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Abstract
This essay explores social justice commitments in dance pedagogy and dance education teacher preparation in the USA as developed through a series of conversations between two dance educators and former administrators in higher education. The authors examine the history of multiculturalism, multicultural practices in postsecondary dance, their influences on dance teacher education, and the limitations of the multiculturalism movement that emerge from misperceptions about, or disregard for differences in culture, gender, ability, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background. Dominant arguments for maintaining status quo perspectives such as scarcity of resources, accreditation standards, and tenured faculty compositions are examined in conversation with a number of prophetic voices for social justice teaching and learning. Examples of pedagogical approaches and project assignments that aim to bring social justice learning to the dance education classroom in concrete ways are presented.
Introduction

Imagine an undergraduate dance education course at the conclusion of a lively discussion on teaching in today’s public schools. The conversation has included some dramatic stories illustrating difficult challenges faced by many young people, the corresponding strengths that they also possess, and the responsibility of dance teachers in such a context. One student is looking particularly overwhelmed. When the instructor gently asks her what she is experiencing, she replies honestly, “Why can’t I just teach pliés?”

As dance educators, we can sympathize with this prospective teacher. We could easily ask a similar question related to preparing teachers of dance: Why can’t we just teach them how to teach pliés and other dance content? Isn’t that enough? After all, they are becoming dance educators. Why do they need to deal with the individual differences, personal problems, and cultural issues that their students will bring with them?

The pragmatic response is that they will not be successful in teaching dance to many of today’s students if they do not deal with all of the issues that can get in the way between the student and learning. How can they help their future students build on their strengths to manage such obstacles? Based on our own experience and the stories we hear from teachers in the field, we have to know more than dance content because this one is developmentally delayed, this one doesn’t understand English, that one is in a wheelchair. Much multicultural teacher education has tried to prepare pre-service educators for teaching students with these differences: Good teachers are expected to learn about instruction for young people from every different demographic group, to customize methodology so that all children can learn. As described below, this orientation has led to some positive developments in the field, including appreciation for the diversity that students bring and what dance can offer. Yet it often ends up leaving teachers, including ourselves, feeling overwhelmed by what sometimes seems more like a collection of different needs than a community of learners.

Not all the obstacles to learning are about disabilities and cultural differences; many are a result of students’ social and economic circumstances: This one’s brother is in prison, this one doesn’t have money for dance clothes, that one is homeless, that one’s parents are fighting, that one was raped. Teachers who care are often called to become therapists and social workers for their students. Anyone who doesn’t care doesn’t belong in the teaching profession. But those who do care often become burned out after a few years, because more students with more challenges keep coming. This situation reminds us of a fable (retold in The Blue Haze, 2007) about a man standing on shore watching bodies float down a river. Being a compassionate person, he tried to rescue those he could and bury the rest, staying so busy he never had time to ask what was going on upriver that sent so many bodies floating down.
Busy teachers, trying to do the best they can with too many students facing too many challenges, may recognize Sue Books’ analogy of education as triage (1994): We don’t give much attention to students who will be fine, or those that will never make it, and instead focus on the few that might survive with our help. We triage those kids, but never think about the system that creates these circumstances. To think about the system creating the challenges so many young people face in schools, takes us beyond thinking about individual and cultural differences to thinking about broader issues of social justice. It means we try not just to help future teachers fit into the world as it is, but to create a world that is more just, more fair, as well as one that is more compassionate.

And yet this seems such a daunting task, especially for dance educators. After all, we and our students chose this particular career because it seemed a good match between our skills and our passions. We did not choose to become politicians or community organizers. At the same time, we believe that dance educators have a role to play in creating a better world for their students to enter, and further, that failure to think about the larger social world is problematic for our students, ourselves, and our art.

This essay has developed through a conversation between two American dance educators willing to be honest with themselves, looking at their own histories as white middle class dance educators and former administrators, at or past middle age, self-defined as liberals committed to inclusivity and social justice. At different institutions with different educational contexts, we have struggled to figure out how to live our values within a larger social world that includes some quite different ideas of what that kind of world might become. Parts of our ongoing dialogue throughout this process, often incomplete, half-baked, and generally messy, are included in audio excerpts for a number of reasons. First, we seek to draw attention to collaborative thinking, learning and writing. Second, we hope to illuminate the ways in which the written word, though seemingly effortless from sentence to paragraph, from problem to possible solution, actually makes its frequently awkward and sometimes doubtful path to the printed page. Last, we believe that exposing and confessing our imperfections, inadequacies, and incomplete understandings of the world reveal more of our humanity in our struggle as educators and citizens. At the same time, readers may elect to skip these audio dialogues entirely and focus on the written essay in its more traditional scholarly form.

We will first look at the history of multiculturalism and dance education in the USA: how we have gotten to where we are today. We will emphasize practices in higher education in our country, especially those that have most influenced teacher education. Following that analysis, we will discuss some of the most-cited reasons for maintaining the status quo. We will conclude with some promising possibilities, including two from international locations, and some potential sources of energy for realizing the role of dance education in moving toward
social justice. We hope that this piece will become part of an expanding international dialogue on issues of social justice in dance education.

http://www.ijea.org/v11n6/audio/audio1.mp3

Audio Clip #1: Reflections on trying to create a better world.

Multiculturalism and Dance Education

Defining multiculturalism is often contingent upon the varied contexts in which it is discussed and deployed. In 1993, Milton Bennett proposed a Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity which has been used by many subsequent researchers to understand how students experience cultural difference. Although there has been some substantive critique of this model (see Hodges and Belcher, 2005), we find it useful here.

