

Studies in Art Education

Forget this Commentary Too: Cultivating an Anti-Possessive, Non-Essentialist, and Anti-Edgy Approach to Art Education Scholarship

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	Forget this Commentary Too: Cultivating an Anti-Possessive, Non-Essentialist, and Anti-Edgy Approach to Art Education Scholarship
Article Type:	Commentary
Abstract:	Art education scholars have been critiqued for not sufficiently engaging in the field's scholarly conversations from the past through citation. In the late 1990s, Mary Hafelli explained this institutional amnesia through three factors: the nausea of information flow, disciplinary fragmentation, and the desire to be temporally edgy. In this paper, I analyse how market dynamics and politics of knowledge condition this amnesia. As a result, I theorise how and why I am shifting my graduate teaching to cultivate art education scholars who are anti-possessive, non-essentialist, and anti-edgy.
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Keywords:	Institutional Amnesia; Citation; Citation Politics; Graduate Education; Graduate Teaching; Critical Whiteness; Art Education

Forget this Commentary Too:

Cultivating an Anti-Possessive, Non-Essentialist, and Anti-Edgy Approach
to Art Education Scholarship

Dr. Tyler Denmead

University Lecturer of Arts and Creativity in Education

University of Cambridge (Queens' College)

Word count: 2,442 words

Author note: Professors Kryssi Staikidis and Dónal O'Donoghue were generous with comments, suggestions, and encouragement as I wrote drafts of this commentary. I will be a better teacher for it. Thank you. I would also like to thank the graduate students who attended the Arts, Creativity, and Education Masters programme at Cambridge during the 2019-2020 academical year. This paper does not make it sufficiently clear how the ideas presented here emerged through (and were demanded by!) my interactions with them. Thank you.

**Forget this Commentary Too:
Cultivating an Anti-Possessive, Non-Essentialist, and Anti-Edgy Approach to Art
Education Scholarship**

Dr. Tyler Denmead

In 2009, Mary Hafeli theorized our field's "lack of regard for antecedents in art education scholarship" (p. 370).¹ She explained this phenomenon through three factors: the nausea of information flow, disciplinary fragmentation, and the desire to be *hypercurrent* (Hafeli, 2009).² Her analysis interested me after reviewing for *Studies* during the past year. Reviewers have encouraged authors, often early career, to engage with scholarly conversations in art education from the distant to more recent past. This repetition suggested that "institutional amnesia" still characterises our scholarship (Hafeli, 2009, p. 375). Here, I analyse how market dynamics and politics of knowledge condition this amnesia, and why I am shifting my graduate teaching to cultivate scholars who are anti-possessive, non-essentialist, and anti-edgy.

Nausea

¹ Hafeli (2009, p. 372) found a lack of engagement amongst art education scholars in the early twenty-first century with scholarly conversations from the mid-twentieth. She counted the frequency of pre-1970 citational references in 100 articles published in *Studies* during the preceding five years; she found that only three percent of these articles' 1449 references cited papers that were published between 1950 and 1970.

² "Scholarly oblivion" has been observed throughout art education's history as a discipline (see Grodoski, Wilcox, & Goss, 2017) for a useful review. Scholars have also shown how genealogical and data visualisation methods can be productive in mapping and tracing the scholarly conversations of our field to address this lack of regard. Doug Blandy (2008), for example, called for formal genealogical projects to support scholars in the field with their "enduring appreciation, affection, and critical orientation to the myriad and complex networks of relationships that define who we are as individuals and as a collective" (p. 4-5). Justin Sutters (2017) used data visualisation techniques to trace the academic lineage of art education scholars; his rhizomatic approach shows potential in that it allows for a more dynamic and relational understanding of scholarly conversations than, say concepts such as "fragmentation" or "idiosyncrasy." Similarly, Juan Carlos Castro and Clayton Funk (2016) used data visualisation techniques to analyse the trajectory of themes at National Art Education Association conventions between 2000 and 2015. Their approaches seem particularly useful in glimpsing how scholarly priorities are framed rhetorically over time, which might point to possible institutional silences and exclusions. Finally, Chris Grodoski, Libba Wilcox, and Samantha Gross (2017) use network analysis and data visualisation techniques to show how different network forms—star, circle, line—point to the interconnection (or lack thereof) of scholarly pursuits. Scholars can draw upon these methodological approaches to reflect on how particular articles in this journal are connected (or not), what those connections (or lack thereof) might say about whose/what interests are served, and what connections they may want to establish in their own scholarship.

