Theses and Dissertations   Graduate School

2019

TEACHING ABOUT RACIALLY DIVERSE ARTISTS AND CULTURES

Hannah Sions
Virginia Commonwealth University

TEACHING ABOUT RACIALLY DIVERSE ARTISTS AND CULTURES:
A QUANTITATIVE SURVEY OF NAEA MEMBERS

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

by

Hannah Kim Sions
Bachelor of Arts, James Madison University, 2007
Master of Arts, James Madison University, 2014

Director: Courtnie N. Wolfgang, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Department of Art Education

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
May, 2019

Acknowledgement

As I look back on my doctoral journey, I am humbled by the amount of love and support I have received. I would like to acknowledge the people that have made this journey possible.

First, I would like to thank my dissertation chair, advisor, mentor, and friend, Dr. Courtnie Wolfgang. Courtnie, I would not have been able to make it through this entire process without you. Thank you for holding my hand, giving me constant encouragement, and helping me find my voice. You have truly changed my life and I am a better person thanks to your teachings and our conversations. I am incredibly lucky to have you as my advisor, mentor, and friend. Dr. Melanie Buffington, words cannot describe how grateful I am for all the academic and emotional support, thoughtful feedback, knitting adventures, and cake. There were many instances where I felt lost, but was able to find my way again because of your advice. To Dr. Pam Lawton for all our chats and the emotional energy as I tried to find my place in academia and Dr. James McMillan, for your kindness and encouragement when I was afraid that I would never understand stats. When you told me "when you become a doctor," it gave me the courage to keep moving forward.

I would also never have been able to get this far if it wasn't for my ladies, Cassandra Willis and Veronica Shuford. Thank you both for being such a big part of this journey with me. We've encouraged each other, studied together, cried together, and celebrated one another's milestones. I'm so lucky to have you both and I know I wouldn't be able to have finished this without our sisterhood. I'm excited to continue celebrating our academic and personal achievements together.

To my friends in Richmond and back home, I am truly grateful for all the emotional support I have received over the last three years. Fatemah, our many coffee shop meetings and running sessions helped me stay grounded when I felt overwhelmed. Amanda, I'm grateful for all your thoughtful encouragement, especially when you stayed with me my very first week of doctorate classes, to make sure I was able to transition to this new role with all the support I needed. Thank you Barbara, Sarah, and Jenny for all your visits and checking in with me in person, through phone calls, and texts. Ronika, for being so generous with your time and offering a listening ear whenever I was having a rough day. Dr. Karin Tollefson-Hall, for all the chats, words of encouragement, and free meals. Next time, I'm buying! Thank you, Dr. Bill Wightman, for putting the idea in my head that I should pursue a doctorate, I never would have imagined that I could do this if it wasn't for you. To my cohort Keyes, thank you for the study sessions and chatting with me during class, ha! And lastly, Kristen who has allowed me to navigate the stresses and responsibilities that I had the last 11 months of this journey. Thank you for always reassuring me that I was doing my best and that my best was good enough.

I would also like to thank my family for playing key roles in helping me be successful throughout this journey. First and foremost, to my father for always supporting my dreams. My sister, Esther, whose time, energy, and support allowed me to have the emotional and mental space to dedicate time to my work. My in laws, Debbie and Kenny, for all the visits, meals, and check ins to make sure we were doing well. And Addy, for whose snuggles helped me through even the hardest study sessions and reading assignments.

Lastly, the biggest figure in my success has been my husband, Chris. Words cannot begin to describe how grateful I am to have such a supportive partner who cheered me on every single day. I am thankful for your willingness to uproot our family from our previous lives so that I

could pursue my dreams. Every day you reminded me that I was capable of anything and everything I put my mind to, and it was because of your encouragement that I slowly believed that these words were true. I wouldn't be here without you. This dissertation is finished because of you.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my father, Sam Kim, who believes in the importance of education. Thank you for helping me achieve my dreams and believing that I could do anything I set my mind to.

And to Sage, who was with me throughout this process.

Tables of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

TEACHING ABOUT RACIALLY DIVERSE ARTISTS AND CULTURES: A
QUANTITATIVE SURVEY OF NAEA MEMBERS

By Hannah Kim Sions, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2019

Director: Courtnie N. Wolfgang, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Department of Art Education

Art education scholars have redefined multicultural teaching practices to include a need
for addressing social inequities. To understand art educators' multicultural teaching practices, it
is important to measure the extent to which they present cultural diversity in the classroom and
present a racially diverse pool of artists. The purpose of this this quantitative, nonexperimental
study was to measure the extent to which practicing K–12 art educators who are members of the
National Art Education Association (NAEA) engage students with racially diverse artists and
cultures within their curricula. The study aimed to measure the extent that educators address
racial and cultural diversity in their classrooms. The study also gathered data on which resources
participants indicated would help create and implement curricula that addresses racially diverse
artists and cultures. Finally, the study explored the relationships between seven different
teachers' self-reported attributes and the extent that they taught about and valued racial/cultural

diversity. The findings show that educators taught about racial and cultural diversity to regularly in their classroom practices and they also voiced a need for more resources to teach more about racially diverse artists and cultures, specifically visual resources and education/training regarding racially/culturally diverse content. Findings also indicated that educators who taught 21+ years, taught predominantly students of color, and those who were more comfortable with conversations pertaining to racial/cultural diversity were more likely to value the importance of racial/cultural diversity in their curricula. The results suggest that resources, such as education, training, or professional development, should be offered to educators in the field so that they may continue learning new language concerning diversity as perceptions and understandings continue to shift.

Chapter 1

Introduction

As a former public school art teacher in a rural county in the U.S., I frequently

encountered superficial presentations of cultures. I remember one instance walking into a

second grade classroom and seeing a Korean doll in the corner during "China week." I

asked the teacher if he knew that the doll was not Chinese and was, in fact, Korean. He

replied, "oh it's okay, the students don't know the difference." (Sions, 2018, p. 44)

This personal story, and many others like it, have stuck with me throughout my journey

as a doctoral student. The more I learned about critical multicultural art education, the more I

recognized the problematic nature of this encounter and, at times, my own understanding of

multicultural art education. For many years, researchers have emphasized the growing number of

students of color in U.S. schools (Banks, 1981/1988; Ladson-Billings, 2005); as such, it is

paramount that teachers reconsider their (multicultural) teaching practices and create curricula

centered on equity. Like Acuff (2016), I believe that the goal for art educators should be to create

a curriculum that is *de*centered from Eurocentric art and *re*centered on a diverse pool of artists.

To do this successfully, art educators should work toward becoming critical multicultural art

educators because, without a critical understanding of power, representation, and social inequity,

multicultural art lessons often perpetuate the inequalities that they were designed to disrupt

(Acuff, 2016; Alden, 2001). Thus, instead of superficially introducing cultures to students to address diversity, art educators need to consider the lived experiences of students and artists when creating multicultural lessons.

To better understand multicultural art education practices, data are needed to measure the extent to which art educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures. This study investigated how practicing K–12 art educators who are members of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) teach about racially diverse artists and cultures within their curricula. This chapter provides an overview of the study and the main concepts explored in the following chapters. In the following section, I discuss the background of the study by introducing critical multicultural art education, and I explore the potential for teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures in the art classroom. Next, I present the statement of the problem and introduce my research questions, and present a review of the literature. Following this, in the methodology section, I describe the purpose of this research and discuss the research design. Finally, I conclude the chapter with a discussion of the significance and limitations of the study.

Background of the Study

Multicultural education became part of the public school curriculum in the mid-1960s (Banks, 1981/1988). After recognizing that certain students, especially students of color and women, were being marginalized in the existing school system, proponents of multicultural education advocated for educational reform that would provide students from all backgrounds with an equitable learning experience (Banks, 1977, 1981/1988, 1996a, 2015; Sleeter & Grant, 1987). This initial push for inclusion allowed room for diverse cultures to be introduced into mainstream curricula; however, merely introducing other cultures without addressing racism and social inequities failed to change the marginalization experienced by minority students (Banks,

1995b). Simply put, the initial purposes of providing equitable education opportunities failed to translate into multicultural teaching practices.

Contemporary scholars recognized this disconnect between multicultural education theory and practice and have since redefined multicultural teaching practices (Banks, 1995b; Grant & Sleeter, 1998), using different language to reimagine multicultural practices and to reemphasize the goals of multicultural curricula (Ladson-Billings, 1992, 1995a, 1995b). Scholars who emphasized social justice education argued that the current structure of education was built on a faulty foundation of inequity, and thus, for all students to have an equitable learning experience, transformation should occur in the larger context of the school environment, higher education, and addressing educators' personal biases (Au, 2014; Ighodaro & Wiggan, 2013; Nieto & Bode, 2018).

Similar trends can be noted in art education literature: Early art education texts often included an introduction of multicultural practices but failed to change the existing structure of education that presented inequitable educational opportunities for minority students. Art education scholars wrote about needing more than just cultural introductions in the classroom and discussed the role of social reconstruction in multicultural teaching practices (Stuhr, 1994); how preservice educators are prepared for multicultural teaching (Howe & Lisi, 1995); addressing a more comprehensive understanding of identity (Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001); and addressing educator bias to enact social change (Blandy & Congdon, 1988). Art educators also critiqued current multicultural practices and emphasized the limited perspectives through which diverse cultures were often introduced in the classroom (Anderson, 1996; Stout, 1997), while others noted the importance of discussing culture and cultural artworks from the perspectives of those who embody the culture being presented (Desai, 2005).

Contemporary conversations in multicultural art education present critical multicultural art education and social justice art education as new theoretical perspectives that can confront the shortcomings of multicultural art education. Critical multicultural art education employs critical thinking and analysis in art criticism to introduce conversations about the social, political, and cultural contexts behind works of art (Holloway & Krensky, 2001). This critical perspective is necessary to address systemic oppression and, ultimately, to enact social change (Acuff, 2016; Chalmers, 2002). Social justice art education shares similar characteristics with critical multicultural art education but addresses other forms of inequity that may be tied to students' identities (Dewhurst, 2010), such as disability, gender, gender identity, sexuality, and socioeconomic status. Social justice art education asks educators to challenge dominant narratives, appreciate the diverse knowledge of students, and discuss these issues through art (Bailey & Desai, 2005; Ballengee-Morris, Daniel, & Stuhr, 2008). The purpose of this shift in instruction is to introduce students to a wider variety of artists and cultures while challenging them to process the world through perspectives that are different from their own (Ballengee-Morris, Daniels, & Stuhr, 2008; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Shin, 2010).

Statement of the Problem

There is a wealth of literature regarding the concepts of multicultural education (Banks, 1991/1998; Banks 1995b; Grant & Sleeter, 1998; Sleeter & Grant, 1987), critical multicultural art education (Acuff, 2016; Chalmers, 2002; Holloway & Krensky, 2001), and social justice art education (Bailey & Desai, 2005; Ballengee-Morris, Daniel, & Stuhr, 2008). Although the language to define the goals of multicultural education has changed over the years, the initial goals of multicultural education run through social justice art education scholarship: to provide an equitable (art) education for all students regardless of their race, gender, social class, ability,

ethnicity, or culture. However, critiques of current multicultural practices suggest that many educators introduce culture only through an additive approach, where diversity is added to an existing curricula, thus presenting the culture superficially (Acuff, 2016); other researchers have described these multicultural practices as a form of colonialism through appropriation (Desai, 2005), noting that they perpetuate stereotypes (Chin, 2011) and social inequities (Alden, 2001).

To understand art educators' multicultural teaching practices, it is important to measure the extent to which they cover cultural diversity in the classroom and present a racially diverse pool of artists. Racial diversity is a vital part of multicultural art education because diverse racial representation of artists helps to provide different perspectives, sparks conversations about artistic representations of people of color, and helps students confront personal biases (Desai, 2010; Knight, 2006).

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze art educators' current practices of teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures through the following research questions:

RQ 1: To what extent do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members address cultural diversity in their classrooms?

RQ 2: To what extent do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members address racial diversity in their classrooms?

RQ 3: What do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members need to create and implement curricula that address racially diverse artists and cultures?

RQ 4: What relationships exist between art teachers' self-reported attributes and the dependent variables (cultural diversity, racial diversity, importance of cultural/racial diversity)?

SQ 1: Is there a relationship between educator race and the dependent variables?

SQ 2: Is there a relationship between years taught in a school and the dependent variables?

SQ 3: Is there a relationship between student demographics and the dependent variables?

SQ 4: Is there a relationship between school setting and the dependent variables?

SQ 5: Is there a relationship between the familiarity with multicultural terms and the dependent variables?

SQ 6: Is there a relationship between highlighted theories in higher art education courses and the dependent variables?

SQ 7: Is there a relationship between educator comfort and the dependent variables?

Review of Literature

The purpose of this study was to provide data on art educators' approaches to teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures and to understand what supports they need to promote (or continue promoting) racial and cultural diversity in their classrooms. The review of the literature related to this study is separated into four sections: history of multicultural education, history of multicultural art education, classroom practices, and gaps in the literature.

History of multicultural education. The history of multicultural education begins almost 100 years before the U.S. Civil Rights movement when, in the late 1880s, African American scholars, such as George Washington Williams, W. E. B. Du Bois, Carter G. Woodson, Horace Mann Bond, and Charles H. Wesley, brought their personal narratives and perspectives to academic scholarship (Banks, 1995a; Banks, 1996). Almost 50 years later,

escalating racial tensions in major cities resulted in riots, highlighting a need for harmony (Banks, 1981/1988). As a result, the Intergroup-Education Movement was implemented in racially diverse populations to help nurture mutual understanding. The Intergroup-Education Movement did not last long and evolved into ethnic studies and, later, multiethnic education (Banks, 1995b). After the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, people of color championed education reform in public schools, arguing that existing curricula excluded the history and cultures of the increasingly diverse population of students in the U.S. (Banks, 1981/1988). It is through this push that multicultural education was adopted into the public school curriculum.

Early stages. Sleeter and Grant (1987) analyzed early multicultural education articles and books to define theoretical and practical applications of multicultural curricula and identified several limitations. Sleeter and Grant found five different approaches to multicultural teaching practices: teaching the culturally different, human relations, single group studies, multicultural education, and education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. Each of these practices introduced diversity into the classroom and, at times, encouraged students from different cultural backgrounds to share their cultures. Many of these approaches put the burden of cultivating understanding and initiating change on minority students by encouraging them to assimilate into existing societal structures and/or assuming that intergroup relations would solve racism (Sleeter & Grant, 1987). None of these approaches directly addressed the negative aspects of racial discrimination, such as power, social constructs, discrimination, or poverty, all of which are commonly experienced by students in minority groups. The shortcomings of the early stages of multicultural education were addressed in the mid-stages of the movement (Sleeter & Grant, 1987).

Mid-stages. Recognizing that the initial goals of educational equity were not being met in the early stages of multicultural implementation, multicultural scholars began writing about better practices that could help the pursuit of educational equality. Grant and Sleeter (1989) introduced practical applications of teaching multicultural curricula based on their 1987 analysis of multicultural articles and books. These approaches focused on the gap between predominantly White educators' lived experiences and their students' experiences and knowledge. Banks (1995b) introduced five dimensions of multicultural education, emphasizing that the structure of education must be changed for the goals of multicultural education to be met. Banks' dimensions called for the integration of cultures within all course content, identifying and addressing students' racial attitudes, diverse teaching practices to meet the needs of all learners, and changing the existing social structures in schools. Later, Ladson-Billings (1995b) introduced culturally relevant pedagogy, a new way to view students of color and their academic strengths. Pointing out that the existing literature on students of color spoke of them from a deficit perspective where emphasis was on students' academic struggles, Ladson-Billings championed pedagogy that empowered students, built cultural competence of educators, and encouraged critical thinking for social change. The works of these authors inspired many subsequent scholars, whose ideas are introduced as recent approaches to multicultural education.

Recent approaches. Ladson-Billings' (1995b) writings have inspired at least four different approaches to multicultural pedagogy: culturally responsive pedagogy, cultural competence, culturally connected pedagogy, and culturally sustaining pedagogy. Culturally responsive pedagogy encouraged the use of students' strengths and knowledge to create a curriculum that is relevant to each individual student (Gay, 2000). Cultural competence emphasized that the educator must be competently able to understand students from diverse

cultural backgrounds (McAllister & Irvine, 2000). Culturally connected pedagogy linked culture with personal identity, highlighting the unique attributes within each student's cultural identity to create a learning experience that is tailored for each individual student (Irizarry, 2007). Finally, culturally sustaining pedagogy built directly on culturally relevant pedagogy by emphasizing and expanding on the aims of asset pedagogy. Culturally sustaining pedagogy further connected identity and culture in hopes of creating a culturally pluralistic school experience for students while sustaining cultural practices (Paris & Alim, 2014). These approaches have shifted the conversation around students of color by viewing students' lived experiences and cultures as assets that can add to their learning experiences.

Emerging topics. Social justice multicultural education emerged from multicultural education, and proponents of the approach championed the creation of equal education opportunities through an active confrontation of social and educational inequities (Nieto & Bode, 2018). Social justice multicultural education deliberately included other aspects of identity and culture that often result in marginalization, such as gender, sexual orientation, religion, and social class. Many authors asked educators to become aware of their biases and create curricula that actively combat racism and other forms of discrimination (Au, 2014; Brooks, 2012; Fiarman, 2016; Nieto & Bode, 2018).

History of multicultural art education. The history of multicultural art education parallels the history of multicultural education. The following section separates the history of multicultural art education into five different sections: art educators of color and the National Art Education Association, the early beginnings, an early analysis, middle stages, and emerging topics.

Art educators of color and the National Art Education Association. Recognizing a need for greater visibility among art educators of color at the National Art Education Association (NAEA) conferences, members of the NAEA Black Caucus staged a protest to voice their concerns at the Dallas Convention in 1971 at the Professional Materials Committee (Grigsby, 1997). Through the efforts of the Black Caucus, now known as the Committee on Multiethnic Concerns (COMC), educators of color gained the visibility, voice, and representation that they have today. The COMC helped increase the membership of minority art educators by voicing the need for diverse representation in conference speakers, highlighting the need to be considered in conversations about art education, and freedom to participate in planning and procedures of conferences.

The early beginnings. I conducted an analysis of multicultural art education literature, from 1948 to 1976, to present an overview of the themes addressed within these texts. The analysis showed that early multicultural art education writings addressed seven different themes: connection, contributions, advocating for the arts, teaching culturally diverse populations, practical applications, understanding diverse students, and a call for change. Authors who emphasized connection wrote about the importance of appreciating other cultures as they are, without assimilation, and recognizing a need for social change (Bloom, 1964; Chalmers, 1974; Glaeser, 1973; Ianni, 1968). Other authors discussed different cultures in relation to their contributions to American society and art (Gruner 1957; Neperud, 1969). Authors whose texts advocated for the arts discussed how the arts could support "disadvantaged students" and, thus, why the arts should be further integrated into education (Cohen, 1969a; Silverman, 1966; Heussenstamm, 1969). Still other authors provided support on how to teach students from culturally diverse populations (Armstrong, 1970; Cohen, 1968; Cohen, 1969b; Grossman &

Torrance, 1970; Lanier, 1970; Silverman, 1971; Wilson, 1963). Authors who wrote about practical applications provided educators with resources to help them implement multicultural teaching in their classrooms (Feldman, 1976; Hudson, 1970; Janoff, 1976; Toyoshima, 1973), while other authors implemented assessments for understanding diverse students (Bolton, 1969; Diamond, 1969; Eisner, 1969; McWhinnie, 1972; Renick, 1972; Rennels, 1969; Silverman, Heopfner, & Hendricks, 1969). Finally, many authors championed a call for a change to art education instruction, promoting positive perceptions toward students of color and challenging art educators to engage in more research about cultures (Efland, 1968; Foster, 1967; Lanier, 1975; Povey, 1969; Schellin, 1973; Taylor, 1975). This analysis painted a picture to help understand how multicultural content was approached during this time in art education history.

Early stages. Utilizing the framework created by Sleeter and Grant (1987) and Gibson (1976), Tomhave (1995) conducted an analysis of multicultural art education literature. Tomhave identified six approaches to multicultural art education texts between the years 1976 and 1989: acculturation/assimilation, bi-cultural education/cross-cultural research, cultural separatism, multicultural education theory, social reconstruction, and cultural understanding. These approaches were defined as follows: *Acculturation/assimilation* articles and books aimed to help immigrants assimilate into society for equal employment opportunities. *Bi-cultural education/cross-cultural* research articles and books were aimed at helping students from two different cultural backgrounds identify the strengths of their background knowledge for educators to employ a more personalized educational experience. *Cultural separatism* discussed instances in which large cultural subgroups preserved their cultural heritage by separating themselves from mainstream education. *Multicultural education theory* emphasized the creation of global perspectives by teachers' introducing multiple cultures into the classroom through art

13

lessons that allowed students to directly experience these cultures. *Social recons*truction focused on the necessity for social change, especially in regards to Eurocentrism, sexism, and classism. Finally, the *cultural understanding* approach paralleled multicultural education theory but emphasized that compromise was necessary between old academic achievement goals and cultural appreciation (Tomhave, 1995).

Middle stages. The analysis of early multicultural art education literature indicated how art educators, like other educators, struggled to reach the goals of multicultural education in practice. During the middle stages of multicultural art education, art education scholars began critiquing the practices and perspectives of multicultural art education. Scholars identified specific shortcomings, such as the oversimplification of cultures (Stout, 1997) and the misinterpretation of artwork through the use of a "Western" lens (Desai, 2005). To redefine the goals of multicultural art education, scholars began using the term *critical multicultural art education* to emphasize the need for critical understanding, analysis, and critical thinking to combat the social inequities that create unequal (educational) opportunities for students of color (Acuff, 2016; Holloway & Krensky, 2001).

