves. Even scarcer is research on the identity of these art educators and their perspectives on the location and possibilities of their practice. In other words, while there is plenty of information on content, methods, and histories of art and cultural education in contemporary India, there is little information on who actually disseminates and teaches this content, what drives them, and what resources offered and deemed necessary by policy and programming they know and use. Therefore, rather than addressing the hybridity of artmaking methods and materials in schools of art, I focused my investigations on the hybridity of teacher identity across sites of practice.

Over the course of three years, at two sites in urban India, I interviewed seventeen artist educators whose professional practice revealed transversals of 1) sites of practice in education, such as K-12, higher education, and community/museum settings, and 2) disciplinary practice, such as artist, teacher, art historian, and art critic. I employed the term 'artist educator' to reflect this hybridity since I recognized early in my research that the terms *art educator* and *art education*, as the discipline-based nomenclature I learned during my studies in the West held no such fixed meaning for my India-based counterparts.

In constructing this study I encountered two major dilemmas: one was my difficulty finding comfortable or linear ways to categorize or define the form or function of art education and artist educators with whom I spoke; the second was my struggle during analysis and interpretation of data to find a balance in my ontological self that thought simultaneously and interchangeably in Western and Indian theoretical paradigms to translate and connect my national-cultural-researcher-self to those with whom I spoke. Eventually, to analyze the narratives of these artist educators, I applied the theoretical model of assemblages (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) to illustrate hybridity in the identity of Indian art educators and in the locations of practice of art education in contemporary urban India. To reflect the hybrid and varied (multicultural) nature of the identities of Indian art education, and artist educators, as well as myself of artist educator-researcher, I defined the construction of my study as well as my findings within a context of post-colonial and globalization theories.

To explain briefly, the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of assemblage describes a machine or structure containing many parts that work together to perform a particular function. Deleuze and Guattari postulate that it is in realizing its function that the machine can be named or its form made visible. The assemblage might be machinic—concerned with technical, content-based, or organizational aspects, or it might be an assemblage of enunciation—concerned with linguistic, communicative, or expressive aspects. In my assemblages, the machinic was the information I collected about art and cultural education policies in place and in process, and the structure and content of programming and curriculum at my sites of study. In other words the machinic provided an idea of the

resources made available by policy and programming—the audible and recognized voices (Sharma, 2012). The enunciated was what I inferred by analyzing the dialogue I heard from the artist educators themselves and juxtaposing it with the dialogue represented by the policy and programming efforts. I decided that it was only with such a juxtaposition that a true or authentic image of Indian art education could be articulated.

Wise (2005) explains the concept of assemblage as a "process of arranging, organizing, fitting together" to create a whole that "expresses some identity and claims a territory" (p. 91). An assemblage of identity comprises stories of professional development as well as personal journeys. This process has been well documented in education and art education research (Olsson, 2009). These collective assemblages of enunciation are "acts and statements" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 88). After analyzing my interview data and applying the concept of assemblages to represent the form that I saw as emerging through juxtapositions of idea and form, I identified three narratives of art education in India that seemed to me, to speak across the multiple cultures of ethnicity, geography, cultural history, and disciplines that I was exploring. I saw these narratives as being those of learning, teaching, and ideology. I presented these narratives by constructing fictional characters that represented assemblages of the voices of my interviewees across spatial-temporal practice. I constructed three composite characters, named for their Sanskrit[8] meanings. These are *Vidya* (knowledge), *Shakti* (power/action), and *Neeta* (policy). A combination of spiritual instinct and material-logical reasoning ran as undercurrent to most of the interviews as well as the documents of curriculum I studied. The narratives demonstrated a disconcerting tug-of-war within every aspect of Indian art education—as both a singular discourse and a collection of ideological terms and practices. To summarize, in defining these composite characters, I illustrated my understanding of how artist educators in India map their practice of learning and teaching art across striations[9] of disciplinary practice marked by institutionalized programs.