1 The massive flow and retrievability of information is nauseating; perhaps we must
2 forget the past to cope with keeping up. Conditions in higher education for art educators have
3 also become nauseating for other reasons. The marketisation of public education has drawn
4 into question the university's role in educating and/or licensing public school art teachers.³
5 This pressure may be having knock-on effects, including decreased student demand for art
6 education programs and academic jobs for doctoral graduates. Now, increased competition
7 for fewer permanent academic jobs means rising publication expectations in shorter time
8 frames. The time to engage with literature, to allow for ideas to mature, and for new lines of
9 time-consuming research to materialise, feels like the privilege of the past.⁴
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 How scholars remember through citation has become increasingly important as a
22 metric of impact amidst these conditions, with implications for hiring, promotion and tenure
23 despite little attention given to the size and reach of a field. Informal agreements whereby
24 scholars cite each other's work is a rational, albeit cynical, response to gaming this market.
25 Such practices have been critiqued for bolstering voices considered to be authoritative within
26 white supremacist, patriarchal, and heteronormative knowledge systems (see Mott &
27 Cockayne, 2017). And yet, not playing this game ignores circumstances of difference that
28 explain who can withstand precarity. Amidst these inflationary, and unevenly experienced
29 conditions, necessary and generative periods of scholarly slowdown become characterised as
30 a "stalled" research agenda in our field (see Savage, 2015).⁵
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 ³ I am primarily thinking about the rise of edTPA in the United States, which is administered by a private
49 corporation, Pearson. This development represents an erosion of the professional autonomy of art education as a
50 discipline, and the transformation of art education licensure into a private market. The ultimate endpoint of this
51 erosion is uncertain, and the pathway there will be contested. Nonetheless, this development does appear to
52 mark a new settlement that threatens the long-term viability of art education programs in universities. For
53 critical discussions of edTPA, see Bae, 2020; Holland & Sheth, 2018; and Potter, 2020. For a broader discussion
54 of the marketisation of higher education, see Denmead, 2019a.

55 ⁴ This claim should not be mistaken for nostalgia, for a call for universities to return to what they were in the
56 past. I am simply stating that the temporality of academia has changed in ways that has had the most negative
57 impacts on early career researchers.

58 ⁵ The double bind facing academics who teach doctoral students is obvious. On the one hand, teaching our
59 students to adapt to these conditions only reproduces those conditions. On the other hand, failing to teach our
60 students to adapt to these conditions risks the viability of launching an academic career.
61
62
63
64
65

1 I push against these conditions through anti-possessive scholarship. Put otherwise, I
2 do not possess ideas, or, better yet, my ideas are not my possessions. Ideas circulate in and
3 through knowledge systems that speak through and for me, and yet, for which I remain
4 responsible. This anti-territorial orientation has been informed by critical whiteness studies
5 and black feminism, which theorize the active, albeit often unconscious, investment in
6 whiteness as property (see Lipsitz, 2006; Sullivan, 2006; Harris, 1993).⁶ To view ideas as
7 possessions reproduces the hegemony of white heteromale knowledge production
8 through the ostensibly autonomous, self-sovereign, and rationale modern subject (who is
9 presumed to be a straight white man).

10 I encourage graduate students to think of themselves as scholars in relation with other
11 scholars, participating generously in the circulation of ideas through exchange, through
12 citation. The aim is not to identify "gaps" in knowledge and claim ownership over them. The
13 aim is to think through how and why gaps are manufactured through what Donna Haraway
14 (1988) called the "conquering gaze from nowhere" (p. 581).⁷ This orientation acknowledges
15 our inheritances, our ways of knowing and being that are constituted through interpretation
16 and exclusion (O'Donoghue, 2020a). Here, we can *contemplate*, as Dónal O'Donoghue
17 (2020b) puts it, by attempting "to hold space for ideas to emerge and take form" (p. 104).
18 This contemplation is *unhurried*, less driven by the need for arrival, but rather motivated by
19 the desire to "relinquish certainty, to loosen one's hold on strong beliefs" (O'Donoghue,

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

⁶ Another key influence here has been Jennifer C. Nash's (2019) critique of Black feminism's possessive orientation towards the concept of intersectionality.