Bennett proposes six stages in experiencing cultural difference. He describes the first three as ethnocentric; they involve 1) denial of cultural difference, 2) raising a defense against it, or 3) minimizing its importance. The next three stages are termed ethnorelative; they involve seeking cultural difference by 4) accepting its importance, 5) adapting a perspective to take it into account, or 6) integrating the whole concept into a definition of identity. In terms of multiculturalism in the United States, Carson’s (1999) definition mirrors the integration suggested in stage six of Bennett’s model:

[M]ulticulturalism is a social and political movement and position that holds differences between individuals and groups to be a potential source of strength and renewal rather than of strife. It values the diverse perspectives people develop and maintain through varieties of experience and background stemming from racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation and/or class differences in our society. It strives to uphold the ideals of equality, equity and freedom on which the United States is based, and includes respect for individuals and groups as a principle fundamental to the success and growth of our country. (np)

Unfortunately, we have very little research on the actual practice of teaching and learning about diversity and social issues in teacher preparation (Lowenstein, 2009). However, what we do know brings up questions about effectiveness, methods, and pedagogy. Studies have shown that teachers’ beliefs and perspectives change only after lengthy and laborious professional development over time (Gomez and Tabachnick, 1992; Noordhoff and Kleinfeld, 1993 cited in Lowenstein, 2009). Multiculturalism in post secondary education during the 1990s stimulated highly-charged debates surrounding the western canon, producing conservative challenges against "political correctness" that continue today in the United States. Regardless, multicultural education and curricula received renewed attention.
We begin with dance in higher education because this is where prospective teachers of dance typically first encounter discussion about social and cultural issues in dance. During the past decade under-representation has continued to be a major theme in dance literature related to social and cultural issues (DeFrantz, 1996a, 1996b; Gottschild, 1996; Bennefield, 1999; Jackson & Shapiro-Phim, 2008; Risner, 2009). DeFrantz (1996b) notes the grave injustice of under-represented populations in major international ballet companies, while also acknowledging the powerful contributions of contemporary choreographers, such as Dwight Rhoden, David Rousseve, Ronald K. Brown, and Jawole Willa Jo Zollar, to the current wave of dance that challenges social norms. Unfortunately, efforts to make post-secondary dance more multicultural have focused nearly exclusively on exposing students to non-western forms and cultivating an appreciation of someone else’s cultural dance form. Though exposure and appreciation initiatives are important first steps, rarely do our programs adapt a multicultural perspective or integrate wider multicultural identities.

For example, we add courses to the curriculum in “global dance” rather than rethinking our assumptions about how we think of all dance. Despite the years that have passed since Joanne Kealiinohomoku’s famous essay on ballet as ethnic dance (1970), we continue to think of western dance forms as “normal,” require these courses, and then conservatively sprinkle non-western dance forms and content like exotic condiments on the traditional western meal of meat and potatoes. At best, our students who are required to take one semester of African dance will emerge with appreciation for this dance form and enough knowledge to teach a unit during Black History Month (in USA schools, the month of February), but will only rarely use their appreciation to challenge taken-for-granted assumptions about what dance is. This is primarily because we in dance education haven’t moved beyond superficial treatment of multiple cultures outside our own.

While significant dance scholarship has identified racism as a central component of ethnocentric bias in dance, it is clear that the persistence of such bias in spite of changing values and more inclusive attitudes is a more complex problem (Asante, 1993; Nicholls, 1995; Mills, 1997, Asante, 1999). Using dance of the African Diaspora as an example, Mills suggests,

In dance, as in other fields, most people are inclined to maintain or reinforce existing images because people tend to perceive information in a way that is consistent with their values. The end result, as Becker posits, is that we either
misperceive information that is not consistent with existing images in order to avoid any inconsistencies, thereby making us uncomfortable, or disregard the information altogether. Many times we simply cue ourselves to perceive information that is consistent with what we expect, believe, or know. (Mills, 1997, p. 141)

Mills’ argument characterizes the outcomes of most current multicultural efforts in dance: misperception of, or disregard for non-western forms because these images are not consistent with what dance faculty and students understand as “dance.” This western ethnocentric perspective, dominant in postsecondary dance, situates the amalgam of African dance as “primarily a somatic, “ethnic” [sic] experience compared to an aesthetic experience… outside the realm of an artistic aesthetic experience” (Mills, 1997, p. 143). As such, the art form, as well as other non-western dance styles (such as Native American, see Lutz & Kuhlman, 2000; Barry & Conlon, 2003), remains on the periphery of most dance education.

Kerr-Berry (2004), in her exploration of black content appropriation in teaching, moves this argument further in a pedagogical critique of multiculturalism in dance education:

[T]he white dance educator must immerse herself in the historical content in order to understand it before she disseminates it. She must be able to acknowledge the painful history that surrounds the content. Accordingly, as the instructor prepares, she must be able to enter African American historical content, not only as a researcher in search of information, but also as a human being capable of empathy. (p. 46)

A recent publication on dance in South African schools (Friedman, 2009) reports similar issues in teacher preparation in that country, which defines itself as “polycultural” but has also had a history of domination of white Western dance forms in educational settings. Sharon Friedman points out that African dance is not just a traditional form; rather, those traditional forms have evolved with urbanization and had impact on contemporary African choreographers and dancers. We would all be wise, we propose, to problematize our notions about what any particular dance form looks like.