Emerging topics. Emerging with critical multicultural art education as a parallel movement is *social justice art education*. Like social justice education, proponents of social justice art education championed equal (educational) opportunities for all students; however, those who wrote about social justice art education recognized other aspects of identity beyond race and ethnicity, including gender, gender identity, sexuality, class, ability, and socioeconomic status (Bailey & Desai, 2005; Congdon, Stewart, & White, 2002; Derby, 2011; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Seidler, 2011). Art education scholars also provided recommendations for practical applications of social justice art education in the classroom, such as promoting

democratic classroom environments (Dewhurst, 2010), assigning student-motivated artwork (Dewhurst, 2010), viewing and analyzing visual culture (Ballengee-Morris, Daniels, & Stuhr, 2008; Desai & Chalmers, 2007), and introducing visual culture of from diverse populations (Shin, 2010).

Other perspectives. Multicultural art education, critical multicultural art education, and social justice art education emphasize social and political inequities, which some educators view as outside the bounds of what should be addressed in an (art) classroom. While this debate is not new, it has been revisited during the last 15 years by scholars who are concerned that art education is slowly removing the "art" from the curriculum (Kamhi, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007; Kamhi & Torres, 2008). These authors have argued that contemporary art, and all topics addressed in contemporary artwork, do not adhere to the aesthetic experience in the traditional sense and have moved away from the standards of "fine art." While these arguments do not align with the purpose of this study, it is important to note that there are art educators and scholars who disagree with the inclusion of cultural values in art education.

Classroom practices. To understand current classroom practices, I analyzed literature to provide a preliminary overview of how educators are teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures within their classrooms. The articles I reviewed were categorized using three themes: lesson plan recommendations, reflections on a lesson or project, and data collection on classroom practices. In articles that included lesson plan recommendations, the authors provided practical teaching strategies for educators to better introduce diverse content into the art classroom such as creating curricula relevant to the student population, including visual culture, and integrating folklore/storytelling (Heise, 2010; Pellish, 2012; Reisburg, 2008; Stokrocki & Eldridge, 2009). Those who wrote about lesson and project reflections provided feedback on the strengths of

specific lessons that they implemented in their studies (Buka, Fedorenko, & Sheridan, 2012; Lopez, 2009; Rufo, 2011). Finally, authors who discussed data collection on classroom practices measured classroom content and teacher perceptions to gain a better understanding of how educators understand and implement multicultural and meaningful themes in their curricula (Bain, Newton, Kuster & Milbrandt 2010) and which factors influenced early educators' curriculum content (La Porte, Speirs, and Young, 2008). The first study found that the participating art educators mainly introduced social justice themes in lessons that explored identity or visual culture (Bain, Newton, Kuster & Milbrandt 2010). Findings from the second study showed that preservice training emphasized Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE) practices and thus incorporated multicultural content on a moderate basis (La Porte, Speirs, and Young, 2008).

Gaps in the literature. Through my review of literature, I recognized that there were limited studies describing classroom practices. Existing research addressed individual lessons or projects, provided recommendations for multicultural teaching, or collected data on classroom practices in the form of surveys. The art education surveys were limited to specific teacher demographics, geographic locations, grade levels, or did not specifically address multicultural art practices. In general education, there were many survey instruments that addressed multicultural teaching practices, but were not specific enough for the purposes of this study. From this review of literature, I concluded that a national survey measuring the extent that art educators taught about racial or cultural diversity could contribute to existing literature by providing data that describe multicultural classroom practices.

Overview of existing art education research. I conducted a search of existing surveys in art education from the last 20 years. From these results, I identified four different themes and/or

study populations: preservice educators, surveys by specific school levels, research in art education, and surveys measuring perceptions and attitudes toward issues of diversity in the classroom. I identified a total of 14 surveys, and while some measured diverse content in curricula (Nichols, 2010; Obiokor, 2002; Walton, 1999), none aligned perfectly with the goals of this study, thus indicating a gap in art education literature.

Overview of existing educational measures. To identify if this study could incorporate a preexisting measure into its methodology, I conducted a search of existing surveys and measures in quantitative educational research with specific search peramiters. The search revealed that many studies were conducted to measure multicultural practices, racial sensitivity, and/or cultural competence within an educational setting (Krigs, Austic, & Gutiérrez, 2015; Littleford & Jones, 2017; Martinelli, 2018; Wangy, Castro, & Cunningham, 2014). However, these existing measures could not be used as the questions were not relevant within an art classroom setting. Through this search of existing measures, I concluded that a new measure must be created for this study to accurately measure the extent to which educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures in the classroom.

Methodology

To conduct the current study, I developed a quantitative, descriptive, nonexperimental, self-reported online survey that I distributed to K–12 art teacher participants who were members of NAEA. Through this survey, the participants indicated the extent to which they include racially diverse artists and cultures in their curricula.

Description of participants. The participants in the study were practicing K–12 art educators who were active members of NAEA at the time of the survey. Participants were selected via a convenience sample (McMillan, 2004) and were chosen because of the NAEA's

large database of currently practicing art educators. Participants included elementary, middle, and high school art educators. Through communication with NAEA's member services and database operations manager in late 2018, I identified that, at the time, the elementary division had 4,417 members, the middle level had 2,276 members, and the secondary division had 5,950 members. The survey was distributed through NAEA's official message board, *Collaborate*. I posted about the survey on the elementary, middle, and secondary division message boards as well as the higher education message board, and I asked educators to distribute a link to my posts to their alumni networks. In addition, on each state chapter's social media page on Facebook, I also shared a link to the post I made on the NAEA message boards. Because the link was to the original *Collaborate* post and not the survey itself, members were required to log in to their NAEA accounts, ensuring that participants were active NAEA members.

Description of the survey. The survey asked participants about four aspects of their engagement with racially and culturally diverse content in the classroom: (a) their personal understanding of teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures, (b) their personal perspectives on the relevance of racially diverse artists and cultures, (c) their demographic data and teaching population data, and (d) their educational history. The first two sections of the survey measured teachers' personal understanding and perspectives on teaching racially diverse artists and cultures. For these sections, participants responded with a four-point Likert-type scale, choosing if they agree: (4) *To a great extent*, (3) *Somewhat*, (2) *Very little*, and (1) *Not at all*. The questions within this section were combined to create a subscale for three dependent variables (racial diversity, cultural diversity, and importance of racial and cultural diversity) that described the extent to which educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures in their classrooms.

Five survey items were combined for each variable, thus resulting in a 20-point subscale for each dependent variable.

The survey also included demographic data on the teachers and the school populations that they were teaching. For participants' educational history, the survey included questions regarding the degrees that participants earned, the extent to which racially diverse artists and cultures were addressed in their higher education courses, the extent to which racially diverse artists and cultures were addressed in their higher education art courses, and descriptions of topics that were emphasized in their art education courses.

Procedures. A prepilot test was conducted to measure the time required to take the survey and to improve the survey's wording and clarity. Following feedback from the prepilot test, amendments were made to the survey, including removing questions, emphasizing language for clarity, and changing the survey platform. I received IRB approval #HM20012462 (see Appendix A) before collecting any data.

Following data collection, I exported the data into a spreadsheet on my personal, password-protected computer so that I could clean and code the data. The data were then exported into SPSS and labeled to run descriptive and correlational data analyses. Descriptive statistics, standard deviation, and mean were calculated for the two dependent variables (racial diversity and cultural diversity), providing data for research questions 1 and 2. I ran tests for descriptive statistics, specifically frequency and percentages, to answer research question 3. Finally, I ran correlational tests between the dependent variables and educator self-reported survey items to answer research question 4. Through this process, I was able to identify further areas that educators may need additional support for teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures.

Significance of the Study

My deep search into art education research demonstrated that there are a number of quantitative research projects exist in the field. Though such a wide range of literature exists, there are a limited number of surveys about racial and cultural diversity in art education and even fewer surveys that measure the extent to which art educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures within their classrooms. The current study was designed to collect responses from practicing art educators to create a more comprehensive measure of art educators' understandings of teaching racially diverse artists and cultures within their classrooms. With this data, art education researchers can find correlations to identify gaps in practicing art educators' presentation of multicultural pedagogy and, thus, can provide them the support they need. In addition, the data collected may be useful in the development of coursework for preservice art educators to better prepare them to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures in their classrooms.

Limitations of the Study

As with all research projects, there were limitations to this study. The first limitation to the study was with the participants of the survey. Survey respondents were limited to NAEA members, and there are many art educators who are not members of NAEA who might report different experiences. Secondly, because the survey was self-reporting, there may have been variations between how different educators measure the extent to which they teach about racially diverse artists and cultures. Another limitation of the study was the sample size ($N = 74$). While many attempts were made to increase participation, the population of the survey is not sufficient in number that results can be generalized for the greater population of K–12 NAEA members. Furthermore, because I am the primary person who analyzed the data and literature, my personal

biases are a part of this research. I acknowledge my subjectivity as someone greatly invested in the outcome.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to identify three things: the extent to which educators teach about racial and cultural diversity; the resources (if any) that are needed to help educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures; and if there are any relationships between educator attributes and the extent to which they teach about racially diverse artists and cultures. Survey results indicated that the respondents teach about racial and cultural diversity in their classrooms to some extent and that they felt additional education/training would help increase the extent to which they taught about racially diverse artists and cultures. Certain teacher attributes, such as familiarity with multicultural terms, student demographics, years of experience, educator race, and theories that had been highlighted in their art education courses, had a statistically significant relationship with at least one of the dependent variables. These results suggest that further education/training could increase the extent to which educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures because training would increase educators' comfort levels to teach diverse content and their understanding of the importance of cultural and racial diversity.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This study investigates the extent to which practicing K–12 art educators who are active members of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) teach about racially diverse artists and cultures within their classrooms. To adequately explore this topic, much background information is needed on the history of multicultural education, the history of multicultural art education, classroom practices, and gaps in the existing literature. This chapter begins with a historical overview of multicultural education and multicultural art education, with a particular focus on the ways in which language and perspectives have shifted over time. Next, I provide an overview of classroom multicultural art education practices, including discussions of lesson content, lesson implementation and feedback, and practicing educators' understandings of multicultural curriculum content. The chapter concludes with an overview of existing studies in education and art education that measure multicultural or diverse classroom content. Through this overview, I provide insight into existing research and identify how this study can contribute to the broader knowledge base of art education.

History of Multicultural Education

For the purpose of clarity, I define the terms culture, race, ethnicity, and multicultural education in the following section.

Definition of terms. *Culture* describes the achievements, behavior patterns, symbols, institutions, values, and other human components that are unique to a human group and that distinguish it from other groups (Banks, 1977). A culture provides the morals, beliefs, and patterns that create structure within a society (Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr, 2001). These social patterns are in place to ensure the survival of the people in a particular cultural group and are unique to the specific needs of its members (Hoopes & Pusch, 1981). In relation to education, culture, or personal culture, can be understood as the "concepts, explanations, and interpretations that students derive from personal experiences in their homes, families, and community cultures" (Banks, 1996a, p. 9). For instance, cultures include religion, food, clothing, and customs.

Race is a socially constructed concept in which large groups of individuals are categorized and identified by perceived shared physical characteristics (Gotanda, 1995; Hoopes & Pusch, 1981). The social context behind race has changed over time, but in U.S. history, racial categories have been used to separate people in socially determinative ways. This is problematic as it reinforces the perceptions that an individual's race, and the social conditions associated with that race, are unchangeable (Gotanda, 1995). In the U.S., the U.S. Census Bureau's (2018) racial categories include the following: White, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. Multiracial participants of the U.S. Census have the option to check more than one box to indicate their racial identity.

Ethnicity is a categorization of a human group based on racial, national, or cultural characteristics. Many times, ethnic groups are categorized as subgroups of a larger cultural or political population. The term "ethnic group" is commonly used to describe members of a minority status (Hoopes & Pusch, 1981).

Multicultural education does not have definitive parameters or a concrete definition, as it is used in a variety of ways (Banks, 1977; Sleeter & Grant, 1987). Multicultural education can include all cultural groups within a society but especially focuses on groups that have historically experienced discrimination in society (Banks, 1977). Multicultural education scholars believe that the education system trivializes the experiences of people of color, women, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, and other minority groups (i.e., based on religion, race, social class, etc.; Banks, 1996a; Banks, 2015). Proponents of multicultural education believe that curriculum and the education system should be reformed so that students from all backgrounds may experience equal educational opportunities (Banks, 2015).

Precursors to multicultural education. There is a long history that predates the development of multicultural education in the United States. Many multicultural education scholars credit African American scholars, including George Washington Williams, W.E.B. DeBois, Carter G. Woodson, Horace Mann Bond, and Charles H. Wesley, for shifting the direction of American scholarship to one that included diverse perspectives (Banks, 1996). These scholars confronted the existing understandings of knowledge that was centered on the lived experiences of White scholars and brought a new perspective to traditional scholarship (Banks, 1995a).

Changing traditional scholarship and understandings of knowledge took time. In the 1920s, Carter G. Woodson helped lay the foundation for future multicultural education through his contributions to the creation of ethnic studies. Woodson created the *Journal of Negro History* in 1916, which allowed scholars to publish articles that presented a counternarrative to the negative view of African Americans that was predominant in works published by White scholars at the time (Roche, 1996). Furthermore, he established Negro History Week, which subsequently

became Black History Month, which highlighted the achievements of African Americans and introduced African American history and life into curricula (Roche, 1996). During the Great Depression and post WWII, the lack of job opportunities caused many Southern Black and White individuals to be displaced; as they settled in new cities, racial tensions occurred, which, in turn, caused riots in major cities (Banks, 1981/1988). In hopes of reducing racial tensions and prejudice, the Intergroup-Education Movement was introduced in the 1940s and 50s within racially diverse cities (Banks, 1981/1988). This movement was not institutionalized in most U.S. schools since many White educators believed it was only necessary in racially diverse schools (Banks, 1981/1988). While the Intergroup-Education Movement largely failed, the Civil Rights movement had a significant impact on shifting trends in multicultural education. After the Civil Rights movement, proponents of multicultural education championed for more teachers of color, the rewriting of textbooks, and positive representations of minorities in education. The existing curriculum, they argued, was exclusionary of their cultural and historical backgrounds, and moreover, minority students and low-income students consistently received lower academic scores. According to these critics, these factors combined to indicate the need for educational reform (Banks, 1981/1988). Multicultural education became a way to address the shifting demographics that indicated that people of color would become the majority within the next fifty years (Sleeter & McLauren, 1995). Thus, while the early seeds of multicultural education were planted in the 1920s and grew throughout the Civil Rights movement, the shifting demographic trends of the 1980s brought about the advent of multicultural education as widespread component in public school curricula.

Early stages of multicultural education (1960s-1980s). Gibson (1976), Pratte (1983), and Sleeter and Grant (1987) conducted thorough analyses of the literature available in the early

stages of multicultural education. Gibson (1976) and Pratte (1983) both laid a foundation of research that Sleeter and Grant (1987) built upon. Since Sleeter and Grant's (1987) analysis is the most recent and thorough, I present their analysis as the primary overview of the early stages of multicultural education.

The purpose of these early analyses was to provide a clearer definition of multicultural education, document and sort existing approaches to multicultural education, evaluate the theoretical and practical contributions of the literature on multicultural education, and identify the limitations of multicultural education (Gibson, 1976; Sleeter & Grant, 1987). Sleeter and Grant (1987) searched the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) for articles with the terms *multicultural education*, *multiethnic education*, *multiracial education*, and *bicultural education*. They also searched the Library of Congress for books with the same terms, as well as *biracial education* and *ethnic education*. Through their search, they found 89 articles and 38 books. Sleeter and Grant (1987) analyzed each of the individual texts using 14 measures. These measures addressed the goals of the texts, theoretical underpinnings, instructional models, recommendations for curriculum and/or instruction, and implementation models. Based on these measures, the texts were categorized into five different approaches, many of which corresponded with Gibson's (1976) categories. Sleeter and Grant (1987) organized the texts into the following five approaches: teaching the culturally different, human relations, single group studies, multicultural education, and education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. In the following section, I provide a brief overview of each approach, describing the number of texts reviewed by Sleeter and Grant, the purposes of each approach, and the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

Teaching the culturally different. Sleeter and Grant (1987) reviewed 17 articles and 11 books published between 1963 and 1984 that discussed the approach of *teaching the culturally different*. This is not an indicator of a specific time period during which teaching the culturally different was popular, but rather, it is a timeframe during which certain authors highlighted this approach. In the texts reviewed by Sleeter and Grant, teaching the culturally different meant that educators recognized that minority students had their own home cultures and did not encourage an erasure of those cultures. The purpose for such a teaching practice as presented in these texts was to assimilate minority students into the "existing social structure" to increase educational achievement while appreciating their individual home cultures (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, p. 422). Citing Lewis (1976), Sleeter and Grant summarized the goal of this approach, which was to help "minority students . . . develop competence in the public culture of the dominant group" (as cited in Sleeter & Grant, 1987, p. 423). Moreover, as Sleeter and Grant noted, most of the authors presented race and ethnicity as markers of difference without mentioning other forms of diversity.

Sleeter and Grant (1987) discussed some shortcomings of teaching the culturally different approach. While the theory behind the approach was clear, there were few practical recommendations for implementation. Furthermore, the goals of academic success were unclear, as it was not explicit what success should look like for all students—not just the students of color. Though the authors of the articles and books that Sleeter and Grant reviewed acknowledged that students from different racial and cultural backgrounds may learn differently, they made few recommendations regarding how to teach students of color, and the articles and books lacked both instructional recommendations and curriculum suggestions. When discussing cultures, most of the authors had a tendency to group distinct cultural groups together as a whole,

often oversimplifying the distinguishing factors between cultures (p. 424). Teaching the culturally different put the burden of changing racial disparities on minority students, resprted more to assimilation, and failed to address how White students could contribute to and learn from this conversation.

   Human relations. The purpose of the *human relations* approach was to have students from different backgrounds learn to get along by appreciating each other's differences. Sleeter and Grant (1987) reviewed nine articles and five books written between 1975 and 1986. The approach highlighted fostering open communication between students of different cultural backgrounds. Citing Perry (1975), the authors stated that the goal of the human relations approach was to serve "as a vehicle to foster conversation" (as cited in Sleeter & Grant, 1987, p. 427), or as Perry noted, "what the students do with these ideas and perceptions gained is really the most important aspect of a reading program in developing positive human relationships" (as cited in Sleeter & Grant, 1987, p. 427). The authors of the reviewed articles and books emphasized the importance of teachers using resources that do not perpetuate stereotypes in their classroom instruction and provided exercises that encouraged an appreciation of differences. Many of the authors were practicing educators who encountered firsthand the challenges of desegregation. Thus, because they were actively engaged in the classroom, these authors provided many practical ideas, instructional strategies, and materials that could be used in the classroom.

   While the practical application of the human relations approach was strong, Sleeter and Grant (1987) pointed out that there were few connections between practical approaches and the theoretical or conceptual frameworks, specifically social psychology, intergroup conflict, prejudice formation, cross-cultural differences, and anthropological literature. The human

relations approach relied heavily on the idea that open communication would promote appreciation between individuals of different backgrounds. However, there was little acknowledgment of the role that outside factors, such as poverty, discrimination, and social constructs, play in the overall narrative and the ways in which such factors shape the perceptions and lived experiences of students of color.

Single group studies. Through the *single group studies* approach, authors discussed the importance of teaching lessons that highlighted the cultures and experiences of specific groups of people, usually a specific ethnic group (Sleeter & Grant, 1987). Sleeter and Grant (1987) examined two books and nine articles that discussed this approach that were written from 1973 to 1986. Similarly to those who advanced the human relations approach, proponents of single group studies believed that exposure to the accomplishments, contributions, concerns, and experiences of a specific group could help foster appreciation within students.

Unlike previous approaches, though, which were heavily grounded in theory but lacked practical application, the single group studies approach provided many ways to apply it practically. However, the authors who discussed single group studies offered little theoretical grounding and did not provide a clear goal for the approach. Sleeter and Grant (1987) suggested that this was the case because the authors believed that the implied goals were clear enough and did not need further defining. Because a common, defined goal was not established by authors of the single group studies, the authors had different ideas about how acceptance could be achieved. The authors also recognized that this approached failed to address the negative experiences that students of color faced, and thus, students were unable to recognize racial oppression or learn to create social action. Finally, the proponents of single group studies failed to acknowledge the range of human diversity: While single group studies incorporated cultural groups into the

curriculum, most of the authors focused on a specific gender (male), failed to recognize class, or predominantly discussed white women (Sleeter and Grant, 1987).

   ***Multicultural education*.** Sleeter and Grant (1987) categorized 47 articles and 19 books that were written from 1973 to 1986 as implementing the *multicultural education* approach. Proponents of the multicultural education approach championed the need for school reformation that reflected diversity. Sleeter and Grant quoted Gollnick (1980) when discussing the five overarching goals that were covered in most of the texts, which were as follows: "strength and value of cultural diversity," "[h]uman rights and respect for cultural diversity," "[a]lternative life choices for people," "[s]ocial justice and equal opportunity for all people," and "[e]quity distribution of power among members of all ethnic groups" (as cited in Sleeter and Grant, 1987, p. 429). Similar to the previous three approaches, most of the texts focused on race and ethnicity; however, some texts included gender and social class. Many practical applications were presented, but none were built upon previously existing curricula in the classrooms.