⁷ This contemplative and anti-possessive approach is far different from the positivist approach that I learned as a doctoral student, which was primarily oriented towards looking for others' shortcomings as means of identifying and filling in gaps. This revised approach seems to me to be the most humane and viable response to the deteriorating and dehumanising conditions of the academy that we have inherited and that we are always at risk reproducing. It accepts that lines of intellectual travel will come and go in the field of art education, with some sustained and others forgotten. At the same time, it sees our publications and our citations as nodes in a network of relation, with an obligation to be mindful of how that network is being constructed and preserved, and whose interests are being served.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
2020a, p. 104).⁸ Through this loosened hold, an anti-possessive orientation to scholarship
abandons the notion that ideas must be digested and accumulated quickly or protected from
theft.⁹

10 **Fragmentation**

11
12 Art education scholars opt for "blazing new trails," Hafeli (2009, p. 373) argues. They
13
14 do not build upon and synthesize lines of inquiry until they establish scholarly conversations.
15
16 Our field is thus fragmented into unsustainable, forgotten subfields. Anxiety about such
17
18 fragmentation is not unique to art education. Timothy Kaufman-Osborn (2006), a professor
19
20 of political science, notes that *the* unifying concern in political science has been the "question
21
22 of whether political science is or is not a discipline" (p. 42). This anxiety is expressed through
23
24 laments about the failure to arrive at the distinct nature of the discipline's object of inquiry,
25
26 what curriculum best introduces students to the discipline, and what methods are deemed
27
28 suitable for inquiry. However, art education's "perpetual pluralism" must be considered in
29
30 relation to our field's size (Pearse, 1992, p. 250). Our field is too small to sustain numerous
31
32 subfields. Blazing new trails will thus be lonely, with metrics of impact not serving as a good
33
34 indicator of the strength of ideas. And yet, I still embrace this pluralism. I teach graduate
35
36 students that if they struggle to see how they fit in our discipline, then they should not
37
38 internalise it as failure. Art education may need their intervention but cannot see it yet.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 ⁸ My critique of the notion of "arrival" is also informed by critical whiteness studies. George Yancy, a
53
54 philosopher of whiteness, argues that white people committed to anti-racism seek to "arrive," to free themselves
55
56 from being racist. Through his transactional ontology, Yancy argues that there is no arrival as long as racism
57
58 and racialization exist, and the presumption that one can arrive presumes the detached, positivist subject that is
59
60 the product of white hegemony. See the introduction to his 2016 edited collection, *White Self-Criticality Beyond
61
62 Anti-racism: How Does It Feel to Be a White Problem?* I have also considered the notion of arrival in my paper
63
64 *White Warnings* (see Denmead, 2019b).

65
⁹ My ideas here are informed by a thread on twitter by Dr. Jonathan Rosa, a linguistic anthropologist of race in
education. See <https://twitter.com/DrJonathanRosa/status/1286381347502608384?s=20>.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Anxiety about fragmentation in art education does also relate to the marginalisation of art education in schools. If the field cannot sustain established lines of inquiry, then it cannot arrive at a robust rationale for why art should be taught and learned. That rationale is needed to counter the marginalisation of art education in schools (see, for example, Siegesmund, 1998). However, a unifying rationale is beset by essentialist theories of art and education, which assume that art and education can be valued for essences independent of social and cultural contexts (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). Moreover, preoccupation with this rationale leads to research that explains the benefits of art education through terms that have little to do with art (Biesta, 2017; Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013).

I encourage graduate students not to lament fragmentation. Instead, paraphrasing Beth Thomas (2019, p. 52), they should ask the question, "How are instances of art *educative for education*?" That question is distinct from "How and why should art be taught and learned?"¹⁰ It broadens our focus from a narrow defence of art education in schools to the broader concern of educational theory and practice. This new orientation *still* addresses the marginalisation of art education in schools (and elsewhere) because schools (and elsewhere) are imagined *otherwise*, as Maxine Greene (2010, p. 1) might put it, through the question itself.