These three composite characters might be read more as collective assemblages of enunciation indicating the ways of knowing illustrated by the 17 participants in my research study: specifically, their knowing of themselves and the spaces within which they function in fluctuations as powerful and powerless, as sharply defined, or as fuzzy and indistinct. For example, the composite characters, Vidya, Shakti, and Neeta, describe their movement across disciplinary striations:

> "I would say I am an art educator—I teach how to make visual art and I
> teach art history so that is being an art educator I think," says Vidya. While
> she and Shakti describe the locations of their students across schools and
> colleges and private tutoring, Neeta adds community-based organizations,
> like museums and NGO's to her locations. " . . . here in India," says Vidya, "we
> are all jack of all trades because see, one hour I teach an art criticism class,
> the next I go to a life drawing class and then into a painting class. Then, onto

---

[8]Sanskrit is a historical Indo-Aryan language that is often considered as the language of Indic traditional thought and theory across the many linguistic and cultural regions of the Indian subcontinent.
[9]Deleuze and Guattari (1987) present space as striated and smooth landscapes; striations are marked borders and boundaries indicating more ordered routes of movement. Smooth space has fewer markers, and while it encourages more transgressions, it also has more bumps and rough areas.

> a value education, religious doctrine . . . based on where you are teaching."
> (Sharma, 2012, pp. 124–125)

The identity of the Indian artist educator, as voiced in these composites/assemblages, is that of a nomad moving across the territorial spaces of defined curriculum and policy and deterritorialized spaces of creative instincts based on necessity and opportunity. As nomads they occupy in-between spaces, off defined paths of professional structures, and outside the organized systems of institutionalized programs. The narratives of learning and teaching reflect a sense of the invisibility of their input into the assemblages. When placed outside their own territory, their narratives become mute enunciations, reflecting the inaudibility of the art teachers' voices and experiences within the dominant narrative. In other words, they reflect the inaudibility of the voices and experiences of the art teacher as resources within Indian art and Indian education.

There is quite a clear recognition of the defined identities of the artist who teaches and of the teacher who employs art as a tool of education in the policy and research documents of organizations like the Center for Cultural Resources and Training (CCRT), National Center for Educational Research and Training (NCERT), and Department of Education in Arts and Aesthetics (DEAA) (see Sharma, 2012). However, once the boundaries of these territories defined by policy, curriculum, and educational politics are crossed—moving into the in-between spaces defined loosely as artist educator—definitions, functions, and acknowledged effects of practice become fuzzy and indistinct. Understanding and recognition of where these practitioners come from, what they should focus on, what they are working towards, and what they accomplish get lost in the inability to track a clearly (pre)defined professional accredited practice because it does not always match up to who the practitioners and students are.

This can be understood in Vidya's clarifications that "Besides teaching, I am also a practicing artist . . . though it's difficult to balance my work as an artist with teaching and also have a family life." Shakti, on the other hand, identifies herself as an academic in her work as a researcher, art critic, and writer, but when it comes to teaching art history and criticism at the higher education level, her language changes. "There, I identify only as a teacher," she explains. "If I was preparing people to be artists, then I would identify as an artist educator or an art educator." Neeta, as a designer, questions her very presence in the study, not quite knowing whether her work "fits" within the definitions of the field or what I as a researcher, with a power to define and represent, am looking for. "I am more a designer than an artist. So does that make me an art educator?" she asks. Their uncertainty about being part of the field: its policy and curricular conversations and structures becomes a space for understanding how the inaudibility of these artist educator voices in the assemblage of enunciation is a lack in the machinic assemblage (the structure of the field) that could be enriched by its inclusion.

In epistemological terms, I posit that we can read these enunciations as a system of signs in the context of post-colonial globalization. When these inaudible enunciations are read as linguistic signs embedded in regimes of inherited language, hybridity in language can be reduced to a sign of colonial legacy and its possible efficacy shunned as inauthentic or less valuable. In post-colonial India, linguistic difference is bridged by communicating in English as a connecting language. For instance, the participants in my study teach, and I interview them (based on the sites of this particular study), in various flows of language that fluctuate between English, Hindi, and Urdu, or hybrid forms of these multiple language and dialectical

systems. However, when read beyond embedded signifying regimes (self-consciousness), this linguistic hybridity can be transformative. In this context, I own English as my language as much as any other language system of which I am a 'native' speaker, namely, Hindi and Urdu. I choose not to locate English in hierarchies nor opposition to any 'other' inherited linguistic system. In the construction of my research and representation of my participants' voices, I employ language not to mark hierarchies but to make connections. Thus, I am able to juxtapose my influences and interpretations drawn from Sanskrit texts in Hindu philosophical systems with the ideas of Deleuze and Guattari, that are written by European scholars for a primarily Western audience. These juxtapositions allow me to think of the power and possibility of both the hybridity and authenticity of ideas and of language, not only those of my own researcher and art educator self, but also those of the audiences for my work that I both recognize and ignore in doing so.