With the recognition that all dance should be considered “ethnic” or cultural dance, we affirm the need for broadening student horizons to understand and appreciate the breadth of cultural dance, and for cultivating empathy. At the same time, if we stop there, such necessary steps often become ways to keep the world as it is: to put boundaries around “other” forms of dance and then congratulate ourselves for our compassionate appreciation of those who struggle. Even dance departments that attempt to substantially revise their programs with ambitious
multicultural approaches and content encounter significant obstacles entrenched in the discipline’s traditional ballet and modern dance paradigm (Hagood, 2000).

Multicultural efforts that provide exposure and cultivate appreciation, though necessary and likely well intentioned, are insufficient. So much is left out: access, representation, historical and cultural context, and the systemic biases that lie beneath continued social inequity and injustice. Simultaneously, those faculty who do this kind of challenging may, in fact, be regarded as “difficult,” “political,” or “activist.”

**Current Limitations**

At this point in our discussion, we begin to see the limitations of the multiculturalism movement and its often meager curricular impact in dance over the past thirty years in the United States, especially when we look closely at the field and the boundaries we continue to impose on “others” and their dancing. These limitations emanate from misperceptions about, or disregard for differences in culture, gender, ability, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background.

In terms of gender and ethnicity, multicultural efforts in dance have not been accompanied by a prioritization of underrepresented faculty hires or underrepresented student recruitment in dance. Statistics from institutions in the USA, collected by the Higher Education Arts Data Services (HEADS), reveal our limited progress. Undergraduate dance students remain overwhelmingly female (89%) and over seven in ten dance students are white (HEADS, 2009). As the United States has become increasingly diverse, a pattern that will accelerate as this century progresses (Gay and Howard, 2000), we wonder if or how the field will respond. How comfortable are we when dance in academe looks less and less like our neighborhoods and communities?

Trends in longitudinal data over the past four years show that post-secondary dance faculty are becoming increasingly white (80% in 2007, a steady increase from 76% in 2003). While the total Hispanic/non-white undergraduate population has fluctuated, it remained stagnant over the same period at 27-30% (HEADS, 2004, 2009). Although multicultural education in dance has grown significantly over the past decade, accompanied by an explosion of non-western scholarship, we have not seen the “trickle down effect” to our student or faculty populations.

Beyond the asymmetries of ethnicity and gender, the limitations of current multicultural efforts in postsecondary dance often ignore socioeconomic diversity and minimize differently abled populations. The ability to enter dance programs usually privileges previous training, normally extensive study in ballet and modern dance. In this respect, auditions serve as a
socioeconomic barrier, filtering out students whose backgrounds have not allowed access to formal dance training. From the outset, these sorting mechanisms build homogenous programs as they simultaneously reduce diversity.

The overarching tenet of inclusiveness embedded in multiculturalism also extends to include persons with different abilities. In the professional realm, a number of dance companies comprised of dancers with and without disabilities, have emerged in the past two decades. Much dance education scholarship addressing the concerns of special needs populations in dance (Hill, 1976; Sherrill, 1976; Walberg, 1979; Fitt and Riordan, 1980; Boswell, 1982; Dunn and Craft, 1985; DePauw, 1986; Jay, 1987; Levete, 1993, Dunphy and Scott, 2003) has its roots in the adapted physical education movement.

More recent research focuses on the social construction of disability and the ways in which differently abled bodies challenge and disrupt conventional expectations of bodies in dance. Albright (1997) exposes the implications of the body in performance and its representation of cultural identity through gendered, racial, and social markings, including disability. Following notions of equitable contribution, Albright is critical of dances by disabled performers that reproduce dominant assumptions about dance, particularly aesthetics of grace, speed, agility, strength, and beauty. Her argument deftly illustrates the hegemonic tendency to value and privilege the abled body, even when the focus is on diversity and dancers with different abilities. Kuppers (2000) argues that the disabled dancing body challenges the audience to see past disability, and in so doing, to locate the social construction of disability in the spectator rather than in the differently abled body. For the most part, however, such research and performance remain on the periphery of academic dance and teacher preparation.2

Clearly, multicultural curricular initiatives in dance have not been met with the same candor or commitment in terms of diverse student and faculty populations. Given the expansion of non-western content and forms in dance over the past thirty years, the continued homogeneity of our programs brings up a number of additional and troublesome questions: What doesn’t happen in dance theory and practice when the conversation excludes the voices of non-whites? Conversely, what does happen when so many voices and bodies are left out of the conversation, and what are the implications? What then has been accomplished in multicultural dance? What remains unaddressed? More importantly, how will we address the shortcomings of our less-than-ambitious commitment to “uphold the ideals of equality, equity and freedom” (Carson, 1999)?

We believe that if answers are to be found, dance must first look at its grounding conceptions and guiding assumptions about what counts as “dance” and how these determinations are rooted in the long-standing exoticism of non-western dance. Second, we must also confront
our inability to look at ourselves and those who, on the surface, look like us. The whiteness of academic dance generally and dance education more specifically, creates a number of challenges for understanding the socioeconomic complexity of white experience and the multiple realities of white identity in the USA. Without underestimating the advantages of unearned power in white privilege (McIntosh, 1990), many problems surface when we ignore the ways in which whiteness is often disregarded, blurring the complexity of disadvantage and struggle regardless of skin color.