Hypercurrency

Mary Hafeli (2009, p. 373) argued that art education scholars are forgetful because they gain currency through positioning themselves as temporally edgy, consuming and re-presenting fashionable ideas at increasing speeds.¹¹ My contribution to the temporality of art education focuses on how *hypercurrency* is entangled in art education's investment in

¹⁰ Or how and why art should be made. See Hickman, 2010.

¹¹ The temporality of art education scholarship has received considerable attention (see Tavin & Tervo, 2018; Tervo, 2017; Tavin, 2005).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
whiteness (Denmead, n.d.). For *hypercurrency* to be a thing of value, a relational construction with other temporalities is needed (e.g., traditional), which are, in turn, racialized.¹² Through this construction, *hypercurrency* provides a temporal element for art to become the presumed property of whiteness (e.g., the avant-garde is *necessarily* white).¹³ Paying attention to this construction draws into question the desirability of *hypercurrency* because it produces art education as white property.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
This critique means teaching graduate students to be consciously *unforgetful*. This approach has been well theorised in critical feminist scholarship.¹⁴ I propose that moving against the grain of *hypercurrency* also requires being anti-edgy. Cultural blogger Brian Micklethwait's observation on shock art is useful here:

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
... for the endlessly repeated claim that art is supposed to make you feel uncomfortable, I don't buy that. And I don't believe the people who say that ... are being honest. I think that a picture which they have no problem with, but which *they believe makes other people whom they disapprove of uncomfortable*, makes them *very comfortable indeed*....¹⁵

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
From here, we can conclude that being anti-edgy means *not* deriving pleasure from believing our scholarship causes discomfort in those whom we disapprove. It requires unsettling ourselves, subjecting ourselves to criticism, interrogating our complicities, acknowledging

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
¹² This idea is largely informed by Fred Moten's analysis of the whiteness of the avant-garde. See Moten, 2003, pp. 31-32.

¹³ Another element of the temporality of art education is the imagined timelessness of the white canon (see Kraehe, Gaztámbide-Fernandez, and Carpenter, 2018).

¹⁴ For example, Sara Ahmed (2017) describes citation as "feminist memory," whereby each citation of prior feminist scholarship becomes a "feminist brick" that builds dwellings for the flourishing of feminist lives (pp. 15-16).

¹⁵ I have not been able to identify the original internet source for this quote. However, it is referenced on several blogs, including <https://www.godofthemachine.com/?p=516>. I should note that I know very little about Brian Micklethwait. I merely found this quote by reading blogs on the notion of "anti-edginess," a concept that came to me as I tried to think through the opposite of hypercurrency. I am unsure of this citational practice within the context of this paper. This quote seems central to how I would like to frame my argument, yet, my engagement with Micklethwait's project, which appears to engage with popular culture, visual art and architecture, and libertarianism, is as transitory as most of my engagement with internet content.