   The multicultural education approach emphasized culture, but much like the previous approaches, it failed to deeply explore social inequities. Sleeter and Grant (1987) argued that the failure to explore social inequities and racial disparities is counterproductive as it is the fundamental reason why multicultural education is necessary. Although the multicultural education approach addressed various forms of human diversity, there was no continuity in the manner in which such identity categories were identified and addressed. Missing in the multicultural education approach were conversations about language and bilingualism, policy, instructional process, ideas for secondary teachers, and recommendations for school- and system-wide changes.

Education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. The education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist approach built upon the goals of multicultural education and strove to prepare students "to challenge social structural inequality and promote cultural diversity" (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, p. 422). To study this approach, Sleeter and Grant (1987) examined seven articles and three books published from 1976 to 1984. Building on the goals of the multicultural education approach, educators who used the education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist approach emphasized the need for students to understand the causes of social inequality and oppression to identify ways in which these inequities can be addressed. While this is the stated goal of this approach, the authors discussed by Sleeter and Grant failed to expand on the topic of social inequities within their actual texts. Sleeter and Grant noted that footnotes and references indicated that the authors were likely aware of social inequities, but the authors presented the information as if the readers were conversant with the content. Thus, according to Sleeter and Grant, their lack of addressing the topic might indicate that the authors assumed their readers had the same level of knowledge on social inequities as they did.

The proponents of the education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist approach are transparent in their critiques of other approaches regarding culture; however, few instructional models are provided. Furthermore, Sleeter and Grant stated that this approach is the least developed and that there is no discussion on how to achieve its goals in a practical, school-related setting.

As seen in Sleeter and Grant's (1987) study, many authors of the early texts on multicultural education approached student learning through a deficit lens. Furthermore, many of

the approaches described in Sleeter and Grant's study highlighted assimilation as a means of educating students of color and failed to challenge existing social and educational structures.

       Five approaches for multicultural teaching. Two years after their 1987 analysis, Grant and Sleeter (1989) published *Turning on Learning: Five Approaches for Multicultural Teaching Plans for Race, Class, Gender, and Disability*, which built upon their early analysis by providing practical applications, such as lesson plans and instructional resources. The five approaches in the book mirror the language they used in their 1987 article (mentioned earlier in this chapter). Each chapter is named after a different approach to multicultural education: teaching the exceptional and culturally different, human relations, single group studies, multicultural education, and education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. *Turning on Learning* highlighted the gap in cultural understanding between the predominantly White, middle-class, and non-disabled teaching force and their racially diverse students. Grant and Sleeter also offered a number of practical applications in each chapter of the book, including lesson plans and action research activities. However, rather than simply providing educators with a template for multicultural curricula, the authors clearly stated that the goal of the book is to provide strategies to educators so they can cultivate their own "analytical and creative teaching skills" (p. 7).

       Turning on Learning provided practical applications for educators and provided clear goals for each of the approaches to multicultural teaching. Similar to the language they used in their 1987 article, Grant and Sleeter (1989) stated that the goal behind teaching students using the *exceptional and culturally different* approach is to encourage their assimilation into "school and wider society" (p. 7). The *human relations* approach emphasizes the appreciation of students' diversity and the diversity of others. The goal of the *single-group studies* approach is to highlight marginalized groups in curricula, specifically from their own perspective. *Multicultural*

education is a combination of the first three approaches, with the curricula changing the existing structures of schools to provide students with equal opportunities in school and society. In Grant and Sleeter's last chapter, the authors discussed *education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist*, which emphasizes social inequities that are experienced by marginalized groups so that students can begin to fight for social change. Grant and Sleeter were not the only scholars that recognized a disconnect between multicultural theory and practices. More scholars began recognizing a need to reassess the goals of multicultural education.

Middle stages (1990s-2000s). In the middle stages of multicultural education, researchers and educators used more approaches that emphasized equitable practices and called for a change to existing practices. The authors in this section addressed the shortcomings of multicultural education and redefined its goals for students. Banks discussed the need to revisit the goals of multicultural education while Ladson-Billings challenged deficit-based pedagogy.

Five dimensions of multicultural education. According to Banks (1995b), the goals of multicultural education are clear to most researchers and scholars (to provide an equitable learning experience for all students), and changes must go beyond curriculum reform to include a restructuring of institutions, teaching styles, and curricula; addressing and acknowledging teacher and administrator bias; and transforming the dominant culture in schools. However, this goal was not always practiced by educators, who have typically understood multicultural education as the inclusion of different cultures into a preexisting curriculum. In an effort to advocate for multicultural education and translate theory into practice, Banks (1995b) analyzed the existing literature and created five dimensions that are necessary for multicultural education: content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and empowering school culture.

According to Banks (1995b), the implementation of these approaches would help achieve the goals of multicultural education. *Content integration* is the extent to which educators incorporate a variety of cultures into all parts of their instructional practices, including examples, data, and information (Banks, 1995b). Content integration goes beyond introducing a culture in an exploratory context and, instead, recommends integration of the culture into curricula throughout all disciplines. Banks described *knowledge construction* as how knowledge is constructed and how different cultural backgrounds can influence this construction of knowledge. Knowledge construction also includes the examination of mainstream social science perceptions regarding various ethnic groups during the 1960s and 1970s, how those perceptions came to be, and the works of scholars who strove to change these (mis)conceptions. As part of the *prejudice reduction* dimension, Banks suggested that educators should use studies that identify children's racial attitudes and implement strategies that nurture a more equitable perspective in the students. This dimension requires educators to recognize how students "develop racial awareness, preferences, and identification" (Banks, 1995b, p. 12). The *equity pedagogy* dimension is practiced when teachers implement strategies to support the academic achievement of students from underserved and/or diverse communities (based on race, ethnicity, and social class). In his text, Banks (1995b) provided recommendations for support so that students from these groups can improve academically. Finally, the *empowering school culture* dimension focuses on the school itself. As Banks stated, equalizing academic achievement opportunities for students from all communities (including those of different races, ethnicities, and social classes) can only happen when the existing structure and organization of the schools are reformed. In other words, for educational equity to become a reality, schools must evaluate their culture and social climate, confront any biases held by staff and administration, have higher

expectations for student achievement, and collaborate with staff, administration, and parents in schools' decision-making processes.

Culturally relevant pedagogy. According to Ladson-Billings (1995a), *culturally relevant pedagogy* is "a pedagogy of opposition . . . committed to collective, not merely individual, empowerment" (p. 160), and the approach emphasizes the importance of encouraging students' strengths, building self-esteem through cultural competence, and empowering them to be critical thinkers who can champion social change. Bringing a new perspective to multicultural education, Ladson-Billings (1995b) wrote *Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy*, an article that challenged the way diversity and multiculturalism were addressed in teacher training. In contrast to the deficit pedagogy that highlighted the academic struggles of students of color, in this article, Ladson-Billings focused on pedagogical practices of educators who found success with these students (Ladson-Billings, 2014). Rather than asking educators to learn new skills to accommodate the increasingly diverse populations in their classrooms, Ladson-Billings called for a fundamental change in educational practices. Building on the work of scholars who studied various educational practices with culturally diverse students, Ladson-Billings found that the commonality within deficit pedagogy scholarship was that success was measured by existing standards that required students to fit specific constructs to become successful. Furthermore, many times, schools reproduced inequalities for minority students that were part of the societies in which they existed (Ladson-Billings, 1992). According to Ladson-Billings (1992), culturally relevant pedagogy requires educators to recognize

- cultures outside of the educator's personal understanding and background,
- the social factors in the world that may affect actions within the classroom,
- that a student's goals may differ from an educator's goals,

35

- that flexibility in student behavior may be necessary,

- that drawing attention to individual students is undesirable,

- that language and communication used in school should be similar to how students speak and communicate in their home and communities,

- that both academic rigor and empathy must be implemented by educators,

- that students respond more positively in a more relaxed learning space,

- that the curriculum must be relevant,

- that they should incorporate more group work, and

- that students require a classroom culture in which there are reliable codes of conduct.

Ladson-Billings' work inspired further conversations challenging deficit-based pedagogy by shifting focus away from deficit pedagogy to pedagogy that builds upon students' lived experiences.

Recent approaches (2000s-2010s). At least four different approaches have emerged since the inception of culturally relevant pedagogy that also address cultural awareness in pedagogy (Bode & Fenner, 2018): culturally responsive pedagogy, cultural competence, culturally connected pedagogy, and culturally sustaining pedagogy. Some of these approaches were created in response to culturally relevant pedagogy while others have emerged because of different phenomena in education, often based on the inequitable learning experiences of students of color. While there are differences between these approaches, they all share certain characteristics, including that they emphasize highlighting students' existing strengths, encouraging cultural competence, and providing opportunities for academic achievement.

Culturally responsive pedagogy. The goal of *culturally responsive pedagogy* is to reverse the academic underachievement of students of color by tapping into their talents, thus unleashing

their potential and nurturing their academic and social skills (Gay, 2000). Highlighting the

disparities in academic achievement between different ethnic groups within the United States,

proponents of culturally responsive pedagogy argue that these differences are too consistent to be

blamed on coincidence (Gay, 2000). According to Gay (2000), the causes of students' failure are

"institutional structures, procedures, assumptions, and operational styles of schools, classrooms,

and the society at large" (p. *xiv*). Thus, culturally responsive pedagogy uses students' prior

knowledge, experiences, and unique cultural experiences to make learning more relevant for

each individual student. Through culturally responsive pedagogy, educators use students'

strengths to teach them and, in doing so, they provide students with positive affirmations about

their cultural backgrounds. Moreover, educators are encouraged to validate different cultural

learning styles, connect students' home and school experiences, provide personalized learning

experiences through different instructional strategies, help students appreciate their own cultures

as well as the cultures of others, and routinely incorporate multicultural resources throughout all

school subjects and lessons (Gay, 2000). While many of the goals in culturally responsive

pedagogy seem to overlap with culturally relevant pedagogy, a key difference is the emphasis on

student achievement. While culturally relevant pedagogy focuses on pedagogical practices that

benefit students as a whole, culturally responsive pedagogy emphasizes the importance of

cultural awareness specifically for student achievement.

   Cultural competence. *Cultural competence* requires educators to appreciate and

understand the differences between cultures while actively combating prejudice by cultivating

acceptance and understanding within their classrooms (McAllister & Irvine, 2000). Simply put,

cultural competence is the ability of an educator to look outside their own lived experiences to

teach a student who comes from a different cultural background than their own (Moule, 2012).

Moule (2012) outlined three key components for educators to reach cultural competence: expertise in teaching strategies for all students, knowledge of cross-cultural education, and awareness of discrimination and other issues involved with cross-cultural education. Unlike culturally responsive pedagogy, cultural competence does not discuss changing the preexisting education and social structures that can be harmful to students of color.

Culturally connected pedagogy. Citing inspiration from culturally responsive pedagogy, *culturally connected pedagogy* incorporates how culture is connected to students' identities (Irizarry, 2007). Cultural connectedness is a "framework for understanding the fluid nature of culture and the variety of ways that members of a cultural group express their cultural identities" (Irizarry, 2007, p. 27). In culturally connected pedagogy, culture is no longer defined only in terms of race or ethnicity but is an identity that manifests within a particular community of people. Educators who practice cultural connectedness are asked to go out and experience the cultures of their students and find a personalized approach that allows them to connect to and respect their students' cultural identities. According to Irizarry (2007), understanding the cultural backgrounds of students allows educators to connect to students' cultural identities, which can increase students' academic success.

Culturally sustaining pedagogy. In response to asset pedagogies, which presented cultural practices of communities of color as a valuable resource, the proponents of *culturally sustaining pedagogy* have argued that although the goals of asset pedagogies indicated a critique of power structures, the language did not always communicate these goals (Paris & Alim, 2014). According to these proponents, pedagogy can be relevant and responsive without ensuring the longevity of cultural practices; more specifically, they suggested that the terms *relevant* and *responsive* do not adequately support multicultural practices (Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014).

Thus, supporters of culturally sustaining pedagogy do not completely move away from asset pedagogy but seek to expand on the aims and visions of previous scholars by attempting "to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of schooling for positive social transformation" (Alim & Paris, 2014, p. 1). Culturally sustaining pedagogy builds on culturally relevant pedagogy by incorporating the multifaceted intricacies of identity and culture that shape the cultures of students (Ladson-Billings, 2014). The ultimate goal of culturally sustaining pedagogy is to support and sustain a culturally pluralistic experience for all students throughout the education system.

Emerging topics. Many multicultural scholars continue to acknowledge the need for diversity in the classroom while also recognizing the shortcomings of past approaches (Au, 2014; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Nieto & Bode, 2018). Educators have adopted a social justice-centered approach to multicultural education to address this problem. *Social justice education* is an educational philosophy that embodies "treating all people with fairness, respect, dignity, and generosity" (Nieto & Bode, 2018, p. 8). To provide students this equitable learning experience, social justice education includes four components: actively engaging and disrupting harmful stereotypes that perpetuate social inequality; providing access to learning materials that meet each students' needs and abilities; recognizing and utilizing students' individual talents and knowledge in their education; and providing a learning environment that nurtures critical thinking and empowers students to become agents of social change (Nieto & Bode, 2018).

A common theme in social justice multicultural education texts is the importance of recognizing racism and educator bias to better understand the sociopolitical implications of multicultural education (Au, 2014; Brooks, 2012; Fiarman, 2016; Nieto & Bode, 2018). Researchers have documented student achievement gaps between racial groups, presenting proof

of the inequity that is present in education for students of color (Ighodaro & Wiggin, 2013). Social change begins when educators increase their ability to recognize racism and bias within school systems, acknowledge that bias when it is seen, build empathy, and hold themselves accountable (Fiarman, 2016). Furthermore, many scholars have recommended an antiracist curriculum that confronts racism, such as stereotypes, as part of accurately representing diverse cultures and individuals in a respectful way (Miner, 2016; Nieto & Bode, 2018).

Because the goal of social justice education is to develop equality and equity both within school systems and beyond, social justice education scholarship address many forms of bias including gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, and social class (Nieto & Bode, 2018). Social justice education addresses the goals of multicultural education by focusing on an equitable learning experience for all students and does so by recognizing that equity can only be achieved by addressing all forms of inequality and marginalization.

History of Multicultural Art Education

The challenges and shortcomings of multicultural education are mirrored in the history of multicultural art education. Studies in multicultural art education reflect the changing demographics in school populations as well as sociopolitical events. The following section is an overview of the history of multicultural education divided into four parts: the early beginnings, an early analysis, middle stages, and emerging topics.

Art educators of color and the National Art Education Association. When it was founded in 1947, the National Art Education Association (NAEA) did not have a racially or ethnically diverse member population (Grigsby, 1997). As the number of members who were educators of color increased, the erasure of educators of color in conference proceedings was noted by members of the Black Caucus (Grigsby, 1997). The Caucus prepared a statement in

1971 that was read during the Professional Materials Committee meeting on April 8, 1971. At this meeting, the Caucus voiced its concerns regarding the lack of representation of educators of color and their desire to have a larger role within the NAEA's leadership. This was a turning point in NAEA history as it paved the way for educators of color to be more visible in NAEA. The Black Caucus, named as such because membership at its conception was predominantly Black, changed its name to the Committee on Minority Concerns in 1978. Notable members have included J. Eugene Grigsby, Jr., Bernard Young, Wanda Knight, Samuel G. Banks, and Vesta Daniels (Grigsby, 1997).

The early beginnings (1948-1976). To discuss the early beginnings of multicultural art education, I completed a brief analysis of articles published between 1948 and 1976, identifying particular themes that arose within the articles I found. I chose the year 1948 as the beginning of the search parameter as it was the inaugural year of *Art Education*, the official journal of NAEA; I ended the search at 1976 because it is the year that Tomhave's (1995) analysis began. I reviewed articles from *Art Education* and *Studies in Art Education* because they are the only journals directly associated with NAEA.

Procedure. I conducted the search through JSTOR, a digital library that has the complete archives of both journals, and used the following search terms: *intercultural*, *inter-cultural*, *multicultural*, *multi-cultural*, *culture*, and *culturally different*. The breakdown of the results can be seen in Table 1. While other terms that are related to multicultural education exist (i.e., pluralism), for the purpose of this study, I decided to use the specific search terms described above to ensure a manageable quantity of results.

Table 1

Breakdown of Search Terms and Results

Search term	Results	Cross-referenced		New results
		With	Without	
Culture	860		Culturally different, Inter-cultural	852
Culturally different	99			
Intercultural	5			
Inter-cultural	235	Culture		144
Multicultural	1			
Multi-cultural	88			

The texts that looked relevant were further analyzed to see if they applied to the topic of multicultural art education. For terms that produced over 100 results, I reviewed each result based on its title, topic/keywords, and a fragment of the text. The resulting items that had the keywords *culture*, *curriculum*, *curriculum design*, (non-"Western" country) *culture*, *curricula*, or similar terms were further analyzed to see if they applied to the topic of multicultural art education. Many of the results overlapped from one search term to another, and many of the texts were about the culture of art education. To further narrow down the results, only articles, seminar proceedings, and list of resources were reviewed in this analysis. Because the purpose of the analysis was to identify texts on the topic of multicultural art education, only texts that addressed the topic of diverse cultures, race, or the described specific populations of students as "culturally

disadvantaged" were examined. Texts that addressed other forms of marginalization, such as gender or socioeconomic class, were excluded unless there was mention of the relevant topics. Furthermore, the study population had to be students in the United States in the K–12 setting.

Analysis. Of all the texts identified in the search, 40 fit the search parameters and were reviewed. Seven different themes were identified in the 40 texts found within these searches: *connection*, *contributions*, *advocating for the arts*, *teaching culturally diverse populations, practical applications*, *understanding diverse students* (assessments), and a *call for change*. Some of these topics overlap and include similar themes; however, for the purpose of this analysis, they were separated into these seven categories to outline the different ways that diverse populations were addressed during this time period.

Connection. Seven texts published from 1948 to 1975 were found to highlight the importance of connecting to other cultures. These emphasized fostering intercultural understanding (Newman, 1970; Rios, 1948) and seeing through the lens of someone with a different lived experience (Glaeser, 1973; Rios, 1948) as ways to increase understanding for other cultures (Bloom, 1964; Smith, 1975). Authors wrote about the importance of presenting diverse visual representation and of students becoming advocates for social change (Chalmers, 1974), and they challenged the assimilative beliefs that all students benefit from a "Western" ("American") art education (Ianni, 1968).

Contributions. Two authors highlighted the benefits of studying diverse cultures by emphasizing their contributions to society. Gruner (1957) wrote that "primitive forms of art" (p. 14) should be viewed by students to so that they may compare it with their more traditional education. Gruner believed that this comparison would help students keep their sense of creativity. Neperud (1969) examined the role of the arts and artists in "primitive societies" (p.

13) as a way to understand how art is appreciated in these cultures. Neperud (1969) argued that by understanding the role that the arts play in these societies, we may be able to learn how to better advocate for art and art education in our society. These two articles overlooked the artistic contributions and cultural content of diverse cultures/artworks and only highlighted the contributions that would be relevant from a Western lens.

Advocating for the arts. Four authors discussed diverse cultures as a means of advocating for the arts. All of these articles emphasized the benefits of art education, while three authors specifically discussed the advantages of an arts education for *disadvantaged populations* (Cohen, 1969a; Foreman, 1968; Heussenstamm, 1969; Silverman, 1966). Cohen (1969), Silverman (1966) and Heussenstamm (1969) discussed previously identified benefits of the arts, such as self-expression and appreciation of other cultures, to determine how these same benefits could specifically support *disadvantaged populations* in terms of their academics, self-esteem, nonverbal communication, and other aspects of their lives. In addition, one text problematized the teaching of *disadvantaged students*, questioning if art can adequately be advocated for if educators have to meet underperforming students where they are (Foreman, 1968).

Teaching culturally diverse populations. Eight articles provided support on teaching culturally different populations. Multiple authors described such students as "culturally disadvantaged," (Grossman & Torrance, 1970; Westby-Gibson, 1968) and many specified members of this group based on race, socioeconomic class, and/or disabilities. Despite these similarities, the exact language in these texts varies. Some authors presented students from these populations as having an assumed deficiency (Wilson, 1963), some highlighted the need for assimilation (Cohen, 1968), and others challenged educators to see students in these populations as culturally advantaged (Lanier, 1970). Many of the authors discussed the importance of

44

understanding the students' cultural backgrounds to better support their needs (Westby-Gibson, 1968; Armstrong, 1970; Cohen, 1969b), and some authors offered teaching strategies to motivate students (Grossman & Torrance, 1970; Silverman, 1971).

Practical applications. I located four articles that presented practical applications for the classroom art teacher. Two of the texts were annotated bibliographies of texts and/or art materials of specific racial groups that could be utilized in the classroom (Hudson, 1970; Toyoshima, 1973). The authors of the other two articles discussed the importance of multicultural teaching and provided additional instructional strategies for art teachers to implement in their instructional practices. Educators were also encouraged to include more accurate literary and visual represeantions in their (Feldman, 1976; Janoff, 1976).