Sharon Welch (1999) cautions educators of the inherent contradictions in unquestioned, debilitating, dualistic ways of thinking that divide communities and classrooms into *us-them*.

In her book *Sweet Dreams in America*, a critical re-envisioning of difference, multicultural education, and social change, Welch asserts, “we need a sense of self and community fluid enough to learn *from and with difference and mistakes*” [our emphasis] (p. 61).

The message conveyed here summarizes the limitations of current multicultural dance approaches that focus only on learning “about” the exotic other, rather than learning “from and with” those unlike us, or those whose dancing is different from ours. At the same time, Welch also clarifies the contradictions we unwittingly harbor when we fail to recognize and learn from the social injustices in our own culture in dance. More simply, a multicultural “tourist” conception, based on superficial exposure and less-than-ambitious appreciation (such as Black History Month), leaves out real learning from and with non-western cultural forms as well as all the complex identities and experiences in our own dominant white population. As Charbeneau (2009) reminds us,

> There is not a monolithic Black, Asian American, Latino, or Native American experience nor is there a monolithic White experience. Most of us hold a combination of agent and target group memberships, thus experiencing advantage in some ways and disadvantage in others (i.e., someone who is upper-class and Latina, lower-class and white, gay and white). Doing so also helps us question the normative assumptions of Whiteness. (p. 16)

Variation and complexity in homogenous groups, especially when these groups hold dominance in a particular population like dance, are frequently masked. However, Gollnick (1992) notes that “there is often as much variation within cultural groups as there is between groups” (p. 162). When dance is normalized as white, which we believe has been the case, and whites comprise over 70 percent of our students and 80 percent of our faculty, we ignore our whiteness and continue to impose boundaries on “others.” This limits multicultural learning for all of us.
Returning briefly to Bennett’s continuum model will provide us with better ways to see our current limitations and move toward a more comprehensive and meaningful approach for multiculturalism rooted in social justice aims. If we think of how postsecondary dance approaches cultural difference, then Bennett’s model helps us map our decreasing levels of ethnocentrism in three stages, from denial to defense to minimization. The limitations we have discussed to this point indicate that multicultural efforts in dance have moved through denial: we have a knowledge of difference and understand there are other world views. Similarly, we have worked through portions of the defense stage, opening our cultural views to include other perspectives different from our own in curricula and teaching. However, our collective journey on this map appears to stall here as we consistently uplift our own cultural values as superior (McAllister and Irvine, 2000). At best, we may be on the outskirts of the least ethnocentric territory, which Bennett describes as minimization: that is, we profess our colorblindness, minimize differences, and “continue to interact within our own cultural paradigm, living under the assumption that our actions and values are shared by others” (McAllister and Irvine, 2000, p. 16).

Although as a field we’re not there yet, the other side of the continuum importantly charts increasing levels of ethnorelativism (the belief that all groups and subcultures are inherently equal), from acceptance to adaptation to integration. It is this part of the map that provides critical process guideposts for social justice in multicultural education: moving from reaction to interaction with difference, and thinking, learning, and acting from empathetic perspectives within all cultural contexts and social differences.

http://www.ijea.org/v11n6/audio/audio3.mp3

Audio Clip #3: Contemplating social justice teaching

Challenges to Multicultural Dance Education

It is often easy for progressives like ourselves to call for social change. Yet we know that change occurs slowly, and can be demoralizing for those who start with high ambitions. As dance students, we learned that many skills develop slowly, over time, and injuries and other set-backs are commonplace. We think that recognizing some of the powerful arguments against change can help us continue our efforts for progress in spite of them. Two of the most prevalent are scarce resources and the pressures of accreditation standards.

Scarcity of Resources

A frequent objection to changing the status quo is scarcity of resources: How can we have an inclusive dance program without the means to add multiple tenure track positions in non-western dance forms? Even if we had the financial resources, how would we find sufficient
faculty who meet the credentialing requirements of our institutions and accrediting organization and have the potential to earn tenure? So we are left with a “core” faculty teaching traditional courses and low-status, part-time adjunct faculty (when available) to provide the variety and spice. At least, that is true if we think about the dance curriculum in the ways we always have.

At our institutions, what we typically have done is make minor changes to the curriculum, not re-imagine it. This is especially true when departments have many tenured faculty whose strengths support the existing program. Most often we end up simply reproducing stronger versions of what we already have, with slightly more of this and a little less of that. What would a dance program look like if it started out from the beginning to be inclusive not just of different dance forms, but of different ways of thinking about dance? Do we even know what those different ways of thinking are?

There are many voices from progressive political (Rosenthal, 2009) and spiritual (Brueggemann, 2009) discourses questioning the “myth of scarcity.” Irwin (1996) writes,

> The myth of scarcity says that we have limited resources and there is not enough to go around. Thus, we must fight over what is available...This mentality pervades our society whether we are talking about food and housing, love, or self-esteem. (p. 64)

Fears about scarcity keep us from the kind of thinking that might even generate additional resources. If we have the courage to do so, faculty in higher education might re-imagine possibilities for dance curriculum for the future, i.e., beyond their own retirements and beyond simply reproducing themselves and their own interests.

**Accreditation Standards**

While acknowledging the significant contributions of our accrediting agencies (national, regional and discipline-specific) in improving dance in higher education, the existence of standards often has the side effect of helping us get better at doing the same things we have always been doing (and measure how well we are doing it), rather than completely rethinking what we are doing; the accreditation process rarely nurtures reconceptualization. As a result, we mostly get better and better at turning out students who will do more of the same (only better, of course).