1 what we do not yet understand, being humbled by the exclusions that haunt our work, letting
2 go of false enemies. I am not there yet. Not even close. But I teach and write based on what I
3
4 want to know and who I want to be. With little time, I teach and I write to be and to know
5
6 otherwise—the urgent responsibility that calls on us as we fashion the institutions our
7
8 students deserve.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- 1
2 Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.
3
4
5 Biesta, G. J. J. (2017). *Letting art teach* (L. Klaassen, Ed.). ArtEZ Press.
6
7 Blandy, D. (2008). Legacies and Lineages. *Studies in Art Education*, 50(1), 3–5.
8
9
10 Castro, J. C., & Funk, C. (2016). Visualizing Art Education in the Twenty-First Century:
11 Mapping the Themes of Art educators Through the NAEA Convention, c. 2000–2015.
12
13 *Visual Inquiry*, 5(2), 175–187.
14
15
16
17 Denmead, T. (n.d.). On Reckoning with the Temporality of Man in Art Education.
18
19 *Unpublished*.
20
21
22 Denmead, T. (2019a). Tier Two Worker Remote Office: Resisting the Marketization of
23
24 Higher Education. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 16(1), 6–34.
25
26
27 Denmead, T. (2019b). ‘White Warnings’. *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education*,
28
29 36(1) (2019): 108–24.
30
31
32 Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2013). Why the Arts Don’t Do Anything: Toward a New Vision
33
34 for Cultural Production in Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(1), 211–237.
35
36
37 Greene, Maxine (2010) Prologue to Art, Social Imagination and Action. *Journal of*
38
39 *Educational Controversy*, 5(1), Article 2, 1.
40
41
42 Grodoski, C., Willcox, L., & Goss, S. (2017). Visualizing Historic Networks in Studies in Art
43
44 Education. *Studies in Art Education*, 58(1), 51–68.
45
46
47 Hafeli, M. (2009). Forget This Article: On Scholarly Oblivion, Institutional Amnesia, and
48
49 Erasure of Research History. *Studies in Art Education*, 50(4), 369–381.
50
51
52 Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the
53
54 Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599.
55
56
57 Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as Property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106(8), 1707–1791.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1 Justin P. Sutters. (2017). Visualizing Art Education Scholars: Antecedents, Lineages, and
2 Pedagogical Places. *Visual Arts Research*, 43(1), 86–91.
3
4 Kaufman-Osborn, T. V. (2006). Dividing the Domain of Political Science: On the Fetishism
5 of Subfields. *Polity*, 38(1), 41–71.
6
7 Kraehe, A. M., Gaztambide-Fernández, R., & Carpenter II, B. S. (2018). The Arts as White
8 Property: An Introduction to Race, Racism, and the Arts in Education. In A. M.
9 Kraehe, B. S. Carpenter II, & R. Gaztambide-Fernandez (Eds.), *The Palgrave*
10 *Handbook of Race and the Arts in Education* (pp. 1–32). Palgrave Macmillan.
11
12 Lipsitz, G. (2006). *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from*
13 *Identity Politics*. Temple University Press.
14
15 Mott, C., & Cockayne, D. (2017). Citation Matters: Mobilizing the Politics of Citation
16 Toward a Practice of ‘Conscientious Engagement.’ *Gender, Place & Culture*, 24(7),
17 954–973.
18
19 Nash, Jennifer, C. (2019). *Black Feminism Reimagined*. Duke University Press.
20
21 O’Donoghue, D. (2020a). Inheriting Art Education. *Studies in Art Education*, 61(1), 3–9.
22
23 O’Donoghue, D. (2020b). Contemplating Art Education. *Studies in Art Education*, 61(2), 99–
24 105.
25
26 Pearse, H. (1992). Beyond Paradigms: Art Education Theory and Practice in a
27 Postparadigmatic World. *Studies in Art Education*, 33(4), 244–252.
28
29 Savage, S. L. (2015). Mapping Tenureland: A Researcher Stalled. *Studies in Art Education*,
30 57(1), 76–87.
31
32 Siegesmund, R. (1998). Why Do We Teach Art Today? Conceptions of Art Education and
33 Their Justification. *Studies in Art Education*, 39(3), 197–214.
34
35 Sullivan, S. (2006). *Revealing Whiteness: The Unconscious Habits of Racial Privilege*.
36 Indiana University Press.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Tavin, K. (2005). Opening Re-Marks: Critical Antecedents of Visual Culture in Art
2 Education. *Studies in Art Education*, 47(1), 5–22.
3
4 Tavin, K., & Tervo, J. (2018). How Soon Is Now? Post-Conditions in Art Education. *Studies*
5 *in Art Education*, 59(4), 282–296.
6
7 Tervo, J. (2017). Always the New: Paradigms and the Inherent Futurity of Art Education
8 Historiography. *Studies in Art Education*, 58(1), 69–79.
9
10 Thomas, B. A. (2019). Education After Art: A Review of *Letting Art Teach: Art Education*
11 *After Joseph Beuys*. *Studies in Art Education*, 60(1), 50–53.
12
13 Yancy, G. (2016). ‘Introduction: Un-Sutured’. In *White Self-Criticality beyond Anti-Racism:*
14 *How Does It Feel to Be a White Problem?*, edited by George Yancy, Reprint edition.,
15 xi–xxvii. Lexington Books.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65