Thus, while language indeed remains an important issue in post-colonial discourses, there can be a choice in how it is used. Within a discourse of art education with nationalistic agendas, such as the simplification of defining *an* Indian art education through government-issued textbooks promoting particular political agendas with fixed definitions and visual markers of 'authentic Indian culture,' this reterritorialization with linguistic and ideological signifiers can provide a bridge between the disconnect of art education policy and artist educator pedagogy. For instance, based on the narratives I constructed from my data analysis, in Indian art education creative instincts to learn through individual exploration and expression push at more structured traditional ways of learning. These are embodied in both the Western atelier and Indian traditions of *Silpin* (master-artisan) and *karkhana (factory-like)* exemplified in the exercises of copying and mimicking the masters, mass-production or craft-as-art, and learning art history as separate from artmaking practices.

This instinct manifests in the narratives of learning and teaching. Fictive composite Shakti defines this structured and prescriptive system as the reason for her frustration at not knowing how to evaluate her originality of expression until the time that she reached college (Sharma, 2013, p. 133). She clearly indicates dissatisfaction with the acquisition of merely technical skills in art classes. In her own words, "the idea was not to explore yourself; it was basically more towards the perfection of the piece of art you were working on with the idea that this could only be gained by copying someone." Neeta's experience of copying *alamkaric* (decorative) designs without ever learning that they were designs drawn from the murals of the historic cultural site of Ajanta and Ellora confirms this. But it was never enough for her as a student to just develop a manual skill in drawing or painting without processing the content and meaning in order to know the history and context.

In other words, these artist educators began articulating their territories of teaching practice based on knowing what was *not* in their spaces of learning or that which needed to be spoken for, a space to be occupied. This instinct also pushed them to explore the criteria of learning and of teaching that became programming and policy. While structured learning produces a sense of comfort by providing known directions, it inhibits nomadic movements that create an open space for learning where questioning arises from multiplicities in combinations of instinct and experience.

In listening to and interpreting these voices, I was able to find more comfortable ways of identifying my own voice in speaking as, for, and about Indian artist educators, and my function in doing so. In making visible components of the definition and practice of Indian art education, I found my own purpose and identity becoming clearer, which has led to my

being able to define my role as an art educator living and working in the West more clearly. For instance, I realize that identifying as an Indian artist educator writing in English, or using vocabulary originating in the West—such as the ideas of Deleuze and Guattari—does not make me less authentic as an Indian scholar, neither does using Vedanta philosophy and Sanskrit terms make me more so. Although my use of the latter might be read as closer and more faithful to Indigenous traditions, I cannot identify myself as *native* to the dialogue in process about Indian art education practice because at this point I am really on the margins, looking in.

Even though this theorized assemblage of enunciation as an identifier of Indian artist educators seems tenuously held together at this point of my examination, it is this very lack of a singularity in definition that keeps the field from falling into complacence with what it is, does, and might be in both form and function, as well as with whom it engages. For "nomadic thought does not immure itself in the edifice of an ordered interiority . . . it does not repose on identity; it rides on difference" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. xii).

Relevance of the Hybridity of Indian Art Educator Identity to Global Discourse

As I struggled to make coherent my findings about Indian artist educator identity, including my own identity and responsibilities as a researcher, I found that my construction of my dissertation reflects my own cultural, disciplinary and intellectual hybridity. For instance, its ontological development reflects my Hindu-upper middle class origins and my education and career in the US and abroad. In the context of Indian art education, it is an exploration of my participants' and my hybrid identities as socio-cultural chameleons migrating between physical, socio-cultural, and disciplinary geographies. In unpacking these hybrid identities, questions emerge: How do we, in art education, value workers inhabiting disciplinary fields of ambivalence incorporating an ethic of care (Noddings, 2002) for those who dare to live as disciplinary nomads having to defend themselves in a political arena that demands set answers to where they are migrating from and where they intend to settle? How do we, as nation/ethnicity/race/religion-based citizens in a globalized world, value ideas of tradition and change from dual or opposing ends of our hybrid ways of thinking illustrating unproductive hierarchies of ontological influences?