Similarly, accreditation standards for K-12 teacher education programs have done much to improve teacher education in dance, but also have created obstacles to more significant social
change. In states which license dance educators for public school teaching, we are appreciative of the opportunity to provide dance education for so many young people who would otherwise not have it. At the same time, responding to the constant bureaucratic requirements and mandates of teacher education, while well-meaning, can be a major distraction to committed dance education faculty. For example, preparing dance educators for public school teaching in the USA means spending significant time in teaching them about school policies and initiatives (national and state level) and making sure they know enough about other areas of the curriculum to not just integrate learning, but also to tutor students in case their low-performing school faces sanctions as a result of national legislation (No Child Left Behind, 2004). If dance educators are to become valued members of a school faculty, they need to be able to join their colleagues in developing overall school improvement plans, so they need to understand types of assessment that do not apply directly to dance. Further, expectations that teachers be able to help all students learn, a cause in which we believe, can often lead us to an overwhelming list of differences and how to accommodate for them; sometimes, due to lack of time, we end up with student teacher candidates simply feeling sorry for those who are facing challenges but not knowing how to make a difference. We as teacher educators do not have all the answers they seek. No wonder we and our students often feel overwhelmed, and lose focus on what matters most.

A 2008 study by Peter Rennert-Ariev sheds light on why even the best accreditation standards do not generate the kinds of changes intended. He studied faculty and students in a teacher education program at a university similar to our own. Although the accrediting organization mandated such important performance-based standards as inquiry and critical reflection on teaching, students’ value for more practical and technical knowledge (specific lesson ideas that “work”) won out over intellectual engagement. Students professed to have completed tasks on which they wrote reflections, even expressing the value of such assignments, but eventually confessed to the researcher that they had not actually done all the tasks and saw them as unimportant. Rennert-Ariev found that faculty, too, became adept at what he called “bureaucratic ventriloquism,” defined as

a defensive response to external mandates that are issued within a deeply hierarchical structure of authority in teacher education. All program participants—students, faculty, field-based supervisors—were required to demonstrate compliance with external regulations. Many of them found ways to resist external compliance without jeopardizing themselves by making insincere gestures that masked their true responses. The program sent [implicit] messages not only to students but also to faculty and field-based supervisors, that superficial demonstrations of compliance with external mandates were more important that authentic intellectual engagement. (p. 125)
In other words, faculty were resisting authority from the state that made them feel disempowered and minimized their control over their professional decisions. Students also engaged in resistance to practices that did not fit their values. Yet all parties appeared compliant when they were being judged by the external standards.

The Rennert-Ariev study presents interesting issues with reference to teaching for social justice. Courage to practice resistance, whether subversive or otherwise, is requisite for social justice work. Yet active and passive resistance can be applied to anything, including social justice. We hear too many people dismissing respect for others as mere “political correctness” and know that students may simply say what they think we want to hear, even if they don’t believe it.

Rennert-Ariev further emphasizes a point we made previously: “A significant body of research has attested to teacher education as a weak intervention—sandwiched in a sense between two powerful forces: previous life history and real life experience in the classroom” (p. 122). How can we make a difference in the relatively small amount of time we have available to us in courses to prepare dance educators for school and community settings?

http://www.ijea.org/v11n6/audio/audio4.mp3

Audio Clip #4: Compassion, social action and angry people.

The [Im]Possibility for Social Justice Teaching

In the face of these kinds of arguments and distractions, it is easy to give up on any expectations for change—it seems too hard, too impossible. A statement by one of our mentors, David Purpel (2004), reminds us of this danger:

Perhaps the most serious threat of all to our hopes for a better world has been the increase of cynicism and despair about the possibilities of fundamental positive change and with it a significant loss of the energy and vitality that has fueled the impulse to create a more just and loving community. Because of this, I have become convinced that, as educators and citizens, our most important and pressing task is to confront and overcome the paralyzing and debilitating effects of cynicism and despair. (p. 10)

To move beyond cynicism and despair, we need to find sources of inspiration both within and outside dance education. We need first of all to recognize that some things are worth doing even if they do not accomplish the desired results within our lifetimes. We need to remind ourselves how far we have come—not just to congratulate ourselves and stop there, but to recognize that change is possible. Some of us may heed this advice from Purpel: “It may be
wiser for educators to see themselves as cultural and moral leaders and critics who choose to focus their efforts on educational institutions…” (2004, p. 4). Others may, for a variety of personal and professional reasons, look for quieter ways to use their power to try to change the attitudes of students within their own daily classrooms. Pierre Bourdieu (1986) reminds us that every child enters the classroom with plentiful cultural capital including languages, symbols, knowledges, aesthetic preferences, and other cultural assets (Fowler, 1997). However, “classrooms often do not value, acknowledge, or use the cultural capital of some groups of students” (Brooks & Thompson, 2005, p. 49). We may find quieter inspiration for opening our classrooms and studios to social justice when we grapple with the fact that some of our students have few or no acceptable ways to communicate and express their own cultural capital (Brooks & Thompson, 2006).

If we choose to see ourselves as cultural leaders and critics in our own classrooms, then we might also gain significant energy by seeing our roles as collaborators with our students, teaching and learning from them and the diverse cultural capital they bring to school. Repositioning the teacher and student as co-editors in the learning process, allows mutual engagement in dismantling and re-assembling multiple cultural ideas and products (McWilliam, 2008) and may move us away from despair and cynicism and instead, closer to social justice learning in the classroom.