Understanding diverse students. Eight articles presented the results of studies that used assessments to improve educators' understanding of students from diverse populations. The assessments measured students' reasoning skills (Renick, 1972), drawings (Eisner, 1969; McWhinnie, 1972), the outcomes of different teaching strategies (Rennels 1969; Silverman, Hoepfner, & Hendricks, 1969), lessons that encourage self-expression (Simons, 1972), and students' creativity (Bolton, 1969; Diamond, 1969). Each of the assessments described students who were from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and who were racial minorities as students from "disadvantaged populations." Many of these assessments were based on assumptions that students from these populations had shortcomings that needed to be addressed.

Call for change. Seven articles championed a change in art education instructional practices. The authors of these articles emphasized that to change teaching practices, educators should change instruction that fostered the internalized racism of students of color (Foster, 1967) by introducing more positive representation of people of color (Kaelin, 1969; Povey, 1969) and

shift their perspectives towards multicultural curricula (Efland, 1968). Lanier (1975) stated that art education should reconsider the theoretical frameworks of the field, and Shellin (1973) challenged educators to consider what is presented as art in our classrooms. Finally, Taylor (1975) recommended that educators engage in more research about different cultures. While each of these authors used a different approach, they all addressed a deficit in art education instruction—the marginalization of students from specific populations. Each author presented a different solution to the marginalization of students, but the overarching theme is that changes must be made to better support students in schools.

Early stages of multicultural art education (1976-1989). Building on the work of Gibson (1976) and Sleeter and Grant (1987), Tomhave (1995) conducted an analysis of multicultural art education literature. Tomhave combined the approaches of Sleeter and Grant with Gibson's analysis to present six approaches to multicultural art education: acculturation/assimilation, bi-cultural education/cross-cultural research, cultural separatism, multicultural education theory, social reconstruction, and cultural understanding. These approaches combined Gibson's five approaches (bicultural education, cross-cultural understanding, cultural differences, cultural pluralism, and multicultural education) with Sleeter and Grant's five approaches (human relations, single group studies, multicultural education, education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist, and multicultural education). Like Sleeter and Grant's (1987) work, many of these approaches overlap one another and are not exclusionary of each other. In Tomhave's analysis, he reviewed 54 articles and books; 45 of those texts were explicitly art education articles and books while the remaining eight were general education or art education texts. The articles and books were ranked with the same 14-category system that was used in Sleeter and Grant's analysis. Each of the following sections

provides a summary of Tomhave's analysis, goals of the approach, and if any strengths/weaknesses were presented by Tomhave.

Acculturation/assimilation. Tomhave (1995) identified three texts that presented the *acculturation/assimilation* approach. The goal of this approach is to help immigrants assimilate into mainstream U.S. society by gaining fluency in the English language, thus obtaining equal opportunities in education and, eventually, in the job market. Tomhave pointed out that, initially, the target population presented in this approach was White European males. Tomhave stated that this approach is still popular in the United States but has expanded to encompass students of all races, genders, and economic statuses.

Bi-cultural education/cross-cultural research. In his analysis, Tomhave (1995) found eight texts that promoted the *bi-cultural education/cross-cultural research* approach. Of these eight texts, half were published in art education journals and the other half were published in educational journals or books or were unpublished manuscripts. Tomhave cited Gibson (1976) in defining the parameters of the bi-cultural education approach as "the circumstance of two cultures vying for power" (p. 51). This approach is used when mainstream culture and a non-English speaking culture are both relevant to students' education. To align these two perspectives, students are taught bicultural competencies. According to Tomhave, this approach is favored by ethnic minority students and researchers: Minority students value the positive representation that the bi-cultural approach embodies, which helps prevent feelings of alienation, while researchers value how contrasting the two cultures can help identify connections and comparisons that help further their understandings of human relations. Bi-cultural education provides opportunities to initiate conversations about inclusion in the curriculum while encouraging educators to consider the different learning styles of students from different cultures

(Tomhave, 1995). However, the latter can also be considered a shortcoming as these articles mainly focus on the culture of the surrounding area and do not present a broader cultural competency of cultures that are not in close proximity of the student population.

　　　　Cultural separatism. Tomhave (1995) identified three texts that discuss the *cultural separatism* approach. Cultural separatism happens when large populations of a specific subculture have the economic and political means to reject mainstream culture and practice their culture as the dominant one (Tomhave, 1995). Tomhave explains that cultural separatists create an independent school system that teaches their culture, languages, traditions, and practices in isolation from other cultures. Although the cultural separatism approach emphasizes the preservation of a minority culture, it does so by separating itself from all other cultures. The fallacy of this approach is the same as the shortcomings of nondiversified mainstream education, in which students may not learn to appreciate cultures outside of the one being emphasized in school.

　　　　Multicultural education theory. Five texts were written about the *multicultural education theory* approach (Tomhave, 1995). Building on the multicultural education approach in general education (Gibson, 1976; Sleeter & Grant, 1987), the goal of this approach is to educate students through diverse lenses so that they can gain the competency of a global perspective. In art education, this was practiced through students experiencing the art of specific cultures through art lessons. These lessons are designed to help students understand culture through the perspective of those who are native to the culture. In theory, this approach can provide a deeper understanding of a culture to students. In practice, however, the likelihood that an educator can present a culture accurately through the lens of an unfamiliar culture is unlikely.

Social reconstruction. Tomhave (1995) identified 15 texts that included the *social reconstruction* approach. Tomhave explains that while the previous approaches have mainly focused on the topics of race and ethnicity, the social reconstruction approach also challenges Eurocentrism, sexism, and classism in order to discuss the social and political changes necessary to restructure society. *Social reconstruction* authors heavily scrutinized curricula to uncover hidden biases that promote exclusionary perspectives. Social reconstructionists believe that change needs to happen, and for that change to happen, schools and curricula must be reconstructed. Although there are many important arguments in the social reconstruction approach, it fails to address that social reconstruction itself has biases and is of a specific perspective.

Cultural understanding. Tomhave (1995) identified 19 texts that were written about the *cultural understanding* approach. This approach began as a response to minority communities demanding change; working from the same goals as the multicultural education approach, proponents of the cultural understanding approach developed a more practical method of reaching global perspectives and competencies by emphasizing compromise as a way to preserve preexisting academic achievement goals. Tomhave (1995) stated that this approach may be the most practical method of addressing the multicultural education approach.

Middle stages (1990s-2000s). In alignment with the discourse around multicultural education that challenged the deficit pedagogy, in the 1990s and 2000s, art educators wrote about the need for a more critical perspective in multicultural art education. In this section, I present the origins of critical multicultural education, discuss scholarship that has critiqued multicultural practices, and describe contemporary texts that have used the term "critical multicultural art

49

education" to discuss multicultural practices that address power dynamics, social inequities, and dominant narratives.

Multicultural art education emerged from a demand to provide all students with an equal opportunity for academic success and to combat racism (Acuff, 2015; Ballengee-Morris, Daniel, & Stuhr, 2008; Sleeter & Grant, 1987). During the 1990s to 2000s, educators and scholars built upon the original goals of multicultural art education to directly and critically address the social inequities that needed to be changed so that all students could have an equal opportunity to learn. This contemporary approach is called *critical multicultural art education* (Acuff, 2016; Bequette, 2009; Chalmers, 2002; Desai, 2010; Holloway & Krensky, 2001) and expands on multicultural art education by including a critical analysis of power, bias, and systemic oppression (Acuff, 2016; Knight, 2006; Lee, 2012). The term critical multicultural art education has been used more frequently in art education scholarship in the last 10 years; however, the conversations that led to its inception began before then.

Origins of critical multicultural art education. Many authors and scholars contributed to the origins of critical multicultural art education, even though not all of them used the term "critical multicultural art education." Despite the lack of this specific terminology, their texts contributed to the foundation of this approach by centering examinations of power, bias, and oppression in art curricula. In the mid-1980s, in response to a racially charged event, Bowling Green State University held a multicultural symposium for the appreciation and understanding of the arts. In an article reflecting on the outcomes of the symposium, Blandy and Congdon (1988) discussed the importance of introducing different cultures to students and helping students recognize their biases so that students can confront them and act toward social change (in the art classroom). Half a decade later, Stuhr (1994) reflected on Sleeter and Grant's (1987) five

approaches and presented the implications of each approach for art education. In this analysis, Stuhr (1994) stated that "multicultural education is a concept, a process, and an educational reform movement" (p. 171), thus emphasizing the role of social reconstruction within each of Sleeter and Grant's (1987) five approaches. Howe and Lisi (1995) wrote about how preservice teachers should be educated on multiculturalism and that training should include confronting racism, increasing the number of teachers representing minority populations, critically examining multicultural teaching practices, supporting minority students' self-esteem, and teaching for character development. Lastly, Ballengee-Morris and Stuhr (2001) discussed how culture is a part of identity, and because education is a part of a cultural experience, it must include topics concerning "power, history, and self-identity" (p. 6). According to these authors, in this format of education, multiculturalism is not a formula that can be readily applied to every circumstance but, instead, is a process in which educators and students critically examine themselves and others to recognize biases in hopes of unlearning them.

Mid-stages of critical multicultural art education: Critiquing multicultural practices. Just as most scholars who laid the foundation of critical multicultural art education did not use the term "critical multicultural art education" to describe the approaches they advanced. Many authors in the middle stages of the development of this approach also did not call it "critical multicultural art education" but, like their predecessors, actively critiqued the practices of multicultural education to champion a more equitable approach. To assess the potential for multicultural art instruction, Anderson (1996) analyzed the National Standards for Art Education to determine whose perspectives and voices were highlighted; Anderson found that the National Standards recognized a need for including diversity but did so from a "Western" perspective. As Anderson argued, this allowed an opportunity for educators to incorporate multicultural values,

but the quality of how cultures were represented would come with much effort on the educator's part. Stout (1997) challenged the commonly used additive approach, by which cultures and diversity are added into preexisting curricula. According to Stout, these kinds of lessons oversimplify cultural understanding and fail to require critical thinking. Thus, instead of focusing on the breadth of cultures, multicultural art education should focus on the depth of cultures and should encourage critical thinking through reflection and questioning (Stout, 1997). Desai (2005) discussed multicultural art in relation to globalization and asserted that cultural artwork should be viewed beyond its culture of origin to begin questioning the production, consumption, assumptions, and impact of such artwork. Desai further described artifact recreation in classroom practices using a "Western" lens as a form of colonialism and cultural appropriation.

Recent developments in critical multicultural art education. It is within the last 18 years that the term "critical multicultural art education" has been defined and used within specific parameters and with particular goals. Chalmers (2002) stated that art education must move from simply celebrating cultures to embodying critical perspectives so that students can confront prior knowledge and biases about art and cultures. Critical multicultural art education requires action, as it calls for thoughtful engagement and action to critique systematic oppression (Acuff, 2016) and uses art-making, art criticism, and art history to explore social and political topics related to the artworks (Holloway & Krensky, 2001). The artists' personal narratives can be used to "counter cultural subjugation, or the idea that one group's knowledge is superior to another's" (Acuff, 2016, p. 36). Desai (2010) pointed out that contemporary artists often introduce the same conversations that critical pedagogy does through artworks that address race and racism. Furthermore, critical multicultural scholars argue that students whose cultural capital is

52

acknowledged within curricula often find intrinsic connections to their classrooms (Bequette, 2009).

Through an action research project, Acuff (2014b) found that art educators are better equipped to understand and implement critical multicultural art education practices if they have a foundational knowledge of critical multicultural education. With this foundational knowledge, educators can help students understand the importance of recognizing power dynamics and be better at critiquing them in art educational practices. Bequette (2009) stated that whiteness is a privileged social construct, and thus, White educators are not always the best prepared to serve students of different cultural backgrounds. In response, art educators should also be comfortable with the continued process of learning and reflecting on themselves, their practices, and issues pertaining to the inequities of their student population (Acuff, 2016). Conversations such as these help educators become more culturally proficient (Lee, 2012).

Coextending topics. In the last decade, art education scholars have continued to write about inequity in education. As a result, the topic of social justice art education, or art education that is inclusive and equitable for all students, has become a visible topic in the field. The following section provides a brief overview of the goals of social justice art education with recommendations for classroom practice.

Social justice art education. *Social justice art education*, like social justice education**,** addresses topics of inequity for all students but goes beyond race and culture to include other aspects of identity (Dewhurst, 2010). Social justice art education includes ability/disability (Derby, 2011; Seidler, 2011), gender, sex, class, (Desai & Chalmers, 2007), and socioeconomic status (Bailey & Desai, 2005; Desai & Chalmers, 2007). Holloway and Krensky (2001) stated that the arts and art education are instrumental to teaching about inequity and social

responsibility (Holloway & Krensky, 2001), and noting this vital role that the arts play, Desai and Chalmers (2007) said that educators must ask themselves, "[W]hat should the relationship be between art education in schools and society at large?" (p. 6). Social justice art education addresses this, as it asks students to consider their place in the world and asks educators to help provide students the skills necessary to become democratic citizens. In other words, art education should be more than just knowledge-centered and should address topics that will prepare students to be "independent, yet socially responsible individuals and informed and critical citizens" (Stuhr, 2003, p. 304). Art projects centered on social justice have the potential to nurture empathy and a sense of success in all students (Desai & Chalmers, 2007).

Social justice art education can be practiced by challenging exclusionary histories and narratives (Bailey & Desai, 2005). This requires a fundamental shift in the relationship between educator and student, allowing more student-driven projects, collaborative planning between educators and students, and educators encouraging students to reflect on their lives to create relevant artwork (Dewhurst, 2010). With a more democratic classroom environment, emphasis should be put on process over product (Ballengee-Morris, Daniel, & Stuhr, 2008). Furthermore, art educators should consider introducing and analyzing visual culture that is representative of a more diverse population of individuals, especially those from local sources (Hunter-Doniger, 2018; Shin, 2010). By introducing ethnic visual culture, art educators can help students view common objects through different lenses and can facilitate conversations that might help students change and shift their perspectives.

Other perspectives. Not all art educators support critical multicultural art education and social justice art education. The ongoing debate about the role of social and political issues in art education has been around for decades (Desai & Chalmers, 2007). The most common argument

is that the political and social perspective of critical multicultural and social justice art education does not belong in the classroom. Kamhi (2003; 2004; 2006; 2007) has written extensively on the topic, arguing that the emphasis on postmodernist perspectives within the classroom and the art world has caused art and art education to stray from "fine art." Specifically, Kamhi and Torres (2008) stated that contemporary art has "anti-art" origins (p. 53) and further questioned why contemporary art is included in the study of fine art. To Kamhi (2007), the purpose of art and art education is in the expression of "such things as love, and death, and the lasting imprint of the spirit despite the fragility of life" (p.38), which they argue are not socially constructed ideas. Thus, according to Kamhi, educators should focus on those topics and steer away from socially and politically oriented conversations, and it would be better to have no art education instruction in schools than to address such sociopolitical topics (Kamhi, 2007).

Classroom Practices

The purpose of this section is to analyze and review the studies of art educators who have implemented diverse content in their classrooms. The term "diverse" is broad, and I searched for articles using the keyword *culture.* I reviewed articles from *Art Education* and *Studies in Art Education*, and the search was restricted to articles published between 2008 and 2018. Furthermore, I only considered articles about classroom practices within the United States. The terms *classroom*, *practice*, and *culture* were used in a Boolean search, so all results contained those keywords. A total of 10 articles were found to fit the criteria for analysis. From these 10 articles, three different themes emerged: articles providing lesson plan recommendations, articles reflecting on a lesson or project, and articles that collected data as a means of understanding classroom practices.

Diverse content in the classroom. Four articles provided lesson examples for diverse content in the classroom. Stokrocki and Eldridge (2009) discussed the importance of creating relevant curricula in the arts classroom. Reisberg (2008) introduced a lesson that required students to engage in conversations about visual culture. Students engaged in a conversation about cultural influences and then provided a lesson on creating currency based on those influences. Heise (2010) wrote about incorporating folklore in the arts curriculum, stating that folk art can help students express their individual cultures by creating artwork that is representative of the unique qualities of their culture. Pellish (2012) presented a case study of three different students from three different cultural backgrounds to demonstrate how a lesson on storytelling can build a foundation for "narrative artmaking and identity formation" (p. 19). These articles acknowledge classroom practices that introduce diverse content in the classroom, but because the articles were of case studies, provided a limited view of what is being practiced in the classroom.

Reflection. Four articles focused on reflection and the authors discussed various teaching experiences and lessons that they implemented. Buda, Fedorenko, and Sheridan (2012) reflected on their individual experiences as art educators, discussing various circumstances that required the educators to reevaluate the role of the arts in the school environment. While two of the narratives in Buday, Fedorenko, and Sheridan's (2012) article did not align as much with the theme of the analysis, the first educator shared a story of having to restructure their art program from a Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE)-style classroom to one where lessons were co-constructed with students, resulting in lessons that were more inquiry-based and community centered. Rufo (2011) provided reflections through a personal journal that detailed the results of a case study on elementary students. Lopez (2009) also conducted a case study that explored

representations and cultural identity in artmaking. Hunter-Doniger (2018) presented a science, technology, engineering, art, and math (STEAM) lesson that focused on ecosystems and introduced a local artist of color. The article discussed the personal connection that students made to the artist and their artwork when they were presented with an artist who "looks like me" (p. 17). These reflections demonstrate the thoughtful nature of art educators and the lifelong learning that is happening within our field. However, there was limited data concerning multicultural practices and reflections on how the lessons expand students' understandings and perspectives of other cultures.

Surveys. Two articles implemented surveys as a way of understanding diverse curriculum content by practicing art educators. La Porte, Speirs, and Young (2008) surveyed K–12 art educators with zero to seven years of teaching experience to find out which factors influenced their curriculum content. Their study found that elementary teachers were more likely to incorporate multicultural art themes than middle or high school educators. Furthermore, they also found that preservice training emphasized DBAE and then studio practice, with multicultural and child-centered pedagogy ranked significantly behind these other pedagogies. Their study concluded that teachers incorporate multicultural and postmodern content into their lessons on a moderate basis. Another survey conducted by Bain, Newton, Kuster, and Milbrandt (2010) collected data from novice teachers to understand how they "define and implement meaningful curriculum" (p. 233). Teachers in the survey defined meaningful curriculum as content that related to the lives of their students and their students' cultural backgrounds. Another finding was that the majority of the art educators were not as proactive in implementing social justice content in their curriculum except through lessons that explored identity or visual culture.

Additional considerations. In the 21st century, resources beyond text and articles should

be considered as art educators increasingly turn to easily accessible resources that are free. A

study examining the publications and resources used by NAEA members showed that a

significant portion of the surveyed population used online sources as a resource (Buffington &

Sutters, 2017). Of the 622 survey participants, 211 indicated that they used websites as a

resource, 114 indicated using Facebook, 104 mentioned blogs, and 88 indicated using Pinterest

as a resource. This can be problematic as some of these online sources can contribute to the

othering of non-White cultures and often fail to address multiculturalism through a critical lens

(Acuff, 2014a). Such lessons can do so by homogenizing cultures, misrepresenting cultural

artifacts and/or rituals, and merely adding multiculturalism to a preexisting curriculum without

challenging or changing preexisting dominant narratives. While this information does not

guarantee that educators are all implementing problematic multicultural curricula within their

classrooms, it is worth considering the possibility that the resources they employ do not

guarantee quality multicultural instruction.

Relevant Surveys

It is important to identify the gaps within the literature to ensure that this study

contributes to the field of art education by covering uncharted territory. Combinations of the

keywords *survey* and *art education* were used to search the Virginia Commonwealth University

(VCU) library database. Although results showed surveys in art education as early as 1974

(Gold, 1974), I restricted the search parameters to the years 1998 to 2018 as curriculum and ideas

about pedagogy have changed significantly since the 1970s. Results were also restricted to those

that pertained to curricula so that I could identify any overlaps between this study and existing

surveys. Furthermore, the search also included master's theses and doctoral dissertations that fell

within these parameters. Because the search was done through the VCU library catalog, the results were limited to those within the library's resources, which includes ProQuest, an online database with unpublished dissertations and theses.

Overview of existing art education surveys. The search results revealed four different categories of surveys: preservice educators, surveys by specific school levels, research in art education, and surveys measuring perceptions and attitudes toward issues of diversity in the classroom. Some surveys overlapped and fell within more than one category, but for the purpose of this review, I categorized the surveys based on what I deemed to be the best fit.

Surveys by specific school levels. A number of surveys focused on specific school levels and measured a range of items, including educator demographics and perceptions of art integration in non-arts classroom. In the early 2000s, NAEA conducted a national survey of secondary art educators to provide demographic and background data on these NAEA members (NAEA, 2001). Burton (2001) also conducted a national survey of secondary art educators in 1999 and published a selected summary of data collected from that study. The summary presented basic demographic data, instructional strategies, courses taught, an overview of content, lesson-planning procedures, use of resources, and support received. Findings of Burton's survey showed that educators favored studio-oriented instruction, using a variety of media, providing step-by-step instructions, questioning students one-on-one, closing lessons with praise, and evaluating lessons through direct observations. Alessandrini (1999) conducted a qualitative and quantitative research project that utilized both surveys and interviews to measure teachers' perceptions of art integration in non-arts classrooms. Results of this study showed that for successful art integration, there was a need for resources, particularly in the form of curriculum materials. Furthermore, mutual respect between art teachers and classroom teachers

was also indicated as an important component to successful art integration, with data showing that classroom teachers were in favor of art integration. This research project was limited to K–8 educators, and Alessandrini also collected data on teachers' perspectives regarding the materials that would support their practice, their desired professional development outcomes, and descriptions of what they thought successful arts integration would look like.