In Conversation

In sharing with each other our insights into our researcher-selves, our participants, and their locations, we focused on a few common concerns: the dismantling of "traditional" cultures through individual and organizational programming in post-colonial and global contexts; the naming and inclusion/exclusion of who and what "Native" cultures are, both in how artists and art educators identify themselves and what they envision their artistic products and roles to be; the naming and inclusion/exclusion of "progressive" cultures in envisioning the territory of our field and the factors that affect this vision; and our entry into and engagement with these artistic and cultural communities to consciously foster productive relationships toward deeper and more equitable learning.

This analysis allowed us to articulate that traditionally the ways we have envisioned spaces or territories of action have become quite easily fixed and rigid. This rigidity occurs when we use geographical and cultural space or profession or occupation to define who is Native or non-Native. Basically, such definitions are about who belongs and who does not, what action is authentic and what is not. When such boundaries are defined whether through

fixed histories or good intentions, our areas of effect and affect become pre-determined and fenced off from creative and equitable change.

Conclusion

It is clear that with increasing migration, multiplicity, and hybridity of both cultures and peoples, our ability to define identities and art forms is becoming more elusive. The backlash against this is the drive toward defining authenticity, culture, nation, and tradition as essential and historically rooted. This backlash is due to socio-political and economic realities as well as to our own basic needs for security and social belonging. We acknowledge this in considering not only the content we intend to teach and research, but also the paradigms within which we choose to do so—those we reach out to—to engage with in terms of cultural, geographical, political, and disciplinary borders. In other words, we choose with whom and with what we ally ourselves, as well as what pre-determined spaces we might challenge and (re)construct through occupation.

The concept of hybridity as explored in this article illustrates the ways in which binaries of eastern/western, traditional/contemporary, Native/non-Native, insider/outsider can be revised allowing us to look inward through the chaos of infinite influences and discourses to inquire: *who are we?* Our theoretical lenses, i.e., Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) assemblage, Bhabha's hybridity (1995), and other voices in postcolonial theory also offer a vocabulary to resist a single essential answer to explore multiplicity in identities and cultures, an enduring concern of post-colonial globalization discourse. Perhaps our identities, cultures, and art forms do not have to be rooted in one discipline, one cultural practice, one set vocabulary for us to be valuable. Our whole range of self-understanding and perceived affect can change with a more hybrid understanding of that simple and most basic question: *who do we want to be?* Of course, the very asking of this question makes visible an understanding of being in positions of power as art educators, researchers, and cultural workers whose self-determination is recognized as a decision to occupy a vocal place in conversations we believe to be important.

In reflecting on our work processes, we found ourselves exploring our participants' hybrid art forms and identities as artists, educators, researchers, and pro-active citizens occupying multiple physical, socio-cultural, and disciplinary geographies. Identifying our art education community as such, we in these various areas of impact can deeply enrich this discourse in claiming an authority of voice(s). We might reposition ourselves with our borderland locations and nomadic statuses as giving us positions of mobility and power.

As researchers and academics, we occupy positions of insight on issues of migration, settlements, hybridity, and ambivalence, in terms of discipline (studio art, art history, aesthetics, design), methodology (area-based artistic practices, vocabularies, transversals, and intersections of arts and crafts), and cultures (traditional practices and media, new media, fine art, mass media, and visual culture). All this is *the* discourse of the moment, and we believe, of the foreseeable future in Peru, India, and abroad. Through our self-reflective analyses in this article, we intend to stress how these positions we occupy must be recognized as positions of power and privilege where the opportunity to engage with and hear inaudible voices must be an ongoing endeavor and choice. We must constantly and critically review our own senses of self and power as teachers and researchers for our work to become authentic representations of those striving for visibility and audibility. In reflecting on and employing our own hybrid selves, we can use our own multiplicities in

productive and satisfying ways instead of allowing ourselves to become invisible and powerless in political and territorial spaces of culture, nation, and academics.

References

About ATA. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.aidtoartisans.org

Alexander, A. (2010). *Collaboratively developing a website with artists in Cajamarca, Peru: A participatory action research study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Al-Rodhan, N., & Stoudmann, G. (2006). *Definitions of globalization: A comprehensive overview and a proposed definitio*n. Working paper from Geneva Centre for Security Policy. Retrieved from http://www.gcsp.ch/Sidebar/GCSP-Papers

Appadurai, A. (1997). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. New Delhi, IN: Oxford University Press.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1998). *The post-colonial studies reader*. London, UK: Routledge.

Atwater, M. M. (1954). *Byways of hand-weaving*. New York, NY: MacMillan.