Finding One’s Social Justice Teaching

In this section, we present a number of pedagogical approaches and project assignments that aim to bring social justice learning to the dance education classroom in concrete ways, trying to enhance student consciousness of social issues and inequities. We preface these perspectives by acknowledging the many challenges that preclude or greatly inhibit teacher educators’ ability to present social justice content in their teaching. In a climate of endless outcomes assessment, we also concede that results are uncertain, rarely quantifiable, and therefore frequently marginalized. Knowing this, we offer the examples below, some ours, others from colleagues, to stimulate and inspire readers’ own creativity for meaningful and relevant social justice projects in their own post-secondary locales and communities, as restrictive or conducive as these may be.

Social Justice and Context-based Dance Education

Isabel Marques

Isabel Marques has developed an approach to dance education that has been heavily influenced by her work with Paulo Freire in her native Brazil. She has struggled with many of the same issues we have struggled with in this essay, writing the following in 1998:
Working directly with the urban social realities of Sao Paulo city…I often felt impotent as a teacher and university consultant to…fight against the unfair…urban reality which went beyond my pedagogical work. Likewise, I understood why students who lived every day in poverty and distress were not so often willing or wishing to revisit the same problems in their school work. On the other hand, working with Freirian concepts helped me to learn that to ignore our social, cultural and political reality could lead me to an endless route of escape, of fearing the future, and feeling absolutely powerless to do something about our social situation. (p. 179)

While committed to social justice, Marques was equally committed to the art of dance, seeking a way for students to learn “about dance as they learn about themselves—and at the same time they can critically dialogue and engage with the fast technological, social and political changes the world is going through” (Marques, 2007, p. 147). Beginning with her doctoral dissertation in 1996 and continuing since that time, she has developed and practiced a process which she calls “context-based dance education,” based on a “tripod” of Dance, Education, and Society. Drawing from a Laban-based understanding of the structure of movement, as well as choreographic principles, improvisation, and dance history, she finds authentic relationships between dance content and the particular social issue to develop in the dance class. Examples of contexts she developed in her teaching are violence, bodily dialogue, communication, relationships, family, being a woman, and religion (Marques, 1998, p. 181). She has suggested that teaching specific dance contents (body, dynamics, space, improvisation, composition, dance history, etc.) should be based on the assumption that students and teachers are co-creators of dance and of the world… So, by dancing and in dancing we should be able to make a difference in the society we live in. By sharing and experiencing bodily possibilities of construction and transformation in dance classes we can also feel empowered to interact with people in different ways. (2007, p. 146)

Social Justice and Embodied Pedagogy
Sherry Shapiro

Sherry Shapiro (1998, 1999, 2008) has also pioneered ways of teaching dance as social justice, growing out of her work with dance students at a southern liberal arts college for women. A graduate of the same doctoral program that we attended, Shapiro’s work is an artful blend of theory and practice. As a critical theorist, she has written extensively about “how the body becomes a vehicle for oppression, as well as resistance and liberation” (1999, p. 79). What differentiates her work from that of many other critical theorists who write about
the body is that she brings this theory into her practice/praxis as a dance educator and choreographer.

Shapiro describes her approach as a form of “liberatory pedagogy” (1998, p. 13) integrated into a collaborative choreographic process with her students. She has illuminated this process of dance making in different publications, describing dances based on body image (1998), finding voice in a society that so often silences women (1999), and a biblical story that raises “issues of power, jealousy, domination of the stranger, compassion, and the value of women in society” (2008, p. 267).

Her recent work in South Africa (Shapiro, personal communication, 10-21-09) as part of a Fulbright Fellowship focused on female identity in post-apartheid South Africa; she used hair as a theme to discuss issues of race, gender, social class and democracy through a process of reflection on the students’ own life stories. The students included white upper middle class university dance students, black students from a local township, and mixed race students known in South Africa as “colored.” Through dialogue, students learned about differences in each other’s lives and how their culture coded women the same and differently as reflected by "hair stories."

What distinguishes Shapiro’s work from that of many other choreographers who make artistic use of social themes is that art is not her only goal. As the dancers/students tell the stories of their lives, centered on their embodied experiences, she hopes they will also develop the consciousness and the courage to engage in transformative acts beyond dance. The centrality of the embodied experience in this process is not accidental. Shapiro writes,

The body experiencing deeply is recognized as that which makes possible the reconnection to our own lives, and others; that which makes possible the recovery of our humanity from its apathetic condition….It is the material foundation upon which the desire for human liberation and social transformation rests. (1999, p. 100)

Social Justice in Pre-service Teaching

Susan Stinson

My approaches to teaching social justice issues have been more conventional in higher education classrooms, including engagement with readings from a variety of perspectives that challenge student ideas about teaching dance. I try to encourage them beyond thinking about dance education as steps and exercises and fun creative activities with a few dance history and anatomy facts added in. One area of growth for me in recent years has been figuring out how critical and reflective watching of dance can be a part of teaching for social justice.
I have long been inspired by Maxine Greene’s writings, which have helped me see that arts education and social justice work can support each other, depending on specific content and methodology. Particularly appealing to me has been Greene’s belief that arts education should not be “linked entirely to the life of the senses or the emotions, or…subsumed under rubrics like ‘literacy’” (1988, p. 13), but should emphasize moving people “to critical awareness, to a sense of moral agency, and to a conscious engagement with the world” (1978, p. 162). Greene advocated doing this by teaching students how to be more thoughtful and reflective in perceiving art, but she recognized that one has to select art works carefully to make them most relevant to social justice.