Research in art education. Burton (1998) conducted a survey of higher education faculty, independent scholars, doctoral dissertations, and master's theses to answer the question "what is the current state of research in art education?" (p. 183). Pfeiler-Wunder, Buffington, Rao, and Sutters (2017) presented results of a national survey of art educators, answering the open-ended question "research is…" (p. 9). This summary was used to provide a measure of art educators' understanding of research in the field. LaPorte, Spiers, and Young's (2008) project measured specific factors that influenced K–12 curriculum content and the extent to which those factors influenced the curriculum. The survey was of U.S. educators with zero to seven years of experience and provided information regarding respondents' demographic data, undergraduate coursework, and grade levels taught.

Perceptions and attitudes toward issues of diversity in the classroom. A number of studies measured educator perceptions of diverse content in the classroom. Three of the six studies in this section were from doctoral dissertations and master's theses. Obiokor (2002) conducted a mixed-methods survey with middle and high school art educators in the state of Illinois. The goal of this dissertation project was to measure "art teachers' perception and implementation strategies concerning the expanding content of art education reform within the last twenty years" (p. iii). Walton (1999) conducted a survey of middle school art educators in Illinois to collect data on multicultural art experiences and perceptions of art educators. The

survey included questions pertaining to curriculum, importance of multicultural content, diversity, expectations of students, collaboration, understanding of learning styles and current practices. Nichols (2010) collected data from Virginia public high school art educators to measure their understanding of multicultural art education, how frequently they implemented multicultural curricula, which cultures were covered, their teaching strategies, and what incentives would encourage educators to incorporate multicultural curricula more frequently. Milbrandt (2002) conducted a survey to measure "current attitudes and practices of public school art educators with regard to addressing social issues through the art education curricula" (p. 144). The methodology of this study was a mixed-methods survey that incorporated open-ended and close ended-questions. The population surveyed was limited to members of the Georgia Art Education Association (GAEA) who were public school art teachers. Lampela (2001) surveyed NAEA members in 1998 to measure the attitudes of teachers toward discussions of homosexuality in classrooms. Similarly, Hsieh (2016) conducted a mixed-methods study to measure preservice art educators' attitudes toward discussing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) issues within their classrooms.

The surveys conducted in the last 20 years span a variety of topics, geographic locations, school levels, and educator backgrounds. Research has been conducted on teachers' perceptions, attitudes, and understandings of multicultural art education and diversity in the classroom. However, I have was not able to locate a national research study that measures the extent to which practicing K–12 art educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures.

Overview of existing education survey instruments. I evaluated existing surveys to identify if any preexisting measures examined the extent to which educators teach about racial and cultural diversity. I conducted the search using APA PsychNET, a research database of

61

behavioral and social science literature, and entering combinations of the keywords *racial* and *education* with *sensitivity* or *competence*. I conducted a second search with keyword *cultural*. The search parameters were within the years 2008 to 2018. Lastly, I conducted a third search with the keywords *multicultural*, *survey*, and *education*. Of these results, I explored those that contained potentially relevant measures even if they fell outside of the search parameter years. Results were restricted to those that were within the United States and pertained to education, with the population including educators, preservice educators, and students. The search for the keywords *multicultural*, *survey*, and *education* provided 749 results. To reduce the number of results, only those that were cited in PsychTESTS were explored since those provided potential measures for the instruments used. Because the search was conducted through APA PsychNET, the results were limited to those within the database's resources.

Relevant studies. Seven studies were identified that measured racial sensitivity and/or cultural competence within an educational setting and potentially overlapped with some of the goals of this study. Four studies had university students as their study population. One of these studies had participants in an online course that addressed topics of racial inequality. The students were asked to rate their professors to identify if there was bias in how they rated their professors based on perceptions of the instructor's race (Littleford & Jones, 2017). The second study examined whether perfectionism, individualism, and racial color-blindness predicted lower levels of cultural diversity awareness in preservice educators (Wang, Castro, & Cunningham, 2014). Martinelli (2018) conducted a mixed-methods study with preservice educators to see if a specific course increased their awareness, intentions, and attitudes regarding teaching students of color. The study was conducted with the Multicultural Teacher Candidate Survey to measure any change in participants' beliefs. Krings, Austic, and Gutiérrez (2015) developed the Multicultural

Activism Scale to measure college students' perspectives and self-confidence in their political participation, civic engagement, and multicultural activism. While the results of these studies were interesting, the scales that were used in the measurement were not relevant to the study.

Two studies had practicing educators as their study population. Mena and Rogers (2017) surveyed the faculty of multicultural psychology courses to identify influences on their multicultural teaching. The survey included questions regarding the faculty members' demographics, personal backgrounds, engagement, multicultural teaching competency, attitudes towards social justice, perceptions of multicultural environment, and social desirability. The second study surveyed participants of the Summer Institute, a professional workshop that has a goal to increase inclusive teaching practices (Aragón, Dovido, & Graham, 2017). Surveys were conducted with participants from 2004 to 2014 ($n = 628$), and the study measured colorblind/multicultural ideologies and the adoption process of those idealogoies in instruction (Aragón, Dovido, & Graham, 2017).

The last study created a new measure, the School Climate for Diversity Scale, to test a campus's racial climate (Byrd, 2018). The purpose of the scale was to measure intergroup interactions and racial socialization on school campuses. While these five studies provided information on current studies measuring racial sensitivity and cultural competency, there were none that overlapped with the research questions in this study.

Potential measures. During this search, I found some articles that cited the preexisting measures on which authors based their research. I explored these measures to see if any could provide a potential measure for this study. Furthermore, I conducted a search using the keywords *multicultural*, *survey*, and *education* through APA PsychNET. Six measures were identified that measured multicultural education competency and/or cultural/racial sensitivity and competence.

Aragona-Young and Sawyer (2018) developed a measure that identified how teachers defined culture, which multicultural practices they implemented, and what factors (school/teacher) were associated with the implementation of those practices. Unfortunately, the measure was specific to classroom practices and was not as relevant in an art education setting. Jensen, Whiting, and Chapman (2018) developed the Multicultural Teacher Disposition Scale (MTSD), which assessed the specific dispositions (meekness, social awareness, and advocacy) of teachers who successfully implemented multicultural teaching practices. Unfortunately, the scale does not overlap with the goals of this study. Spanierman et al. (2011) developed the Multicultural Teaching Competency Scale (MTCS) that assessed multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills as well as demographic data from participants. However, the full measure could not be found online. Ponterotito, Baluch, Greig, and Rivera (1998) developed the Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS), a self-reporting measure of teachers' multicultural awareness and sensitivity. This measure collected data on teachers' perspectives and personal beliefs regarding multicultural teaching but was not specifically for artists and/or cultures, which made it less relevant for the art classroom. D'Andrea, Daniels, and Heck (1991) developed a survey that measured participants' general attitudes towards multicultural instruction. This generalized data did not measure the success of specific instructional strategies. Henry and Schutes (1995) created the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI), which measured participants' attitudes toward students with diverse cultural backgrounds. This measure provided insight into participants' perspectives but did not address classroom instructional practices.

The studies identified in this section demonstrated the great depth and breadth of quantitative studies in both the field of education and art education that focus on the topics of multiculturalism, racial sensitivity, and cultural competence. For the purpose of this study,

however, no preexisting measure could be identified to adequately measure art educators' practices of teaching racially diverse artists and cultures.

Gaps in Literature

In providing this literature review, I had three goals: (a) to examine the history of multicultural (art) education to understand current conversations surrounding the topic; (b) to describe current multicultural art classroom practices to investigate whether these practices mirror the goals of multicultural (art) education; and (c) to assess if any surveys exist that measure the extent to which educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures. The literature review revealed that multicultural art education was introduced into curricula to provide equitable learning experiences and representation for all students. However, multicultural art education practices did not attain these goals, and some multicultural art education scholars determined that critiques of power and social inequities along with critical reflection were necessary to truly provide equitable learning experiences for all students. An examination of current classroom practices indicated that there were limited studies on critical multicultural classroom practices, and a review of existing measures indicated that there were no existing surveys that examined the extent to which educators taught about racially diverse artists and cultures. The following section describes the methodology of the research project, which measures the extent to which art educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology used in this study beginning with a description of the study. This section is followed by the description of the participants in the survey population, my recruitment methods, and my recruitment plan. Then I discuss the procedure for item development, pilot testing, validity testing, and reliability testing and provide the timeline for the research project. The chapter concludes with descriptions of how the data was analyzed and reported.

Description of the Study

This study was a descriptive, nonexperimental, self-reported survey (see Appendix B). The purpose of the study was to measure the extent to which art educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures in their classrooms. A survey was chosen as the method of collecting data because it is reliable for "determining opinions, perceptions, and attitudes; identifying interests and experiences; [and] conducting needs assessment" (Thomas, 2004, p. 1). Self-reporting surveys allow information to be collected from participants and receive direct feedback about the study population from the population themselves. Furthermore, surveys can help measure educator preferences, which influence motivation (McMillan, 2004), and ultimately, can provide information on how to better support educators.

The study was designed to measure the extent to which art educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures, whether educator attributes have an effect on the extent to which they teach about racial/cultural diversity, and what supports are needed for art educators to continue teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures. My priority in this study was to understand art educators' perspectives and knowledge through descriptive statistics regarding the following three variables: racial diversity, cultural diversity, and importance of racial/cultural diversity. Descriptive statistics can help describe how and why a phenomenon is occurring (Lauer, 2006). Correlational tests with variables were also conducted with factors such as educator background and student racial population to further identify supports that educators may need to (continue to) teach about racially diverse artists and cultures.

Description of the Participants

The sample for the study included K–12 art educators in the United States who were members of the National Art Education Association (NAEA). Participants were recruited through nonprobability convenience sampling. Nonprobability sampling occurs when participants are selected to participate in a study in a nonrandom manner; a convenience sample is one that is selected because the participants within the study were accessible for the research project (Thomas, 2004). Recruitment required the participants to be active members of NAEA, as the link to the online survey was distributed by NAEA's elementary division, middle-level division, and secondary division directors.

Recruitment procedures began in January of 2018 when contact was initiated with the elementary, middle, and secondary directors of NAEA. In this initial email, I provided the background of the study and asked for their cooperation in distributing the survey to their respective divisions. After receiving confirmation of their participation, I continued to maintain

open communication with the division directors throughout the survey development process, informing them of timeline. In early October 2018, a survey reminder and presurvey form were sent to the division directors. This presurvey form included information about the forthcoming survey for participants and was distributed to the sample population two weeks prior to the launch of the survey as a means of recruitment. The survey was launched on October 31, 2018, and was available until December 21, 2018. Participation in the survey was lower than expected; to increase visibility, I posted weekly on NAEA's Collaborate pages and on NAEA division pages on social media (Facebook). The final sample consisted of 82 practicing K–12 art educators. The total usable responses were 74, with 8 responses removed because participants did not complete the entire survey or were outside of the study sample.

Demographic data was collected from the survey, however, the questions were optional and some participants chose to opt out from answering questions about themselves. Of the participants who provided demographic data, the participant demographic breakdown is as follows:

- 60 participants were White, 12 were educators of color.

- 5 were Latinx, 65 were non-Latinx, and 2 preferred not to answer.

- 57 female-identified, 14 male-identified, and 2 preferred not to answer.

- 65 taught in public schools, 6 taught in private schools, 3 taught in charter schools, and 3 taught in magnet schools.

- 43 were elementary school teachers, 22 were middle school teachers, and 16 were high school teachers.

Procedure

  This section describes the procedure for developing the survey instrument. The section begins with how the measurement was developed. Next, the measurement was refined through pilot testing, validity testing, and reliability testing. Through this process, the survey instrument was refined to reduce error.

  Item development. Although the literature revealed a variety of surveys that overlapped with some of the goals of this study, none measured racial and cultural diversity in art education curricula. Because the existing measures could not be applied for the same purposes as the original instrumentation, the existing measures were not concurrently valid (Hartas, 2010) and were not implemented in this study.

  The purpose of the survey was to describe and analyze art educators' current practices of teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures. The research questions, posed in Chapter 1, supported this goal by specifically asking about the extent to which art educators address cultural and racial diversity in their classrooms and what supports are needed to implement curricula that address racially diverse artists and cultures. Identifying the purpose of this survey was a key initial step that provided a guideline for item development (Fink, 2003). After deciding on an online survey as the instrument, I mapped out three objectives that had to be addressed through survey items: (a) How often is cultural/racial diversity implemented, and to what extent is it implemented? (b) To what extent do educators emphasize teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures in their curricula? (c) What are the demographics of the teachers and students?

  After determining these objectives, I developed the individual survey questions based on the best practices of survey and evaluation creation. Survey language and content had to be carefully chosen to reflect the survey population, the goal of the survey, and the researcher (Fink,

2003). Furthermore, the survey language had to be clear, coherent, and unbiased by using familiar language, being concise, grammatically correct, and not leading (McMillan, 2004). When possible, the survey should use the same scale for questions and be consistent in wording (McMillan, 2004).

For the first objective, I used language from a preexisting survey that I created in a class project with my colleague. This preexisting survey measured the extent to which preservice educators were comfortable addressing controversial topics within their lessons. Questions for the second, third, and fourth objectives, were created with guidance from one of my committee members. Through this process, a rough draft of the survey items was created. This draft was reviewed and edited by my committee and myself for wording, clarity, and relevance. Following this initial review, the revised draft was sent to two committee members for further feedback and refinement. The final draft of the survey contained 42 questions: 11 questions addressed the first objective, three questions addressed the second objective, 18 questions addressed the third objective, and eight questions addressed the fourth objective.

Responses to questions measuring the extent to which educators discuss racial and cultural diversity were collected using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all*) to 4 (*To a great extent*). A Likert-type scale was used because all the items measured a similar concept (Thomas, 2004) and the level of agreement with each question (McMillan, 2004). Respondents were asked the following five questions to create a 20-point subscale for the dependent variable cultural diversity (survey items 1-5, Appendix B):

1. To what extent do you teach multicultural lessons?

2. To what extent do you have in depth discussions with your students about these **cultures**?

3. To what extent do you have in depth discussions with your students about how these **<u>cultures</u>** influence the art you are viewing?

4. To what extent do you have in depth discussions with your students about contemporary artists from a variety of **<u>cultures</u>**?

5. When discussing **<u>culture</u>** with your students, to what extent do you introduce specific, **historical** artists from the culture being discussed?

Multiple-item measures, such as the one used in this survey, provide internal consistency and content validity (Gogol et al., 2014). Respondents were also asked 5 questions pertaining to racial diversity to create another 20-point subscale for the dependent variable racial diversity (survey items 6-10, Appendix B). The questions were as follows:

1. To what extent do you teach lessons that feature artists of color?

2. To what extent do you introduce artists from a range of **<u>racial</u>** backgrounds into your lessons?

3. To what extent do you introduce the **<u>racial background</u>** of artists in lessons?

4. To what extent do you introduce **contemporary** artists from a range of **<u>racial backgrounds</u>** in lesson?

5. To what extent do you discuss with your students the artist's **<u>racial background</u>** in depth as it relates to the artist's work?

Educators who scored 0–5 points on these subscales were considered to teach about cultural/racial diversity *Not at all*; educators scoring 6–10 points taught *Very little*; those who scored 11–15 points taught *Somewhat*; and those with 16–20 points taught *To a great extent*. Educators were also asked to rank the importance of having conversations with their students about race, culture, historical/current events related to race, and cultural appropriation in art or

visual culture. These five items were combined to create a 20-point subscale for another dependent variable: the importance of racial/cultural diversity. Educators who scored 0–5 points on this subscale were considered to indicate that teaching about cultural/racial diversity was *Not at all important*, 6–10 points indicated *Not very important*, 11–15 points indicated *Important*, and 16–20 points indicated *Very important*.

Pilot testing. A pilot test is a crucial step in survey research as it provides important feedback about the instrument, such as clarity of the survey questions, progression of survey format, and how long the survey takes to complete (McMillan, 2004). A pilot test was conducted on REDCap to examine clarity in language, check for internal validity/reliability, and resolve any technical issues that might occur during the survey. The survey was distributed to a nine-member pilot test group consisting of graduate students and art educators who did not fit the survey population (i.e., non-NAEA members, educators who had undergone recent career changes, etc.). All nine members of the pilot test group participated in this process. The pilot audience included individuals with a broad array of teaching experience (with a variety of student populations), various educational backgrounds, and a range of years of teaching experience. The demographics of the pilot testers were as follows: four art education graduate students, two former art educators, one art educator early in their career, and two art educators with 10 or more years of teaching experience. Participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire as they took the survey to capture their thoughts about the survey. The questionnaire asked about the duration of the survey, clarity in language, redundancy in language, difficulty/probing nature of the questions, and additional feedback.

Pilot testing commenced in May 2018, and the link to the survey was distributed to the participants via email. Two weeks after their completion date, participants were asked to retake

the pilot to provide data for internal reliability. Participants reported that the survey took anywhere from 11 minutes to 45 minutes, with the average duration of the pilot survey being 27 minutes. Feedback received varied as well. Some participants found that the language was straightforward and that the survey was easy to complete. Others mentioned a lack of clarity, confusion in language, and a need for additional answering options. Another revelation was the difficulty of the program's user interface; participants did not like the answering options for certain questions. After feedback from the pilot test, the following amendments were made to the survey: Seven items were removed for measurements outside the purpose of the research project; emphasis in questions was denoted with italics; underlining and bold lettering was used for visual clarity; an additional question was added to the importance of racial/cultural diversity variable to create a 20-point subscale (versus 16); a "no additional resources needed" option was added on the question measuring what additional resources educators felt they needed; and an additional option was added to the question measuring where educators were exposed to multicultural terminology. Lastly, the survey platform was changed from REDCap to SurveyMonkey as it provided a smoother, more user-friendly interface. The complete survey can be found in Appendix A.

Validity. The first step to analyzing the pilot data was to assess measurements for the validity of the instrument. As Hartas (2010) noted, "[t]he validity of a study is an important criterion regarding the meaningfulness of the results and the overall value of research" (p. 74). The validity of the test content was determined by (critical) multicultural (art) education literature. I consulted with committee members who are experts in critical multicultural art education literature and methodology to receive content-related evidence for validity based on their expertise. Art education scholarship highlighted a need for addressing race and culture in

discussions on a deeper level (Acuff, 2016; Chalmers, 2002; Desai, 2010). The questions were composed to measure the extent to which art educators not only introduced but also discussed the racial and cultural diversity of artists in their curricula (survey items 2-5; 6-10, Appendix B). Critical multicultural art education scholars have also discussed the importance of introducing contemporary artists and artworks from cultures to prevent freezing cultures in time (Chin, 2011). Survey items also collected data on the extent that educators introduced historical and contemporary artists and cultures (survey items 4, 5, and 9, Appendix B).

Reliability. Reliability indicates the extent to which a measure is stable, replicable, and free from error (Hartas, 2010). A Cronbach's alpha test was administered on the pilot data to check for internal consistency and homogeneity. A Cronbach's alpha test was conducted because there was no other form of the instrument, and it was administered to a single pilot sample (McMillan, 2004). The test was conducted on each dependent variable subscale to give the highest reliability. The results were as follows:

Table 2

Results of Cronbach's Alpha Test

Variable	Cronbach's alpha
Cultural diversity	.689
Racial diversity	.823
Importance of racial/cultural diversity	.716
All variables	.882

Results from the Cronbach's alpha test show that all items measured acceptably with the cultural diversity variable scoring the lowest at .689.

An attempt was made to check for test–retest reliability. Participants were asked two weeks after their initial pilot test date to retake the pilot; unfortunately, only two participants responded. A Pearson's correlation coefficient was run with the data collected from the two participants and indicated a low correlation (.492). However, because only two samples were used to measure the correlation coefficient, it is not a reliable indicator of test–retest reliability. Thus, threats to the survey's reliability included the lack of stability (where reliability is attained by conducting a test, waiting a period of time, and retesting the instrument) as the attempt to measure test–retest reliability was not conclusive (McMillan, 2004).

Timeline

I created the survey in December 2017 and it was reviewed by committee members the following month. Initial contact was made to NAEA elementary, middle, and secondary division directors in January 2018, and I sent a follow-up email providing updates to the division directors in April 2018. IRB application was submitted in May 2018 and approved in July 2018. A pilot survey was conducted in May 2018, and modifications were made based on the feedback of the pilot group and their response data. Following the pilot survey, I submitted amendments to the IRB application in September 2018 and it was approved within the same month. The prospectus hearing was held in October 2018, and I submitted a final round of amendments to IRB the same month based on feedback from committee members. The survey was launched in November 2018 and concluded in December 2018.

Data Analysis

After closing the survey in December 2018, I downloaded the data from SurveyMonkey. The first step to cleaning the data was making sure to update variable names and labels to accurately correspond with the item measures. Surveys any data were identified through conditional formatting, and those responses were removed. Items measured on a Likert-type scale were also reviewed, and I double-checked that all responses fell within a 1–4 range. The responses that did not fall within the range were highlighted, and those responses were removed. After a thorough review of all responses to check for errors, I exported the data into SPSS for analysis. SPSS was chosen as it is one of the most frequently utilized statistics software programs (Collier, 2010).

Data analysis aimed to answer the research questions as accurately and thoroughly as possible. Tables 3 and 4 provide an overview of the tests that were run with their corresponding research questions.