Ballengee-Morris, C. (2000). Decolonization, art education and one Guarani tribe. *Studies in Art Education, 41*(2), 100-113.

Ballengee-Morris, C. (2002). Culture for sale: Perspectives on colonialism and self-determination and the relationship to authenticity and tourism. *Studies in Art Education, 43*(3), 232-245.

Ballengee-Morris, C. (2010). They came, they claimed, they named, and we blame: Art education in negotiation and conflict. *Studies in Art Education, 51*(3), 275-287.

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

Ballengee-Morris, C., & Sanders, J. (2009). Culture, identity, representation: The economic policies of heritage tourism. *International Journal of Education through Art, 5*(2/3), 129-142.

Ballengee-Morris, C., Sanders, J., Smith-Shank, D., & Staikidis, K. (2010). Decolonizing development through indigenous artist-led inquiry. *The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education, 30*, 60-82.

Bhabha, H. (1990). *Nation and narration*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London, UK: Routledge.Bhabha, H. (1995). Cultural diversity and cultural differences. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin, (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 206-209). London, UK: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (2004). *The location of culture* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bolin, P., Blandy, D., & Congdon, K. G. (2000). *Remembering others: Making invisible histories of art education visible*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Bury, J. (2004). Livelihoods in transition: Transnational gold mining operations and local change in Cajamarca, Peru. *The Geographical Journal, 170*(1), 78-91.

Bury, J. (2008). Transnational corporations and livelihood transformations in the Peruvian Andes: An actor-oriented political ecology. *Human Organization, 67*(3), 307-321.

Chibber, V. (2013). *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*. London, UK: Verso.

Ofili, C. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-britain/exhibition/chris-ofili

Clifford, J. (1988). *The predicament of culture: 20th century ethnography, literature and art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

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

Roth, D. (2004). Retrieved from http://www.moma.org/interactives/exhibitions/2004/dieterroth/flash.htm

Diversi, M., & Moreira, C. (2008). *Betweener talk: Decolonizing knowledge production, pedagogy, and praxis*. Walnut Creek: CA: Left Coast Press.

Duncum, P. (2000). How art education can contribute to the globalization of culture. *Journal of Art and Design, 19*(2), 170-180.

Graburn, N. H. H. (1976). *Ethnic and tourist arts: Cultural expressions from the fourth world*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Guyas, A. S., Poling, L. H., & Keys, K. (2013). Bitter milking art education? Reorienting, redeeming, reclaiming, representing mother work in art education. In C. B. Morris & K. Tavin (Eds.), *Standing up for a change: Voices of art educators* (pp. 90-104). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Hall, S. (1980). Cultural studies: Two paradigms. *Media, Culture and Society*, *2*(1), 57-72.

Hall, S. (1992). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures: Understanding Modern Societies* (pp. 273-326). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Ping, H.Y. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.nottinghamcontemporary.org/art/huang-yong-ping

Khor, M. (2001). *Rethinking globalization: Critical issues and policy choices*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Nair, R. B. (2002). *Lying on the postcolonial couch: The idea of indifference*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Olsson, L. M. (2009). *Movement and experimentation in young children's learning: Deleuze and Guattari in early childhood education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Papastergiadis, N. (2005). Hybridity and ambivalence: Places and flows in contemporary art and culture. *Theory, culture & society*, *22*(4), 39-64.

Peru. (2011). In *New World Encyclopedia.* Retrieved from http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/p/index.php?title=Peru&oldid=956820.

Pieterse, J. N. (2004). *Globalization or empire?* London, UK: Routledge.

Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Sharma, M. (2012). *Indian art education and teacher identity as Deleuzo-Guattarian assemblage: Narratives in a post-colonial globalization context* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Spivak, G. (1990). *The post-colonial critic*. London, UK: Routledge.

Spivak, G. (2003). *Death of a discipline*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Tavin, K., & Hausman, J. (2004). Art education and visual culture in the age of globalization. *Art Education, 57*(5), 1-7.

Tidball, H. (1969). *Peru: Textiles unlimited*. Freeland, WA: HTH Publishers.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies* (2nd ed.). London, UK: ZED Books LTD.

Wise, J. M. (2005). Assemblage. In C.J. Stiyale (Ed.), *Gilles Deleuze* (pp. 77-87). Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Ltd.

Young, R. J. C. (1995). *Colonial desire: Hybridity, culture and race.* London, UK: Routledge.