As someone whose attraction to dance had originated from the power of the movement experience in dancing, it has taken me years, and partnership with dance historian Ann Dils, to figure out how watching dance can be just as powerful. Through use of Dils’ collaborative work on curricular materials *Accelerated Motion* (Wesleyan University Press, 2007-2009)⁵, a new approach to thinking about dance literacy that I think Greene would laud, I have been able to mentor prospective and current dance educators in using dance works to help them and their students come closer to the critical awareness, sense of moral agency, and conscious engagement with the world that Greene valued. The modules in *Accelerated Motion*, designed for advanced high school and university students but adaptable for younger ones, are designed to help problematize the taken for granted, and not just in dance. For example, a module on “Bodies and Machines” looks at the issue of physical ability in dancing bodies, “from the greatly challenged body to the extraordinarily skilled body.” The module titled “Ecologies of Beauty” has been a starting point for my students to develop middle school dance units challenging ideas of what is “beautiful.” “Creating American Identities” has been used by my students as a basis for high school lessons that extend understanding of what it means to be “American.” All of these lessons include experiences in dancing and dance-making as well as watching, talking, and writing about powerful dance works.

Another assignment I have developed in recent years has been a mentoring project between university dance education students and students at a local high school with a diverse student population. It is a multifaceted project involving electronic correspondence and face-to-face encounters between the two groups, along with autobiographical reflections and readings for the university students. Some of the stories that emerge from both groups are raw and painful, challenging assumptions about what is a “normal” adolescent life. My students come to appreciate what they can learn from high school students and their own peers about realities other than their own, and that there is no single “normal” when it comes to life experiences.
Social Immersion Project
Doug Risner

The purpose of this three-part project is to facilitate dance pedagogy students’ better understanding of the social issues generated in class readings, films, and discussions through students’ actual involvement and experience with life situations different from their own. By design, I hope to create stimulating, socially-rich learning opportunities that momentarily reduce the abstractions of poverty, homelessness, hunger, mental illness, racism, gender bias, ability, and homophobia, among others. Central to this assignment is that students, although briefly and in a limited way, experience the range of other people’s existence. Students select one of the immersion projects below as described in the syllabus:

1. 74 cent meals: For one week live on $.74 per meal. You may multiply the allowable amount to create a budget for the week.6
2. Same clothes: Wear exactly the same clothes for one week. You may wash them once.
3. Volunteerism: Volunteer for five hours at a food bank, soup kitchen, homeless shelter, helpline, hospice, or other social service agency.
4. Public transportation: Use only public transportation for one week.7

The first part of the assignment gives students two weeks to determine their project choice and to plan accordingly. I encourage students to reflect upon this initial process and to contemplate the ways in which their privilege, access and socioeconomic capital influence their project selection. For example, many students immediately dismiss the public transportation project because no public transportation is available near their residence, they couldn’t give up their car for a week, or their rehearsal schedule would dictate late night use of public transportation (unsafe in the urban setting of the university). In each of these instances, I encourage students to think more deeply about the privilege that allows them options; many people don’t have these kinds of choices in their lives. Students often carry these early realizations with them throughout the entire project.

The second stage of the assignment is completion of the project itself. The vast majority complete the project without incident. Some, however, fail on first attempt and quickly choose a different project. Others willingly confess their missteps and failures at the end of the project. For example, Felicia recounted her dismay that, out of pure habit, she accidentally bought a vending machine bottled water ($1.00 USD) and thereby had to skip her planned 74 cent lunch, as well as 26 cents worth of her evening dinner meal.

The third part of the project results in a reflective paper and its presentation to the class. Using what they have experienced and learned in the immersion project, students are asked to tie
together important aspects from the class readings, in-class assignments, films and discussions that correlate to their experience of doing the project and the development of their own personal pedagogy. As a midterm paper, the third part of the social immersion project allows students to go more in-depth about issues, concerns, and questions about teaching and education in relationship to race/ethnicity, social class, gender, and privilege, among other topics they self identify.

I realize that these learning moments at best reduce these abstractions only momentarily. Without rationalizing the relatively minimal impact of these projects, students do overwhelmingly relate the immediacy and visceral nature of learning in these experiences and the ways in which only reading about social inequity leaves out far too much and doesn’t help them “learn.”

**Making the Strange Familiar and the Familiar Strange**

In this essay we have attempted to look at the dance educator’s role in teaching for social change, while acknowledging the challenges, fears and possibilities. We have examined the shortcomings and limitations of multicultural education, as well as some of the arguments and distractions that teachers committed to social justice teaching confront. The approaches described in the previous section, though diverse, provide a segue to summarize this work and compel us to teach not only as dance educators but also as cultural workers and as members of the human race.

Each of the pedagogical perspectives heard earlier is rooted in student learning that seeks to make the strange familiar and the familiar strange in student’s lived experience of social (in)equity. In this respect, we try to reduce the abstraction and distance inherent in learning from (even the most innovative) texts, readings, films, and discussions. Though relatively modest, these projects are meant to help students reflect upon the “strangeness” of their own lives as they become more familiar with the lives and experiences of others. If our pedagogies and programs produce students who can move well but not think in empathetic, reflective, and visceral ways, we risk producing dance educators who are skilled technicians, ones able to teach pliés but incapable of moving fluidly between and within diverse populations in a rapidly changing world. We think the skills students develop as dancers—to bend and to stretch, becoming stronger and more flexible in mind and body—can be an important part of this process, as long as teachers help them make connections between the dance studio and classroom and the world beyond these special environments.