Table 3

Research Questions 1-3 and Analysis

Questions	Analysis	Variables
To what extent do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members address cultural diversity in their classrooms?	Descriptive Statistics, Standard Deviation, Mean, Frequency, Percentages	DV: Cultural diversity
To what extent do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members address racial diversity in their classrooms?	Descriptive Statistics, Standard Deviation, Mean, Frequency, Percentages	DV: Racial diversity
What do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members need to create and implement curricula that address racially diverse artists and cultures?	Descriptive Statistic of IVs, Standard Deviation, Mean, Frequency, Percentages	IVs: Comfort level, support needed, multicultural terms, highlighted theories, coursework

Note. DV: Dependent variable. IV: Independent variable

Table 4

Research Question 4 and Analysis

Questions	Analysis	Variables
What relationships exist between art teachers' self-reported attributes and the dependent variables (cultural diversity, racial diversity, importance of cultural/racial diversity)? 1. Is there a relationship between educator race and the dependent variables? 2. Is there a relationship between years taught in a school and the dependent variables? 3. Is there a relationship between student demographics and the dependent variables? 4. Is there a relationship between school setting and the dependent variables? 5. Is there a relationship between the familiarity with multicultural terms and the dependent variables? 6. Is there a relationship between highlighted theories in higher art education courses and the dependent variables? 7. Is there a relationship between educator comfort and the dependent variables?	1x3 ANOVAs: SQs 1–4 • Descriptive • Mean • F-value • P-value (<.05) • Effect size • If significant: ○ Welch's, Brown-Forsythe's, and post-hoc tests	DV: Cultural diversity, racial diversity, importance of cultural/racial diversity IVs: 1. Educator race 2. Years taught 3. Student demographics 4. School setting 5. Multicultural terms 6. Highlighted theories in higher art education courses 7. Educator comfort

Note. DV: Dependent variable. IV: Independent variable

Data reporting. Research questions 1 and 2 were addressed with descriptive statistics, which provided data on the current practices of art educators. Research question 3 was answered through a descriptive statistic of the independent variable "resources identified by educators." Research question 4 was addressed by examining the relationship between the dependent variables and seven different teacher self-reported attributes: educator race, years taught, student

demographics, school setting, familiarity with multicultural terms, highlighted theories in higher art education courses, and educator comfort level. I believed that these data analyses would help better understand what supports educators need to create and implement curricula that addresses racial and cultural diversity.

To explore the extent to which the dependent variables had a relationship with the independent variables, I conducted multiple correlational tests. A factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA), where two or more independent variables are analyzed together (McMillan, 2004), was administered for each dependent variable. The ANOVA allowed me to examine the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables in a single test, instead of multiple *t*-tests, which helped reduce error. The 1x3 ANOVAs were administered with the following independent variables: educator race; student race; school setting; familiarity with multicultural terms; highlighted theories in higher art education coursework; and comfort level with addressing race/culture.

The purpose of running correlational tests on educator race was to determine if there was a relationship between educators' racial backgrounds and the extent that they explored racial/cultural diversity in their curricula; the test was also administered to determine if educators' racial backgrounds influenced their perceptions regarding how important racial/cultural diversity is to their curricula. Scholars have argued that White educators may have difficulty understanding the diverse backgrounds, experiences, and oppressions of their students of color (Brooks, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 2005), making this exploration worthwhile. Student race and school settings were examined to see if educators were more likely to implement racially/culturally diverse content in areas where the student population was more or less diverse. This correlation was explored because prior multicultural education movements, such as the

Intergroup-Education Movement, failed because educators felt that multicultural studies were only relevant in diverse populations (Banks, 1995b). These three independent variables were run in a single factorial ANOVA to reduce error and measure the relationship between the variables (McMillan, 2004). The last three independent variables (familiarity with multicultural terms, highlighted theories in higher art education coursework, and educator comfort) were explored to gauge if educators' (dis)engagement with racially/culturally diverse artists was because of their (lack of) knowledge on the subject. If the survey showed a relationship between knowledge (familiarity, comfort, and education) and implementation of racially/culturally diverse artists in the classroom, then there would be room to explore how to continue teacher education on the subject.

The correlational tests captured a clearer picture of what influenced educators' comfort teaching and ability to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures within their classrooms. By understanding what influenced educators' curricula, I was able to address what additional supports would help educators (continue to) teach about racially diverse artists and cultures.

Chapter 4

Results

In this chapter, I provide the results of the data analyses conducted as part of this research project. For the first two research questions that measured the extent that educators address racial/cultural diversity, descriptive statistics, frequencies, and percentages are presented as an overview of current educator practices. Sample size and percentages are provided for research question three to identify which resources educators indicated that they need to improve or increase their teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures. Finally, results from a series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests are analyzed to answer research question four.

Research Question 1

The first research question asked, "To what extent do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members address cultural diversity in their classrooms?"

Analysis. Seventy-four teachers provided feedback on the survey items that measured the extent to which educators addressed cultural diversity in their classrooms. Out of a maximum total of 20 points, the mean for the dependent variable "cultural diversity" was 15.96, with a standard deviation of 2.49, indicating that educators *somewhat* taught lessons that addressed cultural diversity (Table 5). The frequency of the self-reported results can be seen in Table 6, which shows the varying degrees that educators said they addressed cultural diversity within their curricula. Few participants indicated that they taught about cultural diversity *very little*,

with the majority of participants indicating that they taught about cultural diversity *somewhat*

and *to a great extent* (refer back to page 77 for a breakdown of the scale). None of the

participants indicated that they did not teach about cultural diversity at all.

Table 5

Sample Size, Mean, and Standard Deviation for DV: Cultural Diversity by grade level

Culture (Max 20)	*n*	*M*(*SD*)
Elementary	37	16.46(2.01)
Middle	13	14.85(2.27)
High	13	16(2.71)
Elementary and Middle	6	15.83(4.88)
Total	74	15.96(2.49)

Note. M=Mean. *SD*=Standard Deviation.

Not all participants reported grade level data, resulting in the discrepancy between the sample size and total population

0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

Table 6

Frequency and Percentages for Dependent Variable: Cultural Diversity

Total score (Max 20)	Frequency	Percent
7	1	1.4
10	1	1.4
12	5	6.8
14	14	18.9
15	10	13.5
16	10	13.5
17	14	18.9
18	6	8.1
19	8	10.8
20	5	6.8
Total	74	100

Research Question 2

The second research question asked, "To what extent do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members address racial diversity in their classrooms?"

Analysis. Seventy-three educators provided feedback on survey items that measured the extent to which educators addressed racial diversity in their classrooms. Out of a maximum total of 20 points, the dependent variable "racial diversity" had a mean of 16.12 with a standard deviation of 2.75, indicating that educators addressed racial diversity *to a great extent* within their curricula (Table 7). The data were also analyzed by grade level, and the results suggest that educators in middle school introduce racially diverse artists more than elementary and high school teachers. Educators who taught in elementary and middle schools taught about racial diversity the most ($M = 17.83$).

Answers collected from the participants varied, and the frequency of the answers collected can be seen in Table 8. Similar to the results of the previous research question, no

participants indicated that they did not teach about racial diversity and only one participant

indicated that they taught about racial diversity *very little*. Surprisingly, the majority of the

participants indicated that they taught about racial diversity *to a great extent*.

Table 7

Sample Size, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Dependent Variable: Racial Diversity by grade level

Racial diversity (Max 20)	*n*	*M*(*SD*)
Elementary	37	15.84(2.89)
Middle	12	16.42(2.35)
High	13	15.85(2.99)
Elementary and Middle	6	17.83(2.48)
Total	73	16.12(2.75)

Note. M=Mean. *SD*=Standard Deviation.

Not all participants reported grade level data, resulting in the discrepancy between the sample size and total population

0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

Table 8

Frequency and Percentages for Dependent Variable: Racial Diversity

Total score (Max 20)	Frequency	Percent
9	1	1.4
11	2	2.7
12	5	6.8
13	6	8.2
14	5	6.8
15	14	19.2
16	7	9.6
17	7	9.6
18	8	11
19	7	9.6
20	11	15.1
Total	73	100

Research Question 3

The third research question asked, "What do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members need to create and implement curricula that address racially diverse artists and cultures?"

Analysis. Survey participants identified which resources would be most helpful in teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures. Participants could check as many responses as applied; Table 8 shows the frequencies of responses and percentages of participants who selected each resource. Over 50% of the participants indicated that they would most benefit from visual resources, education/training on how to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures, education/training about how to facilitate positive discussions, and education/training about racially diverse artists and cultures. Only 13.7% of participants indicated that they were confident in their current abilities to teach about race and culture. Educators were also provided the opportunity to fill in blanks to indicate any "other" resource that they felt would be helpful in

teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures. Nine responses were collected: Four of the

responses discussed current supports and resources that the educators used, and five responses

indicated further resources that educators felt would help their teaching practices, which were as

follows: access to "relevant, unbiased information" about diverse cultures with visuals,

recordings, and clips; opportunities to share and collaborate with others; knowledge of more

artists; field trip funds; first-person sources; online materials; and in-person contacts.

Table 9

Frequency and Percentages for Independent Variable: Resources Needed

Resources	*n*	Percent
Education/training about how to facilitate positive discussions	45	61.6%
Education/training about racially diverse artists and cultures	42	57.5%
Education/training on how to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures	41	56.2%
Financial	24	32.9%
I feel confident in my ability to teach about race and culture without additional resources	10	13.7%
Parental support of racially diverse artists and cultures	25	34.2%
Visual resources	46	63%

Note. The response option for this survey item was to "check all that apply." For this reason, the frequency of responses does not add up to 74, as some respondents checked more than one option.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question asked, "What relationship exists between art teachers' self-

reported attributes and the dependent variables (cultural diversity, racial diversity, importance of

cultural/racial diversity)?" This question examined the relationship between the dependent variables and seven self-reported attributes: educator race, years taught in a school, student demographics, school setting, familiarity with multicultural terms, theories highlighted in higher education art education courses, and educator comfort level with teaching racially diverse artists and cultures.

Analysis. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run with each independent variable and the dependent variables to examine if there was a correlation between them. Significant results were further analyzed with robust ANOVAs and post-hoc tests. The following sections present the results of the ANOVA tests and a summary of the findings.

SQ1: Educator race and the dependent variables. Results of the ANOVA suggest that educator race, tested as a binary of White and educators of color, did not have a relationship with the dependent variable racial diversity, $F(1, 68) = .01$, $p = .94$, $\eta^2 = .001$, or cultural diversity, $F(1, 69) = 2.74$, $p = .10$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Educator race had a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity, Welch's and Brown-Forsythe $F(1, 20.47) = 8.022$, $p < .05$. However, because the sample size of educators of color is small ($n = 12$), these results are not worth noting. Furthermore, because the educator race only had two levels (White and educators of color), a post-hoc test was not conducted as there were fewer than three levels.

The relationship between educator race (White and educators of color) and the dependent variables can be further examined in Table 10. Educator race was examined as a binary (White and educators of color) because the population of participants was too small ($n = 71$) to separate into individual racial categories without increasing the chance of error. Results of the data analysis indicated that educators of color taught about cultural diversity *to a great extent* (*M =*

17.08, SD = 2.94) and indicated that racial/cultural diversity was *very important* (M = 17.75, SD = 2.22). In comparison, White educators only taught about cultural diversity to a *somewhat* extent (M = 15.78, SD = 2.39) and only indicated that racial/cultural diversity was *important* (M = 15.61, SD = 3). Both groups scored similarly in terms of teaching racial diversity, with Educators of color (M = 16.08, SD = 16.08) and White educators (M = 16.16, SD = 2.96) indicating that they taught about racial diversity *to a great extent*.

Table 10

Sample Size, Mean, Standard Deviation, F *Value, and* p *Value of Educator Race and Dependent Variables*

DV	Educator race	n	$M(SD)$	F	Sig
Cultural diversity	EOC	12	17.08(2.93)	2.74	.10
	White	59	15.78(2.39)		
Racial diversity	EOC	12	16.08(1.68)	.01	.94
	White	58	16.16(2.96)		
Importance of cultural/racial	EOC	12	17.75(2.22)	5.43	.02
diversity	White	57	15.61(3)		

Note. EOC=Educators of color

For dependent variables cultural diversity and racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

For dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all important*; 6–10 points = *Not very important*; 11–15 points = *Important*; 16–20 points = *Very important*.

SQ2: Years taught in a school and dependent variables. Results of the ANOVA indicate that there is not a relationship between years taught (0–10, 11–20, and 21+) and the dependent variables cultural diversity, $F(2, 68)$ = .380, p = .69, η^2 = .01, or racial diversity, $F(2, 67)$ = .58, p = .57, η^2 = .017. Results from the robust ANOVA, Welch's $F(2, 21.29)$ = 5.23, $p < .05$ and

Brown-Forsythe $F_{(2, 55.15)} = 3.68$, $p < .05$, did indicate a significant relationship between the years of experience that an educator has taught in a school and the dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity. To further explore this relationship, I ran a post-hoc test. The results suggested that educators who have taught 21 or more years valued the importance of teaching about racial and cultural diversity more than educators who have taught 20 or fewer years (Games-Howell, $p < .05$).

The relationship between the dependent variables and the years that an educator has taught in a school can be further examined in Table 11. Teachers who have taught for 0–10 years teach about cultural diversity ($M=16.36$, $SD = 3.05$) to a greater extent than those with 11–20 years of experience ($M =15.75$, $SD = 2.39$) and those with 21+ years of experience ($M = 16$, $SD = 2.06$). Participants indicated that they taught about racial diversity *somewhat*, varying little based on the years of experience the educators had. Interestingly, educators who taught for 21+ years reported that teaching cultural/racial diversity was *very important* ($M = 17.47$, $SD = 1.77$) versus teachers with 11–20 years of experience who indicated that it was *important* ($M = 15.77$, $SD = 2.04$) and educators with 0–10 years of experience who also indicated that it was *important* but scored the lowest of the three categories of teaching experience ($M = 15.10$, $SD = 3.32$).

Table 11

Sample Size, Mean, Standard Deviation, F *Value, and* p *Value of Years Taught in a School and Dependent Variables*

DV	Years taught	*n*	*M(SD)*	*F*	Sig
Cultural diversity	0–10	22	16.36(3.05)	.38	.69
	11–20	32	15.75(2.38)		
	21+	17	16(2.06)		
Racial diversity	0–10	22	16(2.99)	.58	.57
	11–20	31	16.52(2.79)		
	21+	17	15.65(2.5)		
Importance of cultural/racial diversity	0–10	21	15.10(3.32)	3.35	.04
	11–20	31	15.77(3.04)		
	21+	17	17.47(1.77)		

Note. For dependent variables cultural diversity and racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

For dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all important*; 6–10 points = *Not very important*; 11–15 points = *Important*; 16–20 points = *Very important*.

SQ3: Student demographics and dependent variables. Student demographics were separated into three levels that covered a range of percentages of students of color (0-33%, 34-66%, and 67-100%). The independent variable was not separated it into individual racial subgroups to reduce error in running the analysis. Findings indicate that there is not a relationship between student demographics and all three of the dependent variables. ANOVA tests for cultural diversity reported $F(2, 64) = .49$, $p = .62$, $\eta^2 = .02$ and racial diversity reported $F(2, 63) = .61$, $p = .54$, $\eta^2 = .02$. There is a statistically significant relationship between student racial demographics and the importance of cultural/racial diversity in a curriculum, Welch's $F(2,$

32.58) = 4.39, $p = .02$, Brown-Forsythe $F(2, 51.60) = 4.86$, $p = .01$. A post-hoc test revealed a relationship (Games-Howell, $p < .05$) that indicates that educators who taught in populations with 67-100% students of color reported that teaching about cultural and racial diversity was more important than those who had a smaller population of students of color (0-33%).

The relationship between student demographics and the dependent variables can be further examined in Table 12. With each dependent variable, participant responses indicated that in populations with a majority of students of color (67-100%), educators reported teaching more about cultural diversity ($M = 16.48$, $SD = 2.23$) and racial diversity ($M = 16.52$, $SD = 2.51$) than educators who reported higher populations of White students. Similarly, educators who taught in schools with a more diverse population of students also indicated that teaching about cultural/racial diversity was very important ($M = 16.84$, $SD = 2.98$) and scored higher than the other two populations.

Table 12

Sample Size, Mean, Standard Deviation, F *Value, and* p *Value of Student Demographics and Dependent Variables*

DV	Population of students of color	n	M(SD)	F	Sig
Cultural diversity	100-67%	31	16.48(2.23)	.49	.62
	34-66%	13	15.85(2.73)		
	0-33%	23	16(2.045)		
Racial diversity	100-67%	31	16.52(2.51)	.62	.54
	34-66%	13	15.69(3.07)		
	0-33%	22	15.77(3.12)		
Importance of cultural/racial diversity	100-67%	31	16.84(2.98)	4.62	.01
	34-66%	13	16.31(2.63)		
	0-33%	21	14.38(3.06)		

Note. For dependent variables cultural diversity and racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

For dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all important*; 6–10 points = *Not very important*; 11–15 points = *Important*; 16–20 points = *Very important*.

SQ4: School setting and dependent variables. Data analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between school setting and the dependent variables. Cultural diversity is the least significant, $F(2, 18) = .19$, $p = .83$, $\eta^2 = .005$, followed by importance of cultural/racial diversity, $F(2, 66) = .72$, $p = .49$, $\eta^2 = .021$, and racial diversity, $F(2, 67) = 1.99$, $p = .15$, $\eta^2 = .06$.

While the results were not significant, Table 13 provides an overview of the data collected. The data show that educators who teach in suburban areas reported teaching about

cultural diversity the most ($M = 16.14$, $SD = 2.21$) and indicated that cultural/racial diversity was most important ($M = 16.30$, $SD = 2.35$). Educators in urban areas reported teaching about racial diversity the most ($M = 16.62$, $SD = 2.44$), though the mean was only slightly higher than for responses reported by educators who taught in suburban areas ($M = 16.52$, $SD=2.87$). Rural educators reported teaching about cultures to a great extent ($M = 16.09$, $SD = 2.65$) but taught racial diversity to a lesser extent ($M = 15.18$, $SD = 2.92$), and this group of respondents had the lowest score in terms of how important they thought cultural/racial diversity is in curricula ($M = 15.33$, $SD = 3.69$).

Table 13

Sample Size, Mean, Standard Deviation, F *Value, and p Value of School Setting and Dependent Variables*

DV	School setting	n	$M(SD)$	F	Sig
Cultural diversity	Rural	22	16.09(2.65)	.19	.83
	Urban	21	15.71(2.85)		
	Suburban	28	16.14(2.21)		
Racial diversity	Rural	22	15.18(2.82)	1.96	.15
	Urban	21	16.62(2.44)		
	Suburban	27	16.56(2.87)		
Importance of cultural/racial diversity	Rural	21	15.33(3.69)	.72	.49
	Urban	21	16.24(2.95)		
	Suburban	27	16.30(2.35)		

Note. For dependent variables cultural diversity and racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

For dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all important*; 6–10 points = *Not very important*; 11–15 points = *Important*; 16–20 points = *Very important*.

SQ5: Familiarity with multicultural terms and dependent variables. Most participants indicated that they were familiar with multicultural terms ($n = 36$ for DV cultural diversity and importance of cultural/racial diversity, $n = 37$ for DV racial diversity), few participants indicated that they were not very familiar (n = 7), and no participants indicated that they were not at all familiar with the terms. A little less than half of the participants ($n = 28$–29) indicated that they were very familiar with multicultural terminology (Table 14). Participants who were very familiar with multicultural terminology reported teaching about cultural diversity ($M = 16.21$, *SD* $= 2.57$) and racial diversity ($M = 17.07$, SD $= 2.39$) more than those who were not very familiar with multicultural terms, who reported that they somewhat taught about cultural diversity ($M = 15.43$, *SD* $= 3.41$) and racial diversity ($M = 13.29$, *SD* $= 1.5$). Participants who were very familiar and familiar with multicultural terms reported similar results regarding the importance of cultural/racial diversity ($M = 16$, *SD* $= 3.45$ and $M = 16.14$, *SD* $= 2.62$, respectively), while those who were not very familiar scored more than a point lower ($M = 14.57$, *SD* $= 2.44$).

Table 14

Sample Size, Mean, Standard Deviation, F *Value, and* p *Value of Familiarity with Multicultural Terms and Dependent Variables*

DV	Familiarity with multicultural terms	*n*	*M*(*SD*)	*F*	Sig
Cultural Diversity	Not very familiar	7	15.43(3.41)	.31	.74
	Familiar	37	15.89(2.32)		
	Very familiar	29	16.21(2.57)		
Racial Diversity	Not very familiar	7	13.29(1.5)	6.38	.00
	Familiar	37	15.92(2.82)		
	Very familiar	29	17.07(2.39)		
Importance of	Not very familiar	7	14.57(2.44)	.83	.44
cultural/racial diversity	Familiar	36	16.14(2.62)		
	Very familiar	28	16.00(3.45)		

Note. For dependent variables cultural diversity and racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

For dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all important*; 6–10 points = *Not very important*; 11–15 points = *Important*; 16–20 points = *Very important*.

SQ6: Highlighted theories in higher education courses and dependent variables.

Participants were asked to respond regarding the extent to which 14 different theories were highlighted in their art education coursework. Responses were separated into two different categories: those that emphasize diversity (multicultural education, culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally sustaining pedagogy, critical race theory) and curriculum theories (discipline-based art education, teaching artistic behaviors, visual culture art education, creativity, child-centered learning) on a 15-point maximum scale. Responses that scored 0–5 points were categorized as

not emphasized, 6–10 points were categorized as *emphasized somewhat*, and results that scored

11–15 points were categorized as *emphasized a great amount*.