This essay began with the recognition that preparing dance educators means preparing them to enter a troubled world, a reality described by Maxine Greene over twenty years ago as one filled with “homelessness, hunger, pollution, crime, censorship, arms build-ups, and threats of
war, even as it includes the amassing of fortunes, consumer goods of unprecedented appeal, world travel opportunities, and the flickering faces of the ‘rich and famous’ on all sides” (Greene, 1988, p. 12). Today’s reality is no less troubling, making it tempting for anyone to retreat to the safe, the comfortable, the trivial, and the oversimplified.

Still, knowledge alone will not solve these challenges or the troubled world educators confront. There are those who believe that if people understand the gravity of a particular injustice, they will take action by “doing the right thing.” The pedagogical approaches relayed earlier provide committed, if modest examples of human will to do “good.” At the same time, many obstacles—from mundane personal perceptions to a person’s core values—impede informed action and the will to resist dominant structures, including school/institutional constraints as well as local restrictions, whether perceived or real. In recovering voices from our past and discovering new ones, we are inspired to consider new possibilities for reconceptualizing teacher preparation. Through sharing these voices in this essay, we hope to extend this energy to others and expand the community of dance educators seeking similar goals. Our dialogues in the process of writing have convinced us of the importance of community and colleagueship in any arduous effort. Alone, we can lose heart. Even together, we may not be able to change the world in our lifetimes, but we can contribute to the process of recreating the world. We close with an important reminder from a mentor we have shared:

I have concluded that there is an inverse relationship between the significance of a problem and its openness to solution. Put more baldly, I do not believe that our most significant problems can be solved. Problems surely can and should be ameliorated, suffering and pain reduced, justice and equity increased, peace furthered, violence lessened, meaning strengthened. To accomplish even such limited gains is exalting and exhilarating for as the Talmud teaches, “It is not for us to finish the task—but neither are we free to take no part in it.” (Purpel, 2004, p. 107)

Notes

1. While a good deal of research in non-western dance has focused primarily on African and African American-based dance forms, it should be noted that curricular diversity initiatives comprise additional cultural dance forms (see the following multicultural teaching texts in dance: Dils, Gee, & Brookoff, 2007; Vissicaro, 2004; Dils & Albright, 2001; Highwater, 1992; and Jonas, 1992).
2. Since we think discourse about the differently abled is critical in expanding our ideas of who can dance, what dance is, and what it might be, we are mindful that our language in the remainder of this essay does not explicitly include this marginalized group.

3. Marques’ work with her educational dance company since 1996 extends and transforms these "contextualized lessons" into dance performances. Readers who wish to view examples may find them at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P4Ia8PnWwiU and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eypEavGykNY

4. Initially Shapiro planned to use skin color as a thematic tool for her research in South Africa. Wary that analyses based on socially-constructed ideas about skin color might be too sensitive, she later chose to focus on hair. For reader’s familiar with Jawole Willa Jo Zollar’s Hairstories project (2001-04), Shapiro indicates that the similarities between her research and Zollar’s Urban Bush Women project are purely coincidental.

5. Accelerated Motion is co-directed by Ann Cooper Albright and Ann Dils. Albright, Dils, and project administrator Emily Quinn made editorial contributions to the mentioned units.

6. Figures are based on Michigan Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) food assistance for a family of three at/or below the poverty line. 74 cents per meal in the USA is equivalent to .57 EUR; .51 GBP; .82 AUD; 5.12 CNY; 5.61 ZAR.

7. Public transportation in the United States is not widely available; however, many low-wage earners, especially in metropolitan areas, depend solely on public transit systems.

References


**About the Authors**

Doug Risner, Ph.D., M.F.A., is Associate Professor and former Chair of the Maggie Allesee Department of Dance at Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, USA. He is editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Dance Education* and publishes his research nationally and internationally. Risner contributes regularly to *Research in Dance Education, Arts Education Policy Review, Selected Research in Dance, Dance Studio Life* and numerous international volumes. His new book, *Stigma and Perseverance in the Lives of Boys Who Dance*, is published by Mellen Press.

Susan Stinson, Ed.D., is Professor and former Head of the Department of Dance at University of North Carolina-Greensboro, USA. She has published and presented her scholarly work in dance education nationally and internationally for over 30 years.
International Journal of Education & the Arts

Editors
Liora Bresler
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.

Margaret Macintyre Latta
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, U.S.A.

Managing Editor
Alex Ruthmann
University of Massachusetts Lowell, U.S.A.

Associate Editors
Jolyn Blank
University of South Florida, U.S.A.

Chee Hoo Lum
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Editorial Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter F. Abbs</td>
<td>University of Sussex, U.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Denzin</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran Egan</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Eisner</td>
<td>Stanford University, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magne Espeland</td>
<td>Stord/Haugesund University College, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Irwin</td>
<td>University of British Columbia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary McPherson</td>
<td>University of Melbourne, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Sefton-Green</td>
<td>University of South Australia, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Stake</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stinson</td>
<td>University of North Carolina—Greensboro, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Sullivan</td>
<td>Teachers College, Columbia University, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Thompson</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth (Beau) Valence</td>
<td>Indiana University, Bloomington, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Webster</td>
<td>Northwestern University, U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>