The test results indicate that there is not a relationship between curriculum theories and

the dependent variables racial diversity, $F(2, 70) = .10$, $p = .91$, $\eta^2 = .003$, or importance of

cultural/racial diversity, $F(2, 68) = 1.99$, $p = .14$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Similarly, there is not a relationship

between theories that emphasize diversity addressed in higher art education courses and the

dependent variables racial diversity, $F(2, 70) = .55$, $p = .58$, $\eta^2 = .016$, or importance of

cultural/racial diversity, $F(2, 68) = .77$, $p = .47$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Robust ANOVA tests indicate that

there is a statistically significant relationship between cultural diversity and highlighted theories

that emphasize diversity, Welch's $F(2, 31.59) = 7.78$, $p < .05$, Brown-Forsythe $F(2, 50.27) =$

7.59, $p < .05$, as well as curriculum theories, Welch's $F(2, 28.55) = 3.3$, $p < .05$, Brown-Forsythe

$F(2, 47.42) = 3.73$, $p < .05$. Post-hoc tests were run to further explore these relationships. These

tests indicate that educators who had higher art education courses that taught theories that

emphasized diversity a great amount were more likely to teach about cultural diversity than those

who had courses that did not (Games-Howell, $p < .05$). The tests also indicate that educators who

had higher art education courses that emphasized curriculum theories a great amount were more

likely to teach about cultural diversity than those that whose higher education courses only

emphasized it somewhat (Games-Howell, $p < .05$). Simply put, educators who had coursework

that greatly emphasized educational theories, regardless of whether or not the theories

emphasized diversity, were more likely to teach about cultural diversity than educators who had

coursework that did not emphasize educational theories.

Data analysis, the results of which can be viewed in Table 15, indicates that respondents

while educators who had courses that emphasized theories a great amount were more likely to

teach about cultural diversity than those whose coursework did not emphasize theories, the theories themselves seemed to have a direct relationship to the extent that educators taught about cultural diversity. Educators whose coursework emphasized curriculum theory a great amount were less likely to teach about cultural diversity ($M = 17$, $SD = 2.53$) than educators whose coursework focused on theories that emphasized diversity ($M = 17.93$, $SD = 1.98$). There is a similar relationship between curriculum theories (DBAE, TAB, choice based art education) and the extent that educators taught about racial diversity ($M = 16.12$, $SD = 2.74$), which had a lower mean than theories that emphasize diversity (culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally sustaining pedagogy, critical race theory) and the dependent variable racial diversity ($M = 16.29$, $SD = 2.27$). Cultural diversity was the only dependent variable in which more emphasis, from either theories, resulted in a higher mean. Racial diversity showed the opposite trend: Educators who had more emphasis on either theories taught about racial diversity less. There seems to be no pattern for the dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity, as the means showed no indication that an emphasis on theory had any effect on the extent to which educators believed in the importance of cultural/racial diversity.

Table 15

Sample Size, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Highlighted Theories in Higher Art Education Courses and Dependent Variables

DV	Extent theories emphasized	Curriculum theories		Theories that emphasize diversity	
		M(SD)	*n*	*M(SD)*	*n*
*Cultural diversity	Not emphasized	15.36(2.16)	11	15.50(1.97)	16
	Emphasized somewhat	15.45(2.39)	38	15.50(1.97)	44
	Emphasized a great amount	17.00(2.53)	25	17.93(1.98)	14
Racial diversity	Not emphasized	16.45(3.08)	11	16.69(2.87)	16
	Emphasized somewhat	16.03(2.72)	37	15.86(2.87)	43
	Emphasized a great amount	16.12(2.74)	25	16.29(2.27)	14
Importance of cultural/racial diversity	Not emphasized	15.90(1.60)	10	16.67(1.84)	15
	Emphasized somewhat	16.56(2.99)	36	15.60(3.17)	42
	Emphasized a great amount	15.04(3.18)	25	16.14(3.28)	14

Note. *Indicates statistically significant results with $p < .05$

For dependent variables cultural diversity and racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

For dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all important*; 6–10 points = *Not very important*; 11–15 points = *Important*; 16–20 points = *Very important*.

SQ7: Educator comfort and the dependent variables. Survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they were comfortable leading discussions pertaining to race and culture. The independent variable had a maximum allowance of 8 points, with responses collected from two survey items that asked the extent that educators felt comfortable leading student discussions pertaining to race or culture. Each of the survey items collected responses on a 4-point Likert-type scale: *not at all comfortable*, *not comfortable*, *comfortable*, and *very*

comfortable. No participants indicated that they were *not at all comfortable* with leading

discussions pertaining to race or culture, and only two participants indicated that they were *not*

comfortable. Because the responses were low in these two categories, they were removed from

further analysis for more accurate results. There was no relationship between educator comfort

and the dependent variable cultural diversity, $F(1, 69) = .08$, $p = .78$, $\eta^2 = .001$. However, robust

ANOVA tests indicate a significant relationship between educator comfort with racial diversity,

Welch's and Brown-Forsythe's $F(1, 68.786) = 6.33$, $p < .05$, and the importance of

cultural/racial diversity, Welch's and Brown-Forsythe's $F(1, 67) = 7.791$, $p < .05$. The results of

the robust ANOVA tests indicate that the more comfortable educators were with leading

discussions about race and culture, the more likely they were to teach about racial diversity and

indicate that racial/cultural diversity was more important in their classrooms. Post-hoc tests were

not run on the significant results as the removal of the two categories, *not comfortable* and *not at*

all comfortable, made the independent variable have only two levels.

The relationship between educator comfort and the dependent variables can be further

examined in Table 16. Educators who reported that they were very comfortable leading

discussions pertaining to race and culture were more likely to teach about racial diversity ($M =$

16.97, $SD = 2.36$) and indicated that cultural/racial diversity was important in their classroom

practices ($M = 17$, $SD = 2.53$), compared to educators who indicated that they were only

comfortable with leading discussions about race and culture (racial diversity: $M = 15.40$,

importance of cultural/racial diversity: $M = 15.11$). Interestingly, educators who reported that

they were comfortable leading discussions pertaining to race and culture were more likely to

teach about cultural diversity ($M = 15.90$, $SD = 2.6$) than those who were very comfortable ($M =$

15.90, $SD = 2.6$).

Table 16

Sample Size, Mean, Standard Deviation, F Value, and p Value of Educator Comfort and Dependent Variables

DV	IV	*n*	*M*(*SD*)	*F*	Sig
Cultural diversity	Comfortable	40	16.08(2.50)	.08	.78
	Very comfortable	31	15.90(2.60)		
Racial diversity	Comfortable	40	15.40(2.89)	6.01	.02
	Very comfortable	31	16.97(2.36)		
Importance of	Comfortable	38	15.11(3.11)	7.47	.01
cultural/racial diversity	Very comfortable	31	17.00(2.53)		

Note. For dependent variables cultural diversity and racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all*; 6–10 points = *Very little*; 11–15 points = *Somewhat*; 16–20 points = *To a great extent*.

For dependent variable importance of cultural/racial diversity: 0–5 points = *Not at all important*; 6–10 points = *Not very important*; 11–15 points = *Important*; 16–20 points = *Very important*.

This chapter provided the results of the data collected from the self-reported survey according to the research questions posed in Chapter 1. Results from the data analysis suggested that participating educators taught about cultural and racial diversity to a great extent in their classrooms. Furthermore, there seemed to be statistically significant relationships between educator self-reported attributes and the dependent variables. These findings will be further explored in the following chapter which will present conclusions, implications, and recommendations based on these findings.

Chapter 5

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

This final chapter completes the research study by providing conclusions from data analysis, implications for the field, and recommendations for future research based on the findings of the data analysis. First, I review the key findings and limitations of the research project. Next, I discuss the implications for the field and recommendations for future research. Finally, the chapter ends with my concluding considerations.

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which practicing K–12 art educators who were active members of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) taught about racially diverse artists and cultures and which resources they believed would help them (continue to) teach about racially diverse artists and cultures. Additionally, the study explored whether there were relationships between educators' self-identified variables and the extent to which the educators taught about racially diverse artists and cultures, as well as how important the educators viewed racially/culturally diverse curricula. Because the results seemed to be measuring two distinct topics based on research questions 1–3 and research question 4, I have separated the reporting of the study's conclusions and implications based on this distinction. The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

RQ 1: To what extent do practicing K–12 art educators address cultural diversity in their classrooms?

RQ 2: To what extent do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members address

racial diversity in their classrooms?

RQ 3: What do practicing K–12 art educators who are NAEA members need to create

and implement curricula that address racially diverse artists and cultures?

RQ 4: What relationships exist between art teachers' self-reported attributes and the

dependent variables (cultural diversity, racial diversity, importance of cultural/racial

diversity)?

> *SQ 1*: Is there a relationship between educator race and the dependent variables?

> *SQ 2:* Is there a relationship between years taught in a school and the dependent

> variables?

> *SQ 3:* Is there a relationship between student demographics and the dependent

> variables?

> *SQ 4:* Is there a relationship between school setting and the dependent variables?

> *SQ 5*: Is there a relationship between the familiarity with multicultural terms and

> the dependent variables?

> *SQ 6*: Is there a relationship between highlighted theories in higher art education

> courses and the dependent variables?

> *SQ 7:* Is there a relationship between educator comfort and the dependent

> variables?

Conclusions

Results of the data analysis (Tables 5 and 6) indicate that the survey participants reported

that they taught about cultural diversity *somewhat* and *to a great extent* ($M = 15.96$ out of a

maximum of 20), with the mean just shy of *to a great extent*. While the mean is high, indicating

that educators taught about cultural diversity considerably, there were educators who indicated that they taught about cultural diversity *very little*. Educators who participated in the survey also reported that they taught about racial diversity to a great extent ($M = 16.12$, Tables 7 and 8). Only one participant indicated that they taught about racial diversity *very little* and the rest of the participants indicated that they taught about racial diversity *somewhat* or *to a great extent*. These findings were interesting but not necessarily surprising, as multicultural art originated to combat racism in schooling (Sleeter & Grant, 1987). Over half of the participants indicated that they need more of the following resources to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures (Table 9): education/training about racially diverse artists and cultures (57.5%), education/training on how to facilitate positive discussions about racially diverse artists and cultures (61.6%), education/training on how to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures (56.2%) and visual resources (63%). Of these findings, the largest percentage of respondents indicated that they needed more visual resources to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures and more education/training on how to facilitate positive discussions about racially diverse artists and cultures, in that order.

Through the last research question, I explored the relationship between educators' self-reported data and the dependent variables. Statistically significant findings were notable but limited. Because the research question addressed a range of variables, conclusions are listed below:

1. There was some indication that race may be related to the level of importance that educators valued discussions about race and culture. However, because the sample size of educators of color was small ($n = 12$), a future study is needed to confirm these findings.

2. Participating educators who had taught for 21+ years indicated that discussions about racial/cultural diversity were *very important* compared to participants who taught 0–10 years, who reported that discussions about racial/cultural diversity were less important. The difference was almost 2.5 points, which translates to a 12.5% increase in the mean.

3. Participants who taught in school populations that had a larger minority population (0–40% White students) valued discussions about racial/cultural diversity more than those who taught in predominantly White schools (71–100% White students).

4. The more that the participants were familiar with multicultural terms, the more they reported teaching about racial diversity in their curricula. These data seem closely related to the findings from research question 3, in which a majority of the participants indicated that they needed additional education or training to introduce more racial and cultural diversity into their classrooms.

5. Participating educators who had taken higher art education courses that highlighted theories (those that emphasized diversity and those that did not) were more likely to teach about cultural diversity in their classrooms. While the mean for those who had taken courses with theories that emphasized diversity (*M* = 17.93) was a little higher than the mean for those who had taken courses with curriculum theories (*M* = 17), both had a statistically significant positive correlation between the independent and dependent variable. There was a 1.5-point (7.5%) increase in the mean (from *not emphasized* to *emphasized a great amount*) for theories that did not emphasize diversity but a higher difference (2 points or 10%) for theories that did emphasize diversity.

6. Data analysis indicated that the more comfortable participants were with leading discussions pertaining to race/cultural diversity, the more likely they were to value these discussions and

teach about racial diversity in their curricula. Unfortunately, the majority of the responses indicated that participants were only *comfortable*, rather than *very comfortable*, with these discussions. This suggests that the majority of participants were moderately comfortable leading discussions bout race and culture.. Interestingly, educator race did not seem to be an indicator of educator comfort levels, as educators of color had a distribution across the independent variable (educator comfort) that reflected the greater trend of the variable.

Implications for Teacher Training

Based on the responses collected from survey items, the findings of the study imply that educators responding to the survey have in-depth discussions about cultures, the influences of cultures on artwork, contemporary artists from different cultures, and historical artists from different cultures adequately in their classrooms. Similarly, it can also be inferred that participants teach lessons that feature artists of color, introduce artists from a range of racial backgrounds, introduce the racial backgrounds of artists, introduce contemporary artists of diverse racial backgrounds, and discuss the racial backgrounds of artists as it relates to their work *to a great extent*. Results from the data collected about resources needed (Table 8) demonstrated that participants voiced a need for further training to better teach about racially diverse artists and cultures, indicating that they need visual resources (63% of participants) and further education/training about how to facilitate positive discussions (61.6%).

Data collected from research question 4, sub question 3, *Is there a relationship between student demographics and the dependent variables*, suggests that educators who taught in more diverse populations believed that discussions about culture/race were more important than those who taught in predominantly White populations. Just as educators did during the Intergroup-Education Movement, it seems that participants believed multicultural content was more relevant

for diverse student populations. This is problematic as normalizing diversity (vs. Whiteness) should be an integral part of all students' educations—not just for minority students. Furthermore, these data indicate an integral misunderstanding of the purpose of multicultural education. Results from research question 4, sub question 5, suggest that educators who were very familiar with multicultural terminology ($M = 17.07$) were more likely to teach about racial diversity than those were familiar ($M = 15.89$). Finally, results from research question 4, sub question 7, imply that educator comfort is directly correlated to the extent that educators teach about racial diversity in their classrooms.

These results provide some implications for future teacher training. A central theme that seems to connect the implications from research question 4 is the extent to which educators value racially/culturally diverse content in their curricula. Educators who had had exposure to and were familiar with multicultural theories seemed to value and integrate racially/culturally diverse artists into their curriculum more than those who did not. This trend can also be seen in educators' perceptions of the relevance of multicultural lessons for their students based on students' racial demographics. Based on the evidence, increased support is needed for current teachers. Specifically, an emphasis on the philosophical underpinnings of multicultural content and the impact of racial/cultural diversity in curricula is necessary. For educators to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures, they must value the impact that such representation can have on their students. Finally, educators indicated that additional supports are needed to implement more diverse content in their curricula. From the data collected from the respondents, I believe that resources such as professional development opportunities, vetted or reviewed content about racially diverse artists/cultures, and opportunities to explore conversations about racial/cultural

diversity to a greater depth may help provide educators the supports that they need to implement more diverse content in their curricula.

Implications for Research

This research project provided a foundation for understanding a small population of art educators' current multicultural classroom practices. To better understand the depth of cultural practices, a specific survey measuring cultural competence should be implemented. Furthermore, to better measure how educators discuss culture, a survey measuring cultural competency should be implemented. Similarly, identifying whether educators discuss power, social inequities, and other intersections of identity that are affected by race is important. A future study measuring the extent to which educators understand and discuss power (im)balances affected by race would be insightful. Potential populations could include educators from different geographic locations (rural, urban, suburban) as well as diverse student demographics. Finally, to better understand how educators define good multicultural practices, a document analysis of multicultural lessons from educators would provide more insight to current multicultural practices.

The findings of this research project indicate that there is room to further explore some of the educators' self-reported variables and the extent to which they teach about racially diverse artists and cultures, including student demographics or years taught. A future study that examines why educators value culturally/racially diverse content in schools with majority students of color could provide insight into how they understand the goals of multicultural art education. Most importantly, these results point to whether preservice teachers have, and to what extent, training in these areas. A future study examining preservice teacher coursework would provide a better understanding of how preservice educators are being prepared to teach multicultural content.

Limitations

The most notable limitation to this study is the sample size ($N = 74$). Although there is no simple way to measure the exact number of participants that would have been ideal for this research project, too small of a sample size may not adequately represent the population being studied (McMillan, 2004). The second limitation was in the selection process: survey participants were a convenience sample and recruited from NAEA membership. Participants may have felt obligated to respond and/or may not be an accurate reflection of the greater population of art educators. Another limitation of this study is in the nature of self-reported data. Research questions 1 and 2 measured the extent to which educators taught about racial and cultural diversity; there could be variations in terms of how the participants interpreted the depth of how they teach about racial and cultural diversity and what the terms of the survey mean. Depending on the educator, their interpretations and evaluation of their own teaching practices can vary. Furthermore, survey participants may have felt pressured to answer more positively or progressively about their teaching practices because they were a part of a study. Finally, a main threat to external validity was the treatment of the measure. If participants did not finish the survey, there was no option for them to return and finish at a later time. However, we can surmise from these data that participating educators recognized a need for additional resources to teach about racial/cultural diversity and the more that the participants were familiar with racial/cultural content, the more likely they were to implement curricula that addressed racial/cultural diversity.

Conclusions

Through this project, I was able to get a glimpse into the classroom practices of K–12 art educators who are NAEA members. While future research may point to data that supports or

refutes these findings, the results indicating that educators need additional supports and are more likely to implement racially/culturally diverse content offer important insights into how higher education can better support teachers. With continued support and education, art educators might be able to implement lessons that are racially/culturally diverse and begin discussions about power and social inequities within their classrooms.

References

Acuff, J. B. (2014a). (Mis)Information highways: A critique of online resources for multicultural art education. *International Journal of Education Through Art*, *3*(30), 303–316.

Acuff, J. B. (2014b). (Re)constructing cultural conceptions and practices in art education: An action research study. *Visual Arts Research*, *40*(2), 67–78.

Acuff, J. B. (2015). Failure to operationalize: Investing in critical multicultural art education. *Journal of Social Theory in Art Education*, *35*, 30–43.

Acuff, J. B. (2016). "Being" a critical multicultural pedagogue in the art education classroom. *Critical Studies in Education*, *59*(1), 35–53.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alden, D. (2001). Multicultural art education's illusion of equity. *Journal of Social Theory in Art Education*, *21*, 25–46.

Alesandrini, J. (1999). *Integrating the arts: A nationwide survey of current practices in K–8 visual art education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Alim, H. S., & Paris, D. (2017). What is culturally sustaining pedagogy and why does it matter? In H.S. Alim & D. Paris (Eds.), *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 1–21). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Anderson, T. (1996). The national standards for art education: A (multi)cultural assessment. *Studies in Art Education*, *38*(1), 55–60.

Anderson, T., Eisner, E., & McRorie, S. (1998). A survey of graduate study in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *40*(1), 8–25.

Aragón, O. R., Dovidio, J. F., & Graham, M. J. (2017). Colorblind and multicultural ideologies are associated with faculty adoption of inclusive teaching practices. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *10*(3), 201–215.

Aragona-Young, E., & Sawyer, B. E. (2018). Elementary teachers' beliefs about multicultural education practices. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *24*(5), 465–486.

Armstrong, C. (1970). Black inner city child art: A phantom concept? *Art Education*, *23*(5), 16–35.

Au, W. (Ed.). (2014). *Rethinking multicultural education: Teaching for racial and cultural justice* (2nd ed.). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Bailey, C., & Desai, D. (2005). Visual art and education: Engaged visions of history and community. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *7*(1), 39–43.

Bain, C., Newton, C., Kuster, D., & Milbrandt, M. (2010). How do novice art teachers define and implement meaningful curriculum? *Studies in Art Education*, *51*(3), 233–247.

Ballengee-Morris, C., Daniels, V. A. H., & Stuhr, P. (2008). Social justice through curriculum: Investigating issues of diversity. In R. Mason & T. Esca (Eds.), *International dialogues in art education* (pp. 81–96). Bristol, UK: Intellect Books Ltd.

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

Banks, C. A. M. (1995a). Intellectual leadership and the influence of early African American scholars on multicultural education. *Educational Policy*, *9*(3), 260–280.

Banks, J. (1995b). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3–24). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Banks, J. (1977). The implication of multicultural education for teacher education. In F. Klassen & D. Gollnick (Eds.), *Pluralism and the American teacher: Issues and case studies* (pp. 1–30). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Banks, J. (1981/1988). *Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Banks, J. (1996a). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge, and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 30–45). New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. (1996b). The African American roots of multicultural education. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge, and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 30–45). New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2015). Multicultural education. In J.D. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 18–21). New York, NY: Elsevier Ltd.

Bequette, J. W. (2009). Tapping a postcolonial community's cultural capital: Empowering Native artists to engage more fully with traditional culture and their children's art education. *Visual Arts Research*, *35*(1), 76–90.

Blandy, D., & Congdon, K. (1988). Multi-cultural art education a multi-cultural symposium on appreciating and understanding the arts. *Art Education*, *41*(6), 20–24.

Bloom, K. (1964). Educational media for insight and understanding. *Art Education*, *17*(5), 14–16.

Bode, P., & Fenner, D. (2018, March). *Racial literacy and culturally sustaining pedagogies: Continuing to break down racial divides and discipline boundaries.* Presented at the National Art Education Association Conference, Seattle, WA.

Bolton, S. L. (1969). An introductory study of art as creative learning for the rural culturally disadvantaged. *Studies in Art Education*, *10*(2), 50–56.

Brooks, J. (2012). *Black school, white school: Racism and educational (mis)leadership*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Buda, S., Fedorenko, J., & Sheridan, M. A. (2012). The business of art education: A fairytale adventure. *Art Education*, *65*(2), 6–14.

Buffington, M. L., & Sutters, J. P. (2017). Access and barriers: The publications and resources that NAEA members use. *Visual Arts Research*, *43*(2), 91–106.

Burton, D. (1998). Survey of current research in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *39*(2), 183–186.

Burton, D. (2001). How do we teach? Results of a national survey of instruction in secondary art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *42*(2), 131–145.

Byrd, C. (2018). A measure of school racial socialization and quality of intergroup interactions. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.vcu.edu/10.1037/cdp0000202

Chalmers, F. G. (1974). A cultural foundation for education in the arts. *Art Education*, *27*(1), 20–25.

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

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

Choi, C. (2002). *A web-mediated multicultural model for preservice art education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

Cohen, H. L. (1968). Design and alienated youth. *Art Education*, *21*(6), 24–45+31.

Cohen, E. (1969a). Color me black. *Art Education*, *22*(4), 7–9.

Cohen, H. (1969b). In support of human behavior. *Art Education*, *22*(7), 10–40.

Collier, J. (2010). *Using SPSS syntax: A beginner's guide.* Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Congdon, K. G., Stewart, M., & White, J. H. (2002). Mapping identity for curriculum work. In Y. Gaudelius & P. Spiers (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in art education* (pp. 108–118). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *70*, 143–150.

Derby, J. (2011). Disability studies and art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *52*(2), 94–111.

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

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

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

Dewhurst, M. (2010). An inevitable question: Exploring the defining features of social justice art education. *Art Education*, *63*(5), 6–13.

Diamond, F. R. (1969). The effectiveness of a children's workshop in the creative arts in forwarding personal and intellectual development. *Studies in Art Education*, *11*(1), 52–60.

Dobbs, S. M. (1989). Discipline-based art education: Some questions and answers. *NASSP Bulletin*, *73*(517), 7–13.

Efland, A. D. (1968). Some problems of structure in art and their curriculum consequences. *Studies in Art Education*, *9*(3), 2–11.

Eisner, E. W. (1969). The drawings of the disadvantaged: A comparative study. *Studies in Art Education*, *11*(1), 5–19.

Feldman, E. (1976). Art and the image of the self. *Art Education*, *29*(5), 10–12.

Fiarman, S. E. (2016). Unconscious bias: When good intentions aren't enough. *Educational Leadership*, *74*(3), 10–15.

Fink, A. (2003). *How to ask survey questions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Forman, B. I. (1968). Early antecedents of American art education: A critical evaluation of pioneer influences. *Studies in Art Education*, *9*(2), 38–51.

Foster, R. (1967). From whose perspective? *Art Education*, *20*, 12–15.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gibson, M. A. (1976). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *7*, 7–18.

Glaeser, W. (1973). Art, concepts of reality, and the consequences of "the celebration of peoples." *Studies in Art Education*, *15*(1), 34–43.

Gogal, K., Brunner, M., Goetz, T., Martin, R., Ugen, S., Keller, U., Fischbach, A., & Preckel, F. (2014). "My questionnaire is too long!" The assessments of motivational-affective constructs with three-item and single-item measures. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 39,* 188-205.

Gold, M. (1974). *A survey of elementary art instruction in open education* (Unpublished master's thesis). Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven, CT.

Gotanda, N. (1995). A critique of "our constitution is color-blind." In K.Crenshaw (Ed.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 257–275). New York, NY: New York Press.

Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1989). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Grigsby, J. E., Jr. (1997). People of color, their changing role in the NAEA. In J. A. Michael (Ed.), *The National Art Education Association: Our history-celebrating 50 years 1947–1997* (pp. 167–179). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Grossman, M., & Torrance, E. P. (1970). A creativity workshop for disadvantaged children. *Art Education*, *23*(5), 32–35.

Gruner, S. (1957). Art education and adolescence/L'éducation artistique et l'adolescence. *Art Education*, *10*(1), 13–15.

Hartas, D. (2010). Quantitative research as a method of inquiry in education. In D. Hartas (Ed.), *Educational research and inquiry: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (pp. 65–81). New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Heise, D. (2010). Folk art in the urban art room. *Art Education*, *63*(5), 62–67.

Henry, G. (1995). *Determining the reliability and validity of the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Heussenstamm, F. K. (1969). Digest and review: A seminar on the role of the arts in meeting the social and educational needs of the disadvantaged. *Studies in Art Education*, *11*(1), 34–43.

Holloway, D. L., & Krensky, B. (2001). Introduction: The arts, urban education, and social change. *Education and Urban Society*, *33*(4), 354–365.

Hoopes, D. S., & Pusch, M. D. (1981). Definition of terms. In M.D. Pusch (Ed.), *Multicultural education: A cross cultural training approach* (pp. 1–8). Chicago, IL: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Howe, W., & Lisi, P. (1995). Beyond diversity awareness: Action strategies for adult education. *Adult Learning*, *6*(5), 19–31.

Hsieh, K. (2016). Preservice art teachers' attitudes toward addressing LGBTQ issues in their future classrooms. *Studies in Art Education*, *57*(2), 120–138.

Hudson, R. (1970). Afro-American art: A bibliography. *Art Education*, *23*(6), 20–25.

Hunter-Doniger, T. (2018). "But he looks like me. I never saw an artist look like that": Making connections to social justice through art. *Art Education*, *71*(1), 17–19.

Ianni, F. A. J. (1968). The arts as agents for social change: An anthropologist's view. *Art Education*, *21*(7), 15–20.

Ighodaro, E., & Wiggan, G. (2013). *Curriculum violence: America's new civil rights issue*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova.

Irizarry, J. (2007). Ethnic and urban Intersections in the classroom: Latino students, hybrid identities, and culturally responsive pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *9*(3), 21–28.

Janoff, B. (1976). Facilitating interdisciplinary learning. *Art Education*, *29*(8), 15–16.

Jensen, B., Whiting, E. F., & Chapman, S. (2018). Measuring the multicultural dispositions of preservice teachers. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *36*(2), 120–135.

Kaelin, E. (1969). Are "behavioral objectives" consistent with social goals of aesthetic education? *Art Education*, *22*(8), 4–11.

Kamhi, M. M. (2003). Where's the art in today's art education? *Art Education Policy Review*, *104*(4), 9–12.

Kamhi, M. M. (2004). Rescuing art from visual culture studies. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *106*(1), 25.

Kamhi, M. M. (2006). Modernism, postmodernism, or neither? A fresh look at "fine art." *Arts Education Policy Review*, *107*(5), 31–38.

Kamhi, M. M. (2007). Why teach art?: Reflections on Efland's art and cognition. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *108*(4), 33–40

Kamhi, M. M., & Torres, L. (2008). What about the other face of contemporary art? *Art Education*, *61*(2), 53–58.

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

Krings, A., Austic, E. A., Gutiérrez, L. M., & Dirksen, K. E. (2015). The comparative impacts of social justice educational methods on political participation, civic engagement, and multicultural activism. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *48*(3), 403–417.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Culturally relevant teaching: The key to making multicultural education work. In C.A. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream* (pp. 106–121). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, *34*(3), 159–165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465–491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Is the team all right?: Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *56*(3), 229–234.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 74–84.

Lampela, L. (2001). Lesbian and gay artists in the curriculum: A survey of art teachers' knowledge and attitudes. *Studies in Art Education*, *42*(2), 146–162.

Lanier, V. (1970). Art and the disadvantaged. *Art Education*, *23*(9), 7–12.

Lanier, V. (1974/75). Conception and priority in art education research. *Studies in Art Education*, *16*(1), 26–30.

Lauer, P. A. (2006). *An education research primer: How to understand, evaluate, and use it.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint.

La Porte, A. M., Speirs, P., & Young, B. (2008). Art curriculum influences: A national survey. *Studies in Art Education*, *49*(4), 358–370.

Lee, N. (2012). Culturally responsive teaching for 21st-century art education: Examining race in a studio art experience. *Art Education*, *65*(5), 48–53.

Littleford, L. N., & Jones, J. A. (2017). Framing and source effects on White college students' reactions to racial inequity information. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *23*(1), 143–153.

López, V. (2009). The hyphen goes where? Four stories of the dual-culture experience in the art classroom. *Art Education*, *62*(5), 19–24.

Martinelli, A. (2017). *Teacher candidates' awareness of their intentions, attitudes, and perceptions regarding teaching children of color in urban communities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Widener University, Chester, PA.

McAllister, G., & Irvine, J. (2000). Cross cultural competence and multicultural teacher education. *Review of Educational Research*, *70*(1), 3–24.

McMillan, J. H. (2004). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

McWhinnie, H. J. (1972). A note on methodology in using children's figure drawing to assess racial and cultural differences. *Studies in Art Education*, *13*(2), 30–33.

Mena, J. A., & Rogers, M. R. (2017). Factors associated with multicultural teaching competence: Social justice orientation and multicultural environment. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *11*(2), 61–68.

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

Miner, B. (2016). Taking multicultural, anti-racist education seriously: An interview with Enid Lee. In W. Au (Ed.), *Rethinking multicultural education* (pp. 10–15). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Moule, J. (2012). *Cultural competence: A primer for educators* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

National Art Education Association. (2001). *A national survey: Secondary art education*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Neperud, R. W. (1969). Visual arts instruction in primitive societies: Its implications for art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *10*(2), 12–26.

Newman, A. (1970). Promoting intercultural understanding through art. *Art Education*, *23*(1), 18–20.

Nichols, L. (2010). *Assessing multicultural art education: What approaches are currently being used in Virginia public high schools?* (Unpublished master's thesis). Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2018). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (7th ed.). London, UK: Pearson.

Obiokor, P. (2002). *A study of secondary art teachers' knowledge, interpretation, and implementation of major art education reform initiatives with implications for art teacher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(3), 93–97.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 85–100.

Pellish, J. (2012). Past, present, future: Stories of identity in an elementary art room. *Art Education*, *65*(1), 19–24.

Pfeiler-Wunder, A., Buffington, M., Rao, S., & Sutters, J. (2017). Research is . . . Results from a national survey. *Art Education*, *70*(2), 8–15.

Pratte, R. (1983). Multicultural education: Four normative arguments. *Educational Theory*, *33*, 21–32.

Ponterotito, J., Baluch, S., Greig, T., & Rivera, L. (1998). Development and initial score validation of the Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *58*(6), 1002–1016.

Povey, J. (1969). African art in the classroom. *Art Education*, *22*(4), 13–26.

Reisburg, M. (2008). Finding value(s) for a currency of caring: Exploring children's picture books, a dollar bill, and fine art sources. *Art Education, 61*(6), 41–47.

Renick, P.A. (1972). An assessment of perception and reasoning among Negro and White third, fourth, and fifth grade students. *Studies in Art Education*, *14*(1), 24–46.

Rennels, M.R. (1969). Two methods of teaching spatial tasks to disadvantaged Negroes. *Studies in Art Education*, *11*(1), 44–51.

Rios, J. (1948). Art materials and intergroup relations. *Art Education*, *1*(5), 1–6.

Roche, A. M. (1996). Carter G. Woodson and the development of transformative scholarship. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge, and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 91–114). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rufo, D. (2011). Allowing artistic agency in the elementary classroom. *Art Education*, *64*(3), 18–23.

Schellin, P. (1973). Is it Wilshire Boulevard which is ugly or is it we? *Art Education*, *26*(9), 6–9.

Seidler, C. O. (2011). Fighting disability stereotypes with comics: "I cannot see you, but I know you are staring at me." *Art Education*, *64*(6), 20–23.

Shin, R. (2010). Why does the Buddha laugh? Exploring ethnic visual culture. *Art Education*, *63*(3), 33–39.

Silverman, R. (1966). Watts, the disadvantaged, and art education. *Art Education*, *19*(3), 17–20.

Silverman, R. H. (1971). What research tells us about motivating students for art activity. *Art Education*, *24*(5), 27–31.

Silverman, R. H., Hoepfner, R., & Hendricks, M. (1969). Developing and evaluating art curricula for disadvantaged youth. *Studies in Art Education*, *11*(1), 20–33.

Simons, A. P. (1972). Viktor Lowenfeld and social haptics. *Art Education*, *25*(6), 8–15.

Sions, H. K. (2018). K-Pop and critical multicultural art education. *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education*, *35,* 44–54.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*, *57*(4) 421–444.

Sleeter, C. E., & McLaren, P. L. (1995). Introduction: Exploring connections to build a critical multiculturalism. In C. E. Sleeter & P.L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference* (pp. 5–32). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Smith, R. A. (1975). Cultural services, the aesthetic welfare, and educational research. *Studies in Art Education*, *16*(2), 5–11.

Spanierman, L. B., Oh, E., Heppner, P. P., Neville, H. A., Mobley, M., Wright, C. V., . . .
Navarro, R. (2011). The Multicultural Teaching Competency Scale: Development and
initial validation. *Urban Education*, *46*(3), 440–464.

Strauch-Nelson, W. (2008). Emaki: Japanese picture scrolls. *Art Education*, *61*(3), 25–32.

Stokrocki, M., & Eldridge, L. (2009). Preadolescents reflect on their drawings of dance:
Students' voices in art learning. *Art Education*, *62*(4), 6–12.

Stout, C. J. (1997). Multicultural reasoning and the appreciation of art. *Studies in Art Education*,
38(2), 96–111.

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

Stuhr, P. L. (2003). A tale of why social and cultural content is often excluded from art
education: And why it should not be. *Studies in Art Education*, *44*(4), 301–314.

Taylor, A. (1975). The cultural roots of art education: A report and some models. *Art Education*,
28(5), 8–13.

Thomas, S. (2004). *Using web and paper questionnaires for data-based decision making: From
design to interpretation of the results.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tomhave, R. (1995). Value bases underlying conceptions of multicultural education: Analysis of
selected literature in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *34*(1), 48–60.

Toyoshima, N. (1973). An annotated bibliography of the arts of the Far East: The arts of China,
Korea, Japan. *Art Education*, *26*(3), 16–21.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2018). *About race.* Retrieved from
https://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html

Walton, B. J. (1999). A survey of multicultural art experiences and teachers' attitudes regarding
multicultural art experiences in Illinois middle level schools (Unpublished doctoral
dissertation). Illinois State University, Normal, IL.

Wang, K. T., Castro, A. J., & Cunningham, Y. L. (2014). Are perfectionism, individualism, and
racial color-blindness associated with less cultural sensitivity? Exploring diversity
awareness in White prospective teachers. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *7*(3),
211–225.

Westby-Gibson, D. (1968). New perspectives for art education: Teaching the disadvantaged. *Art
Education*, *21*(8), 21–24.

Wilson, D. (1963). Art in the difficult school: A Study. *Art Education*, *16*(6), 4–8, 28.

Appendix A

IRB approval letter

Office of Research and Innovation
Office of Research Subjects Protection
BioTechnology Research Park
800 East Leigh Street, Suite 3000
Box 980568
Richmond, Virginia 23298-0568

(804) 828-0868
Fax: (804) 827-1448

TO: Courtnie Wolfgang

        Hannah Sions

CC: Courtnie Wolfgang

FROM: VCU IRB Panel A

RE: Courtnie Wolfgang ; IRB HM20012462 Critical Race Theory in the Art Classroom

On 6/7/2018 the referenced research study *qualified for exemption* according to 45 CFR 46.101(b), **category 2**.

The information found in the electronic version of this study's smart form and uploaded documents now represents the currently approved study, documents, and HIPAA pathway (if applicable). You may access this information by clicking the Study Number above.

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Subjects Protection (ORSP) or the IRB reviewer(s) assigned to this study.

The reviewer(s) assigned to your study will be listed in the History tab and on the study workspace. Click on their name to see their contact information.

Attachment – Conditions of Exempt Approval

Appendix B

Survey

The purpose of this survey is to measure the extent that practicing art educators teach about racially diverse artists and cultures in their curriculum.

The first 5 questions relate to culture. For the purposes of this survey, culture is defined as **distinct social patterns, achievements, values, and other human components that are unique to a human group that distinguishes it from other groups including religion, clothing, and customs.**

1. To what extent do you teach multicultural lessons?
    a. To a great extent
    b. Somewhat
    c. Very little
    d. Not at all

2. To what extent do you have in depth discussions with your students about these **cultures**?
    a. To a great extent
    b. Somewhat
    c. Very little
    d. Not at all

3. To what extent do you have in depth discussions with your students about how these **cultures** influence the art you are viewing?
    a. To a great extent
    b. Somewhat
    c. Very little
    d. Not at all

4. To what extent do you have in depth discussions with your students about **contemporary** artists from a variety of **cultures**?
    a. To a great extent
    b. Somewhat
    c. Very little
    d. Not at all

5. When discussing **culture** with your students, to what extent do you introduce specific, **historical** artists from the culture being discussed?
   a. To a great extent
   b. Somewhat
   c. Very little
   d. Not at all

The next 5 questions relate to race. For the purpose of the survey, race is defined as **a socially constructed concept where large groups of individuals are categorized and identified by perceived physical characteristics including Asian, Black, White, etc.**

6. To what extent do you teach lessons that feature artists of color?
   a. To a great extent
   b. Somewhat
   c. Very little
   d. Not at all

7. To what extent do you introduce artists from a range of **racial** backgrounds into your lessons?
   a. To a great extent
   b. Somewhat
   c. Very little
   d. Not at all

8. To what extent do you introduce the **racial background** of artists in lessons?
   a. To a great extent
   b. Somewhat
   c. Very little
   d. Not at all

9. To what extent do you introduce **contemporary** artists from a range of **racial backgrounds** in lessons?
   a. To a great extent
   b. Somewhat
   c. Very little
   d. Not at all

10. To what extent do you discuss with your students the artist's **racial background** in depth as it relates to the artist's work?
    a. To a great extent
    b. Somewhat
    c. Very little
    d. Not at all

11. For the following questions, please indicate the level of importance of the following areas for discussion within your curriculum:

	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important
Discussions about cultural diversity				
Discussions about racial diversity				
Discussions about historical events pertaining to race				
Discussions about current events pertaining to race				
Discussions about current events pertaining to culture (i.e., cultural appropriation)				

12. For the following questions, please rank your familiarity with the following terms:

	Very familiar	Familiar	Not very familiar	Not familiar at all
Multicultural Education				
Critical Race Theory				
Culturally Relevant Pedagogy				
Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy				
Culturally Sensitive Pedagogy				

13. How comfortable are you leading student discussions pertaining to the following topics?

	Very Comfortable	Comfortable	Not Comfortable	Not at all comfortable
Race				
Culture				

The purpose of the following 14 questions is to be able to describe the group of respondents to the survey:

14. What is your racial background?
   a. American Indian/Alaska Native

b. Asian
c. Black/African American
d. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
e. White
f. Hispanic (any race)
g. Multiracial/Biracial
h. Other

15. What is your ethnic background?
   a. Hispanic or Latino/a
   b. Not Hispanic or Latino/a
   c. Prefer not to answer

16. What is your gender identity?
   a. Male-identified
   b. Female-identified
   c. Non-binary/Gender non-conforming
   d. Prefer not to answer

17. Mark all that apply to your school:
   a. Public School
   b. Private School
   c. Charter School
   d. Magnet School
   e. Homeschool
   f. Other (fill in blank)

18. How many years have you been teaching in a school? (Fill in blank)

19. What grades do you currently teach (Check all that apply)?
   a. Elementary
   b. Middle
   c. High

20. Are you required to follow a curriculum framework?
   a. Yes, with guidelines mandated by state and/or local curricula
   b. No
   c. Other: _____

21. **Approximately** what percentage of the student population are (fill in with approximate percentages):
   a. Asian
   b. Black/African American
   c. White
   d. Hispanic (any race)
   e. American Indian/Alaska Native

f. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
g. Other

22. Is your school:
   a. Rural
   b. Urban
   c. Suburban

23. Is your school overseas/military?
   a. Yes
   b. No

24. Please check the degrees (major) that you hold and in each area:

	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
Studio Art			
Art Education			
Art History			
Education			
Other (Fill in blank)			

25. Thinking about your ***ENTIRE*** higher ed program, how many courses did you take that emphasized race/culture (e.g., readings, discussions, theoretical considerations)? (Fill in blank)

26. Thinking about your entire higher ed program, how many ***art education*** courses did you take that emphasized race/culture (e.g., readings, discussions, theoretical considerations)? (Fill in blank)

27. Please check the extent to which the following areas of theory/research was emphasized in your art education coursework?

	Emphasized a great amount	Emphasized somewhat	Not emphasized
Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE)			
Inquiry-based Art Education			
Teaching Artistic Behaviors (TAB/Choice)			

Child-centered learning			
Multicultural education			
Culturally relevant pedagogy			
Culturally sustaining pedagogy			
Culturally sensitive pedagogy			
Design Thinking			
Issues-based art education			
Big Ideas			
Visual Culture Art Education			
Creativity			
Critical Race Theory			
Other (Fill in blank)			

28. What kinds of resources would you find most helpful in teaching about racially diverse artists and cultures? (check all that apply)
    a. Visual resources
    b. Financial
    c. Education/training on how to teach about racially diverse artists and cultures
    d. Education/training about how to facilitate positive discussions
    e. Education/training about racially diverse artist and cultures
    f. Parental support of racially diverse artists and cultural content
    g. Other (Fill in blank)
    h. I feel confident in my ability to teach about race and culture without additional resources

If you would like to add additional comments on this subject, please do so in the space below: